EFFECT OF JOB REDESIGN ON EMPLOYEES PERFORMANCE:
A CASE STUDY OF THE INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR
RESEARCH AND AGRO-FORESTRY (ICRAF)

BY

HAWA JAMILA AHMED

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY-AFRICA

SUMMER 2018
EFFECT OF JOB REDESIGN ON EMPLOYEES PERFORMANCE: A CASE STUDY OF THE INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR RESEARCH AND AGRO-FORESTRY (ICRAF)

BY

HAWA JAMILA AHMED

A Research Project Report Submitted to the Chandaria School of Business in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Science in Organization Development

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY-AFRICA

SUMMER 2018
STUDENT’S DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that this projects report is my original work and has not been submitted to any other college, institution or university other than United States International University-Africa in Nairobi for academic credit.

Signed: ___________________________  Date: ___________________________

Hawa Jamila Ahmed (ID No: 652272)

This project has been presented for examination with my approval as the appointed supervisor

Signed: ___________________________  Date: ___________________________

Dr. Teresia Linge

Signed: ___________________________  Date: ___________________________

Dean, Chandaria School of Business
COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2018 Hawa Jamila Ahmed. No part of this Master of Science in Organization Development project may be copied, reproduced, used to create derivative works, publicly distributed or displayed, or transmitted including but not limited to storage in a retrieval system, or transmission electronically, mechanically via photocopying, recording, or other means without the prior written permission of the author.
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the influence of job redesign on employee performance at ICRAF. The study was guided by the following research questions: To what extend does job enlargement influence employee’s performance at ICRAF? To what extend does job enrichment influence employees performance at ICRAF? And to what extend does task autonomy influence employees performance at ICRAF?

The study utilized descriptive research design. The target population included 545 employees working at World Agro-forestry Centre (ICRAF). The study applied random sampling technique. A sample size of 85 respondents was calculated from the target population. The study utilized structured questionnaire with close ended questions as the primary tool for data collection. Descriptive statistics was computed using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations. Inferential statistics was computed using regression test, which assessed whether job enlargement, job enrichment and task autonomy affected employee performance (outcome). The data was analyzed by a computer software named Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and the outcome was presented in tables and figures.

Findings on the job enlargement and employee performance indicate that a majority of the respondents were strongly in agreement that job enlargement contributes to increased levels of job satisfaction. Further, the respondents agreed that job enlargement contributes to increased tasks efficiency, enhanced level of operational capacity and enhanced employee’s motivation. The findings indicate that respondents moderately agreed that job enlargement contributed to identification of capacity shortfall, matched skills and competencies and finally enhancement towards execution of responsibilities. The study thus found that job enlargement wielded significant effect on employee performance within ICRAF.

On the aspect of job enrichment and employee performance, job enrichment contributed to an overall increase in duties and responsibilities the respondents were facing. The findings also show that job enrichment has impacted on areas of self-management and work independence. In addition, respondents agreed that, job enrichment has resulted in increased confidence in decision making on operational strategies and also impacted on the work delivery timelines.
The study therefore makes a finding that, job enrichment impact on employee esteem, motivation, confidence and quality thus impacting on employee performance.

The findings on task autonomy and employee performance indicate that majority of the respondents were in agreement that task autonomy contributed to increased levels of work commitment. The findings indicate that respondents expressed overwhelming agreement that task autonomy boosts employee confidence in executing their duties and responsibilities. In addition, the respondents agreed that task autonomy contributed to improvement in self efficiency in task execution amongst employees. The findings also show that the respondents agree that job enrichment positively impacts on self-motivation, esteem and trust amongst employees. The study hence establishes that task autonomy yields significant influence on employee performance at ICRAF.

Major conclusions drawn from this study indicate that job enlargement factors notably; job satisfaction, task execution efficiency, employee competencies and interests, work motivation, employee attitude on work engagements, capacity adjustment, and organizational capacity are central determinants of employee performance within an organization. The study concludes that job enrichment factors notably; employee job attendance, employee self-management, employee decision making, operational autonomy, employee work quality and employee work commitment wielding overwhelming influence. The study also concludes that task autonomy factors including; employee work commitment, employee operational confidence, operational efficiency, employee level of trust, employee self-motivation strategies, employee self-esteem and individual task responsibility wield overwhelming influence on employee performance.

The recommendations submitted from this study seek to encourage for the adoption of best practices when instituting job redesign programs within an organization. The study recommends for the adoption of adoption of performance evaluation tools to aid in the implementation of job redesign programs and employee task reorganization since they can aid the identification of areas that will reciprocate the job reorganization plans with enhanced operational productivity. The study also recommends for the reorganization and continued improvement of work environment to give organization employees favorable environment to exercise their responsibilities to the optimal capacity.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Problem

Job redesign is an essential undertaking within an organizational, operational scope that has the potential of enhancing employee performance. Initiatives focusing on job redesign are centred on the component of employee performance, which forms the central determinant in the overall success of the organization (Kytöharju, 2013). Whereas employee performance is tantamount to overall organizational performance, the total employee performance is subject to other organizational facets such as corporate culture, reward systems, work environment and overall motivation strategies (Opiyo, Ochieng & Awuor, 2014). Job redesign has emerged as one of the organizational initiatives that can help shape the operational framework and consolidate optimal productivity. Through continued evaluation of job-related components, it is possible to identify the strengths and value of each element and devise a mechanism to optimize their contribution towards increasing employee productivity and general organizational performance (Mensa-Bonsu, 2012).

There is significant value in appraising employee performance components as an approach to the implementation of job redesign initiatives (Siruri & Muathe, 2014). Critical aspects of implementing job redesign must focus on each item in the work chain, which eventually determines net organizational productivity. These items include employee roles and their quantified input across the corporate, operational framework. Dessler and Varkey (2009) observed that employee's role in an organization form the foundational pillar upon which organizational performance is derived from. Therefore, an initiative aimed at increasing or enhancing organizational productivity must commence with the improvement of employee performance. Employee performance is linked with overall organizational productivity and competitiveness. Thus job redesign program that aims to enhance overall organizational performance must centralize on shaping and with the determination of the employee component to its optimal output (Alber, 2007).
Execution of job redesign initiative must focus on the organizational, administrative objectives on job enhancement and optimization of employee productivity (Frankforter & Cristen, 2005). There is the need for an elegant approach through which all roles within the purview of the organizational, operational framework are subject to continued review and assessment through job redesign with the intention of seeking to empower each role to enhance its output. According to Ugboro (2006), thoughtfully devised jobs have a positive impact on employee motivation and job performance, which leads to improved overall organizational performance outcomes such as reduced employee turnover, high productivity, and initiative to perform beyond expectations. Besides, the realization of optimal output from the human resources makes it possible address other organizational factors that are fundamental for the realization of overall increased organizational performance (Campion, Mumford, Morgeson & Nahrgang, 2005).

There is the need for aligning all operational activities with the organizational overall performance targets. Through job redesign, emphasis should centralize on improving internal efficiencies towards the realization of increased outcome from the human resource pool (Elloy, 2012). According to Kytoharju (2013) Efficiency is the outcome of job design resulting in the highest productivity within a short span of time, i.e., making employees understand their jobs efficiently. Additionally, job redesign tackles internal efficiency from an employee's perspective as well as adeptness derived from worker's motivation to give the best at work because they have a sincere interest in the job. (Campion, 2005) observed that the basic rule in job redesign is to attain stimulating jobs with positive psychological impact on the worker so that the employee will get more motivated to do the job, which in turn contributes, to higher productivity and increased performance.

Using job redesign to enhance employee's levels of commitment to their job description requires the understanding of their job characteristics dimensions. The job characteristics model that as pitched by Hackman and Oldham in 1976 highlighted specific job features factors that wield influence on employee's mind thereby impacting on their work performance (Kytoharju, 2013). Rehman (2011) linked job characteristics with the job satisfaction, motivation, and performance, noting that they present an explanatory relationship. The idea presents a psychological ownership feat based on Hackman and Oldham's Job Characteristics
Model. The scholars determined that it is the feeling of ownership that creates motivation for high productivity at the personal level. They also highlighted the possibility for undesirable results emanating from job enrichment's psychological aspect such as anxiety, physical and psychological drain, defensive behavior, and isolation from other employees (Pierce, Jussila & Cummins, 2009).

Scholars link up the job description to employee contentment where they suggest that employee job satisfaction merely is how contented employees are with their jobs. A researcher can use various survey methods to measure job satisfaction. The standard variables measured in job design surveys are employee rewards, work volumes, perceptions of management, flexibility, teamwork, career progression, working condition, and managerial approach (Abdi, Sarwar, Imran, Jabbar & Hannan, 2013).

Job redesign should also seek to explore on expanded facets of employee-centered approach that appreciates employee engagement. Kangure (2015) focused on the aspect of operational efficiency enhancement through job designing centered on employee engagement. Balkin and Cardy (2010) noted that some employees are already highly motivated and enthusiastic regarding their work. Cavanagah and Virdie (2007) on the other hand argue that employee engagement is a three-pronged approach composed of intellectual engagement which is a thought process that results in high performance; active engagement which is a feeling associated with doing a good work; and social engagement which denotes seizing every available opportunity to deliberate matters relating to job improvement with colleagues. Australian Public Service (2010) explains that engagement utilizes a range of human behavior and attitudes including motivation, commitment, satisfaction, desire to align with organizational goals, and the desire to achieve the organizational goals. Furthermore, engagement is frequently linked with outcomes such as loyalty to the organization and its goals, support for the workplace, as well as sense that employees will exert extra effort to achieve the organizational goals (Kangure, 2015).

This study proposes the valuation of Job characteristics dimensions centered in three fundamental components, notably; job enlargement, job enrichment, and task autonomy. Campion, Mumford, Morgeson & Nahrgang (2005) noted that whereas job enlargement
focuses on increasing operational tasks for organization employees, to deliver on each task effectively requires a spectrum of operational freedom and autonomy to give them self-controlled delivery capacity. Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli (2009) stressed that job description influenced employee's levels of involvement to work and the experience regarding significant enthusiasm and challenge. To achieve optimal employee performance, organizations need to engage in proper and applicable job designs plans. Task autonomy is tied to confidence, support one another, and motivating employees to develop their skills further while at the same time respecting the current skills they have. Thus in employing job redesign, there is a need for understanding the implication of job enlargement, job description and task autonomy in the realization of optimal employee performance.

