Article

The Effect of Employee Involvement in Strategic Change on the Performance of Insurance Companies in Zimbabwe

Bibi Zaheenah Chummun * and Lizanani Nleya

Posted Date: 24 July 2023

doi: 10.20944/preprints202307.1507.v1

Keywords: employee involvement; strategic change; organizational performance; insurance companies; industry leaders

Article

The Effect of Employee Involvement in Strategic Change on the Performance of Insurance Companies in Zimbabwe

Bibi Zaheenah Chummun [1,*] and Lizanani Nleya [2]

[1] Affiliation 1
[2] Affiliation 2; nleyalizananina@yahoo.com
* chummunB@ukzn.ac.za .

Abstract: In this dynamic 21st Century global economy, managers of insurance companies cannot afford to ignore the involvement of their employees in strategic change programmes. The employee's voice in strategic change programmes is now a prerequisite for organizational performance. This study seeks to determine the effect of employee involvement in strategic change programmes through participation in decision-making, teamwork, communication, creativity, and innovation. The research approach used was quantitative to collect data from 115 respondents using a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire. The study employed the multiple regression method to analyse data using the IBM SPSS V28 software. All five constructs of employee involvement had a significant effect on the performance of insurance companies in Zimbabwe. The study findings will convince top managerial leaders of the insurance industry to acknowledge and appreciate the importance of involving employees in strategic change programmes. Besides, industry regulatory authorities can advocate for policies that encourage employee involvement in decision-making.

Keywords: employee involvement; strategic change; organizational performance; insurance companies; industry leaders

1. Introduction

Employee involvement is an organizational aspect that researchers view as critical in driving organizational performance. Employees are resources; whose skills are the basis for organizational co-competencies (Thompson et al, 2015). They have skills that an organization employs to turn inputs into outputs. Some organizations have outstanding customer service, excellent product development capabilities, refined innovation and manufacturing processes because of good employee skills and competencies. However, this happens when an organization allows its employees to contribute to the strategic decision-making programs. Their participation, results in higher individual and organizational performance (Phipps, Prieto and Ndinguri, 2013). To this end, organizations must give their employees room to have their voices heard and encourage them to make meaningful contributions to the performance of their organizations. The insurance sector contributes meaningfully to employment creation in many countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. The Zimbabwe insurance sector is an arm of the overall financial services sector. In 2019, the sector grew its assets to $17.2 billion from $4.2 billion in 2018 (Abel and Marire, 2021). However, the COVID-19 pandemic derailed the sector resulting in many insurance companies laying off staff. According to Cenfri (2020), most companies opted to retain critical staff working remotely from their homes. Equally, the number of registered insurers and participants dropped from 2235 in 2019 to 2156 in 2020 (Cenfri, 2020). KPMG (2020) points out that besides the COVID-19 pandemic, high inflationary trends, which spiked the cost of living, also contributed to the industry decline. Moreover, consumers beset by low disposable incomes abandoned insurance products since they could not afford them. Despite these challenges, ZIMSTAT (2019) views the Zimbabwean insurance sector as a key employer, putting the number of employees in the sector as of December 2018 to 4,400. To this end, employers in the Zimbabwean insurance sector must give due importance to their employees' views and allow them to contribute to the strategic decision-making process through teamwork.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202307.1507.v1

The Zimbabwean economy has been facing challenges since the collapse of the economic structural adjustment program in the late 1990s (Majoni, Matunhu and Chaderopa, 2016). Despite the challenges and the economic downturn, the Zimbabwean insurance sector is still a crucial employer in a struggling economy. The owners/managers of these institutions do not involve their employees in the strategic decision-making process. They do not view their employees as a resource to drive organizational performance. This study seeks to assess employee involvement in strategic change programs and how their involvement affects the performance of insurance companies in Zimbabwe.

2. Literature Review

Phipps, Prieto and Ndinguri (2013:110) define employee involvement as "a conscious and intended effort by individuals at a higher level in an organization to provide visible extra-role or role expanding opportunities for individuals or groups at a lower level in the organization to have a greater voice in one or two areas of organizational performance". The definition implies that organizations must appreciate the importance of their employees by giving them room to contribute to the strategic change initiatives to drive performance. Allowing employees to participate in strategic change initiatives helps to empower them to commit themselves to their individual and organizational performance (Safijanova and Zabijakin, 2013). An organization embarking on a strategic change initiative must provide adequate information to its employees on the intended change. Phipps, Prieto and Ndinguri (2013) point out that managers must provide their employees with correct information and train and develop them to acquire the necessary skills. Once employees get adequate information on the intended change program, they get motivated and fully commit themselves to the success and performance of the organization.

Strategic change involves radical changes in the structure, culture, organizational work processes, and strategy at hand in an organization (Balogun, 2001). It involves what managers decide to change and how and when to make the desired changes. More often than not, developments from the external environment and poor organizational performance compel managers to embark on some strategic change initiatives (Roberts, 2008). Fusch et al (2020) state that as managers battle to make strategic changes in line with the demands of the external environment, they must communicate the intended changes to every employee in the organization. The implication is that employees are the cornerstone for an organization's strategic changes. To this end, Balogun (2001) argues that failure to acknowledge the importance of employees' involvement in strategic change programmes, and their behaviours and attitudes, is a recipe for strategic change failure. Fusch et al (2020) concur that meaningful change must compel employees to change hence the importance of their involvement in strategic change initiatives (Chummun & Singh, 2019). Managers can therefore involve employees in strategic change programmes by allowing them to participate in decision-making, encouraging the development of teamwork, communicating the strategic change, and building blocks for creativity and innovation to mushroom.

