

**MANAGER`S PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IMPLEMENTED AT
KANSANSHI MINE, ZAMBIA**

A half thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

in the

RHODES BUSINESS SCHOOL

by

MAIMBO MARK SILIMI

SEPTEMBER 2013

I. INTEGRATIVE SUMMARY

It is every organization's desire to have a motivated workforce that will ensure competitive advantage is achieved in a sustainable manner. To achieve this, one of the requirements is to have a performance management system that is well executed and supported by a very effective performance appraisal system. This qualitative study aims to build an understanding of how line managers at Kansanshi mine in Solwezi, Zambia, implement the performance appraisal system. In particular, this study explores what barriers and enablers are experienced by line managers as they implement the performance appraisal process. The study has three interrelated sections which are however considered as standalone. The first section is an evaluation report on the barriers and enablers of performance appraisal implementation by line managers at Kansanshi mine in Zambia. This section consists of a literature review, the methodology followed in conducting the study, findings and the discussion thereof. The report also highlights limitations of the study, recommendations and the perceived value of the study. The report ends with recommendations on what needs to be done to improve the implementation of the performance appraisal system at Kansanshi mine. Section 2 comprises a more comprehensive literature review while Section 3 documents the research methodology followed in the study.

The literature reviewed shows that a lot of research has been done (e.g. Osemeke, 2012; Gupta and Kumar, 2013; Ahmed et al., 2011; Fletcher, 2001; Viedge, 2003; Bohlander et al., 2001 and Chatterjee, 1999) with regard to performance appraisal as a process and its implementation, but no studies were identified that focused on the interaction between line managers and their subordinates in an appraisal interview specifically, as well as the challenges faced in the implementation process in Zambia in general, and Kansanshi mine in particular. Therefore, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- **How do line managers at Kansanshi mine in Zambia conduct performance appraisal interviews?**
- **What barriers and enablers do they face in the conduct of performance appraisals?**

This qualitative study explores the multiple perspectives of line managers at Kansanshi mine regarding how they conduct performance appraisal interviews and what barriers and enablers they face in the implementation process. The main focus of this study was on granular level of

individual employee performance appraisal implementation by line managers at Kansanshi mine in Zambia.

Ten of the 30 line managers from all ten departments across the mine site were selected using stratified random sampling. Data was collected from these managers using semi-structured, in-depth, face-to-face interviews. A total of 15 interviews were conducted on the mine site in the interviewees' offices as well as other convenient places such as the Kansanshi main boardroom during May 2013. On average, each interview took between 45 to 60 minutes.

Interviews were audio recorded, transcribed and thereafter analysed using both open coding and constant comparison technique to induce themes. Five follow-up interviews and six members' checks were also conducted to enhance credibility and dependability. During the member checking process five members agreed with the results of the study as presented by the researcher and only one had a different view on few of the results, especially on the issue of commitment from top management towards performance appraisals at Kansanshi.

The findings of the study show a variety of barriers and enablers of line managers in their conduct of performance appraisal interviews at Kansanshi mine in Zambia. Predominantly, line managers were of the view that (a) lack of clear job descriptions and set of individual targets, (b) perceived subjectivity of the system, and (c) predominant focus and priority on production were some of the barriers to how they conducted performance appraisals. Additionally, some of the line managers agreed that (d) lack of adequate refresher training impacted on how they conducted performance appraisals.

On the other hand, (a) top management commitment to performance appraisal system, (b) employee hope for reward and (c) perception of performance appraisal as a spring for career development and progression were highlighted as enablers by line managers in their conducting of performance appraisals.

Recommendations regarding how line managers need to be assisted to effectively balance the developmental but also evaluative functions of performance appraisal, refresher trainings of line managers on how to make the best out the performance system and ensure its integrity were made. This study will further help the company to evaluate the entire performance appraisal system as a whole and see how best the system can be improved and utilized. The study contributes to our

understanding of the barriers and enablers of line managers in their conduct of performance appraisals in a mining context.

II. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank God our father, Jesus Christ his son and the Holy Spirit for guiding me through this challenging and somewhat trying time. Without Him this would not have been possible.

Secondly, I would like to acknowledge Dr. MacDonald Kanyangale, my supervisor, who coached, panel beat and pushed me through this process. Thank you for your guidance, tolerance and never-ending support.

To the class of 2011, with whom I have walked this journey, thank you for inspiring my life through our various interactions in classes, syndicates, presentations and the few occasional drinks.

All the best in your future endeavours

I also wish to thank Kansanshi Management, particularly Mrs. Linda Mambwe, Mr. Adrian Hosack and Mr. Cheikh Maiga for the belief, support and opportunity offered towards this degree.

Last but not the least my beautiful and loving wife Walyanji for enduring the stress and lonely nights during my studies. You are truly God given as you have been a blessing not only to me but the entire family. Thank you for being there for me. I owe you and this degree is partly yours.

This thesis is dedicated to Luyando Dominique Silimi, my son.

III. TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	SECTION 1: EVALUATION REPORT	1
1.1.	ABSTRACT	1
1.2.	INTRODUCTION	2
1.3.	LITERATURE REVIEW	6
1.3.1.	Definition of performance appraisal.....	6
1.3.2.	Perspectives on purpose of performance appraisal.....	7
1.3.3.	Performance appraisal methods.....	8
1.3.4.	Performance appraisal interview	16
1.3.5.	Types of performance interviews	17
1.4.	RESEARCH METHOD	18
1.4.1.	Description of interviewees.....	18
1.4.2.	Sampling.....	18
1.4.3.	Data collection.....	18
1.4.4.	Data analysis.....	20
1.4.4.1.	Research Quality.....	21
1.4.5.	Limitations of study.....	21
1.4.6.	Ethical concerns.....	21
1.5.	FINDINGS	21
1.5.1.	Barriers to implementation of performance appraisal at Kansanshi.....	22
1.5.1.1.	Lack of clear job descriptions and set individual targets.....	22
1.5.1.2.	Lack of refresher training	23
1.5.1.3.	Perceived subjectivity of the system.....	24
1.5.1.4.	Predominant production focus and priority	25
1.5.2.	Enablers to implementation of performance appraisal at Kansanshi.....	26
1.5.2.1.	Top management commitment	26
1.5.2.2.	Employees' hope of reward.....	27
1.5.2.3.	Spring for career development and progression	27
1.6.	DISCUSSIONS	28
1.7.	LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH.....	32
1.8.	VALUE OF THE RESEARCH.....	32
1.9.	AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	33
1.10.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	33
1.11.	CONCLUSION	34

REFERENCES	36
2. SECTION 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	39
2.1. INTRODUCTION	39
2.2. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL ORIGIN AND DEFINITIONS	39
2.3. PURPOSE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL	42
2.4. TYPES OF APPRAISAL	44
2.5. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL METHODS.....	45
2.5.1. Absolute Standards.....	45
2.5.2. Relative Standards (Traits).....	47
2.5.3. Objectives (Results).....	48
2.5.4. 360 Degree Feedback Appraisal.....	48
2.5.5. Balanced score card.....	48
2.5.6. 720 Degree Feedback Appraisal.....	49
2.6. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS.....	57
2.7. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INTERVIEW.....	57
2.8. SUMMARY	59
REFERENCES	60
3. SECTION 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	64
3.1. OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH PARADIGM FOR THIS STUDY	64
3.2. RESEARCH GOAL	65
3.3. DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEWEES.....	66
3.4. SAMPLING.....	66
3.5. DATA COLLECTION	66
3.6. DATA ANALYSIS	69
3.6.1. Research Quality	69
3.7. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	70
3.8. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	70
REFERENCES	71
Appendix 1 – Permission to conduct research letter	72

IV. LIST OF TABLES

SECTION 1

Table	Title	Page
1	Kansanshi performance grading criteria	5
2	Summary of different appraisal methods	9
3	Initial Interview Guide	19

SECTION 2

Table	Title	Page
1	Summary of different appraisal methods	51

SECTION 3

Table	Title	Page
1	Initial Interview Guide	72

1. SECTION 1: EVALUATION REPORT

1.1. ABSTRACT

As managers with direct contact with workers on the floor, line managers are responsible for implementation of the performance appraisal system at Kansanshi Mining plc. Commonly, implementation of performance appraisal is affected by how line managers interact with their subordinates before, during and after an appraisal interview.

Notably, no study has been conducted at Kansanshi mine to understand how line managers conduct performance appraisals since their introduction. This qualitative study aims to build an understanding of how line managers at Kansanshi conduct performance appraisal interviews and what enablers and barriers they face in this process.

In pursuit of the research aim, line managers from all the ten departments of the mine were considered as eligible for the study. Using stratified random sampling, ten of the 30 line managers from all ten departments across the mine site were selected. A total of fifteen semi-structured, in-depth, face-to-face interviews were conducted with ten line managers to gather data. These individual interviews were conducted on the mine site in the interviewees' offices as well as other convenient places such as the Kansanshi main boardroom. On average, each interview took between 45 to 60 minutes. All these interviews were audio recorded, transcribed and thereafter analyzed using open coding and constant comparison technique to induce themes.

Findings of the study show a variety of barriers and enablers of line managers in their conduct of performance appraisal interviews at Kansanshi mine in Zambia. All ten line managers unanimously highlighted that (a) lack of clear job descriptions and set of individual targets as well as (b) lack of adequate refresher training on how to conduct performance appraisals affected how they conducted performance appraisals. Eight of the ten line managers highlighted that (c) perceived subjectivity of the system while seven of the ten highlighted that (d) predominant production focus and priority were barriers to them in how they conducted performance appraisals.

On the other hand, ten line managers highlighted that (a) top management commitment to the implementation of a performance appraisal system, seven highlighted that (b) employees' hope for

rewards and five line managers highlighted that (c) spring for career development and progression were perceived as enablers in their implementation of performance appraisals.

This research is of value as it highlights how the conduct of performance is not only impacted by organizational support and other complementary organizational systems but also how the barriers to the conduct of performance appraisals affect both the appraisee and the appraiser.

1.2. INTRODUCTION

Mining is the main economic driver for many countries in Africa and Zambia in particular. As part of the structural adjustment program (SAP) designed and driven by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) with a major objective of privatizing of public businesses as well as its services, First Quantum Minerals acquired the Kansanshi Copper Gold project from Cyprus Amax between the years 1997 to 2000 (Phiri and Chakanika, 2010). The Kansanshi mine produces both sulphide and oxide ores. The project is owned 80% by First Quantum (a Canadian company headquartered in Vancouver) and 20% by the government of Zambia.

Currently, the mine has 2,485 direct employees and 9,500 contract labourers with an 8% annual turnover. The mine has no formal policy document on staff performance appraisal. However, there is a procedure set out by the Human Resource department which provides the purpose, objectives, and procedures for carrying out staff performance appraisal at the mine (Kansanshi Performance review guide, 2011). Succinctly, the guide is clear that the purpose of the appraisal at Kansanshi mine is to provide feedback on how employees are performing and reinforce areas where the employee is doing well as well as identifying areas where the employee is not doing well and needs to improve. Notably, the objective of the appraisal procedure is to provide the necessary guidelines for consistent administration.

The implementation of an annual formal performance appraisal system at Kansanshi mine is compatible with the desire to be an employer of choice in the mining industry in Zambia. Specifically, this study does not focus on appraising performance at the organizational level or an appraisal system for integrating the appraisal of organizational and employee performance. It focuses particularly on employee performance appraisal interviews and any pre-interview processes. Performance appraisal discussions between an employee and line manager determine employees' annual salary raise and also helps check for any improvements or weaknesses of

employees at Kansanshi mine. This system that involves an employee's input was introduced in 2011 to replace the old system which only involved the manager doing an assessment and the employee only learnt of his performance either when his contract was not being renewed or when his salary had not been adjusted accordingly. The new system allows the employee to assess their own performance based on identified behavioural factors, namely teamwork, initiative, safety, quality of work, technical skills, quantity and attendance. These are rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being very poor and 5 being outstanding.

The performance review interview process as done by line managers at Kansanshi involves two stages: the pre-interview stage and the actual interaction between the line manager and the subordinate.

Pre-interview stage – this stage involves continuous monitoring of the individual employee performances to track performance during the period of one year and constantly highlighting areas that need immediate attention and correction. Two weeks before the designated performance review date, the employees are issued with performance review forms designed by the human resource department of the mine. This form has three main dimensions which focus on the First Quantum Minerals behaviours of Bolder, Smarter and Driven, broken down into seven different sections (Teamwork, Initiative, Safety, Quality, Technical skills, Quantity and Attendance).

These forms have two provisions on which to indicate the ratings, one for the line manager and the other for the respective employee. The employees then rate themselves on the scale of 1-5 on the seven sections of the target behaviours. After the employees have completed the forms they submit the completed forms to their respective line managers. The line manager also does his own rating on the same form and then sets a date for the actual interview to discuss the ratings and the performance of the employee for the period under review.

Performance appraisal interview – this stage involves the actual interaction between the line manager and the employee. No other person is present during the interview apart from the line manager and the employee being appraised. The interview is supposed to begin with the line manager welcoming the employee to be appraised and asking him/her to feel free to express themselves honestly. It is then explained to the employee that the purpose of the meeting is performance related and that the discussion will mainly focus on the job and not necessarily the individual person. Furthermore, the employee is then supposed to be given an opportunity to

highlight areas where he feels he did well followed by what he feels he will do differently going forward. The line manager is then expected to highlight the areas he expects the employee to do differently as well as any shortcomings noted during the period under review. The line manager is expected to go further to discuss what the employee did well in the period under review. At the end of the discussion the two are expected to agree on the overall rating which is taken as final by both the employee and the line manager by both signing the review form.

All line managers at Kansanshi are expected to follow these steps in conducting their performance appraisal interviews. According to the coaching model provided by the company for performance reviews, the employees should first discuss what they did well to allow them open up and feel comfortable during the interview and then later discuss what they will do differently in the coming year.

On the other hand the manager should highlight areas they feel the employee should do differently first and conclude by discussing areas that they feel the employees did well to end the interview on a positive note. It is with this understanding that the study aims to understand the barriers and enablers of implementing performance appraisal from the standpoint of line managers who appraise employees working on the floor. All managers as well as employees had to undergo a 2-day training program on the new system and ongoing refresher training is conducted on site.

The performance appraisal process at Kansanshi is different from new types of appraisal which use multiple perspectives on performance by using downward feedback from superiors, upwards feedback from subordinates, and peer feedback (e.g. 360 degree systems). As seen in the literature, there are three different methods that can be used in measuring staff performances: traits, behaviours and task outcomes (results). Kansanshi uses a mixture of the three methods. The elements used for the measurement of staff performances in Kansanshi mine are based on First Quantum Group behaviours (Bolder, Smarter and Driven) which stand for

- Bolder – Team work and Initiative
- Smarter – Safety, Quality and Technical skills
- Driven – Quantity and Attendance

Furthermore, performance criteria are grouped under the three methods shown in Table 1 below

Table 1: Kansanshi Performance grading criteria

Trait	Outcome	Behaviour
Initiative	Quality of work	Attendance
	Technical Skills	Safety
	Quantity	

Source: Kansanshi performance appraisal document (2011)

The performance criteria of ‘Safety record’ and ‘Attendance/punctuality’ measure behaviours of the staff, hence fall under the behavioural method. Initiative is a trait and therefore an aspect of the trait method. Quantity and Quality of work and Technical skills relates to productivity and therefore fall under the task outcome or the results. There is, however, heavy reliance on task outcomes and behaviours.