The study will examine the effect of Job redesign on employee performance at the World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF). ICRAF is a scientific institution whose primary operations center in offering scientific information on the benefits of trees to ordinary people and the environment. ICRAF integrated data science in its operational framework, through providing environment practitioners and stakeholders, such as farmers, with technical data on various environment management techniques, which confers them with environmentally friendly farming methods that not only improves the farm yields and food security but also contributes to the sustainable environment.

ICRAF has comprehensive employee performance enhancement programs that are continuously reviewed to ensure that they impart the best skills and knowledge geared towards the enhancement of the organization's roles in formulating Agro-forestry centered policies that promote care for the environment. The organization is guided by the vision of the world with the equitable distribution of resources and healthy livelihoods tied to productivity and a healthy environment. The organization uses its research to advance meaningful programs and customs and pushes the application of the policies to the advantage of the poor and the environment. ICRAF administration encourages the human resources to facilitate capacity development programs that are correlated to the emerging trends in employee productivity. This is supported through an annual allocation of sufficient human capital development budget with the sole purpose of enhancing the employee performance.
The organization pays particular attention to the roles each employee plays in the overall corporate framework. Through employee participation initiative, the departmental supervisors are tasked with seeking employee contribution in different assignments by allocating them assignments which are expected to be presented before the panel of select organizational stakeholders. Through this, the employees are required to work on assignments that contribute positively to organizational overall corporate objectives.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Even though job redesign is a well-known operational strategy that has been embraced by numerous organizations, there is little information on its effect on the performance of employees (Siruri & Muathe, 2014). Mensa-Bonsu (2012) used a comparative evaluation on the use of job design to build employee motivation mechanism as a way of improving employee performance within an organization. The study found an association between the employee performance and the success of continued capacity development. Marwa and Muathe (2014), carried out an evaluation of job design for socio-technical systems. They found that, job design was a factor of socio-technical systems which form central determinants of employee performance.

Muhoro (2015) evaluated the factors that were central to the performance of employees in the government run agencies. The study linked employee performance to clarity in job description. In addition, Muhoro (2015) adduced that employee performance was subject to employee perceptions on their job structure and the work environment.) Approaches to job redesign as a mechanism of implementing employee performance evaluation (Opiyo, Ochieng & Owuor, 2014).

The aforementioned studies centered on the aspect of organizational driven programs of job redesign that are focused on the realization of organizational performance. The studies fail to demonstrate the importance of job redesign on the employee performance within the purview of organizational operational framework (Mahmoud, 2014). There is need for an investigation that will create an understanding on what espouses job redesign and its effect on employee performance. This study sought to evaluate the effects of job redesign on the employee
performance with emphasis on three job characteristics, notably; job enlargement, job enrichment and task autonomy.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of Job Redesign on the employee performance.

1.4 Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following research questions;

1.4.1: What is the influence of job enlargement on the performance of employees at ICRAF?

1.4.2: What is the influence of job enrichment on the performance of employees at ICRAF?

1.4.3: What is the influence of task autonomy on the performance of employees at ICRAF?

1.5 Significance of the Study

1.5.1 The Management of ICRAF

This study sought to examine the role of undertaking job redesign in the realization of employee performance. The study findings, assisted in formulating the recommendations on how organizations can effectively conduct job redesign to impact positively on employee productivity and eventual increased employee performance. The study hopes that the recommendations of this study will help the management of ICRAF, identify pro-active approaches to executing effective job redesign in order to affect positive outcome in terms of increased employee productivity.

1.5.2 The Government

The findings informed the formulated recommendations on the subject of employee productivity through effective job redesign frameworks. The study hopes that, these recommendations will wield reference for policy formulation that can be used by the
government to implement industry standards on undertaking of job redesign by corporate organizations.

1.5.3 Scholars and Academicians

The literature on job redesign is replete with content centered on job redesign that is focused on overall organizational performance. This study expands knowledge on the impact of job redesign on the performance of employees in an organization. The study hopes that this will enrich the field of organizational development and add more content that can be referenced by academicians and students on organizational development.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study was carried out at ICRAF which is based at North West region of Nairobi County. The study targeted all the employees in the organization, who were selected through the method of simple random sampling. ICRAF is estimated to have about 500 serving active employees. The study was carried out from April to June 2018. Some of the respondents were uncomfortable to fill some questions but they were assured that the process was completely anonymous and untraceable.

1.7 Definitions of Terms

1.7.1 Job Redesign

This is the process of restructuring the elements of a job like tasks, roles, duties and responsibilities (Campion, 2005).

1.7.2 Job Enlargement

It is a technique that involves the increase in the number of tasks associated with a particular job. It also means that the scope of one’s responsibilities is increased (Kytoharju, 2013).
1.7.3 Job enrichment

Job enrichment is seen as a process where management allocates more responsibilities from the superiors to the employees (Salau, Adeniji & Oyewunmi, 2014).

1.7.4 Task Autonomy

Is the execution of one’s duties and responsibilities with a determined level of freedom (Crane, 2010).

1.8 Chapter Summary

This section of the study examines the background to the problem and presented the statement of the problem in regard to the influence of job redesign on employee performance. Chapter one covers; the background of the study, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions, justification of the study, scope of the study and the operational definition of terms. Chapter two covers the literature review, examining past studies that have been done on the effect job redesign on the performance of employees within an organization. Chapter three reviews the research methodology which details the process that was used in data collection. Chapter four presents the data gathered from the field survey. Finally, chapter five covers a summary of the findings, discussion, conclusion and recommendations for the study.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

The second part of the study covers relevant textual evidence on the subject of job redesign and its effect on the performance of employees in an organization. The chapters shall explore on past studies as published by scholars in organizational management on the importance of job redesign and employee performance. The section evaluates, the primary job redesign factors, notably, job enlargement, job description and task autonomy on the performance of employees in an organization.

2.2 Job Enlargement and Employee Performance

Job enlargement is described as the process of allocating employee’s additional identical activities, which eventually increases the number of duties that they perform (Dessler, 2005). Raza and Nawaz (2011) observed that the fundamental determinants of employee's behavior at work are related to job enlargement. As a result, more studies are needed to determine the effects of job enlargement and its correlation with employee motivation, employee commitment to the organization, and job contentment. According to (Siruri & Muathe, 2014) job enlargement is an alternative reason for redesigning jobs. The consequences of job enlargement are that most employees view the move as lacking the motivating element as organizations implement it without considering the effects it will have on employee motivation. That is if such moves are bound to fail since they are not centered on employees and that it defeats the very purpose of their execution. Low employee motivation renders any benefits of job enlargement unhelpful to the organization and the employees.

Modern day corporate environment, initiatives towards job enlargement informs the actions towards expanding the scope of an employee's role and the enhancement of the primary workload (Raza & Nawaz, 2011). Organizations carry out job enlargements to increase the organizational capacity of handling new customers, to address labor shortages, or to forestall the effects of high employee turnover in the organization (Hellgren & Sverke, 2001).
Employees can positively adopt job enhancement at the beginning but as time goes by and the workload becomes heavier with no compensation forthcoming the employees can become demoralized and view the extra duties as a burden (Dessler, 2005). Some scholars argue that job enlargement is designed to meet the lower needs of Maslow theory. Raza & Nawaz (2011) concluded it is possible for job enlargement to lead to higher job satisfaction.

2.2.1 The Primary Role of Job Enlargement

Job enlargement seeks to advance specific changes in the number of tasks that the company expects an employee to accomplish. At a particular employment level (Aina & Omoniyi, 2014). Implementation of employee reforms to reassign tasks to employees incorporates appraisal activity (Saleem, Shaheem & Saleem, 2012). Ameh (2013) acknowledged the effect of job enlargement in enhancing productivity through capitalizing on the employee best capabilities in task execution. Job enlargement addresses elements of employee capacity determination through executing appraisals for the employees to be deployed. Upon determination of the employee levels of competencies abilities and the overall commitment to their daily duties makes it possible to implement seamless task reassignment (Dessler, 2005).

Researchers posited that job enlargement is a factor of reorganization of employees capacities to effect operational changes aimed at enhancing the levels of employee performance and overall organizational productivity (Saleem, Shaheen & Saleem, 2012) Aswathappa (2005) explained that job enlargement formed a critical human resources undertaking that helped in redefining employee tasks and responsibilities towards the realization of the organizational, operational objectives. The organization needs to enhance the levels of efficiency in critical operational tasks that are deemed to be operating below par of inability to achieve optimal productivity.

Ameh, (2013) noted that job enlargement enables the organization to undertake employee performance assessment and make deductions on grey areas. Underperformance evaluation, human resources department profiles the capacities by employee individual abilities in specific areas of responsibility and proceed to reassign them in their areas of excellence (Oladapo, 2011).
Raza and Nawaz (2011) addressed the subject of evaluation and reassignment, highlighting the importance of continuously undertaking the exercise. Job enlargement is viewed as a strategic undertaking by the management to implement an employee rotation strategy to continue to ensure employee best commitment for tasks assigned. Mahmoud (2014) viewed job enlargement as horizontal restructuring implemented to address numerous performance-related factors such as talent and ability matching to individual roles and tasks. Appraising assists in determining fit for the task in particular time among the organization employees to address the underlying performance shortcomings (Ewidah, 2008). Muhsan (2012) determined that the rotation of employees is subject to the determination of employee capacities and technical skills to ensure continuity and efficiency in organization operational tasks.

Mahmoud (2014) referenced Fredrick Taylor theory of scientific management positing that job enlargement is a necessary undertaking for addressing the subject of improved operational efficiency. According to task identification, Mahmoud (ibid) explains that, whereas the primary role of job enlargement seeks to reassign tasks, it is however essential to appraise all the employees about the current tasks. This helps in determining which tasks need to be improved through strategic deployment of employees in conformity to their technical abilities. Oladapo (2011) agree with The Fredrick Taylor Theory on scientific management where efforts on job reassignments center on tasks and which a particular employee is more efficient at handling. Ewidah (2008) agree with Oladapo (2011) that through evaluation of employee performance, it makes it possible to create a hierarchical model that compares efficiency in task delivery and employee skills and rank them to reassign them. In this case, job enlargement is affected by assigning employee more roles that they perform with much ease and high levels of individual efficiencies.

Kaymaz (2010) postulated that employee appraisal was necessary undertaking before the reassignment of new tasks as it enabled the organization to match individual employee interest in exercising responsibilities for particular roles. Mbah and Ikemefuna (2012) explained that the appraisal gave the organization a clear picture of which roles employees executed with the highest level of satisfaction and felt more motivated. This formed the basis for partially evaluating levels of satisfaction employees draw from performing a certain number of tasks. Since job redesign seeks to implement new operational framework with employees having
more tasks to perform, it was possible to utilize the process and address issues of motivation and satisfaction by matching competencies with interests (Ameh, 2013; Wasri & Shamim, 2009). Kaymaz (2010) observed that employees are more efficient when executing roles that they deem to be of enormous value and interest to them and subsequently offer their very best because they draw utmost satisfaction. Mahmoud (2014) notes that job enlargement should form the basis for expanding employee roles by also addressing the component of job satisfaction.