Participation in Decision Making

Employee involvement in strategic decision making is the cornerstone for organizational success and performance. The main benefit of their involvement is that they make strategic decisions together as a team with their managers. Kentab (2018) states that involvement in the decision-making process breeds fertile ground for teamwork as managers and their subordinates come together to make decisions focusing on solving organizational issues. Moreover, allowing employees to participate in decision-making makes them feel appreciated, empowered, and motivated to contribute positively to the success and performance of the organization. Saha and Kumar (2017) note that when employees work as a team, they feel motivated to deliver performance beyond their call of duty.

Teamwork

Isik, Timuroglu and Aliyev (2015:136) define teamwork as "a means and process by which team members tend to work together in a harmonious, productive and effective way to accomplish tasks

and achieve team goals." It is clear that teamwork involves getting employees with complementary skills to form a distinct group whose focus is on common goals. Besides, members must be able to share knowledge, collaborate, and develop synergies to deliver superior organizational performance. According to Isik, Timuroglu and Aliyev (2015), organizational success depends on the ability of team members to share information and ideas using open communication lines to solve organizational problems and conflicts.

Communication

Communication touches every aspect of an organization. It cuts across all sections and departments. It is a process every manager must embrace to coordinate organizational activities. It provides employees with adequate information and guides them to achieve organization objectives (Bucata and Rizesc, 2017). Agarwal and Garg (2012) note that managers might fail to communicate the correct information to their subordinates. They point out that communication is a skill that managers must have to encourage low-level employees to perform effectively. A good communication process requires managers to inform their subordinates on performance requirements, engage them in an open dialogue, and receive feedback in time. Nebo, Nwankwo and Okonkwo (2015) argue that employee involvement and organizational performance can be a pipe-dream in the absence of open communication lines between managers and their subordinates.

Creativity and Innovation

Well-informed, committed, and motivated employees bring creative ideas as participants in the strategic decision-making process (Chummun & Mathithibane, 2020). The generation of new ideas depends on the quality and calibre of employees from various departments. Creative employees are an organizational resource and a source of competitive advantage (Thompson et al, 2015). Creativity, therefore, forms the basis for innovation when employees transform generated ideas into product or service offerings. There is a thin line between creativity and innovation. Innovation is associated with implementation of new ideas into new products and services. Mafini (2015:941) states that innovation is "the creation of better or more effective products, processes, services, technologies, or new ways of doing things as well as the flow of technology and information among the members of an organization." However, creativity and innovation are possible when an organization recruits skilled employees and involves them in its strategic change programmes (Anderson, Potocnik and Zhou, 2014).

Organizational Performance

Such employees are likely to become active drivers of organizational performance. They tend to commit fully to their organizations, driven by organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior occurs when employees feel attached to their organization and willing to offer their services beyond their call of duty (Nleya and Chummun, 2021). The result of such behavior is an increase in the success and performance of an organization. The aim of a profit-making organization is to accomplish set objectives to enhance overall performance. The success and survival of an organization depend on its ability to attain acceptable levels of performance (Singh, Darwish and Potocnik, 2016). Organizational performance encompasses the financial and non-financial aspects of an organization. The financial aspects are set objectives such as profit achieved, and return on shareholders' value. Non-financial indicators include market share and sales turnover (Al Khajeh, 2018). Essentially, financial indicators are objective and non-financial indicators are subjective. The conceptual framework in figure 1 outlines participation in decision-making, communication, teamwork, creativity, and innovation as independent variables. Organizational performance is the dependable variable.

In light of the above literature review, we formulate our hypotheses as follows**: -**

H1: *Communication has a significant effect on the performance of insurance companies.*

H2: *Teamwork has a significant effect on the performance of insurance companies.*

 doi:10.20944/preprints202307.1507.v1

H3: *Participation in decision making has a significant effect on the performance of insurance companies.*

H4: *Creativity has a significant effect on the performance of insurance companies.*

H5: *Innovation has a significant effect on the performance of insurance companies.*

3. Methodology

This study followed the quantitative research approach. Using the survey research design, the researcher used a 5-point Linkert scale questionnaire to collect data from 115 respondents from the Harare province in Zimbabwe. Because of the COVID-19 restrictions in place, the researcher distributed the questionnaire online. The selection of the respondents followed the simple random sampling method, and 71 respondents returned the questionnaire. The response rate was 62%. The researcher used the multiple regression method to analyse data.

4. Results and Discussion

This section presents the major findings on the six major constructs, that is, communication, teamwork, decision making, creativity, innovation and performance. The data collected using the methodology specified in the preceding section was first collated, then coded and analysed. The first section reviews the sample adequacy and data cleaning, the second section presents the demographic results, while the third section presents the descriptive statistics, and the last section tests the research hypotheses. For the evaluation of sampling adequacy, G*Power was used, while for the rest of the descriptive statistics and inferential statistics, IBM SPSS Version 28 was used.