Performance appraisal was instituted at Kansanshi in 2005 and revised in 2011 and no evaluation of how the system is being implemented has been done so far. This study is an attempt to fill that gap. The purpose of this study is to explore the multiple perspectives of line managers regarding how they conduct the performance appraisal system at Kansanshi mine.

In this light, the objective of the research was to investigate how line managers conduct performance appraisals. With a particular focus on performance appraisal interviews as done by line managers at Kansanshi, the following were the two key questions which reflect the research problem.

Goal 1: How do line managers at Kansanshi conduct performance appraisal interviews?

Goal 2: What barriers and enablers do they face in the conduct of performance appraisal interviews?

While the research problem has been expressed in a form of research questions, it is of paramount importance to note that this study seeks to make recommendations on how performance appraisal can be improved at Kansanshi mine. It is hoped that with the recommendations of this report management will be in a position to reap the best from both the line managers conducting appraisals and subordinates to ensure increased productivity through proper monitoring and rewarding of good performance from the entire workforce on the mine.

In pursuit of the objectives of the study, the paper will focus on literature review of key concepts and research methods used in this study before presenting and discussing the findings.

1.3. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.3.1. Definition of performance appraisal

A review of literature on definitions of performance appraisal (e.g. Fletcher, 2001; Viedge, 2003; Bohlander et al., 2001; Chatterjee, 1999 and Certo, 2009) highlight a number of aspects as important and also common to the process. For instance, performance appraisal is sometimes construed as a systematic evaluation of employee's performance to check their weaknesses and strengths for further development as well as reward good performance or punish poor performance (Bohlander et al, 2001; Chatterjee, 1999; Certo, 2009; Invancevich, 1998; French and Bell, 1994; Kreitner, 1986). Alternatively, Certo (2009) underscores the formality of feedback on performance to assert that performance appraisal is a formal feedback on how well an employee is performing on the job. It can be contested that although very old, the definition by French and Bell (1994) captures the salient points in the subject, namely (a) formal assessment, (b) job performance, (c) establishment of standards for comparison with performance, (d) a feedback system, and (e) a development plan.

Shifting the emphasis from feedback towards measurement, performance appraisal can also be looked at as a rating process where employees' performance is rated against predetermined criteria. In this respect, specific techniques, such as rating scales and forced-comparisons, are used for performance appraisal (Viedge, 2003). In this way, Viedge (2003) refers to performance appraisal as part of the performance management process. Drawing from this perspective, one can plausibly refer to performance appraisal as an event as it takes place occasionally, for example, four times a year, depending on how the organization structures its performance management process. In terms

of frequency, the appraisal system at Kansanshi is designed to have one evaluation of staff performance within a year. It is noteworthy that during the course of the year, departmental appraisals are conducted to ensure that the employees are on course in the performance of their duties. Usually, at the end of May every year all appraisal forms must be completed and signed by both the employee and the supervisor, and then sent to the Human Resource Department for processing. Procedures require that a copy must be given to the employee for their file. When an employee's performance is adjudged poor, it is discussed with his supervisor and an agreement is reached and documented on how performance would be improved in the light of the identified weaknesses and strengths. On the other hand, if performance is deemed good, a reward in the form of a salary increment or a promotion into a higher position is offered to the deserving employee.

According to Fletcher (2001:473), performance appraisal was a term once associated with a rather basic process involving a line manager completing an annual report on a subordinate's performance and (usually but not always) discussing it with him or her in an appraisal interview. Performance Appraisal has become a general heading for variety of activities through which organizations seek to assess employees and develop their competence, enhance performance and distribute rewards. While performance appraisals are viewed as important, they are also seen as problematic. Many managers dislike giving appraisal reviews and employees often dislike receiving them (Clifton, 2012). This mainly occurs because of problems in the performance appraisal systems of organizations and it also occurs in part as a result of the inherent difficulties people have in giving and receiving feedback (Clifton, 2012).

For the purpose of this research, performance appraisal is thus defined as "a variety of activities through which organizations seek to assess employees and develop their competence, enhance performance and distribute rewards" (Fletcher, 2001:473). The study has adopted this definition because it has captured all the elements that the performance appraisal system on the research site seeks to address, which are assessment of performance for developmental purposes, reward of good performance and overall improvement of the production output and quality.

1.3.2. Perspectives on purpose of performance appraisal

It is the view of Gupta and Kumar (2013) that performance appraisal is one of the most important human resource management practices as it yields critical decisions integral to various human

resource actions and outcomes. Performance appraisals seek to serve numerous specific objectives or purposes such as employee development, identifying career needs and linking performance to rewards (Jafari et al. 2009).

Most literature on the US context assert that major appraisal purposes include documentation, development, administrative purposes involving pay and promotion and subordinate expression (Jafari et al. 2009). The purpose of performance appraisal is to identify employee strengths and weaknesses, evaluate training needs, set plans for future development and provide motivation by serving as a basis for determining rewards and career feedback. Milliman et al. (2002:88) Furthermore, Milliman et al. (2002:88) contend that performance appraisals are seen as one important way by which multinational enterprises obtain full abilities from their diverse workforce as well as control and coordinate their overseas operations.

While performance appraisal is one of the most important human resources management practices which yields critical decisions integral to various human resource actions and outcomes, it is asserted that organizations strongly believe that appraisals cannot be used for all the purposes they often appear or purport to serve in organizations (Gupta and Kumar, 2013; Jafari et al. 2009). For example the primary objective of introducing a performance appraisal system in the public service in Zambia in 1997 was to crucially link performance appraisal to a performance management package (Njekwa, 2006). From a slightly different viewpoint, a recent survey done by Osemeke (2012) reported that appraisals could be used by private sector organizations in Nigeria to determine adequate compensation for the workforce and explore the relationship between appraisals and adequate compensation. As such, it is apparent that performance appraisals may serve numerous specific objectives or purposes such as employee development, identifying career needs and linking performance to rewards (Jafari et al 2009).

1.3.3. Performance appraisal methods

Decenzo and Robbins (2002), state that there are three existent approaches for measuring performance. These are (1) absolute standards, (2) relative standards and (3) objectives. Table 2 overleaf gives a summary of some of the different appraisal methods as well as their advantages and disadvantages.

Table 2: Summary of different appraisal methods

	Technique	Key Idea	Advantages	Disadvantages
A.	Ranking Method	Ranking employees from best to worst on a particular trait, choosing highest, then lowest, until all ranked.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fastest 2. Transparent 3. Cost-effective 4. Simple and easy to use 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Less objective 2. Morale problems for those who are not rated at or near the top of the list. 3. Suitable for small workforce. 4. Workers' strengths and weaknesses cannot be easily determined.
B.	Graphic Rating Scales	A scale that lists a number of traits and a range of performance for each, the employee is then rated by identifying the score that best describes his or her performance for each trait.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simple. 2. Easily constructed. 3. Ease of use. 4. Results are standardized which allows comparison to be made between employees. 5. Reduces personal bias. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rating may be subjective. 2. Each characteristic is equally important in evaluation of the employee's performance.

C.	Critical Incident	Keeping a record of uncommonly good or undesirable examples of an employee's work-related behaviour and reviewing it with the employee at predetermined times.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Easy and economical to develop and administer. 2. Based on direct observations. 3. It is time-tested and provides more face time. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Time-consuming and laborious to summarize and analyze the data. 2. Difficult to convince people to share their critical incidents through a survey. 3. Provides a personal perspective of organizational issues.
D.	Narrative Essays	Evaluator writes an evaluation of employee's strength and weakness points, previous performance, position and suggestions for his (her) improvement at the end of evaluation time.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Report actually shows employee's performance. 2. Can cover all factors. 3. Examples are given. 4. Provides feedback. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Time-consuming. 2. Supervisor may write a biased essay. 3. Effective writers are very difficult to find.

E.	Management by Objectives	Employees are evaluated on how well they accomplished a specific set of objectives that have been determined to be critical in the successful completion of the job.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Easy to implement and measure. 2. Employee motivated as he is aware of expected roles and accountability. 3. Performance-oriented diagnostic system. 4. Facilitates employee counselling and guidance. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Difficult to get employees to agree on goals. 2. Misses intangibles such as honesty, integrity, quality, etc. 3. Interpretation of goals may vary from manager to manager, and employee to employee. 4. Time-consuming, complicated, lengthy and expensive.
----	--------------------------	--	--	---

F.	Behaviourally Anchored Rating Scale	BARS combines elements from critical incident and graphic rating scale approaches. The supervisor rates employees according to items on a numerical scale.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Job behaviours describe employee performance in a better way. 2. More objective. 3. More acceptances due to participation of managers and employees. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scale independence may not be valid/reliable. 2. Behaviours are activity- oriented rather than result-oriented. 3. Very time-consuming to generate BARS. 4. Each job will require creating a separate BARS scale.
----	-------------------------------------	--	---	---

G.	Human Resource Accounting (HRA)	The people are valuable resources of an organization or enterprise. Information on investment and value of human resource is useful for decision making in the organization.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ascertain the cost of labour turnover. 2. Development of human resources. 3. Planning and execution of personnel policies. 4. Return on investment on human resources. 5. Improve the efficiencies of employees. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no specific and clear-cut guidelines for finding cost and value of human resources of an organization. 2. The method measures only the cost to the organization but ignores completely any measure of the value of the employee to the organization. 3. The life of human resources is uncertain and therefore, valuing them under uncertainty seems unrealistic.
----	---------------------------------	--	---	--

H.	Assessment Centres	Employees are evaluated over a period of time; say one or three days, by observing their behaviours across a series of selected exercises or work samples.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concepts are simple. 2. Highly flexible methodology. 3. Helps in selection and promotion decisions and for diagnosing employee development needs. 4. Allow for the measurement of multiple attributes. 5. Exercise is hard to fake. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expensive and difficult to manage. 2. Requires a large staff. 3. Requires a great deal of time. 4. Only a limited number of people can be processed at a time. 5. Heavy cognitive loads of assessors.
----	--------------------	--	--	--

I.	360 Degree	It relies on the input of an employee's superior, colleagues, subordinates, sometimes customers, suppliers and/or spouses.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Excellent employee development tool. 2. Accurate, reliable and credible system. 3. Legally more defensible. 4. More objective being a multi-rate system. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Time-consuming and very costly. 2. Sensitive to organization and national culture. 3. May damage self-esteem of employees if the feedback is brutal. 4. Prone to political and social games played by people. 5. Difficult to implement in cross-functional teams.
J.	720 Degree	360 degree appraisal method is practiced twice. When 360 degree appraisal is done, then the performance of the employee is evaluated and having a good feedback mechanism, the boss sits down with the employee again a second time and gives him feedback and tips on achieving the set targets.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved feedback from more resources. 2. Team development 3. Personal and organizational performance development. 4. Responsibility for career development. 5. Reduced discrimination risk. 6. Improved customer 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exceptional expectations for the process. 2. Insufficient information. 3. Design process downfalls. 4. Failure to connect the process. 5. Insufficient training and process understanding. 6. Focus on negatives and weaknesses. 7. Requires

Source: Aggarwal and Thukur (2013:619)

1.3.4. Performance appraisal interview

Performance appraisal interview is one of the most important steps in the whole appraisal process. According to Churchill (2010:225), its success depends on the planning, the skill of the appraiser and the approach of the appraisee. There must be no surprises for either participant. The appraisers must be trained as they need to understand the objectives of the process and the priorities of the department. They need self-awareness, particularly of their own biases, and must be positive and constructive even when problems have been identified. Churchill (2010) further states that the ability to listen actively and reflect back to the appraisee are invaluable qualities and appraisers must not be afraid to challenge or tackle difficult issues.

Appraisal interviews must be approached constructively in a proactive manner by appraisees as it is their opportunity to get support for their development plans (Churchill, 2010). Goodall et al. (1986:78) argue that a performance appraisal interview is a rhetoric situation marked by the natural presence of the reasoned drama. Goodall et al. (1986) adds that for line managers the fundamental communicative requirement is to persuade the subordinate to accept his judgments vis-à-vis quantity, quality and ultimate value of his or her work and the secondary exigency is to provide a dialogic opportunity through which both participants can negotiate future goals as well as means of achieving them.

According to Sprietzer and Porath (2012:98), feedback constructs opportunities for learning. By resolving feelings of uncertainty, feedback keeps people's work-related activities focused on personal and organizational goals.

It is the view of Clifton (2012:283), performance appraisal interviews are faced with trepidation by appraisers as well as appraisees. Mathis and Jackson (2006), however, argue that the appraisal interview presents both opportunity and danger as it can be an emotional experience for the manager and the employee because the manager must communicate both praise and constructive criticism. If this is not handled efficiently, the employee may feel resentment when criticized which may lead to conflict in future working relationships. Nonetheless, performance appraisal interviews are important because they decide the training needs and career developments of the workforce.

Owing to the need to give feedback in an appraisal interview, communication from both the

appraiser and the appraisee becomes vital (Clifton, 2012:283). As stated in much older but relevant research done by Fletcher and Williams (1976), what is communicated in an appraisal interview will determine whether the outcome will be positive or negative. The interviews which included a balanced discussion of both strengths and weaknesses in performance achieved the greatest positive effects overall.

1.3.5. Types of performance interviews

There are three types of appraisal interviews: (1) tell and sell, (2) tell-and-listen and (3) problem-solving (Mathis and Jackson, 2006). The “Tell-and-Sell” interview is a situation where the appraiser tries to influence behaviour change in the subordinate through persuasion and subtle use of motivational incentives. The “Tell-and-Listen” interview is characterized by a manager who uses his/her strong communication skills to point out the strong and weak points of the subordinate’s job performance during one leg of the interview. In the second leg, the feelings of the staff member are thoroughly explored. The appraiser listens to disagreements while coping with defensive behaviour and making an effort not to refute any statements (Bohlander et al., 2001). The underlying assumption in this method is that if a subordinate is given the opportunity to release frustrated feelings those feelings of frustration will be reduced. The last type of appraisal interview is problem-solving, in which the supervisor listens, accepts, and responds to feelings of the subordinate. According to Bohlander et al. (2001), problem-solving also seeks to stimulate growth and development in the employee by discussing the problems, needs, innovations, and satisfactions the employee may have encountered during the performance of his job. From a communicative perspective, Clifton (2012:283) in his research on conversation analysis looked at the contents of the performance appraisal interview by looking at the actual conversation that goes on between the appraiser and the appraisee and what feedback is given during the interview as well as the factors that influence good communication.

