

**EMPLOYEES ATTITUDE
TOWARDS PROMOTION ON MERIT:
A CASE STUDY OF KENYA COLLEGE OF
COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY**

BY

JOHN MBURUGU KIMATHI

191080

**A MANAGEMENT RESEARCH PROJECT
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (MBA)**

**FACULTY OF COMMERCE, UNIVERSITY OF
NAIROBI**

AUGUST 2000

**UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
LIBRARY
P. O. Box 30197
NAIROBI**

DECLARATION

This project is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university.

SIGNATURE: _____

**JOHN MBURUGU KIMATHI**

DATE: _____

24-10-2000

This project paper has been submitted for examination with my approval as university supervisor.

SIGNATURE: _____

**DUNCAN O. OCHORO**

Lecturer, Business Administration Department, Faculty of Commerce

DATE: _____

25/10/2000

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

DEDICATION

To my Beloved parents: Robert and Margaret.

Thank you for all the sacrifice, support and vision.

To my brother Moses for your encouragement, and lastly to

my wife Lucy and children Brian, Kevin and Ian for your

?

patience during the period of study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
TITLE.....	i
DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
ABSTRACT	viii

CHAPTER I

1:0 INTRODUCTION	1
1:1 BACKGROUND	1
1:2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	7
1:3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	8
1:4 IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY	10

CHAPTER 2

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	11
-----------------------------	----

CHAPTER 3

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	22
3:1 THE POPULATION	22
3:2 THE SAMPLE	22
3:3 DATA COLLECTION	23
3:4 DATA ANALYSIS	25

	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>CHAPTER 4</u>	
4.0 DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS.....	25
<u>CHAPTER 5</u>	
5:0 CONCLUSION.....	44
5:1 SUMMARY	44
5:2 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	52
5.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	52
5:3 BIBLIOGRAPHY	54
<u>APPENDICES</u>	
(i) LETTER TO RESPONDENTS	57
(ii) EMPLOYEES QUESTIONNAIRE	58

<u>LIST OF TABLES</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
1. Education Level and Gender of Respondents.....	26
2. Education Level and Employment category of respondents.....	27
3. Years of service at KCCT.....	28
4. Promotions.....	29
5. Employees attitude towards performance appraisal.....	30
6. Importance of performance appraisal interview.....	33
7. Opinions on promotion on merit.....	35
8. Reasons for satisfaction with promotion on merit.....	37
9. Reasons for the dissatisfaction with promotion on merit.....	38
10. Recommendations to improve promotion on merit.....	40
11. Educational level and satisfaction with promotion on merit.....	42
12. Departments and satisfaction with promotion on merit.....	43

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Many people have contributed greatly in one way or the other during the preparation of this project. First of all I wish to extend my sincere thanks to my supervisor Mr. Duncan Ochoro for his guidance and time taken in reviewing my work and his contribution towards the realisation of this project.

Secondly, I am greatly indebted to Director, Kenya College of Communications Technology for providing me with time, resources and permission to carry this project at the College. Thirdly my sincere thanks goes to all the respondents who willingly provided valuable information and co-operation during the survey.

Lastly, but not least my gratitude's goes to Mrs. Malia for the typing of my project proposal and to Mrs. Jerita Mtali for typing my final report.

ABSTRACT

The study reported here analysed the employee's attitude towards promotion on merit. The case of Kenya College of Communications Technology (KCCT). Under the above broad objective the study explored the opinions of employees towards performance appraisal form, performance appraisal interview and their views on promotion on merit. It also sought to find out what factors cause satisfaction and dissatisfaction with promotion on merit and finally it sought suggestions and recommendations to make promotion on merit more efficient and acceptable to employees.

The need for the study arose out of the urge to develop a better understanding of the link between promotion and performance and to help managers to refine promotion policies already in existence. This was as a result of the current trends on the market place where organizations are right sizing with a view of increasing the productivity of the fewer employees to surpass the total productivity of all employees before right sizing and also the need for all other organizations to improve their productivity.

The study was exploratory in nature as not much research had been conducted in the area and little is known in the subject. A sample survey of KCCT employees was carried out, data was collected using a structured self-reporting questionnaire, based on Likert (1932) type of scale and analysed and presented in tables and percentages.

In conclusion, the finding of the study revealed that employees have negative attitude towards promotion on merit. This could be attributed to certain factors, such as the weakness of performance appraisal to accurately capture performance indicators and measure them. The employees feeling that performance appraisal interview is not carried out fairly and impartially and the failure to link promotion to merit.

CHAPTER 1

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The current state of the economy characterized by globalisation, liberalisation and intense competition from within and outside the country has led many organizations in both private and public sector become preoccupied on how to increase the “added value” of their employees. That is to encourage the employees to increase their productivity beyond that which is at a minimum acceptable standard using scarce resources.

Managers, in different organizations have adopted different methods of achieving the above objective. Among the popular approach used by many enterprises to increase productivity from employees is by setting an organizational reward management system to support its achievement, that is, by linking promotion to performance.

This is based on the theory of behaviour modification, which attempts to explain how desirable employee behaviour can be encouraged.

It takes into account Thorndike's "Law of effect" which states that "of several response made to the same situation those which are accompanied or closely followed by satisfaction (reinforcement) will be more likely to recur, those, which are accompanied or closely followed by discomfort (punishment) will be less likely to occur" *Burns (1992)*.

The above fact has led to many enterprises developing performance evaluation which ties promotion to performance, and in this way employees who are highly committed to the organization and who exhibit exceptional performance receive promotion to justify their efforts. This is supported by findings of behavioural research, which consistently demonstrates that performance levels are highest when rewards are contingent on performance.

Performance appraisal schemes are therefore established to support multiple objectives which includes, among others, telling subordinate how he/she is doing and suggesting needed changes in his/her behaviour, attitudes, skills and knowledge.

It is also being increasingly used as a basis for the coaching and counseling of the individual employees by the superior and it provides systematic judgements to back up promotions. It is this linkage between promotion and merit, that is promotion given to reward individual merit, which greatly interests managers.

The advantages of linking promotion to performance includes among other things helping organizations to develop a performance oriented culture by delivering a clear message that promotions are contingent on performance. It also defines expectations, focus effort and if used as a basis for discussions between managers and their teams, increase commitment.

Promotions further serves to retain high quality employees and deliver messages to poor quality employees either to improve or to go. It is also fundamentally equitable to promote people in accordance with their contribution. A survey carried out in United States of America (USA) and Britain show that overwhelming majority of companies has some type of a merit pay program, which relate promotion to performance.

