# Chapter 4 – Findings and Discussion

## Introduction

This chapter will discuss the findings of the investigation on performance management’s impact on employee productivity and presenteeism. When organizations seek to engage employees and encourage productivity, they use performance management systems. These systems measure and reward employee performance and may prove to reduce grievances and develop and manage organizational capabilities. In instances where organizations face challenges with lowered employee morale, lack of compensation and uncertainty of employment status, performance management systems are implemented to mitigate these challenges faced. The study found that performance management systems had no impact on presenteeism but showed a positive correlation between performance management and employee productivity.

## Demographic Data

The following depicts the overall participants’ genders, ages, and number of years served at Bahamas Customs. There were 19 of 20 uniformed officers who participated in the survey. Participants’ ages ranged from 18 to 64 and included both male and female workers.
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## Presentation of Findings

**Quantitative Research**

To answer the research question and investigate the variables discussed, a survey was conducted. The survey instrument consisted of 10 questions that were inclusive of details that represented the variables. The researcher distributed 20 surveys via email and WhatsApp and received a total of 19 completed responses. The responses yielded the following:

The figure below indicates that employees showed mixed emotions as it concerned the

importance of receiving feedback of their productivity on the job. Almost 50% indicated that

they agreed that receiving feedback was important to their performance.

Figure 5

*Feedback and Productivity Question*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Feedback of Productivity** | | |
|  | N | % |
| Strongly Agree | 7 | 36.8% |
| Agree | 8 | 42.1% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 4 | 21.1% |

The table below shows more than 50% of respondents indicated that they are knowledgeable of their job descriptions and responsibilities at work. This shows that performance is not hindered by lack of defined roles.

Figure 6

*Working Knowledge of Job Responsibilities Question*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Understanding of Job Description** | | |
|  | N | % |
| Strongly agree | 6 | 31.6% |
| Agree | 13 | 68.4% |

The table below indicates that a high percentage of employees did not receive rewards for performance on the job; with only approximately 16% agreeing that they were rewarded for performance.

Figure 7

*Question about Receiving Rewards for Performance*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Rewards** | | |
|  | N | % |
| Strongly agree | 1 | 5.3% |
| Agree | 2 | 10.5% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 4 | 21.1% |
| Disagree | 7 | 36.8% |
| Strongly disagree | 5 | 26.3% |

The table below shows a percentage of employees who are knowledgeable of the target institute’s performance management system and can be guided based on what is required of them.

Figure 8

*Awareness of Organization’s Performance Management System Question*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Awareness of Requirements** | | |
|  | N | % |
| Strongly agree | 5 | 26.3% |
| Agree | 7 | 36.8% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 4 | 21.1% |
| Disagree | 2 | 10.5% |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 5.3% |

The table below shows a percentage of employees whose level of productivity and performance would improve on the job if they were guaranteed to be rewarded for the work that is done. The results indicated that 42.1% of respondents strongly agree that the expectation of being rewarded would help to increase productivity.

Figure 9

*Level of Productivity Question*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level of Productivity** | | |
|  | N | % |
| Strongly agree | 8 | 42.1% |
| Agree | 6 | 31.6% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 1 | 5.3% |
| Disagree | 3 | 15.8% |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 5.3% |

The table below shows a percentage of respondents who output the required amount of work regardless of rewards or compensation. Approximately 52% of respondents indicate that their level of productivity is based on the visions and goals of the organization and their daily level of productivity reflects those visions.

Figure 10

*Presenteeism Question*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Productivity Required** | | |
|  | N | % |
| Strongly agree | 4 | 21.1% |
| Agree | 10 | 52.6% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 3 | 15.8% |
| Disagree | 1 | 5.3% |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 5.3% |

The table below shows respondents' reflection of what happens if they show up to work but fail to perform. 42.1% of respondents indicate that they are never disciplined if they are unable to complete daily assigned tasks.