Where only the particularly good work done by the appraisee was reviewed, the encouraging effect of the interview and the favourable attitude towards it appear to be offset in some cases by the tendency to get too rosy a picture of the assessment given and perhaps to feel in consequence that further improvement is neither possible nor desired. However, interviews containing an element of negative feedback seem to have been much more successful than other studies would lead one to expect (Fletcher & Williams, 1976:81).

1.4. RESEARCH METHOD

It is the view of Denzin and Lincoln (2005:3) that qualitative research focuses on “how people learn about and make sense of their experiences, themselves and others in their setting”.

This qualitative research adopted a social constructionist paradigm to explore and understand the multiple perspectives of how line managers at Kansanshi mine actually conducted performance appraisals. These were subjective perspectives of line managers involved in performance appraisal at Kansanshi, thus the focus was on the views of the appraiser rather than the appraisee.

1.4.1. Description of interviewees

All interviewees were based in Solwezi where the mine is situated. Kansanshi mine site was used for this research as no such study had been done to look at how the line managers conduct performance appraisals across the mine site. Ten line managers were randomly selected from a population of 30 line managers across all ten departments on site which were considered for the study.

A total of fifteen semi-structured, in-depth, face-to-face interviews were conducted with ten line managers to gather data. These individual interviews were conducted on the mine site in the interviewees' offices as well as other convenient places such as the Kansanshi main boardroom. On average, each interview took between 45 to 60 minutes.

1.4.2. Sampling

A total of 10 line managers out of 30 line managers in the entire mine were randomly selected from each of the 10 departments. As the sample is small, this was in no way representative, but sufficient to provide insights into how line managers conduct performance appraisals and the barriers and enablers that they encounter at Kansanshi.

1.4.3. Data collection

Qualitative data was collected from the one-on-one in-depth and semi-structured interview with line managers who conduct the performance appraisals at Kansanshi mine in Zambia. A total of fifteen interviews with 10 line managers provided data on how they actually conducted performance appraisal interviews, as well as barriers and enablers which they had experienced. These interviews lasted between 45 to 60 minutes. An interview guide was used to ensure that

key questions about pre-interview processes and the conduct of the actual performance appraisal interview were included in the interviews with respondents. Follow-up and member checks were also conducted.

All interviews were audio recorded to gauge the line managers' perceptions of the performance appraisal system as it is currently used. The interviews were conducted in Solwezi and all interviews were conducted in a secure and private setting to ensure confidentiality, either in the interviewees' offices or in the Kansanshi main boardroom. Permission seeking informed consent from the interviewee was sent to the selected line managers, outlining the nature of the study, and the associated ethical concerns.

Five follow-up interviews were made to gather additional information or to clarify developing concepts and themes. This process was also used to validate data gathered during the preceding interviews with the same individuals. An interview guide based on the key research question and its objectives was used in these interviews.

Refer to Table 2 below for the interview questions.

Table 3 Initial Interview Guide

MBA RESEARCH INTERVIEW QUESTION GUIDE

GENERAL UNDERSTANDING AND EXPERIENCE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

- Kindly give your position details and length of service in current position.
- When was the last time you conducted an appraisal?
- What is the purpose of performance appraisals at Kansanshi mine?
- How often do you conduct performance appraisals at Kansanshi mine?

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS

- What steps do you follow when doing a performance appraisal? Why, When?
- In your view what are some common mistakes being made in the appraisal process at Kansanshi mine? (Ask for many examples as possible.)
- What enables you to conduct performance appraisals at Kansanshi mine? (Ask for many examples as possible.)
- What do you think of the current method being used to appraise the

performance of your subordinates'? Do you know of a better method?

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INTERVIEW

- How do you prepare for a performance appraisal interview? Why?
- How long have you been conducting appraisal interviews here at Kansanshi?
- How do you strive to get the best out of your subordinates during an appraisal interview?
- How do you mitigate any conflicts that might arise during the interview? (Get as many examples as possible.)
- How often are you given training on performance appraisal?

BARRIERS AND ENABLERS

- According to you, what challenges are affecting effective implementation of the current appraisal system? Why are they challenges? When? (Probe and get as many examples as possible.)
- According to you, what positive factors currently exist at Kansanshi that help in the implementation of the performance appraisal system? Why are they considered as positive? When? (Probe and get as many examples as possible.)
- What other benefits does the implementation of the performance appraisal at Kansanshi offer to the overall performance of the organization?

IMPROVEMENT OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

- How do you think the current appraisal system at Kansanshi mine can be improved? Why should the aspects mention need to be improved?

Source: Author's construction (2013)

1.4.4. Data analysis

The collected qualitative data was transcribed. Data analysis was done by open coding and constant comparison technique as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994). Categories reflecting how line managers at Kansanshi carry out their performance appraisal interviews and the pre-interview processes, barriers and enablers of line managers in implementing the performance appraisal were developed were induced from data collected through interviews.

1.4.4.1. Research Quality

Guba and Lincoln (1981), Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Guba and Lincoln (1982) emphasise the concept of trustworthiness to replace reliability and validity together with aspects of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability to indicate qualitative rigour.

In this study, an audit trail is provided to enhance dependability and confirmability. Furthermore, member checks were done to enhance credibility of the findings. In this regard, credibility or internal validity focused on how the researcher provided assurances of fit between respondents' views and the reconstructions and representations of the same (Ohman, 2005:7).

Furthermore, sufficient data and details of procedures used in this study have been included in this research to "allow the reader to judge whether the interpretation proffered is adequately supported by the data" (Mays and Pope, 2000: 51).

Furthermore, to improve the quality of interpretation and explanation in this research, elements in the collected data that were unclear or seemed incomplete were searched and further discussed with interviewees to clear potential ambiguity.

1.4.5. Limitations of study

A major limitation of this study was the collection of data mainly through one method, as line managers chose what to report, divulge or not during interviews.

1.4.6. Ethical concerns

The researcher is a member of the Human Resource Department at Kansanshi Mine and this may have inhibited openness of respondents. Line managers were encouraged to be open as anonymity and confidentiality were upheld. They were advised that no one would be punished at all for what they said in the research conversation. Informed consent was sought while voluntary participation was emphasized (Berg, 2007:79-80; Creswell, 2007:141)

1.5. FINDINGS

As highlighted earlier on, the aim of this study was to investigate how line managers conducted performance appraisals, and the barriers and enablers which they encountered at Kansanshi mine.

In presenting the findings to answer the research question, this section starts with a discussion on the barriers experienced by line managers when implementing performance appraisals. Thereafter, the section focuses on enablers to the implementation of the performance appraisal system at Kansanshi mine.

1.5.1. Barriers to implementation of performance appraisal at Kansanshi

Four barriers were identified by line managers as affecting how they conducted performance appraisals. All ten interviewees concurred with regard to two of these barriers: (1) lack of clear job descriptions and individual targets, and (2) lack of refresher training on performance appraisal implementation were prevalent barriers to how they conducted performance appraisal.

Additionally, eight line managers asserted that (3) subjectivity and bias towards certain employees was a barrier for them in how they conducted performance appraisals. Last but not least, seven line managers shared the view that (4) their focus and priority was on production rather than performance appraisal.

1.5.1.1. Lack of clear job descriptions and set individual targets

According to all ten line managers, the lack of clear and proper job descriptions for their subordinates was a barrier in how they conducted performance appraisal interviews. In this regard, line manager 8 expressed the feeling of being ill-equipped and also the difficulty of discussing performance-related issues in the absence of a job description, specifying the expected functional behaviours of employees:

This organization has no clear job descriptions and it's very difficult for us as line people to discuss performance issues with our subordinates when we have nothing to point to. A job description is supposed to be a starting point so that at the end when I sit to discuss performance with my subordinates, I'm able to say you were supposed to do this and that but you have not done that or you were supposed to do a ABC I'm happy you did CD as well.

Furthermore, line managers lamented about the lack of clear and commonly agreed targets for each individual employee. Line managers echoed that there was no translation of business objectives to individual targets. Consequently, this created a hurdle for them to be specific to their subordinates about what they were actually appraising them on. Line manager 4 expressed frustration by stating that;

The overall company objectives are not clearly spelt out for everyone to understand them well. How can you tie individual targets to the overall business objectives if the mission is not clearly stated? We need to seriously look at this issue of the mission for this company, its business objectives and not just have annual budgeted copper production numbers as set targets this has made it very difficult for line managers to align individual targets to the overall targets for the business and the lack of well-defined job descriptions makes it even worse.

1.5.1.2. Lack of refresher training

All ten interviewees in this study unanimously concurred that preparation for performance appraisal was time-consuming as they were not well-equipped and needed more training. In this respect, line manager 4 reiterated how they spend more time preparing for appraisal interviews which is a new system altogether than they used to on using the old system. This line manager attributed this to lack of refresher training on how to conduct performance appraisals which was a barrier for them to get the best out of the system:

This is a very good system which has given an opportunity for employees to give their input towards their own performance appraisal but we as managers together with the employees need more training on how to conduct the appraisals so that we can achieve the intended goals. It has not been easy the past two years for us to carry on with the new system because it a new thing to us at Kansanshi. The fact that I will sit with my subordinate means I need to prepare myself well to answer any technical or even social questions regarding performance of my subordinates. In short we need refresher training on how best to conduct performance appraisal interviews.

Additionally, Line manager 6 highlighted that the short duration of the initial training on the use of the new appraisal system was not sufficient to give him confidence in the use of the tool:

Clearly we have a new approach to doing these reviews and I have only been given one day training on it and asked to use it. I'm using it but I don't have the confidence that I truly need to handle the reviews. It's a huge challenge for most of us but again you can't show it to your subordinates but we have made a request for refresher trainings.

1.5.1.3. Perceived subjectivity of the system

Eight of the ten interviewed line managers shared the perception that the performance appraisal was subjective and that this created difficulties for them especially to justify their negative ratings of employee performance. As such they experienced difficulties of giving subjective feedback and risk being labeled as a bad manager by subordinates. While acknowledging the significance of negative feedback to appraise, Line manager 1 aptly echoed how this perception of subjectivity was a huge stumbling block for him as a human being to give negative performance appraisal feedback which could not be objectively justified:

The system is behaviour based and it's very difficult for me to justify certain bad ratings because it's based on how I see something or someone. Communicating bad performance is necessary but because it not based on something more quantifiable or objective it becomes hard for me to give feedback because as a human being I don't want to be seen in bad light by my subordinates. This issue of subjectivity is a huge stumbling block in giving bad performance feedback. It is more subjective as it relies on behaviours and not clearly set out targets this makes it hard to use.

Notably, line managers conducted performance appraisals mindful of the huge resentment from subordinates. This resentment was due to perceptions that line managers favoured others more. This created difficulties for the managers as they tried to avoid resentment from such subordinates. Tension between the line manager and a subordinate which characterized performance appraisal interviews was also attributed to the subjective nature of the system by line manager 7. The difficulty of being objective in the eyes of subordinates was evident in how the line manager believed that performance appraisal was a “necessary evil” for employees to get rewards or bonuses, as illustrated in this quote:

It has bias in the eyes of the people whose performance we review because it is subjective, the tool of assessment is not scientific, some of the works are not scientifically measured, it is bound to be subjective and most of the subordinates believe that loyalty counts more than the job schedule, but staff have to live with it, it is a necessary evil, it is the requirement for them to have their rewards, increments, promotions and dismissal. Although it has a lot of importance the subordinates have developed a negative perception about it because of its subjective nature of implementation and it creates a lot of resentment from our subordinates because they

think we favour others more. You can imagine the tension that we have during those one-to-one interviews to report but performances.

1.5.1.4. Predominant production focus and priority

Seven out of ten line managers shared the view that their focus and priority was predominantly on production issues such that performance appraisal was perceived as added workload. As such these line managers directed most of their efforts and priorities towards production. This is how Line manager 10, who identified himself as a production person, typifies the predominant production focus of most line managers:

I am a production person who has budgets to meet at the end of the day. Because my focus is on number I only get to know about these reviews when HR come knocking on my door for their documents on the performance of my subordinates. This is why I feel all these performance reviews are event triggered and not clearly structured policy issues in this organization. Yes the good part is that the intention is there from management to have an appraisal system in place but it's the implementation which is bad. This needs to be a clear policy issue pushed by the top boss, the General Manager through the HR department.

Commonly, line managers had their minds focused on production numbers rather than on the people producing the copper and their performance appraisals. To illustrate the prevalent focus and priority on production output rather than the people, line managers alluded to the fact that even top management was more interested in high production figures, and how line managers got to those figures was none of their business. The views of Line manager 2 exemplify how production numbers as what was most valued by top management undermined the activity of performance appraisal:

This focus on the set behaviours of Bolder, Smarter and Driven hasn't been well articulated and is being enforced in a wrong way. There is no focus on value add to the company by individuals because they just look at the final production numbers. Those employees that add more value but work quietly are not being given the full recognition that they deserve. This issue of just focusing on the final numbers will not take us anywhere in our quest as an organization to be the number one producer of copper in the world. Because my mind is focused on numbers there is a chance I

might make wrong assumptions on certain behaviours that are not directly linked to the production numbers but are part of the performance rating criterion.

1.5.2. Enablers to implementation of performance appraisal at Kansanshi

Line managers revealed three enablers in how they conducted performance appraisals. Interestingly, all ten line managers agreed on (a) top management commitment, while seven of the ten revealed that (b) employee excitement with prospect of reward, and five revealed that employees saw performance appraisals as a (c) spring for career development and progression.

1.5.2.1. Top management commitment

All ten line managers interviewed indicated that training plus proper communication on the importance of performance appraisal supported by top management has made it easier for line managers to implement the performance appraisal system at Kansanshi. This has made it easier since the message on appraisals is communicated through the heads of departments and everyone on the mine site is required to undergo the appraisal process at a given time.

As stated by line manager 9,

With the introduction of the new approach to performance appraisal and the drive from the new manager of the Resource Optimization Department, we have been able to sit with our subordinates and discuss issues concerning their performance and identify areas where they need help in terms of training and as such individuals are able to grow out of their little silos. The commitment from top management has made it easier for us to carry out these performance reviews.

Furthermore, line manager 4 spoke about the positive outcomes of top management commitment which enabled performance conversations between line managers and employees to be easier:

This training and push for more involvement of subordinates in the appraisal process by top management shows that the company is slowly showing appreciation for the well-being of the employees on the floor and it's even easier for us as line managers to sit and chat with the employees on their performance.

This perception on commitment was further echoed by line manager 4:

Every promotion or recommendation from us as line managers must be accompanied by a performance review form which is duly signed. This clearly shows how seriously management is taking this issue of appraisals. It's actually very encouraging because it has given us more authority to discuss performance issues with subordinates.

