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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine the effect of generational differences on employee productivity in selected faith-based organizations in Nairobi, Kenya. Specifically, the study was guided by the following research questions: How do generational differences in work-life balance affect employee productivity? How do generational differences in communication styles affect employee productivity? How do generational differences in learning styles affect employee productivity?

The study adopted a descriptive design. The target population of this study was the faith based humanitarian organizations in Nairobi Kenya. The study selected only six faith based organizations while the target respondents were 907 staffs drawn from various departments from which a sample of 30% was selected to participate in the study. The study used questionnaire to collect primary data, data analysis was carried out by use of Statistical package for the social Scientists (SPSS) version 22 to obtain descriptive statistics and excel to obtain a summary regression and the linear regression model. The findings were presented using tables and figure to summarize responses to facilitate comparison and interpretation.

The findings indicated that Gen Xers were more concerned on how a decision affects the rest of their life before making a commitment, Gen Xers are work-centric and that Gen Xers held work/life balance, opportunities for growth and development and good work relationships higher in importance than generations before them. Gen Xers are more family-centric than Boomers. The study examined how generational differences in communication styles affects employee productivity. The study found that Millennials do enjoy using technology in learning, they tend to be less satisfied with web-based learning than older generations, If Gen Xers do in fact have a higher learning goal orientation, but are not being given adequate opportunities to learn on the job and increase their skills set this might cause them to be more likely to leave the organization. The study examined how generational differences in learning styles affect employee productivity. The study found generation X workers want direct, straightforward communication, baby boomers are relational focused and prefer phone calls and personal interaction, boomers prefer once-a-year performance appraisal and make use of personality assessments which influence communication and team-building. Boomers’ communication style focuses on personal growth, achievement and political correctness.
The study concluded that Gen Xers were more concerned on how a decision affected the rest of their life before making a commitment, they were work-centric and they held work/life balance, opportunities for growth and development and good work relationships higher in importance than generations before them. Secondly, the study concludes that baby Boomers were more satisfied with web-based learning than any other generation; they also enjoyed using technology in learning and tend to be less satisfied with web-based learning than older generations. Lastly, the study concludes that generation X workers want direct, straightforward communication. Baby boomers preferred once-a-year performance appraisal and made use of personality assessments which influenced communication and team-building.

It was recommended that organizations should initiate work life balance program to improve employee productivity. When employees feel a greater sense of control and ownership over their own lives, they tend to have better relationships with management and are able to leave work issues at work and home issues at home. Secondly, the study recommends that since generational differences in training needs and training styles do exist. Managers and trainers should consider possible age-related preferences when teaching ‘soft skills’. Since workers of different generations have similar preferences for learning hard skills, it may not be necessary to differentiate that type of training for workers of different ages. Lastly, the study recommends that generational conflict is more likely to arise from errors of attribution and perception, than from valid differences. Therefore, effective communication is critical in dealing with generational conflict.

Future research should consider other generational differences which affect employee productivity. Furthermore, an inclusion of moderating characteristics such as organizational structure and culture should also be incorporated in such studies. It would be useful to carry out the same type of research in other organizations and across East Africa and beyond and see whether the same results would be replicated.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

In today’s workplace one can distinguish three generations of employees: Baby Boomers or Boomers (1946-1964); Generation Xers (1965-1981); and Millennials or Generation Yers (1982-1999) (Abdul, Bayu, & Mohd, 2014). A generation is defined as a group of people born within a specified birth year range who grew up in the same historical and socio-cultural context, and shared formative life experiences, such as pop culture, economic conditions, world events, natural disasters, technology, and as a result developed core values that are different from those of other generations. Many authors argue that these values affect people’s attitude, commitment, ways of working, and work values in the workplace; and also that differences in values may create tensions between different generations. Such tensions may hamper the successful implementations of projects and lead to increase in employee turnover, difficult communications and poor morale (Ahmad, Mehdi, Ali, & Saeed, A Study on Generational Differences in Work Value and Person Organization Fit and Its Effect on Turnover Intention of Generation Y in India., 2016).

In a global point of view, today’s workforce is diverse, not only with respect to gender, race-ethnicity, culture and work styles, but also with respect to age. In fact, by 2017, approximately one in every five employees will be over the age of 55 (Ahmad, Mehdi, Ali, & Saeed, Generational Differences in Job Engagement: A Case of an Industrial Organization in Iran., 2017). With these changes in employee demographics, the workplace now consists of four generations: Traditionalists, Boomers, Generation Xers and Millennials or Generation Y. While there are bound to be unique challenges in the workplace with four generations working together, there are also unique opportunities. Becton, Walker, and Jones, (2014) found that “Generational differences impact communication styles, technology needs, professional development preferences, workplace expectations, compensation and benefits needs, desired leadership styles and the effectiveness of reward and recognition systems.” In essence, generational differences impact every aspect of the workplace.

Before looking at the characteristics of the four generations currently in the workforce, it is important to note the controversy surrounding the birth dates of each generation. This
study uses the generally accepted dating for each generation, but it is important to note that people born during the transition between generations can adopt characteristics of either generation or a mixture of both. It is also important to note that the characteristics of each generation do not apply across the board, as individuals are diverse and unique. The Silent Generation also known as The Traditionalist or Matures, were born between the year 1925 and 1945. Majority of this generation endured distressing world events, living through the Great Depression and World War II and poverty. This generation inclines to place more prominence on what is best for the group, rather than what is best for self. Although The Silent Generation for the most part have not encompassed new technology, those who have are among the fastest-growing group of Internet users (Ann, Understanding and Managing Generational Differences in the Workplace, 2011). Jacqueline and Jun, (2013) go on to state that Matures “prefer to receive information in an artless, straightforward, and précised fashion,” such as “direct mail and any other forms of written communication.”

Baby Boomers is the generation that were born between the year 1946 and 1964, coming of age during the civil rights era and the Woodstock. They lean towards being fervent and are willing to expense personally and professionally in order to attain success. Although they are seen as “highly competitive micromanagers who disdain lethargy,” they are “generally exceptional at networking and seeking consensus with others” (Benson & Brown, 2011). Kelly, Matthew, and Nicholas (2016) found that Baby Boomers live to work and tend to have reverence towards authority and hierarchy in the place of work, in part perhaps because they were brought up in a work environment where power and chain of command were respected. In addition, Baby Boomers tend to feel younger than they are. Although Paul, Anna and Alan (2013) state that The Silent Generation have trouble learning new tricks, are resistant to change and have trouble multitasking. Perry and Urwin (2013) point out that Baby Boomers have embraced technology, from e-mail to blogs and heavily rely on networking in their personal and professional lives. The commonly accepted birth years of Generation X, are between 1965 and 1980. They have grown up as latchkey kids in a state of vagueness and uncertainty, from seeing their parents laid off, challenges to the honesty of national leaders, rising personal debt and the threat of AIDS to personal relationships. As a result, they tend to be self-reliant, self-determining and are somewhat skeptical of authority (Bezrukova, Jehn, & Spell, 2012). Although they choose working alone to working in teams and can lack interpersonal
skills, Gen Xers “are good at multi-tasking” and relish working on “instantaneous projects as long as the company lets them prioritize the projects” (Lyons & Kuron, Generational Differences in the Workplace: A review of the Evidence and Directions for Future Research, 2013). They abode a high level of importance on maintaining a work-life balance and are more unlikely to sacrifice their personal life for the company (Ann, A Study on Effects on Turnover in Generational Differences in Tourism, 2016). Generation X learned from seeing their parents laid off that abiding by the company rules does not guarantee a job, therefore they have little tolerance for bureaucracy and rules, especially with respect to time and presence (Benson & Brown, 2011).

Millenials, also known as Generation Y or Echo Boomers or Nexters, is generally referred to the generation that was born between 1980 and 1999. Even though the generational label “Echo Boomers” refers to their many resemblances with Baby Boomers, Millennials look very different physically, with tattoos, piercings, and electronic “decorations,” like iPods, smart phones and laptops. They grip technology because they were brought up around it, and as a result, are very content, comfortable with change. Generation Y are “more affluent, more technologically savvy, better educated and more ethnically diverse than any previous generation” (David, Understaing Generation Y and Their Use of Social Media: A Review and Research Agenda, 2013). They communicate via social networking websites and text messaging, expecting instant feedback and acknowledgement, and are sometimes thought to have poor communication and problem-solving skills (Chloé & Sébastian, Undersanding Generation Y and Their Use of Social Media: A review and Research Agenda, 2013).

Although Nexters are very confident, animated and liberal, they are not as fiercely independent as Gen Xers. They favor teamwork and fancy to follow directions as long as there is flexibility for them to get the work done in their own way (Chloé & Sébastian, Meeting Career Expectation: Can it Enhance Job Satisfaction of Generation Y?, 2015). They place great significance in having meaning in their work, desiring to make the world a better place (Lyons , Nest, & Kuron, 2013). Lyons, Nest and Schweitzer (2017) found that Millennials always want to “make an important impact immediately on projects they are involved with” and are “looking for immediate gratification and an opportunity to excel”. Lyons, Nest and Schweitzer (2017) also found additional characteristics of Millennials which make them employable, but hard to incorporate into present corporate
structures, including: ability to multitask, yearning for mentor-like managers, who are highly engaged in their professional development; whereby they “seek out creative challenges and view coworkers as vast resources from whom to gain knowledge”; conversely, they need “thought-provoking projects in order to prevent boredom and attrition”; necessity for “small goals with tight deadlines so that they can build ownership of responsibilities; and balance and flexibility, especially with respect to a work-life balance.