Figure 11

*Question on Discipline for Lack of Productivity During Working Hours*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discipline for Unfinished Tasks** | | |
|  | N | % |
| Agree | 3 | 15.8% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 6 | 31.6% |
| Disagree | 8 | 42.1% |
| Strongly disagree | 2 | 10.5% |

The table below indicates the responses of employees who noted their progress and daily productivity were not being monitored by supervisors and therefore had no way to measure productivity to offer rewards.

Figure 12

*Tracking and Measuring Presenteeism*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tracking Productivity** | | |
|  | N | % |
| Strongly agree | 4 | 21.1% |
| Agree | 7 | 36.8% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 5 | 26.3% |
| Disagree | 3 | 15.8% |

The research presented is inter-related to Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs and its intent is to uncover whether performance management and its rewards system can translate from the theoretical tool to impacting how employees perform. Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, when incorporated into performance management systems, is intended to empower employees to show up, perform and optimize productivity. In this study, statistical analysis was conducted between the independent variable (performance management) and the dependent variables (employee productivity and presenteeism) to test the hypothesis and seek to answer the following research questions and hypotheses.

***Research Question 1***

**What is the relationship between performance management and presenteeism.**

H0: There is no relationship between performance management and presenteeism.

H1: There is a positive relationship between performance management and presenteeism.

H2: There is a negative relationship between performance management and presenteeism.

Figure 13

*Correlation between Performance Management and Presenteeism*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Descriptive Statistics** | | | |
|  | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
| PerformanceManagement | 5.5263 | 1.89644 | 19 |
| Presenteeism | 7.1579 | 2.03479 | 19 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Correlations** | | | |
|  | | Performance Management | Presenteeism |
| Performance Management | Pearson Correlation | 1 | -.080 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .744 |
| N | 19 | 19 |
| Presenteeism | Pearson Correlation | -.080 | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .744 |  |
| N | 19 | 19 |

A Pearson’s (r) correlation was conducted to determine the relationship between the independent variable (performance management) and the dependent variable (presenteeism). The above table indicates that there is a strong negative correlation between performance management and presenteeism. Similarly, there is not enough evidence to show a significant relationship between presenteeism and performance management. Therefore, the nul hypothesis could not be accepted or rejected.

***Research Question 2***

**What is the relationship between performance management and productivity.**

H0: There is no relationship between performance management productivity.

H1: There is a positive relationship between performance management and productivity.

H2: There is a negative relationship between performance management and productivity.

Figure 14

*Descriptive Statistics and Correlation between Performance Management & Employee Productivity*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Descriptive Statistics** | | | | |
|  | Mean | Std. Deviation | | N |
| PerformanceManagement | 5.5263 | 1.89644 | | 19 |
| EmployeeProductivity | 3.8421 | 2.11511 | | 19 |
| **Correlations** | | | | | |
|  | | | Performance Management | | Employee Productivity |
| Performance Management | Pearson Correlation | | 1 | | .285 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | |  | | .237 |
| N | | 19 | | 19 |
| Employee Productivity | Pearson Correlation | | .285 | | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | | .237 | |  |
| N | | 19 | | 19 |

A Pearson’s (r) correlation was conducted using a two-tailed test to determine the relationship between the independent variable Performance Management and the dependent variable Employee Productivity. The above table indicates that there is a weak positive correlation between performance management and employee productivity. Similarly, the p-value indicates a moderate linear relationship between employee productivity and performance management. Therefore, the null hypotheses was rejected indicating that there is no relationship between performance management and employee productivity and the alternative hypothesis accepted indicating a positive relationship.

## Discussion

The results suggest that employees at the target institution are not influenced by performance management systems that are presently in place. Weak positive correlations indicate that there is still some linear relationship between performance management and employee productivity. When collected individually, the results of the survey instrument indicate that employees at the target institution show some significant interest in being rewarded for performance. That reward or the expectation of such a reward has the potential to influence productivity. These findings support the literary work of Victor Haines and Sylvie St. -Onge (2012) who indicated that performance management has a significant influence on practices and contexts in the workplace. The respondents’ feedback corresponds with the literature suggestion that by incorporating training, multisource feedback and employee recognition, employees would be more likely to increase productivity.

