Journal of
*Risk and Financial Management*

*Article*

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

**Bibi Zaheenah Chummun * and Lizanani Nleya**

Graduate School of Business and Leadership, University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN), Durban 4000, South Africa; nleyalizanani@gmail.com
* Correspondence: chummunb@ukzn.ac.za

**Abstract:** Due to rapid technological advancements and intense competition, organizations must find new ways to do business. As a result, changes in an organization's structures, systems, and strategies are now a pre-requisite to survive the competition. Involving employees in strategic change programmes will harness ideas that enhance competitive advantage and organizational performance. The purpose of this study is to inform industry executives, especially in insurance companies, that employees are crucial resources that must be valued for their contribution to the survival of the organization. A total of 115 respondents were surveyed using a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire in a quantitative research approach. This study employed the multiple regression method to test the effect of five employee involvement constructs on organizational performance using IBM SPSS V28 software. All five constructs, that is, participation in decision-making, teamwork, communication, creativity, and innovation, significantly affected the performance of insurance companies in Zimbabwe. This study's findings will convince top managerial leaders of the insurance industry to acknowledge and appreciate the importance of involving employees in strategic change programmes. Furthermore, industry regulatory authorities can promote policies and practices that involve employees in decision-making.

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

check for updates

**Citation:** Chummun, Bibi Zaheenah, and Lizanani Nleya. 2023. The Effect of Employee Involvement in Strategic Change on the Performance of Insurance Companies in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management* 16: 409. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm16090409

Academic Editor: Thanasis Stengos

Received: 19 July 2023
Revised: 24 August 2023
Accepted: 31 August 2023
Published: 13 September 2023



## 1. Introduction

The dictates of the 21st-century global economy require organizations to review their operations, structures, strategies, systems, and procedures to survive intense competition. Due to the changing pace of technology, buyers are now well-informed and have easy access to information they require concerning competing products and services. Change management experts such as Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) advise organizations to choose the best strategies to survive stiff competition. Strategy gurus such as Porter (1985) have added their voices to this call, advising organizations to select one competitive strategy at a time to attain the much-desired competitive advantage. No doubt, organizations have no choice but to adjust their ways of doing business and recruit skilled human capital that is ready to accept change and be involved in strategic change initiatives. In light of this development, Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) advocate for employee involvement in strategic change initiatives but only when managers inform them of the benefits associated with the planned change.

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. 2020). They have the skills that an organization employs to turn inputs into outputs. Some organizations have outstanding customer service, excellent product development capabilities, and 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 programmes. Their participation results in higher individual and organizational performance (Phipps et al. 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 Zimbabwean insurance sector is a key employer, and as of December 2018 the number of employees in the sector stood at 4400 (ZIMSTAT 2019). 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. However, 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. The main objective of this study is to encourage insurance industry leaders to value the importance of employees' involvement in strategic change initiatives and programmes. Therefore, this study aims at informing industry leaders of the importance of employees as valuable organizational citizens who should not be left out when an organization seeks to make strategic changes in its systems, structures, strategies, and operations.

Strategic change involves radical changes in the structure, culture, organizational work processes, and strategy at hand in an organization (Asa et al. 2023). 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. Therefore, organizations must accept that change is inevitable. 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. Phipps et al. (2013) points out that managers must provide their employees with correct information and train and develop them to acquire the necessary skills. Once employees receive adequate information on the intended change programme, they become motivated and fully commit themselves to the success and performance of the organization.