Faith-based organizations have long played a role in international development, and are increasingly involved in environmental sustainability initiatives. They not only express the moral values of millions of their faithful but also provide some of the most dependable support systems for millions of people in the developing world. In Kenya, for example, 30 percent of all health-care services are provided by Christian hospitals. Faith-based organizations have been engaged in a wide range of services—as broad in scale as those delivered by secular counterparts. They range from education and health to financial assistance and in-kind support to the poor, as well as humanitarian relief in crises and less conventional forms of services such as legal aid. The scale of Faith Based Organizations service provision varies from one context to another. According to a report of the United States Agency for International Development quoted by the United Nations Population Fund, Faith Based Organizations account for 50 per cent of health service provision in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, 40 per cent in Kenya and Lesotho, and 55 per cent in Uganda. With respect to poverty alleviation, Faith Based Organization’s work has ranged from charity founded on religious precepts, such as care for widows and orphans, to large poverty alleviation programmes founded on comprehensive development, similar to the work of secular development organizations. As a result, entrepreneurial churches are able to tackle whole neighborhoods and a plethora of issues within them—education, business development, housing, commercial development, job training, crime and safety, and so on (Kemper & Adkins, 2005 cited in Marangu, 2014).

A good percentage aid passes through Faith Based Organizations to reach communities in need of humanitarian support. This aid is mostly from private donations. Some Faith Based Organizations apply different policies on how much government support they can receive, and so can add government aid to private donations. It seems clear that there is an
inevitable and expected role for Faith Based Organizations to play in providing relief. Faith Based Organizations provide humanitarian relief using a well-coordinated approach working together with governments and organizations to effectively deliver support to affected people. They entirely depend on grants from donors which requires reports to show projects’ outcomes. These outcomes can only be achieve by emphasizing on employee performance. Some of the most active Faith Based Organizations in Kenya are World Vision, World Relief, World Concern, Samaritan's Purse, Mercy Corps, Lutheran World Federation, Jesuit Refugee Service, Islamic Relief Worldwide, International Medical Corps, Concern Worldwide, Cordaid, Christian Health Association of Kenya, Catholic Relief Services, Food for the Hungry, Cafod, and Caritas Internationalis.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

According to Bezrukova, Jehn and Spell (2012), the workplace has changed, and fulfilling organizational responsibilities today is much tougher and more frustrating than it was for the predecessor generations. Part of this challenge has been blamed on the existence of several generations within the same work force which has introduced issues associated with clashing values, beliefs, and attitude inherent in a multi-generational workforce (Ahmad, Mehdi, Ali, & Saeed, Do Different Generations Look Differently at High Performance Organizations?, 2017). In many companies generational issues are a common and continuing problem that can have an all-encompassing organizational impact and can lead to employee unhappiness and ultimately, loss of employee productivity (Ann, 2015).

In view of the foregoing, Muhammed and Mohsin (2014), warn that the “one-size fits all” incentive plans of the past no longer encompass the diverse needs and desires of today’s multigenerational workplace. They added that the same can be said regarding their differing views about policies, rules, boundaries, work hours, tools and dress code in the work place. In the perspective of Chloé & Sébastian (2015), each group requires a unique approach to issues such as recruitment, compensation, expectations, motivators, collaboration, learning styles, and training.

A study by Paul and Alan (2017) showed that training and education, health and safety, human rights, work life balance and workplace diversity have significant influential
effects on employee engagement and affective and normative commitment. However, Muhammed and Mohsin (2014), observed that each generation assumes that the succeeding generation will experience the same desires, have the same values and appreciate and cherish the same things, in an unchanging continuum. This potentially affected organizational productivity. However, literature on this effect has been supported by very little empirical evidence in a developing country context such as Kenya. For example, a recent study on the Kenyan perspective by Wambui, Wang'ombe, Muthura, Kamau and Jackson (2013) was merely a review of literature to let all human resources, management, public and government leaders read and understand the importance of managing diversity at the workplace. In their report, multi-generational workforce was only mentioned in passing, thereby further suggested the paucity of research in this area in Kenya. In order to influence organizational policy, there was need to undertake scientific research to determine the significance of this phenomenon on productivity at the workplace. This study aimed at closing the research gap by investigating how generational differences are affecting employee productivity in Kenya with special focus on faith based organizations in Nairobi County.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the effect of generational differences on employee productivity in selected faith-based organizations in Nairobi, Kenya.

1.4 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1.4.1 How do generational differences in work-life balance affect employee productivity?

1.4.2 How do generational differences in communication styles affect employee productivity?

1.4.3 How do generational differences in learning styles affect employee productivity?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study would be beneficial to the following stakeholders:
1.5.1 Faith-Based Organizations – Interdenominational Churches
Since this study would be undertaken in five faith-based organizations – interdenominational churches, they will benefit first hand from the insights derived from the research concerning the tractions between multigenerational workforce and employee productivity.

1.5.2 Human Resource Practitioners
Human resource professionals in Kenya would find this study useful in helping them develop strategic personnel management programs and initiatives towards the enhancement of employee productivity in their respective organizations.

1.5.3 Employers
Employers generally might find this research important for appreciating diversity and how they can harness the benefits of a multigenerational workforce to enhance workplace productivity.

1.5.4 Researchers and Scholars
Theoretically, the research would be significant to academicians and researchers as it would enable them add to the existing knowledge on generational differences and also provide background information to research organizations and scholars who may want to carry out further research in this area. The study would also facilitate individual researchers to identify gaps in the current research and carry out research in those areas.

1.6 Scope of the Study
This research was undertaken in six faith-based organizations namely Anglican Communion, Caritas International, Christian AID, DanChurchAid, Mildmay International and Serving in Mission, all in Nairobi County. The target population was the staff working at all levels of the organizational hierarchy. Data was collected and analyzed in Summer (April-June) 2018. The main limitation was that the approached respondents were reluctant to offer information and in order to overcome this challenge, an introductory letter from the University, accompanied the study to assure the respondents that the information they provided was not only confidential but solely for academic purposes.
1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Faith-based Organizations

These are Non-governmental, non-profit making organizations with a religious foundation and are therefore guided by the values and principles of that particular religion.

1.7.2 Generations

This is as an approximation of the collective set of attitudes, behaviors, ideals, memories and life experiences that will certainly affect work-life.

1.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the study background which has entailed a look at the phenomenon of multigenerational workforce and a description of four different generations in today’s workplace. The chapter has also briefly discussed the implications of a multigenerational tension on employee productivity and considered global trends as well as the local context. The chapter has also stated the problem and put forward the objectives which it will seek to achieve. Further, it has provided the scope of the research, discussed the significance of the study and defined operational definition of terms.

Chapter two reviews pertinent theoretical as well as empirical literature to the study topic and specifically focused on the phenomenon of multigenerational workforce. The specific areas covered here are generational differences, work-life balance and employee productivity, generational differences, communication style and employee productivity; generational differences, learning style and employee productivity and lastly chapter summary. Chapter three defines the methodology that was used. It comprises of the research design, the population and sampling design, data collection instrument, research procedures and data analysis techniques to be adopted. Chapter four reports the findings of the study based on the methods discussed in the previous chapter. Its purpose is to analyze the variables involved in the study. Chapter five provides a discussion of the results and their relation to the existing literature. From the investigation and data collected, discussions, conclusion and recommendations were made.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the information from other researchers who have carried out their research in the same field of study. The specific areas covered here are generational differences, work-life balance and employee productivity, generational differences, communication style and employee productivity; generational differences, learning style and employee productivity and lastly chapter summary.

2.2 Generational Differences in Work-Life Balance and Employee Productivity

Work–life balance has been defined as “satisfaction and good functioning at work and at home with a minimum of role conflict”. The evidence from the literature suggests that work-life balance can influence individuals’ attitudes at work. Work-family conflicts play an important role in career and job choice, especially for women who are primarily responsible for child rearing. The question is whether generations differ significantly in regards to attitudes about work-life balance, and whether those differences translate into different decisions about work. Gen Xers are said to hold work/life balance, opportunities for growth and development and good work relationships higher in importance than generations before them.

If a promotion is available to Boomers they will tend to take it and figure out how it affects other aspects of their life, whereas Gen Xers will be more concerned on how a decision affects the rest of their life before making a commitment (Ahmad, Mehdi, Ali, & Saeed 2016). Similarly Abdul, Bayu and Mohd (2014)found that job satisfaction was more important than promotion for Gen Xers than for Baby Boomers and that Gen Xers would accept less desirable promotions if it suited their lifestyle. Gen Xers define their career success in part by how well they are able to balance work and their personal lives.

One distinguishing characteristic frequently ascribed to younger workers, perhaps more so to Xers, is their longing for sense of balance between life and work. As they were growing up, Gen Xers seemingly saw their fathers and mothers lose their jobs, despite making sacrifices for their careers, and grew up to value a balance between work and life (André, Linde, & Merel, 2017).
Even though much of the evidence is subjective, 45% of workforce aged 18 to 24, 37% of workforce aged 25 to 34, and 37% of workforce of all ages who participated in the 2014 General Social Survey, National Opinion Research Center indicated that they worked hard, but did not let work impede with the rest of their lives. The youngest workforce was most likely to try not to let work interfere with the rest of their lives. Only 37% of the younger members of Gen Xers reported doing the best work they could even if it interfered with the rest of their lives, as opposed to 54% of all workers, again approving that younger workers were attempting not to let work interfere with the rest of their lives. However, although older Xers are most likely to want a work-life balance, members of other age groups to varying extent also aspire to the same thing (Ahmad, Mehdi, Ali & Saeed, 2016).