Data Cleaning and Sampling Adequacy

Upon collecting the data, data cleaning was first done using listwise deletion, or rather complete case analysis, given that the data was Missing Completely at Random (Buuren, 2012; Dong and Peng, 2015; Raghunathan, 2015). The final cleaned sample size was 71. However, further data cleaning was done to identify outliers and the results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Outlier Detection.

				Missing		Number of Extremes[a]	
	N	Mean	SD	N	%	Low	High
Communication	71	3.34	.799	0	.000	0	0
Teamwork	71	3.30	.695	0	.000	0	0
Decision	71	3.28	.718	0	.000	0	0
Creativity	71	3.94	.558	0	.000	0	0
Innovation	71	3.33	.594	0	.000	2	0
Performance	71	4.25	.740	0	.000	5	0

a. Number of cases outside the range (Q1 - 1.5*IQR, Q3 + 1.5*IQR).

There were only 2 outliers below the lower quartile for the innovation construct, while for the organizational performance construct, there were five outliers. Given that their prevalence was below the maximum allowed 10%, no listwise deletion of these outliers was done, but rather, they were transformed to minimize their impact on the results (Garson, 2012). Power analysis was then conducted using G*Power to determine whether the final sample size of 71 was adequate for a regression analysis involving five predictors at alpha 0.05 and using the established effect size of $f^2 = 0.34$. From the outcome, the established power was 0.971; $F(5,65) = 2.356$; $\lambda = 24.14$. Being greater than the minimum acceptable power threshold of 0.80, these results confirm that the sample size that was used for this study was more than adequate.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202307.1507.v1

Demographic Analysis

Five demographic variables were considered for this study and these were gender, age, highest level of education, position and experience. Table 2 summarises these demographics.

Table 2. Demographic Results.

Variable	Category	N	%
Gender	Male	40	56.3
	Female	31	43.7
Age	18-30 Years	6	8.5
	31-40 Years	38	53.5
	41-50 Years	16	22.5
	50 Years and above	11	15.5
Highest Level of Education	High School	5	7
	Graduate	24	33.8
	Post-graduate	42	59.2
Position	Ordinary employee	11	15.5
	Supervisor	7	9.9
	Middle management	28	39.4
	Top management	25	35.2
Experience	1-5 Years	8	11.3
	6-10 Years	15	21.1
	11-15 Years	24	33.8
	16 Years and above	24	33.8
	Total	71	100

On the gender, the majority were males (56.3%) and this is reflective of the general management landscape where there is no parity in the gender distribution. However, the difference in the proportion of males against females was rather negligible. With regards to the age of respondents, the modal category was the 31-40-year-old group (53.5%), while the second dominant age group was 41-40 years old (22.5%), and the third was 50 years and above (15.5%), while the least dominant age group was 18-30 years (8.5%). These findings do show that a cumulative total of 76.0% were aged between 31 years and 50 years, implying that the sample used was predominated by the middle-aged respondents rather than the young respondents. This was expected given the fact that the study mainly focused on the management tier, and hence these would normally have attained ample experience and academic qualifications something that very few young people would have accomplished below the age of 30. With respect to the highest level of education, post-graduates (59.2%) were the majority, while the second dominant group were graduates (33.8%), and only 7.0% were high school certificate holders. These findings further qualify the respondents as being competent to comprehend and authoritatively respond to the questions, which made the outcome of this study more credible. Regarding the positions, the middle-management were the majority (39.4%), while the top-management were the second highest (35.2%). Thus, these two formed a cumulative total proportion of 74.6% of the respondents, while supervisors were only 9.9%, and ordinary employees were just 15.5%. Therefore, with the proportion of middle-to-senior managers being the highest, this meant that the findings from this study were more credible. Lastly, the experience of the respondents was evaluated and from the outcome, the majority had more than 10 years of experience, that is a cumulative total of 67.6%, with 33.8% having 11-15 years of experience and the other 33.8% having more than 16 years of experience. Those with 6-10 years of experience were only 21.1%, while those with 1-5 years of experience were 11.3%. Overall, it is evident that with

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 24 July 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202307.1507.v1

the majority of the respondents being the senior management, with higher qualifications and more years of experience, their input to this study made it more credible.

Construct Reliability and Validity

Given the fact that the constructs for this study were measured using well-established scales, only confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to establish the validity and reliability of the constructs without having to conduct exploratory factor analysis first (Thompson, 2018). To validate the constructs, convergent validity and discriminant validity were computed, while for the reliability, the Cronbach's alpha was tested. Convergent validity was tested using the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), while discriminant validity was tested using the heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlations (Hair et al., 2019). Table 2 below presents the reliability and validity results.

Table 2. Construct Reliability and Validity.