(Ogbonda 2023, p. 134) defines employee involvement as "a program that allows staff members to participate in decision-making and the improvement of activities appropriate to their positions within an organisation." Phipps et al. (2013, p. 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". These definitions imply that organizations must appreciate the importance of their employees by giving them room to contribute to the strategic change initiatives to drive performance. Therefore, employee involvement is an essential process that organizations cannot afford to ignore. Because of the intense competition in global markets, organizations have to be flexible to allow the generation of new ideas by their employees. Mambula et al. (2021) encourage organizations to involve their employees in strategic change initiatives as they usually bring new ideas and innovation, which are the bedrock for attaining a competitive advantage. Moreover, employee involvement results in happiness (Ogbonda 2023), motivating employees to commit themselves to their call of duty (Ulrich et al. 2023). Allowing employees to participate in strategic change initiatives also helps to empower them to commit themselves to their individual and organizational performance (Sofijanova and Zabijakin-Chatleska 2013). In other words, 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) argue that meaningful change must compel employees to change, hence the importance of their involvement in strategic change initiatives (Chummun and 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 creating the building blocks for creativity and innovation to mushroom. It is evident that in today's ever-changing global economy, organizations embrace employee involvement to boost their performance and effectiveness.

Employee involvement in strategic decision-making is the cornerstone for organizational success and performance. Mambula et al. (2021) state that it is necessary for managers to invite employees to participate in decision-making. The main benefit of their involvement is that they make strategic decisions together as a team with their managers. Their participation drives performance positively when managers and employees agree on suitable policies and procedures to direct the organization into the future. Their participation further gives them a sense of responsibility and ownership of the business (Ogbonda 2023), which allows for the development of organizational citizenship behaviour (Nleya and Chummun 2021). Kentab (2018) concurs, stating 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. 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, Mambula et al. (2021) observed that managers often exclude employees from participating in decision-making. They argue that such a move might be problematic, especially when employees hit back by resisting the implementation of decisions they were never part of in the first place.

A team is a group of individuals who work together to accomplish organizational goals. Usually, team members have shared organizational goals and objectives, and all members focus on utilising their skills to enhance organizational performance (Abbas 2021). One of the most noticeable benefits of employee involvement in strategic change initiatives is the development of teamwork and team spirit among excited and motivated employees in organizations. Isik et al. (2015, p. 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 to achieve common goals. Furthermore, members must be able to share knowledge, collaborate, and develop synergies to deliver superior organizational performance. Ideally, team members work collectively as a coherent unit requiring little or no supervision (Obiekwe et al. 2019). According to Isik et al. (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. Equally, teamwork becomes a success if employees work together as a tight unit driven by their inclusion in strategic decision-making (Obiekwe et al. 2021) and possessing the right core competencies resident in their skills and capabilities (Obiekwe et al. 2019). Essentially, involved employees feel relaxed and free to experiment with new ways of enhancing their performance and doing business without fear of their superiors. A study involving selected basic schools in Accra, Ghana by Agarwal and Adjirackor (2016), revealed that teamwork has a positive effect on organizational productivity.

Communication touches every aspect of an organization. It is a necessary process for the survival of any business enterprise. 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 Rizescu 2017). However, if done haphazardly, it can bring harm and misery to an otherwise peaceful work environment (Musheke and Phiri 2021). Good communication ideally brings managers and employees together, and managers can share valuable information such as company value statements, policies, procedures, systems, and all relevant information that keeps employees informed of the developments in the organization. Ahmad and Huvilla (2019) outline numerous benefits associated with sharing information. They range from enhanced organizational performance and creativity to stability in the work environment and positive individual performance. Essentially employees tend to understand and appreciate the benefits of involving them in strategic change initiatives if communication lines between managers and employees are open and fluid.

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 a timely manner. Nebo et al. (2015) argue that employee involvement and organizational performance can be a pipedream in the absence of open communication lines between managers and their subordinates. A study by Agyeiwaa and Arboh (2022) 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, committed, and motivated employees bring creative ideas as participants in the strategic decision-making process (Chummun and 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. 2020). 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 the implementation of new ideas into new products and services. Mafini (2015, p. 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 et al. 2014).

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 are willing to offer their services beyond the 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 et al. 2016). Organizational performance encompasses the financial and non-financial aspects of an organization. The financial aspects are set objectives such as the profit achieved and the 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.

