



SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES

**EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND
ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT:
THE CASE OF A MEAT CORPORATION IN NAMIBIA**

by

**Vivian Kaposambo
(KPSVIV001)**

A research project submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the
Degree of Master of Philosophy in People Management

Faculty of Commerce
University of Cape Town
2016

Supervisor: Professor Jeffrey Bagrain

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works of other people has been attributed, cited and referenced.

Signature:

Date:

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge several individuals for their invaluable support in the success of this dissertation. Thanks to my God for His unmerited Grace, Mercy and Strength that enabled me to complete this thesis. To my spiritual fathers, Apostle Kingsley Gyasi, Reverend Vuyo Mhambi and Reverend Mandla Mhambi: thank you for the love, support and encouragement.

I would like to acknowledge my lovely mom, Ms Emilie Utarera Kaposambo, for her love and continued support and belief in my ability. In addition, I am grateful to Mr Lucky Shindume, my partner and love, for the exceptional support and relentless confidence in my potential. To my beautiful daughter, Okeri Kaposambo, for her patience and understanding and allowing her mommy time out to complete her studies.

I would like to thank and acknowledge the invaluable guidance and expert assistance of my supervisor, Professor Jeffrey Bagraim, who provided continuous support throughout and never gave up on me during the research process.

To my employer, for giving me a career opportunity to pursue my dream of completing my Master's degree studies.

Lastly, I would like to extend my gratitude to my family and friends (most especially my Lighthouse Chapel International Namibia family) who have been supportive throughout the years.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

ABSTRACT

Performance appraisal is a human resources function that many organisations undertake. Organisations should therefore try to understand why many often perceive their performance system to be unfair. The purpose of this study was to examine employee perception of performance appraisal and its relationship with their organisational commitment. Using a justice approach, this study considers issues regarding perceived fairness, trust, process clarity, and quality of communication regarding the performance appraisal system. Performance appraisal is a tool, which if managed well, will increase work performance.

A quantitative research approach was used and a cross-sectional field survey generated the primary research data. An online survey consisting of 55 questions was e-mailed to 150 staff members who participate in the performance appraisal system at a Meat processing plant in Namibia. Regression analysis was employed to examine the relationship between employee perception of performance appraisal and organisational commitment. The results of the statistical analyses show that very weak to moderate relationships exist between organisational commitment and employees' perceptions' of performance appraisal. The results indicate that for an organisation to obtain employee commitment, the organisation should ensure that performance appraisal is a company-wide system that is well understood, fair and clearly communicated to the employees. Furthermore, managers should create an environment within the organisation to enhance employees' perceptions about the performance appraisal system.

Keywords: organisational commitment, organisational justice, performance appraisal, performance management.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
ABSTRACT	IV
LIST OF TABLES	VII
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	VIII
INTRODUCTION	9
Background	9
Research Aims	11
Research Question	11
Structure of the Dissertation	11
LITERATURE REVIEW	12
Introduction	12
Performance Management	12
Performance Management Process	14
Employee Perception of Performance Appraisal	15
Organisational Commitment	16
Organisational Justice Approach to Performance Appraisal	17
Performance Appraisal and Trust Theory	19
Performance Appraisal and Organisational Commitment	20
Research Propositions	21
Conclusion	21
METHOD	22
Introduction	22
Research Design	22
Research Participants	23
Procedures	27
Measures	27
Statistical Analyses	29
Summary	30
RESULTS	30
Data Screening	30
Psychometric Properties	31
Exploratory factor analysis	31
Descriptive Statistics	38
Reliability Analysis	38
Correlation Analysis	39
Regression Analysis	41
Final Notes	43
DISCUSSION	43
Introduction	43
Contributions of the Study	43
Findings	44
Implications of Findings	46
Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research	46
CONCLUSION	47

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

REFERENCES	48
APPENDICES	55
Appendix A: Performance Appraisal at a Meat Corporation of Namibia	55

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of respondents (N=111) _____	26
Table 2: Results of the factor analysis on the OrgComm scale _____	32
Table 3: Results of the factor analysis on the EPA scales _____	33
Table 4: Results of the factor analysis on the Trust scale _____	34
Table 5: Results of the factor analysis on the Organisational Justice scales _____	35
Table 6: Results of the factor analysis on the Demographic Control Variable scales _____	36
Table 7: Results of the factor analysis on the Control Variable scales _____	37
Table 8: Descriptive statistics and distribution of the composite variables _____	38
Table 9: Correlation matrix and reliability analysis _____	40
Table 10: A five-step hierarchical multiple regression _____	42

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

C	Communication variable
CL	Clarity variable
CV	Control variable
CVD	Control variable: Demographic
DJ	Distributive Justice
DV	Dependent variable
EPA	Employee perception of performance appraisal
ET	Ethical Views variable
F	Fairness variable
HR	Human resources
IR	Resource Inadequacy variable
IT	Task Independence variable
IV	Independent variable
JA	Job Autonomy variable
JS	Job Security variable
KMO	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin
KUT	Klein et al. (2012), Unidimensional, Target-free dimension
N.S	Not significant
OC	Organisational Commitment variable
OrgComm	Organisational Commitment
PA	Performance appraisal
PJ	Procedural Justice
SMART	Specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
SUP	Supervising variable
T	Trust variable
TN	Tenure variable
U	Understanding variable

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

INTRODUCTION

Background

Dargham (2010) argued that the most successful organisations in the 21st century would be those that focus on a more integrated human resource (HR) system. The role of human resources has become progressively vital, and organisations should increase the emphasis on re-engineering their processes. Among all the human resource processes, performance management is the most critical for the success of any organisation.

The Human Resource Management field has been keenly interested in adding value to organisations, which has led to the focus on high performance work systems (Farndale, Hope-Hailey & Kelliher, 2011). Performance management enables organisations to engage employees for optimal performance, provide development, reward employees and drive organisational performance and sustainability. In ensuring that performance management is a process that attains the right outcomes, organisations need to ensure that the process is fair and transparent and that there is acceptance from the employees. In many instances, employees form perceptions about the system and thus, the trust relationship between the organisation and its employees is disputed. Employee perception of performance management can affect an organisation in either a positive or a negative way. The effect or impact can be positive and result in good company performance or negative, which results in poor company performance.

The perception of unfairness within the performance management system can adversely affect employees' organisational commitment, job satisfaction, trust in management and their performance at work. Reserachers ((Mobley, 1977; Riketta, 2002; VanVoorhis and Levinson, 2006) have noted that factors such as job autonomy, role conflict, resource inadequacy, task independence and job security have an impact on employees expected outcome on job satisfaction, organisational commitment and intent to quit. Brown, Haytt and Benson (2010) found that there is a direct relationship between performance management satisfaction and employee outcomes, which mainly comprise satisfaction and commitment among employees. They further explained that psychological contracts and justice literature suggest employees' experiences of the performance appraisal process may affect their willingness to be committed to their organisation (Brown et al., 2010). Hendrix, Robbins,

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Miller and Summers (1998) explained how good, relational, psychosocial contracts between employers and employees provide the basis of high-quality performance appraisal experiences that increase employees' perceived commitment to the organisation and improve their attitudes and behaviours at work. As a result, quality performance appraisal tends ultimately to improve organisational effectiveness by promoting organisational commitment (Fletcher & Williams, 1996). However, Brown et al. (2010) disputed the notion that performance appraisal processes contribute to higher levels of organisational commitment. Instead, they argued that employees do not regard performance appraisal as a legitimate tool of human resource management.

Fakharyan, Jalilvand, Dini and Dehafarin (2012) noted that performance management helps in the success of the organisation by realising the strategic purpose and increasing effective working processes through continuous improvement of an individual's performance. Performance management is a process that many organisations embrace and practise; however, there seems to be a perception that the system is not being employed as intended. The system is often perceived as being biased and subjective, with irrelevant criteria being used to appraise the performance of employees. In addition, the system is perceived to be unable to provide feedback on time, and there is dissatisfaction with the implementation of the process. As a result, these perceptions of the system have a negative impact on the performance of the organisation and its employees.

Negative perceptions of employees result in the perceived outcomes of the system not being realised. Rajendran (2008) agreed and stated that once there is a negative perception, there is a significant influence on the overall job dissatisfaction of employees and a decrease in the expected work outcomes in the form of work performance, commitment and turnover intentions.

Employees are more likely to be receptive and supportive of the performance management system if they perceive the process as a useful source of feedback that helps to improve their performance (Mullins, 2007). The way in which employees perceive the system has an overall effect on the success of the system and the organisation. The outcome of a performance management system for employees and the organisation should include commitment, job satisfaction and improved organisational performance. This study,

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

therefore, sought to investigate employee perception of performance management and its relationship with organisational commitment.

Research Aims

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between perceptions of performance appraisal and organisational commitment at a Meat Corporation of Namibia. Specifically, this research aims to enhance existing theoretical knowledge concerning employee perception of performance appraisal (EPA) by examining several distinct dimensions of employee perception. In doing so, it is possible to determine the relative significance of employees' perceptions regarding performance appraisal and the impact on their commitment to the organisation. Additionally, this study seeks to understand how an organisational justice approach to performance appraisal helps explain the relationship between performance appraisal practices and organisational commitment (Macky & Boxall, 2007; McAllister, 1995; Farndale et al., 2011).

Research Question

What is the relationship between employee perception of performance appraisal and organisational commitment at a Meat Corporation of Namibia?

Structure of the Dissertation

The section above presented an introduction to the study, posed the research question and outlined the research objectives. The following section examines the literature reviewed and provides a theoretical framework for the relationship between organisational commitment and employee perception of the performance appraisal system. The literature review concludes by presenting propositions for the study. This is followed by a description of the research method that investigates the research design, the research participants, the relevant measures and the statistical analysis, which renders the study reproducible. The results section presents the findings and statistical analysis data. Lastly, contributions of the study, summary of the findings, limitations, recommendations for future study and conclusions of the study are provided.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This section outlines in detail the review conducted of literature regarding the concepts of performance management, organisational commitment and the organisational justice and trust theories that link the relationship between performance management and organisational commitment.

Performance Management

Performance management is the integrated and often strategic approach for continued success in improving the performance of employees within an organisation (Armstrong & Baron, 1998). Performance management is thus, an organisational tool that is used to sustain and improve performance for the benefit of both the employee and employer. Organisations rely heavily on the performance management tool to drive their success.

Performance management focuses on the range of activities undertaken by an organisation with the intention of improving organisational effectiveness through enhancing the performance of a target person or group (DeNisi, 2000). It is noted that there is a relationship between the variables, employee and the organisation, and the perceived outcome of performance management on the effectiveness and success of these variables. In this regard, performance management viewed from a system-thinking perspective is an ongoing approach to improve results through rational and evidence-based decision-making, resulting in a continuous organisational learning focused on accountability of performance (Mucha, 2009). As an integrated process, performance management ensures that managers work with their employees to set expectations, to measure and review results and thereafter, to reward performance in order to improve employee performance with the aim of achieving a positive effect on the success of the organisation (Mondy, Noe & Premeaux, 2002).