			HTMT					
	Alpha	**AVE**	**COM**	**TEAM**	**DM**	**CRE**	**INN**	**OP**
Communication	0.827	0.747	**0.739**					
Teamwork	0.754	0.639	0.427***	**0.662**				
Decision Making	0.737	0.683	0.532***	0.771***	0.**695**			
Creativity	0.746	0.696	0.170	0.207	0.234	**0.544**		
Innovation	0.875	0.663	0.754**	0.770**	0.738**	0.126	**0.513**	
Performance	0.909	0.767	0.107	0.165	0.156	0.711*	0.014	**0.717**

The recommended minimum acceptable Cronbach's Alpha is 0.70 (Taber, 2018). From the output above, the highest alpha was for organizational performance (α = 0.909), while the second highest was innovation (α = 0.875) followed by communication (α = 0.827). On the other hand, the least alpha was for decision making (α = 0.737), and the second being creativity (α = 0.746), while the third least was teamwork (α = 0.754). Since none of these alpha coefficients was less than the minimum accepted 0.70, this confirms that the constructs that were used for this study were reliable and internally consistent.

The Average Variance Explained (AVE) tested the convergent validity of the constructs. The minimum accepted AVE is 0.60 (Jöreskog, Olsson and Wallentin, 2016). The results above show that the least AVE statistic was 0.639 for the teamwork construct, while the second least was 0.663 for the innovation construct, and the third least being 0.683 for the construct decision-making. On the other end, the highest AVE was for the organizational performance construct (0.767), while he second highest was for the communication construct (0.827). By virtue of all the AVEs being greater than 0.60, it meant that convergent validity was not violated.

Lastly, the HTMT test was conducted to determine the discriminant validity of the constructs. The maximum acceptable threshold is 0.85 for any HTMT ratio. From the findings above, the highest observed HTMT was 0.771 between decision making and teamwork while the second highest was 0.754 between communication and innovation. Because none of the HTMT ratios was greater than the maximum threshold 0.85, it can be confirmed that discriminant validity was not violated.

Descriptive Statistics

With the reliability and validity of the constructs having been confirmed, this section further investigates the statistical distribution of the items for each and every construct as well as for the overall constructs. All in all, there were 25 items. Five of the constructs had 4 items each, that is, communication, teamwork, decision making, creativity, and innovation, while the organizational performance construct was measured by five items. Each of the items was measured using a 5-point

 doi:10.20944/preprints202307.1507.v1

Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree [1] up to Strongly Agree [5]. According to Hair, Page and Brunsveld (2020), the optimal descriptive statistics to analyse these items and composite constructs would be the mean and standard deviation. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics.

	Mean	**SD**
Managers communicate frequently with subordinates	3.77	.929
Managers allow views of employees to be heard	3.30	1.047
Managers usually consult subordinates to solve problems	3.08	.967
Managers have an open-door policy	3.21	.999
Overall Communication	**3.34**	**.799**
Managers encourage teamwork	4.15	.624
Managers and subordinates always consult each other	3.15	.951
Views of both managers and subordinates are all important and respected	3.21	1.068
Managers and their subordinates work in a friendly environment with no conflicts	2.68	.968
Overall Teamwork	**3.30**	**.695**
Employees are always encouraged to make decisions	3.03	1.108
Decisions made by subordinate employees are given due importance	2.83	1.055
Employees are free to identify problems and make decisions	2.90	1.044
Without employee participation in decision making, our organisation will poorly perform	4.35	.758
Overall Decision Making	**3.28**	**.718**
Employees in this organisation are very creative	3.96	.764
Employees are encouraged to bring new ideas always	3.76	.886
Employees are very inquisitive and always have new ideas	3.56	.906
Without new ideas filtering through, our organisation will poorly perform	4.48	.753
Overall Creativity	**3.94**	**.558**
It's easy to turn new ideas into successful innovations in this organisation	3.03	1.121
Managers encourage employees to be innovative	3.61	.902
Employees are rewarded for successful innovations	2.72	.944
Innovation is the only way to stimulate performance of our company	3.97	1.121
Overall Innovation	**3.33**	**.594**
Performance of our organisation depends on communication	4.41	.821
Performance of our organisation depends on teamwork	4.38	.704
Performance of our organisation depends on employee participation in decision making	4.00	1.000
Performance of our organisation depends on creativity	4.17	.941
Performance of our organisation depends on innovation	4.28	.865
Overall Performance	**4.25**	**.740**

***Communication*:** All the four items measuring the level of communication had mean ratings that were above the mid-point 3.0, with the highest rating being for the item on whether the managers communicate frequently with subordinates (M = 3.77; SD = 0.929), while the second highest was on whether the management allows the views of employees to be heard (M = 3.30; SD = 1.047). The third

 doi:10.20944/preprints202307.1507.v1

was on whether the management has an open-door policy (M = 3.21; SD = 0.999). However, the least rated communication item was on whether the management usually consult subordinates to solve problems or not (M = 3.08; SD = 0.967). The overall communication rating was M = 3.34 (SD = 0.799) and this shows that there was a fairly positive level of communication within the organisations, although there was much room for improvement.

***Teamwork*:** With respect to teamwork, again, there was a fairly positive outlook, with three of the four items being positively rated above the mid-point. The highest rating was for the item on whether the management encouraged teamwork or not (M = 4.15; SD = 0.624), while the second highest rated item was on whether the views of both the management and subordinates are equally important and respected across the board (M = 3.21; SD = 1.068). The third highest rating was on whether the management and subordinates always consult each other (M = 3.15; SD = 0.951). However, the least rated item was poorly rated with a mean that was less than the mid-point, that is, whether the management and their subordinates work together in a friendly environment with no conflicts (M = 2.68; SD = 0.968). The fact that this was poorly rated suggests that there was a relatively high prevalence of conflicts in the organisations. However, the overall teamwork rating was above the midpoint (M = 3.30; SD = 0.695), and this implies that despite the prevalence of conflicts, the level of teamwork was generally satisfactory.