Although much of the literature indicates work-life balance to be more important to Gen Xers than Baby Boomers, there seems to be mixed results, as other research have found no significant differences between cohorts. For example, Ann (2016) found that freedom-related work values, such as work-life balance and working hours, were not significantly different for Gen Xers and Baby Boomers. Ann as cited by Ahmad, Mehdi, Ali and Saeed (2017) found that Gen Xers were particularly concerned about work/life balance. Boomers reported that work interfered significantly more with their family than Gen Xers, and Gen Xers reported higher levels of work-family synergy than Boomers.

In cross sectional data, Sarah, Debra and Ceridwyn (2012) report also found that more Boomers (22%) than Gen Xers (13%) were work-centric, and Gen Xers (52%) were more family-centric than Boomers (40%). This was true even when only those with children at home were compared and the age of the youngest child was controlled. These findings, along with their finding that Gen Xers had higher marital satisfaction, might suggest that Gen Xers do indeed place more importance on their personal life and value work-life balance more than Baby Boomers. Overall, the research on generational work-life balance differences is still limited and inconclusive, thus warranting further investigation. Specific sub-components of work/life balance, such as flexibility in working hours, have begun to emerge as recent research topics in generational research.
2.2.1 Generational Differences, Preferences for Work Flexibility and Employee Productivity

In a study of lawyers, Benson and Brown as cited by Akhavan, Abzari, Nasri and Fadhi (2016) found flexibility in working hours was weakly negatively related to Baby Boomers’ productivity and non-significant for Gen Xers. The finding that flexibility in working hours was negatively related to Baby Boomers’ productivity is particularly surprising. It would seem that if organizations give their employees more control over their schedule they would be more committed to that organization, especially Gen Xers because some research indicates they place a high importance on work – life balance.

In addition, this was the only study to examine the relationship between schedule flexibility and productivity among Gen Xers and Baby Boomers and they only used a 2-item scale of schedule flexibility, whereas this study will use a more reliable 4-item measure. Research on “fun in the workplace” suggests that there is a relationship between having fun at work and job satisfaction, task performance, and organizational citizenship behavior (the likelihood of helping a coworker/boss) for Millennials. Students who had yet to enter the workforce reported that they were looking for a fluid relationship between work and play (André, Linde, & Merel, 2017). They contended that the allowance of breaks to use personal technology (i.e., Facebook), along with changes in other simple policies such as dress code flexibility, could increase satisfaction. Thus, workplace fun may have an effect on employee productivity, especially for Millennials.

Not all Millennials are comfortable with working eight hours a day, five days a week; they would rather customize their job schedules to be more flexible.

According to Ann (2011), more and more companies, such as IBM, are using technology to provide opportunities to work out of the office, at home, or while traveling. However, Kelly, Matthew and Nicholas (2013) found no significant relationship between computer competence, work flexibility, or autonomy and the desire to telework. There is no consensus on why Millennials value work flexibility more than Generation X and Baby Boomers. In a review of previous research, no difference was found in the hours worked by Millennials, Generation X, and Baby Boomers at the same age Deal, Altman and Rogelberg as cited by Becton, Walker and Jones, 2014), Deal, Altman, and Rogelberg speculated that because Millennials start at the bottom, they have less work responsibility and more flexibility than Baby Boomers and Generation X, whose higher positions
require them to work more. In contrast, a New Zealand study suggested that Millennials may value work flexibility more than older generations because Millennials have not yet achieved positions that allow flexibility. Millennials and Generation X with young children share a need for work-life balance, unlike those who do not have children or whose children are already grown. Our review of literature revealed a gap in research on the difference between preferences (values) and expectations for work flexibility, as well as the gap between other generations’ perceptions of Millennials.

### 2.2.2 Generational Differences in Teamwork and Employee Productivity

As mentioned earlier, teamwork appears to be one of those work attributes in which a clear difference between Gen X and Gen Y seems to exist. Although personal relationships are important to Gen X, many workers of this generation are considered poor team players and often do things themselves (James, Michael, & Samantha, 2013). It is found that Gen X members do not have the patience for a working group to come together, perhaps due to their 'independent' characteristic (Ann, 2016).

On the other hand, in 2012, Fortune, along with Youth Intelligence, and Towers Perrin, conducted interviews and focus groups with more than 220 teens, mostly high school students in 12 cities in nine states. They were asked about their career plans, social concerns, and anxieties; about their attitudes toward money, their relationships with friends and family, and their expectations for the future. Overall, results show that these teens are under severe stress to perform well in all that they do from choosing to go to college (and which college) to thinking about the future careers they might go into. These teens are overwhelmed and exhausted. Yet the most striking finding about these Gen Y teens is the amazingly close bonds they have developed with their friends (Benson & Brown, 2011). This finding should come as no surprise as it was previously mentioned from the 2014 BCSSE survey that 94% of incoming college students indicated moderate or high levels of team participation during their high school years (UAO, 2014).

Additionally, Gen Y members reported that their ability to work in teams was above average (UAO, 2014). These findings appear to indicate that Gen Y has not only been involved in teamwork since they were children through events such as their little league teams, but also they have the confidence that during the group project process they have "struck a harmonious chord" with the others. Since Gen Y members tend to gravitate
towards group work, whether it is through face-to-face or virtual projects, organizations should see teamwork as an effective way to organize tasks and initiatives for this generation (Bezrukova, Jehn & Spell, 2012).

Beyond these differences, both Gen X and Gen Y seek comfort and tend to have more respect for those who share their own values, therefore this easily presents an opportunity for group assignments (Chloé & Sébastien, 2013). In Wilson’s, Squires, Widger, Cranley, and Tourangeau’s (2017) study, nurses who acknowledged and appreciated their colleagues from different generational backgrounds had an advantage at teamwork. Furthermore, such collaboration allowed them room for higher levels of job satisfaction, but most importantly, it gave these nurses a higher probability of positively impacting patient outcomes. Cooperative and diverse teams offer a strategic advantage to the learning of both the individual and what the team as a whole can accomplish. Therefore, creating cooperative and cohesive teams that allow different generations to learn from each other and work well together can further enhance an organization's value. As a result, in this study, teamwork is defined as the belief that an employee is part of an effective and collaborative team. To the Net Generation, work is about deadlines not schedules. As long as the job is finished on time it does not matter when they do it. Because this generation is made up of active information seekers, they value autonomy and see themselves as the experts (Chloé & Sébastien, 2014). Based on the above findings, the present study tests the following research question: Do Generations differ on the belief of being part of an effective and collaborative team?

2.3 Generational Differences in Learning Styles and Employee Productivity
Generational differences are a topic of wide discussion in the corporate world. However, most of the published work on generational diversity is unapologetically theoretical in nature. Two of the leading theorists on generational diversity, Lancaster and Stillman as cited by Chloé and Sébastien (2015) in addressing concerns about perpetuating stereotypes. There is no research supporting the claim presented in their work. In addition, the field has not come to a consensus on some of the stereotypes being perpetuated in the literature. For example, Espinoza et al. as cited by Chloé and Sébastien (2015) called Generation X, the MTV generation. According to David (2013), Millennials are the MTV generation. Both present this stereotype without defining what implications there are for being the MTV generation. Lyons and Kuron (2013) claimed Generation X
is the generation of out-of-the-box thinkers while André, Linde and Merel (2017) called Millennials the out-of-the-box thinkers. Likewise, Howe and Strauss as cited by Jacqueline and Jun (2014) called Millennials the volunteer generation whereas Leila, Silva and Abdul, (2016) assigned that same label to the Baby Boomers. It is clear more empirical research is needed to address the contradictory nature of the published literature on generations.

There have been some quantitative studies done on generational differences, specifically as they pertain to generational learning styles, but these studies often contradict generational stereotypes that abound in corporate circles. For example, while many generational theorists stress the importance of technology for engaging Millennials, other researchers found older generations tended to prefer web-based learning more than younger generations did. While some scholars found Millennials do enjoy using technology in learning, they tended to be less satisfied with web-based learning than older generations (Jacqueline & Jun, 2013)

Oblinger and Oblinger as cited by Jacqueline and Jun (2013) addressed this contradiction in their seminal eBook titled Educating the Net Generation. Oblinger and Oblinger gathered experts in all areas of learning, technology, and generational trends to write on the topic of learning and the Net Generation. They argued the Net Generation is not necessarily defined only by age. In fact, in their view, the generation is defined by use and exposure to technology. Given Oblinger and Oblinger’s definition, older generations that has been heavy users of information technology (IT) since a younger age may also fall into the Net Generation category. Dede as cited by Jacqueline and Jun (2013) also noted Baby Boomers exhibit neomillenial learning style preferences because they used the same tools and media as Millennials. A 2009 study produced by the Office of Information Technology at the University of Minnesota on the 21st-century student revealed that since 2007, fewer differences have been found between older and younger students. No correlation was found between age and desire for technology in the classroom, technology use, comfort level, or even perceived usefulness of technology.

Ahmad et al. (2016) cited a similar survey at the University of Central Florida (UCF). The UCF regularly surveyed students about their web-based learning experiences and preferences. The survey received 1,489 respondents and pulled data from three generations (Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials). The results showed that
older learners reported higher satisfaction with web-based learning than younger generations. Reasons for dissatisfaction across the three generations varied considerably.

Boomers wished there was more face-to-face interaction, Generation X felt the continuous connectedness of web-based learning failed to get to the point, and Millennials felt a lack of immediacy in the web-based learning. Overall, however, the Baby Boomers were more satisfied with web-based learning than any other generation. Ahmad et al. (2016) argued that an awareness of these different learning preferences among each generation would allow institutions to build curricula addressing the students’ varying needs. They argued courses need to be redesigned to align with student preferences, true not only at a curriculum level, but at an IT infrastructure level as well. Jacqueline and Jun (2015) suggested the reason Millennials are dissatisfied with web-based learning may be because the web-based learning tools used by the institutions are far behind the technology those students are using in their everyday lives. As a result, the students are not engaged by the web-based learning interface. Therefore, Ahmad et al. (2016) argued being aware of student learning preferences gives instructional designers more options for engaging students in web-based learning. The understanding allows instructional designers to be forward thinking about student needs rather than reactionary.