1.5.2.2. Employees' hope of reward

Seven of the ten line managers shared the view that fruitful performance appraisal interviews with employees were partly the result of the fact that input from the employees themselves was used in the reward and promotion system. This link to rewards was a motivating factor for subordinates as they always looked forward to these reviews because they were expectant of good things at the end. It is in this way that line managers feel that the employee prospect of being rewarded creates an enabling environment to discuss performance. This was highlighted in the words of Line manager 3 who stated that:

For me, it is a positive attitude, staff look forward to it because without it how do they get their promotion, how do they get their increment, how do they get their reward? So they look forward to it by the end of which they are promoted. Those that perform exceptionally are promoted even those that perform averagely are given increment, so they are excited about it, they look forward to it because the end result is obvious because it is beneficial to staff and the organization.

1.5.2.3. Spring for career development and progression

Five out of the 10 line managers shared the view that employees' knowledge that performance appraisal is used to make career development decisions helps to create a better understanding of benefits they can get from being appraised in this manner. As highlighted by Line manager 4, concrete evidence of using performance appraisal for career development and promotion enabled many employees to see the value of the appraisal system and their involvement:

All my juniors know that we will not promote anyone based on a toss of coin, it has to been seen by everyone that the person getting the promotion actually deserves it. This can only be done through proper performance appraisal and reviews. You know the goodness with performance based promotions, everyone in the team knows who the best performer is and it's because of transparency in the whole process. We send

employees for further training so that as I leave I know I will have left the company in good hands that will keep it going for the foreseeable future.

Alternatively, Line manager 3 emphasized how employee eagerness to benefit from the appraisal system helped him open up discussions on poor performance:

It's like killing two birds with one stone. The subordinate comes wanting to hear what career plans you have for them and for me as a manager it gives me time to harmer the individual in areas he is lacking and in the end we have a win win situation.

It was interesting that the conduct of performance appraisal by Line manager 8 was made easier because he considered the identification of talent as one of his tasks which could mainly be accomplished through annual performance appraisals:

This company needs to create a big pool of talents for it to operate at minimum costs. We as line managers have the duty to identify the talent, nurture it and then preserve it so that we can plug and play at any time. The process is not an easy one but because we have performance reviews that we conduct annually we are able to see which employees have been performing consistently well and which ones have potential and ability. Remember for us, its potential and ability that we critically look at. This enables me as a manager to appraise the employees' performance objectives because I have a purpose in mind for those performance review outcomes.

1.6. DISCUSSIONS

Although line managers at Kansanshi mine conduct performance appraisals which have some aspects of top management commitment, i.e. the drive by the new Resource Optimization manager by arranging and taking the lead in the training of the managers involved in performance appraisal as well as the constant reminders on the dates for the reviews, encouraging performance discussions, it is notable that they consider themselves as not well equipped such that they are not sufficiently self-confident to conduct an objective performance appraisal. Precisely, line managers lack refresher training, while the organizational system of only having targets at corporate and not individual level makes it difficult for line managers to justify how they have appraised subordinates.

This means there is a lack of an appropriate organizational support system (e.g. process and system of setting targets, job descriptions) for the performance appraisal system such that both line managers and their subordinates do not use individual level targets to inform employee performance and the manager`s conduct of the performance appraisal. The system of setting targets at individual employee level is very important in order to focus on both measurable results achieved by an employee and also to guide the necessary performance behaviours that are required or expected (Kondrasuk, 2011). As such, the system of setting targets at Kansanshi needs to support or enable line managers to conduct performance appraisals in a way that has fewer perceptions of bias by both employees as appraisees and line managers themselves as appraisers. The lack of alignment between corporate targets and individual employee targets is sometimes due to lack of discussions between supervisors and subordinate. Results of a study by Kumar (2013) on gazetted officers serving in the Klang Valley in which the importance of discussing targets was investigated, it was concluded that there was no discussion between the first rating officer and subordinates to set work targets, and subordinates were not given guidance on setting work targets and performance indicators. This underscores the need for a system of setting targets at corporate, departmental and individual level, not only to support but also to resonate with performance appraisal to address barriers such as those faced by line managers at Kansanshi.

Additionally, the difficulty of line managers in conducting performance appraisals is exacerbated by the absence of job descriptions. There is a danger that the perceived lack of objectivity of the system by subordinates (e.g. employees` perceptions of favouritism by line managers and the resentment of appraisals by subordinates) on one hand and the line managers` difficulties of communicating bad performance without clear references and justification and the risk of being labelled as bad managers on the other hand reflect that the way performance appraisals are conducted by line managers has a negative effect on both the appraiser and the appraisee. Because the performance appraisal at the mine has two purposes, namely assessment of performance for reward, and development, the emphasis at Kansanshi is more evident on performance appraisal for evaluation rather than development (e.g. line managers are not comfortable giving negative feedback during the annual appraisals which could develop subordinates) (Kondrasuk, 2011). In this vein, Kondrasuk (2011) echoes that giving frequent feedback to appraisees on performance helps to reduce biases perceived by employees being appraised. On the other, hand there is also the need to train appraisers and periodically review the effectiveness of the performance system. In the context of the findings in this study, there is

need for training not only on how to conduct performance appraisals, but more importantly on how to give developmental and negative feedback. The performance appraisal interview being a vital part of the entire appraisal process as conducted at Kansanshi requires that the appraisers are trained in how to give feedback, whether good or bad, to the appraisees. Churchill (2010:225) agrees that the success of an appraisal interview depends on the planning, the skill of the appraiser and the approach of the appraisee. In a similar vein, Sprietzer and Porath (2012) echo that feedback is very important as it actually constructs opportunities for learning. Based on the communicative and developmental perspective, Fletcher and Williams (1976) allude to the fact that what is communicated in an appraisal interview will determine whether the outcome will be positive or negative. Without individual targets for the employee, it can be argued that the company is losing an opportunity to get the best out of the individual employees as well as the system in totality. It is vital to note the concern of line managers that setting of targets is important, as it will individualize performance targets and enable them to give feedback on bad performance to individuals without fear of being regarded as bad managers.

The predominant perception of subjectivity of the system coupled with lack of individual targets makes managers face performance appraisal interviews with trepidation and less confidence (Clifton, 2012:283).

Notably, line managers conduct performance appraisals in a highly production-oriented context. As such, they are more concerned with production as a priority so that the only moment they think about performance appraisal is when human resources request appraisal documents for subordinates. According to Milliman et al. (2002) another fundamental objective of performance appraisal is a developmental focus (e.g., training, planning, etc.) regarding how employees can improve their performance in the future. Focusing on the developmental dimension of performance appraisal, Miliman et al. (2002:89) assert that studies have indicated that appraisals in Canada (Stone and Meltz, 1992), Australia (Dowling and Fisher, 1996; Shelton, 1995), Korea (Steers, Shin, and Unison, 1989), Taiwan (McEvoy and Cascio, 1990), and Japan (Pucik, 1989; Pucik, 1984) seek to determine the future potential of employees and are used to determine job assignments and training opportunities. The line managers' predominant focus on production output at Kansanshi suggests however that performance appraisal is not considered as a tool to enhance performance but rather a "necessary evil" or requirement for employees to get their rewards and promotion. Line managers at Kansanshi should therefore be made to understand that the performance of their subordinates is equally critical to the ultimate achievement of their set production targets.

Despite the common perception of bias in the system by employees, it is very notable that some employees have some hope in the system, or consider it as a spring to career development and progression. In this vein, the organization's effort and results of helping line managers to confidently and competently conduct performance appraisals may further boost the hope that these employees already have in the system. In the view of Murphy and Cleveland (1995), personal assessment processes are usually perceived to be just if they are transparent and explained sufficiently, gather evidence rather than express personal bias, and allow employees to present their own views and point out the elements of performance appraisals they have perceived to be unfair or unfortunate. In this way, perception of fairness on the part of the appraisee leads to the issue of organizational justice and procedural justice in particular. Organizational justice is the study of people's perception of fairness in organizations while procedural justice is concerned with the perceived fairness of the application of procedures (Milliman et al., 2002).

Two types of measures are associated with procedural justice. One concerns the PA process, the other concerns feedback, which is more likely to be accepted when the requirements of procedural justice have been fulfilled (Murphy and Cleveland, 1995). A study done by Vasset et al. (2010) among nurses in Norway on perceptions of procedural justice found that the most important element in employees' perceptions of procedural justice in performance appraisals is their own ability to contribute. This lack of trust in the performance appraisal system has an effect on the organization commitment of the affected employees. According to a model developed by Ahmed et al. (2011), perceived fairness in performance appraisal is positively and significantly related to the organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour. Focusing within the banking sector in Pakistan, the study by Ahmed et al. (2011) reveals that organizational commitment leads to organizational citizenship behaviour among the employees and that organizational commitment is a mediator role player between perceived fairness in performance appraisal and organizational citizenship behaviour.

It is central to note that sustaining the perception of performance appraisal as hope for reward and career progression would be insufficient without procedural fairness and line managers' confidence arising from being well-equipped to conduct performance appraisals. It can therefore be stated that an opportunity is being lost by the company through managers who are willing to conduct appraisals but do not have the necessary tools to do so, while on the other hand there are employees who are willing to take part in the performance appraisal.

Commitment is a force that binds an individual to a course of action that is of relevance to a particular target. From a performance appraisal point of view commitment can be viewed as the amount of time line managers dedicate to issues of performance. In this study, line managers at Kansanshi are therefore less committed to performance appraisal because they focus more on the actual production of the final product and do not see the real importance of the performance appraisal system.

It can be seen from the outcomes of the results of the study that line managers have a mind-set not fully focused on performance appraisal implementation but on the other tasks that they feel feed directly in the outcomes of the final products. In this regard, goal regulation as defined by Meyer et al. (2004) helps to clarify where the focus for the line managers at Kansanshi lies.

It must therefore be noted that a performance appraisal is a process and not a form. It requires setting expectations of both supervisors and subordinates, appraising the performance on those expectations, giving feedback of the performance and then applying the results of the assessment in ways that benefit the organization, the supervisor and the subordinate involved.

1.7. LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

A major limitation of this study was the collection of data mainly through one method, namely interviews. This is a limitation because line managers may choose what to report, divulge or not during interviews. To mitigate this, where necessary follow-up interviews were used to seek clarification and completeness of what was reported by line managers. Although informed and voluntary consent was secured from the interviewees to enhance openness, it cannot be absolutely ruled out that the fact that the researcher is member of human resource management might have impacted the responses of these interviewees in one way or another.

1.8. VALUE OF THE RESEARCH

This research is valuable as it highlights how the conduct of performance appraisals is not only impacted by organizational support (e.g. training of appraisers) and other complementary organizational systems (e.g. setting of targets), but also how the barriers to conducting the performance appraisal affect both the appraisee and the appraiser.

In this way, this study is equally valuable to the line managers as the questions posed helped

them to view the entire process from a different perspective and some were surprised at some of their own responses and how valuable the process was to their own performance and the organization in general. Perceptions of fairness of the system and procedural justice are also vital to safeguard the integrity of a performance appraisal system.

1.9. AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Further research needs to focus on appraisees in the mining context to get their experiences of being appraised using the current system. The perspectives of lower-level employees would be valuable as this sector has a large work force of non-managerial employees.

Future research may also explore the perspectives of both managers and lower-level employees on how performance appraisal data is used.

1.10. RECOMMENDATIONS

Performance appraisal is clearly difficult but essential for an organization that needs to manage its employees effectively (Al-Zhrani, 2010). It is therefore recommended that Kansanshi mining plc looks at the following to improve implementation of the current performance appraisal system.

- **Performance appraisal policy**

The developmental and evaluation aspects of performance appraisals should not be divorced from the current focus on production that is common among line managers. Instead, evaluation and development of employees should be combined in a clear policy on what management seeks to achieve from a performance appraisal system. This should help line managers to effectively balance the evaluative and developmental functions of performance appraisal as a tool to achieve the set production targets.

- **Job descriptions for all jobs on the mine**

Job descriptions are an important guide in the way people do their jobs. It is very important that every employee on the mine knows what is expected of them and how their job is linked to the overall performance of the organization as well as its survival and growth. A job description is a very important document and as such Kansanshi management must ensure that all employees are made aware of their job requirements as part of performance management.

- **More targets in the system**

Clear SMART KPI's for each job must be set up to add more objectivity to the assessment process and reduce the perceived subjectivity of the system. This will make the system focus not only on the performance, but also on the ability to purposefully get the desired performance from the workforce.

- **Training on importance of performance appraisal**

Management of Kansanshi should explain and train all its managers on the importance of conducting good performance reviews. Refresher training must also be provided to all other managers previously trained to give them more confidence to conduct performance appraisals. Managers at Kansanshi seem to be more preoccupied with final copper production numbers and they treat performance appraisals as a “by the way task” on their plate or worse still as an extra burden. A well-implemented performance appraisal system will act as a motivator and a well-motivated workforce may lead to increased production.

1.11. CONCLUSION

This qualitative study aimed to build an understanding of how line managers at Kansanshi mine in Solwezi, Zambia, implement the performance appraisal system. In particular, this study explored what barriers and enablers are experienced by line managers as they implement the performance appraisal process.

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

- How do line managers at Kansanshi mine in Zambia conduct performance appraisal interviews?
- What barriers and enablers do they face in the conduct of performance appraisals?

To collect data ten of the thirty line managers from all ten departments across the Kansanshi mine site were selected using a stratified random sampling technique. Data was collected from these managers using semi-structured, in-depth, face-to-face interviews. A total of 15 interviews were conducted on the mine site in the interviewees' offices as well as other convenient places such as the Kansanshi main boardroom during May 2013.

Interviews were audio recorded, transcribed and thereafter analysed using open coding and constant comparison technique to induce themes. Five follow-up interviews and six members'

checks were also conducted to enhance credibility and dependability.

The findings of the study show a variety of barriers and enablers of line managers in their conduct of performance appraisal interviews at Kansanshi mine in Zambia. Predominantly, line managers were of the view that (a) lack of clear job descriptions and individual targets, (b) perceived subjectivity of the system, and (c) predominant focus and priority on production were some of the barriers to how they conducted performance appraisals. Additionally, some of the line managers agreed that (d) lack of adequate refresher training impacted on how they conducted performance appraisal.

On the other hand, (a) top management commitment to the performance appraisal system, (b) employee hope for reward and (c) perception of performance appraisal as a spring for career development and progression were highlighted as enablers by line managers in their conduct of performance appraisal.

Recommendations regarding how line managers need to be assisted to effectively balance the evaluative and developmental functions of performance appraisal, and refresher training of line managers should be provided to help them knowhow to make the best out of the performance system and ensure its integrity. This study further helped the company to evaluate the entire performance appraisal system as a whole and see how best the system can be improved and utilized. The study contributed to the understanding of the barriers and enablers of line managers in their conduct of performance appraisal in a mining environment.

A major limitation of this study was the collection of data mainly through one method, namely interviews. This is a limitation because line managers may choose what to report, divulge or not during interviews. To mitigate this, where necessary follow-up interviews were used to seek clarification and completeness of what was reported by line managers.