***Participation in Decision Making*:** There were mixed perceptions among the respondents when it came to the degree of participation in decision making. Two of the four items were rated below the mid-point, that is whether decisions made by subordinates are given due importance (M = 2.83; SD = 1.055), and whether employees are free to identify problems and make decisions (M = 2.90; SD = 1.044). These findings do confirm the poor level of decision by subordinates. The fact that the encouragement of employees to make decisions was also rated barely marginally above the mid-point (M = 3.03; SD = 1.108) shows that there is not enough being done by organisations to ensure the active involvement of subordinates in decision making. However, there was consensus among the respondents that employee participation in decision-making was very vital for the performance in the organisation (M = 4.35; SD = 0.758). On aggregate, the overall construct mean was M = 3.28 (SD = 0.718), which shows that in light of the poor participation of employees in decision making, there was a very strong consensus that this was imperative.

***Creativity*:** This was the most rated predictor variable, with the respondents giving fairly high ratings to all the four items. The rating with the highest mean was on the significance of new ideas filtering through the organisation and its positive effect on performance (M = 4.48; SD = 0.753), while the second highest rating was on the level of creativity of the employees (M = 3.96; SD = 0.764). This finding shows that there was a very high level of creativity in the organisations where the participants were from. It was also confirmed that generally, employees were being encouraged to bring new ideas always (M = 3.76; SD = 0.886). The least rated item was on whether employees were very inquisitive and always had new ideas (M = 3.56; SD = 0.906). The overall mean rating for the four items measuring creativity was M = 3.94 (SD = 0.558), and being very close to 4.0, this is a strong indicator of the high levels of creativity in the organisations.

Innovation: Three of the four items were positively rated above the mid-point. The highest rating was for the item that innovation was the only way to stimulate performance of the company (M = 3.97; SD = 1.121), while the second highest was the item that measured whether the managers encouraged employees to be innovative (M = 3.61; SD = 0.902). The third was rated marginally above the mid-point and was for the item that measured whether it was easy to turn new ideas into successful innovations in the organisation (M = 3.03; SD = 1.121). The last item was rated below the mid-point, that is, whether or not employees were being rewarded for successful innovations (M = 2.72; SD = 0.944). The fact that this was poorly rated suggests that the majority of the respondents did disagree that employees were being compensated for successful innovations, which shows that there was poor recognition and appreciation of employees for their innovative ideas. Overall, the aggregate mean rating for innovation was M = 3.33 (SD = 0.594) implying an overall positive rating for the innovation construct.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 24 July 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202307.1507.v1

***Insurance Companies Performance*:** This was the dependent variable. Unlike the other five independent variables, this was measured by five items, all of which had very high positive ratings. The majority of the respondents concurred that their companies' performance strongly depended on communication (M= 4.41; SD = 0.821), while the second highest was the dependence of the performance on teamwork (M = 4.38; SD = 0.704). The third highest mean was for the dependence of performance on innovation (M = 4.28; SD = 0.865). On the other hand, the least rating was for the dependence of organizational performance on employee participation in decision-making (M = 4.00; 1.000), while the second least was the dependence of the organizational performance on creativity (M = 4.17; SD = 0.941). The overall mean rating for organizational performance was M = 4.25 (SD = 0.740), and being very high, this shows that overall, there was consensus among the respondents regarding their positive sentiments on the performance items.

Overall, among the six constructs, performance had the highest mean rating (M = 4.25; SD = 0.740), while the second highest was creativity (M = 3.94; SD = 0.558), then communication (M = 3.34; SD = 0.799), innovation (M = 3.33; SD = 0.594), teamwork (M = 3.30; SD = 0.695) and the least was participation in decision making (M = 3.28; SD = 0.718).

Hypothesis Testing

The main thrust of this study was to establish the effect of five constructs, that is, communication, teamwork, participation, creativity and innovation on performance of insurance companies. Since multiple predictors were involved, according to Field (2018), the optimal statistical approach was multiple regression analysis. To validate the use of multiple linear regression, several assumptions were tested. The first was residual normality and this was tested using the Shapiro-Wilk tests given the fact that the sample size was less than 200 (Healey, 2012; George and Mallery, 2019). The results show that residual normality was not violated: $W(71) = 0.976$, $p>0.05$, and that for the risk propensity measured by the BART score, $W(76) = 0.980$, $p>0.05$. Since the p-value was greater than 0.05, this implied that the normality assumption had not been violated (Howell, 2013; Kirk, 2016). Multicollinearity was also tested using the condition index and the value inflated factor (VIF). The maximum acceptable threshold for the condition index is 30, while for VIF, this is 5.0 (Garson, 2012; Gravetter and Wallnau, 2017). The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Collinearity Diagnostics.