Performance management involves managing employee outcomes through measuring them against agreed and set expectations. These outcomes can be measured using different

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

tools, of which performance appraisal is one. Performance appraisal is an evaluation tool that organisations use to track and manage employees' performance (Erdogan, 2003). The performance appraisal tool is used to identify, evaluate and develop work performance of the employees in the organisation to ensure that proper tracking and measuring of employee expectations is carried out.

Authors have defined performance appraisal in different ways; however, there is a common understanding of this tool (Erdogan, 2003). Nzube (2007) defined performance appraisal as a means of evaluating employees' work performance over a set period. Similarly, DeNisi (2000) defined performance appraisal as a system whereby an organisation assigns "scores" to indicate the level of performance of a target person or group. Performance appraisal is a tool that identifies what is being appraised, how it is appraised as well as who is carrying out the appraisal. Dessler (2000) explained that performance appraisal is a process that involves evaluating how well employees perform in their jobs according to set expectations and standards. These are sets of standards with which to measure employee performance and the expectations that an organisation requires the employees to meet. Venkataraman Rao (2005) opined that performance appraisal is a method of evaluating the behaviour of employees in the workplace that normally includes both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of job performance. Fletcher (2001) agreeably also defined performance appraisals as activities through which organisations seek to assess employees, develop their competencies, enhance their performance and reward them.

DeNisi and Pritchard (2006) defined performance appraisal as a discrete, formal, organisational-sanctioned event. However, with increased advancement and development, performance appraisal is being used as a tool to enhance organisational performance and identify development opportunities for employees. The work of Kaynak (2003) concurs and states that performance appraisal is not only an evaluation activity but also a dynamic process that should be viewed as a plan to improve performance of the employees and the organisation. In order to enhance performance appraisal, researchers have designed better systems that are more behavioural-based (Bretz, Milkovich & Read, 1992) and that better define the essential job functions of employees and the 360-degree feedback mechanisms that allow for cross-validation via multiple raters.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Performance appraisal is a system within performance management that enhances and enables the performance management process to deliver the results effectively. DeNisi and Pritchard (2006) referred to performance appraisal as:

[The] discrete, formal, organisationally sanctioned event, usually not occurring more frequently than once or twice a year, which has clearly stated performance dimensions and/or criteria that are used in the evaluation process. (p. 254)

Roberts (2001) elaborated that performance management involves establishing the corporate department, the team and the individual objectives that use performance appraisal systems. For monitoring the effectiveness of the performance management system and the interventions, appropriate reward strategies, development strategies and plans, training, feedback, communication and coaching as well as career planning should be implemented.

Performance management is a system within the human resources function that needs to be managed and processed effectively. If the system is not managed effectively, the outcome or results thereof will have an impact on the overall success of the organisation. Many stakeholders are involved in managing a performance system, each playing an important role. By managing the process, a level of accountability and commitment is expected from each individual. Human resource management is the custodian of the process and thus, it needs to ensure that the process has a structure and policies in place that support the system. The two most important stakeholders in performance management systems are the employees and the line manager, and full responsibility and accountability is expected of these key players. Aguinis (2009) explained that in the performance appraisal process, a critical stakeholder is the employee, and the performance appraisal process is designed to stimulate employee performance. Line managers should ensure that clear goals and targets are set, adapting the specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) approach, originally delineated by Raia (1965) for the typical goals.

Performance Management Process

The performance management process is derived from the organisation's strategy and vision that have been designed by the executive management of the organisation. A well-crafted performance management system focuses on the organisation's strategic priorities and identifies the activities needed to maximise the extent to which employees

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

exhibit the desired behaviours and produce the intended results (Cascio & Aguinis, 2005). For organisations to set their goals and achieve their strategies, performance appraisal is one of the tools that guides and sets the organisations' expectations of their employees (Bacal, 2004).

Only once an organisation has determined its strategies and understood its objectives can a performance agreement be set. The performance agreement will then provide guidance to the employees in terms of which activities and actions will help meet the organisation's set of expectations (Gardner, Moynihan, Park & Wright, 2001). Setting performance goals and providing feedback are important performance appraisal activities in organisations (Earley, Northcraft, Lee & Lituchy, 1990; Fletcher, 2001; Neubert, 1998) and are key in increasing individual performance. Management needs to convey their individual goals to the rest of the organisation. An agreement or contract between employees and the organisation needs to be set up, in which the goals or targets are determined. Preferably, the goals or targets should be impactful and should not be excessive in number. Once these targets are set, measurable, realistic and specific outputs need to be determined, and these should be tracked and evaluated on an ongoing basis rather than as a once-off event. In many organisations, the performance system is conducted once or twice a year (Bersin, 2008).

Performance management is a process that needs to be evaluated and monitored on an ongoing basis to avoid the process being viewed as ineffective. There are 18 individual behavioural factors that are crucial to the effective implementation and systematic use of a performance management system (De Waal, 2003). These individual behaviours focus on internal management control, organisational culture, alignment of managers' responsibilities to the system and the managers' understanding of the nature of performance management (De Waal, 2003).

Employee Perception of Performance Appraisal

Employees are the recipients of performance management, and how they perceive the system or process has an impact on the system. According to Dusterhoff, Cunningham and MacGregor (2014), satisfaction with the performance appraisal process depends on whether those being appraised perceive it as morally justified or not. Fletcher (2004) stated that employees' consultation is vital because it enhances ownership of the system and its

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

effectiveness. Purcell, Kinnie, Hutchinson et al. (2003) denoted that perceptions influence employees' level of outcome by affecting the way they think, feel and behave. Dusterhoff et al. (2014) suggested that dissatisfaction with the appraisal process and the failure of performance reviews to change how people work has often been linked to lower organisational commitment and increased intentions to resign.

The success of a performance appraisal system depends on how employees perceive and experience the process. According to Jawahar (2007), the success of a performance appraisal system may well depend on loyalties, perceptions of fairness and reactions of employees to important aspects of the appraisal process. According to Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland (2007), employees' perceptions of the fairness of performance appraisal could influence their level of organisational commitment.

Fakharyan et al. (2012) explained that if employees are satisfied with the implementation of the performance management system, they will regard it in a positive manner and exert every possible effort to carry out the responsibilities and duties assigned to them efficiently and effectively and thus will make the organisation to which they belong more productive and successful. Alwadaei (2010) explained that for the performance system to be successful, it is very important for the organisation to know how the employees responsible for conducting appraisals, as well as those being appraised, generally perceive the system. Despite recent advancements in improving and enhancing performance systems, critics continue to argue that performance management systems are not consistently effective (Atkins & Wood, 2002; DeNisi & Kluger, 2000).

Organisational Commitment

Commitment is a specific type of psychological bond between an individual and a target (Klein, Molly & Brinsfield, 2012). Klein et al. (2012) emphasised that not all bonds should be regarded as commitment and explained that individuals can experience bonds differently. If all bonds were classified as commitment, this would result in:

- amorphous conceptualisations that lack construct clarity;
- the distinctiveness of commitment being obscured;
- confounded definitions and measures; and

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

- cumbersome models for examining multiple commitments (Klein et al., 2012, p. 133).

Meyer (2009) defined commitment as an internal binding force between an individual and a target or a course of action relevant to that target. Meyer and Allen (1991) developed a three-component model that described commitment as consisting of the affective, normative and continuance models.

In a re-definition of commitment, Klein et al. (2012) nullify the perceptions that all workplace bonds are committed to the employing organisation and believe that commitment is a particular bond and not necessarily the only bond with the target. Bonds within workplaces differ and can be experienced differently by employees. Klein et al. (2012) identified four bond types that explain the different types of psychological bonds, namely acquiescence, instrumental, commitment and identification. The authors define acquiescence bonds as the perceived absence of alternative situations and the consequent viewing of the bond by the individual as compulsory, resulting in compliance or resignation to the bond (Klein et al., 2012). Klein et al. (2012) define instrumental bonds as bonds that focus on the costs or losses that would be incurred if the bond were severed. These bonds are largely transactional and are experienced as the calculated acceptance of bonds (Klein, Cooper, Molly & Swanson, 2014). Commitment bonds in this context are characterised by volition, dedication and responsibility to the target but do not require the merging of self to the target (Klein et al., 2012). An identification bond is a bond defined by the merging of the self with the target (Mael & Ashforth, 1992). Meyer, Allen and Gellatly (1990) stated that although all forms of commitment are expected to bind employees to the organisation and reduce turnover, one of the major reasons for distinguishing between them is the belief that they can have different implications for on-the-job behaviour.

Organisational Justice Approach to Performance Appraisal

Organisational justice is defined as the study of fairness at work (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001). Brown et al. (2010) explained that performance appraisal has a sizeable effect on a number of important employee attitudes, such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment and turnover intentions. Furthermore, justice perceptions are related to organisational commitment attitudes (Farndale et al., 2011), trust in management and intention to resign (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). Performance and organisational citizenship behaviours

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

(Moorman, 1991) serve as criteria for effectiveness in performance appraisals. Consequently, improving individuals' perceptions of fairness will also improve the outcomes that are important to organisations, such as performance, job satisfaction and commitment (Hornibrook, Fearn and Lazzarin, 2009).

For performance management practices to have the effect of achieving high commitment, Farndale et al. (2011) argued that in terms of the process and the outcomes, these practices depend on the extent to which employees perceive them to be fair. The outcome of high commitment can be studied by exploring not only the practices implemented but also how they are experienced by employees (Gratton & Truss, 2003). Greenberg (1990) explained that organisational justice plays an important intermediate role in this relationship and has been found to explain a wide range of employee behaviours (Farndale et al., 2011; Greenberg, 1990). Furthermore, Greenberg (1990) highlights the importance of fairness and justice ideals in the effective management of organisations. As discussed in literature, organisational justice can be classified into the two most prevalent forms, distributive and procedural justice (Farndale et al., 2011).

Distributive Justice

Farndale et al. (2011) defined distributive justice as the perceived equity of outcomes for individuals and procedural justice as the individual's perception of the fairness of the process carried out. Distributive justice deals with the decisions made in the appraisal process and the content of fairness (Tang & Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996). Procedural justice relates to the making of decisions in a fair manner (Tang & Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996). Measures such as employee commitment, job satisfaction and trust management are particularly related to perceptions of procedural justice in performance appraisal (Farndale et al., 2011; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Greenberg (1990) explained that distributive justice could be related to the outcome of satisfaction, such as the levels of fairness in performance evaluations and reward.

Procedural Justice

Brown et al. (2010) explained that procedural justice is related to organisational commitment, which can be measured by four indicators:

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

- *Clarity*: refers to the extent to which employees are clear about the role and purpose of the performance appraisal and how the process will determine their fate within the organisation.
- *Communication*: the extent to which information flows between employees and their supervisors. It is the extent to which employees are given opportunities to express their viewpoints and the extent to which their viewpoints are valued. It validates a sense of belonging to the organisation.
- *Trust*: refers to the level of trust employees have in their supervisors. Greenberg (1986) denoted that employees are more likely to trust that their supervisors will rate their performance appraisals positively if they believe their supervisors to be competent and to have a good knowledge of their job duties.
- *Performance appraisal fairness*: refers to fair treatment of the process. Fortin (2008) explained that fairness has an impact on the quality of the outcomes of the performance appraisal process. Employees need to be fairly treated throughout the process.