## 2. Materials and Methodology

This study followed the quantitative research approach. The quantitative research approach uses a structured questionnaire to collect data from a large sample. It is suitable when a researcher intends to move from a particular situation to the general patterns by developing and testing a theory (Easterby-Smith et al. 2015; Saunders et al. 2019). In this study, we developed five hypotheses, which we tested by employing a multiple linear regression analysis; thus, allowing us to move from theory building to general patterns. Below are the five hypotheses:

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

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

**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.*

Using the survey research design, we used a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire to collect data from 115 respondents from the Harare province in Zimbabwe. The instrument carried statements that required respondents to answer on a scale of 5, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Joshi et al. (2015, p. 397), state that a Likert scale is "a set of statements offered for a real or hypothetical situation under study. Participants are asked to show their level of agreement (from strongly disagree to strongly agree) with the given statement on a metric scale". Moreover, the Likert scale is a reliable research instrument which measures respondents' perceptions with a relatively high degree of accuracy (Tanujaya et al. 2022). Because of the COVID-19 restrictions in place, we 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%. We then used the multiple regression method to analyse the data. The multiple linear regression (MLR) model is a popular data analysis technique that uses several independent variables to explain the outcome of one dependent variable (Trunfio et al. 2022). The main difference between MLR and the simple linear regression (LR) model is that MLR uses multiple independent variables while the LR model uses only one independent variable. In this study, we used the MLR model to test the effect of 5 explanatory independent variables (participation in decision-making, communication, teamwork, innovation, and creativity) on one dependent variable (organizational performance).

The data collected using the methodology specified above were first collated, then coded and analysed. It was also necessary to establish sample adequacy and conduct a data cleaning exercise in this study. 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. Upon collecting the data, data cleaning was first conducted using listwise deletion, or rather complete case analysis, given that the data were missing completely at random (van Buuren 2012; Raghunathan 2015). The final cleaned sample size was 71. However, further data cleaning was conducted to identify outliers, and the results are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Results of Outlier Detection.

| | N | Mean | SD | Missing | | Number of Extremes [a] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | N | % | Low | High |
| Communication | 71 | 3.34 | 0.799 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 |
| Teamwork | 71 | 3.30 | 0.695 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 |
| Decision | 71 | 3.28 | 0.718 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 |
| Creativity | 71 | 3.94 | 0.558 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 |
| Innovation | 71 | 3.33 | 0.594 | 0 | 0.000 | 2 | 0 |
| Performance | 71 | 4.25 | 0.740 | 0 | 0.000 | 5 | 0 |

[a] Number of cases outside the range (Q1 − 1.5 × IQR, Q3 + 1.5 × IQR).

There were only two 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 performed, 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 an alpha of 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.

## 3. Results

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

Regarding 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%), 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 show that a cumulative total of 76.0% were aged between 31 years and 50 years, implying that the sample used was predominated by middle-aged respondents rather than young respondents. This was expected given the fact that this 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 was 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 made up only 21.1%, while those with 1–5 years of experience made up 11.3% of the sample. Overall, it is evident that with the majority of the respondents being senior management with higher qualifications and more years of experience, their input to this study made it more credible.

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 3 below presents the reliability and validity results.

**Table 3.** Construct Reliability and Validity.

| | Alpha | AVE | HTMT | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 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 |

* Result significant at 0.05; ** Result significant at 0.01; *** Result significant at 0.001.

The recommended minimum acceptable Cronbach's Alpha is 0.70 (Taber 2018). From the output above, the highest alpha was for organizational performance ($\alpha$ = 0.909), while the second highest was for innovation ($\alpha$ = 0.875) followed by communication ($\alpha$ = 0.827). On the other hand, the lowest alpha was for decision-making ($\alpha$ = 0.737), the second lowest being creativity ($\alpha$ = 0.746), while the third lowest was for teamwork ($\alpha$ = 0.754). Since none of these alpha coefficients were 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 et al. 2016). The results above show that the lowest AVE statistic was 0.639 for the teamwork construct, while the second lowest was 0.663 for the innovation construct, and the third lowest being 0.683 for the construct decision-making. On the other end, the highest AVE was for the organizational performance construct (0.767), while the 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 were greater than the maximum threshold of 0.85, it can be confirmed that discriminant validity was not violated.