For example, in 1990 A case study of a major British clearing bank with a branch network in England and Wales-United bank, on the implementation of a performance related Reward Scheme concluded that the scheme had succeeded because it had given positive direction and motivation to employees. *Elebert (1989)*

In Kenya, Posta Code E, Section II of Kenya College of Communications Technology (KCCT) Code of Regulations states that "in considering employees for promotion the first consideration will be given to merit. Where it is difficult to distinguish between the candidates using this quality seniority will be considered"

The KCCT is a wholly owned subsidiary of Telkom Kenya. The College, which was formerly the Central Training School, was founded in 1948 to provide advanced Telecommunications and Postal training to employees of the East African Posts and Telecommunications Administration. After the collapse of the East African Community the School was taken over and made a department within the defunct Kenya Posts and Telecommunication Corporations.

In July 1992, it was upgraded to a College (KCCT) and made autonomous. The executive function of the College is vested in a Director, who reports to a Board of Directors. The College has complete management and financial autonomy from Telkom Kenya. Currently, it has three campuses, Mbagathi (Main campus) Loresho, and Teleposta city center campus. The College has employed 670 employees. Mbagathi campus has 585 employees Loresho campus has 80 employees and Teleposta city center campus has 5 employees. The College offers a wide range of basic, medium and advanced skills development courses in Business Administration, Postal Services, Telecommunications Engineering and Operations. It also offers modern conference facilities to both local and International meetings. ʘ

The KCCT Advancement/Promotion policy for all staff depends on the fulfillment of the requirements of the Scheme of Services, which sets the minimum qualifications and or experience required for advancement from one grade to another. It is emphasized however, that these are minimum requirement for the fulfillment, which makes an officer eligible for consideration for promotion to next grade.

In addition promotion from one grade to another will be subject to: -

- [i] Existence of a vacancy in the authorised establishment
- [ii] Merit and ability as reflected in work results based on performance appraisal system.
- [iii] The approval of the Director for Grade K6 and below or the Board of Governors for Grade K5 and above.

The KCCT nomenclature and grades are as follows:-

K1, K2, K3, K4, K5, K6, K7, K8, K9

Grade K1 is the Director/Chief Executive position.

Grades K2 – K4 consists of Deputy Director's and Heads of

Departments, they form top level management.

Grade K5 – K6 is the entry grade for graduates and it also consists of other experienced staff with a minimum education of secondary school. They form middle and lower level management.

Grades K7 – K8 consists of school certificates and diploma holders, they are the unionisable employees.

It therefore appears that there has been more and more emphasis placed on relationship between promotion and performance, hence enterprises are striving to recognize good performers and reward them for their effort.

There is therefore merit in looking at employee attitude towards promotion on merit.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The primary aim of promotion on merit is that of increasing motivation to achieve higher productivity by tying at least part of the employee salary and rise in status to their performance. The above facts rests heavily on three assumptions, that employees difference in performance can be accurately measured, employees can objectively perceive salary differences as relating to performance differences and individuals will increase future performance to gain promotion. It is also believed that salary increase that is obtained as a result of one's promotion will have greater value than salary increase that is given to everyone.

This is supported by current research, *Rue and Byars (1992)* which clearly show that appraising performance without having a system that ties the results of the appraisal to the organization promotion policy creates an environment where employees are poorly motivated. Presently, the current policy in KCCT is to promote employees on merit. This is in the belief that linking promotion to performance is an effective way of motivating

employees to higher performance. This is in line with the law of effect which states that, behaviours that are rewarded are more likely to be repeated behaviours that are punished are less likely to be repeated. *Burns (1992)*.

The degree to which employees are motivated will depend not only upon the perceived value of their actions but also their perceptions of the likelihood of achieving their expectations. Higher effort and motivation therefore, exist when employee perceives a strong link between effort, performance and promotion. If relating promotion to merit is desirable why then is it that employees have no confidence in promotion on merit.

This study therefore aims at filling this void in knowledge by focusing at KCCT. Do employees of KCCT link promotion to merit?

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aims at establishing KCCT employee's attitude towards promotion on merit through: -

- 1) Assessing the attitude of KCCT employees towards promotion on merit.

- 2) Finding out the causes for positive and or negative attitude and what can be done to improve the attitude.

The first objective can be broken into three questions.

- (i) What is the employee's attitude towards performance appraisal form/instrument?
- (ii) What is the employee's attitude towards performance appraisal interview?
- (iii) Is there a relationship between promotion and merit?

The second objective can be broken down into two questions: -

- (i) Why are the employees satisfied or dissatisfied with promotion on merit?
- (ii) What are the employees recommendations regarding promotion on merit?

1:4 IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

This study will be of importance to: -

1. Human Resource Managers: It is hoped that the study will help them refine promotion policies already in existence by highlighting the adequacy or otherwise of promotion policies.
2. Further Research: It is a pioneer study that ought to form the basis and stimulate research in order to develop a better understanding of the link between promotion and performance.

CHAPTER 2

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

The free enterprise system is based on the premise that rewards should depend on performance. This performance reward relationship is desirable not only at corporate level but also at individual level. The underlying theory, which provides the theoretical foundation for promotion on merit, is the Porter and Lawler's Model of Motivation (1968) which considers the relationship between effort-performance-reward for each individual and introduces the importance of having individual perform jobs for which they have proper skills, abilities and traits.

Porter and Lawler modified and built upon Adam's (1963) Equity and Vroom's (1964) expectancy theories of motivation also termed as process theories of motivation. Their proposition is that managers are able to control employee behaviour by linking the occurrence of the desired behaviour to some form of reward, thereby, ensuring predictability of behaviour.

The intention is to introduce and enforce agreed norms of behaviour and achievement of organization objectives.

The major principles in the Porters' and Lowler's model to succeed is that performance must be measured accurately and systematically, so that rewards can be distributed fairly. If this is not done fairly expending necessary effort to do the job will seem senseless to employees. Employees must also value their rewards both intrinsic rewards which are part of the job and occur when employee performs work, such as a sense of self actualisation and accomplishment, and extrinsic rewards administered by managers and supervisors examples would be job security, working conditions and fringe benefits.

There must also be a meaningful difference in rewards between high and low performers. If there are no meaningful differences, high performers will lose motivational intensity and probably cut back on their performance. Employee must also believe that good performance will be linked to achievement of the preferred rewards and that an organisation hopes all employees will consider long term costs and opportunities although the reward is geared towards short-term results.

It is however; clear that although these principles have their own weakness, it is evident that there is now and always has been some relationship between promotion and performance.

Presently enterprises are striving to recognise good performance of employees based on careful appraisal and sound selection and promote them for their efforts. This has resulted in performance evaluation system being introduced, modified and reviewed scrupulously to ensure promotion of right employees and to aid in meeting productivity objectives.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Performance appraisal is the basic tool used by enterprises to evaluate the performance of employees. A comparative survey of twelve American and nine Indian companies showed some interesting similarities in their objective of the performance appraisal. According to this study all the twelve and nine Indian companies were found to use merit evaluation for determining promotion.