		Condition			
Dimension	**Eigenvalue**	**Index**	**Tolerance**	**VIF**	**Tolerance**
(Constant)	5.903	1.000			
Communication	.043	11.781	.268	3.729	.268
Teamwork	.021	16.884	.319	3.136	.319
Decision Making	.016	18.954	.489	2.047	.489
Creativity	.010	24.578	.819	1.221	.819
Innovation	.008	27.461	.629	1.591	.629

The results show that all the condition indexes were less than the maximum threshold of 30.0, while the VIF statistics were also less than the maximum tolerable 5.0. To this effect, these findings do confirm that there was no multicollinearity among the five predictor variables. The last assumption was autocorrelation and this was tested using the Durbin-Watson Test. From Table 5, the Durbin-Watson coefficient was d = 1.733 and was within the acceptable range [1.50 – 2.50], therefore, the assumption was not violated. Table 5 also presents the overall model summary.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 24 July 2023 doi:10.20944/preprints202307.1507.v1

Table 5. Overall Model Summary.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	SE	Durbin-Watson
1	.748[a]	.559	.534	.706	1.733

a. Predictors: (Constant), Innovation, Creativity, Communication, Decision Making, Teamwork

b. Dependent Variable: Performance

The regression coefficient of 0.748 shows that there was a very strong relationship between the predictor variables and the dependent variable [F (5, 65) = 3.019; p<0.05]. With an r-square of 0.559, this confirms that 55.9% of the variance in performance of insurance companies was explained by the five predictors innovation, creativity, communication, decision making and teamwork. The regression coefficients for each and every predictor are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Regression Coefficients.

	Unstandardized		Standardized		
	B	SE	Beta	t	p
(Constant)	1.860	.691		2.690	.009
Communication	.315	.210	.234	3.497	.000
Teamwork	.173	.223	.158	1.976	.047
Decision Making	.246	.174	.233	3.148	.000
Creativity	.342	.171	.256	4.005	.000
Innovation	.213	.182	.170	2.171	.013

The highest standardized coefficient was for the predictor variable creativity: $\beta_{cre} = 0.256$ (t = 4.005, p<0.05), and this was statistically significant. The second highest beta coefficient was for the predictor communication: $\beta_{comm} = 0.234$ (t = 3.497, p<0.05), and again, this was statistically significant. The third was for the construct participation in decision making: $\beta_{pdm} = 0.233$ (t = 3.148, p<0.05), while the fourth was for the construct innovation: $\beta_{inn} = 0.170$ (t = 2.171, p<0.05). On the other hand, the least coefficient was for teamwork: $\beta_{tem} = 0.158$ (t = 1.976, p<0.05). Since all the p-values were less than 0.05, therefore, all the null hypotheses were rejected. In other words, the alternative hypotheses proposed earlier were all confirmed, that is:

H_1: *Communication has a significant effect on the performance of insurance companies;* ***CONFIRMED.***

H2: *Teamwork has a significant effect on the performance of insurance companies;* ***CONFIRMED.***

H3: *Participation in decision making has a significant effect on the performance of insurance companies;* ***CONFIRMED.***

H4: *Creativity has a significant effect on the performance of insurance companies;* ***CONFIRMED.***

H5: *Innovation has a significant effect on the performance of insurance companies;* ***CONFIRMED.***

Overall, while all the hypotheses were found to be significant predictors of insurance companies' performance, the fact that 44.1% of the variance in performance was not explained by these five predictors, shows that there are other factors as well that do contribute to performance other than these five. The captains of the insurance industry, despite the problems bedevilling the Zimbabwean economy, will find the study results helpful. Insurance companies in Zimbabwe and beyond help pool risk and further reduce the impact of losses companies incur locally and across borders (Arkell, 2011). No doubt, insurance companies play a critical role in economic and financial development of

an economy, hence the need for managers in the Zimbabwean insurance industry to embrace the results of this study.

Results from several studies confirm that employees' involvement through participation in decision-making, teamwork, communication, creativity, and innovation, has a significant effect on organizational performance. Chimaobi and Chikamnele (2020) point out that employees' participation in decision-making motivates them to put more effort into their jobs. Ivan-Sarfo and Akpamah (2020) concur. They argue that employees focus on attaining organizational goals when managers give them room to participate in decision making. Moreover, as committed and motivated organization citizens, employees bring new ideas to enhance growth and performance of the organization. Chimaobi and Chikamnele (2020) studied the impact of employees' participation in decision-making on organizational performance involving 125 managers and employees of Government-owned enterprises in Port-Harcourt, River state, Nigeria. The results showed that employees' participation in decision-making positively affects organizational performance. A study conducted by Saha and Kumar (2017) involving 397 managers in India produced similar results. However, besides participation in decision-making, managers are duty-bound to communicate the desired strategic change to their subordinates. Agyeiwaa and Arboh (2022) point out that communication from managers to employees must be clear and unambiguous to drive organizational performance. Their study on the role of effective communication on organizational performance in the Ghanaian National Health Insurance Scheme, established that effective communication positively impacts organizational performance. Well-informed and motivated employees are likely to focus on achieving organizational goals. Agarwal and Adjirackor (2016) argue that motivated employees are a bedrock for teamwork and team spirit. The results of their study of selected basic schools in Accra, Ghana, reveal that teamwork has a positive effect on organizational productivity. To this end, employees working together as a cohesive unit create room for creativity and innovation to emerge. Chinhanga (2017) believes an organization that is not creative and innovative becomes irrelevant in the market place. Customers may abandon its products and services in favour of competitors, a development that negates organizational performance.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The study aims to encourage insurance industry leaders to value the importance of employees' involvement in strategic change initiatives and programmes. The study also aims at informing industry leaders of the importance of employees as valuable organizational citizens who shouldn't be left out when an organization seeks to make strategic changes in its systems, structures, strategies, and operations. The study findings show that each of the five variables of employee involvement positively impacts organizational performance. Despite being subdued by COVI-D 19 pandemic and the struggling economy, the insurance industry in Zimbabwe is still a crucial contributor to the development of the economy. Managers of insurance companies must allow employees to contribute to decision-making as a coherent team. Employees require motivation to actively participate in driving organizational performance. Involving employees enables the Government and Insurance Industry regulatory authorities to design policies that embrace employee involvement in strategic change initiatives to save the industry from collapsing.