Organisational justice explains how employee behaviour and attitudes can trigger employee commitment in organisations (Farndale et al., 2011). Farndale et al. (2011) anticipated that employees' perceptions of the organisation's justice in the performance appraisal practices would mediate the relationship between the experienced performance appraisal practices and employee commitment.

Performance Appraisal and Trust Theory

Literature suggests that organisational justice plays a mediating role in the relationship between performance management practices and organisational commitment (McAllister, 1995), and trust creates conditions that have an emotional impact on employee responses to commitment and performance appraisal practices (Farndale et al., 2011; Macky & Boxall, 2007). Trust can be defined as "a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behaviours of another" (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt & Camerer, 1998, p. 395). For the purpose of this research, trust is defined as the relationship between an employee and a line manager. Aryee, Budhwar and Chen (2002) explained that trust could be viewed from a macro perspective of the relationship between the employer and senior management and a micro perspective of the relationship between the employee and the line manager.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

According to Cummings (1983), performance appraisal can have an effect on an employee's trust in the organisation. He explained that self-appraisal in a performance evaluation system is positively associated with trust (Cummings, 1983). Trust can be enhanced through feedback of appraisal results to the appraisee. Mayer and Davis (1999) explained that should the performance appraisal system reflect the employees' true performance, employees' trust in the performance appraisal is enhanced. Employees' link to true performance, with rewards and recognition based on the performance appraisal, forms the basis of their trust in the performance appraisal system. In conclusion, they denoted that trust is affected by an appraisal system that increases the perceived linkages between performance and rewards, which affect the trust relationship (Mayer & Davis, 1999).

Farndale et al. (2011) established that there is a link between employee behaviour, their attitudes (such as trust in the organisation and perceptions of justice and commitment) and their experiences of performance appraisal practices. Aryee et al. (2002) state that trust in the organisation partly mediates the relationship between procedural and distributive justice and the employee's attitudes of organisational commitment, turnover intentions and job satisfaction.

Performance Appraisal and Organisational Commitment

Performance appraisal enables employers to drive organisational performance in order to attain the organisational objectives with the effect of enhancing the organisational commitment of employees. Sojoudi and Farahbod (2012) defined organisational commitment as a type of emotional attachment to the values and goals of the organisation. Thus, if there is an absence of organisational commitment, the quantity and quality of work will be reduced (Sojoudi & Farahbod, 2012). In their study, Neha and Himanshu (2015) explained that employees who are satisfied with the performance appraisal systems of their organisations are committed to their organisations.

A performance appraisal system that is fair and transparent has an influence on how employees show commitment towards their organisation. A study by Farndale et al. (2011) supports the finding that an employee's experience of performance appraisal is a key variable that determines the employee's level of commitment. Hai and Mian (2007) denoted that

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

performance appraisal, including system and process facets, has a significant effect on organisational commitment and that organisational commitment plays a mediating role between performance appraisal and employee behaviour.

According to Farndale et al. (2011), performance appraisal experiences are related to employees' perceptions of organisational justice, and there is a positive relationship between perceived organisational justice and employee commitment. These perceptions mediate the relationship between the experience of performance appraisal and commitment levels. The study also showed that trust is very strongly and positively related to employee commitment and that the levels of trust employees have in their line managers affect the extent to which performance appraisal practices are linked to higher commitment (Farndale et al., 2011). The link between performance appraisal and commitment is fully mediated by perceptions of organisational justice and trust (Farndale et al., 2011). The findings suggest that an increased focus on improving perceptions of justice by ensuring line management is capable of carrying out performance appraisal practices may help improve commitment to the organisation during change (Farndale et al., 2011). Cheng (2014) explained that performance appraisal is highly linked with employees' perceptions of organisational justice, while perceptions of organisational justice are closely aligned to levels of organisational commitment. This implies a direct relationship between performance appraisal and organisational commitment that is partially mediated by organisational justice perceptions.

Research Propositions

Proposition 1: There is a perceived relationship between performance appraisal as experienced by employees and levels of employee commitment to the organisation.

Proposition 2: The organisational justice approach to performance appraisal helps to predict the relational perceptions regarding performance appraisal and organisational commitment.

Conclusion

The literature review introduced employee perception of performance appraisal and established the need to explore further the relationship between employee perception of performance appraisal and organisational commitment. It is evident that performance appraisal has the capacity to highlight the contributions of individual employees to group and

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

organisational goals and in so doing, has a positive impact on organisational commitment (Kuvaas, 2006).

In exploring this relationship, Farndale et al. (2011) conducted a study that found a positive relationship between employee commitment and employees' experience of the performance appraisal process. The present study provides a holistic exploration of the relationship between employees' perceptions of the performance appraisal process and organisational commitment.

METHOD

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between organisational commitment and employee perception of performance appraisal in a Meat processing plant. This section describes the research method by investigating the research design, the research participants, the relevant measures and the statistical analysis, which makes the study reproducible.

Research Design

For this research, a descriptive study was conducted. Descriptive research is social research with the primary aim of describing rather than explaining a particular phenomenon (Bless & Higson-Smith, 2000). Neuman (2000) emphasised that descriptive research presents a picture of the specific details of a social situation, setting or relationship. Descriptive research was more relevant to the topic of this research study because the study focused on describing employee perception of performance management and the relationship it has with organisational commitment.

Fouché (2002) indicated that a research approach refers to a quantitative or qualitative approach or a combined quantitative-qualitative approach. A quantitative approach is more appropriate to determine the extent of the problem, issue or phenomenon by quantifying the variability. A qualitative approach is more appropriate to explore the nature of the problem, issue or phenomenon without quantifying. In utilising the quantitative approach, the main

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

objective is to describe the variations in a phenomenon, situation or attitude. Examples include a description of an observed situation, the historical enumeration of events, an account of different opinions of different people regarding an issue and a description of working conditions in a particular working environment. This study adopted a quantitative approach. Quantitative research allowed the study to focus on investigating employee perception of performance appraisal and the relationship it has with organisational commitment. This involved examining the relationship between variables of interest, for example, perceptions of different categories, different levels of employees and local comparisons. In this study, the purpose was to gain insight into each employee's commitment to the Meat processing plant as an organisation.

This study will also contribute to understanding the opinions of employees regarding their present jobs. It measured employee perception and experience, combined items to assess the overall quality of the employees' performance appraisal experiences and measured distributive and procedural justice. This allowed the researcher to gain a better understanding of employee perception of the performance appraisal system at a Meat processing plant.

Research Participants

A population represents an entire group of people, events or elements of interest (Creswell, 2014). According to Adler and Clark (2014), a population is a group of elements from which a researcher samples and to which they may wish to generalise. For this study, the selected sample size comprised female and male management and non-management staff members employed at a Meat processing plant in Namibia.

The sample size comprised 150 staff members (managers and non-managers) employed at a Meat processing plant. In general, one of the most important issues in sample design is the size of the sample required for the estimates obtained in a sample survey to be reliable enough to meet the objectives of the survey. An estimator is said to be precise if it has a low variance, that is, if it produces values that centre increasingly around the expected value as the sample size (N) increases (Pallant, 2010).

Neuman (2003), cited in De Vos, Strydom, Fouche and Delpont (2011), stated that the factors influencing the size of the sample are heterogeneity of the population, desired degree

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

of accuracy, type of sample and the number of variables in which the data is grouped. The recommended sample size for a given population size, the level of confidence and the margin of error can thus be calculated.

In determining the sample size for this study, the following formula was used:

$$n = \frac{k^2 pq}{E^2} = \frac{1.96^2 \times 0.5 \times 0.5}{0.08^2} = 150$$

Where,

n = sample size

e = margin of error is fixed at 8%

K = desired confidence level 95% where the critical value K = 1.96

P = estimated prevalence (proportion) in the target population is 50% (0.5)

q = 1-p = 0.5

Therefore, the final sample size under the above conditions was fixed at 150 respondents and in total, 150 questionnaires were sent out at the organisational level. A Meat Corporation of Namibia provided the sampling frame for the selection of respondents, which was a list of permanent staff members who are involved in performance appraisal at the Meat processing plant.

De Vos et al. (2011) referred to a sample as a small measure of a population that is considered representative or characteristic of the total population. The sample selected represents the larger population, and it is used to draw inferences about that population. According to the authors, there are two sampling techniques: non-probability and probability sampling (De Vos et al., 2011). The former is a sampling technique in which the samples are gathered in a process that does not give all the individuals in the population an equal chance of being selected. Probability sampling is a sampling technique in which the samples are gathered in a process that gives all the individuals in the population an equal chance of being selected (De Vos et al., 2011). Such sampling includes simple random sampling, systematic sampling, stratified sampling and cluster sampling. For the purpose of this study, probability sampling was used (De Vos et al., 2011).

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Marlow (2005), cited in De Vos et al. (2011), stated that simple random sampling is the most straightforward method, and each individual in the population has an equal chance of being selected for the sample. In this study, managers and non-managers (N=150) were selected. A response rate of 74% resulted in 111 usable questionnaires. The socio-demographic breakdown of participants is presented in Table 1 below. Table 1 shows that 32.4% of the respondents are junior managers, with 28.8% and 27% representing general staff and middle management respectively. It also demonstrates that less than 5% are executives, 39.6% of the population are in the operations unit and 14.4% are in livestock procurement. Females comprise 49.5% of the respondents. The table also shows that 34.2% of the respondents belong to the age group 33–40 years, while only 1.8% are in the age group of less than 25 years. Approximately 54% of the respondents have managerial responsibility and manage the performance of the employees who report to them. The tenure indicates the number of years employees have been employed at the institution and reveals valuable information on performance appraisals and organisational commitment. About 34% of the study population has worked for the organisation for less than three years. About 6% of the respondents have a Master's or postgraduate degree as their highest level of qualification attained. The majority of the employees have either Grade 12 (32.4%) or a National Diploma (31.5%) as their highest qualification.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of respondents (N=111)

Demographics		Frequency	%
Position/level	Executive (Exco)	5	4.5
	Senior management	8	7.2
	Middle management	30	27.0
	Junior management (Supervisory)	36	32.4
	General staff	32	28.8
Business unit	Operations (Windhoek & Okahandja abattoirs)	44	39.6
	Head office & support services	31	27.9
	Local markets & value addition	20	18.0
	Livestock procurement (Feedlot & procurement)	16	14.4
Gender	Male	53	47.7
	Female	55	49.5
	Not stated	3	2.7
Age category	Less than 25 years	2	1.8
	26–32 years	34	30.6
	33–40 years	38	34.2
	41–50 years	26	23.4
	More than 50 years	10	9.0
	Not stated	1	0.9
Tenure	Less than 3 years	38	34.2
	Between 3 and 5 years	21	18.9
	Between 6 and 10 years	22	19.8
	More than 10 years	29	26.1
	Not stated	1	0.9
Managerial Responsibility	Yes	60	54.1
	No	49	44.1
	Not stated	2	1.8
Qualification	Grade 10	6	5.4
	Grade 12	36	32.4
	National Diploma	35	31.5
	Degree	26	23.4
	Master's/Postgraduate	7	6.3
	Not stated	1	0.9
Total		111	100.0

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Procedures

Permission was requested and obtained from the authorities of a Meat Corporation in Namibia to conduct the study. The research was commenced upon receipt of approval from the Ethics in Research Committee of the University of Cape Town. The respondents were informed about the purpose of the study and the advantages of conducting such a study. In addition, they were informed that the main aim was to evaluate employee perception of performance appraisal and the relationship it has with organisational commitment. The instructions on the research instrument clearly indicated what was expected of the respondents.