With the reliability and validity of the constructs having been confirmed, the researcher further investigated 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 four 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 Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree [1] up to strongly agree [5]. According to Hair et al. (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 4.

**Table 4.** Descriptive Statistics.

| | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|
| Managers communicate frequently with subordinates | 3.77 | 0.929 |
| Managers allow views of employees to be heard | 3.30 | 1.047 |
| Managers usually consult subordinates to solve problems | 3.08 | 0.967 |
| Managers have an open-door policy | 3.21 | 0.999 |
| **Overall Communication** | 3.34 | 0.799 |
| Managers encourage teamwork | 4.15 | 0.624 |
| Managers and subordinates always consult each other | 3.15 | 0.951 |
| 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 | 0.968 |
| **Overall Teamwork** | 3.30 | 0.695 |
| 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 organization will perform poorly | 4.35 | 0.758 |
| **Overall Decision-making** | 3.28 | 0.718 |
| Employees in this organization are very creative | 3.96 | 0.764 |
| Employees are encouraged to bring new ideas always | 3.76 | 0.886 |
| Employees are very inquisitive and always have new ideas | 3.56 | 0.906 |
| Without new ideas filtering through, our organization will perform poorly | 4.48 | 0.753 |
| **Overall Creativity** | 3.94 | 0.558 |
| It is easy to turn new ideas into successful innovations in this organization | 3.03 | 1.121 |
| Managers encourage employees to be innovative | 3.61 | 0.902 |
| Employees are rewarded for successful innovations | 2.72 | 0.944 |
| Innovation is the only way to stimulate performance of our company | 3.97 | 1.121 |
| **Overall Innovation** | 3.33 | 0.594 |
| Performance of our organization depends on communication | 4.41 | 0.821 |
| Performance of our organization depends on teamwork | 4.38 | 0.704 |
| Performance of our organization depends on employee participation in decision-making | 4.00 | 1.000 |
| Performance of our organization depends on creativity | 4.17 | 0.941 |
| Performance of our organization depends on innovation | 4.28 | 0.865 |
| **Overall Performance** | 4.25 | 0.740 |

Communication: All 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 was on whether the management has an open-door policy (M = 3.21; SD = 0.999). However, the lowest rated communication item was on whether the management usually consulted 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 organizations, 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 lowest 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 organizations. 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 confirm the poor level of decision-making 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 organizations 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 organization (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 four items. The rating with the highest mean was on the significance of new ideas filtering through the organization 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 organizations where the participants were from. It was also confirmed that, generally, employees were being encouraged to bring new ideas (M = 3.76; SD = 0.886). The lowest 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 organizations.

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 organization (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 disagreed 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.

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 mean 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 lowest rating was for the dependence of organizational performance on employee participation in decision-making (M = 4.00; SD = 1.000), while the second lowest 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 lowest 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 the 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, $p > 0.05$. 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 it is 5.0 (Garson 2012; Gravetter and Wallnau 2017). The results are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Collinearity Diagnostics.

| Dimension | Eigenvalue | Condition Index | Tolerance | VIF | Tolerance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (Constant) | 5.903 | 1.000 | | | |
| Communication | 0.043 | 11.781 | 0.268 | 3.729 | 0.268 |
| Teamwork | 0.021 | 16.884 | 0.319 | 3.136 | 0.319 |
| Decision-making | 0.016 | 18.954 | 0.489 | 2.047 | 0.489 |
| Creativity | 0.010 | 24.578 | 0.819 | 1.221 | 0.819 |
| Innovation | 0.008 | 27.461 | 0.629 | 1.591 | 0.629 |

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 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. As shown in Table 6, 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 6 also presents the overall model summary.