According to Jathana (2011), job enlargement is a basis for enhancing job specifications, workload, and future job security as it shows the employee's role is expanded and his stay certified which contributes to job satisfaction. Mahmoud (2014) observed that job security is the assurance that the employees have of keeping their present job. Scholars consider Job security as one of the applications of Maslow's Hierarchy of needs. That is, the job provides the employees with income, which enables them to meet their needs and secures the employees present and future life. The employees will never have job satisfaction when they are under constant threat of losing their jobs.

Raza and Nawaz (2011) noted that job enlargement leads to loss of employee social life due to an increase in the work volume. This leads to decreased motivation, lack of job satisfaction, and low commitment of employees to organizational goals. Khan (2005) carried out a study on which approaches were used by the Pakistan government to motivate its labor force. The scholar suggested that government organizations not reward employees based on their performance hence their low motivation levels compared to those of workers in the country's private sector. The scholar further argued that government workers had job security and hence no fear of job loss leading to their low performance which was not the case in the private sector. After an assessment of the motivational theories, Khan (2005) suggested ways of improving government employee’s performance levels. The scholar recognized that government organizations are non-profit making institutions hence the same motivational methods employed non-profit organizations can be applied to government sectors to motivate the workers. Additionally, the work environment is key to improving employees' attitudes and behaviors. It can be concluded that environmental conditions are a factor in employee motivation.
Koys (2001) acknowledged the need for balancing the aspects of implementing job enlargement in consideration for the importance of work contentment. According to Ketchand and Strawser (2001), equates job satisfaction to contentment gained by employees who realise the value in the job. Raza and Nawaz (2011) acknowledged that job satisfaction was subject to change with changing individual needs and how it matches with the static nature of the job. It should also be remembered that dissatisfied employees display undesirable behaviors like low performance, high absenteeism level, high turnover, and productivity below the company expectations (Koys, 2001). This underscores, the purview of job enlargement with the likelihood of impacting on employee perceptions towards the job environment and the work activities. Raza and Nawaz (2011), holds that job satisfaction is related to work attitudes and features. Therefore, besides work enlargement initiative, consequent commitment dictates that employees should be more committed to the organization rather than specific duties, work environment, and the company location.

Studies by Ameh (2013), Mahmoud (2014), and Muhsan (2012) examined the implementation of job enlargement using diverse appraisal models, with keen interest centering on the aspect of the task currently being performed and the levels of employee capacity to efficiently deliver on their operational obligations. The studies fail to address the process of assigning more roles in the aspect of bridging the perceived ‘gap.’ This is to say before job enlargement is affected, it is premised that appraisal processes commence with identifying what is the capacity of employees and proceed to allocate them more duties with a clear picture on what they are capable of. Also, the studies do not give a clear roadmap concerning allocating standardized timelines for transitioning the employees from the current posting to the new set of responsibilities.

2.2.2 Job Enlargement as a Method of Job Design

According to Mahmoud (2014), job enlargement forms the core component of job design, and the approaches organizations take to enhance organizational performance. Mahmoud (2014) further explained that the primary aim of job design is to improve work performance and
employee work satisfaction by changing the specifics of a particular job. The process allows the workers to expand their activities with the view of making work more appealing hence reducing boredom and dull routine. Besides job enlargement, the organization can employ various additional techniques to carry out job design. For instance, organizations should prioritize work enrichment which is a practical design aimed at incorporating achievement, recognition, and motivators into jobs. Dessler (2008) suggested that the purpose of job enrichment job was to increase the motivation level and promote workers satisfaction as well as improve productivity. Dressler distinguished job enlargement with job enrichment. He explained that job enlargement dealt with horizontal restructuring approach whereas job enrichment was a vertical restructuring technique that equipped employees with additional authority, independence, and ability to control the way jobs are accomplished.

Job enlargement can be enforced via job rotation approach. Mahmoud (2014) explained job rotation to be a technique where employees are transferred between one or several jobs in a prearranged manner. Therefore, it is viewed as a tool that helps organizations be more competitive since the workers are evenly distributed in the organization according to the company-specific skills needs. Furthermore, Muhsan (2012) and Kaymaz (2010) noted that through job rotation, employees had the chance to develop new skills and master new ways of carting out a duty following new procedures in the same level and difficulty. This results in the increased level of satisfaction and commitment to the organization since employees feel that the company is concerned about reducing job monotony emanating from carrying out repetitive tasks and improving the staff welfare. Kaymaz (2010) postulated that this could make individuals more satisfied and motivated.

( Oladapo, 2011) Postulated that job enlargement should form the basis through which the organization looks towards tackling existing operational needs through the consolidation of individual responsibilities. These needs are informed by an operational shortfall in specific levels within the organization. An example can be one operational unit undertaking many duties and register different levels of outputs. If output for task A is more prominent than task B, and Task C is lingering behind an operational schedule, an organization will seek to undertake team redeployment to cover the existing operational shortfalls. (Wasri & Shamim, 2009) explained that reorganization of responsibilities would mean that individual employees
will be assigned the duty to pursue the execution of more roles as long as they are addressing existing operational needs like ensuring that all operations in a particular department are registering consistent output in job productivity. (Mahmoud, 2014) noted that employees registering more work output in a particular department should be assigned more roles and assigned new formal duty portfolio that will enhance the overall department productivity.

Muhsan (2012) observed that job enlargement was a strategic undertaking by an organization to address the levels of market competitiveness. The aspect of having existing roles consolidated and aligned with a quality strategy regarding overall organizational productivity. Aswathappa (2005) explained that organizations tap into strategic service and duty redeployment to stand out in the industry of operation or sector by ensuring that its employees are assigned consolidated responsibilities that are offering unique output that is unmatched in the sector. Siruri and Muathe (2014) linked job enlargement to job portfolio redevelopment to balance the operational value and create uniqueness. In a competitive industry, the key to survival lies in the consolidation of efforts, service delivery to offer something unique, and builds on the organizations a competitive edge.

According to Kehinde (2011) job enlargement can be informed by the need to match new industry changes that require different aspects of task execution. In the technology sector, the evolution of systems and approaches to execution of specific tasks especially in software development requires the practitioners in the sector to continuously address and embrace the new task execution changes or risk lagging behind. Muhsan (2012) explained that new changes in the industry could require that employees who undertake specific task are reassigned to different roles for the organization to remain competitive. In the energy sector, companies specialized in power production are continuously faced with the need of diversifying its operations to match the prevailing market conditions. For instance, transitioning from Coal or Nuclear power production to clean energy sources such as solar and wind, the energy companies will need to retrain and also reassign its employees a new unique set of responsibilities to remain competitive in the sector.
2.3. Job Enrichment and Employee Performance

Job enhancement is a job redesign approach that seeks to realign components of job tasks through adding more responsibilities in the effort to make the job more interactive and fulfilling to the employee (Vijay & Indradevi, 2015). According to Azeez and Abimbola (2016), job enrichment is a strategy that is used in implementing additional job motivators to make it more interesting for the employees. The idea of job enhancement is widely credited to the works of Fredrick Hertzberg in his 1968 breakthrough work while examining the motivation-hygiene theory. Job enrichment seeks to inspire employees by according them enough opportunities to apply their capabilities in work-related activities (Davoudi & Mehdi, 2013).

Companies can enhance their employee's jobs by involving them in high-level decision-making activities, adding them more responsibilities, independence, and the ability to evaluate their performance (Neyshabor, 2013). Organizations can use job enrichment as a work scheme approach for augmenting job content by making jobs more appealing to the workers (Lunenburg, 2011). Studies by Herzberg between 1968 and 1969 undertook a detailed expedition on the critical aspects of job enrichment and its account for the accrued outcome in employee performance. Feder (1999) noted that some job enrichment programs, which got instituted in the previous decade, accrued an array of inconsistent results on the component of job performance.

2.3.1 The Components of Job Enrichment

Vijay and Indradevi (2015) who reviewed McLean and Sims, 1978 article on job enrichment from theoretical poverty perspective considered various components that defined the model of job enhancement and examined the scope of job enrichment initiative. The article also pointed out the weakness in the model in its applications. The scholars summarized the inadequacies so that an individual can easily understand the failures of the model. The research evidence indicated that a practitioner would be better off pursuing an approach which enables them to discover directly from the employees the meaning of their work, their aspirations and the satisfaction level the employees gain from their job (Kinick & Williams, 2009). Vijay and
Indradevi (2015) concluded that only such reformed strategy to choosing and making an informed decision can lead to positive job redesigns.

Scholars view Job enrichment as a process where management allocates more duties to the superiors and the employees (Salau, Adeniji & Oyewunmi, 2014). Job enrichment makes employees develop a sense of responsibility and gain satisfaction in their jobs. Besides, Williams (2009) postulated that job enrichment is an essential aspect encouraging employees to put more efforts in their work processes by adding them more work responsibility and according them more control over their jobs. Job enrichment is an organized way of inspiring employees by according them the opportunity to employ their various skills and abilities in carrying out a task. (Feder, 1999). Kotila (2001) linked Job enrichment with job satisfaction and explained that the by giving employees more autonomy and control over their duties, they are bound to gain more interest in their jobs leading to job satisfaction.

According to Pillai, Mashood, Amoodi, Husain & Koshy (2012), job enrichment centers in the evaluation of jobs to meet the individual needs and aspirations of the workers. The study insisted that a job enrichment programs begin with defining the jobs that had to be done and which did the program effect. The scholars further suggested that a project team made up of the task holder should be put in place to oversee the job enrichment initiative on behalf of the organization. According to Newstrom (2011) ‘brainstorming’ sessions involving jobholders could suggest as many changes as possible and invariably make the jobs more challenging and exciting, as well as provide ways to make the jobs more productive. Researchers further observed that job enrichment is not the only a strategy, but a way of managing all aspects of the organization and such job enrichment should include the full participation of the workers. (Pillai, Mashood, Amoodi, Husain & Koshy, 2012)

Raza and Nawaz (2011) explained that job enrichment is a system, which encompasses the worker needs and the organizational needs and the two forces should be merged to make the process successful. According to Eze (2004), the primary goal of job enrichment is to enhance the relationship between the employee and the job. Job- worker relationship is the primary concern of job enrichment to ensure that the worker draws more benefit with the work leading to job satisfaction (Saleem, Shaheen & Saleem, 2012). Raza and Nawaz (2011) observed
relationship changes must take place in the whole organization for workers to understand that job enrichment was designed to get the most out of them with minimal rewards since they have a formed opinion that job enrichment is manipulative. Additionally, adjusting the work responsibilities for each worker sends a positive signal to the worker-company relationship, since the employee gets fewer distractions associated with the job. Ideally, the workers can realize their real potential through job enrichment.