The consent form covered the principles of voluntary participation. It ensured that the respondents were informed of their rights. Voluntary participation implies that respondents cannot be coerced to participate in a study. They must do so voluntarily and must be allowed to withdraw freely from the study at any time. The respondents who participated in the study were allocated 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire online. The language used in the questionnaire was simple, clear and understandable. Follow-ups were carried out via telephone and e-mail to remind respondents of the deadline. The responses were automatically captured in a database in Qualtrics Survey Software.

The principle of confidentiality refers to an agreement between persons that prevents other people accessing specific information. Leedy and Ormrod (2010) stated that researchers must keep the nature and quality of participants' performance strictly confidential. This principle was adhered to for this study, and the respondents were not required to write their name on the data collection tool. The questionnaires were self-administered online with e-mail and telephonic support from the researcher.

Participants were informed that their responses would be kept confidential and that all information collected would be used for the study only and not for any personal issues. The study did not expose the respondents to any harm.

Measures

A structured questionnaire was developed, and data was collected via an online survey. Time to complete the questionnaire was set at 20 minutes. This method for collecting the data

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

was regarded to be less time consuming and more cost-effective. Follow-up contact was made telephonically and through e-mails to ensure a high response rate.

The questionnaire consisted of the following sub-sections: organisational commitment (dependent variable); employee perception of performance appraisal (independent variable); organisational justice (independent variable); demographics; and career information (control variable). The study included five additional variables to account for situations in which the employees undertake their work. The five control variables were job autonomy, role conflict, resource inadequacy, task independence and job insecurity.

Organisational Commitment

This section measured employees' psychological attachment and bond to the organisation. It consisted of four questions (items 1 to 4), adopted from Klein et al. (2014). Responses were provided on a five-point Likert scale (5 = extremely; 1 = not at all).

Employees' Perceptions and Experience of Performance Appraisal

The measurement of employees' perception and experience involves combining items to assess the overall quality of an employee's performance appraisal experience. In measuring these variables, Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996) used 22 items with a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 5 (1 = strongly agree) to 1 (1 = strongly disagree). The 22 items used by Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996) consisted of the following factors: clarity of performance expectations (3 items) with a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 5 (high clarity) to 1 (low clarity); level of communication between employee and supervisor (6 items) with a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 5 (high two-way communication) to 1 (low two-way communication); trust in the supervisor (4 items) with a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 5 (high level of trust) to 1 (low level of trust); fairness of the performance appraisal process (6 items) with a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 5 (very fair) to 1 (unfair); and understanding of performance appraisal (3 items) with a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 5 (high level of understanding) to 1 (low level of understanding).

Organisational Justice

Organisational justice was measured with distributive justice and procedural justice. Distributive justice was measured using the Price and Mueller (1986) 4-item scale, with a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Procedural justice

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

was measured using the Moorman (1991) 3-item scale, with a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Demographic Control Variables

To control for differences in individual employees and differences in the work context, the demographic information was used as control variables (Brown et al., 2010). The included eight demographic characteristics of the employees were:

- 1) Position/level in the organisation
- 2) Business unit of participant within A Meat Corporation of Namibia
- 3) Gender
- 4) Age category
- 5) Tenure / number of years in the organisation
- 6) Highest formal qualification
- 7) Managerial responsibility towards employees in the management of employee performance
- 8) Ethical considerations (2-item scale) concerning the accuracy of employee responses regarding their views of the organisation (i.e. there was no interference with the completion of the questionnaire.)

Control Variables

Job Autonomy was measured using the Bass and Grzywacz (2011) 3-item scale, with a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Job Security was measured using the Francis and Barling (2005) 5-item scale, with a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Resource Inadequacy was measured using the Bagraim (2005) 3-item scale, with a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Role Conflict was measured using the Bagraim (2005) 3-item scale, with a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Task Independence was measured using the Kiggundu (1983) 3-item scale, with a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Statistical Analyses

The Qualtrics Survey data file was imported into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22, and the cleaning, checking and validation of the data was carried out. The data was cleaned and coded based on the codes of the Likert scales in the

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

questionnaire (Pallant, 2010). Pallant's (2010) exploratory factor analysis method was used to check the scale validity of the measures. Additionally, Cronbach's alpha reliability test in SPSS was used to assess the internal reliability of the measuring instruments in the sample. To achieve the objectives of the study, both descriptive and non-parametric analyses were employed in the study. The descriptive tools applied involved univariate analysis, using the central measures of tendency (see Table 8). Pearson's correlation (Hair, Babin, Money & Samuel, 2003) was used for the non-parametric analysis, and the research proposition was tested using Pallant's (2010) hierarchical regression analysis procedure.

Summary

This section dealt with the research method and design used for the study. The data collection methods were addressed. The following section presents and analyses the findings. The results are linked to the literature review.

RESULTS

The objective of the study was to investigate employees' perceptions regarding performance appraisal and the relationship with organisational commitment at a Meat Corporation of Namibia. This section presents the findings and the statistical analysis data. Firstly, the data screening procedures applied on the Qualtrics Survey data imported into SPSS version 22 are outlined and followed by an assessment of the psychometric properties of the measures using Pallant's (2010) method. The latter entailed exploring the dimensionality of the relevant variables and internal consistency of the scales. In achieving the objectives of the study, descriptive statistics and Pearson's correlation analysis were carried out. Lastly, the six-step hierarchical regression analysis procedures that were done to explore the nature of the relationships of the relevant variables are presented.

Data Screening

In preparation for the statistical analyses, the data was screened following the process outlined by Pallant (2010). The patterns of missing data were examined to ensure they were randomly distributed and free from any systematic bias. The descriptive statistics for each of the scales were checked to assess their appropriateness for advanced statistical procedures.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

The questionnaire response rate was good (74%), with 111 questionnaires being usable from the sample size of 150.

Psychometric Properties

The psychometric properties of the measures were assessed using Pallant's (2010) method, which entailed exploring the dimensionality of the relevant variables and internal consistency of the scales. Exploratory factor analyses were used to explore the dimensionality of the relevant variables based on the existing literature regarding the study's measures. There are two main issues to consider in determining whether a particular data set is suitable for factor analysis or not, and these are sample size and the strength of the relationships between the variables (or items) (Pallant, 2010). Pallant's (2010) method states that the data set should contain at least five respondents for each item in the scale under evaluation, and for the sampling adequacy, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test must produce a value larger than 0.5. The items within the scales should adequately correlate with a Bartlett's test of sphericity, which should be significant ($p < .05$) (Pallant, 2010). The study results showed that all the necessary conditions were met and that it was appropriate to conduct an exploratory factor analysis.

The factor extraction method used principal axis factoring with varimax rotation. This method was chosen in order to simplify the interpretation of the factors by focusing on the shared variance between items. The method also places limitations on the location of the factors within the factor space by minimising the number of variables that have high loadings on each factor (Kline, 1994). Furthermore, only items that contained factor loadings greater than 0.30 were considered to be significant and were thus retained (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson & Tatham, 2013).

Exploratory factor analysis

This sub-section presents the results of the exploratory factor analyses that were conducted.

Organisational Commitment: From the four-item Organisational Commitment (OrgComm) scale, only one significant factor was extracted (see Table 2 below). This factor produced an eigenvalue of 2.793 and explained 69.82% of the variance in OrgComm (factor

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

loadings: $.696 < r < .870$). The scale is thus unidimensional as reported by Klein et al. (2014). Klein et al. (2014) hypothesised that organisational commitment, as a Klein et al. (2012), Unidimensional, Target-free dimension (KUT) will be unidimensional, such that a single factor model will constitute a good fit to the data for each of the examined commitment targets. In this research, the target was the company.

Table 2: Results of the factor analysis on the OrgComm scale

Code	Item	OrgComm
OC1	How committed are you to the Meat manufacturing plant?	.718
OC2	To what extent do you care about the Meat manufacturing plant?	.696
OC3	How dedicated are you to the Meat manufacturing plant?	.809
OC4	To what extend have you chosen to be committed to the Meat manufacturing plant?	.870
Eigenvalue		2.793
% Variance explained		69.82%
% Cumulative variance		69.82%

Notes: OrgComm = Organisational Commitment

Employee perception of performance appraisal (EPA): The EPA scale includes 18 items, consisting of the following four factors: clarity of performance expectations (three items); level of communication between the employee and supervisor (six items); fairness of the performance appraisal process (six items); and understanding of performance appraisal (three items).

From the 18 items in the EPA scale, the expected four factors (Tang & Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996) were extracted. See Table 3 for the full set of item-level factor loadings, eigenvalues and variance explained.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Table 3: Results of the factor analysis on the EPA scales

	Fairness	Communica tion	Clarity	Understanding
F6: If you have been evaluating your own performance, how similar would your rating have been to the last one that your supervisor gave to you? Click to write Choice 1.	.645			
F5: How much do you feel your last performance was free from bias? (Bias means unfair or favoritism)	.642	.314		.303
F4: How justified do you feel your supervisor was in his/her last rating of your performance?	*			
F3: How accurately do you feel your performance has been evaluated?	.880			
F2: How fair do you feel your last performance appraisal was?	.841			
F1: How much do you feel your last performance rating truly represented how well you have performed?	.746			
C6: How much opportunity are you given to express your feelings when your performance is evaluated?		*		
C5: How often does the performance appraisal process at the Meat manufacturing plant result in specifications of new goals?		.646		
C4: How much does your supervisor sit down and discuss with you the results of your performance?		.777		
C3: How much input does your supervisor ask for during the appraisal process?		.660		
C2: How much guidance does your supervisor give you about how to improve your performance?		.735		
C1: How often is the progress toward your goals set in previous appraisal meetings reviewed by you?		*		
CL3: How clear was it, when you were hired, that your performance would be periodically evaluated?			.935	
CL2: When you were hired, how much information was given to you about the performance appraisal?			.770	
CL1: How clear was it made to you when you were hired that the results of your performance evaluation would be tied to certain personnel actions (i.e., pay raises/increases)?			.669	
U3 18: How comfortable do you feel expressing your feelings to your supervisor?		.314		.776
U2 17: How free do you feel to discuss job-related problems with your supervisor?				.889
U1 16: How well do you understand the performance appraisal process at your organisation?	.318			.477
Eigenvalue	7.206	1.708	1.468	1.093
% of Variance	48.04%	11.39%	9.79%	7.29%
Cumulative %	48.04%	59.42%	69.21%	76.50%

Note: *Items that had cross-loadings were removed from the analysis through an iterative process.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Trust: The four-item Trust scale regarding employee trust in their supervisor was evaluated using principal axis factoring, and in line with Tang and Sarsfield-Baldwin (1996), resulted in a single trust factor. This factor produced an eigenvalue of 3.073, explaining 76.83% of the total variance in trust in the supervisor (Table 4).