**Table 6.** Overall Model Summary.

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | SE | Durbin–Watson |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.748 [a] | 0.559 | 0.534 | 0.706 | 1.733 |

[a] Predictors: (Constant), Innovation, Creativity, Communication, Decision-making, and Teamwork. 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 7.

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 lowest coefficient was for teamwork: $\beta_{tem}$ = 0.158 (t = 1.976, $p < 0.05$). Since all the p-values were less than 0.05, all the null hypotheses were rejected. In other words, the alternative hypotheses proposed were all confirmed:

H1. 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.

**Table 7.** Regression Coefficients.

| | Unstandardized | | Standardized | T | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | Beta | | |
| (Constant) | 1.860 | 0.691 | | 2.690 | 0.009 |
| Communication | 0.315 | 0.210 | 0.234 | 3.497 | 0.000 |
| Teamwork | 0.173 | 0.223 | 0.158 | 1.976 | 0.047 |
| Decision-making | 0.246 | 0.174 | 0.233 | 3.148 | 0.000 |
| Creativity | 0.342 | 0.171 | 0.256 | 4.005 | 0.000 |
| Innovation | 0.213 | 0.182 | 0.170 | 2.171 | 0.013 |

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 contribute to performance other than these five. The captains of the insurance industry, despite the problems bedevilling the Zimbabwean economy, will find this study's results helpful. Insurance companies in Zimbabwe and beyond help pool risk and further reduce the impact of losses companies incur locally and across borders. 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.

## 4. Discussion

Many studies have found that employees' involvement in decision-making, teamwork, communication, creativity, and innovation has a significant impact on the performance of an organization.

This study's findings highlight the importance of allowing employees to be part of decision-making bodies in organizations. As a result of their involvement, employees feel a sense of belonging to the organization and a commitment to its success. Besides making them feel respected, honoured, and loved (Abbas 2021), participation in decision-making enables them to showcase their skills and competencies. Thompson et al. (2020) and Porter (1985) keep reminding companies to respect their employees since they are a source of core competencies. Chimaobi and Chikamnele (2020) observed that participation in decision-making motivates employees to put more effort into their jobs as committed organizational citizens. They argue that employees focus on attaining organizational goals when managers give them room to participate in decision-making. Individual employees' performance and productivity are likely to be enhanced as a result. Moreover, staff turnover and absenteeism decrease or disappear altogether.

However, besides participation in decision-making, this study's findings also reveal that communicating the desired strategic change to employees is a seedbed for organizational success, productivity, and performance. Agyeiwaa and Arboh (2022) point out that communication between managers and employees must be clear and unambiguous to drive organizational performance. Therefore, communication is vital to ensuring that managers and their subordinates are united in their quest for achieving a competitive advantage. It clarifies many issues that might derail teamwork and further removes roadblocks in employees' minds to allow the accomplishment of set objectives (Bucata and Rizescu 2017; Musheke and Phiri 2021). The result is that organizations are able to focus more on productivity and performance when they have open communication networks that are not constrained by bottlenecks. According to Ahmad and Huvilla (2019), sharing information with employees has more advantages than disadvantages. An effective communication flow between the concerned parties improves the performance of the organization and the individual employees (Ahmad and Huvilla 2019). The work environment becomes friendly and motivational to entice commitment from employees.

This study's findings reveal that successful organizations rely on teamwork, where managers and employees put their heads together to solve problems affecting the organization. Well-informed and motivated employees focus on accomplishing goals. The findings concur with Agarwal and Adjirackor (2016) that united and motivated employees develop teamwork and team spirit. Managers and employees can therefore pull in the same direction when they have a chance to air their views on decision-making (Saha and Kumar 2017), are well informed of the developments in the organization (Ahmad and Huvilla 2019), and are free to come up with creative ideas (Mafini 2015). To this end, employees working together as a cohesive unit create room for creativity and innovation to emerge. Chinhanga (2018) believes an organization that is not creative and innovative becomes irrelevant in the marketplace. Customers may abandon its products and services as a result.