A survey conducted in 1978 of eighty-nine (89) Indian manufacturing and sales companies revealed promotion as the most important objective of performance appraisal¹.

While the objective of performance appraisal vary from culture to culture, organization to organization and in the same organisation from time to time the broad objective according to Monnapa and Salyadain (1979) is to identify employees for promotion.

OTHER CASES

The Government of India (1983) established a very elaborate procedure for evaluating the performance of all the employees at the end of the year. The objective of this exercise were manifold, it included among other key objectives to determine the upward mobility of the employees. It is therefore, clear that the primary objective of performance appraisal, as far as an employee is concerned is promotion. It is believed that after an organization has implemented and conducted a systematic performance appraisal, the next step is to consider how to tie promotion to the outcomes of the appraisal. *Steers (1981)*.

In Kenya, the civil servants are graded from lowest grade Job Group A to the highest grade, Job Group T - the Head of Civil Service. Promotions from Job group A to Job group H are done under delegated powers by Permanent Secretary who is the Authorised officer/Accounting officer in a Ministry (Cap 185 of Laws of Kenya).

Promotions on Job Group J to Job Group Q are done by the Public Service Commission of Kenya. In the above cases, Educational and Professional qualifications and Experience required are set out in relevant schemes of service and allows an officer to be eligible for consideration for promotion to the next grade. However, the decision to promote or not is based on the individual performance in the promotion interview. ✓

The performance appraisal results hardly courts as long as the performance results are not negative in which case the employee is supposed to have been informed by his/her immediate superior. Promotions above Job Group Q are done by the President through the Head of Civil Service.

There are many reasons why some organizations like Kenya Civil Service are reluctant to relate promotion directly to performance, among other reasons, giving everyone an equal opportunity in a promotion interview is much easier. Usually this method requires very little justification and involves fewer hassles than relating promotion to performance.

In other organizations the promotion policy may dictate that pay raises conform to guidelines that are unrelated to performance, example, due to risk involved in location of the office, or cost of living for instance the United Nations (UN) bodies located in different countries.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AT KCCT

Postacode E.11 of KCCT, Code of Regulations states that "In considering employees for promotion first consideration will be given to merit. Where it is difficult to distinguish between the candidates using this quality seniority will be considered". In KCCT the employees are evaluated at the end of the year and the results are used for promotion purposes. In some cases employees are evaluated for other reasons like acting

appointment, post-training evaluation and special review for salary increase beyond efficiency bar among others.

The employee and the immediate Supervisor go through appraisal form together evaluating performance objectives. In case of dispute in any rating, there is a provision for employee to give the reasons. Then, the immediate supervisor rates the employees on personal qualities and traits confidentially, after that, the appraisal form is again rated by the controlling officer on personal qualities and traits. There is no provision for controlling officer to rate employee on performance objectives. It is then tabled to the performance appraisal panel for discussion and further rating. The panel rates only personal qualities and traits and not performance objectives.

It is from this rating of personal qualities and traits and not performance objectives that the best performing employee(s) are identified and subsequently recommended for promotion to the Director in case of those in K6 and below and Board of Directors for those in K5 and above.

It is therefore, clear that the need to relate performance to promotion is generally supported by a large cross section of organization, managers and scholars to an extent Robbins (1988) argues that, the principle of promoting for performance is so logical and so deeply instilled in our value system that few attack it. He states that "Like apple pie, motherhood and the flag The allocation of rewards on the basis of performance is a revered concept in organization."

WEAKNESS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Despite good intentions however, in actual practice some problems crop up that often disturb the achievement of the objective of linking performance to promotion. According to Burns (1995) "the allure of a system that provides greatest reward for superior performance is matched only by the difficulty of designing and using merit evaluation with no dysfunctional consequences".

A survey carried out in USA indicated that even though overwhelming majority of USA companies have some type of merit pay programs, most do a poor job of relating promotion to performance⁸.

Among the weakness of merit evaluation is that most organizations believe their promotion system is designed to pay off for merit but, the problem is we finding differing definitions of merit. According to Levinson (1976) merit evaluation purports to focus on behaviour aspects as well as performance aspects of an individual employee, but in practice people are really appraised on how they do things.

Other weakness of merit evaluation include lack of training and experience by supervisor who may make human errors, like halo effect, that is tendency to influence evaluation of other traits by the assessment of one trait, this takes place when traits are not clearly defined and are unfamiliar. A central tendency error that is bunching of employees in middle, extreme low side or extreme high side of the scale, in most cases it reflects the personality of the supervisor. Recency effect, which refers to the proximity/closeness to appraisal period, employee take it easy for the whole year doing just enough to earn a salary, however, came appraisal time he/she became very active.

Others include problems of criteria, that is if a discrepancy between expected and actual performance is pointed out, the question of whether the expected was fully defined and communicated to the employee in absence of such an attempt the appraisal reports are questioned among others. The issues raised above essentially focus on the problems of reliability and validity of performance evaluation. That is, how do we know whether what is appraised is what was supposed to be appraised? Saiyadain (1998). According to Thompson and Dalton (1970) when promotions are based on rating of results rather than on behaviour, competent employees may not only be denied promotions but also become demotivated.

It is therefore widely recognized that there are many things inherently wrong with most of the merit evaluation system, therefore, trying to base promotion decision on appraisal data leaves decisions to acrimonious debate. Hence no matter how well defined the dimensions for appraising performance on quantitative goals are, judgement on performance is usually subjective and impressionistic, to a level where in an article Nazi (1979) emphasized the need of delinking appraisal from the promotion.

In reality however, there are many situations in which employees are actually penalized for high performance particularly when their supervisors consider this high performance "rocking the boat".

This research will therefore, try to investigate whether promotion on merit that is linking Promotion to individual merit as practised by KCCT suffers any dysfunctional consequence and attempt to make suggestion for its refinement.

CHAPTER 3

3:0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3:1 THE POPULATION

The population of study consisted the KCCT employees at Mbagathi, Loresho and Teleposta Towers City Center Campuses. The KCCT has 670 employees. Mbagathi campus has 585 employees; Loresho Campus has 80 employees and Teleposta Towers City Center Campus 5 employees.

3.2 THE SAMPLE

It consisted of 84 employees drawn from Mbagathi, Loresho and Telepost Towers City Center Campuses. The 84 employees were selected using the random sample from the list of personal numbers provided by Human Resource Department. It was also assumed that there were no significant differences in attitudes towards promotion on merit among employees in the three campuses. This is because promotions are done at Mbagathi campus and transfers to and from the three campuses are done every two years and involves almost everybody.

3.3 DATA COLLECTION

The data for the survey was collected by self reporting questionnaire based on Likert (1932) type of scale (summated rating method). The questionnaire consisted of seven parts was designed and administered through “drop and pick technique”. The questionnaire was developed after extensive review of literature and it had been pilot tested on a convenient sample of KCCT employees who were not included in the final sampling.

