

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344596712>

Negotiating Performance: Exploring the Effect of Negotiations as Conflict Resolution Strategy on Employee Performance in KCCA, Uganda

Article · October 2020

CITATION

1

READS

1,343

4 authors:



Tumwebaze Ester

Kampala International University (KIU)

4 PUBLICATIONS 2 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Wandiba Augustine

Kampala International University (KIU)

5 PUBLICATIONS 2 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Olutayo Kadmiel Osunsan

47 PUBLICATIONS 106 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Christine Kabasinguzi

Kampala International University (KIU)

4 PUBLICATIONS 2 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Information about COVID-19 Vaccination [View project](#)



Success Factors for Smart Schools and Role of Information Technology [View project](#)



Negotiating Performance: Exploring the Effect of Negotiations as Conflict Resolution Strategy on Employee Performance in KCCA, Uganda

Article History	
Received:	15.09.2020
Revision:	24. 09.2020
Accepted:	07. 10.2020
Published:	10. 10.2020
Author Details	
Tumwebaze Ester, Wandiba Agustine, Olutayo K. Osunsan & Christine Kabasinguzi	
Authors Affiliations	
Kampala International University, Kampala, Uganda	
Corresponding Author*	
Olutayo K. Osunsan	
How to Cite the Article:	
Tumwebaze Ester, Wandiba Agustine, Olutayo K. Osunsan & Christine Kabasinguzi (2020); Negotiating Performance: Exploring the Effect of Negotiations as Conflict Resolution Strategy on Employee Performance in KCCA, Uganda. <i>IAR J Bus Mng</i> , 1(3), 103-108.	
Copyright @ 2020:	
This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution license which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non commercial use (NonCommercial, or CC-BY-NC) provided the original author and source are credited.	

Abstract: The study was carried out to find out how a negotiation as a conflict strategy affects employee performance in an organization using KCCA as a focus. A sample size was 222 technical staff were considered using simple random sampling technique in the cross-sectional research. The study found that both the levels of negotiations (average mean=4.15, Std=0.618) and employee performance (overall average mean=4.04, Std=0.602) were satisfactory. The regression analysis revealed that negotiation can explain a total variance of 7.9% in employee performance (Adjusted R Square=0.079, p=0.00). The null hypothesis that there is no significant effect of negotiation as a conflict resolution strategy on employee performance in KCCA was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis that states there is a significant effect of negotiation as a conflict resolution strategy on employee performance in KCCA was upheld. The conclusion holds that negotiations has a significant positive effect on employee performance and the recommendation was made that KCCA management should adopt the use of negotiation so as to address issues that can lead to conflicts before they break open or escalate.

Keywords: Negotiation; Conflict Resolution; Employee Performance; Uganda.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

According to Ahmad *et al.*, (2019), the success of any business is directly affected by the performance of the employees within the organization, whether or not those employees are dealing directly with customers. Businesses that clearly understand the impact of their employees' performance are better able to manage employee output and productivity. Properly managing employee performance helps any business to increase profits and consistently meet sales goals.

Conflict among employees in an organization is not simply unavoidable; rather it is the norm due to the complexity of organizations. However, if properly managed it can have a positive impact on employee satisfaction and performance (Olang, 2017). Generally, employee performance is of great significance in businesses. Stakeholders want to know abilities of workers, the level of the works that should be performed and whether they are working according to the targets set. It is a fact that in

order to reach the maximum efficiency in the businesses, employee performance should be monitored closely and continuous progress should be provided in line with the success (Nart & Batur, 2014).

There is poor level of employee performance at KCCA. This was indicated by the high level of inefficiency in the overall level of the performance of KCCA as an organization. The poor employee performance was attributed to majorly lack of motivational incentives, poor leadership, high employee turnover, political interference, lack of transparency and accountability, and high level of corruption among top officials (Ndagire, 2019). In addition, the problem of poor leadership due to the disagreements among the Minister of Kampala, former KCCA Executive Director and Kampala Mayor leave little to be desired of how an institution of that nature can be able to perform effectively (Ndagire, 2019).