A study by Collins and Raubolt (1975) examined the correlation between employee background, professional traits and the level of resisting a job enhancement initiative in a large manufacturing firm. The study participants included engineers and their associates as well as drafters. The study questionnaire required information about occupation, age, education, position and period of service. The findings of the study revealed that there was a correlation between education level and the level of resistance to job enhancement programs in the organization.

Vijay and Indradevi (2015) pointed out that workers with a college degree were less resistant to job enrichment programs as compared to employees with no college degree. Other significant determinants found in Collins and Raubolt (1975) study, were age and job responsibilities. The study disclosed that young employees were less resistant than older workers were. The study further revealed that a higher number of employees performing similar tasks was less resistant than to job enrichment than the employees who were performing general tasks. The study also indicated that employees who were almost retiring were less resistant to change in job duties.

### 2.3.2 The Primary Role of Job Enrichment

Job enrichment is necessary initiative to reorganize work for productive employees (Behson, Eddy, & Lorenzet, 2000). According to Robbins and Judge (2011), job enhancement develops jobs vertically and increases the number of tasks in a job whereas job enlargement increases the span of the job. What this means is that job enrichment enables the employees to exercise greater influence in their jobs. Rentsch and Steel (1998) stated that the range of tasks in an enhanced job enables an employee to carry out the assigned duties with independence,
originality, and responsibility (Kamal, Chegg, Malcolm, Andrew, Chris, Toby & Wood, 2008). Organizations should give sufficient feedback to employees to enable them carry out an appraisal of their performance (Armstrong, 2010). In situations where job enrichment has taken place, employees display satisfaction when labour turnover reduces and as well as absenteeism (Saavedra & Kwun, 2000).

According to Choudhary (2016), Job enrichment is an approach to redesign jobs to improve intrinsic motivation and increase job satisfaction. Workers are given power over their work, and they can make their work more specialized and straightforward. Of these workers can develop the skills that they have. Also, job enrichment can make workers gain the motivation to succeed in achieving job satisfaction (Azeez & Abimbola, 2016). Because the job enrichment herein workers to do the job on their abilities. Job enrichment is expanding the design task to give more meaning and provide job satisfaction by involving workers with job planning, implementation of organizational and work supervision so that job enrichment aims to increase responsibility in decision-making, increase autonomy and authority to design jobs and expand the horizons of work, the addition of these elements to work is sometimes called the working load vertically (Davoudi & Mehdi, 2013).

Job enrichment itself is one of the engineering design work. Job enrichment can increase a person's autonomy in organizing their work (Choudhary, 2016). According to Hackman and Oldham (1980) classical approach of the job, the design is by the job characteristics theory. The theory holds the premise that jobs can give rise to three psychological states pertaining to meaning, responsibility, and knowledge of work. Williams & Kinicki (2009) noted that job enrichment is a basic aspect of motivating employees to put more effort by increasing jobs responsibility and autonomy

2.4 Task Autonomy and Employee Performance

Task autonomy is defined as the degree to which the job offers freedom to the employee to choose and schedule the work process to accomplish a task (Marchese & Ryan, 2001; Axtell, & Turner, 2001). More specifically, task autonomy can be described as the inherent choice and freedom to perform large number of tasks. Many organizations apply the theory of work design
put across by Hackman and Oldham considering it as the basis for management traditions. Application of the theory has led to higher motivation, improved performance, and high satisfaction levels of employees as well as decreased absenteeism level and commitment. Job autonomy is taken as one of the most vital job design characteristics, which have been used by most researchers (Smith, Kot & Leat, 2003).

According to Sisodia and Das (2013) task autonomy refers to the level to which organizations allows their employees to make important procedural decision regarding their duties with little or no interference. Organizations have different levels of autonomy; therefore, the impact of performance is proportional to the level of autonomy employees are offered in the organization. This means that organizations with high levels of autonomy realise better performance. Heathfield (2016) postulated that task autonomy shares a positive relationship with work engagement and it serves as an antecedent of employee commitment, and there is a possibility that the impact of employees' perceived job autonomy on commitment is conditional to their work engagement levels. This has brought the present study to examine the relationship between autonomy and engagement.

2.4.1 Aspects of Task Autonomy

Langfred and Moye (2004) noted that executing a task with a higher level of autonomy results to higher job performance and better job satisfaction. Chu (2006) examined the correlation between autonomy and happiness in Chinese in the United States. Correlation and multiple regression analysis revealed a positive correlation between self-esteem and satisfaction. The study also revealed that autonomy had a positive correlation to higher self-esteem. However, no significant relationship existed between autonomy and happiness.

A study by Sisodia and Das (2013) evaluated the impact of managerial behaviour and job autonomy on industrial salesperson's job satisfaction. The study also investigated the applicability of the theoretical framework developed for U.S. salespersons when applied to salespersons in Australia and India. The study findings suggested that observed employee independence was a significant originator to job satisfaction among salespersons from the nations under study. Surprisingly, insignificant differences were observed in the influence of
managerial attitude to job satisfaction among the sales people from the US, India, and Australia. The researcher, therefore, feels that the job autonomy varies depending on the seniority of employee position in the organization.

Task autonomy has been profoundly afflicted with employee engagement. Based on a study conducted by Yong, Suhaimi, Abdullah, Rahman & Nik (2013), in the Malaysian private sector, job autonomy is rewarded to employees who display high work productivity emanating from high level of work engagement. When the organization neglects encouraging positive characteristics or provide sufficient resources to perform tasks, employees display the negative effects of job dissatisfaction like low productivity and poor work attendance pattern (Saks, 2006). This once more indicate that the level of engagement displayed by the employee to organization goals is affected by the amount of resources invested by the firm in encouraging employees to adopt autonomy and the emotional connection that the firm makes with the employee.

Royer (2009) derived from literature that motivation is the main link between job satisfaction and autonomy. The most specific model on how motivation influences autonomy is found in Hackman and Oldham's (1976) job characteristics model. Hackman and Oldham (1976) cited by Langfred and Moye (2004) cited), pointed out that autonomy is one of five job features that determine the motivating capacity of a job. As one of a set of job characteristics, autonomy leads to the outcomes of increased motivation and work effectiveness. The motivational effect of autonomy is commonly recognised as an underlying assumption in other job autonomy-related studies. A lot of information has been derived from the correlation between autonomy and job performance from most of previous studies conducted in the field. Several researchers have tried to examine and explain the relationship between job autonomy and performance, however Sisodia & Das (2013), noted that the level of specificity in the job feature theory is limiting. The model is more general in nature and focused on autonomy amongst many other job features. The theory also focused on the motivational influences of the particular job characteristics. The model does not take a concrete position on how other ways in which autonomy affects employee job performance.
Researchers utilized a 1997 framework developed by Bundra suggested that motivation will only influence workers if they believe that they can take advantage of it. If an individual does not have the belief that they can tackle a task with autonomy, then they will be unable to develop any such perceived belief during their job performance. Therefore, beyond utility, an individual's self-interest on carrying out job with autonomy contributes to their desire on autonomy and any other motivational effects emanating from job autonomy. For example, a skilled software engineer who has developed a source code for specific types of applications for several years is much more likely to expect job discretion more than inexperienced new employee and practising writing code for the first time. An experienced worker is therefore highly likely to take full advantage of job independence to improve performance and is, therefore, highly likely to express desire for autonomy in a restrictive job environment. The new employee on the other hand will be more comfortable working under direction as they gain experience in the new job, which is an indicator that new employees have limited self-efficacy for task autonomy (Tang Phaik Lin & Chen Lee Ping, 2016).

Man and Lam (2003) noted that autonomy affects individual’s job performance when it is not bundled motivational components. Autonomy affects individual performance due to informational and decision making circumstances prevailing in the job environment. Although not sparsely detailed in task autonomy literature, an informational mechanism has been listed in motivation related literature (Chang, 2008). Specifically, informational benefits are experienced by employees with more knowledge on the job than their supervisors. For instance, experienced software engineers may have more current and technical knowledge about a particular project they are working on than their project supervisor. Hence, the more experienced and knowledgeable employees will have information related performance benefits from allowing the software engineer to participate making important decisions concerning the programming of the project. Since the more informed worker can take advantage of the task related knowledge in their possession to make relevant decisions regarding the project as a whole or specific tasks they are required to tackle.
2.4.2 The Importance of Task Autonomy

There exists a high chance to confuse autonomy with control; therefore, it is vital to distinguish the two terms. Control comprises shaping projects and specific tasks, work process, and working conditions. Autonomy, on the other hand, is the freedom to make choices on job related tasks with minimal supervision from the managers. For professionals to be successful in the work environment, they not only have to be skilled but also possess enough knowledge in their field to make independent decision regarding specific tasks. Professionals must also possess the freedom to make important decisions in their work place. Task autonomy affects work procedures and targeting setting in the organization. Individuals with autonomy have the liberty to control the pace of work and to regulate work processes and evaluation procedures (Ozturk, 2011). Autonomy involves responsibility for the work related outcomes, high work efficiency and increased motivation levels (Langfred & Moye, 2004).

There is a positive correlation between work autonomy, employee competence, and creativity. Work related autonomy allows individuals to limit their exposure to stress causing factors and as well as their access to stress causing tasks, thereby reducing feelings of threat and encouraging positive stress adapting behaviours (Kauffeld,2006). Thompson and Pottas (2005) supported finding that employees’ autonomy reduces the employees’ exposure to stress causing agents in the work place. The scholars found out that task autonomy significantly reduces job stress, intention to quit a job, and family-work conflicts. Task autonomy brings about better employee performance because individuals become more creative and skilful in accomplishing their day-to-day tasks. Individuals with high job independence are less affected by situational factors than employees with low job autonomy (Gellatly & Irving, 2001). Work-role transitions theory according to (Ozturk, 2011) shows that workers with job autonomy are able to envision how a task will end hence able to plan their work processes better.