Part I of the questionnaire dealt with respondents biodata questions to assist in finding out whether there is a systematic bias resulting from random sample. /

Part 2, 3 and 4 of the questionnaire, dealt with respondents attitude towards promotion on merit. A5 point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) was used to measure the extent to which respondents were generally infavour of promotion on merit.

Part 5 and 6 of the questionnaire dealt with attitude information seeking and part 7 dealt with respondents suggestions on the best way to improve promotion on merit.

3.4 DATA ANALYSIS

The main tool of analysis used was descriptive statistics. The data from the questionnaires were coded and then a statistical analysis programme (SPSS) was used to analyse the data. Frequencies and percentages were used to summarise the data collected, which was also compared to see whether it converges in particular areas or diverges. Summary statistics including tables and percentages were used to present the findings.

Further statistical analysis was done to bring out any significance differences between the various biodata categories analysed and for this purpose a cross tabulation were used to bring out trends that would lead to conclusions.

CHAPTER 4

4.0 DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The data analysis was guided by the objective of the study which were to assess the attitude of KCCT employees towards promotion on merit. The response rate was 84.5% of the sample anticipated.

The data from the completed questionnaires is summarized and presented in form of tables and percentages. The analysis is presented in seven stages. The first stage presents data on biodata characteristics, and cross tabulation of data from various respondents on various categories to enable comparisons. The second stage, presents data on the attitude of employees towards performance appraisal form. The third stage presents respondents data on employees attitude towards performance appraisal interview and the fourth stage presents respondents data on employees attitude towards promotion on merit.

The fifth and sixth stages presents data on respondents attitude information seeking (reasons for satisfaction or dissatisfaction) and the last stage seven, represents data on respondents suggested recommendations on improving promotion on merit.

SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHIC

The tables below presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents, which include, gender of the respondents, education level, current scale, number of the years worked at KCCT, Departments, employees who have had promotions since joining KCCT and cross-tabulation of data of respondents on various categories.

TABLE I**Education level and Gender of Respondents.**

The table below presents a cross tabulation of data between education level and gender of respondents.

N = 71

EDUCATION LEVEL	GENDER OF RESPONDENTS		TOTAL
	FEMALE	MALE	
Primary School	2	5	7
Secondary School	11	14	25
College Diploma	5	20	25
University Degree	0	7	7
Graduate degree	2	1	3
Others	0	4	4
Total	20 28%	51 72%	71 100%

Source: Field data

N = Number of Respondents

From the sample of seventy one respondents, twenty eight (28%) are female while fifty one (72%) are male. Out of twenty female thirteen (65%) have primary or secondary level of education while males were nineteen (45%) only.

TABLE 2**Education level and employment category of respondents.**

The table below presents a cross tabulation of data between education level and employment category of respondents.

N = 69

LEVEL	CURRENT SCALE		TOTAL
	K5 - K6	K7 - K9	
Primary School	0	6	6
Secondary School	6	19	25
College Diploma	10	15	25
University Degree	6	0	6
Graduate Degree	3	0	3
Others	1	3	4
Total	26 38%	43 62%	69 100%

Source: Field data

The respondents on scales K5 – K6 are senior officers who were twenty six (38%) and have minimum education of secondary school while the respondents in scales K7 – K9 were middle and lower level cadres who were forty three (62%) of respondents with college diploma as the highest level of education. They form the bulk of employees at KCCT.

TABLE 3**Years of service at KCCT**

N = 71

Years of Service	No. Of Respondents	Percentage
Below 1 year	1	1.41
1 –3 Years	6	8.45
Above 4 years	64	90.14
Total	71	100

Source: Field data

The respondent who have worked in KCCT for less than one year was one (1.41%)while six (8.45%) have worked in KCCT for one to three years and sixty four (90.14%) of respondents have been working in KCCT for four years and above.

TABLE 4

Promotions

N = 70

Promotions	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Promoted	17	24.29
Not yet promoted	53	75.71
Total	70	100

Source: Field data

The sample was divided into two categories as in the table above. Those who have had promotions were seventeen (24.29%) while fifty three (75.71%) were not yet promoted.

THE EMPLOYEES ATTITUDES TOWARDS PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FORM

The nature of this study was that it sought to get opinions from the respondents about promotion on merit. This stage analyse the attitude held by employees towards performance appraisal form. To do this, the attitude score of each respondent was taken to indicate the attitude held. Those who score 1 and 2 were taken to hold positive attitude as they disagreed with the statements, 3 as holding indifferent attitude while, those scoring 4 and 5 are considered holding negative attitude as they agreed with the statements.

Positive attitude is taken as indication of agreement with performance appraisal form and negative attitudes as disagreement.

TABLE 5

The table below shows employees attitude towards Performance Appraisal Form

N=71

Importance of Performance appraisal form	Disagree	Indifferent	Agreed
1. It does not capture actual performance.	16(22%)	9 (13%)	46(65%)
2. It measures items which are not related to Performance.	24(34%)	9 (13%)	38(53%)
3. It is difficult to understand and fill.	17(24%)	9 (13%)	45(63%)
4. It does not capture the standards of measurements as agreed by both employee and supervisor.	33(46%)	7 (10%)	31(44%)
5. It does not give room for disagreements.	40(56%)	14(20%)	17(24%)
6. It is written in technical terms which are difficult to understand and measure.	25(35%)	5 (7%)	41(58%)
7. It does not give enough space to explain about performance	37(53%)	7 (10%)	27(37%)
Total	39%	11%	50%

Source: Field data

From the sample of respondents forty-six (65%) of respondents had the opinion that performance appraisal form does not capture actual performance while sixteen (22%) disagreed and nine (13%) were indifferent as to whether it captures the actual performance or not.

Thirty-eight (53%) of the respondents had the opinion that performance appraisal form measures items which are not related to performance while twenty-four (34%) of the respondents disagreed and nine (13%) were indifferent.

Forty five (63%) of the respondents felt that the performance appraisal form is difficult to understand and fill while seventeen (24%) disagreed and nine (13%) were indifferent as to whether it was difficult to understand and fill or not. Thirty-one (44%) respondents had the opinion that performance appraisal form does not capture the standards of measurement as agreed by both the employee and supervisor while thirty-three (46%) disagreed and seven (10%) were indifferent.

Out of seventy-one respondents seventeen (24%) had the opinion that performance appraisal does not give room for disagreements while forty (56%) disagreed and fourteen (20%) were indifferent as to

whether it gives room for disagreement or not. Forty-one (58%) of the respondents felt that performance appraisal is written in technical terms which were difficult to understand and measure while twenty five (35%) disagreed and five (7%) were indifferent.