According to Olang (2017) negotiation is the most frequently used strategy of solving conflicts and it is successful when the interests of the conflicting sides are partly common and partly different. Negotiation is a process by which cooperation or agreement is attained while avoiding argument and dispute. On the basis of these the study sought to explore the role of Negotiation as a conflict resolution strategy on employee performance in KCCA, Uganda.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Negotiations

Organizational conflict occurs, as actors engage in activities that are incompatible with those of colleagues within their network, members of other organizations, or unaffiliated individuals who utilize the services or products of the organization (Rahim, 2002). This often leads to disagreements and buildup of tensions that require intervention through conflict resolution (Akanji, 2005). The conflict resolution process encompasses a wide range of activities including negotiation, problem solving, dealing with emotion, and understanding positions (Brett, 2001). According to Dawson (2016), negotiation is a process by which two parties, each with its own viewpoint and objectives, attempt to reach a mutually satisfactory result on a matter of common concern. Negotiation can also be defined as the interaction between two or more parties with divergent interests in order to reach an agreement (De Dreu & VanVianen, 2001). Negotiation is used to minimize conflict affecting individuals so as to maximize cooperation and keep conflict to acceptable levels. This in turn drives performance (Wall & Callister, 1995).

According to Olang (2017), there are several negotiation tactics that can be applied. These include Face-to-face tactic whereby a mutual confidence as a foundation for negotiation can be established, Persuading tactic which assumes using different methods and manners to win over partners and to reach a better negotiating position, Deceitfulness tactic which assumes presenting false data and arguments, Threat tactic is based on deterrence from the side which holds a better position, or has more power. Promise tactic is based on having a better position and more power, with the stronger side persuading the weaker that it will keep its promises and Concession tactic which is the most important tactic in the negotiation strategy. All actors in the conflict count on both sides making a concession since negotiation increasingly gains importance as a popular and constructive way to manage conflict. De Dreu and Weingart (2003) assert that negotiators can help adversaries communicate with each other in many ways.

2.2 Performance

Employee performance is the most critical subject which plays an important role in accomplishing employee performance (Wang *et al.*, 2015). According to Rizwan *et al.*, (2014) employee performance contains a quality and quantity of results driven from individual or group struggle completion. In another meaning job performance can be described as the ability of individuals to achieve their respective work aims, then meet their expectations, achieve benchmarks or accomplish their organizational goals (Ismail *et al.*, 2009). Employee performance is one of the most important constructs in management research (Zulkiffli,

2014). Continuous performance is the objective of any organization because only through this, can organizations grow and progress. Moreover, knowing the determinants of employee performance is important especially in the context of the current economic crises because it enables the identification of those factors that should be treated with an increased interest in order to improve the performance. Performance measurement estimates the parameters under which programs, investments, and acquisitions are reaching the targeted results (Belvedere & Gallmann, 2014). According to Gavrea *et al.*, (2011), most performance measures could be grouped into six general categories: effectiveness, efficiency, cost, quality, timeliness, innovation and productivity.

2.3 Negotiations and Performance

A survey of more than 550 employees of large Canadian organizations by Downie (2017) revealed that employees wanted to feel involved in decisions that affect them by negotiating with managers before decisions were made. Employees equated negotiation with fairness since participation led to creation of shared values. The survey report concluded that the components of a high-performance workforce included effective voice for employees in strategy and governance, contingent compensation, teamwork and employee involvement in negotiation in problem solving. It further cautioned employers to recognize that employees had clear expectations of their employers and, in turn, that employers' actions were critical since employees needed to have ownership of Strategy if they are to fully realize organizational performance.

Ajike *et al.*, (2015) observed that negotiation and its influence on performance can be seen in an organization's performance appraisal process. It goes without saying that an effective performance appraisal system can lead an organization to take strides towards organization performance and growth by leaps and bounds (Ajike *et al.*, 2015). These measures give top managers a fast but comprehensive view of the organization's performance and conversely, an ineffective performance appraisal system can seal the fate of an organization by creating chaos and confusion from top to bottom in the administrative hierarchy. This may result into conflict if employees feel that they are appraised unfairly. It can also result in poor performance if the employees do not clearly understand what is expected of them. It is therefore important that a negotiation be at the beginning of the performance contract so that an employee is well informed of what is expected (Osisioma *et al.*, 2013).

Ideally, Reys (2011) explains that performance appraisal negotiations provide employees with useful feedback they can immediately apply to improve their performance. This feedback includes suggestions for change, as well as encouragement to continue with positive behavior. Managers show employees how

improving their overall performance and developing new skills will lead to additional responsibilities, promotions and increased monetary benefits (Miller, 2016). Employees appreciate this honest feedback and become motivated to improve their performance. In addition, managers benefit by receiving insightful input on ways to improve both their leadership styles and departmental operations. Most would agree however, that organizations' performance appraisal processes operate in ways that are less than ideal (Thompson, 2005).

A study by Okoth (2014) on conflict resolution strategies used in secondary schools in Kisumu Municipality, Kisumu County concludes that the conflict resolution strategies of negotiation used in secondary schools in Kisumu municipality are effective in increasing performance. Therefore, negotiation was key to corporate performance since it helps to secure a consensus in resolving conflicts by making sure all members understand the reasons behind the compromises made by individual members.