According to Tang and Lee Ping (2016), previous studies have revealed that higher work autonomy is related to higher organizational commitment. A study by Adler (1991) cited by Tang and Lee Ping (2016), found out that that even if autonomy is granted to employees they realise little difference in their work experience. Adler's findings indicated that workers with more standardized jobs reported the equal level of autonomy as workers who had more
autonomy in their work settings. The same level of autonomy between two job categories was occasioned by standard operating procedures workers with standardized jobs had to adhere to during their work procedures. Furthermore, not much research has been done to effectively conclude the impact to the organization by allowing employees more autonomy in their jobs. Sisodia and Das (2013) initiated a study on the impact of job autonomy on the employees of different seniority levels in the organizations in India. The scholars found out those employees at higher hierarchical levels enjoyed higher autonomy levels than the employees at the lower level of the organizational structure. The study conducted by Sisodia and Das (2013) is a forerunner to the present study to focus on the views of employees at the lower hierarchical structure of the organization on autonomy.

Previous studies have examined the importance of employee autonomy in employee engagement. Based on a study conducted by Yong, Suhaimi, Abdullah, Rahman &Nik (2013) that found out that Malaysian organizations use autonomy as reward to those employees who show high commitment to their jobs with positive performance results. The study by Saks (2006) found out that employees who did not receive autonomy in their work place ended up have negative attitudes towards their jobs and the organization and saw no need to give high performance. The social engagement theory explains the different levels of engagement existing in the work place. Tang and Lee Ping (2016) explained that it social engagement can be explained by the amount of psychological and physical resources invested by the employees to boost their work performance as well as the resources invested by the organization in enhancing the employees job performance. Considering that job autonomy shares a positive relationship with engagement, and it serves as an antecedent of job commitment, there is a possibility that the effect of employees' perceived job autonomy on commitment is dependent on their engagement levels.

According to Laschinger, (2013) the fundamental factors which contribute to the levels of task autonomy within any organizational setting and have an indirect impact on employee commitment is the leadership approaches adopted by the organizational leadership. Schaufeli & Bakker (2004), observed that organizational leaders practicing transformational leadership approach tend to empower their junior employees to assume more independence in their work leading to higher sense of engagement on the employees in the work place. Also, leadership
strategies practiced by organizational leaders led to development of perception by the employees to their jobs and that managers who employed transformation leadership styles realised a positive employee job perception (Felfe & Schyns, 2006). According to Tang and Lee Ping (2016), giving employees job autonomy without any empowerment from the management affects the employee intention to stay in the organization since autonomy goes hand in hand with managerial consent to perform a task with minimal supervision.

According to Crane (2010), task autonomy also gives employees responsibility over vital job decisions. Crane (2010) further suggest that work autonomy gives employees freedom to control the job process and come up with strategies needed to reach a job target. For example, some tasks come with standardized procedures for employees to follow when delivering a task, while other work activities have no standard procedure and employees are required to come up with own processes for the task. Deci and Ryan (2011) posited that autonomy affects work behaviours since employees who are given more work freedom are able in independently plan the work procedures and set targets for the activity on which they are working. When workers are accorded discretion in their jobs, they can easily eliminate bottlenecks and devise shorter and more efficient ways to carry out a task (Joo, Jeung, and Yoon, 2010).

2.5 Chapter Summary

This section reviewed relevant literature on the effects of job redesign on the performance of employees in an organization. The section covered the spectrum of past studies on the factors on the job redesign, using empirical and theoretical evidence to examine the impact on employee performance. The next section is chapter three, which covers the research methodology that will be adopted in this study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section of the study describes the methodology that was used in the process of gathering data required for assessing the influence of job redesign on employee performance. The research methodology covers critical field research aspects, notably; research design, population & sampling, data collection methods, research procedure and data analysis methods. Research methodology, can also be explored as the research philosophy, which builds the scope for the research paradigm (Mugenda, 2008).

3.2 Research Design

Research design is a plan and structure of investigation developed with the intention of inquiring for answers to research questions (Kothari, 2010). Sekeran and Bougie (2016) posited that research design is an activity which focuses on arranging, accumulation and examination of information to give data and furthermore answers for the current issue of the investigation. Submissions by Green and Tull (2009) indicated that a research design refers to standardization of processes that are used for extracting information needed in a study. Operationally, its basic requirement to highlight the primary framework on how information will be collected and which procedures will be followed. Research design lays down the framework, which stipulates the specific activities which will be undertaken in collecting the data.

The descriptive design was used since the study will gather quantitative on the effects of Job redesign on the performance of employees. This approach made it possible to execute descriptive statistical modeling for different job redesign aspects, notably; job enlargement, job description and task autonomy and measure their impact on the performance of employees. According to Sekeran and Bougie (2016), descriptive research design is a type of design used to obtain information concerning the current status of the phenomena to describe "what exists" with respect to variables or conditions in a situation. Kothari (2010) describes descriptive
research as including surveys and fact-finding enquiries adding that the major purpose of descriptive research is description of the state of affairs as it exists.

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

Population is the entire set of units for which the study data are to be used to make inferences (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). Mugenda (2008) suggested that the target population is the entire set of units which the findings of the study are meant to be generalized. Kothari (2010) defines research population as a well-defined collection of individuals or objects known to have similar characteristics. The study targeted all the active employees working at ICRAF, across different organizational departments by the month of June 2017. According to ICRAF data on active workforce, it’s estimated that the organization has about 500 employees.

3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

Sampling frame covers the support resource such as materials and devices from which the sample will be drawn (Green & Tull, 2009). Further, sampling frame can also be defined as the list of elements from which the sample is actually drawn (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). The requisite sample frame ought to replicate total characteristics of the study population. The sampling frame can incorporate the entire set or part of the study population. The sampling frames focused on all the employees working at ICRAF and who had at least a year of working experience within the organization.

The sampling frame focused on the aspects of job redesign within the organization and how it has affected the employees. The list of employees was obtained from the human resources department at ICRAF head office. Consideration of 1-year experience is sufficient for this study, as the period of time is sufficient for an employee to familiarize themselves with all the organizational operations and the formal organizational culture, hence in a position to offer valid input.
3.3.2.2 Sampling Techniques

Sampling technique is the actual process through which the entities of a sample are selected (Kothari, 2010). Sampling technique defines the scientific procedures which are used in selecting a sample in a given set of target population (Bryman & Bell, 2015). The study relied on stratified random sampling in selecting the participants for the study. Stratified sampling involves constraining the sample by segregating elements into mutually exclusive subpopulations (Cooper and Schindler, 2014).

3.3.2.3 Sample Size

Sample size is a smaller part representation of the whole population which is identified by the researcher (Green & Tull, 2009). The sample size forms the epicenter of the research process as it comprises the individual entities of observation. Cooper and Schindler (2014) observed that when selecting a sample size, a researcher must ensure that the right procedures are followed so as to get the most adequate number of respondents. The study used sample size determination as per the Table 3.1.

\[ n = \frac{N}{1+Ne^2} \]

Where, \( n \) = sample size, \( N \) = target Population, and \( e^2 \) = probability error (derived from the confidence interval).

\[ n = \frac{545}{1+545(0.1^2)} \]

\[ n = \frac{545}{1+545(0.01)} \]

\[ n = \frac{545}{1+545} = \frac{545}{6.45} = 84.5, \text{ round off to the nearest person, } = 85 \text{ individuals} \]

Thus, \( n = 85 \) respondents
Table 3.1 Population and Sample Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Admin</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Division</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Development</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>35 %</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>545</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Data Collection Methods

According to Green and Tull (2009), data collection procedure is the process of gathering snippets of data that are essential for the research process. Primary data exhibit the real details gathered for the purpose of research. Data collection instrument refer to the tool a research adopts to assist in gathering data in an objective and a systematic manner for the purpose of the research (Kothari, 2010). Types of data collection instruments include; questionnaires, interviews, schedules and available records. Questionnaires are a paper and a pencil data collection instruments filled in by respondents for the purpose of the research study (Cooper & Schindler, 2014).

This study utilized a structured questionnaire that was designed with close-ended questions as the primary tool for data collection. The structured questionnaire used a 5-point satisfaction scale, built in ordinal format was used to gauge respondent’s responses. The ordinal format was selected because according to Sekeran and Bougie (2016), it provides equal-interval measurements, a fact that allows for the use of more powerful statistical tools to test research variables. Questionnaire was preferred since according to Kothari (2010) are effective data collection instruments that offer respondents with freedom to freely express their opinions pertaining to the researched problem.
The questionnaire was split into different sections each covering a different element of the study. Section A, of the questionnaire covered the demographic details of the respondents. The subsequent Sections, notably B, C, D and E covered the study variables, job enlargement, job enrichment, task Autonomy and employee performance respectively. The questions from section B through E were structured close-ended questions where a likert scale, $1 - 5$ (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 strongly agree) was used to measure the respondent’s opinions across the different questions.

3.5 Research Procedure

Kothari, (2010) noted that research procedure is the sequence of activities that are followed when carrying out field study. The researcher sought for an official letter from the university that will be used to request for permission to conduct a field survey at ICRAF. The letter explained all the details regarding the field survey. Upon granting of the permission to conduct the survey, the researcher took the initiative to personally deliver the questionnaires to all the respondents. The researcher pledged utmost confidentiality throughout the whole process.

Before commencement of the actual data collection process, the researcher undertook a pilot study that helped in evaluating the reliability and the validity of the research tool. A group of 5 respondents was selected to participate in the pilot study of who were not part of the final sample. The pilot study was used to assess the reliability of the research tool. Reliability test was implemented through an examination of the internal consistencies of the research tool. A Chronbach alpha was used compute the reliability estimate. An alpha score of above 0.75, indicated that the research tool was valid and reliable.
Table 3.2 Pilot Test on Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha value</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha when variable omitted</th>
<th>Number of questionnaire items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job enlargement</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enrichment</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task autonomy</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tabulations for Cronbach alpha revealed the findings presented in table 3.1. All the variables recorded an alpha value of above 0.75. The outcome for alpha value in case the questionnaire was removed was also above 0.75. Cooper and Schindler (2014) ascertained that if a coefficient of over 0.7 is computed, it will signify the justification of the tool with acceptable reliability. The study was therefore satisfied that the data collection tool was valid instrument for data collection.