Twenty seven (37%) of the respondents felt that the performance appraisal does not give enough space to explain about performance while thirty seven (53%) disagreed and seven (10%) were indifferent as to whether it gives enough space to explain about performance.

OPINIONS ON PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INTERVIEW

In this stage the opinions of the employee towards performance appraisal interview were sought. Like in performance appraisal form stage, the attitude score was obtained using the same scale, indifferent score was 3. So that score above it indicate negative attitude while below it denotes positive attitude.

Table 6

The table below shows employees attitude towards performance appraisal interview.

N = 71

Performance appraisal Interview	Disagreed	Indifferent	Agreed
1. It is a waste of time.	14(20%)	9 (13%)	48(67%)
2. It is carried by immediate supervisor as a matter of routine.	44(62%)	6 (9%)	21(29%)
3. The interview results are useless, they do not affect ones performance in anyway.	22(31%)	10(14%)	39(55%)
4. Supervisors Award scores on basis of ethnicity and politics.	26(37%)	19(27%)	26(36%)
5. Individual personal relationship with supervisor determines the score one gets.	17(24%)	10 (14%)	44(62%)
6. The scores are kept confidential from employees.	23(33%)	13(18%)	35(49%)
Total	(34%)	(16%)	(50%)

Source : Field data

From the sample of respondents forty-eight (67%) of the respondents had the opinion that performance appraisal interview is a waste of time while fourteen (20%) of the respondents disagreed and nine (13%) were indifferent as to whether it is a waste of time or not.

Twenty one (29%) of the respondents had the opinion that performance interview is carried by immediate supervisor as a matter of routine while forty-four (62%) of respondents disagreed and six (9%) were indifferent.

Thirty nine (55%) respondents felt that the performance interview results are useless, they do not affect ones performance in anyway while twenty two (31%) of respondents disagreed and ten (14%) of respondents were indifferent. Twenty six (36%) of respondents were of the opinion that supervisors award scores on basis of ethnicity and politics while twenty six (37%) disagreed and nineteen (27%) were indifferent as to whether supervisors award scores on basis of ethnicity and politics or not.

Forty four (62%) respondent had the opinion that individual personal relationship with supervisor determines the score one gets in performance appraisal interview while seventeen (24%) disagreed and ten (14%) were indifferent. Out of seventy one respondents thirty five (49%) had the opinion that the scores are kept confidential from employees while twenty three (33%) disagreed and thirteen (18%) were

indifferent as to whether the scores are kept confidential from employees or not.

Table 7

080121/2001

Opinions on promotion on merit

The table below shows employees attitude towards promotion on merit.

N= 71

Promotion on merit	Disagreed	Indifferent	Agreed
1. It is not based on performance appraisal results.	10(14%)	16 (23%)	45(63%)
2. It is based on the considerations like ethnicity and politics.	18(25%)	10 (14%)	43(61%)
3. Hard work does not assure one a promotion when an opportunity arises.	10(14%)	10 (14%)	51(72%)
4. It is based on academic; technical and professional qualifications and not on merit.	25(36%)	23 (32%)	23(32%)
5. It should be based on promotion interview and not on performance appraisal results.	19(27%)	12 (17%)	40(56%)
Total	(23%)	(20%)	(57%)

Source : Field data

From the respondents in the sample forty five (63%) of respondents had the opinion that promotion was not based on performance appraisal results while ten (14%) of respondents disagreed and sixteen (23%) were indifferent. Forty-three (61%) of the respondents felt that promotions are based on other considerations like ethnicity and politics while eighteen (25%) disagreed and ten (14%) were indifferent on whether promotion is based on ethnicity and politics or not.

Fifty-one (72%) of the respondents had the opinion that hard work does not assure one promotion when an opportunity arises while ten (14%) of respondents disagreed and ten (14%) were indifferent. Twenty-three (32%) of respondents felt that promotion is based on academic, technical and professional qualifications and not merit where twenty-five (36%) disagreed and twenty three (32%) were indifferent.

Forty (56%) respondents had the opinion that promotion should be based on promotion interview and not on performance appraisal results while nineteen (27%) disagreed and twelve (17%) were indifferent as to whether promotion should be based on promotion interview and not performance appraisal results or not.

Table 8**Reasons for satisfaction with promotion on merit**

The table below shows reasons why employees are satisfied with promotion on merit.

N=40

Reasons for satisfaction with promotion on merit	Percentage of Respondents
1. It encourages hard work.	100%
2. It is carried out in a fair and objective manner.	78%
3. It reduces time wasted on complaints about unfairness.	85%
4. It increases motivation and morale in an organization.	100%
5. It increases teamwork.	78%
6. It increases profitability through superior performance.	95%
7. Other reasons	20%

Source: Field data

The most popular reasons for satisfaction with promotion on merit includes encouraging hard work one hundred percent (100%).

Increasing motivation and morale in an organization one hundred percent (100%) and increasing profitability through superior performance ninety five percent (95%). However it is notable that all reasons put on the table above contributed to the respondents satisfaction with promotion on merit.

Table 9**Reasons for the dissatisfaction with promotion on merit.**

The table below shows reasons why employees are dissatisfied with promotion on merit.

N=31

Reasons for dissatisfaction with promotion on merit	Percentage of Respondents
1. It has demoralized the employees.	60%
2. It is carried out in unfair manner.	100%
3. It encourages individual loyalty instead of building teamwork.	100%
4. It favours those who are well connected politically to the disadvantage of hard working employees who are not politically connected.	86%
5. It encourage favouritism.	78%
6. It discourages hard work.	70%
7. It encourages tribalism and or "God fatherism".	91%
8. Other reasons.	22%

Source: Field data

All respondents one hundred percent (100%) who were dissatisfied with promotion on merit, had the opinion that, it was carried out in

unfair manner and that it encourages individual loyalty instead of building teamwork. Ninety one percent. (91%) felt that, it encourages tribalism and or "God fatherism" whereas, eighty six percent (86%) felt that it favours those who are well connected politically to the disadvantage of hard working employees who are not politically connected.

Seventy eight per cent (78%) felt that it encourages favouritism whereas only twenty two percent (22%) of the respondent who were dissatisfied with promotion on merit suggested other reasons for dissatisfication. However, it is notable that all resons put on the table above contributed to the respondents dissatisfaction with promotion on merit.

Table 10**Recommendations to improve promotion on merit**

N=71

Recommendations to make promotion on merit more efficient and acceptable	Percentage of Respondents
1. Train employees on how to fill the performance appraisal form.	65%
2. Explain the use of performance appraisal results.	66%
3. Make performance appraisal form as objective as possible.	67%
4. Give immediate feedback to employees about their performance.	87%
5. Create an independent forum to handle disputes arising from performance appraisal rating.	68%
6. Make performance appraisal exercise open and let it be carried out regularly.	72%
7. Others	16%

Source: Field data

Majority of respondents eighty seven percent (87%) felt that employees should get immediate feedback about their performance. Seventy two percent (72%) of respondents felt that performance appraisal exercise should be open and carried out regularly.