Table 4: Results of the factor analysis on the Trust scale

Code	Item	Trust
T1	How competent do you feel your supervisor is to evaluate your job?	.607
T2	How familiar is your supervisor with the details and responsibilities that your job entails?	.507
T3	To what extent do you have confidence and trust in your immediate supervisor regarding his/her general fairness?	.667
T4	How much do you trust your supervisor to accurately report your performance to his/her supervisor?	.692
Eigenvalue		3.073
% Variance explained		76.83%
% Cumulative variance		76.83%

Organisational Justice: The seven-item Organisational Justice (OJ) scale was evaluated using principal axis factoring with a varimax rotation. In line with literature, two significant factors were extracted (Farndale et al., 2011). See Table 5 below for the full set of item-level factor loadings.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Table 5: Results of the factor analysis on the Organisational Justice scales

Code	Item	Distributive Justice (DJ)	Procedural Justice (PJ)
PJ3	Policies and procedures in this organisation are designed to ensure that accurate information is used when making decisions.		.904
PJ2	Policies and procedures in this organisation provide the opportunity for employees to challenge or appeal against decisions.		.813
PJ1	Policies and procedures in this organisation are designed so that all parties affected by the decision are considered.		.803
DJ1	I am fairly rewarded, given my level of experience.	.961	
DJ2	I am fairly rewarded, given my level of responsibility.	.932	
DJ3	I am fairly rewarded, given my work effort.	.880	
DJ4	I am fairly rewarded, given my level of prior education & training.	.766	
Eigenvalue		3.837	2.019
% of Variance		54.82%	28.84%
Cumulative %		54.82%	83.66%

Demography control variables: The Demographic Control Variable scale includes eight items, consisting of Position (or level) in the Organisation, Business Unit within the company, Gender, Age Group, Tenure, Highest Formal Qualification, Managerial Responsibility and Ethical Views (two items).

The Highest Formal Qualification item was excluded for cross loading of factors, and the Business Unit item was not significant. From the remaining six items, three distinct factors emerged, which explained a cumulative variance of 72.34% in the Demographic control variables. Refer to Table 6 for more detailed information concerning the individual factors, eigenvalues, variance explained and factor loadings associated with each factor. The three factors are Ethical Views of the study (factor loadings: $.691 < r < .929$), Managerial Supervision of the Performance Appraisal Process ($.399 < r < .737$) and Organisational Tenure ($.659 < r < .819$).

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Table 6: Results of the factor analysis on the Demographic Control Variable scales

	Ethical Views	Supervision	Tenure
ET1 1: My responses accurately reflect my views about my organisation.	.929		
ET2 2: No one in the organisation interfered with the completion of my questionnaire.	.691		
SUP2 7: Managerial responsibility: Do you have employee's reporting to you of which you manage performance appraisal?		.737	
SUP1 1. Please indicate your position / level in the organisation.		.696	
SUP3 3. Please indicate your gender.		.399	
TN2 4. Please indicate your age category.			.819
TN1 5. Please indicate your tenure / the number of years you have worked for the organisation.			.659
Eigenvalue	2.148	1.867	1.048
% of Variance	30.69%	26.68%	14.97%
Cumulative %	30.69%	57.36%	72.34%

Control variables: The Control Variable scale includes 17 items, consisting of the following five factors. Principal axis factoring with a varimax rotation was conducted on the items of the Control Variable scale. Table 7 below details the individual factors, eigenvalues, variance explained and factor loadings associated with each factor.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Table 7: Results of the factor analysis on the Control Variable scales

	IR	IT	JS	JA	RC
IT2: I must wait for someone else before my work is finished in the Meat manufacturing plant.		.923			
IT3: I must wait for someone to finish their job before I can do my job in the Meat manufacturing plant.		.796			
IT1: I have to talk to other employees to get my job done in the Meat manufacturing plant.		.495			
IR1: I do not have enough of the supplies that I need to do my job in the Meat manufacturing plant.	.774				
IR2: I do not have enough technological resources to do my job in the Meat manufacturing plant.	.837				
IR3: I do not have enough administrative support to do my job in the Meat manufacturing plant.	.692				
JA2: It is basically my own responsibility to decide how my job gets done at the Meat manufacturing plant.				.646	
JA1: I have the freedom to decide what I do on my job at the Meat manufacturing plant.				.918	
JA3: I have a lot of say about what happens on my job in the Meat manufacturing plant.					
JS5: I can keep my current job for as long as I want it.			.892		
JS4: This job has retirement security.			.541		
JS3: I can be sure of my present job as long as I do good work.			.615		
JS2: I am not really sure how long my present job will last.					
JS1: I am afraid of losing my present job.					
RC3: I receive conflicting requests from different people in the Meat manufacturing plant.					.415
RC2: I have to “bend the rules” to carry out some assignments at the Meat manufacturing plant.					
RC1: I work under conflicting policies, guidelines or expectations in the Meat manufacturing plant.					.939
Eigenvalue	3.199	2.125	1.763	1.315	1.044
% of Variance	24.61%	16.34%	13.56%	10.12%	8.03%
Cumulative %	24.61%	40.95%	54.51%	64.63%	72.66%

Notes: Multiple items had cross-loadings and these were removed from the analysis through an iterative process. IR = Resource Inadequacy, IT = Task Independence, JS = Job Security, JA = Job Autonomy, RC = Role Conflict

In line with the study of Brown et al. (2010), five distinct factors emerged that explained a cumulative variance of 72.66% in the control variables. Job Autonomy and Role Conflict were left with only two item scales after one was excluded from each, while Job Security (JS) was left with three items scales after two were excluded for multiple cross loadings and insignificant coefficient values (< 0.3).

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive tools employed involved univariate analysis, using the central measures of tendency (see Table 8 below).

Table 8: Descriptive statistics and distribution of the composite variables

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis
OrgComm (DV)	110	2,25	5,00	4,51	0,61	-1,31	1,34
Understanding (IV)	111	1,00	5,00	3,54	0,98	-0,41	-0,44
Fairness (IV)	110	1,00	5,00	3,44	0,85	-0,24	-0,37
Communication (IV)	111	1,00	4,67	2,77	0,87	-0,22	-0,20
Clarity (IV)	106	1,00	5,00	2,70	1,02	0,18	-0,63
Trust (IV)	111	1,00	5,00	3,53	0,79	-0,39	-0,32
Distributive Justice (IV)	111	1,00	5,00	3,00	0,99	-0,20	-0,87
Procedural Justice (IV)	111	1,00	5,00	3,40	0,79	-1,01	0,45
Ethical Views (CV)	111	1,00	5,00	4,31	0,59	-1,61	7,75
Tenure (CV)	111	1,00	4,50	2,74	0,98	0,22	-1,19
Supervision (CV)	111	1,00	3,00	2,24	0,56	-0,25	-0,68
Resource Inadequacy (CV)	111	1,00	4,33	2,43	0,81	0,23	-0,59
Task Independence (CV)	111	1,00	5,00	3,10	0,88	-0,20	-0,56
Job Security (CV)	111	1,00	5,00	3,56	0,72	-0,47	1,01
Job Autonomy (CV)	111	1,00	5,00	3,59	0,91	-0,75	0,44

Notes: Valid N (list wise) = 104; DV = Dependant variable; IV = Independent variable; CV = Control variable

The sample indicates a high OrgComm (M = 4.51; SD = .61), a high Ethical Views (M = 4.31; SD = .59) and a high Resource Inadequacy (M = 4.33; SD = 2.43). Job Autonomy (M = 3.59; SD = .91), Job Security (M = 3.56; SD = .72) and Understanding (M = 3.53; SD = .88) indicate a common average, which is above the scales mid-point of three. The values of skewness should be zero in a normal distribution. Most of the variables have a negative value of skewness close to zero. This implies that the sample follows a normal distribution curve, lightly skewed to the right. Moreover, this skewness means most of the responses were on the lower side of Organisational Commitment.

Reliability Analysis

Cronbach's alpha test for reliability was used to test for internal consistency of the scales. Hair et al. (2013) argue that Cronbach's alpha coefficient values above .700 are indicative of acceptable, good or excellent reliability. The results from Table 9 below show

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

that some of the scales have poor internal consistency with alpha values ranging from 0.582 to 0.941.

Correlation Analysis

A bivariate analysis using Pearson correlation coefficient was done to explore associations between the variables in preparation for the regression analysis. The relational effects were interpreted according to the recommendations of Cohen (1988). The correlation coefficients results in Table 9 indicate weak to strong relationships between the variables, ranging from -0.01 to 0.623 with a varying significance level ($p < .1$; $p < .05$; $p < .01$; and $p < .001$).

The correlation matrix in Table 9 indicates that most of the variables have a weak or no effect on Organisational Commitment, with Job Autonomy ($r = 0.233$; $p = .014$) and Role Conflict ($r = -.190$; $p = .047$) having the most significant effects. This is despite the analysis detecting strong correlational effects from the variables that determine the quality of the employee's performance appraisal experience and perception. The effects highlighted the importance of the level of understanding and trust ($r = .741$; $p = .000$) between employees and supervisors in relation to the perceived fairness of the performance appraisal process ($r = .596$; $p = .000$ and $r = .588$, $p = .000$) and the level of communication between the employee and the supervisor ($r = .589$; $p = .000$). Additionally, if the level of communication between the employee and the supervisor is very good, the employees are more likely to believe in the fairness of the performance appraisal process ($r = .551$; $p = .000$).