### 3.6 Data Analysis Method

At the end of data collection process, the next stage was data analysis. The data and information obtained through the questionnaire was first checked for completeness. The questionnaires were found correctly filled and fit for analysis, thus were coded and all the data entered into statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 20 and analyzed based on descriptive statistics. The descriptive statistics that were used included mean scores, percentages and ratios. The tabulations of percentages and the measures of central tendencies, including mean scores and standard deviations assisted in determining the influence of job redesign factors, notably; job enlargement, job enrichment and task autonomy on the performance of employees. The study also performed regression analysis which assisted in drawing the inferences in the research variables thus highlighting the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables. In addition, the regression test assisted in making the inferential conclusions, where the findings of this study can be inferred to a larger population.
3.7 Chapter Summary

This section of the study covered the research methodology, which highlighted detailed description of the process that the researcher was adopted while conducting the field survey. The section covered the research design which the researcher adopted. The chapter defined the target population for the study and the sample size which is the number of participants who participated in the study. The section also described the research procedure which was adopted in the course of field survey and finally highlighted the research analysis method which was adopted after the completion of the field survey. The next chapter covers results and findings.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This section of the study covers the results and findings as obtained from the field survey. The main purpose of the study was to examine the effect of job redesign on employee performance. The data collection process centered on distribution of the data collection tool and subsequent processes of follow-up on respondents who had agreed to take part in the study. The researcher undertook personal initiative to distribute the questionnaires in person to all the respondents who had agreed to participate. The basic criteria for the respondents was the understanding of the subject of job redesign as was conceptualized in this study with its three subsections namely; job enlargement, job enrichment and task autonomy on employee performance. The presentation in chapter four commences with a view on the response rate, then an examination of the respondent’s demographic details, followed by descriptive statistics and finally the inferential statistics.

4.2 Response Rate

The data in Table 4.1 present the outcome in terms of the participation by the respondents in the field survey with the total units of observation derived from the study estimate of 85 participants.

Table 4.1 Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-responded</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings in Table 4.1 present the response rate from the field survey exercise. A total of 85 questionnaires were distributed to respondents who were identified and accepted to take part in the study. A total of 76 questionnaires were successfully returned in time to commence the data analysis process. The researcher took personal initiative to contact all the participants but eventually about 76 successfully contribute their opinions in the study. This represented an 89.4% response rate and N = 76.

4.3 Demographic Data

The demographic data covered the background information of respondents covering aspects including; age distribution, education level, department and job experience.

4.3.1 Distribution of Respondents by Age

The data presented in figure 4.1 highlights respondent’s distribution by age as computed in frequencies and percentages.

![Age Distribution Chart](image)

**Figure 4.1 Age Distribution**

The findings presented in figure 4.1 indicate that majority of the respondents 23.7% (18) indicate that they were in the age group 41 – 45 years. The findings also indicate that, 21.1% (16) indicated to be in the age group 36 – 40 years and 19.7% (15) of the respondents indicated to be in the age group, 31 – 35 years. Further, 18.4% (14) of the respondents indicated to be in the age group, 18 – 30 years and 17.1% (13) indicated to over 46 years of age. This implies that age diversity is an important demographic factor in the implementation of job redesign.
strategies and processes that are aimed at influencing the performance of employees in a corporate environment.

4.3.2 Distribution of Respondents by Education Level

The data covered in Figure 4.2 highlights the distribution of respondents by education level computed in frequencies and percentages.
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**Figure 4.2 Education Level**

The findings in figure 4.2 indicate that majority of the participants, 44.7% (34) have attained a Bachelor’s degree. Further, the findings indicate that 31.6% (24) of the respondents have attained college Diplomas. The findings indicate that 11.8% (9) of the respondent attained post-graduate qualification with Masters and post-graduate Diplomas. The findings also show that another 11.8% (9) of the respondents indicated to have an academic attainment to the PhD level. The findings highlight a population with a decent academic attainment all through.

4.3.3 Distribution of respondents by Department

The data presented in figure 4.3 indicate the respondent’s distribution in terms of organizational departments within which they work. The data is computed in frequencies and percentages.
The findings presented in Figure 4.3 indicate that majority of the respondents 47.4% (36) were drawn from the finance and administration department. The findings show that, 25.0% (19) of the respondents were drawn from the ICT department, 14.5% (11) indicated to have been drawn from the research division, 9.2% (7) of the respondents indicated to have been drawn from the human resources division and 3.9% (3) indicated to have been drawn from the science and development department. The respondent’s distribution indicates distinct demarcation within the organization structure into different departments.

### 4.3.4 Respondents Distribution by Job Experience

The data covered in Figure 4.4 highlight the distribution of respondents by job experience computed in frequency and percentages.
Figure 4.4 Job Experience

The findings in Figure 4.4 indicates that majority of the respondents, 39.5% (30) have work experience stretching for 6 – 10 years. The findings also indicate that, 32.9% (25) of the respondents have working experience of below 5 years and 18.4% (14) indicated to have working experience of 11 – 15 years. Further, the findings show that, 5.3% (4) of the respondents have a working experience of 16 – 20 years and 3.9% (3) of respondents indicated to have a working experience of over 20 years. The findings show that a significant chunk of the respondents have a working experience of below 15 years. This implies that, job redesign programs are continuous in nature and are not subject to work experience.

4.4 Job Enlargement and Employee Performance

The first objective of this study was to examine the influence of job enlargement on employee performance. The data in Table 4.2 highlights the descriptive statistics on the feedback to the questions on job enlargement computed in mean and standard deviations.
Table 4.2 Job Enlargement Factors Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job enlargement factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job enlargement has increased my job satisfaction</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enlargement has increased task efficiency in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enlargement has merged my capacities and enabled me to be more efficient in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enlargement has motivated me to undertake my daily duties and responsibilities</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enlargement has made my work more interesting and fulfilling hence reducing boredom at my workplace</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enlargement has enhanced my capability on task execution</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enlargement has identified capacity shortfall in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enlargement has matched my competencies with my interests</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.2 highlight the respondent’s views on the influence of job enlargement on employee performance. A scale of 1 – 5 was used, where; 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree. The findings indicate that respondents agree that job enlargement has contributed increased levels of job satisfaction, with a mean 4.45 (standard deviation = 0.700). Job enlargement has also contributed to merging of employee’s capacities enabling them to be more efficient within the organization (mean = 4.42, SD = 0.617). More so respondents agreed that job enlargement contributes to identification of capacity shortfall within an organization (mean = 4.36, SD = 0.605).

Others also agreed that job enlargement motivates employees to undertake their daily duties and responsibilities with more dedication, with a mean of 4.32 (SD = 0.571), and that job
enlargement has contributed to matching employee competencies with their interests, with a mean of 4.25 (SD = 0.676). The respondents expressed affirmation that job enlargement has contributed to enhancing employee capability on task execution (mean = 4.16, SD = 0.767), and that job enlargement has contributed to increased levels of task efficiency within the organization (mean = 4.03, SD = 0.653). Fewer respondents also agreed that job enlargement has contributed to making the workplace more interesting and fulfilling thus reducing boredom (mean = 3.86, SD = 0.934).

The findings indicate that job enlargement programs that are well crafted flaunt positive impact on different components of employee job undertaking. The findings imply that job enlargement factors wield a huge effect on organization’s employee’s perspective on how they should pursue their duties. The findings indicate job enlargement positively impact on job satisfaction, task efficiency, capacity enhancement, fulfilling work engagement and employee competency enhancement.

**4.4.1 Regression Test Between Job Enlargement and Employee Performance**

The study performed regression test between the independent variable job enlargement versus the dependent variable employee performance to examine whether there exists substantial association, difference and predictability of the variables.

The regression results showed that job enlargement explained a significant proportion of variance in employee performance, $R^2$ was 26.2%. The ANOVA showed $F (1,74) = 26.263; p< 0.000$. This means the null hypothesis was rejected.

**Table 4.3 Regression Test for Job Enlargement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.512a</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job enlargement

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4.847</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.847</td>
<td>26.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>13.657</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.504</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Job enlargement

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.664</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>3.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job enlargement</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. **Dependent Variable: Employee performance**

The study found that job enlargement significantly predicted employee performance, the coefficient was $\beta=0.589$, $t=5.125$, $p<0.000$. These results indicated that the null hypothesis was rejected.

**4.5 Job Enrichment and Employee Performance**

The second research question of this study was to evaluate the effect of job enrichment on employee performance. The data in Table 4.4 highlights the descriptive statistics on the feedback to the questions on job enrichment computed in mean and standard deviations.
Table 4.6 Job Enrichment Factors Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job enrichment factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job enrichment has increased employee job attendance in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enrichment has increased employee self-management in executing their duties in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enrichment has enhanced employee capacity in making prompt operational decisions in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enrichment has increased employees sense of autonomy in task completion in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enrichment has increased my responsibility in decision making at my workplace</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enrichment has improved the quality of work that I deliver at my workplace</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enrichment has increased levels of employees commitment towards the task execution in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 4.6, highlights the respondent’s views on the influence of job enrichment on employee performance. A scale of 1 – 5 was used, where; 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree. The findings indicate that respondents agree that job enrichment enhances employee capacity in making prompt operational decisions within an organization, with a mean of 4.38 (SD = 0.588), More so job enrichment contributes to increased employee job attendance within an organization with a mean of 4.32 (SD =0.616). Further the findings indicate that, job enrichment increases employees sense of autonomy in task completion within an organization (mean = 4.28, SD = 0.665), Job enrichment increases the level of employee commitment towards tasks execution within their organization, recording a mean of 4.21 (SD = 0.718), and also respondents affirmed that job enrichment contributes to increased level of responsibility in employee decision making at workplace, with a mean of 4.12 (SD = 0.765). Fewer respondents agreed that job enrichment improves the quality
of work employees deliver at their workplace, recording a mean of 4.05 (SD = 0.710), and other respondents agree that job enrichment contributes to increased levels of employee self-management in executing their duties within an organization, recording a mean of 3.82 (SD = 1.003).

The findings imply that, job enrichment wields significant effect on the employee’s perspectives on their roles within an organization. This means that, positive effect of job enrichment influences factors such as employee work management, quality in tasks execution, commitment to duty and increased motivation to effectively pursue work obligations. These factors wield positive impact on employee job performance.

4.5.1 Regression Test between Job Enrichment and Employee Performance

The regression test sought to examine the existing relationship between the independent variable job enrichment versus dependent variable employee performance.

The regression results showed that job enrichment explained a significant proportion of variance in employee performance, $R^2$ was 34.7%. The ANOVA showed $F (1,74) = 39.33; p< 0.000$. This means the null hypothesis was rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Regression Test for Job Enrichment versus Employee Performance
The study found that job enrichment significantly predicted employee performance, the coefficient was $\beta=0.693$, $t=6.271$, $p<0.000$. These results indicated that the null hypothesis was rejected.