Sixty-eight (68%) of respondents felt that an independent forum should be created to handle disputes arising from performance appraisal rating. Sixty seven percent (67%) of respondents felt that performance appraisal should be made as objective as possible where sixty six percent (66%) of respondents felt that the use of performance appraisal results should be explained.

Only sixty-five (65%) of respondents felt the need to train employees on how to fill the performance appraisal form where sixteen (16%) recommended other ways.

RESPONDENTS VIEWS ON PROMOTION ON MERIT

To gain further insight on data a cross tabulation between various bio data characteristics and promotion on merit was carried out and chi-square (X^2) test administered to find out whether there was significant relationship. The X^2 test revealed that there were no significant relationship between various bio data characteristics with promotion on merit.

Table 11**Educational level and satisfaction with promotion on merit.**

The table below present a cross tabulation of data between the level of education and satisfaction with promotion on merit.

N=71

Level of Education	Satisfaction with promotion on merit	
	Yes	No
Primary and Secondary school	17 (53%)	15 (47%)
College Diploma & Graduates	23 (59%)	16 (41%)

Source: Field data

After computation it was found that X^2 value of 0.244 with one degree of freedom is not significant. That is level of education and satisfaction on merit is not related. The differences in percentages observed are due to chance.

Table 12**Departments and satisfaction with promotion on merit.**

The table below present a cross tabulation between the department and satisfaction with promotion on merit.

N= 71

Department	Satisfied with promotion on merit	
	Yes	No
Non teaching (others)	26 (60%)	17 (40%)
Teaching (Business and Engineering)	14 (50%)	14 (50%)

Source: Field data

Respondents were grouped into two departments teaching and non-teaching departments. After computation a X^2 value of 0.755 with one degree of freedom was obtained. It can therefore be concluded that the department and level of satisfaction on merit are not related. In other words respondents in both teaching and non-teaching department appear to be holding similar opinion and the differences observed above are due to chance.

CHAPTER 5

5.0 CONCLUSION

This chapter discusses and summarises the findings of the study as they relate to the objective of the study. It also includes the implications and limitations of the study as well as suggestions for further research.

5.1 **Summary**

Promotion has been defined by Wehrich and Kootz (1984) as a change by an employee within the organization to a higher position that has greater responsibilities and requires more advanced skills. It usually involves a higher pay and frequently the job has higher status and carries improved fringe benefits and privileges. Its purpose is to improve both the utilization and motivation of employees.

The focus in this research has therefore been employees attitude towards promotion on merit. This is a promotion usually given to reward individual merit, in belief that if performance is accurately and systematically measured and promotion fairly distributed on basis of performance then, employee will be motivated to work even harder. Alternatively, if performance is not accurately measured and promotion fairly given on basis of performance, then expending

necessary effort to do the job will seem senseless to employees, resulting in loss of motivational intensity and probably employee might cut back on their performance to the barely acceptable levels, for them to retain their jobs. It is therefore evident from literature that organizations today need to tackle the issue of promotion seriously.

This study sought to shed some light on promotion on merit, an area which not much have been documented locally, but which is a key area in management of human resource for superior performance. In an addition it sought to find out the causes of positive or negative feelings and also increase the body of knowledge in this area of promotion. This will help managers and organizations improve performance through appropriate use of promotion on merit.

The major objectives of this study were, to assess the attitude of KCCT employees towards promotion on merit and to find the cause for positive and negative attitudes. In the first stage of the study a cross tabulation of biodata characteristics of respondents was carried out to enable comparisons. The cross-tabulation revealed that there was no systematic bias on selection of respondents, for example a cross tabulation between gender of respondents and education level

revealed that out of twenty females and fifty one (51) males two (2) females and five (5) males were graduates which represented twenty per cent (20%) of the two categories.

To gain further insight on data, a cross tabulation between various bio data characteristics and satisfaction with promotion on merit was carried out and X^2 test administered to find out whether there was significant relationship. The various X^2 test revealed that there was no significant relationship between various biodata characteristics and satisfaction with promotion on merit, for example a cross tabulation between gender of respondents and satisfaction on merit revealed a X^2 of 0.152 at one degree of freedom. Hence, gender of respondents were not related to satisfaction with promotion on merit. Also, a cross tabulation between level of education and satisfaction with promotion on merit resulted to a X^2 of 0.244 at one degree of freedom, hence revealing the fact that there was no significant relationship between level of education and promotion on merit.

In the second stage of the study we focussed on the first objective: To assess the attitude of KCCT employees towards promotion on merit. This objective was broken down into three areas, firstly, to find employees attitude towards performance appraisal form, their attitude

towards performance appraisal interview and finally their attitude towards promotion on merit.

The study revealed that half of respondents fifty per cent (50%) had negative attitude towards performance appraisal form. Eleven per cent (11%) were indifferent towards performance appraisal form and thirty nine per cent (39%) of respondents had positive attitude towards performance appraisal form. Thus half (50%) of the employees felt that the performance appraisal form does not capture what it is supposed to measure. The major reasons given for negative feelings includes, the opinion by respondents that performance appraisal form does not capture actual performance sixty seven per cent (67%). Sixty three per cent (63%) felt that the form is difficult to understand and fill, while fifty eight per cent (58%) felt that the performance appraisal form is written in technical terms which are difficult to understand and measure. Therefore, to improve performance appraisal form the management should design the form in a way that it will be easier to be understood by employees and capture performance indicators and accurately measure employees performance.

On performance appraisal interview the study revealed that fifty per cent (50%) of respondents had negative attitude towards performance appraisal interview. Sixteen per cent (16%) of the respondents were indifferent as to whether performance appraisal interview was serving its purpose or not while thirty four per cent (34%) of respondents had positive attitude towards performance interview. Thus majority of the employees (50%) feel that all is not well with the way performance appraisal interview is conducted. The major reasons given for this negative attitude is that majority of employees consider performance appraisal interview as a waste of time, sixty seven per cent (67%). Sixty per cent (60%) felt that what matters to get high score is individual personal relationship with supervisor. Fifty five per cent (55%) felt that the interview results are useless, they do not affect one's performance in any way. To improve on performance appraisal interview, the supervisors and the employees need to be trained with a view of minimising or eliminating human bias and that the results should be tied with the objective of carrying out performance appraisal interview, so as to make it more meaningful and focused.

Finally, the study revealed that majority of respondents fifty seven per cent (57%) had negative attitude towards promotion on merit.