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Table 9: Correlation matrix and reliability analysis

	Variable	M	S.D	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	OrgComm	4.51	0.61	(.853)														
2	Understanding	3.53	0.88	0,10	(.854)													
3	Fairness	3.44	0.85	0,11	.596***	(.908)												
4	Communication	2.81	0.84	0,17a	.536***	.551**	(.862)											
5	Clarity	2.70	1.02	0,12	.362***	.411**	.408**	(.864)										
6	Trust	3.53	0.79	,180a	.741***	.588***	.589***	.373***	(.894)									
7	Procedural Justice	3.00	0.99	0,14	.373***	0,17a	0,18a	.306**	.203*	(.0885)								
8	Distributive Justice	3.40	0.79	0,15	.331***	.328**	.275***	.253**	.400***	.270**	(.941)							
9	Ethical Views	4.31	0.59	0,02	0,08	0,13	-0,05	0,04	,008	0,04	0,03	(.781)						
10	Tenure	2.74	0.98	0,16a	0,07	-0,05	-0,08	-0,02	,017	0,07	0,19a	-.221*	(.709)					
11	Supervision	2.24	0.56	-0,09	-.329**	-0,12	-0,10	-0,05	-.290**	-0,18a	-.198*	-0,14	-.254**	(.582)				
12	Resource Inadequacy	2.43	0.81	-0,16a	-.328**	-.367**	-.228*	-.345**	-.334**	-.291**	-.348**	-0,14	-0,04	0,07	(.825)			
13	Task Independence	3.10	0.88	-0,13	-0,13	-0,12	-0,17a	-0,14	-.180a	-0,10	-0,02	0,11	0,02	.216*	0,04	(.763)		
14	Job Security	3.56	0.72	0,14	0,16a	.262**	0,18a	0,10	,151	0,18a	.229*	.308**	-0,12	0,05	-.223*	(.715)		
15	Job Autonomy	3.59	0.91	.233*	.443**	.347**	.330**	.263**	.380***	.277**	.222*	0,18a	0,05	-.277**	-.194*	.317**	(.785)	
16	Role Conflict	3.01	0.93	-.190*	-.324**	-.223*	-.205*	.363***	-.306**	-.351***	-.387**	-0,01	-0,09	0,11	.295**	-0,11	-.265**	(.610)

Notes: Significance level set at $\alpha = p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; N = 106 with case-wise deletion of missing data. M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation. The brackets represent the reliability coefficients.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Regression Analysis

In multiple regression analysis, the model takes the form of an equation that contains a coefficient (*b*) for each predictor (Oreku, Mtenzi & Al-Dahoud, 2013). Table 10 below provides estimates for these *b* values, which indicate the individual contribution of each predictor to the model (Field, 2009; Oreku et al., 2013). The *b* values ascertain the relationship between Organisational Commitment and each predictor. If the value is positive, there is a positive relationship between the predictor and the outcome, whereas a negative coefficient represents a negative relationship (Oreku et al., 2013). Data predictors that have positive *b* values indicate positive relationships (Oreku et al., 2013).

Consequently, a six-step hierarchical multiple regression model was used to explore the relationship between EPA and OrgComm. Table 10 displays the unstandardised regression coefficients, the standard error and the standardised regression coefficients, R , R^2 , and change in R^2 for steps one to six of the analysis.

Step 1: Job Autonomy and Role Conflict were entered at Step 1, explaining 8.4 % of the variance in Organisational Commitment ($F(2,101) = 4.629$; $p = 0.012$).

Step 2: Resource Inadequacy, Task Independence and Job Security were entered at Step 2, explaining 10.3% of the variance in Organisational Commitment ($F(5,98) = 2.249$; $p = 0.055$).

Step 3: Tenure, Ethical Views and Supervision were entered at Step 3, accounting for a 1.6% change in the total variance of 11.6% in Organisational Commitment ($F(8,95) = 1.599$; $p = 0.135$).

Step 4: Procedural Justice, Distributive Justice and Trust were entered in Step 4, explaining 12.4 % of the variance in Organisational Commitment ($F(11,93) = 1.181$; $p = 0.311$).

Step 5: After entry of the EPA sub-scales (Clarity, Communication, Fairness, Understanding) at Step 5, the total variance explained by the model as a whole increased by 15.7% ($F(15, 88) = 1.090$; $p = 0.378$).

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Table 10: A five-step hierarchical multiple regression

Model	1			2			3			4			5		
	B	S.E	Beta	B	S.E	Beta	B	S.E	Beta	B	S.E	Beta	B	S.E	Beta
(Constant)	4.272	.353		4.497	.521		4.097	.790		3.866	1.016		3.971	1.032	
Job Autonomy (CV)	.145	.067	.216	.115	.072	.171	.111	.075	.165	.103	.078	.153	.119	.081	.176
Role Conflict (CV)	-.095	.065	-.144	-.076	.068	-.115	-.071	.069	-.109	-.067	.074	-.102	-.083	.076	-.127
Resource Inadequacy (CV)				-.050	.078	-.066	-.045	.079	-.060	-.032	.087	-.042	-.049	.089	-.064
Task Independence (CV)				-.079	.069	-.111	-.080	.072	-.113	-.078	.073	-.110	-.081	.074	-.114
Job Security (CV)				.054	.089	.063	.060	.094	.070	.055	.097	.064	.048	.099	.056
Supervision (CVD)							.007	.120	.007	.024	.127	.022	.011	.129	.010
Tenure (CVD)							.085	.067	.131	.089	.070	.136	.095	.071	.146
Ethical Views (CVD)							.029	.110	.028	.040	.114	.039	.069	.116	.068
Distributive Justice (IV)										.009	.073	.015	.000	.074	.000
Procedural Justice (IV)										-.021	.087	-.027	.015	.092	.020
Trust (IV)										.049	.079	.075	.158	.117	.240
Communication (IV)													.083	.099	.116
Clarity (IV)													-.015	.071	-.026
Understanding (IV)													-.157	.108	-.253
Fairness (IV)													-.077	.105	-.107
R															
R Square															
Adjusted R Squared															
R Square Change															
F															
Sig.															

Notes: Significance level set at *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .0001; Dependent Variable: OrgComm (DV); B= unstandardised coefficients; Beta=standardised coefficients; S.E= standard error

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Final Notes

The regression analysis indicated a significant relationship between Organisational Commitment and Job Autonomy (Beta = 0.216; $p = 0.031$) when modelled together with Role Conflict. However, when other factors were entered, the relationship effects weakened. This section outlined the analysis of the data and presented the results of the statistical testing phase. The following section provides the concluding discussion that relates the findings of this study to the existing literature and details the limitations of the study as well as the implications for future research and practice.

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The primary purpose of the study was to investigate employee perception of performance appraisal and explore its relationship with organisational commitment at a Meat Corporation of Namibia. The findings of this study help organisations and managers alike by enhancing their understanding of the relative significance of employees' perceptions regarding performance appraisal and the impact on employees' levels of commitment to the organisation. Additionally, the findings of this study indicated that contrary to expectations, the organisational justice approach to performance appraisal and trust did not create conditions that affected employees' responses to performance appraisal practices and organisational commitment (Farndale et al., 2011; Macky & Boxall, 2007; McAllister, 1995). This section outlines the contributions of the study, presents a summary of the findings and details the limitations, recommendations for future study and the conclusions of the study.

Contributions of the Study

This study contributes to the body of knowledge relating to employee perception of performance appraisal and its relationship with organisational commitment by:

- 1) providing empirical evidence of the directionality of organisational commitment; and
- 2) providing empirical evidence of employees' perceptions of performance appraisal that significantly account for the most variance in organisational commitment.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Findings

Klein et al. (2014) hypothesised that organisational commitment as a KUT variable will be unidimensional such that a single factor model will constitute a good fit to the data for each of the examined commitment targets. In this research, the target was the company. Klein et al. (2014) used KUT on different targets, which included Organisation, Organisational Goal, Supervisor, Team, Co-Worker, Occupation, Union and Academic Goal. In this research, KUT was used on only one target. However, these other targets (Klein et al., 2014) may also have associations with employees' perceptions and experience of performance appraisal.

According to Klein et al. (2012), organisational commitment is a volitional, psychological bond reflecting dedication to and responsibility for the organisation. In the current research, Organisational Commitment was linked to the key perceptual evaluations that examined individual differences in personal values, such as Supervisor ($r = -.093$; $p = 0.333$), Ethical Views ($r = 0.023$; $p = 0.810$) and Tenure with target ($r = 0.162$; $p = 0.087$). However, Tenure was significant at the 90% confidence interval; it is associated with sunk costs (instrumental bonds) and would not be expected to contribute to the formation of commitment bonds (Klein et al., 2014). Brown et al. (2010) argue that the attitudes and approach of supervisors to the performance appraisal process is a source of quality variations in performance appraisal, resulting in varying employee perception and commitment levels. However, in this research, the attitudes and approach of supervisors did not show any association with the levels of commitment to the organisation.

Correlation analyses revealed that the contextual control variables had a weak to no effect on Organisational Commitment, with Job Autonomy ($r = 0.233$; $p = .014$), Role Conflict ($r = -.190$; $p = .047$) and Resource Inadequacy ($r = -.164$; $p = .087$) having the most significant effects. Job Security ($r = .143$; $p = .137$) and Task Independence ($r = -.134$; $p = .163$) were not significant. However, the findings from the regression analyses showed that Job Autonomy ($b = .216$; $p = .012$) and Role Conflict ($b = -.155$; $p = 0.055$) significantly predicted the levels of organisational commitment. Previous research suggests that employees reporting high-quality performance appraisal experiences, work in jobs that have a higher level of autonomy, less role conflict, more supportive co-workers and a higher perceived job

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

security than employees reporting low-quality performance appraisal experiences (Brown et al., 2010).

The Trust in my Supervisor variable had a positive effect on Organisational Commitment ($b = .240$; n.s). However, the effect was not significant in explaining 0.5% of the variance in Organisational Commitment and its correlation ($r = 0.180$; $p = 0.060$). The Trust variable was only significant at the 90% ($p < .10$) confidence interval. However, Organisational Justice had a very weak positive to no effect on Organisational Commitment. Distributive Justice ($b = 0.00$; n.s) had no effect on the organisational commitment model comprising all the variables, and Procedural Justice ($b = 0.020$; n.s) was also not significant with a weak positive effect. These findings are not consistent with previous studies that suggested organisational justice as a mediator in the relationship between performance management practices and organisational commitment (Farndale et al., 2011; Macky & Boxall, 2007; McAllister, 1995). Therefore, Proposition 2, which stated that the organisational justice approach to performance appraisal helps to predict the relational perceptions regarding performance appraisal and organisational commitment, could not be substantially supported.

The current study detected strong correlational effects from the variables that determine the quality of an employee's performance appraisal experience and perception. These effects highlighted the importance of the levels of understanding and trust ($r = .741$, $p = .000$) between employees and their supervisors in relation to the perceived fairness of the performance appraisal process ($r = .596$; $p = .000$ and $r = .588$; $p = .000$) and the level of communication between the employee and the supervisor ($r = .589$; $p = .000$). Additionally, if the level of communication between the employee and the supervisor is very good, the employee is more likely to believe in the fairness of the performance appraisal process ($r = .551$; $p = .000$). However, the strength of these relationships did not extend to their relationship with Organisational Commitment, with the level of Communication ($r = .180$, $p = .080$) having the most significant relationship at the 90% confidence interval.

The findings suggested a positive relationship between Communication and Organisational Commitment, which is consistent with Brown et al. (2010). Brown et al. (2010) found that there was a positive relationship between the quality of performance

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

appraisal experiences and organisational commitment, which can convert to negative when low-quality performance appraisal experiences are assessed.

In the current study, the quantum of employee perception is low for Communication (Mean = 2.77; S.D = 0.87) and Clarity (Mean = 2.70; S.D = 0.87) and average for Understanding (Mean = 3.54; S.D = 0.98) and Fairness (3.44; S.D = 0.85).

Implications of Findings

From a practice perspective, the current study highlighted the importance of high levels of communication between employees and supervisors to organisational commitment. If the levels of communication between employees and supervisors are very good, employees are more likely have high levels of organisational commitment. However, if there are low communication levels within an organisation, this will negatively affect the employees' perceptions of fairness and understanding, resulting in poor clarity that adversely affects organisational commitment. The human resources department should ensure that awareness regarding performance appraisal is created, and fairness in the appraisal system should be practised at all times. Through consistent implementation of fair and unbiased practices, managers can control employees' perceptions of fairness.