References

1. Agarwal, S. and Adjirackor, T. (2016). Impact of Teamwork on Organizational Productivity in Some Selected Basic Schools in the Accra Metropolitan Assembly. *European Journal of Business, Economics and Accounting*, Vol. 4, No. 6, 2016, 40-52 Https://www.idpublication.org Accessed 15 November, 2022
2. Agarwal, S. and Garg, A. (2012). The Importance of Communication within Organizations: A Research on Two Hotels in Uharakhand, *IOSR Journal of Business and Management,* Volume 3, Issue 2 (July-Aug. 2012), 40-49 https://www.iosrjournals.org Accessed: 08 January, 2023
3. Agyeiwaa, O. E. and Arboh, F. (2022). The Role of Communication on Organizational Performance: A Case Study of Ghana's National Health Insurance Scheme. *International Journal of Healthcare Sciences*, Vol. 10, Issue 1, 366-376 https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7118461 Accessed 8 January, 2023

4. Al Khajeh, E. H. (2018). Impact of Leadership Styles on Organizational Performance, *Journal of Human Resources Management Research,* Vol. 2018 (2018) https://DOI.org/10.5171/2018.687849 Accessed 19 January, 2023
5. Anderson, N. R., Zhou, J., and Potočnik, K. (2014). Innovation and Creativity in Organizations: A State-of-the-Science Review, Prospective Commentary, and Guiding Framework, *Journal of Management* 40(5) DOI:10.1177/0149206314527128 Accessed 17 November, 2022
6. Arkell, J. (2011). The Essential Role of Insurance Services for Trade Growth and Development. The Geneva Association. https://www.genevaassociation.org/sites/default/files/research-topics-document-type/pdf_public//sys_ga2011-the_essential_role_of_Insurance_services.pdf Accessed 20 January, 2023
7. Balogun, J. (2001). Strategic Change, *Management Quarterly* 10 (1), 2-11
8. Bucata, G. and Rizescu, A. M. (2017). The Role of Communication in Enhancing Work Effectiveness of an Organization, *Land Forces Academy Review*, Vol. XXII, No. 1(85), 2017.
9. Buuren, S. (2012). *Flexible Imputation of Missing Dat*a (Chapman & Hall/CRC Interdisciplinary Statistics). Chapman and Hall/CRC.
10. Cenfri (2020). Impact of COVID-19 on the Zimbabwean Insurance Sector, Available: https://www.fsdafrica.org/wp-constant/uploads/2020/10/impact-of-COVID-19-on-the-Zimbabwean-insurance-sector-21.10.20.pdf Accessed 20 January, 2023
11. Chimaobi, I. and Chikamnele, M. J. (2020). Employee Participation in Decision Making and its Impact on Organizational Performance: Evidence from Government Owned Enterprises, Port Harcourt, Nigeria, *SSRN Electronic Journal* 27(18 Sep 2020): 18, 1-18 https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3667548 Accessed 17 November, 2022
12. Chinhanga, S. S. (2018). Creativity and Innovation play a significant role in business performance in the modern-day organization. *International Journal of Social Relevance and Concern*, Volume 6, Issue 6, 13-25
13. Chummun, B. Z., & Singh, A. (2019). Factors Influencing the Quality of Decision-Making
14. Using Business Intelligence in a Metal Rolling Plant in KwaZulu-Natal. *Journal of Reviews on Global Economics, 8, 1108-1120.*
15. Chummun, B.Z. & Mathithibane, M. (2020). Challenges and Coping Strategies of Covid2019
16. in the Tourism Industry in Mauritius. African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 9(5):810-822.
17. Dong, Y., & Peng, C. -Y. J. (2013). Principled missing data methods for researchers. *Springer Plus* 2013, 2:222.
18. Field, A. 2018. *Discovering statistics using SPSS for windows*, 5th Edition, Los Angeles, Sage, USA
19. Fusch, G.E., Ness, L., Booker, J. M., and Fusch, P. I. (2020). People and Process: Successful Change Management Initiatives, *Journal of Social Change 2020*, Volume 12, Issue 1, 166-184 https://DOI.org/10.5590/JOSC.2020.12.1.13 Accessed 17 November, 2022
20. Garson, G. D. (2012). *Testing statistical assumptions*. Asheboro, NC: Statistical Associates Publishing.
21. George, D. and Mallery, P. (32019). *IBM Statistics 26 Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference,* 16th Edition, Routledge, New York https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429056765 Accessed 21 January, 2023
22. Gravetter, F. J., and Wallnau, L. B. 2017. *Statistics for the behavioural sciences* (10th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage.
23. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., and Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). London: Cengage Learning.
24. Hair, J. F., Page, M. J., and Brunsveld, N. (2020). *Essentials of business research methods* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
25. Healey, J. F. (2012). *Statistics: A Tool for Social Research*, 9th Edition, Wadsworth Cengage Learning, USA.
26. Howell, K. E. (2013). *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Methodology*, Sage Publications Ltd https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781473957633 Accessed 21 January, 2023
27. Isik, M., Timuroglu, K., and Aliyev, Y. (2017). The Relationship between Teamwork and Organizational Trust, *International Journal of Research in Business and social Science*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 2015 ISSN: 2147-4478 https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v4i1.33 Accessed 17 November, 2022
28. Ivan-Sarfo, E. and Akpamah, P. (2020). Organizational Performance and Employees' Participation in Decision Making. *The International Journal of Business and Manag*ement 8(7), 127-134 https://doi.org/10.24940/theijbm/2020/v8/i7/BM2007-040 Accessed 17 November, 2022
29. Jöreskog, K. G., Olsson, U. H., & Wallentin, F. Y. (2016). *Multivariate analysis with LISREL*. Basel, Switzerland: Springer.
30. Kentab, M. Y. (2018). The Reality of Participation in Decision Making: A Field Study on the Supervisory Offices in Riyadh City, *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 6(5): 881-896 https://DOI.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.060510 Accessed 17 November, 2022
31. Kirk, A. (2016). *Data Visualisation: A Handbook for Data Driven Design*, Sage Publications Ltd