Ultimately the research was valuable as it highlighted how the conduct of performance is not only impacted by organizational support (e.g. training of appraisers) and other complementary organizational systems (e.g. setting of targets), but also how the barriers to the conducting of performance appraisal affects both the appraisee and the appraiser. The study is equally valuable to the line managers as the questions posed helped them to view the entire process from a different perspective and some were surprised at some of their own responses and how valuable the process was to their own performance and the organization in general.

REFERENCES:

- AGGARWAL, A.** and **THUKUR, G. S. M.** (2013). Techniques of performance Appraisal – A Review. *Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 2(3) pp. 617-621
- AHMED, I., MUHAMMAD R., MOHAMMAD, S. K. and ISLAM, T.** (2011). Relationship between perceived fairness in performance appraisal and OCB; mediating role of organizational commitment. *International Journal of Academic Research* 3(5) pp. 15-20
- AKUOKO, K.O.** (2012). Performance appraisal as employee motivation mechanism in selected financial institutions in Kumasi, Ashanti region of Ghana. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 12 (6), pp.20-37
- AL-ZHRANI, S.** (2010). Management information systems role in decision-making during crises: Case study. *Journal of Computer Science* 6 (11), pp. 1247-1251
- BERG, B.L.** (2007). *Qualitative Research Methods for Social Sciences* (6e). New York: Pearson Education.
- BOHLANDER, G., SNELL, S. and SHERMAN, A.** (2001). *Managing Human Resources*. Mason Ohio. South Western College Publishing.
- CERTO, S. C.** (2009). *Supervision Concepts and Skill Building*. (8e) USA: McGraw-Hill.
- CHATTERJEE, B.** (1999). *Human Resource Management, A contemporary Text*. New Delhi: Sterling Pub Pvt. Ltd.
- CHURCHILL, D** (2010). Appraisal a developing process. *Obstetrics, Gynecology & Reproductive Medicine* 20(7) pp. 225-226.
- CLIFTON, J.** (2012). Conversation Analysis in Dialogue with stock of interaction knowledge: Face work and Appraisal Interviews. *Journal of Business communication*, 49(4) pp. 283-311
- CRESWELL, J. W.** (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DECENZO, D. A. and ROBBINS, S. P.** (2002). *Human Resource Management*. (7e) Hoboken, New Jersey, John Wiley and Sons
- DENZIN, N.K. and LINCOLN, Y.S.** (2005). *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3e).Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DOWLING, P.J. and FISHER, C.** (1996). *The Australian HR professional: A 1995 profile*. Work paper series, 96-04. University of Tasmania, School of Management
- FLETCHER, C.** (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 74 (4), pp. 473-487.
- FLETCHER, C. and WILLIAMS, R.** (1976). Influence of performance feedback in appraisal interviews. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 49 (2) pp. 75-83.

- FRENCH, W. L.**, and **BELL, C. H.** (1994). *Organization Development*. Practice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey
- GOODALL Jr. H.**, **WILSON, G.** and **WAAGEN, C.** (1986). The performance appraisal interview: an interpretive reassessment. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 72, (1), pp. 74-87
- GUBA, E. G.** and **LINCOLN, Y. S.** (1981). *Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches*. San Francisco , Jossey-Bass
- GUBA, E. G.** and **LINCOLN, Y. S.** (1982). Epistemological and methodological bases of naturalistic inquiry. *Educational Communication and Technology* 30(4), 233-252
- GUBA, E.G.** and **LINCOLN, Y.S.** (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In: Denzil, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- GUPTA, A.** and **KUMAR, S.** (2013). Impact of performance appraisal justice on employee engagement: a study of Indian professionals. *Employee Relations*, 35 (1), pp.61-78
- IVANCEVICH, J. M.** (1998). *Human Resource Management*. McGraw-Hill Companies Inc., USA
- JAFARI, M.**, **BOURAMI, A.** and **AMIR, R. H.** (2009). A new framework for selection of the best performance appraisal method. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(3) pp.92-100
- KANSANSHI MINING PLC** (2011). Performance appraisal guide
- KONDRASUK, J. N.** (2011). So what would an ideal performance appraisal look like? *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, 12(1) pp. 57-71
- KREITNER, R.** (1986). *Management*. Houston: Mufflin Company.
- MATHIS, R. L.** and **JACKSON, J. H.** (2006). *Human Resource Management*. Mason, Ohio, Thomson/South-western.
- MAYS, N.** and **POPE, C.** (2000). Qualitative research in health care: Assessing quality in qualitative research. *British Medical Journal*, 320(7226), p.50
- McEVOY, G.M.**, and **CASCIO, W.R.** (1990). The U.S. and Taiwan: Two different cultures look at performance appraisal. In G.R. Ferris and K.M. Rowland (Eds.) *Research in personnel and human resources management*, Supplement 2 (pp. 201–219). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- MEYER, J. P.**, **BECKER, T. E.**, and **VANDENBERGHE, C.** (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: a conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of applied psychology*, 89 (6) p. 991
- MILES, M.B.** and **HUBERMAN, A.M.** (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded source book*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- MILLIMAN, J. NASON, S. ZHU, C. and DE CIERI, H.** (2002). An exploratory assessment of the purposes of performance appraisals in North and Central America and the Pacific Rim. *Human Resource Development International*, 41 (1) pp. 87-102
- MONDY, W. R.** (2008). *Human Resource Management* (10e). Pearson Education.
- MURPHY, K. R. and CLEVELAND, J.** (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. Sage.
- NJEKWA, M.** (2006). Evaluation of Performance Management Packages in the Zambian Civil Service. *Master's Thesis*. University of Zambia, Lusaka
- OHMAN, A.** (2005). Qualitative methodology for rehabilitation research. *Journal of rehabilitation medicine*, 37(5), 273-280
- OSEMEKE, M.** (2012). Appraisal as a Determinant for Adequate Compensation in Private Sector: A Study of Selected Organizations in Nigeria. *An International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia*, 6 (24), pp. 116-135
- PHIRI, S. K. and CHAKANIKA, W.** (2010). Awareness and Participation of Mineworkers in Workers' Education Programmes: The Case of Nchanga Mine in Chingola District, Zambia. Institute of Economic and Social Research, *The University of Zambia, Zambian Papers Number 22*
- PUCIK, V.** (1984). White collar human resource management: A comparison of the U.S. and Japanese automobile industries. *Columbia Journal of World Business*, Fall, 19, pp. 87–94.
- SHELTON, D.** (1995). Human resource management in Australia. In L.F. Moore & P.D. Jennings (Eds.), *Human resource management on the Pacific Rim* (pp. 31–60). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- SPRIETZER, G. and PORATH, C.** (2012). Creating Sustainable Performance. *Harvard Business Review*, January – February, pp. 92-99
- STEERS, R.M., SHIN, Y.K., and UNISON, G.R.** (1989). *The chaebol*. New York: Harper & Row
- STONE, T.H., and MELTZ, N.M.** (1992). *Human resource management in Canada* (3rd ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace.
- VIEDGE, C.** (2003). Performance management in a learning organization. In: Schultz, H. (ed). *Organizational Behaviour. A contemporary South African Perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- VASSET, F., MARBURG, E. AND FURUNES, T** (2010) Employees' perceptions of justice in performance appraisals *Nursing Management* 17 (2) p. 30

2. SECTION 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. INTRODUCTION

Performance appraisal is used in the organizations to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of employees. As such, performance appraisal is desired because all employees have a different attitude to how they handle their work. It has been argued that performance appraisal tends to improve work performance and communication expectations, to determine employee potential and aid employee counselling (Aggarwal and Thukur, 2013). In this way, performance appraisal continues to be a topic of great attention and importance to most human resource professionals. According to Smith et al. (1996:15), a great number of authors maintain that there is a significant gap between theory and practice. This section provides an outline of what performance appraisal is, its importance and how it has been implemented in some of the business environments around the world. It further discusses the role that line managers play in the performance appraisal interview process.

2.2. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL ORIGIN AND DEFINITIONS

Though the practice of performance appraisal has grown over the last few decades, the practice of officially appraising employees has existed for centuries. Patten (1997) cited in Saibu (2011) states that as early as the third century A.D., Sin Yu, an early Chinese philosopher, criticized a biased rater employed by the Wei dynasty on the grounds that “the Imperial Rater of Nine Grades seldom rates men according to their merits but always according to his likes and dislikes”.

According to Saibou (2011:264), systematic employee appraisal techniques came into prominence just after the end of World War I. According to Bellows and Estep, (1954) cited in Saibou (2011:264), during the war, Walter Dill Scott succeeded in persuading the United States Army to adopt a ‘man-to-man’ rating system for evaluating military officers. Furthermore, Murphy and Cleveland (1995) cited in Saibou (2011) suggest that formal performance appraisal probably began in the United States in 1813 when army General Lewis Cass submitted to the War Department an evaluation of each of his men using such terms as “a good-natured man” or “knave despised by all”.

According to Saibu (2011:264) most of the merit rating plans from 1920 to the mid-1940s were of the rating scale type with factors, degrees and points. Indeed the analogy between a point plan

of job evaluation and a rating scale plan of merit is very close. From the early 1950s greater interest was devoted to the performance appraisal of technical, professional and managerial personnel. However it has to be pointed out that with the changing nature of the emphasis, the terminology has also been changing over the years. Some of the other terms currently being used include personnel appraisal, personnel review, progress report, service rating, and performance evaluation and fitness report (Saibu, 2011).

Early literature on performance appraisal was dominated by psychologists and focused on the psychometric properties of appraisal. In particular, there was a focus on the role of supervisors and the precision of performance evaluation (Hunnes et al., 2012:22). Recent psychological literature has put more emphasis on worker reaction to appraisals and the social context in which appraisal occurs (Hunnes et al., 2012:22). According to Hunnes et al. (2012:22), issues of employee satisfaction with performance appraisal systems are explored by Boswell and Benson (2000) and Brown and Benson (2003), who both argue that individual involvement and development opportunities play an important role for the success of performance appraisal systems.

Hunnes et al. (2012:22) further highlights that economists started to develop a theoretical interest in performance appraisal in the 1970s when economics of incentives and asymmetric information made its way into the theoretical literature. However, it was not until recently that economists have begun to investigate performance appraisal empirically. For example, the literature indicates a wider dispersion of labour income due to performance appraisal, both within each firm (Barth et al., 2008) and for society as a whole (Lemieux et al., 2009). While the majority of the research on performance appraisal has focused on the rater, some work has also been conducted on rater effects (Boswell and Boudreau, 2002).

Performance appraisal is a function of human resource management that is essential to the growth of employees and organizations (Osemeke, 2012). Hall et al. (1989) identified common objectives of performance appraisal as reviewing past performance, rewarding past performance, goal setting for future performance and employee development. Taylor and Zawacki (1976) published the first two articles that documented trends in performance appraisal usage among U.S. organizations. The findings of their survey noted a remarkable shift away from what they called collaborative (e.g. Management By Objectives and Behaviourally Anchored Rating Standards) towards the more traditional performance appraisal techniques (graphic rating scales). Bernardin and Klatt (1985) note that small firms tended to rely heavily

on trait-based approaches, while large firms relied on a combination of trait, behavioural and findings-based techniques. In another study, Locher and Teel (1988), unlike Taylor and Zawacki (1984), identified a shift towards more use of MBO as a popular technique. Although a lot of research on performance appraisal methods has been done by many authors (Bernardin and Klatt, 1985; Hall et al., 1989; Maroney and Buckley, 1992; Thomas and Bretz, 1984), only a few researchers have reported on how the performance appraisal data is used. Thomas and Bretz (1994) report that performance appraisal information is most likely used for employee development or to administer merit pay. They identified the main developmental uses as improving work performance, communicating expectations, determining employee potential and aiding employee counselling. Other common administrative uses included promotions, lay-offs, transfers, terminations and validation of hiring decisions.

According to Smith et al. (1996), considerable change has taken place between what was reported in research of the 1970s and 1980s, and even though Taylor and Zawacki (1984) had identified a trend towards more objective techniques, the trend did not continue as predicted. MBO still maintains a significant following in the workplace, as does the graphic rating scale. Smith et al. (1996) further points out that the rise of the narrative is far from being an anomaly as most companies surveyed used it as a supporting document to other evaluation formats.

A review of the literature on definitions of performance appraisal highlights a number of aspects as important and common to the process. In this regard, performance appraisal is a systematic evaluation of employees' performance to check their weaknesses and strengths for further development as well as to reward good performance or punish poor performance (Bohlander et al., 2001; Chatterjee, 1999; Certo, 2009; Invancevich, 1998; French and Bell, 1994; Kreitner, 1986). On the other hand, Certo (2009) underscores formality of feedback on performance to assert that performance appraisal is formal feedback on how well an employee is performing on the job. It can be contested that although very old, the definition by French and Bell (1994) captures the salient points on the subject, namely (a) formal assessment, (b) job performance, (c) establishment of standards for comparison with performance, (d) a feedback system and (e) a developmental plan.

Performance appraisal can also be looked at as a rating process where employees' performance is rated against predetermined criteria. Specific techniques, such as rating scales and forced-comparisons, are used for performance appraisal (Viedge, 2003). In his definition, Viedge (2003) refers to performance appraisal as part of the performance management process. One can

refer to it as an event as it takes place occasionally, for example four times a year, depending on how the organization structures its performance management process.

According to Fletcher (2001:473), performance appraisal was a term once associated with a rather basic process involving a line manager completing an annual report on a subordinate's performance and (usually but not always) discussing it with him or her in an appraisal interview. Performance Appraisal has become a general heading for a variety of activities through which organizations seek to assess employees and develop their competence, enhance performance and distribute rewards. While performance appraisals are viewed as important, they are also seen as problematic. Many managers dislike giving appraisal reviews and employees often dislike receiving them (Fletcher, 2001:473). This mainly occurs because of problems in the performance appraisal systems of organizations and it also occurs in part as a result of the inherent difficulties people have in giving and receiving feedback (Fletcher 2001:473).

For the purpose of this research, performance appraisal is defined as “a variety of activities through which organizations seek to assess employees and develop their competence, enhance performance and distribute rewards” (Fletcher, 2001:473). The researcher has adopted this definition because it has captured all the elements that the performance appraisal system on the research site seeks to address, which are assessment of performance for developmental purposes, reward of good performance and overall improvement of the production output and quality.

Focusing on appraisal content and process, this research will look at how the line managers who are implementers of the appraisal system conduct their semi-annual appraisal interviews. This is useful for the researcher to ascertain how well the entire process is being conducted in order for the performance appraisal to address the key outcomes of the exercise which are career development, reward and improved overall performance of the organization in terms of the actual quality of output. The process involves the interaction between supervisor and subordinate, development of their competences and reward or punishment based on performance.

2.3. PURPOSE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Performance appraisal is one of the most important human resource management practices as it yields critical decisions integral to various human resource actions and outcomes (Gupta and Kumar, 2013). Performance appraisals seek to serve numerous specific objectives or purposes

such as employee development, identifying career needs and linking performance to rewards (Jafari et al, 2009).