## 5. Conclusions

In today's ever-changing global markets, there is evidence of some companies from diverse industries struggling to meet their objectives due to poor performance. Some companies still do not realise the need to involve employees in strategic change initiatives, yet performance in competitive markets depends on managers and their subordinates working as a coherent team. Companies in the Zimbabwean insurance industry are not an exception. However, good performance is possible if managers involve employees in strategic change initiatives. This study's findings show that each of the five variables of employee involvement positively impacts organizational performance. This study's findings are original and will contribute to the literature on the effect of employee involvement on the performance of insurance companies. This study's findings will therefore provide insights that can inform strategies and practices managers can employ to enhance the importance of involving employees in strategic change programmes.

Despite being subdued by the COVID-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. Furthermore, this study's findings will bring positive change in companies locally, in Sub-Saharan Africa, and globally when top managers accept and embrace employees' suggestions and contributions in the strategic decision-making process. Moreover, the performance of insurance companies, which previously were struggling, is likely to improve due to the involvement of motivated employees in strategic change programmes.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, B.Z.C. and L.N.; methodology, B.Z.C. and L.N.; software, B.Z.C. and L.N.; validation, B.Z.C. and L.N.; formal analysis, B.Z.C. and L.N.; investigation, B.Z.C. and L.N.; resources, B.Z.C. and L.N.; data curation, B.Z.C. and L.N.; writing—original draft preparation, B.Z.C. and L.N.; writing—review and editing, B.Z.C. and L.N.; visual-ization B.Z.C. and L.N.;

supervision, B.Z.C.; project administration, B.Z.C.; funding acquisition, B.Z.C. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Data Availability Statement:** We cannot provide data due to ethical restrictions.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

Abbas, Sahar K. 2021. Team building Effect in Improving Employees' Performance for Government Institutions. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal* 27: 1–12.

Agarwal, Shipra, and Ashish Garg. 2012. The Importance of Communication within Organizations: A Research on Two Hotels in Uharakhand. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management* 3: 40–49. Available online: https://www.iosrjournals.org (accessed on 8 January 2023). [CrossRef]

Agarwal, Sonal, and Theophilus Adjirackor. 2016. Impact of Teamwork on Organizational Productivity in Some Selected Basic Schools in the Accra Metropolitan Assembly. *European Journal of Business, Economics and Accounting* 4: 40–52. Available online: https://www.idpublication.org (accessed on 15 November 2022).

Agyeiwaa, Owusu E., and Fransisca Arboh. 2022. The Role of Communication on Organizational Performance: A Case Study of Ghana's National Health Insurance Scheme. *International Journal of Healthcare Sciences* 10: 366–76. [CrossRef]

Ahmad, Farhan, and Isto Huvilla. 2019. Organizational changes, trust and information sharing: An empirical study. *Aslib Journal of Information Management* 71: 677–92. [CrossRef]

Al Khajeh, Ebrahim H. 2018. Impact of Leadership Styles on Organizational Performance. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research* 2018: 687849. [CrossRef]

Anderson, Neil R., Jing Zhou, and Kristina Potočnik. 2014. Innovation and Creativity in Organizations: A State-of-the-Science Review, Prospective Commentary, and Guiding Framework. *Journal of Management* 40: 1297–333. [CrossRef]

Asa, Romeo A., Johanna Pangeiko Nautwima, and Jesaria Khom-Oabes. 2023. The Role of Strategic Change Management in Enhancing Academic Institutions' Sustainability. *International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Administration* 9: 41–53. [CrossRef]

Bucata, George, and Alexandru M. Rizescu. 2017. The Role of Communication in Enhancing Work Effectiveness of an Organization. *Land Forces Academy Review* 22: 49. [CrossRef]

Chimaobi, Ijeoma, and Mbah Jacintha Chikamnele. 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. [CrossRef]

Chinhanga, Samuel S. 2018. Creativity and Innovation play a significant role in business performance in the modern-day organization. *International Journal of Social Relevance and Concern* 6: 13–25.