32. KPMG (2020). Overview of the Zimbabwe Insurance Industry. Available: https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmg/za/pdf/2021/overview-of-the-zimbabwean-insurance-industry.pdf Accessed 20 January, 2023
33. Mafini, C. (2015). Predicting Organizational Performance Through Innovation, Quality and Inter-Organizational Systems: A Public Sector Perspective, Journal of Applied Business Research, 31(3); 939-952 https://doi.org/10.19030/jabr.v31i3.9227 Accessed 17 November, 2022
34. Majoni, T., Matunhu, J and Chaderopa, B. C (2016), SMEs Policies and Challenges: A Comparative Analysis of Zimbabwe and South Korea, *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, Volume 6, Issue 6, June 2016, 377-383
35. Nebo, C. S., Nwankwo, P. N., and Okonkwo, R. I. (2015). The Role of Effective Communication on Organizational Performance: A Study of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, AWKA, *Review of Public Administration and Management*, Vol. 4, No. 8, December 2015 www.arabianjbmr.com/RPAM_index.php Accessed: 8 February, 2022
36. Nleya, L. and Chummun, B. Z. (2021). The effect of strategic leadership capabilities on the development of organizational citizenship behaviour, *Problems and Perspectives in Management,* Volume 19, Issue 4, 2021, 97-109 https://doi.org/10.21511/pp.19(4).2021.09
37. Phipps, S. T. A., Prieto, L. C., and Ndinguri, E. N. (2013). Understanding the impact of employee involvement on organizational productivity: The moderating role of organizational commitment, *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict* 17(2):107-120
38. Raghunathan, T. (2015). *Missing data analysis in practice*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL
39. Roberts, C. (2008). Implementing Educational Technology in Higher Education: A Strategic Approach, *The Journal of Educators Online,* Volume 5, Number 1, January 2008 https://DOI.org/10.9743/JEO.2008.1.1 Accessed 8 February, 2023
40. Sahar, S. and Kumar, S. P. (2017). Influence of Participation in Decision Making on Job Satisfaction, Group Learning, and Group Commitment: Empirical Study of Public Sector Undertakings in India, *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 1, 79-101, 2017
41. Sanderson, A. and Marire, J. | (2021) Competition in the insurance sector – An application of Boone indicator, *Cogent Economics & Finance*, 9:1, 1974154, DOI: 10.1080/23322039.2021.1974154
42. Sofijanova, E. and Zabijakin-Chatleska, V. (2013). Employee Involvement and Organizational Performance: Evidence from the Manufacturing Sector in the Republic of Macedonia, *Trakia Journal of Sciences,* Vol. 11, Suppl. 31-36 https://www.uni-sz.bg Accessed 17 November, 2022
43. Singh, S., Darwish, T. K., and Potocnik, K. 2016. Measuring organisational performance: A case for subjective measures. *British Journal of Management*, (27): 214-224. Available: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12126 Accessed 8 February, 2023
44. Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, *48*(6), 1273–1296 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2 Accessed 20 January, 2023
45. Thompson, B. (2018). E*xploratory and confirmatory factor analysis: Understanding concepts and applications*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
46. Thompson, A., Peteraf, M., Gamble, G. and Strickland, A. J. III 2015. *Crafting and executing strategy: The quest for competitive advantage: Concepts and cases,* 20th Edition, New York, New York: McGraw Hill, USA.
47. ZIMSTAT (2019). Employees and Earnings by Industrial Sector, *Quarterly Digest of Statistics,* Third Quarter 2019. Available: www.zimstat.co.zw/wp-constant/uploads/publications/Miscellenious/Digest_Q3_2019.pdf Accessed 20 January, 2023.