### 4.6 Task Autonomy and Employee Performance

The third research question of this study was to assess the effect of task autonomy on employee performance. The data in Table 4.5 highlights the descriptive statistics on the feedback to the questions on task autonomy computed in mean and standard deviations.
Table 4.5 Task Autonomy Factors Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task autonomy factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task autonomy has increased my commitment at work</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task autonomy has increased my confidence in duty execution</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task autonomy has increased employee levels of operational efficiency in executing technical duties in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task autonomy has influenced high levels of individual responsibility toward daily task in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task autonomy has encouraged employees to create self-motivation strategies in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task autonomy has empowered employees with high level of self-esteem in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task autonomy has enhanced trust between management and employees at all levels in my organization</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The computed findings in Table 4.5 highlight the respondent’s views on the influence of task autonomy on the employee performance computed in measures of central tendencies, mean and standard deviation. A scale of 1 – 5 was used, where; 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree. The findings show that, respondents agree that task autonomy empowers employees with high level of self-esteem within an organization (mean = 4.26, SD =0.755). Further, the findings indicate that respondents affirmed that task autonomy increases employee levels of operational efficiency in executing technical duties within an organization, with a mean of 4.22 (SD = 0.685). Computed results show that the respondents were in agreement (mean= 4.18, SD = 0.647), that task autonomy increases employee confidence in duty execution. Respondents expressed affirmation that, task autonomy encourages employees to create self-motivation strategies within an organization,
recording a mean of 4.18 (SD = 0.668). The respondents agreed that task autonomy contributes to increased levels of work commitment (mean = 4.17, standard deviation = 0.737). The findings indicate that, employees agree that task autonomy enhances trust between management and employees at all levels within organization, recording a mean of 4.16 (SD = 0.767). The findings indicate that respondents agree that task autonomy trigger high level of individual responsibility toward undertaking their daily task within an organization (mean = 4.11, SD = 0.842).

The findings show that effective adoption and implementation of task autonomy strategy impacts on employee productivity. This implies that, task autonomy impacts on factors such as, work commitment, self-responsibility and accountability, confidence, operational efficiency, self-esteem and trust. This indicates that task autonomy has a huge significant influence on employee capacity to execute their obligations.

4.6.1 Regression Test between Task Autonomy and Employee Performance

The study performed regression test between the independent variable task autonomy versus the dependent variable employee performance. The regression test assists in determination the existing relationships between the research variables, notably; correlation, variance and predictability.

The regression results showed that task autonomy explained a significant proportion of variance in employee performance, $R^2$ was 47%. The ANOVA showed $F (1,74) = 65.519; p<0.000$. This means the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 4.6 Regression Test for Task Autonomy and Employee Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study found that task autonomy significantly predicted employee performance, the coefficient was $\beta=0.768$, $t=8.094$, $p<0.00$. These results indicated that the null hypothesis was rejected.

### 4.7 The Multivariate Regression Test

The multivariate regression test, involved a linear regression test that combined all the independent study variables, including; job enlargement, job enrichment and task autonomy on the employee performance. This will help in highlighting the overall effect of combine job redesign factors on employee performance.
Table 4.7 Multivariate Regression Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.724a</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Task autonomy, Job enlargement, Job enrichment

Table 4.15 ANOVA for the multivariate regression test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>9.710</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.237</td>
<td>26.502</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>8.794</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.504</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Task autonomy, Job enlargement, Job enrichment

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enlargement</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job enrichment</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task autonomy</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance

The findings in Table 4.7 highlights the linear regression outcome for the regression test between combine job redesign factors and employee performance presented in coefficients output. The test deduces the beta coefficients for the independent variables and the p-values.

The regression test establishes that the combined independent variables, notably; job enlargement, job enrichment and task autonomy significantly predicted employee performance.
performance, $R^2$ was 52.5%. The ANOVA showed $F (3,72) = 26.50; p<0.000$. The coefficient was at $\beta=.265$, $t=2.058$, $p<0.043$ for job enlargement, at $\beta=.72$, $t=.443$, $p<0.659$ for Job enrichment and at $\beta=.607$, $t=4.858$, $p<0.000$ for task autonomy. This means the null hypothesis was rejected. The finding implies that, job redesign factors notably; job enlargement, job enrichment and task autonomy can quantitatively forecast quantitative value change for employee performance.

4.8 Summary

This section of the study presented the data collected from the field survey on the influence of job redesign on employee performance. Data presentation was split into three components including the demographic data, descriptive statistics and inferential data. The demographic data offers an insight into the background information on each of the participants of the study. The descriptive statistics uses measures of central tendencies including mean and standard deviation. The inferential statistics examined the relationships that exist between the independent variables and the dependent variables. The next section is chapter five, which covers summary of the findings, discussion, conclusion, recommendations and suggestions for further studies.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This section of the study marks the homestretch of the research process with the researcher making final submissions on the study subject. The purpose of this was to evaluate the effect of job redesign on employee performance. Three critical components of job redesign, namely; job enlargement, job enrichment and task autonomy formed the basis for examination in the
course of this study. Therefore, chapter five of the study covers the summary of the findings, discussion, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further studies.

5.2 Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the influence of job redesign on the performance of employees in an organization. The study was guided by the following research questions; to evaluate the influence of job enlargement on employee performance, to examine the influence of job enrichment on employee performance and finally the influence of task autonomy on employee performance.

Descriptive research approach was adopted in this study as the research design. The population of study included 545 employees working at World Agro Forestry Centre (ICRAF). Stratified random sampling was used to select a sample size of 85 respondents. The study utilized structured questionnaire with close ended questions as the primary tool for data collection. SPSS software was used to process the data gathered from the field survey. Descriptive statistics was computed using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations. Inferential statistics was computed using regression test, which assessed whether job enlargement, job enrichment and task autonomy affected employee performance.

The findings on job enlargement and employee performance indicate that indicate majority of respondents agree that job enlargement wields significant influence on the employee performance within an organization. The findings also show that respondents agree that job enlargement programs focus on instituting initiatives primarily designed to expand prevailing employee scope in executing their daily tasks and it wields statistical effect on overall employee performance. The study found that, respondents agree that the combined job enlargement factors wield significant influence on employee performance. Therefore, the study establishes that job enlargement components including; job satisfaction, task execution efficiency, employee competencies and interests, work motivation, employee attitude on work engagements, capacity adjustment, and organizational capacity consolidation wield an influence on employee performance within an organization.
Regarding job enrichment and employee performance, majority of respondents were in agreement that job enrichment constitutes a significant effect on employee performance within an organization. The findings also show that, the respondents agree that organizational initiatives geared towards aligning job tasks in effort to increase the number of tasks an employee performs wield an overwhelming overall impact on employee job performance. The study also found that job enrichment espouses an array of factors which account for significant influence on the component of employee performance. The findings show that respondents agree job enrichment components include; employee job attendance, employee self-management, employee decision making, operational autonomy, employee work quality and employee work commitment. Therefore, the study establishes that job enrichment factors wield a significant effect on employee performance on the aspect of new realignment of the employee job components.

Findings on task autonomy and employee performance show that the respondents agree that task autonomy highlights the initiatives implemented in effort to create an independent operational space. The study establishes that instituting task autonomy infer to extending operational freedom among organizational employees on execution of their daily tasks and it wields significant impact on the overall aspect of employee performance. The findings show that, respondents agree that task autonomy component comprises of numerous underlying factors which whether independently or consolidated wield considerable effect on employee execution of their obligated duties which subsequently influence employee performance.

The findings indicate that respondents agree that task autonomy factors espouse diverse employee engagement determinants which influence employee perception on their responsibilities within an organization. Majority of respondents agreed that, task autonomy influences factors including; employee work commitment, employee operational confidence, operational efficiency, employee level of trust, employee self-motivation strategies, employee self-esteem and individual task responsibility. The study therefore establishes that task autonomy yields significant influence on employee performance.
5.3 Discussions

5.3.1 Job Enlargement and Employee Performance

The findings indicate that job enlargement wield significant influence on the employee performance within an organization. The findings also indicate that job enlargement factors contributed significant impact on the employee performance. These findings are consistent with Ameh (2013) who submitted that the effect of job enlargement in enhancing productivity through capitalizing on the employee best capabilities in task execution. findings indicate that respondents agree that job enlargement has contributed increased levels of job satisfaction. The findings also agree with the views of Saleem, Shaheen & Saleem (2012), who explained that job enlargement is a factor of reorganization of employee’s capacities in effort to effect operational changes aimed at enhancing the levels of employee performance and overall organizational productivity.

The findings also indicate that, job enlargement initiatives seek to enhance operational effectiveness with focus on expansion of employee capacities. These findings agree with Oladapo (2011) who explained that employee operational capacity should be aligned in accordance with employee individual abilities on specific areas of responsibility and proceed to reassign them in their areas of excellence. Respondents expressed affirmation that, job enlargement has contributed to increased levels of task efficiency within the organization. The findings agree with Mahmoud (2014) who examined job enlargement as horizontal restructuring implemented to address numerous performance related factors such as talent and ability matching to individual roles and tasks.

Respondents agreed that job enlargement has contributed to merging of employee’s capacities enabling them to be more efficient within the organization. The findings agree with Mahmoud (2014), who supported Fredrick Taylor theory on scientific management positing that job enlargement is a necessary undertaking for addressing the subject of improved operational efficiency. The findings support views by Ewidah (2008) and Oladapo (2011) who posited that through evaluating employee performance, it makes it possible to create a hierarchical model
that compares efficiency in task delivery and employee skills and rank them in effort to reassign them.

The findings show that job enlargement has contributes to identification of capacity shortfall within an organization. These findings agree with the submissions of Kaymaz (2010) who postulated that employee appraisal was necessary undertaking before the reassignment of new tasks as it enabled the organization match individual employee interest in exercising responsibilities for particular roles.

The study establishes that job enlargement has contributed to matching employee competencies with their interests. The findings agree with Mbah and Ikemefuna (2012) who posited that job appraisal gave the organization a clear picture of which roles employees executed with highest level of satisfaction and felt more motivated. The findings also agree with the submissions by Jathana (2011), who explained that job enlargement is a basis for enhancing job specifications, workload and eventual job security as it shows the employee’s role is expanded and his stay certified which contributes to job satisfaction.

5.3.2 Job Enrichment and Employee Performance

The findings in this study show that job enrichment yields considerable influence on employee performance within an organization. The findings indicate that, job enrichment factors yield significant statistical effect on employee performance. These findings are in line with submissions by Salau, Adeniji & Oyewunmi (2014), submitted that job enrichment is a process where management allocates more responsibilities to the superiors to the employees. The findings agree with Williams (2009) who postulated that job enrichment is a fundamental aspect of stimulating the effort of employees by expanding job responsibilities and giving increased autonomy over the task processes and completion.