The outcomes of negotiation to a large extent determine if the opposing teams will gain a mutual understanding and work towards the achievement of organizational goals to improve performance. According to Laddha *et al.*, (2012), in any negotiation

exercise the outcome will either promote group cohesiveness or buildup of tensions. The outcomes include win-win, win-lose and lose-lose outcome. The win-win negotiating outcome applies to many situations, including contract negotiations as well as conflict resolution. Negotiation is not one party dictating or imposing terms on another. When that happens, the outcome will rarely produce mutual satisfaction. The result can only be mutually satisfactory if both differences and common interests are considered (Khan *et al.*, 2015).

3.0 METHODOLOGY

This study adopted quantitative descriptive cross-sectional survey design, because it aims at studying a particular phenomenon (or phenomena) at a particular time. Cross-sectional studies often employ the survey strategy (Amin (2005)). Thus, the study population of this study was 1,425 respondents. However, the study targeted 498 technical staff using simple random sampling technique from only two directorates, namely: administration and human resource management, and Office of the Executive Director because they are most knowledgeable of the study elements than other categories of directorates. The sample size was 222 determined using Slovine's formula;

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(\alpha)^2};$$

Where n=sample size; N=target population; $\alpha=0.05$ level of significance.

$$n = \frac{498}{1 + 498(0.05)^2}, n = 222$$

Table 3.1: Sample Size

Directorates	Target Population	Sample Size
Technical staff	476	212
Managerial staff	22	10
Total	498	222

The study preferred to use a five Likert Scale questionnaire because of its universal nature. The five Likert scale included: 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=not sure; 4=agree; and 5=strongly agree. The questionnaire was subdivided into three sections, namely: Section A included information about the profile of the respondents (i.e. gender, age, education and work experience); Section B included information regarding negotiation (5-items); and Section C captured information regarding employee performance which was measured using efficiency (5-items), effectiveness (5-items), and quality of work (5-items). Amin (2005) says, if the CVI is ≥ 0.70 , the instrument can then be considered valid. Content Validity Index formula:

$$CVI = \frac{\text{Number of items rated relevant by all judges}}{\text{total number of items in the instrument}}$$

$$CVI = \frac{31}{34}$$

$$CVI = 0.91$$

The study found that the CVI of the instrument was 0.91 thus using the recommendation by Amin (2005), the instrument was confirmed as valid.

The analysis was conducted using frequency and percentage distribution tables to analyze data the profile of the respondents. Mean and Standard Deviations were used to compute the central tendency and measure of dispersion of conflict resolution and employee performance respectively. To interpret the mean values, the following numerical values and descriptions were used as indicated in table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Mean Interpretation Values

Mean Range	Response Mode	Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree	Very satisfactory
3.41-4.20	Agree	Satisfactory
2.61-3.40	Not sure	Fairly satisfactory
1.81-2.60	Disagree	Unsatisfactory
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree	Very unsatisfactory

Furthermore, inferential statistics was used to determine the variations in the dependent variable. Specifically, linear regression analysis was used to determine the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable. In addition, multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the highest predictor variable in the independent variable. The null hypothesis was determined at $p=0.05$ level of significance. The **decision rule** was that: if $p \leq 0.05$, the null hypothesis would be rejected, and the alternative hypothesis accepted.

4.0 RESULTS

4.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Majority (39.6%) of the respondents were Diploma Holders, followed by 29.2% Degree Holders, and 27.5% Certificate Holders. Only 3.6% had Master's Degree and none of the respondents had a PhD. Most (45%) of the respondents have more than 10 years of work experience, followed by 27.5% with 6-10 years of work experience, while those with 1-5 years and less

than 1 year work experience were represented by 25.2% and 2.3% respectively. 64% of the respondents were male while 36% were female. A majority of 36.9% were within the age group of 30-39 years, followed by 34.2% who were within the age group of 40-49 years while the respondents within the age group of 20-29 years and 50 and above were represented by 14.4% respectively.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics of Negotiation

Table 4.1: Negotiation

Negotiation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation	Ranks
Explore issues with others to find solutions	4.22	0.632	Very satisfactory	1
Negotiation where we both lose (lose-lose negotiation).	4.19	0.597	Satisfactory	2
Communication and agree on one issue.	4.15	0.579	Satisfactory	3
Negotiation where both of us win (win-win negotiation).	4.10	0.623	Satisfactory	4
Negotiation where one of us wins or loses (win-lose negotiation).	4.08	0.661	Satisfactory	5
Average Mean	4.15	0.618	Satisfactory	