Most literature on the US context assert that major appraisal purposes include documentation, development, administrative purposes involving pay and promotion, and subordinate expression (Jafari et al, 2009). The purpose of performance appraisal is to identify employee strengths and weaknesses, evaluate training needs, set plans for future development and provide motivation by serving as a basis for determining rewards and career feedback (Milliman et al., 2002:88). Milliman et al. (2002:88) further contend that performance appraisals are seen as one important way by which multinational enterprises obtain full abilities from their diverse workforce as well as controlling and coordinating their overseas operations.

Organizations assess the compatibility of the various intended uses of performance appraisals and strongly believe that appraisals cannot be used for all the purposes they often appear to serve in organizations (Jafari et al, 2009). For example, the objective of introducing a performance appraisal system in the public service in Zambia in 1997 was to crucially link performance appraisal to a performance management package (Njekwa, 2006). Furthermore a recent survey done by Osemeke (2012) reported that appraisals could be used by private sector organizations in Nigeria to determine adequate compensation for the workforce and explore the relationship between appraisal and adequate compensation.

Another study done in Ghana by Akuoko (2012:33) linked appraisal and motivation to suggest that a “performance appraisal system can be an effective tool in employee motivation if both the process and outcome are fair”. In particular, the current study investigates the actual performance appraisal process and content, specifically the interaction between the appraiser and the appraisee in a private sector. Line managers at Kansanshi mine conduct the performance appraisal which is designed to improve employee performance as the findings of this process have an effect on the reward or punishment that is given to employees. Cultural factors, employee attitude to feedback based on learning goals or performance goal orientation, perceptions of procedural justice, politics of appraisal and bias are some of the numerous factors that have been highlighted in literature as impediments to the implementation of performance appraisal (Fletcher, 2001).

2.4. TYPES OF APPRAISAL

There are several ways by which appraisal can be carried out. Below are some of the different ways in which an appraisal can be done.

Managerial / supervisor appraisal

The managerial or supervisor appraisal has been the traditional approach to evaluating an employee's performance. Writers such Belcourt et al. (1999), Certo (2009) and Carlson et al. (2008) conclude that, in this appraisal, the superior appraises the subordinate and in most situations a review is done by the supervisor's superior. The reviews of the appraisal by another person who is superior to both the appraisee and appraiser reduce subjectivity and superficial and or biased evaluations (Carlson et al., 2008 and Certo, 2009).

Self- appraisal

Sometimes employees are asked to evaluate themselves on a self-appraisal form. This form of appraisal is beneficial when managers seek to increase an employee's involvement in the review process (Belcourt et al., 1999 and Vaughan, 2003). This process gets the employees thinking about their strengths and weaknesses and may lead to discussions about barriers to effective performance. During the performance interview, the manager and employee discuss job performance and agree on a final appraisal.

Subordinate appraisal

This is a system where managers give feedback on how their subordinates view them as supervisors. Subordinate appraisals give employees power over their bosses, and this makes managers hesitant to endorse such a system. Nevertheless, to avoid potential problems, Bohlander et al. (2001) opined that subordinate appraisal should be submitted anonymously and combined across several individual raters.

Peer appraisal

This is a process where individuals of equal rank who work together are asked to evaluate each other. In this form of appraisal individuals are brought to account for their actions and professional practice by their peers (Blackmore, 2005). Peers can readily identify leadership and personal skills along with other strengths and weaknesses of their co-workers. One advantage of peer appraisal is that it gives more accurate and valid information than appraisal from supervisors (Bohlander et al., 2001).

Team appraisal

This is an extension of the peer appraisal while peers are on equal standing with one another, they may be working in a team situation. As stated by Jafari et al (2009), in this method, employees are placed into a particular classification, such as “top one-fifth” where it may be nearly impossible to separate one’s individual contribution from the others. Writers such as Mathis and Jackson (2006) argue that in such situations appraisal can be dysfunctional since it detracts from the critical issues such as the actual input in the production or execution of set objectives.

The majority of authors in human resource management, such as Jafari et al (2009), Drucker (1954) and Cole (2002) are of the opinion that employee performance appraisals should be conducted by every employee’s superior. That is, the superior assesses or evaluates the performance of his subordinate over a period of time. For example, Drucker (1954) writes that to appraise a subordinate and his performance is part of the manager’s job. According to Cole (2002), Drucker’s view as a whole is that managers are responsible for assessing their subordinates.

At Kansanshi a combination of the self and managerial/supervisor type of appraisal is employed. This has been adopted mainly to offer fair input from the employee him or herself regarding performance review.

2.5. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL METHODS

Aggarwal and Thukur (2013) state that there are two types of methods used in performance appraisal: (1) objective measures which are directly quantifiable and (2) subjective measures which are not directly quantifiable. Decenzo and Robbins (2002) state that there are three approaches for measuring performance: (1) absolute standards (2) relative standards and (3) objectives.

2.5.1. Absolute Standards

One group of appraisal methods uses absolute standards. This means that employees compare to a standard, and their evaluation is independent of any other employee in a weak group (Dessler, 2000). Included in this group are the following methods: the essay appraisal, the critical incident appraisal, the checklist, the graphic rating scale, forced choice and behaviourally anchored rating scales.

The essay appraisal:

The essay appraisal is the simplest evaluating method: the evaluator writes an explanation of the employee's strengths and weaknesses, previous performance, position and suggestions for his (her) improvement at the end of evaluation term. This kind of evaluation often combines with other methods by including parts of other systems to make them flexible. This method focuses on behaviours (Mondy 2008).

The critical incident appraisal:

The critical incident appraisal method focuses on key factors which make a difference in performing a job efficiently. This method is more credible because it is more related to the job and is based on an individual's performance rather than his/her characteristics. This system tries to measure individuals' performance in term of incidents and special episodes which take place in job performance. These incidents are known as critical incidents. In this method, the manager writes down the positive and negative individuals' performance behaviour in evaluation terms (Mondy 2008).

The checklist:

In this method, the evaluator has a list of situations and statements and compares it with employees. The checklist is a presentation of employee's characteristics and performance. The findings can be quantitative and give weight to characteristics. Answers to checklist points are often "Yes" or "No" (Decenzo, 2002).

The graphic rating scale:

This is the most commonly used method of performance appraisal because graphic rating scales are less time-consuming to develop and administer and allow for quantitative analysis and comparison. The scale lists some characteristics and rank of performance of each individual, and employees are ranked by determining a score which shows their performance level. The utility of this technique can be enhanced by using it in conjunction with the essay appraisal technique (Mondy, 2008).

Forced choice:

This method evolved after a great deal of research conducted for the military services during World War II. In this method the evaluator ranks individual work behaviour between two or more states. Each state may be favourable or unfavourable. The evaluator determines which

state best describes the employee (Mondy, 2008).

Behaviourally anchored rating scales (BARS):

This method replaces traditional numerical anchor tools with behavioural prototypes of real work behaviours. BARS lets the evaluator rank an employee based on observable behavioural dimension. The elements of this method are the result of a combination of major elements of critical incident and adjective rating scale appraisal methods (Wiese and Buckley, 1998). BARS consists of five stages (Decenzo, 2002)

- 1) Generate critical incidents,
- 2) Develop performance dimensions,
- 3) Relocate incidents,
- 4) Rate the level of performance for each incident, and
- 5) Develop the final instrument.

2.5.2. Relative Standards (Traits)

In the second general category of appraisal methods, individuals are compared against other individuals. These methods are relative standards rather than an absolute measuring device. The most popular relative methods are group order ranking, individual ranking and paired comparison.

Group order ranking:

In this method, employees are placed into a particular classification, such as “top one-fifth”. For example, if a rater has 20 employees, only four can be in the top fifth and four must be relegated to the bottom fifth (Decenzo, 2002).

Individual ranking:

In this type of appraisal, individuals are ranked from highest to lowest. It is assumed that the difference between the first and second employee is equal to the difference between the 21st and 22nd employees. In this method, the manager compares each person with others; work standards (Dessler, 2000).

Paired comparison:

In this method, employees are compared with all others in pairs. The number of comparison is followed as $N \cdot (N - 1)$ in which N shows the number of employees. After doing all

comparisons, the best person is determined for each characteristic (Mondy, 2008).

2.5.3. Objectives (Results)

The third approach to appraisal makes use of objectives. Employees are evaluated on how well they accomplished a specific set of objectives that have been determined to be critical in the successful completion of their job. This approach is frequently referred to as Management by Objectives (MBO) (Drucker, 1954). Management by objectives is a process that converts organizational objectives into individual objectives and is a popular performance appraisal technique that involves evaluation input from multiple levels within the firm as well as external sources (Aggarwal and Thukur, 2013).

2.5.4. 360 Degree Feedback Appraisal

360 degree evaluations are the latest approach to evaluating performance. This is a popular performance appraisal method that involves evaluation input from multiple levels within the firm as well as external sources. According to Aggarwal and Thukur (2013:618), 360 degree feedback depends on the input of an employee's superior, colleagues, subordinates, sometimes customers, suppliers and/or spouses and provides people with information about the effect of their action on others in the workplace. Aggarwal and Thukur (2013:618) further state that it provides a notion that behavioural change might be elicited through a process of enhanced self-awareness. Feedback about a target individual is solicited from significant others using a standardized instrument. Jones and Bearley (1996) refer to 360 degree feedback as the practice of gathering and processing multi-rater assessments on individuals and feeding back the findings to the recipients. Hoffman (1995) explains that 360 degree feedback is an approach that gathers behavioural observations from many layers within the organization and includes self-assessment.

The 360 degree evaluation enables one person be rated from different sides and different people, which can give a wider perspective of the employee's competencies (Shrestha, 2007). It has been used for human resource development, appraisal and pay decisions (Armstrong, 1998; Stone, 2002).

2.5.5. Balanced score card

Using a balanced score card approach not only measures the performance of employees but also includes:

- a) Financial Perspective: Includes measures such as operating income, return on capital employed, etc.
- b) Customer perspective: Includes measures such as customer satisfaction, customer retention, etc.
- c) Business process perspective: Includes measures such as cost incurred on the employee, quality of output, etc.
- d) Learning and growth perspective: Includes parameters such as employee satisfaction, employee retention, skills, etc. (Kaplan and Norton, 1992).

Banker et al. (2004) propound that through the combination of these different perspectives, the balanced scorecard assists managers to understand the links and trade-offs among the performance dimensions and leads to improved decision making and problem solving. At Kansanshi mine the appraisal system is more inclined to the absolute standard method and combines the essay, the self-review and the graphic rating scale methods.

2.5.6. 720 Degree Feedback Appraisal

According to Aggarwal and Thukur (2013:618), 720 degree review focuses on what matters most, which is the customer and investor perception of their work. The 720 degree approach gives people a very different view of themselves as leaders and growing individuals. In this method, the 360 degree appraisal method is practiced twice. According to Aggarwal and Thukur (2013:618), Rick Galbreath was dissatisfied with 360 degree reviews. Galbreath started using the 720 degree method which he believed was a more intense, personalized and above all greater review of upper level managers that brought in the perspective of their customers or investors, as well as subordinates.

Performance appraisal discussions between an employee and his/her line manager determine an employee's annual salary increase and also helps check for any improvements or weaknesses of employees at Kansanshi mine. This system, which involves an employee's input, was introduced in 2011 to replace the old system which only involved the manager doing an assessment while the employee only learnt of his performance either when his contract was not renewed or when his salary was not adjusted. The new system allows the employee to assess their own performance based on identified behavioural factors: teamwork, initiative, safety, quality of work, technical skills, quantity and attendance, on a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1

being very poor and 5 being outstanding. The supervisor will do a separate assessment and a date is set when the two meet to discuss the ratings and a conclusion is reached based on the one-to-one discussion. All managers and employees had to undergo a 2-day training program on the new system and on-going refresher training is conducted on site.

The table below gives a summary of the some of the different appraisal methods as well as their advantages and disadvantages.

Table 1: Summary of different appraisal methods

	Technique	Key Idea	Advantages	Disadvantages
A.	Ranking Method	Ranking employees from best to worst on a particular trait, choosing highest, then lowest, until all ranked.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fastest 2. Transparent 3. Cost-effective 4. Simple and easy to use 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Less objective 2. Morale problems for those who are not rated at or near the top of the list. 3. Suitable for small workforce. 4. Workers' strengths and weaknesses cannot be easily determined.

B.	Graphic Rating Scales	A scale that lists a number of traits and a range of performance for each, the employee is then rated by identifying the score that best describes his or her performance for each trait.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simple. 2. Easily constructed. 3. Ease of use. 4. Results are standardized which allows comparison to be made between employees. 5. Reduces personal bias. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rating may be subjective. 2. Each characteristic is equally important in evaluation of the employee's performance.
C.	Critical Incident	Keeping a record of uncommonly good or undesirable examples of an employee's work-related behaviour and reviewing it with the employee at predetermined times.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Easy and economical to develop and administer. 2. Based on direct observations. 3. It is time-tested and provides more face time. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Time-consuming and laborious to summarize and analyze the data. 2. Difficult to convince people to share their critical incidents through a survey. 3. Provides a personal perspective of organizational issues.

D.	Narrative Essays	Evaluator writes an evaluation of employee's strength and weakness points, previous performance, position and suggestions for his (her) improvement at the end of evaluation time.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Report actually shows employee's performance. 2. Can cover all factors. 3. Examples are given. 4. Provides feedback. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Time-consuming. 2. Supervisor may write a biased essay. 3. Effective writers are very difficult to find.
E.	Management by Objectives	Employees are evaluated on how well they accomplished a specific set of objectives that have been determined to be critical in the successful completion of the job.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Easy to implement and measure. 2. Employee motivated as he is aware of expected roles and accountability. 3. Performance-oriented diagnostic system. 4. Facilitates employee counselling and guidance. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Difficult to get employees to agree on goals. 2. Misses intangibles such as honesty, integrity, quality, etc. 3. Interpretation of goals may vary from manager to manager, and employee to employee. 4. Time-consuming, complicated, lengthy and expensive.