The findings indicate that job enrichment factors influence assessment of operational capabilities and integration of mechanisms to enhance the overall operational productivity. These findings explained that job enrichment centers in evaluation of jobs in effort to meet the needs and fulfill the aspirations of people as individuals. The study found that job enrichment contributes to enhanced employee capacity in making prompt operational decisions in my
organization. He further explains that job enrichment is not a technique, but a way of managing which is married into the company philosophy and organizational structure – job enrichment is in essence, true participation and worker involvement. (Pillai, Mashood, Amoodi, Hussain & Kooshy, 2012)

The study established that job enrichment gives employees increased sense of autonomy in task completion in my organization. The findings also agree with Raza and Nawaz (2011) who noted that job enrichment views the total work enrichment confronting employees as a system which consists of two overlapping areas: the worker-job subsystem and the worker-organization subsystem.

The findings indicate that job enrichment expands the employee responsibilities and duties. The findings support submissions by Robbins and Judge (2011) who explained that job enrichment develops jobs vertically and increases the variety of tasks in a job whereas job enlargement expands the job scope. The findings show that job enrichment modifies the operational tasks employees perform. The findings agree with Davoudi and Mehdi (2013) who noted that job enrichment is the implementation of programs intended to influence the design task to give more meaning and provide job satisfaction by involving workers with job planning, implementation of organizational and work supervision so that job enrichment aims to increase responsibility in decision-making, increase autonomy and authority to design jobs and expand the horizons of work. The addition of these elements to work is sometimes called the working load vertically.

5.3.3 Task Autonomy and Employee Performance

The findings indicate that task autonomy wield significant influence on employee job performance. Task autonomy factors comprise of underlying mechanisms that are instituted to influence employee’s level of operational productivity. The finding agrees with Sisodia and Das (2013) who explained that task autonomy highlight the degree to which employees are offered the freedom, independence and discretion to make decisions pertaining to the substantive and other procedural aspects of their jobs. The finding indicates that task
employees give employees comfort and motivation to execute their duties. The findings also agree with Heathfield (2016) who explained that task autonomy shares a positive relationship with work engagement and it serves as an antecedent of employee commitment, there is a possibility that the effect of employees’ perceived task autonomy on commitment is dependent on their work engagement levels.

The findings show that task autonomy comprise of individual employee capacities to effectively pursue their daily responsibility with a considerable sense of freedom in operational execution. This is consistent with the submissions of Royer (2009), who posited that if an individual does not believe that he or she can successfully perform a task with increased autonomy, then he or she will most likely not be able to secure the perceived benefits. The findings indicate that, extending task autonomy to employees in performing their duties motivates them to perform their tasks more diligently. The findings also agree with Man and Lam (2003) who submitted that beyond motivational mechanisms, they viewed that autonomy affects individual performance because of issues related to information and decision making.

The findings indicate that task autonomy gives employees freedom to make their own operational decisions while executing their duties. The findings in this study also agree with the submissions of Ozturk (2011), who explained that task autonomy included the capacity of individuals in making free choices from continuous observation and also from interaction with the supervisor in a work environment.

The findings show that task autonomy enables employees develop creativity to execute their duties with more freedom. The findings support the submissions of Saragih (2011), who observed that task autonomy results in an improved individual work performance because individuals think and consider themselves skillful and creative in accomplishing their tasks. In addition, the findings support the views that individuals who experience high job autonomy are less constrained by the situational factors than the individuals who experience low autonomy. The findings agree with Yong et al. (2013) who posited that the allowance of autonomy at work serves as an impetus to employees who develop a sense of return by showing higher levels of engagement in their jobs.
5.4 Conclusion

5.4.1 Job Enlargement and Employee Performance

The study concludes that job enlargement forms a critical factor with an overwhelming influence on employee performance. Job enlargement encompass underlying array of organizational aspects that form critical operational determinants for affecting the present scope of employee tasks to a new scope with increased obligations. The study concludes that adopting job expansion programs should address the component of employee willingness to accept additional responsibilities and deliver to the optimal set standards. The study concludes that fundamental employee job execution factors notably; job satisfaction, task execution efficiency, employee competencies and interests, work motivation, employee attitude on work engagements, capacity adjustment, and organizational capacity determine the effect of job enlargement on employee performance within an organization.

5.4.2 Job Enrichment and Employee Performance

The study concludes that job enrichment deduces fundamental organizational strategy that seeks to undertake employee tasks evaluation and subsequent alignment towards enhanced employee performance. Job enrichment, entail execution of measures that evaluate present employee’s capacities within an organization, and then infer operational reorganization strategy where more tasks that seek to energize employees are added integrated in new operational framework. The study concludes that, organizational initiatives aimed at reorganizing employee daily operational tasks is subject to numerous factors namely; employee job attendance, employee self-management, employee decision making, operational autonomy, employee work quality and employee work commitment that influence overall employee performance within the organization.

5.4.3 Task Autonomy and Employee Performance

The study makes a finding that task autonomy forms an important factor in facilitating expanded operational framework with organizational employees exercising increased freedom to undertake their daily responsibilities. Task autonomy influences employee’s perception on
the operational framework geared towards achieving increased operational productivity influenced by employee exercising operational autonomy in executing their responsibilities. The study concludes that task autonomy is subject to numerous factors including; employee work commitment, employee operational confidence, operational efficiency, employee level of trust, employee self-motivation strategies, employee self-esteem and individual task responsibility, which have an impact on the overall employee performance.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Job Enlargement and Employee Performance

The study identifies existing gaps in practice on the implementation of job redesign programs towards employee performance. The study recommends organizational managers to build capacity within the organizational department or division that is dedicated towards management of human resources. This is because, job redesign initiatives focus on restructuring tasks defined in employee scope of operation, which presents HR professional with immense capacity in determining best strategic decisions for reorganization the organization workforce.

The study further makes recommendation that organizations prioritize adoption of performance evaluation tools to aid in the implementation of job reorganization programs, such as job enlargement. This will be crucial in identifying areas that will reciprocate the job reorganization plans with enhanced operational productivity.

5.5.1.2 Job Enrichment and Employee Performance

The study recommends for the adoption of regulatory framework that will peg guidelines on how corporate organizations should operate when intending to undertake strategic measures aimed at implementing job redesign initiatives. By introducing labor policy and regulatory framework, will force standardization of organizational programs that add more
responsibilities to employees and opt to use internal determination mechanisms in remuneration for new work structures. In addition, having a regulatory framework will prevent exploitation of skilled work force by scrupulous organizations that burden employees with more responsibilities but fail to match such increase with the remuneration component.

5.5.1.3 Task autonomy and Employee Performance

The study also recommends that corporate organizations to prioritize creation and the development of enabling work environment in order to give employees comfort in execution of their daily duties. Similarly, developing job redesign programs should focus on making the employees feel comfortable in undertaking their duties, hence more welcoming to expanded scope of operation.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

The main purpose of this study was to evaluate the influence of employee job redesign on the performance of employees in an organization. This particular scope was limited on only three components of job redesign. The study notes that, numerous subtopics on job redesign need to be examined in detail in future and evaluate the effect they have on employee performance. The study suggests more evaluation in future studies on effects of job enlargement strategies on employee productivity within an organization, an evaluation into the effect of job enrichment process on the realization of organizational corporate objectives, a study on the impacts of expanded operational liberties amongst employees on the levels of operational efficiency in executing organizational operations and an examination into the quantitative effect of task autonomy on the realization of organization corporate objectives.
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**APPENDIX I: COVER LETTER**

Hawa Jamila Ahmed

United States International University

P.O.BOX 14634-00800

NAIROBI
Dear Respondent,

REF: REQUEST FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

I am a Master of Science in Organization Development student at the United States International University Africa. As a requirement before graduation, is to write a thesis, which I chose the topic, “Effects of Job redesign on employee performance within an organization.”

You have been selected to take part in the study. This is to kindly request you to help me in collecting the required data by filling the questionnaire. The information you will provide will only be used for the academic purposes, thus it will be treated with utmost confidentiality. If you would like to receive a copy of this report, please indicate so by writing your email address on the back of the questionnaire.

Yours sincerely,

Jamila Ahmed
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS

1. Age Distribution
   i. 18 – 30 years
   ii. 31 – 35 years
   iii. 36 – 40 years
   iv. 41 – 45 years
   v. Over 46 years

2. Education Level
   i. Secondary School Certificate
   ii. Diploma
   iii. Degree
   iv. Masters/Post-Graduate Diploma
   v. PhD

3. Department attached at ICRAF
   i. Human Resources Department
   ii. Finance Department & Admin
   iii. ICT Department
   iv. Research Division
   v. Science Programs Development Department

4. Job Experience
   i. Below 5 years
   ii. 6 – 10 years
   iii. 11 – 15 years
   iv. 16 – 20 years
In the subsequent sections, kindly indicate how much you agree/disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 as per the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Job enlargement has increased my job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job enlargement has increased task efficiency in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job enlargement has merged my capacities and enabled me to be more efficient in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job enlargement has motivated me to undertake my daily duties and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job enlargement has made my work more interesting and fulfilling hence reducing boredom at my work place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job enlargement has enhanced my capability on task execution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job enlargement has identified capacity shortfall in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job enlargement has matched my competencies with my interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating on the Level of Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION C: JOB ENRICHMENT**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statement on the effect of Job Enrichment on Employee Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Job enrichment has increased employee job attendance in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Job enrichment has increased employee self-management in executing their duties in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Job enrichment has enhanced employee capacity in making prompt operational decisions in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Job enrichment has increased employees sense of autonomy in task completion in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Job enrichment has increased my responsibility in decision making at my workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Job enrichment has improved the quality of work that I deliver at my workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Job enrichment has increased levels of employee commitment towards the task execution in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rating on the Level of Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION D : TASK AUTONOMY**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statement on the effect of Task Autonomy on Employee Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Task autonomy has increased my commitment at work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Task autonomy has increased my confidence in duty execution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Task autonomy has increased employee levels of operational efficiency in executing technical duties in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Task autonomy has influenced high levels of individual responsibility toward daily task in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Task autonomy has encouraged employees to create self-motivation strategies in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Task autonomy has empowered employees with high level of self-esteem in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Task autonomy has enhanced trust between management and employees at all levels in my organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rating on the Level of Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION : EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statement on Employee Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I am motivated to undertake my duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I put extra effort in my work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I have acquired more skills in executing technical tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I have embraced self-management techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I am confident in undertaking challenging responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I do all my duties to the best of my ability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I achieve my operational targets that I set for each task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I am committed towards achieving my work targets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>