Furthermore, if employees trust their line managers, they embrace positive expectations regarding the managers' motives and have confidence that the managers will act in their best interests. The research indicated a strong relationship for trust and understanding between supervisor and employee. This implies that for managers to improve the trust between themselves and the employees, they must understand their employees' goals and aspirations and ensure that they are aligned with theirs and those of the organisation.

The study found that the approach and attitudes of managers towards the performance appraisal process are sources of quality variations in performance appraisal that result in varying employee perception and commitment levels.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of the study support the KUT approach to organisational commitment. However, further research should focus on all relevant variables that contribute to

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

organisational commitment. The line of questioning in the questionnaire of this study focused on the relationship between the employee and the supervisor and hence, the need to include another dependent variable, supervisor commitment guided by the KUT approach, was determined. This would ensure that the responses given are controlled for supervisor commitment since the responses in this study may have been due to the influence of employees' supervisors in managing the performance appraisal. In other words, employees may be committed to their supervisors and not the company or vice versa.

The present study was implemented in one national organisation situated in Namibia. The results, therefore, may not be generalisable to other regions and environments. The method consisted of a cross-sectional survey of employees subsequent to their annual performance appraisal and thus, the results could be affected. Time was definitely a limiting factor because the researcher personally managed the distribution, collection and analysis of questionnaires. The questionnaires were distributed to staff members (managers and non-managers) who form part of the performance appraisal system at a Meat processing plant. Since the questionnaires were distributed online, the researcher had to rely on the time available to the staff members for completing the questionnaire.

It is recommended that future research be conducted in other private and public sector organisations and parastatals in Namibia to establish how employees in these entities perceive their organisations' performance appraisal systems. Future research should investigate the effect of employee perception of performance appraisal regarding other human resource outcomes, such as job satisfaction, employee turnover intentions and job involvement.

Further research on organisational commitment should combine variables such as organisation, organisational goal, supervisor, team, co-worker, occupation, union and academic goal and explore the relationships these may have with employee perception of performance appraisal systems. Furthermore, there is a need to carry out similar surveys over a time series to determine if time of appraisal has an impact on the results.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between perceptions of performance appraisal and organisational commitment at a Meat Corporation of Namibia. Specifically, this research aimed to enhance existing theoretical knowledge concerning

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

employee perception of performance appraisal by examining several distinct outcomes of employee perception. In doing so, the study concluded that there is a perceived relationship between performance appraisal as experienced by employees and levels of employee commitment to the organisation.

However, the organisational justice approach to performance appraisal could not significantly predict the relational perceptions regarding performance appraisal and organisational commitment. The findings of this study will help organisations and managers alike by enhancing their understanding of the relative significance of employee perception of performance appraisal and its effect on employees' levels of commitment to the organisation.

REFERENCES

- Adler, E., & Clark, R. (2014). *An invitation to social research: how it's done*. Stanford, CT: Cengage Learning.
- Aguinis, H. (2009). *Performance management*. (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall.
- Alwadaei, S.A. (2010). Employee's perception of, and satisfaction, of performance appraisal: a case of electricity and water authority (EWA) in Kingdom Of Bahrain. *Unpublished Research Report*. Kuala Lumpur: Open University Malaysia.
- Amerstrong, M., & Baron, A. (1998). Performance management: the new realistic. *Institutes of Personnel and Development*, London.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P.S. & Chen, Z.X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organisational justice and work outcomes: test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 23(3), 267-285.
- Atkins, P.W., & Wood, R.E. (2002). Self-versus others' ratings as predictors of assessment centre ratings: validation evidence for 360-degree feedback programs. *Personnel Psychology*, 55(4), 871-904.
- Bacal, R. (2004). *Manager's guide to performance reviews*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Bagraim, J.J. (2005). New measures of workplace attitudes: Scale development and construct validation. Unpublished manuscript. *School of Management Studies, University of Cape Town*. Adapted from Caplan, R.D., Cobb, S., & French, J.R. (1975). Relationships of cessation of smoking with job stress, personality, and social support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 211.
- Bass, B.L., & Grzywacz, J.G. (2011). Job adequacy and work-family balance: looking at jobs as a whole. *Journal of Family Issues*, 32(3), 317-345.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

- Bennett, H. (2000). The effects of organisational change on employee psychological attachment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(2), 126-148.
- Bersin, J. (2008). The business case for performance management systems: a handbook for human resource executives and managers. *Bersin and Associates Research Reports*, 10, 9-22.
- Bless, C., & Higson-Smith, C. (2000). *Social research methods. an African perspective*. Cape Town: Juta.
- Bretz, R.D., Milkovich, G.T., & Read, W. (1992). The current state of performance appraisal research and practice: concerns, directions, and implications. *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 321-352.
- Brown, M., Haytt, D., & Benson, J. (2010). Consequences of the performance appraisal experience. *Personal Review*, 39(3), 375-396.
- Burns, R.B., & Burns, R.A. (2008). *Business research methods and statistics using SPSS*. Cornwall, Great Britain: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Byrne, Z.S., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). The history of organisational justice: the founders speak. In: Cropanzano, R. (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: from theory to practice*. (pp. 3-26). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cascio, W.F., & Aguinis, H. (2005). *Applied psychology in human resource management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Cheng, S.Y. (2014). The mediating role of organizational justice on the relationship between administrative performance appraisal practices and organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(8), 1131-1148.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences*. (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D.E., & Gilliland, S.W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34-48.
- Cummings, L.L. (1983). Performance evaluation systems in context of individual trust and commitment. In: Landy, F.J., Zedrick, S., & Cleveland, J. (Eds.), *Performance Measurement And Theory*. (pp. 89-93). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dargham, S.N. (2010). Effective management of the performance appraisal process in Libanon: an exploratory study.
- De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouche, C.B., & Delport, C.S.L. (2011). *Research at grass roots: for the social sciences and human services professions*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- De Waal, A.A. (2003). Behavioural factors important to the successful implementation and use of performance management systems. *Management Decision*, 41(8), 688-697.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

- DeNisi, A.S. (2000). Performance appraisal and performance management: a multilevel analysis. In: Klein, K.J., & Kozlowski, S. (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research and methods in organisations*. (pp. 121-156). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- DeNisi, A.S., & Kluger, A.N. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: can 360-degree appraisals be improved? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 14(1), 129-139.
- DeNisi, A.S., & Pritchard, R.D. (2006). Performance appraisal, performance management and improving individual performance: a motivational framework. *Management and Organization Review*, 2(2), 253-277.
- Dessler, G. (2000). *Human resource management*. (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Dusterhoff, C., Cunningham, J.B., & MacGregor, J.N. (2014). The effects of performance rating, leader–member exchange, perceived utility, and organizational justice on performance appraisal satisfaction: applying a moral judgment perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119(2), 265-273.
- Earley, P.C., Northcraft, G.B., Lee, C., & Lituchy, T.R. (1990). Impact of process and outcome feedback on the relation of goal setting to task performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 87-105.
- Erdogan, B. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of justice perceptions in performance appraisals. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(4), 555-578.
- Fakharyan, M., Jalilvand, M.R., Dini, B., & Dehafarin, E. (2012). The effect of performance appraisal satisfaction on employee's outputs implying on the moderating role of motivation in workplace. *International Journal of Business and Management Tomorrow*, 2(4), 1-9.
- Farndale, E., Hope-Hailey, V., & Kelliher, C. (2011). High commitment performance management: the roles of justice and trust. *Personnel Review*, 40(1), 5-23.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Sage publications.
- Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: the developing research agenda. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 74(4), 473-487.
- Fletcher, C. (2004). *Appraisal and feedback: making performance review work*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel Development.
- Fletcher, C., & Williams, R. (1996). Performance management, job satisfaction and organisational commitment. *British Journal of Management*, 7, 69-179.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M.A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(11), 115-130.
- Fortin, M. (2008). Perspectives on organisational justice: concept clarification, social context integration, time and links with morality. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10(2), 93-126.
- Fouché, C.B. (2002). *Research strategies. Research at grassroots for social sciences and human service professions*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

- Francis, L., & Barling, J. (2005). Organizational injustice and psychological strain. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 37(4), 250-261.
- Gardner, T.M., Moynihan, L.M., Park, H.J., & Wright, P.M. (2001). Beginning to unlock the black box in the HR firm performance relationship: the impact of HR practices on employee attitudes and employee outcomes. *Working paper no. 01-12*. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.
- Gratton, L., & Truss, C. (2003). Three-dimensional people strategy: putting human resource policies into action. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(3), 74-86.
- Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 320-324.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organisational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- Hai, L., & Mian, Z. (2007). The relationship between performance appraisal and organizational citizenship behavior: the mediating role of organizational commitment in wireless communications, networking and mobile computing. *Paper presented at the WiCom 2007 International Conference, Shanghai*. (pp. 6489-6492). Shanghai: IEEE.
- Hair, J.F.J., Babin, B., Money, A.H., & Samuel, P. (2003). *Essentials of business research methods*. USA: John Wiley and Sons, Leyh Publishing, LLC.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., & Tatham, R.L. (2013). *Multivariate data analysis*. (7th ed.). USA: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hendrix, W.H., Robbins, Y., Miller, J., & Summers, T.P. (1998). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on the factors predictive of turnover. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 98(1), 611-632.
- Hornibrook, S., Fearne, A., & Lazzarin, M. (2009). Exploring the association between fairness and organisational outcomes in supply chain relationships. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 37(9), 790-803.
- Jawahar, I.M. (2007). The influence of perceptions of fairness on performance appraisal reactions. *Journal of Labor Research*, 28(4), 735-754.
- Kaynak, H. (2003). The relationship between total quality management practices and their effects on firm performance. *Journal of Operations Management*, 21(4), 405-435.
- Kiggundu, M.N. (1983). Task interdependence and job design: test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 31(2), 145-172.
- Klein, H.J., Cooper, J.T., Molly, J.C., & Swanson, J.A. (2014). The assessment of commitment: advantages of a unidimensional, target-free approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(2), 222-238.
- Klein, H.J., Molly, J.C., & Brinsfield, C.T. (2012). Reconceptualising workplace commitment to redress a stretched construct: revisiting assumptions and removing confounds. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1), 130-151.
- Kline, P. (1994). *An easy guide for factor analysis*. New York, USA: Routledge.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

- Konovsky, M.A., & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(5), 698-707.
- Kuvaas, B. (2006). Performance appraisal satisfaction and employee outcomes: mediating and moderating roles of motivation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(3), 504-522.
- Leedy, P.D., & Ormrod, J.E. (2010). *Practical research: planning and design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Macky, K., & Boxall, P. (2007). The relationship between 'high-performance work practices' and employee attitudes: an investigation of additive and interaction effects. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(4), 537-567.
- Mael, F.A., & Ashforth, B.E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: a partial test of the reformulated model of organisational identification. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 13(2), 103-123.
- Mayer, R.C., & Davis, J.H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: a field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(1), 123-136.
- McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organisations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24-29.
- McFarlin, D.B., & Sweeney, P.D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organisational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 626-637.
- Meyer, J.P. (2009). Commitment in a changing world of work. In: Klein, H.J., Becker, T.E., & Meyer, J.P. (Eds.), *Commitment in organisations: accumulated wisdom and new directions*. (pp. 37-68). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor and Francis.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organisational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., & Gellatly, I.R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organisation: evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(6), 710-720.
- Mobley, W.H. (1977). "Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover", *Journal of Applied Psychology*. (62), 237-40.
- Mondy, R.W., Noe, R.M., & Premeaux, S.R. (2002). *Human resource management*. (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship between organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviors: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