Similar to Hartman et al. and Billings et al. as cited by Jacqueline and Jun (2015) conducted a study in an attempt to gain insight into teaching strategies and best practices when engaging in web based learning across generations. The purpose of the study was to understand if there were different perceptions among younger and older student using web-based learning. Five hundred fifty-eight nursing students representing each generation were surveyed with the Evaluating Educational Uses of the Web in Nursing (EEUWIN) instrument. The instrument was developed by Billings et al. (2005) and obtained data around student perceptions of educational practices and the use of technology. They found that while there was no difference between groups in use of technology, there were differences in perceptions. Most notably, the older generations felt less connected to other students and the instructor when engaging in web-based learning. Billings et al. as cited by James, Michael and Samantha (2012) hypothesized the disconnection may be due to a generational issue and younger generations were more comfortable connecting with their peers online than older generations. They also suggested educators should explore new instructional design strategies to accommodate
for the diverse generations in the online environment, as understanding generational differences is paramount to creating effective online instruction.

To understand generational learning differences, Holyoke and Larson (2009) argued it is imperative to understand the different learning motivations of each generation. McGuire, By, and Hutchings as cited by Kelly, Matthew and Nicolas (2011) analyzed the effects of generational diversity in the workforce and, while they argued intergenerational conflict can stifle organizational learning, they proposed a model for dealing with such conflict. They contended that while generational groups are counterproductive to creating an empowering work environment that encourages learning at all levels, there is a way to leverage the diversity to encourage learning at an organizational level. Some of their suggestions included intergenerational team building activities and pairing across generations. While McGuire et al. offered a theoretical model for how human resources (HR) could respond to the needs of different generations in the workplace, Beaver and Hutchings (2015) offered very specific strategies on how to leverage the generational diversity to encourage organizational learning.

Like Beaver and Hutchings as cited by Kelly, Matthew and Nicolas (2016) contended an ecological approach to understanding organizational learning and the intergenerational dynamic is important. However, they also pointed out that while an organizational approach to learning would contribute to the future success of the organization, there are benefits to the individual as well. Beaver and Hutchings further suggested each generation has different learning styles and values, so the traditional approach to learning is no longer sufficient with such a diverse workforce. As a result, the learning itself must be diverse. The authors suggested it is no longer sufficient for a trainer to teach in the traditional format, as classroom learning is quickly becoming an outdated format for education. Therefore, they proposed organizations take an ecological and integrative approach to learning. For example, mentoring programs are an excellent way to encourage organizational learning. However, with the new intergenerational workforce, mentoring need not be one directional. For example, “while younger employees can be mentored by older, more experienced employees, the younger employee can in turn mentor older employees about the internet and other new technologies”.

Kelly, Matthew and Nicolas (2017) also believe learning need not only take place in the traditional format. They stated Millennials have joined the workforce with a new set of
expectations and requirements when it comes to their learning. They posited much of this change is a result of technological advancements. Since Millennials have grown up as digital natives, they are “technologically literate, highly mobile, and autonomous individuals with short attention spans and are more inclined to question authority”. For example, Millennials are not interested in passive, classroom learning, but instead prefer many learning opportunities on a variety of subjects, taught in an interactive and participatory fashion. Thus, workplace experiences such as on-the-job training are now the new classroom. However, the authors pointed out that informal learning can be frustrating if there is a lack of direction. Therefore, Kelly et al. (2017) offered that instead, learners must be considered active partners in the design and facilitation of the learning process. This means an ecological learning system must evolve in which the facilitator, subject matter experts, and students are all an integral part to the creation of learning. Through such an active learning process, the organization may engage the generationally diverse workforce more effectively. Many emerging technologies support and encourage this type of collaborative learning environment. Specifically, social media and mobile learning tools revolve around this type of learning exchange. The next stream of literature looks specifically at these existing and emerging technologies.

2.3.1 Generational Learning Goal Orientation, Preferences for Learning Activities and Employee Productivity

Some research has indicated that Gen Xers are more likely to display higher levels of learning goal orientation than Baby Boomers and that learning goal orientation can be a retention factor for Gen Xers. Some researchers have suggested that due to Gen Xers’ higher learning goal orientation, development opportunities might be seen as favorable and thus increase their organizational commitment. If Gen Xers do in fact have a higher learning goal orientation, but are not being given adequate opportunities to learn on the job and increase their skills set this might cause them to be more likely to leave the organization (Leila, Silva & Abdul, 2016).

Building on motivational theory, Lyons and Kuron (2013) suggested that goal orientation is a relatively stable dispositional trait. She defined the two major classes of goal orientation, learning goal orientation and performance goal orientation. Individuals with a learning goal orientation seek to develop competence by acquiring new skills and
mastering new situations. Individuals with a performance goal orientation seek to demonstrate and validate their existing competence by seeking favorable judgments and avoiding negative judgments.

Learning oriented individuals see intelligence as malleable and continually seek challenging assignments where they can learn from experience. In the workplace, they value experiences that provide growth and development, seek feedback, demonstrate a desire to work hard and select skill improvement goals. The present study will investigate if employees’ desire to learn is dependent on the generational cohort the individual is from. A few studies suggest that generational cohorts have different desires to learn on the job (Lyons, Ng & Schweitzer, 2012).

In one study, out of 15 different work-related motivational factors, Gen Xers ranked “chance to learn new things” significantly higher than Boomers did. In another study, Shelton and Shelton (2014) found that out of 15 different work related importance factors, Gen X men ranked opportunities for learning number three, and women ranked it number four. In another study conducted by Cole-Gomolski (2014), 84% of Gen Xers who received at least six days of training were satisfied with their jobs and 80% said training was a factor in accepting new jobs, which was higher than what Baby Boomers reported (percentage not given). Thompson (2014) found that younger workers viewed training as a key to their advancement and believed that training would prepare them for future opportunities more than Boomers did.

The research on generational differences in learning goal orientation is mixed though. One of the only empirical articles to examine generational differences in constructs relating to learning goal orientation found that Gen Xers and Baby Boomers did not differ significantly on the degree of motivation concerning training and development opportunities (Carpenter, as cited by Lyons et al., 2012). This study examined motivation to learn, training effort, and training participation from scales developed by Noe and Schmitt (2014). Motivation to learn refers to the desire of the trainee to learn the content of a training program. It is a key determinant of the choices individuals make to engage in, attend to, and persist in learning activities.

Learning orientation, on the other hand, is slightly different than motivation to learn because it is a dispositional trait. Individuals with a learning goal orientation dispositional
trait have a stronger motivation to learn, and learning goal orientation has demonstrated a strong and consistent relationship with motivation to learn. So the two constructs are similar, but distinct. It might be that, compared to Baby Boomers, Gen Xers have a stronger inclination to always be learning on the job, but both cohorts may be equally motivated by specific training programs when they become available. This might explain why Carpenter (2014) did not find that Gen Xers and Baby Boomers differed on motivation concerning training and development opportunities. Or perhaps the underlying construct that influences motivation for training and development opportunities is learning goal orientation (Muhammad & Mohsin, 2014).

One of the only studies that has examined learning orientation in Gen Xers and Baby Boomers is D’Amato and Herzfeldt as cited by Nest and Schweitzer (2016). Their results indicated that Gen Xers expressed higher learning goal orientation than Baby Boomers, though the effect was small. Since D’Amato and Herzfeldt is the only study that has attempted to find a difference between Gen Xer and Baby Boomers in goal orientation, this construct deserves further exploration with these generations.

Net Generation learners are active learners. According to Muhammad and Mohsin (2014) this generation does not ask what something means or how it works, but instead how to build it. This generation prefers group and collaborative activities over individual assignments. The Net Generation also tends to be doers rather than listeners. Because the Net Generation would rather do than listen, they prefer learning activities that allow them to explore, discover, and experiment. In addition, this generation enjoys activities that involve social interaction such as debates and class discussions. For instructors, teaching to the Baby Boomers and Generation X are the least of their concerns. Most instructors fall into one of these categories themselves and therefore have similar characteristics and general learning styles to those of their learners. In addition, these two generations have internal motivators, such as the desire to learn, before they begin attending school. In comparison, the Net Generation seeks external motivators. They want the instructor to challenge them and engage them in active critical thinking activities (Oblinger, 2014).
2.3.2 Generational Differences in Training Styles, Training needs and Employee productivity

Generations have different favored learning styles. There are five major preferred methods of learning ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ skills, from Deal as cited by Chloé and Sébastien (2015). Popularly, Generation X and Y prefer to learn both soft and hard skills on the job, while majority of The Silent Generation and Boomers, prefer to learn soft skills on the job, and learn hard skills through teaching space instruction. Conversation or discussion groups was the second method of choice for learning soft skills for older workers, but was the fifth choice for Xers and the third choice for Yers. While Xers and Yers acknowledged getting valuation and feedback as a top five method to learn soft skills, this was not the case for older generations, lending some credibility to the stereotype that while older generations may be somewhat sensitive to feedback, younger generations desire it (André, Linde, & Merel, 2017). By contrast, people in the different generations had similar top five approaches and means for learning hard skills. While these systems are endorsed by a large proportion of the interviewees, individual inclinations among members of a generation varied.

As expected, the generations contrasted in their perceived training needs. Traditionals and Boomers were more inclined to skills training in their areas of expertise mostly, and although Xers and Yers liked such training, most would prefered training in leadership. While leadership is also an area of perceived need for Baby Boomers, this was not the same for Matures. Additionally, while computer training is a perceived need of Matures and Baby Boomers, this was not so for Millenials and Generation X. Lastly, team building was a zone in which Traditionals and Generation X preferred training, and problem solving was an area in which Millenials liked training (Benson & Brown, 2011).