Twenty per cent (20%) were indifferent as to whether promotion on merit was good or not, while twenty three per cent (23%) had positive attitude towards promotion on merit. Thus despite the use of promotion on merit majority of employees have a negative attitude about it. The main reasons given by respondents for their negative attitudes against promotion on merit is that majority felt that hard work does not assure one a promotion when an opportunity arises, seventy one per cent (71%). Sixty one per cent (61%) had the opinion that promotion on merit is not based on performance appraisal results, while sixty one per cent (61%) felt that it is based on other considerations like ethnicity and politics.

In light of the above therefore it appears that the link between performance and promotion is completely blurred hence, employees do not work hard to achieve promotion. For promotion to spur employees to higher performance the link between performance and promotion need to be established. This can be done by first improving performance appraisal form, the way interviewing is carried out and finally tying promotion to merit. This requires effort and commitment by the top management to make it succeed.

The second objective was to find causes for positive and negative attitudes. The study revealed that the popular reasons for satisfaction with promotion on merit includes, the fact that it encourages hard work hundred per cent (100%), it increases motivation and morale in an organization hundred per cent (100%) and that it increases profitability through superior performance ninety five per cent (95%) while other respondents twenty per cent (20%) suggested other reasons.

On the main reasons for respondents dissatisfaction with promotion on merit, the study revealed that all (100%) respondents who are dissatisfied with promotion on merit felt that it is carried out in unfair manner, and it encourages individual loyalty instead of building teamwork. Ninety one per cent (91%) felt that it encourages tribalism and or "god fatherism" while eighty six per cent (86%) had the opinion that it favours those who are well connected, politically to the detriment of those who are not politically connected.

On the issue of suggestions and recommendations for making promotion on merit more efficient to employees eighty seven (87%) of

respondents indicated that they should get immediate feedback about their performance. Seventy two per cent (72%) of respondents indicated that the performance appraisal exercise should be made open and be carried out regularly and sixty nine per cent (69%) indicated that it should be made as objective as possible and only sixteen percent (16%) of the respondents recommended other methods.

All in all, promotion on merit is an important intervention tool for motivating employees and improving their morale in order to achieve high productivity. To make it even more effective the management needs to review carefully the performance appraisal form as a tool for measuring performance. Improve on the way the interviews are carried out with the view of making them more objective, tie promotion to individual merit as measured through performance appraisal results, and carry out periodical surveys to find out whether promotion on merit is achieving its objective.

Finally, the management should make individual rating on personal qualities and traits open to the employees being appraised and allow controlling officers and the panel to rate employees on performance

objectives. An independent forum should also be created to handle disputes arising from performance appraisal rating and lastly the results from both performance objectives and personal qualities and traits should count when considering employees for promotion. In this way organizations will be able to increase employees motivation and increase productivity.

5.2 SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The problem of promotion on merit is clearly one that merits further study. This study being exploratory in nature has provided insights on the problem of promotion on merit and identified probable causes of negative attitude.

Therefore there is a need to undertake a similar study in other sectors of the economy, specifically a study into the attitude of Top Management and operatives to find out whether they hold different attitudes towards promotion on merit.

The study also did not reveal various biodata categories of respondents as having different opinions towards promotion on merit, this should not be taken as totally conclusive.

Hence, further study can be undertaken to establish conclusively whether they hold different opinions and investigate the reasons for it.

5.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was mainly constrained by the following limitations

- (i) Lack of literature on the subject specifically on the Kenyan situation, hence there was heavy reliance placed on literature from other countries especially the United Kingdom and India
- (ii) The sample would have been increased but due to costs involved with large sample coupled with constraint of time period over which the study had to be carried this would not have been possible and
- (iii) Finally, a limitation of measurement common to all surveys was encountered. The use of self-reported opinion or attitude is somewhat unreliable given biases of respondent. Hence data cannot be treated as perfectly reliable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1) **Bolar M.**
Performance Appraisal, Readings, Case Studies, and
A Survey Practices New Delhi Vikas, (1978).
- 2) **Cannel M & Woods (1992)**
IPM/NEDO
Incentive Pay, Impact and Evaluation
Institute of Personnel Management, London
- 3) **Carrel, Kuzmits, Elebert**
Personnel and Human Resource Management
Merril Publishing Company
Columbus, Toronto, London, Melbourne (1989).
- 4) **David A De Cenzo/Stephen P. Robbins**
Personnel/Human Resource Management
Prentice Hall
W. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey (1988).
- 5) **Douglas Mcgregor**
Harvard Business Review
May-June 1957
- 6) **E. James Brennan**
The Myth and the Reality of Pay for Performance
Personnel Journal (1985).
- 7) **Flanagan John C. & Robert K. Burns**
The Employee Performance Record
a New Appraisal and Development Tool
Harvard Business Review (September-October 1
1995).
- 8) **Fredrick S. Hills, Robert M. Madigan\F. Dow Scott and
Steven E. Markham**
“ Tracking the Merit of Merit Pay”
Personnel Administrator, March 1987.

- 9) **Furneaux, D.**
Data Analysis
Open University Press, Walton Hall
Milton Keynes 1973
- 10) **Gary Dessler**
Human Resource Management
Prentice - Hall Inc.
Englewood Cliffs, (1997).
- 11) **Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs**
Workshop on Performance Appraisal System
Proceedings and Recommendations
New Delhi
Department of Personnel Administrative Reforms
(1983)
- 12) **Harry Levinson**
Appraisal of What Performance?
Harvard Business Review
July - August (1976).
- 13) **Ian Beardwell and Len Holden**
Human Resource Management
"Contemporary Perspective"
Pitman Publishing, 2nd Edition, London (1997).
- 14) **J. Stacy Adams**
Towards an Understanding of Inequity
Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology
Vol.64(1963)
- 15) **Kenya College of Communications Technology**
Terms and Conditions of Service
Personnel Circular No. 1'b' of 1993
- 16) **L.W. Porter and E.E. Lawler**
Management Attitudes and Performance
Homewood TT.Richard D.Irwin Inc. (1968)
- 17) **Leslie W. Rue and Lloyd L. Byars**
Management Skills and Application
Irwin Burr Riodge, Llionois, Boston Masachuesets
Sydney, Australia (1992).