Chummun, Bibi Z., and Anesh Singh. 2019. Factors Influencing the Quality of Decision-Making Using Business Intelligence in a Metal Rolling Plant in KwaZulu-Natal. *Journal of Reviews on Global Economics* 8: 1108–20. [CrossRef]

Chummun, Bibi Z., and Mpho Mathithibane. 2020. Challenges and Coping Strategies of Covid-2019 in the Tourism Industry in Mauritius. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure* 9: 810–22. [CrossRef]

Easterby-Smith, Mark, Richard Thorpe, and Paul Jackson. 2015. *Management Research*, 5th ed. Thousand Oaks: Cage Publications.

Field, Andy. 2018. *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS for Windows*, 5th ed. Los Angeles: Sage.

Fusch, Gene E., Lawrence Ness, Booker Janet M., and Patricia Fusch. 2020. People and Process: Successful Change Management Initiatives. *Journal of Social Change* 12: 166–84. [CrossRef]

Garson, David G. 2012. *Testing Statistical Assumptions*. Asheboro: Statistical Associates Publishing.

George, Darren, and Paul Mallery. 2019. *IBM Statistics 26 Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*, 16th ed. New York: Routledge. [CrossRef]

Gravetter, Frederick J., and Larry B. Wallnau. 2017. *Statistics for the Behavioural Sciences*, 10th ed. Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage.

Hair, Joseph F., Michael M. Page, and Niek Brunsveld. 2020. *Essentials of Business Research Methods*, 4th ed. New York: Routledge.

Hair, Joseph F., William C. Black, Barry J. Babin, and Rudolf E. Anderson. 2019. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 8th ed. London: Cengage Learning.

Healey, Joseph F. 2012. *Statistics: A Tool for Social Research*, 9th ed. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Howell, Kerry E. 2013. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Methodology*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Ltd. [CrossRef]

Isik, Musab, Kursad Timuroglu, and Yussuf Aliyev. 2015. The Relationship between Teamwork and Organizational Trust. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* 4: 113–32. [CrossRef]

Jöreskog, Karl G., Ulf H. Olsson, and Fan Y. Wallentin. 2016. *Multivariate Analysis with LISREL*. Basel: Springer.

Joshi, Ankur, Saket Kale, Satish Chandel, and Dinesh K. Pal. 2015. Likert Scale: Explored and Explained. *British Journal of Applied Science and Technology* 7: 396–403. [CrossRef]

Kentab, Mohammad 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: 881–96. [CrossRef]

Kirk, Andy. 2016. *Data Visualisation: A Handbook for Data Driven Design*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Kotter, John P., and Leonard A. Schlesinger. 2008. Choosing Strategies for Change. *Harvard Business Review* 86: 20–36. [CrossRef]

Mafini, Chengedzai. 2015. Predicting Organizational Performance Through Innovation, Quality and Inter-Organizational Systems: A Public Sector Perspective. *Journal of Applied Business Research* 31: 939–52. [CrossRef]

Mambula, Charles J., Felix Francis, and Clifford Zirra T. O. 2021. Effect of Employee Involvement in Decision Making and Organization Productivity. *Archives of Business Research* 9: 28–34. [CrossRef]

Musheke, Mukelabai M., and John Phiri. 2021. The Effects of Effective Communication on Organizational Performance Based on the Systems Theory. *Open Journal of Business and Management* 9: 659–71. [CrossRef]

Nebo, Chidiebere S., Precious N. Nwankwo, and Rito Ifeoma Okonkwo. 2015. The Role of Effective Communication on Organizational Performance: A Study of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, AWKA. *Review of Public Administration and Management* 4: 131–48. Available online: www.arabianjbmr.com/RPAM_index.php (accessed on 8 February 2022).