For decades, there has been a debate among educational researchers and learning theorists about the effectiveness of various pedagogical approaches. The scholarly debate among educational researchers and learning theorists about the relative merit of behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, and social constructivism continues. Indeed, some argue that this debate is devolving into ideological stances rather than carefully examined theoretical models. In any case, this debate largely takes place in scholarly journals that few people read or at research conferences attended only by researchers, and thus most practitioners are unaware of it.
Meanwhile, in the real world of business and industrial training, practitioners are likely to change their instructional approaches based primarily on the promotion of the latest and greatest training technologies touted to “revolutionize” training rather than on the basis of dubious learning theory or weak research findings. At the same time, Generation “experts” are making big bucks as consultants who issue recommendations that are also uninformed by strong theory or the findings of sound research. For example, Chester as cited by Ann (2016) offers the following five basic principles for training the Net Generation without any reference to principles of learning theory or findings from educational research studies: Make it fun; Engage them; Make it fresh; Keep up the pace and Reward skill development.

In another book titled Getting Them To Give A Damn, Chester as cited by Ann (2016) offers six slightly more specific guidelines for training, although again unsupported by theory or research: Begin with an orientation, not skills training; Assess what they know; Continually reinvent your training; Communicate where to turn for answers; Don’t just train the what, train the why; Keep training fun, interactive, and engaging. Lancaster and Stillman as cited by Chester as cited by Ann (2016) also fail to reference learning theories or the results of educational research in their “Training the Generations” chapter. They do include a few “buzzwords” from corporate training literature, such as “learning organization” and “lifelong learning,” but do not list sources for these ideas. Their training advice is boiled down what they call “the three Ss”: setting, style, and substance (p. 282). These are elaborated as the following principles: Make sure the setting for training is comfortable; Pay attention to the learning styles of the different generations represented; Be sure the training has real substance.

In her book titled Connecting Generations: The Sourcebook for a New Workplace, Raines (2013) provides five tips for training the Mature Generation, four tips for the Baby Boomers, seven for Generation X trainees, and three for the Net Generation. All of these tips lack any references to learning theory or educational research. Zemke, Raines, and Filipczak (2012) provide advice for training “Veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters” throughout their book without mention of learning theory or research findings. For example, without providing any clear references, they offer the following “points to keep in mind” when training the Net Generation, (p. 244): They read more than any generation ahead of them; They are used to learning in a highly interactive way; The popularity and
productivity of role-playing and other interactive activities work in inverse proportion to their age; The experts say that the Millennial Generation will make the Xers look like technological dinosaurs.

In contrast to the dubious bromides provided by the “experts” quoted above, a review of educational research reveals that there are virtually no research-based findings or evidence drawn from robust learning theory that supports the differential effectiveness of different instructional designs or strategies across the generations. Nor is there a compelling case for the development of a new instructional design model to accommodate generational differences. To help answer these questions educators can review past research, and conduct new research on the differences between generational groups. In this chapter, the researcher will review what research has been accomplished on the matter, and will analyze past studies that show differences in generational groups motivations and learning styles. The researcher also analyze research that shows how working together in an educational setting can eliminate conflict among different generational groups (Jacqueline & Jun, 2012).

Before deciding if there are differences in motivations and learning styles based on generation, educators and leaders need to understand why this type of research is important. As mentioned above, more non-traditional students are entering universities every day. In addition Baby Boomers are leaving stable careers for new endeavors as well. Finally a lack of skill or interest in key positions in the economy has forced corporations to prepare younger generations of workers. This combination will lead to a mixture of age groups in corporate training programs, and degree programs across the world. First let us take a look at the skill gap situation facing our global economy.

Not only are specific industries preparing for a lack of skilled workers, business leaders across all sectors of the global economy are preparing their talent for management positions. With the skills gap, corporations are starting to see how effective managers can help them be more competitive in the marketplace when it comes to recruiting top talent. Good managers assist with employee engagement, turnover, and productivity. And executives are willing to pay to train their managers, “about one-third of that spending, or roughly $13 billion was devoted to grooming leaders, including spending for manager training programs, outsourcing, trainers’ salaries, content development, coursework and other services,” (Jacqueline & Jun, 2013).
In addition to the skills gap situation, there are also a number of nontraditional students heading back to educational institutions. This has caused an increase in the amount of different generational groups attending colleges and universities. These different generational groups have different needs, motivations, and learning styles.

**2.3.3 Generational Differences, Training Implications and Employee Productivity**

In the workforce, training and education seem to still be very important to the Nexters so training should be available to them in the workplace. Nexters also appear to do well with mentors in a work environment so mentoring may be a good idea for some training in a work environment (Zemke et al., 2012). There was no empirical/theoretical literature found related to these two generations and training. However, some of the popular literature suggests that these generations prefer to learn through a formal setting such as a classroom. They also prefer printed texts versus electronic formats. Face to face instruction or verbal learning styles are preferable over visual learning methods (Ng, Schweitzer & Lyons, 2010).

Bova and Kroth as cited by Parry and Urwin (2011) investigated the learning preferences of Generation X employees through descriptive research. Results indicated that Generation X prefers and values action learning and incidental learning in the workplace. Action learning is a type of learning that results from individuals being given the opportunity to find solutions to real problems. Learning occurs in the process of problem-solving. A Generation X employee described it as being a way for the organization and the individual to win. The organization gets its problem solved and the individual develops new skills.

Incidental learning involves learning that occurs as a result of an unintended consequence of another activity. Learning can even happen because of mistakes made on the job. This kind of learning is hard to measure and promote as an effective learning strategy because most organizations are not going to give an employee a task with the intention of failing or with a purpose to learn something different. Some organizations may try to promote risk-taking, but employees seem to be skeptical of this if the culture is not one of forgiveness (Paul & Alan, 2008). Because the preferred learning environment for Generation X is self-directed, formal or traditional learning was the least attractive to Generation X. They do not prefer a face to- face trainer who requires them to be there for a certain number of days and times. They are motivated to learn when it is fun, have an
opportunity to sample and role-play, and prefer training materials that have fewer words and more visual stimulation (Paul, Anna & Alan, 2011).

Jurkiewicz as cited by Paul and Leask (2014) compared the differences in work-related values of Generation X and Boomer employees. They found that these two generations were more alike than different, with the only statistically significant differences being that the Boomers ranked “chance to learn new things” and “freedom from pressures to conform both on and off the job” higher than Generation X and Generation X ranking higher “freedom from supervision”. Though this is contrary to what the popular literature states on what GenXers want on the job, a more robust study on work-relate values was done by Smola and Sutton (2012). Their study revealed significant differences among Generation X and Baby Boomers. Generation X employees were less loyal and had a more “me” attitude, wanted to be promoted more quickly, were less likely to think that work was an important part of one’s life, and were more likely to quit work if they won a large sum of money.

Pendergast (2010) made an assessment that Generation Xers no longer stay at the same job for very long and this has led to the idea that learning new skills in their job is important to them so that they can continue to build their skill set for the next job. It also appears that Generation Xers value continuous learning in their jobs and that organizations who want to keep them in their workplace should provide them with many learning opportunities (Bova & Kroth, 2012). To give more credibility to this finding, the research done by Lyons, Duxbury, and Higgins (2014) also suggest that Generation X places a high importance on intrinsic work values, meaning that the desire for training and learning for this generation is good. In order to attract and retain members of this generation, organizations should provide opportunities for intellectual stimulation and unique learning opportunities for engagement.

Based on this information, it seems that the motivation for training Generation Xers readily exists. Suzanne Robert, who is an e-Learning specialist at IBM has developed the following strategies and methods for training Generation X and even the Nexter generation (2014). She says companies should develop self-study learning guides, web-based training, web-based discussion forums, online workshops, mobile wireless courseware, and even incorporate face-to-face workshops for Generation X and the Nexter generation. Others caution that some “Boomers” and “Silents” may also have
characteristics like “Generation X” and “Nexter” and may also prefer some of the same training strategies (Dede, 2014).

In a report published by Pricewaterhouse Coopers, Millennials ranked training and development activities highest in regards to what they would value the most over the next five years in employment. Close to one-third of Millennials surveyed chose training and development over salary as their first choice value. Development ranked very high in this survey and 98% of Millennials said working with strong coaches and mentors was very important in their personal development. Surprisingly, e-learning was ranked as least important, but it was still very important to 62% of the Millennials surveyed. Millennials have been characterized as having vastly different communication styles than the other generational cohorts. Some likely influences on communication styles include their knowledge and experience with diversity, their “helicopter” parents, educational trends, psychological issues, use of technology at a young age, and their exposure to popular culture (Peter, 2012).

Research suggests that initiatives and trainings for the Millennials should take a more strategic view in order to respond to more competitiveness in the world. Gorman, Nelson, and Glassman also contend that HR has the opportunity to “redefine the role of the entry-level worker”. Instead of an entry-level job consisting of prescribed, mundane tasks that provide limited opportunities to interact with others, companies should capitalize on the unique and more sophisticated skills of Millennials in order to better acclimate themselves to achieve their organizational goals and be competitive in the marketplace. They propose that Millennial workers should be socialized into the organization by being “technology mentors” to other employees in the organization. By setting high expectations from the start and implementing mentoring relationships, this could provide the first challenging task that a new employee often seeks. Early work experiences have been shown to affect the organizational commitment of new employees in a positive way (Peter, 2012).