Table 4.1 shows that negotiation was assessed by the respondents as satisfactory (average mean=4.15, Std=0.618). This was attributed to the fact that majority of the respondents strongly agreed that they explore issues with others to find solutions that meet everyone's needs (mean=4.22, Std=0.632). In addition, respondents agreed that they preferred to be in a negotiation where they both lose (lose-lose negotiation) (mean=4.19, Std=0.597), or try to discuss their stand point and also listen to the other party's argument and then agree on one issue (mean=4.15, Std=0.579). Similarly, respondents agreed that they preferred to be in a negotiation where both of them win (win-win negotiation) (mean=4.10, Std=0.623). Likewise, respondents agreed that they preferred to be in a negotiation where they or the other party wins or loses (win-lose negotiation) (mean=4.08, 0.661). This implies that the employees of KCCA explore negotiation options with their colleagues such as lose-lose negotiation, win-lose negotiation or win-win negotiation so as to address any conflicts arising amongst them.

Table 4.2: Employee Performance

Employee Performance	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation	Ranks
Efficiency	4.07	0.587	Satisfactory	3
Effectiveness	4.02	0.604	Satisfactory	1
Quality of Work	4.04	0.614	Satisfactory	2
Mean	4.04	0.602	Satisfactory	

Table 4.2 shows that the overall assessment of employee performance at KCCA was satisfactory (overall average mean=4.04, Std=0.602). This was attributed to the fact that all the measurable of employee performance used in this study were all assessed as satisfactory, i.e., efficiency, effectiveness, quality of work, and timelessness.

Table 4.3: Effect of Negotiation on Employee Performance in KCCA

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	3.044	.226		13.492	.000
	Negotiation	.242	.054	.289	4.471	.000
R	0.289					
R²	0.083					
Adjusted R²	0.079					
F	19.994					

Table 4.3 shows that negotiation significantly affects employee performance at KCCA. This is attributed to the fact that negotiation can explain a total variance of 7.9% in employee performance (Adjusted R Square=0.079, $p=0.00$). This implies that the use of lose-lose negotiation strategy, win-win negotiation strategy and win-lose negotiation strategy has the capacity to influence the improvement in employee performance by 7.9%.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant effect of negotiation as a conflict resolution strategy on employee performance in KCCA. The decision rule was that: if $p \leq 0.05$, the null hypothesis would be rejected, and alternative hypothesis accepted. Therefore, the finding in table 4.3 shows that the null hypothesis that there is no significant effect of negotiation as a conflict resolution strategy on employee performance in KCCA was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant effect of negotiation as a conflict resolution strategy on employee performance in KCCA was upheld.

Furthermore, the study revealed that the regression model was the best fit for predicting the effect of negotiation on employee performance ($F=19.994$, $p=0.000$). Similarly, the study revealed that every unit change in negotiation would significantly predict a variance in employee performance by 28.9% ($Beta=0.289$, $p=0.000$). This implies that the application of a good negotiation strategy like 'win-win' strategy would improve the performance of employees by 28.9%.

CONCLUSIONS

The finding of this study is in line with the findings of the following studies: Olang (2017), Downie (2017), Reys (2011), and Okoth (2014). For example, Olang (2017) conducted a study on the influence of conflict resolution on employee performance and a positive relationship between negotiation and employee performance. Downie (2017) found out that employees wanted to feel involved in decisions that affect them by negotiating with managers before decisions were made. Employees equated negotiation with fairness since participation led to creation of shared values. The survey report concluded that the components of a high-performance workforce included employee involvement

in negotiation in problem solving. Reys (2011) in his study found out that performance appraisal negotiations

provided employees with useful feedback that they could immediately apply to improve their performance. This feedback included suggestions for change, as well as encouragement to continue with positive behavior.

In like manner, a study by Okoth (2014) on conflict resolution strategies used in secondary schools in Kisumu, Kenya found out that conflict resolution strategies of negotiation used in secondary schools were effective in increasing performance. Therefore, negotiation was key to corporate performance since it helped to secure a consensus in resolving conflicts by making sure all members understand the reasons behind the compromises made by individual members.

It should therefore be known that the outcomes of negotiation to a large extent determines if the opposing teams will gain a mutual understanding and work towards the achievement of organizational goals to improve performance. This is because in any negotiation exercise the outcome will either promote group cohesiveness or buildup of tensions. The outcomes include win-win, win-lose and lose-lose outcome. However, the win-win negotiating outcome applies to many situations, including contract negotiations as well as conflict resolution.