- 18) **Mirzas Saiyadain**
Human Resource Management
Tata Mcgraw – Hill (1998).
- 19) **Monappa A. and Sayadain, M.S.**
Personnel Management
New Delhi, Tata
Mcgraw – Hill (1979).
- 20) **Moser, C.A. & Kalton G.**
Survey Methods in Social Investigation
the English Language Book Society And
Heinemann Educational Books
2nd Edition, 1974
- 21) **Niazi A.A.**
Performance Appraisal
Another Look at its Objectives
Indian Management (1979).
- 22) **Pareek U. & Rao T.V.**
Designing and Managing Human Resource System
New Delhi, Oxford And Ibh 1981
- 23) **R. Vaughan**
The Spoiled System
New York Charter House Books (1975).
- 24) **Richard M. Steers**
Introduction to Organizational Behaviour
Goodyear Publishers Co.Inc. Santa Monica
California (1981)
- 25) **Shetty Y.K.**
Personnel Management Practices
A Comparative Study
Indian Journal Of Social Work (1970).
- 26) **Victor H. Vroom**
Work and Motivation
New York, John Wiley and Sons . Inc. (1964)
- 27) **William J. Burns, Jr.**
Performance Measurement, Evaluation and
Incentives
Havard Business School Series in Accounting
Harvard Business School Press (1992)

P. O. BOX 30305,
NAIROBI.

APPENDIX I

LETTER TO RESPONDENTS

Dear Sir/Madam,

This questionnaire has been designed to gather information regarding employee's opinion towards promotion on merit. This information is to be used to complete a research project, a requirement for a degree of master of business Administration, University of Nairobi.

You have been carefully selected to take part in the research project, please assist me by completing the questionnaire to the best of your knowledge. This information will be used for academic purpose and Executive Summary will be given to Human Resource Manager to help the Department improve in this area. Any information give by you will be treated with strict confidence.

Please, do not write your name in the questionnaire.

Thanking you in advance for your anticipated co-operation.

Yours sincerely,

Kimathi Mburugu
MBA STUDENT

EMPLOYEE QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1 ABOUT YOURSELF

Please circle the number representing the most appropriate response according to you in respect to the following items.

1. Your current scale

- (i) K1 - K2 (ii) K5 - K6 (iii) K7 - K9

2. Your highest level of education

- (i) Primary School (ii) Secondary School
 (iii) College Diploma (iv) University Degree
 (v) Graduate Degree (vi) Others (Specify)

3. Your Gender

- (i) Female (ii) Male

4. Number of years worked at KCCT

- (i) Less than 1 (ii) 1-3 (iii) 4 and above

5. Your marital status

- (i) Married (ii) Single (iii) Widowed (iv) Divorced or separated
 (v) Others (specify)

6. Number of other organisations you have worked before joining KCCT

- (i) None (ii) One (iii) Two (iv) Three (v) Four or more

7. Your current Department

- (i) Director's (ii) Finance
 (iii) Human Resource (iv) Engineering
 (v) Business Studies (vi) Commercial Services
 (vii) Other Specify

8. Have you been promoted since you joined KCCT?

- (i) Yes (ii) No

PART TWO

For each of the following statements circle the number that best represents your feelings or opinion about performance appraisal form

Where 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither disagree nor agree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree

- 1) Performance appraisal form does not capture the actual performance.

1 2 3 4 5

- 2) Performance appraisal form measures items, which are not related to performance.

1 2 3 4 5

- 3) Performance appraisal form is difficult to understand and fill.

1 2 3 4 5

- 4) Performance appraisal form does not capture the standards of measurement as agreed by both the employee and supervisor.

1 2 3 4 5

- 5) Performance appraisal form does not give room for disagreements.

1 2 3 4 5

- 6) Performance appraisal form is written in technical terms, which are difficult to understand and measure.

1 2 3 4 5

- 7) Performance appraisal form does not give enough space to explain about performance.

1 2 3 4 5

PART THREE

For each of the following statements circle the number that best represents your feelings or opinions about performance appraisal interview.

Where 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither disagree nor agree, 4 = Agree, 5 = strongly agree

- 1) Performance appraisal interview is a waste of time.

1 2 3 4 5

- 2) Immediate supervisors carry out performance appraisal interview as a matter of routine.

1 2 3 4 5

- 3) Performance appraisal interview results are useless, they do not affect ones performance in anyway.

1 2 3 4 5

- 4) Immediate supervisor award performance appraisal interview scores on basis of ethnicity and politics.

1 2 3 4 5

- 5) Individual personal relationship with immediate supervisor determines the score he/she gets in performance appraisal interview and not based on Performance.

1 2 3 4 5

- 6) Performance appraisal interview scores are kept confidential from employee.

1 2 3 4 5

PART FOUR

Four each of the following statements circle the number that best represents your feelings or opinions about promotion on merit.

Where 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither disagree nor agree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree

1) Promotion is not based on performance appraisal results.

1 2 3 4 5

2) In my opinion promotions are based on other considerations like ethnicity and politics.

1 2 3 4 5

3) Hard work does not assure one a promotion when an opportunity arises.

1 2 3 4 5

4) Promotions are based on academic, technical and professional qualifications and not on merit.

1 2 3 4 5

5) In my opinion promotion should be based on promotion interview and not on performance appraisal results.

1 2 3 4 5

PART FIVE

For each of the following questions please tick the box of fill blank space as appropriate.

1) Are you satisfied with promotion on merit?

Yes

No

IF NO, GO TO PART SIX

IF YES, PROCEED

If you are satisfied with promotion on merit which of the following reasons explain why (if some of the reasons, which explain, why not listed below, please write them in the space for "others"

Tick the bracket to indicate the reasons that explain your satisfaction.

- 1) Promotion on merit encourages hard work. (
- 2) Promotion on merit is carried out in a fair and objective manner. (
- 3) Promotion on merit reduces time wasted on complaints about unfairness. (
- 4) Promotion on merit increases motivation and morale in organisations. (
- 5) Promotion on merit increases teamwork. (
- 6) Promotion on merit increases profitability through superior performance. (
- 7) Others. (

PART SIX

If you are not satisfied with promotion on merit which of the following reasons explain why (if some of the reasons, which explain why your dissatisfied are not listed below, please write them in the space for others).

- 1) Promotion on merit has demoralised employees. ()
- 2) Promotion on merit is carried out in unfair manner. ()
- 3) Promotion on merit encourages individual loyalty instead of building teamwork. ()
- 4) Promotion on merit favours those who are well connected politically to the disadvantage of hard working employees who are not politically connected. ()
- 5) Promotion on merit encourages favouritism. ()
- 6) Promotion on merit discourages hard work. ()
- 7) Promotion on merit encourages tribalism and or "God Fatherism". ()
- 8) Others (specify).

PART SEVEN

The following are recommendations suggested to make promotion on merit more efficient and acceptable to employees. Please tick the bracket to indicate the ones that you agree with (if some of the recommendations you wish to make are not included, please write them in space for others).

- 1) Employees should be trained on how to fill the performance appraisal form. ()
- 2) Employees should be explained the use of performance appraisal results. ()
- 3) Performance appraisal form should be made as objective as possible. ()
- 4) Employees should get immediate feedback about performance. ()
- 5) An independent forum to handle dispute arising from performance appraisal rating should be created. ()
- 6) The performance appraisal exercise should be open and carried out regularly. ()
- 7) Others (please specify).....