2.4 Generational Differences in Communication Styles and Employee Productivity

Recognizing, understanding, and respecting the differences of the four generations is essential to effectively lead a multi-generational workforce. Respecting employees for who they are includes respecting communication methods (Peter, 2014). Murphy (2007)
recommends that the Golden Rule, ‘Do unto others as you would have them do unto you’, be adapted for the diverse workplace into the Titanium rule: Do unto others, keeping their preferences in mind. Traditionalists prefer communication to be respectful, with words and tone, with good grammar, clear diction, and void of any slang or profanity. Language should be somewhat formal and professional, relating messages to the common good or the company’s history and long-term goals. Feedback is preferred in the form of memos, letters, and personal notes. Traditionalists’ sense of discipline impacts their preferences on feedback, believing “no news is good news” (Princeton, 2013).

Baby Boomers are relational focused and prefer phone calls and personal interaction. Managers should plan conversations over coffee or lunch, integrating mutual interests into the dialog. Linking the conversation to the team or individual vision, mission, and values will have an impact on Baby Boomer workers. Communication with Baby Boomers should be participative, inviting their input in the process. By contrast, Generation X workers want direct, straightforward communication. An email or voicemail with specificity and clarity will suffice. Millennials have redefined “timely” as it relates to feedback. The high expectations of this cohort extend to performance related feedback and they want it in an instant. Managers should communicate with a positive tone, delivering messages face to face or via text messaging. Tie the message to the worker’s personal goals will make the connection to these achievement-oriented individuals. Millennials will have higher regard for managers who are not condescending, cynical, or sarcastic (Rocky & Dwyer, 2016).

2.4.1 Generational Differences in Communication Styles, Computer-mediated Communication and Employee Productivity

This section examines two computer-mediated communications namely flaming and use of emoticons. Because CMC is still a relatively new phenomenon in the business world, the body of knowledge on all the aforementioned subjects is still new and continually changing. Flaming is a phenomenon unique to computer-mediated communication. Equivalent to being yelled at or otherwise verbally assaulted in face-to-face conflict, flaming is more formally defined as “hostile and aggressive interactions via text-based computer mediated communication” (O’Sullivan and Flanigan, 2013, p. 67). Flaming can be expressed in a variety of ways, ranging from profanity, offensive or derogatory remarks, to typing in all-caps to simulate shouting (Johnson et al., 2015). Because CMC,
an inherently weaker communication medium, oftentimes results in “reduced social constraint”, flaming is much more likely to occur (Sarah, Debra & Ceridwyn, 2012). When communication breaks down to the point that flaming occurs, all forms of negotiation are very likely to cease being effective. Flaming is an increasingly relevant topic, in part because of the increased frequency of computer-mediated negotiations and group work in the workplace (Sarah, Debra & Ceridwyn, 2012).

Sarah et al., (2012) have identified and categorized what they believe are two “types” of flaming. The first type, opponent-directed flaming, arises because of the perception that one participant in the conversation has about the other. The idea that another member of a group is somehow “unfair” or uncooperative can potentially lead to the other party flaming the opposite contact. These types of personal attacks can inhibit the effectiveness of a group, limiting group unity, cohesion, and willingness to agree on issues at hand. In an experiment done in 2014 by Johnson, Cooper, and Chin, it was found that opponent-directed flaming does indeed decrease the likelihood that a group consensus can be reached. The shunning of “social norms” (Johnson et al., 2014) that flaming causes prevents the group from being able to easily trust each other to accomplish the task at hand.

The second type of flaming identified is context-directed flaming. This type of flaming involves one side of a conversation becoming frustrated or angry not at another person involved in the discussion, but instead at the medium in which the conversation is being held in. Frustration tends to rise when the medium is not able to meet the needs of the user (Johnson et al., 2014). The channel with which teams utilize computer-mediated communication can greatly impact how a team is able to perform and function. Email, for instance, is a channel that is much more limited compared to traditional face-to-face conversation. The message is asynchronous, meaning that questions may not be answered as quickly as they could be otherwise. In addition, verbal, pictorial, and nonverbal expressions (such as expression or tone of voice) are not conveyed as easily (Sarah et al., 2012). This could potentially inhibit group effectiveness and frustrate a team member who is not accustomed to dealing with these hurdles.

Emoticons are another unique component of CMC. First utilized in the 2012s, an emoticon has been defined as “an ASCII glyph used to indicate an emotional state in e-mail or news” (Wolf, 2012, p. 828). Emoticons allowed the sender of a message to
simulate a facial expression as closely as possible. In what has historically been a rather "lean" medium of communication, emoticons provide a much more accurate way to judge emotion and mood from the sender (Lo, 2014). Text-based CMC in particular inhibits numerous channels of communication from being properly conveyed. One such channel, which is crucial for discerning items such as mood and agreement, are facial expressions. Over an email conversation, for instance, there is no way for members of a team to entirely determine the facial reaction of another team member. Non-verbal cues, often unique to face-to-face interaction, are much more difficult to convey through a CMC medium. This is a major blockade to the communication process, and a difficult obstacle to overcome for virtual teams or those utilizing CMC. In addition, the inability to read and interpret non-verbal cues can cause entire emotions to be hidden and undetectable in a message (Sarah et al., 2013).

To help combat this inability to perceive emotion and tone through CMC, many users of text-based CMC mediums have come to rely on emoticons to properly convey feelings. Since then, emoticons, along with the more advanced and graphic smileys have become commonly used by everyday users of chat rooms and other text-based CMC mediums. Ranging from the simple =-) to the more complex, these figures have helped convey more social information across CMC than previously possible (Ganster et al., 2012). This ability to simulate nonverbal communication has led some scholars such as Lo to proclaim emoticons as “quasi-nonverbal cues”.

Numerous studies have investigated what types of CMC-mediated messages are best conveyed by emoticons, as well as how effective they truly are in expressing a correct emotion in group settings. Others have analyzed the social motives for using emoticons. When participants in a 2014 study by Derk, Bos, and Grumbkow were asked to observe and respond to short CMC chat logs, the aspects of communication that were “delivered” the best by emoticon usage were “the expression of emotion, for strengthening the verbal part of a message, and for expressing humor” (p. 101), much like the role facial expression plays in traditional face-to-face communication. This supports the earlier idea from Lo (2014) that emoticons in CMC are best used as quasi-nonverbal cues. It was also found in the same study that people who are more familiar with each other are more likely to utilize emoticons. For teams utilizing CMC, this provides another reason why group members need a way to bond and connect before exclusively relying on CMC wherever
possible. This is particularly important, once again, when a diverse team forms together in the workplace.

2.4.1 Generational Differences in Communication Styles, Flaming across Genders and Employee Productivity

When diverse teams need to utilize CMC to accomplish workplace goals, perceptions about flaming between both genders and by generation have both various differences and similarities. The one thing that all groups have in common is that, by and large, flaming is something that should be avoided when at all possible. Groups as a whole enjoy being able to cooperate and communicate openly and safely with members, even when conflict does occur. Flaming occurs when these societal expectations and norms fall apart (Johnson et al., 2014). Though these norms do slightly vary between genders and by generation, basic desire to work together and coexist among peers has remained constant for much of human existence.

Numerous studies have theorized and expanded in detail on how men and women communicate differently. As a whole, women tend to adopt more emotion and personal anecdotes into their communication. Even through computer-mediated communication, scholars have found that women are more likely to ask questions, insert a more personal orientation, and be more emotive in their messages (Jaffe and Lee, 2015, Savacki et al., 2012). In contrast, men are typically more likely to exhibit stoic behavior, minimal emotion, and are more prone to adopting aggressive language and conversation when needed (Spottswood et al., 2013).

In particular, the tendency for men to be more aggressive is the most obvious link to flaming behavior. In a Savicki and Kelley (2012) study concerning gendered communication in CMC mediums, male-only groups were more likely to ignore ways to adapt to the CMC medium, and instead only focused on the task at the end. The environment created a less rich channel for understanding, which led to higher dissatisfaction with CMC and the addition of “mild flaming”. In contrast, women learned to overcome the challenges posed by CMC and avoided flaming altogether (Savicki and Kelley, 2012). The flaming that was demonstrated by the men was by and large opponent-directed, particularly because the group did not take the time to learn how to utilize a CMC medium properly. Conflict more easily formed because of how the group members
could not properly communicate and connect. Gender can impact flaming considerably over computer-mediated communication, based on traditional styles of gender communication. When it comes to generational viewpoints over flaming, however, there is not an obvious schism over how baby boomers and millennial group members perceive it. As discussed earlier, human culture promotes finding ways to work together and to avoid negative conflict if possible. Partially because of this, there is no real research on how different generations perceive flaming over CMC mediums.

A possible source of flaming among generations, however, is context-directed flaming. Particularly among older generations, such as the baby boomers, frustration may occur in utilizing newer technologies with which they are not familiar. The millennial generation, on the other hand, has grown up with a rapid influx of new technologies that they are much more familiar with (Beekman, 2015). Another way that generations could potentially engage in flaming behavior is if they do not like the way a message is being conveyed over the medium. In a study by Kallinen and Ravaja (2013), older and younger subjects were asked to evaluate, measure preference, and discuss how they preferred to receive messages through CMC. Older generations preferred a slower pace of information, while younger subjects flocked towards the opposite (Tomislav & Nina, 2014). If a generational group perceives that the medium is preventing them from fully understanding a situation, context-directed flaming might be possible.