Nleya, Lizanani, and Bibi Z. Chummun. 2021. The effect of strategic leadership capabilities on the development of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Problems and Perspectives in Management* 19: 97–109. [CrossRef]

Obiekwe, Onyebuchi, Gideon Olakunle Mobolade, and Mojisola Esther Akinade. 2021. Team Building and Teamwork in Organizations: Implications to Managers and Employees in Work Places. *International Journal of Management, Social Sciences, Peace and Conflict Studies* 4: 261–74.

Obiekwe, Onyebuchi, Isaac Zeb-Obipi, and Henry Ejo-Orusa. 2019. Employee Involvement in Organizations: Benefits, Challenges and Implications. *Management and Human Resource Journal* 8: 1–11.

Ogbonda, Eno. 2023. Enhancing Employee Involvement and Participation in Work Settings. *International Journal of Management Sciences* 10: 132–50.

Phipps, Simone T. A., Leon C. Prieto, and Erastus N. Ndinguri. 2013. Understanding the impact of employee involvement on organizational productivity: The moderating role of organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Culture Communications and Conflict* 17: 107–20.

Porter, Michael E. 1985. *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*. Glencoe: The Free Press. Available online: http://eprints.stiperdharmawacana.ac.id/56/1/%5BMichael_E._Porter%5D_Competitive_advantage_creatin%28BookFi%29.pdf (accessed on 20 January 2023).

Raghunathan, Trivellore. 2015. *Missing Data Analysis in Practice*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Saha, Shipli, and S. Pavan Kumar. 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* 22: 79–101. [CrossRef]

Saunders, Mark N. K., Philip Lewis, and Adrian Thornhill. 2019. *Research Methods for Business Students*, 8th ed. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.

Singh, Satwinder, Darwish Tamer K., and Kristina Potocnik. 2016. Measuring organisational performance: A case for subjective measures. *British Journal of Management* 27: 214–24. [CrossRef]

Sofijanova, E., and Vesna Zabijakin-Chatleska. 2013. Employee Involvement and Organizational Performance: Evidence from the Manufacturing Sector in the Republic of Macedonia. *Trakia Journal of Sciences* 11: 31–36. Available online: https://www.uni-sz.bg (accessed on 17 November 2022).

Taber, Keith S. 2018. The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education* 48: 1273–96. [CrossRef]

Tanujaya, Benidiktus, Rully Charitas Indra Prahmana, and Jeinne Mumu. 2022. Likert Scale in Social Sciences Research: Problems and Difficulties. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences* 16: 89–101. [CrossRef]

Thompson, Arthur R., Margaret A. Peteraf, John E. Gamble, and Lonnie A. J. Strickland III. 2020. *Crafting and Executing Strategy: The Quest for Competitive Advantage: Concepts and Cases*, 22nd ed. New York: McGraw Hill.

Thompson, Bruce. 2018. *Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Understanding Concepts and Applications*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Trunfio, Teresa A., Ariana Scala, Cristiana Giglio, Giovanni Rossi, Maria Romano, and Giovanni Improta. 2022. Multiple regression model to analyse the total LOS for patients undergoing laparoscopic appendectomy. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making* 22: 141. [CrossRef]

Ulrich, Andre, Malte ReiBig, Silke Niehoff, and Grischa Beier. 2023. Employee involvement and participation in digital transformation: A combined analysis of literature practitioners' expertise. *Journal of Organisational Change Management* 36: 29–48. [CrossRef]

van Buuren, Stef. 2012. *Flexible Imputation of Missing Data*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Interdisciplinary Statistics. Boca Raton: Chapman and Hall/CRC. Available online: https://stefvanbuuren.name/fimd/ (accessed on 20 January 2023).

ZIMSTAT. 2019. Employees and Earnings by Industrial Sector. *Quarterly Digest of Statistics Third Quarter*. Available online: www.zimstat.co.zw/wp-constant/uploads/publications/Miscellenious/Digest_Q3_2019.pdf (accessed on 20 January 2023).