F.	Behaviourally Anchored Rating Scale	BARS combines elements from critical incident and graphic rating scale approaches. The supervisor rates employees according to items on a numerical scale.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Job behaviours describe employee performance in a better way. 2. More objective. 3. More acceptances due to participation of managers and employees. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scale independence may not be valid/reliable. 2. Behaviours are activity-oriented rather than result-oriented. 3. Very time-consuming to generate BARS. 4. Each job will require creating a separate BARS scale.
----	-------------------------------------	--	---	--

G.	Human Resource Accounting (HRA)	The people are valuable resources of an organization or enterprise. Information on investment and value of human resource is useful for decision making in the organization.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ascertain the cost of labour turnover. 2. Development of human resources. 3. Planning and execution of personnel policies. 4. Return on investment on human resources. 5. Improve the efficiencies of employees. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no specific and clear-cut guidelines for finding cost and value of human resources of an organization. 2. The method measures only the cost to the organization but ignores completely any measure of the value of the employee to the organization. 3. The life of human resources is uncertain and therefore, valuing them under uncertainty seems unrealistic.
----	---------------------------------	--	---	--

H.	Assessment Centres	Employees are evaluated over a period of time; say one or three days, by observing their behaviours across a series of selected exercises or work samples.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concepts are simple. 2. Highly flexible methodology. 3. Helps in selection and promotion decisions and for diagnosing employee development needs. 4. Allow for the measurement of multiple attributes. 5. Exercise is hard to fake. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expensive and difficult to manage. 2. Requires a large staff. 3. Requires a great deal of time. 4. Only a limited number of people can be processed at a time. 5. Heavy cognitive loads of assessors.
----	--------------------	--	--	--

I.	360 Degree	It relies on the input of an employee's superior, colleagues, subordinates, sometimes customers, suppliers and/or spouses.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Excellent employee development tool. 2. Accurate, reliable and credible system. 3. Legally more defensible. 4. More objective being a multi-rate system. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Time-consuming and very costly. 2. Sensitive to organization and national culture. 3. May damage self-esteem of employees if the feedback is brutal. 4. Prone to political and social games played by people. 5. Difficult to implement in cross-functional teams. 6. Maintaining
J.	720 Degree	360 degree appraisal method is practiced twice. When 360 degree appraisal is done, then the performance of the employee is evaluated and having a good feedback mechanism, the boss sits down with the employee again a second time and gives him feedback and tips on achieving the set targets.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved feedback from more resources. 2. Team development 3. Personal and organizational performance development. 4. Responsibility for career development. 5. Reduced discrimination risk. 6. Improved customer service. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exceptional expectations for the process. 2. Insufficient information. 3. Design process downfalls. 4. Failure to connect the process. 5. Insufficient training and process understanding. 6. Focus on negatives and weaknesses. 7. Requires commitment of top management and

Source: Aggarwal and Thukur, 2013:619

2.6. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS

The performance appraisal process is the procedure which an organization has outlined to be followed or used by managers or supervisors to ascertain the level of performance of their employees. Cole (2002) is of the opinion that any systematic approach to performance appraisal should commence with the completion of an appropriate appraisal form. The form should be designed in such a way that it will elicit the appropriate performance response from an employee.

This stage is then followed by an interview between the superior (appraiser) and the subordinate (appraisee). Clifton (2012) suggests that the interview is a discussion on both the strengths and weaknesses of the subordinate. Cole (2002) further states that the main purpose of the interview is to assist the subordinates to improve their performances through an action mutually agreed between them and the supervisor. According to Cole (2002), the agreed action may lead to job improvement, promotion or transfer and appropriate salary review.

The appraisal process therefore makes both the superior and the subordinate aware of the direction in which the performance of an employee should go and the means for correcting performance defects. When the process is clearly defined and laid out, and objectively followed by the superior, it makes the subordinate have confidence in it (Cole, 2002).

2.7. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INTERVIEW

According to Sprietzer and Porath (2012:98), feedback constructs opportunities for learning and the energy so critical for a culture of thriving and, by resolving feelings of uncertainty, feedback keeps people's work-related activities focused on personal and organizational goals.

According to Clifton (2012:283) performance appraisal interviews are faced with trepidation by both appraisers as well as appraisees. Performance appraisal interviews are important because they decide the training needs and career developments of the workforce. According to Bohlander et al. (2001), the appraisal interview is the most important part of the whole appraisal process. Apart from the interview giving the manager the opportunity to discuss a subordinate's performance, and record and explore areas of possible improvement and growth, it also provides an opportunity to identify the subordinate's attitudes and feelings more thoroughly and thus to improve communication. Mathis and Jackson (2006), however, argue that the appraisal interview presents

both opportunity and danger as it can be an emotional experience for the manager and the employee because the manager must communicate both praise and constructive criticism. If this is not handled efficiently, the employee may feel resentment when criticised which may lead to conflict in future working relationships. There are three types of appraisal interviews: (1) tell and sell, (2) tell-and-listen, and (3) problem- solving (Mathis and Jackson, 2006).

In the “Tell-and-Sell” interview, the appraiser tries to influence behaviour change in the subordinate through persuasion and subtle use of motivational incentives. The “Tell-and-Listen” interview is characterised by a manager who uses his/her strong communication skills to point out the strong and weak points of the subordinate’s job performance during one leg of the interview. In the second leg, the feelings of the staff are thoroughly explored. The appraiser listens to disagreements while coping with defensive behaviour and making an effort not to refute any statements (Bohlander et al., 2001). The underlying assumption in this method is that if a subordinate is given the opportunity to release frustrated feelings those feelings of frustration will be reduced. The last type of appraisal interview is the problem-solving, in which the supervisor listens, accepts, and responds to the feelings of the subordinate. According to Bohlander et al. (2001), the problem-solving interview also seeks to stimulate growth and development in the employee by discussing the problems, needs, innovations, and satisfactions the employee may have encountered during the performance of his job. From a communicative perspective, Clifton (2012:283) in his research on conversation analysis looked at the contents of the performance appraisal interview by looking at the actual conversation that goes on between the appraiser and the appraisee and what feedback is given during the interview as well as the factors that influence good communication. Owing to the need to give feedback in an appraisal interview, communication from both the appraiser and the appraisee becomes vital. As stated in much older but relevant research done by Fletcher and Williams (1976), what is communicated in an appraisal interview will determine whether the outcome will be positive or negative. The interviews which included a balanced discussion of both strengths and weaknesses in performance achieved the greatest positive effects overall. In contrast, where there was no review of performance much less was achieved (Fletcher and Williams, 1976:81). Where only the particularly good work done by the appraisee was reviewed, the encouraging effect of the interview and the favourable attitude towards it appear to be offset in some cases by the tendency to get too rosy a picture of the assessment given and perhaps to feel in consequence that further improvement is neither possible nor desired. However, interviews containing an element of negative feedback seem to have been much more successful than other studies would lead one to expect (Fletcher and William,

1976:81).

Previous research on performance appraisals has focused on (a) use and validity of ratings in appraisals, (b) social and motivational aspects of performance appraisal (e.g. appraisals not motivating or even reducing employee motivation and commitment), (c) politics of appraisal, (d) content of what is appraised (e.g. achievement against goals or objectives, assessment of competencies or job specific performance behaviours, and process of appraisal (e.g. appraiser-appraisee interactions, appraisee participation levels and perceptions of procedural justice; link between supervisor's positive regard for subordinate with tolerant appraisal ratings (Clifton, 2012, Fletcher and Williams, 1976, Latham et al., 2008). Indeed research illuminates factors at work in the appraisal interaction or process but these are not always useful in actually handling it better in practice or in generating developmental plans and actions on the part of the recipient of feedback (Fletcher, 2001:480).

A study conducted by Latham et al. (2008:226) suggests that a “predictor of one’s future performance evaluation is the prior performance appraisal of the individual who will be doing the assessment”. The outcome of the appraiser’s performance appraisal tends to affect the findings of the people they will appraise. As stated by Lance (1994), cited in Latham et al., (2008:226), findings are consistent with earlier findings indicating inaccuracy in performance appraisals due to rater bias.

2.8. SUMMARY

Performance appraisal is an on-going process. It involves both the employee as well as the managers. The literature reviewed has shown that employee performance appraisal is a useful tool to measure the performance of employees in an organization. There are three methods of assessment – traits, behavioural and results – and the latter two are most used for performance appraisal. The literature reviewed also identified that feedback to employees about their performance is key and that the appraisal interview is also fundamental to the process. Performance appraisal is a complex process which needs to be conducted properly as it is equally capable of generating unintended outcomes.

REFERENCES

- AGGARWAL, A** and **THUKUR, G. S. M.** (2013). Techniques of performance Appraisal – A Review. *Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 2(3) pp.617-621
- AKUOKO, K.O.**, (2012). Performance appraisal as employee motivation mechanism in selected financial institutions in Kumasi, Ashanti region of Ghana, *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 12 (6), pp.20-37
- ARMSTRONG, M.** (1998). *Performance management: The new realities*. London: Institute of personnel and development.
- BANKER, D. R. CHANG, H., JANAKIRAMAN, S. N.** and **KOSTAN, C.** (2004) Balanced scorecard analysis of performance metrics, *European Journal of Operational Research* 154, pp. 423-436
- BARTH, E., BRATSBERG, E., HÆGELAND, T.** and **RAAUM, O.** (2008). Who pays for performance? *International Journal of Manpower*, 29(1), pp8-29
- BELCOURT, M., SHERMAN, A., BOHLANDER, G.,** and **SNELL S. A.** (1999). *Managing Human Resources*. Ontario, ITP Nelson.
- BERNARDIN, J. H.,** and **KLATT, L. A** (1985) Managerial appraisal systems: Has practice caught up to the state of art? *Personnel Administrator*, pp. 79-86
- BLACKMORE, J. A.** (2005). A critical evaluation of peer review via teaching observation within higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*. 19 (3), pp. 218-232
- BOGDAN, R.C.** and **BIKLEN, S.K.** (2003). *Qualitative research for education. An introduction to theories and methods* (4e). New York: Pearson education group
- BOHLANDER, G., SNELL, S.,** and **SHERMAN, A.** (2001). *Managing Human Resources*. Ohio: South Western College Publishing, Mason.
- BOSWELL, M.** and **J. BENSON.** (2000). Employee satisfaction with performance appraisals and appraisers: The role of perceived appraisal use. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 11(3), 283.
- BOSWELL, W. R.** and **BOUDREAU, J.W.** (2002). Separating the developmental and evaluative performance appraisal uses. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 16 (3), pp. 391-412.
- BROWN, M.** and **J. BENSON.** (2003). Rated to exhaustion? Reactions to performance appraisal processes. *Industrial Relations Journal* 34(1), pp. 76-81.
- CARLSON, D. S., WITT, L. A., ZIVNUSKA, S., KACMAR, K. M.,** and **GRZYWACZ, J. G.** (2008). Supervisor appraisal as the link between family–work balance and contextual performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 23(1-2), pp. 37-49
- CERTO, S. C.** (2009). *Supervision Concepts and Skill Building*. (8e) USA: McGraw-Hill.

CHATTERJEE, B. (1999). *Human Resource Management*, A contemporary Text. New Delhi: Sterling Pub Pvt. Ltd.

CLIFTON, J. (2012). Conversation Analysis in Dialogue with stock of interaction knowledge: Face work and Appraisal Interviews, *Journal of Business communication*, 49(4) pp. 283-311

COLE, G. A. (2002). *Personnel and Human Resource Management*. Biddles Ltd, Guildford and King's Lynn, London.

DECENZO, D. A. and **ROBBINS, S. P.** (2002). *Human resource management*. (7e). Hoboken, New Jersey John Wiley and sons

DESSLER, GARY. (2000). *Human Resource Management*, (8e) Prentice Hall

DRUCKER, P. F. (1954). *The Practice of Management*. Heinemann, London.

FLETCHER, C. and **WILLIAMS, R.** (1976). Influence of performance feedback in appraisal interviews, *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 49 pp. 75-83.

FLETCHER, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 74 (4), pp. 473 -487.

FRENCH, W. L., and **BELL, C. H.** (1990). *Organization Development*. Practice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey

GUPTA, A and **KUMAR, S** (2013) Impact of performance appraisal justice on employee engagement: a study of Indian professionals, *Employee Relations*, 35 (1), pp.61 - 78

HALL, J. L., POSNER, B. Z. and **HARDNER, J. W.** (1989). Performance appraisal systems: Matching practice with theory. *Group and Organization Studies*, 14(1), 51-69.

HARRIS, M. M., SMITH, D. E., and **CHAMPAGNE, D.** (1995). A field study of performance appraisal purpose: Research versus administrative-based ratings, *Personnel Psychology*, 48 (1), pp. 151

HOFFMAN, R. (1995). Ten reasons why you should be using 360-degree feedback. *HR Magazine*, 40 (4), pp.82-86.

HUNNES, A., KVALOY, O. and **MOHN, K.** (2012). An Empirical study of Performance Appraisal and career Opportunities. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1) pp. 22-35

IVANCEVICH, J. M. (1998). *Human Resource Management*. McGraw-Hill Companies Inc., USA

JAFARI, M., BOURAMI, A and **AMIR, R. H.** (2009). A new framework for selection of the best performance appraisal method. *European Journal of Social Sciences* 7(3) pp92-100

JAWAHAR, I. M. and **WILLIAMS, C. R.** (1997). Where all the children are above average: The performance appraisal purpose effect, *Personnel Psychology*, 50 (4), pp. 905

- JONES, J.E** and **BEARLEY, W.L.** (1996). *360° Feedback: Strategies, Tactics and Techniques for Developing Leaders*. HRD Press, Armhurst, MA.
- KAPLAN, R. S.** and **D.P. NORTON** (1992). The Balanced Scorecard: Measures that Drive Performance, *Harvard Business Review*, (January-February): 71-79
- KREITNER, R.** (1986). *Management*. USA: Houston Mufflin Company.
- LATHAM G.**, and **WEXLEY, K.** (1986). *Increasing Productivity through Performance Appraisal*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- LATHAM, G. P., BUDWORTH, M., YANAR, B.** and **WHYTE G.** (2008). The influence of a manager's own performance appraisal on the evaluation of others. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 16 (3), pp. 220-228
- LEMIEUX, T., MACLEOD, W. B.,** and **PARENT, D.** (2009). Performance Pay and Wage Inequality. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(1), pp. 1 – 49
- LOCHER, A. H.** and **TEEL, K. S.** (1988). Appraisal trends. *Personnel Journal*, pp139 -145
- MARONEY, B. P.,** and **BUCKLEY, M. R.** (1992). Does research in performance appraisal influence practice of performance appraisal? Regretfully not? *Public Personnel Management* 21 (2) pp. 185-196
- MATHIS, R. L.,** and **JACKSON, J. H.** (2006). *Human Resource Management*, Mason, Ohio.
- MILLIMAN, J., NASON, S., ZHU, C.,** and **DE CIERI, H.** (2002) .An exploratory assessment of the purposes of performance appraisals in north and Central America and the Pacific Rim, *Human Resource Development International* 41 (1) pp. 87-102
- MONDY, W. R.** (2008). *Human Resource Management* (10e). Pearson Education.
- MURPHY, K. R.,** and **CLEVELAND, J.** (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. Sage.
- NJEKWA, M.** (2006). Evaluation of Performance Management Packages in the Zambian Civil Service. *Master's Thesis*. University Of Zambia, Lusaka
- OSEMEKE, M.** (2012). Appraisal as a Determinant for Adequate Compensation in Private Sector: A Study of Selected Organizations in Nigeria An *International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia*, 6 (24), pp. 116-135
- ROSSI, P.** and **FREEMAN, H.,** (1994). *Evaluation: A system Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- SAIBOU, H.** (2011). Performance Appraisal in the Public Sector in Niger. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6 (6), pp. 263