- Mucha, J. (2009). A performance management framework. *Government Finance Review*, 25(5), 51-54.
- Mullins, L.J. (2007). *Management and organisational behaviour*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Neha, S., & Himanshu, R. (2015). Impact of performance appraisal on organisational commitment job satisfaction. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Sciences*, 6(2), 95-104.
- Neubert, M.J. (1998). The value of feedback and goal setting over goal setting alone and potential moderators of this effect: a meta-analysis. *Human Performance*, 11(4), 321-335.
- Neuman, W.L. (2000). *Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Nzuve, S.N.M. (2007). *Management of human resources: a Kenyan perspective*. Nairobi: Basic.
- Oreku, G.S., Mtenzi, F.J., & Al-Dahoud, A. (2013). A viewpoint of Tanzania e-commerce and implementation barriers. *Computer Science & Information Systems*, (10)1, 264.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual: a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS*. England: Open University Press.
- Price, J.L., & Mueller, C.W. (1986). *Handbook of organizational measurement*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.
- Purcell, J., Kinnie, N.J., Hutchinson, S., Rayton, B., & Swart, J. (2003). *Understanding the people and performance link: unlocking the black box*. London: CIPD.
- Raia, A.P. (1965). Goal setting and self-control: an empirical study. *Journal of Management Studies*, 2(1), 34-53.
- Rajendran, V. (2008). The relationship between performance appraisal satisfaction and employee outcomes: a study conducted in peninsular Malaysia (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya).
- Riketta, M. (2002), "Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 257-66.
- Roberts, E.B. (2001). Benchmarking global strategic management of technology. *Research-Technology Management*, 44(2), 25-36.
- Rousseau, D.S., Sitkin, S., Burt, R., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: a cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 387-392.
- Sojoudi, S., & Farahbod, F. (2012). Organizational commitment and performance management: the roles of trust and justice. *Trends in Advance Science and Engineering*, 6(1), 55-63.
- Tang, T.L.P., & Sarsfield-Baldwin, L.J. (1996). Distributive and procedural justice as related to satisfaction and commitment. *Advanced Management Journal*, 61(3), 25-31.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

VanVoorhis, R.W. and Levinson, E.M. (2006), "Job satisfaction among school psychologists: a meta-analysis", *School Psychology Quarterly*, 21(1), 77-90.

Venkataraman Rao, R. (2005). Making performance appraisal an open system. *Human Resource Management Review*, 48-57.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Performance Appraisal at a Meat Corporation of Namibia



You are invited to participate in a research study about performance appraisal and its relationship with employee attitudes. Please complete the survey. It should take no longer than 20 minutes to complete, and your responses are completely voluntary, confidential and anonymous. You can decide to withdraw from the survey at any time.

The research will help me complete my minor dissertation. The survey has been approved by the Ethics in Research Committee of the University of Cape Town. The management of a Meat Corporation of Namibia has agreed to participate in this study and allowed me access to the Meat processing plant employees.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact me, Vivian Kaposambo, on 081 1462581/ vkaposambo@meatco.com.na or my research supervisor at the University of Cape Town, Prof Jeffrey Bagraim at jeffrey.bagraim@uct.ac.za

Kind regards

Vivian

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

You and your organisation: Organisational Commitment

1. How committed are you to the Meat manufacturing plant?

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

2. To what extent do you care about the Meat manufacturing plant?

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

3. How dedicated are you to the Meat manufacturing plant?

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

4. To what extent have you chosen to be committed to the Meat manufacturing plant?

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Moderately
- Quite a bit
- Extremely

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Performance Appraisal at a Meat manufacturing plant

1. Fairness: How fair is appraisal of your performance?

1	How much do you feel your last performance rating truly represented how well you have performed in your job at the Meat manufacturing plant?				
	1 ← Not at all	2	3	4	5 → Very much represented
2	How fair do you feel your last performance appraisal was?				
	1 ← Not fair at all	2	3	4	5 → Very Fair
3	How accurately do you feel your performance has been evaluated?				
	1 ← Not at all accurately	2	3	4	5 → Very accurately
4	How justified do you feel your supervisor was in his/her last rating of your performance?				
	1 ← Not at all justified	2	3	4	5 → Very justified
5	5. How much do you feel your last performance was free from bias? (Bias means unfair or favoritism)-&nbsp;				
	1 ← Biased	2	3	4	5 → Free from bias
6	If you have been evaluating your own performance, how similar would your rating have been to the last one that your supervisor gave to you?				
	1 ← Not at all similar	2	3	4	5 → Very similar

2. Communication: How is your performance appraisal evaluation discussed with you?

7	How often is the progress toward your goals set in previous appraisal meetings reviewed by your supervisor with you?				
	1 ← Not at all	2	3	4	5 → Very often
8	How much guidance does your supervisor give you about how to improve your performance?				
	1	2	3	4	5

**EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT**

	Not guidance at all				Very much guidance
9	How much input does your supervisor ask for during the appraisal process?				
	1 ← Not at all	2	3	4	5 → Very much
10	How much does your supervisor sit down and discuss with you the results of your performance evaluations?				
	1 ← Not at all	2	3	4	5 → Very much
11	How often does the performance appraisal process at the Meat manufacturing plant result in specifications of new goals?				
	1 ← Not at all	2	3	4	5 → Very often
12	How much opportunity are you given to express your feelings when your performance is evaluated?				
	1 ← Not at all	2	3	4	5 → Very much

3. Clarity: How much information has been shared and clarified to you, pertaining to the performance appraisal system in the Meat manufacturing plant?

13	How clear was it made to you when you were hired that the results of your performance evaluation would be tied to certain personnel actions (i.e., pay raises/increases)?				
	1 ← Not at all	2	3	4	5 → Very clear
14	When you were hired, how much information was given to you about the performance appraisal criteria used for your evaluation?				
	1 ← Not at all	2	3	4	5 → Very much
15	How clear was it, when you were hired, that your performance would be periodically evaluated?				
	1 ← Not at all	2	3	4	5 → Very clear

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

4. Understanding: How well do you understand the performance appraisal system within the Meat manufacturing plant?

16	How well do you understand the performance appraisal process at your organisation?				
	1 ← No understanding at all	2	3	4	5 → Very well
17	How free do you feel to discuss job-related problems with your supervisor?				
	1 ← Not free at all	2	3	4	5 → Very free
18	How comfortable do you feel expressing your feelings to your supervisor?				
	1 ← Not at all	2	3	4	5 → Very comfortable

5. Trust: What is the trust relationship between line managers and employees?

19	How competent do you feel your supervisor is to evaluate your job?				
	1 ← Not at all competent	2	3	4	5 → Very competent
20	How familiar is your supervisor with the details and responsibilities that your job entails?				
	1 ← Not at all familiar	2	3	4	5 → Very familiar
21	To what extent do you have confidence and trust in your immediate supervisor regarding his/her general fairness?				
	1 ← No extent	2	3	4	5 → Very large extent
22	How much do you trust your supervisor to accurately report your performance to his/her supervisor?				
	1 ← Not at all	2	3	4	5 → Very much

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Work at a Meat manufacturing plant: Job Autonomy & Role Conflict

1. My job at the Meat manufacturing plant

1. I have the freedom to decide what i do on my job at the Meat manufacturing plant.
 - Strongly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Agree
 - Strongly agree

2. It is basically my own responsibility to decide how my job gets done at the Meat manufacturing plant.
 - Strongly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Agree
 - Strongly agree

3. I have a lot of say about what happens on my job in the Meat manufacturing plant.
 - Strongly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Agree
 - Strongly agree

4. I work under conflicting policies, guidelines or expectations in the Meat manufacturing plant
 - Strongly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neither agree nor disagree

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

- Agree
- Strongly agree

5. I have to “bend the rules” to carry out some assignments at the Meat manufacturing plant

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

6. I receive conflicting requests from different people in the Meat manufacturing plant

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

2. **My job resources at a Meat manufacturing plant: Resource Inadequacy**

7. I do not have enough of the supplies that I need to do my job in the Meat manufacturing plant.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

8. I do not have enough technological resources to do my job in the Meat manufacturing plant.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

9. I do not have enough administrative support to do my job in the Meat manufacturing plant.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

3. How getting my job done depends on others: Task Independence

10. I have to talk to other employees to get my job done in the Meat manufacturing plant.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

11. I must wait for someone else before my work is finished in the Meat manufacturing plant.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

12. I must wait for someone to finish their job before I can do my job in the Meat manufacturing plant.

- Strongly disagree

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

4. My job security at a Meat manufacturing plant

13. I am afraid of losing my present job.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

14. I am not really sure how long my present job will last.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

15. I can be sure of my present job as long as I do good work.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

16. This job has retirement security.

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

17. I can keep my current job for as long as I want it.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

5. How am I rewarded at the Meat manufacturing plant (Distributive justice)

18. I am fairly rewarded, given my level of experience.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

19. I am fairly rewarded, given my level of responsibility.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

20. I am fairly rewarded, given my work effort.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

21. I am fairly rewarded, given my level of prior education & training.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

6. How policies in the Meat manufacturing plant affects me (Procedural justice)

22. Policies and procedures in this organisation are designed so that all parties affected by the decision are considered

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

23. Policies and procedures in this organisation provide the opportunity for employees to challenge or appeal against decisions

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Strongly agree

24. Policies and procedures in this organisation are designed to ensure that accurate information is used when making decisions

Strongly disagree

Disagree

Neither agree nor disagree

Agree

Strongly agree

About me

Please indicate your job level in the Meat manufacturing plant

Executive (Exco)

Senior Management

Middle Management

Junior Management

General Staff

Please indicate your business unit

Operations (Windhoek & Okahandja Factory, NCA)

Head office & Support Services

Local Markets & Value addition (Wholesale, Canning, Tannery & Meatma)

Livestock Procurement (Feedlot & Procurement)

Please indicate your gender

Male

Female

Prefer not to answer

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Please indicate your age category

- Less than 25 years old
- 26 - 32 years
- 33 - 40 years
- More than 40 years
- Prefer not to answer

Please indicate your tenure / the number of years you have worked for the organisation

- Less than 3 years
- Between 3 and 5 years
- Between 6 and 10 years
- More than 10 years
- Prefer not to answer

What is your highest formal qualification?

- None
- Grade 10
- Grade 12
- National Diploma or Degree

Do you have an employee's reporting to you of which you manage performance appraisal?

- Yes
- No

My responses accurately reflect my views about my organisation

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTION OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND THE
RELATIONSHIP WITH ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

No one else in the organisation interfered with the completion of my questionnaire

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Thank you for your participation.

Your response is important to the success of this study.