Similarly, if another member of a group is utilizing CMC in a way that another member of a different generation is not familiar with, opponent-directed flaming is possible. Different generations prefer different styles of communication. Older generations as a whole prefer face-to-face communication or phone calls in order to accomplish items at work. On the other hand, the millennial generation is much more prone to utilizing email and text messages to communicate. Frustration may occur when having to communicate in a style that an individual does not like, which could contribute to negative perceptions of the other member of the conversation (Goudreau, 2013). When left unchecked, and without ways for groups to monitor and potentially remedy this issue, flaming could likely occur unless discussed. The one thing that both genders and multiple generations have in common concerning flaming is that it should be avoided whenever possible. Although some genders may prefer report over rapport, and different generations view
CMC mediums in different ways, flaming is always viewed as a severe destruction of group dynamics.

2.4.2 Generational Differences in Communication Styles, Use of Emoticons across Genders and Employee Productivity

There has been little written on the role that gender plays in utilizing emoticons in CMC. One of the few studies in the area was completed by Wolf in 2012. The traditional school of thought, as cited by Wolf, is that men, often regarded as the more emotionally-restrained of the two genders would be less likely to use emoticons when using a CMC medium. Women, on the other hand, would be much more likely to use them as a way to express emotion more ably. In same-gendered groups, this pattern holds true. Wolf discovered, however, that mixed-gender groups would be much more likely to have all members, especially males, begin to utilize emoticons more frequently. The study also revealed why each gender tended to use emoticons. Women used them to express general humor and camaraderie, while men utilized them to convey sarcasm or teasing. The study concluded that men viewed emoticons as ways to express emotions in a more typical and stoic style. Women, however, utilized them as a way to express “solidarity, support, assertion of positive feelings, and thanks” (Zaniboni, Truxillo & Fraccaroli, 2013). In teams with both genders present, remembering exactly why a certain emoticon is present can help all members of the group more properly understand what emotion is trying to be conveyed, along with why the message is being sent in the first place.

There is also, sadly, little research on linking perceptions of emoticons by generation. However, there are ties in existing research that could link concepts together to create an overview of varying perceptions. The contrast between the baby boomers and millennials towards emoticons are quite different and warrant further exploration. As discussed earlier, the baby boomer generation is, as a whole, much more accustomed to a more “standard” environment when it comes to communication- memos, face-to-face meetings, and phone calls are the common approach to reaching out to peers in the workplace (Robinson and Stubberud, 2012, Beekman, 2015). On the other hand, the millennial generation is comfortable with CMC mediums being used to more casually send messages back and forth. Because of the millennial worker’s comfort and familiarity with CMC, this means that they are also more familiar with using emoticons from a young age.
Conversely, the baby boomer generation can very easily see emoticon usage as unprofessional and not suited for work (Sean, Lyons, Schweitzer & Ng, 2015).

There is some common ground between both generations, however, when it comes to using emoticons at the workplace. While older generations such as the baby boomers are much more against the idea of using emoticons at work compared to millennials, a common shared value between both is that overusing emoticons is very possible. Wolf cites The Hacker’s Dictionary when noting in her article that “More than one [emoticon] per paragraph is a fairly sure sign that you’ve gone over the line.” (p. 828) Millennials do recognize when utilizing CMC and emoticons is not appropriate for the task at hand. However, they are still much more likely to utilize them than peers from older generational cohorts would (Yuliya & David, 2013). Using emoticons has the potential to raise concerns of professionalism in a diverse group environment, as well as demonstrate different communication styles among group members.

2.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter summarized the statistics from other researchers who have managed to carry out their research in the same ground of study. From the reviewed literature it has been established that different generations have different preferences for communication and learning styles. Given the contradictory research on generational learning preferences and communication preferences as, further study is warranted on the generational learning style and communication preferences of the corporate employee. In addition, an understanding of such differences (or lack thereof) can inform instructional design best practices if training developers create training programs catering to the entire learning cycle. With a myriad of technological tools and learning activities available, the next age of corporate training will look vastly different from the corporate training of the last decade. As the evolution takes place, an understanding of the needs of the generationally diverse workforce can lead to more effective and engaging training. The next chapter minutiae the methods used and the approach taken in this research. It specifically, explains the research design that was adopted; the population, the type of data that was collected, sampling frame, sample and sampling techniques, data collection instrument, data collection procedure, pilot test, validity and reliability of the instrument, and the data analysis and presentation are also discussed in detail.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter designates the methodology which was used in this study. It mainly focused on: the research design, study area, the target population, sampling techniques, research instruments, the experimental study, data collection and data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

The study embraced a descriptive design where, a descriptive research design determines and reports the way things are (Bryman, 2014). Descriptive research is where the investigation in which quantitative data is collected and analysed in order to describe the specific phenomenon in its current events, current trends and linkages between different factors at the current time. The main focus of this study was quantitative. However qualitative approach was used in order to gain a better understanding and possibly enable a better and more insightful and specific interpretation of the results from the quantitative study. (Hamuľák, 2016) in his study on generational differences in work values and job satisfaction adopted descriptive research design. Other studies that used a similar research design include, Wilson, Squires, Widger, Cranley and Tourangeau (2017), and Wong, Gardiner, Lang and Coulon (2017).

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

A research population in statistics is generally the specific population about which information is desired. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2013), a population is a well-defined or set of people, services, elements, and events, group of things or households that are being investigated. It is for the profit of the population that researches are usually undertaken. The target population of this study was the 60 faith based humanitarian organizations in Nairobi Kenya (See appendix V). However the study selected only six faith based organizations (see section3.4) while the target respondents were 907 staffs drawn from various departments.
Table 3.1: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Project M&amp;E</th>
<th>Project IT</th>
<th>Project R&amp;D</th>
<th>Finance &amp; Accounting</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>Logistics</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Communion</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caritas International</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian AID</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DanChurchAid</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildmay International</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving in Mission</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>262</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>907</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: HR departments of participating organizations (2018)*

3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

The sampling frame describes the list of all population units from which the sample was selected (Cooper & Schindler, 2008). It is a physical representation of the target population and comprises all the units that are potential members of a sample (Kothari, 2008). The sampling frame for this study was the 907 employees obtained from the HR departments in the six Faith Based Organization.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

Cooper and Schindler (2011) argue that if well chosen, samples of about 10% of a population can often give good reliability. This study will therefore purposely select 6 faith based organizations operating in Nairobi County as shown in Table 3.1. Stratified random sampling technique will be used since population of interest is not homogeneous and could be subdivided into groups or strata to obtain a representative sample.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size

From the above population of 907, a sample of 30% from within each group in proportions that each group bear to the study population. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2013), a sample size of 30% is appropriate. This generated a sample of 272 respondents which the study sought information from. The selection was as follows.
Table 3.2: Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Population (Frequency)</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Technology</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Accounting</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>907</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>272</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Data Collection

This study collected quantitative data using a self-administered questionnaire. The researcher dropped the questionnaires and pick them later from the respondents in a situation where they would not in a position to fill them straightaway. This was to permit the respondents’ enough time to objectively complete them to ensure validity and reliability of information collected.

For this study, questionnaires were used to collect primary data, according to Mugenda and Mugenda (2013), questionnaires are cheaper and quicker to analyze than responses to open questions. The questions were structured using the concepts of generation differences. The structured questions were combined with open questions. The questions were developed to capture the knowledge of the human resource managers and of the faith based organizations in Nairobi County in view of multigenerational workforce effect on workplace productivity, while the open questions provided room for the respondents to provide additional information. The questionnaire comprises of two sections with the likert scale questions. The first part includes the demographic and operational characteristics meant to determine key issues such as the demographic characteristics of the respondent while the second part concentrated on seeking answers to questions based on: generational differences, work-life balance and work place productivity; Generational learning styles, preferences for learning activities and work place productivity and generational communication styles preferences and work place productivity.
3.5 Research Procedures

The researcher carried out a trial study to pretest the reliability of the questionnaire before carrying out the actual study and its validity. The researcher used a pre-test sample of 2 respondents which is 1% of the goal population. Its intent was to refine the questionnaire and help in polishing any vague questions which the respondents may interpret differently. Mugenda and Mugenda (2008) debate that the quantity of cases in the pretest should not be very large, it should be between 1% and 10%. Comments and suggestions made by the respondents during the pretest were seriously considered and incorporated to improve the questionnaire. However, the results of the pretest were not included in the actual study.

The dependability of the instrument was tested through Cronbach’s alpha method. Cronbach’s alpha has the most utility for multi-item scales at the interval level of measurement, requires only a single administration and provides a unique, quantitative estimate of the internal consistency of a scale (Cooper & Schindler, 2008). Mugenda (2008) concur that Cronbach’s alpha has the most utility for multi-item scales at the interval level of measurement, requires only a single administration and provides a unique, quantitative estimate of the internal consistency.

A reliability co-efficient (Rho) of 0.8 and above is considered adequate (Mugenda, 2008). Sekaran (2007) explains that reliabilities less than 0.6 are considered to be poor, those in the range of 0.70, acceptable, and those over 0.80 are considered as good. The content validity was considered suitable because items were obtained from a review of literature and a pilot test. Kothari (2004) defines content validity as the extent to which a measuring instrument provides adequate coverage of the topic under study and explains that determination of content validity is judgmental and intuitive. He explains that the content validity is good if the instrument contains a representative sample of the universe.

The researcher sought permission from the provincial administration to visit and supply questionnaires to respondents at faith based organizations in Nairobi County, Kenya. Data were collected using questionnaires. The sampled respondents filled in the questionnaires provided while being assisted by research assistants where they are unable to interpret the questions during any scheduled meetings, otherwise, the research assistants dropped and pick the questionnaires as agreed.
3.6 Data Analysis Methods

Before processing the responses, the completed questionnaires were edited for completeness and consistency. The data were then coded to enable the responses to be grouped into various categories. Data analysis was carried out by use of Statistical package for the social Scientists (SPSS) to obtain descriptive statistics and excel to obtain a summary regression and the linear regression model. Inferences and calculations were made from these measures and compared with the existing literature to arrive at the conclusion of the study. The findings were presented using tables and figures to summarize responses to facilitate comparison and interpretation.