Negotiation significantly affects employee performance at KCCA due to the use of win-win, and win-lose strategy that enables employees to amicably address their grievances successfully to their satisfaction. In other words, it provides exploration of conflict resolution options that each aggrieved party will find it difficult to feel that they have been biased against or sidelined. Thus, once a conflict is resolved in a manner that leaves all the parties involved-satisfied, their participation in work improves hence improving their overall performance.

The recommendation can be made therefore that KCCA management should adopt the use of negotiation so as to address issues that can lead to conflicts before they break open. In a similar vein, conflict situations should be promptly confronted and addressed whenever they occur rather than being avoided.

REFERENCE

- Ahmad, I., Danish, R. Q., Ali, S. A., Ali, H. F., & Humayon, A. A. (2019). A Comparative Study of Banking Industry Based on Appraisal System, Rewards and Employee Performance. *SEISENSE Journal of Management*, 2 (1), pp.1-11.
- Ajike, E. O., Akinlabi, B. H., Magaji, N., & Sonubi, A. O. (2015). Effect of Conflict resolution on the Performance of Financial Service Organization in Nigeria: An Empirical Study of Access Bank Plc. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 3 (7), pp. 260-272.
- Akanji, T. A. (2005). Perspective on workplace conflict management and new approaches for the twenty-first century. Perspectives on peace and conflict in Africa. Ibadan: John Archers Publishers Ltd.
- Amin, M. E. (2005). Social science research: Conception, methodology and analysis. Kampala: Makerere University.
- Belvedere, V., & Gallmann, F. (2014). The alignment among competitive strategy, operations improvement priorities and manufacturing and logistics performance measurement systems. Evidence from a case-based study, (In *Models and Methods in economics and management science*), Springer, Cham., pp. 221-241.
- Dawson, R. (2016). Five Basic Principles for Better Negotiating Skills. Retrieved January 15, 2019 from <http://www.creonline.com/principles-for-better-negotiation-skills.html> [Accessed 9.10.2019]
- De Dreu, C. K., & Van Vianen, A. E. (2001). Managing relationship conflict and the effectiveness of organizational teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 22 (3), pp. 309-328.
- De Dreu, C. K., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 88 (4), pp. 741.
- Gavrea, C., Ilies, L., & Stegorean, R. (2011). Determinants of organizational performance: The case of Romania. *Management & Marketing*, 6 (2).
- Ismail, A., Suh-Suh, Y., Ajis, M. N. E., & Dollah, N. F. (2009). Relationship between Occupational Stress, Emotional Intelligence and Job Performance: An Empirical Study in Malaysia. *Theoretical & Applied Economics*, 16 (10).
- Khan, M. L., Langove, N., Shah, F. A., & Javid, M. U. (2015). The Modes of Conflicts and Managerial Leadership Styles of Managers. *Global Business & Management Research*, 7 (2).
- Laddha, A., Ayyub, A., & Gidwani, G. D. (2012). Conflict management practices in pharmaceutical industry. *International Journal of Management Research and Reviews*, 2 (1), p.164.
- Miller, B. A. (2016). *Assessing organizational performance in higher education*. US: John Wiley & Sons.
- Nart, S., & Batur, O. (2014). The relation between work-family conflict, job stress, organizational commitment and job performance: A study on Turkish primary teachers. *European journal of research on Education*, 2 (2), pp. 72-81.
- Ndagire, S. (2019). *Role conflict, work related stress and performance among KCCA revenue collectors* (Doctoral dissertation, Makerere University).
- Okoth, O. J. (2014). Teachers' and Students' Perception on Bullying Behaviour in Public Secondary Schools in Kisumu East District, Kenya. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4 (6), p. 125.
- Olang, B. A. (2017). *The influence of conflict management on organizational performance: a case of stima sacco society limited* (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa).
- Osisioma, H., Nzewi, H., & Mgbemena, I. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and performance of selected commercial banks in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 4 (10).
- Rahim, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict. *International journal of conflict management*, 13 (3).
- Reys, W. J. (2011). *The negotiation of conflict management in long-distance and geographically close romantic relationships* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Rizwan, M., Waseem, A., & Bukhari, S. A. (2014). Antecedents of job stress and its impact on job performance and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Learning & Development*, 4 (2), pp. 187-203.
- Thompson, L. L. (2005). *The mind and heart of the negotiator*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Wall Jr, J. A., & Callister, R. R. (1995). Conflict and its management. *Journal of management*, 21 (3), pp. 515-558.
- Wang, C. H., Yen, C. D., & Liu, G. H. (2015). How intellectual capital influences individual performance: A multi-level perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 51, pp. 930-937.
- Zulkiffli, S. N. A. (2014). Business performance for SMEs: Subjective or objective measures?. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 3 (1), pp. 371.