Furthermore, the findings highlight the importance of not only making employees aware of performance management systems that are in place, but it supports the literature of Dorsey and Mueller-Hanson (2016) who suggest that incorporating the organization’s mission and goals into these systems can help to heighten the importance of performance and employee productivity. This strategic alignment between the employees’ knowledge of systems that are in place and job requirements can influence and impact the level of productivity.

All in all, the research reflected previous literature on presenteeism and employee productivity and suggests that performance management systems do have some correlation as it relates to the variables. Despite the unexpected analysis of the variables, the researcher’s hypothesis was still supported . One plausible explanation for these unexpected results was the size of the sample population. Greater sample size yields more significant findings. Nevertheless, the aims and objectives of this research have been achieved.

# Chapter 5 – Recommendations and Limitations

## Introduction

The investigation of the impact of performance management on employee productivity and presenteeism has led the researcher to identify some limitations and make recommendations as a result of the data collected and analysis conducted. These limitations and recommendations will be presented in this chapter. The information presented here may be used to further test the relationships between the independent variable and the dependent variable. It may be used in the HR Department of Customs Department to understand the need for employee engagement. Additionally, the paper can be used to show the significance of being able to measure and track employee productivity.

## Acknowledgement of Limitation

When research is done to determine the impact one variable may have on another, special consideration must be made as it relates to the number of elements within the targeted population. If a sample of that population is used to collect primary data, that sample size must reflect the true representation of the population. In addition, the size of the sample must be significant enough to garner relevant results. In this investigation, the limitations of the research were due to having a small sample size. With a population of 500 in the targeted institution, the use of data collected from 19 respondents is a grossly unfair generalization of the consensus of the population. As a result, the data analysis did not show strong correlations or significance where it otherwise may have with bigger sampling to reflect the true representation of The Customs Department.

In addition, another limitation came as a result of a slow data collection process. The steps involved in receiving written approval to collect data were cumbersome and time consuming. Additionally, participants were hesitant to answer questions as the researcher initially was unable to give assurance that permission had been granted. This affected the timing needed to record findings. The length of time for the field work of the study proved to be limiting and did not allow room for error. This limitation extended into the time frame required for analysis and interpretation.

Furthermore, computing survey questions and having the ability to effectively decipher results yielded from IBM SPSS’s software proved to be difficult. Identifying the strong or weak relationships and significance between the two variables were also a challenge encountered in the research paper.

Nevertheless, the results of this paper are valid as the researcher showed no bias and allowed the responses to be collected and analyzed ethically and with integrity. The data gathered in this research has been analyzed through a statistical program. The results yielded were not of opinion but rather a computation of a reliable statistical software.

## Implications of the Results

The results presented in this research highlight a trend in the workplace where systems implemented fail to encourage employee engagement. Respondents are aware of their job requirements and roles and indicate that on the job performance is rarely measured and thereby there is no real consequence for work not being completed. This discovery may encourage an in-depth investigation and analysis of a larger sample of the workforce to acquire a clearer understanding of the current situation.

## Recommendations

For future study on the topic of the impact of performance management and employee productivity and performance management and presenteeism, it is recommended that the limitations for the research be considered and the following addressed:

i. Increase sample size to reflect a generalized population of the target institution.

ii. Future papers can use mixed methods to collect primary data. Incorporating qualitative research can give the research a stronger understanding of the results of the study. Being able to incorporate the subjects point of view gives the study a stronger quality.

## Conclusion

Understanding the impact performance management has on employee productivity and presenteeism is vital to generating business results. As the study investigated what performance management is, it gave insight into how the use of performance management systems can help to increase employee productivity. The study explores how Maslow’s Theoretical Tool can be applied in the workplace through rewards systems and encourage employee engagement. The results indicated some level of relationship between the independent variable of the research and one of the dependent variables -employee productivity. The research was limited due to the selection of a small sample size, limited timing and difficulty processing survey questions through IBMs SPSS software. Ultimately, both research questions were answered, and their hypotheses were satisfied.