- SHRESTHA, S.** (2007). Improving employee performance appraisal method through web-based appraisal support system: system development from the study on Thai companies. *IEICE transaction on information and systems*, 90 (10), pp. 1621-1629
- SMITH, B. N. HORNSBY, J. S.** and **SHIRMEYER, R.** (1996). Current trends in performance appraisal: An examination of managerial practice, *Sam Advanced Management Journal*, 61 (3) pp. 10-15
- SPRIETZER, G** and **PORATH, C.** (2012). Creating Sustainable Performance, *Harvard Business Review*, January – February, pp. 92-99
- STONE, R.** (2002). *Human Resource Management* (4e) Wiley, Brisbane
- TAYLOR, R. L.** and **ZAWACKI, R. A.** (1976). A view of performance appraisal from organizations using it. *Personnel Administrator*, June, pp.290-299
- TAYLOR, R. L.** and **ZAWACKI, R. A.** (1984). Trends in performance appraisal: Guidelines for managers. *Personnel Administrator*, March, pp.81-80
- THOMAS, S. L.** and **BRETZ, R. D.** (1984). Research and practice in performance appraisal: Evaluating employee performance in America's largest companies. *Sam Advanced Journal*, 59 (2) pp. 28-34
- VAN DER MESCHT, H.** (2002). Four levels of rigour in interpretive qualitative research. *Education as Change*, 6(1) pp. 28-42
- VAUGHAN, S.** (2003). Performance: Self as the Principal Evaluator, *Human Resource Development International* 6 (3) pp. 371-385
- VIEDGE, C.** (2003). *Performance management in a learning organization*. In: Schultz, H. (ed). Organizational Behaviour. A contemporary South African Perspective. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- WEXLEY, K. N.** and **SNELL, S. A.** (1987). Managerial power: A neglected aspect of the Performance Appraisal Interview, *Journal of Business Research*, 15, pp.45-54
- WIESE, D. S.** and **BUCKLEY, M. R.** (1998). The evolution of the performance appraisal process *Journal of Management History*, 4 (3), pp. 233-249

3. SECTION 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

First and foremost, this is a qualitative study. It is a descriptive, non-numerical way to collect and interpret information. Cassell and Symon (2004:2-4) suggest that it is more sensible and practical to discuss qualitative research in terms of characteristics rather than a definition. This perspective is mainly influenced by the difficulty of getting consensus on an overarching definition, in view of the numerous and diverse methods under the rubric of qualitative research (Cassell and Symon, 2004:1).

Shanks (2002:5), states that qualitative research is “a form of systematic empirical inquiry into meaning”. Shanks (2002) further suggests that qualitative inquiry is “planned, and ordered”, guided by rules agreed upon by the qualitative research community. Qualitative research is exemplified by a commitment to understanding a unique, particular, and natural context (Maxwell, 2005:22). “How people learn about and make sense of their experiences, themselves and others in their setting” is the main focus of qualitative research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005:3).

3.1. OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH PARADIGM FOR THIS STUDY

Among other aspects, a research paradigm has ontology (i.e. what is the nature of knowledge); epistemology (i.e. what is the relationship between the knower (inquirer and the known)); and methodology (i.e. how should the inquirer go about finding knowledge).

The researcher employed qualitative research approach informed by post-positivism (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Post-positivism, ontologically is based on the concept of critical realism philosophy (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Critical realism assumes that there is reality, independent of our thinking about what science can study (Guba and Lincoln, 2004). This is different to the belief in the notion of subjectivity in understanding reality. Post-positivism is also different to positivism as a research paradigm in that positivism believes in the existence of an absolute truth, while post-positivism believes that even though reality is out there, independent of our thinking, it is fallible and has error and is revisable. This is based on the belief that researchers as human beings have questionable ability to know reality with certainty (Guba and Lincoln, 1994).

Post-positivism does not see reality as a rigid object. The ontological perspective of qualitative research stresses the existence of multiple realities held by different researchers, research participants and readers of a report of a qualitative study (Creswell, 2007:16-18). This is consistent

with the researcher's view that even though a researcher can do an extensive and thorough study, it is possible that we may not understand fully what we need to understand. It is also important to note that post-positivism rejects the idea that researchers can see perfectly as it really is, and it recognizes that we are all biased and therefore emphasizes that the best efforts to try and achieve objectivity is through multiple fallible perspectives. It is seen as a creation of those individuals involved in the research, and recognizes that reality is influenced by context, and that there are multiple realities. This is consistent with the researcher's view that context plays a huge role in fully understanding the phenomena being studied, and in the context of this research enablers and barriers linked with the implementation of performance appraisal at Kansanshi Mining Plc.

Epistemologically, post-positivists assume that human knowledge is not based on unchallengeable, rock solid foundations, but rather upon human conjectures (Phillips and Burbules, 2000). This suggests that accepting the pursuit of knowledge does not necessitate a commitment to a claim of absolute truth or its attainability in understanding problems associated with the implementation of a performance management system. This justifies the epistemological relationship between the researcher and the researched which entails close interaction, in order to understand and acquire knowledge (Creswell, 2007:18; Guba and Lincoln, 1994:107). This further implies that knowledge on the enablers and barriers associated with implementation of a performance appraisal will change as new evidence emerges as part of the research process. Researchers engaging within this paradigm accept fallibility as an unavoidable fact of life. It is therefore acceptable, as post-positivists argue that knowledge can be built up when there are no authoritative sources and it further indicates that every source is welcome but is not taken as authoritative.

3.2. RESEARCH GOAL

The objective of the research was to investigate the implementation of the performance appraisal by line managers. With a particular focus on performance appraisal interviews as done by line managers at Kansanshi, the following were the two key questions:

Goal 1: How do line managers at Kansanshi conduct performance appraisal interviews?

Goal 2: What barriers and enablers do line managers at Kansanshi face in the conduct of performance appraisal interviews?

3.3. DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEWEES

All interviewees were based in Solwezi where the mine is situated. Kansanshi mine site was used for this research as no such study had been done to look at how the line managers conduct performance appraisals across the mine site. Ten line managers randomly selected from a population of 30 line managers across all ten departments on site were considered for the study.

A total of fifteen semi-structured, in-depth, face-to-face interviews were conducted with ten line managers to gather data. These individual interviews were conducted on the mine site in the interviewees' offices as well as other convenient places such as the Kansanshi main boardroom. On average, each interview took between 45 to 60 minutes.

3.4. SAMPLING

The participants were line managers who have more than one year's experience of conducting performance appraisals with their subordinates at Kansanshi mine. This is considered as the minimum period for a line manager to be able to espouse and evaluate his or her hands-on experience regarding performance appraisal. Any line manager who has less experience of this at Kansanshi or has experience of using the performance appraisal in other organizations but has not conducted a performance appraisal at Kansanshi will not be included in the study.

A total of 10 line managers out of a total of 30 line managers in the entire mine were randomly selected from each of the ten (10) departments. As the sample was small, this was in no way representative, but sufficient to provide insights into how line managers conduct performance appraisals and the barriers and enablers that they encounter at Kansanshi.

3.5. DATA COLLECTION

Qualitative data was collected from one-on-one in-depth semi-structured interviews with line managers who conduct performance appraisals at Kansanshi mine in Zambia. Interviews with 10 line managers provided data on how they actually conducted performance appraisal interviews, as well as barriers and enablers which they had experienced. These interviews lasted between 45 to 60 minutes. An interview guide was used to ensure that key questions about pre-interview processes and the conduct of the actual performance appraisal interview were included in the interviews with respondents. The questions in the interview guide were partly derived from the definition of performance appraisal adopted in this study to gain insights on aspects such as (a) variety of

activities and evidence used to assess employees, (b) developing of employee competence, (c) enhancing performance, (d) feedback process and system, (e) decisions regarding distribution of rewards and also other internal aspects that guide the appraisal interview process and content. Questions in the interview were not necessarily asked in a particular order as the interviewer's aim was to create a conversation where the participants do most of the talking, covering the main topics that lead to the achievement of the research objectives.

A total of fifteen interviews with 10 line managers provided data on how they actually conducted performance appraisal interviews, as well as barriers and enablers which they had experienced. An interview guide was used to ensure that key questions about pre-interview processes and the conduct of the actual performance appraisal interview were included in the interviews with respondents.

Data was gathered through semi-structured, in-depth face-to-face interviews with each of the ten line managers to gauge their perceptions of the performance appraisal system as it is currently used. The interviews were conducted in Solwezi and all interviews were conducted in a secure and private setting to ensure confidentiality, mainly in the interviewees' offices as well as the Kansanshi main boardroom. Permission seeking informed consent from the interviewees was sent to the selected line managers, outlining the nature of the study and the associated ethical concerns.

Five follow-up interviews were made to gather additional information or to clarify developing concepts and themes. This process was also used to validate data gathered during the preceding interviews with the same individuals. All interviews were audio recorded.

The interview guide used was based on the key research question and its objectives.

Refer to Table 2 below for the initial interview questions.

Table 1: Initial Interview Guide

GENERAL UNDERSTANDING AND EXPERIENCE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

- Kindly give your position details and length of service in current position.
- When was the last time you conducted an appraisal?
- What is the purpose of performance appraisals at Kansanshi mine?
- How often do you conduct performance appraisals at Kansanshi mine?

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PROCESS

- What steps do you follow when doing a performance appraisal? Why? When?
- In your view what are some common mistakes being made in the appraisal process at Kansanshi mine? (Ask for as many examples as possible)
- What enables you to conduct performance appraisals at Kansanshi mine? (Ask for as many examples as possible)
- What do you think of the current method being used to appraise the performance of your subordinates? Do you know of a better method?

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INTERVIEW

- How do you prepare for a performance appraisal interview? Why?
- How long have you been conducting appraisal interviews here at Kansanshi?
- How do you strive to get the best out of your subordinates during an appraisal interview?
- How do you mitigate any conflicts that might arise during the interview? (Get as many examples as possible)
- How often are you given training on performance appraisal?

BARRIERS AND ENABLERS

- According to you, what challenges are affecting effective implementation of the current appraisal system? Why are they challenges? When? (Probe and get as many examples as

possible)

- According to you, what positive factors currently exist at Kansanshi that help in the implementation of the performance appraisal system? Why are they considered as positive? When (Probe and Get as many examples as possible)
- What other benefits does the implementation of the performance appraisal at Kansanshi offer to the overall performance of the organization?

IMPROVEMENT OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

- How do you think the current appraisal system at Kansanshi mine can be improved?
- Why should the aspects mention need to be improved?

Source: Author's construction (2013)

3.6. DATA ANALYSIS

The collected qualitative data was transcribed. Data analysis was done by open coding and constant comparison technique as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994). Categories reflecting how line managers at Kansanshi carry out their performance appraisal interview and the pre-interview processes, barriers and enablers of line managers in implementing the performance appraisal were developed into themes.

3.6.1. Research Quality

In this regard Guba and Lincoln (1981 and 1982) and Lincoln and Guba (1985) emphasise the concept of trustworthiness to replace reliability and validity together with aspects of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirm-ability to indicate “qualitative rigour”.

In this study, an audit trail is provided to enhance dependability and confirm ability in this study. Furthermore, member checks were done to enhance credibility of the findings. In this regard,

credibility or internal validity focused on how the researcher provided assurances of fit between respondents' views and the reconstructions and representations of the same (Ohman, 2005:7).

Furthermore, sufficient data and details of procedures used in this study have been included in this research to “allow the reader to judge whether the interpretation proffered is adequately supported by the data” (Mays and Pope, 2000:51).

Furthermore, to improve the quality of interpretation and explanation in this research, elements in the collected data that were unclear or seemed incomplete were searched and further discussed with interviewees to clear potential ambiguity.

3.7. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

A major limitation of this study was the collection of data mainly through one method, as line managers chose what to report, divulge or not during interviews. To mitigate this, where necessary follow-up interviews were used to seek clarification and completeness of what was reported by line managers. Although informed and voluntary consent was secured from the interviewees to enhance openness, it cannot be absolutely ruled out that the fact that the researcher is member of human resource management might have impacted the responses of these interviewees in one way or another.

3.8. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The researcher is a member of the Human Resource Department and this may have inhibited openness of respondents. Line managers were encouraged to be open as anonymity and confidentiality were upheld. They were advised that no one would be punished at all for what they said in the research conversation. Informed consent was sought while voluntary participation was emphasized (Berg, 2007:79-80; Creswell, 2007:141).

REFERENCES

- BERG, B.L.** (2007). *Qualitative Research Methods for Social Sciences* (6e). New York: Pearson Education.
- CASSELL, C.** and **SYMON, G.** (2004). *Essential Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research*. London: Sage.
- CRESWELL, J.W.** (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DENZIN, N.K.** and **LINCOLN, Y.S.** (2005). *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3e). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- GUBA, E.G.** and **LINCOLN, Y.S.** (1994). *Competing paradigms in qualitative research*. In: Denzil, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- LINCOLN, Y. S.,** and **GUBA, E. G.** (1985). Establishing trustworthiness. In E. G. Guba (Ed.), *Naturalistic inquiry* (pp. 289 - 431). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- MAXWELL, J.A.** (2005). *Qualitative Research Design: An interactive approach* (2e). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- MAYS, N.** and **POPE, C.** (2000). Qualitative research in health care: Assessing quality in qualitative research. *British Medical Journal*, 320(7226), p.50
- MILES, M.B.,** and **HUBERMAN, A.M.** (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded source book*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications
- PHILLIPS, D. C.** and **BURBULES, N. C.** (2000). *Post positivism and Educational Research*. Boston, Rowman and Littlefield
- SHANKS, G.** (2002). *Qualitative Research: A Personal Skills Approach*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Appendix 1 – Permission to conduct research letter

KANSANSHI MINING PLC
A COMPANY OWNED BY



REGISTERED NO: 37529
VAT NO: 10165738-13

P.O. Box 110385 Solwezi Zambia Solwezi – DR Congo Road Telephone: 260 2 658 000
Facsimile: 260 2 658 300 E-mail: kansanshi@fqml.com

Mark Silimi
Kansanshi Mine Plc
P.O Box 110385
Solwezi

25th March, 2013

Dear Mark

Re : Authorisation to conduct Academic Research

Please be informed that your request to conduct an academic research on Kansanshi Mine site has been granted.

We wish you the best of luck in this daunting task.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Linda Mambwe".

Linda Mambwe
Human Resource Manager
KANSANSHI MINING PLC

REGISTERED OFFICE:
C/o Choice Corporate Services Limited
P.O. Box 32565
Lusaka, Zambia
Telephone: 260 1 222 191
Facsimile: 260 1 224 383

AUSTRALIAN REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE:
Level 1, 24 Outram Street
West Perth, Western Australia 6005
PO Box 1407, West Perth WA 6872
Telephone: 61 8 9346 0100
Facsimile: 61 8 9226 2522