A multivariate regression model was applied to determine the relative importance of each of the generational differences based on study research questions. This was in an effort to establish the extent to which each independent variable affects the dependent variable. Workplace productivity will be regressed against workplace productivity. The regression model was as follows:

\[ Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \varepsilon \]

Where:

- \( Y \) = the dependent variable (Employee productivity)
- \( \alpha \) = Is a constant; explaining the level of performance given and it is the Y value when all the predictor values (\( X_1 \ X_2 \ X_3 \)) are zero.
- \( \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4 \) = Are constant regression coefficients representing the condition of the independent variables to the dependent variables.
- \( X_1 \) = Generational differences in work-life balance
- \( X_2 \) = Generational differences in Learning Styles
- \( X_3 \) = Generational differences in Communication Styles
- \( \varepsilon \) = (Extraneous) error term

3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter described the methodology that was used in undertaking the study. The study adopted a descriptive design to study the research problem. The target population comprised of all the faith based organizations in Kenya. A questionnaire was used to collect primary data for the purpose of analyzing multi-generational and employee productivity in faith-based organizations in Kenya. A pilot study to pretest the validity
and reliability of the questionnaire before carrying out the actual study was carried out and the reliability of the instrument was tested through Cronbach’s alpha method. A multivariate regression model was applied to determine the relative importance of each of generational preference. The next chapter presented the findings of the primary data that were collected from the field using the questionnaire as a tool. It began with a presentation of the findings and analysis of the data concerning demographics of the respondents and from there it presented the findings based on the study objectives. The findings were presented in form of tables and figures for easier analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter reports the findings of the study based on the methods discussed in the previous chapter. Its purpose is to analyze the variables involved in the study. Data from the respondents was collected and analyzed to assess the effect of generational differences on employee productivity in selected faith-based organizations in Nairobi, Kenya. Data collected was both qualitative and quantitative which involved the use of frequencies, percentages and means. Data was presented by use of tables, pie charts and bar graphs.

4.1.1 Response Rate

On the response, the study had targeted 272 respondents, 243 respondents filled and returned their questionnaires thus constituting 89.3% response rate. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2013), a 50% response rate is considered adequate, 60% would be good and above 70% would be rated very good. This indicates that basing on this assertion; the response rate in this case of 89.3% was sufficient and considered very good.

Table 4.1: Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributed Questionnaires</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires Returned</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 Reliability of the Data Collection Instrument

Table 4.2 shows the results of the reliability analysis where the Cronbach’s alpha was calculated. The value of the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient ranges from zero to one and is used to describe the reliability of factors extracted from questions with two possible answers and/or multi-point formatted questionnaires or scales (Sekaran, 2007). A higher value; close to one, shows a more reliable generated scale.

Mugenda and Mugenda (2013) indicated 0.6 while Cooper & Schindler (2008) has indicated 0.7 as an acceptable reliability coefficient. The analysis involved questionnaires from seven respondents and the Alpha coefficients were all greater than 0.7 indicating an
acceptable reliability of the instruments. The instrument therefore was appropriate for the study.

Table 4.2: Reliability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generational differences in work-life balance</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational differences in communication styles</td>
<td>0.7721</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational differences in learning styles</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Demographic Information

4.2.1 Age Distribution

The study sought to establish the age of the respondents. Figure 1, majority (58%) were ranging between 30-40 years, followed by 29% ranging between 21-30 years, 8% were aged between 41-50 years while only 4% were above 51 years. This implies that majority of the respondents were at their maturity stage to be conversant with the effect of generational differences on employee productivity in selected faith-based organizations in Nairobi, Kenya.

Figure 4.1: Age of the Respondents

4.2.2 Highest Level of Education
On analysis, the study found it paramount to determine the respondents’ level of education in order to establish whether they were well equipped with the necessary knowledge regarding the effects of generational differences on employee productivity in selected Faith-Based Organizations in Nairobi, Kenya. From the study findings, majority (60%) indicated that they had bachelor’s degree, followed by 26.7% who had a higher national diploma with a few (13%) indicating that they were masters’ degree holders.

These findings clearly show that the respondents were qualified for their job and furthermore the researcher also had confidence in the data collected as all the respondents were able to read, and understand the questionnaire and give the most appropriate responses.

![Bar Chart: Highest Level of Education](image)

**Figure 4.2: Highest Level of Education**

**4.2.3 Number of years worked**

The study sought to establish how long the respondents had been at their institutions, this was to ascertain to what extent their responses could be relied upon to make conclusions for the study based on experience. From the study findings as indicated in Figure 3, majority (63%) of the respondents indicated they had been at their institutions for a period ranging between 6-10 years, followed by 29% who indicated they had been working for more than 10 years while 4% of the 17% respondents indicated that they had been working at their institutions for a period less than two years and between 3-5 years respectively. From this information, there was confidence in the data collected since most of the respondents (63%) had been working at their respective institutions for 6-10 years respectively, and this shows that they were well versed with the effect of generational
differences on employee productivity in selected faith-based organizations in Nairobi, Kenya.

![Bar chart showing the number of years worked by respondents.](image)

**Figure 4.3: Number of years worked**

### 4.2.4 Respondents Department

The study sought to establish in which department the respondents worked. From the findings in Table 5, majority (32%) worked in the finance department, 22% in accounting department, 21% in information technology, 14% indicated they worked in Human resource department while 11% indicated they worked in the administration department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Technology</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>243</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.3: Respondents Department**

### 4.3 Generational differences in Work-life balance

The study sought to establish the effect of generational differences in work-life balance on employee productivity as responded upon in Table 4.4. The study used a scale of 1-5. Where 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree.
4.3.1 Descriptive Statistics of Generational Differences in Work-life balance

From the study findings as indicated in Table 6, majority of the respondents strongly agreed that Gen Xers were more concerned on how a decision affects the rest of their life before making a commitment (M = 4.8; SD = 0.32), Gen Xers are work-centric (M = 4.7; SD = 0.05) and that Gen Xers held work/life balance, opportunities for growth and development and good work relationships higher in importance than generations before them (M = 4.6; SD = 0.26). the respondents also strongly agreed that job satisfaction was more important than promotion for Gen Xers than for Baby Boomers and that Gen Xers would accept less desirable promotions if it suited their lifestyle (M = 4.6; SD = 0.24). The respondents agreed that Gen Xers are more family-centric than Boomers (M = 3.6; SD = 0.16). The respondents also agreed that Gen Xers were particularly concerned about work/life balance (M = 3.6; SD = 0.19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen Xers hold work/life balance, opportunities for growth and development and good work relationships higher in importance than generations before them</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Xers are more concerned on how a decision affects the rest of their life before making a commitment</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction was more important than promotion for Gen Xers than for Baby Boomers and that Gen Xers would accept less desirable promotions if it suited their lifestyle.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Xers are most likely to want a work/life balance, members of other age groups to varying extent also aspire to the same thing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Xers were particularly concerned about work/life balance</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomers report that work interfered significantly more with their family than Gen Xers, and Gen Xers report higher levels of work-family synergy than Boomers.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Xers are work-centric</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Xers are more family-centric than Boomers</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, the respondents were neutral that Boomers reported that work interfered significantly more with their family than Gen Xers, and Gen Xers report higher levels of work-family synergy than Boomers (M = 2.5; SD = 0.21). To sum up, the respondents
disagreed that older Xers were most likely to want a work/life balance, members of other age groups to varying extent also aspired to the same thing (M = 2.0; SD = 0.28).

4.3.2 Generational differences in work-life balance and Employee Productivity

The study used Table 4.5 to establish whether Generational differences in work-life balance has a linear dependence on the independent variables (Employee Productivity). The study established a correlation value of 0.851. This depicts a very good linear dependence between dependence on the independent variables. An R-square value of 0.724 was established and adjusted to 0.692. The coefficient of determination depicts that generational differences brings about 72.4% variations in Employee Productivity. The coefficient of determination ($R^2$), further, shows a strong relationship as the value of $R^2$ is greater than 0.1 ($R^2 < 0.1$). Durbin Watson value of 2.169 was established illustrating lack of autocorrelation in the model residuals.

Table 4.5: Goodness of Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.851a</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.23484</td>
<td>2.169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Generational differences in work-life balance

Table 4.6: Coefficient Generational differences in work-life balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational difference in</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work life balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study conducted a regression analysis so as to establish the influence of Generational differences in work-life balance on Employee Productivity.

The regression equation ($Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \epsilon$) was:

$$Y = 1.65 + 0.25X_1 + 2.348$$

Whereby: $Y = $Employee Productivity and $X_1 = $Generational differences in work-life balance
According to the regression equation established, taking generational differences in work-life balance constant at zero, the employee productivity will be 2.65. The data findings analyzed also shows that taking all other factors at zero, a 1 percent change in generational differences in work-life balance will lead to a 0.25 percent variation in employee productivity.

4.4 Generational Differences in Learning Styles
The study sought to establish the influence of generational differences in work-life balance on employee productivity as responded upon in Table 9 related statements as responded upon in Table 9. The study used a scale of 1-5. Where 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree.

4.4.1 Descriptive Statistics for Learning Styles
From the finding as shown in Table 4.7, majority of the respondents strongly agreed that baby Boomers are more satisfied with web-based learning than any other generation (M = 4.7; SD = 0.05). The respondents also agreed that millennials do enjoy using technology in learning, they tend to be less satisfied with web-based learning than older generations (M = 4.1; SD = 0.22). If Gen Xers do in fact have a higher learning goal orientation, but are not being given adequate opportunities to learn on the job and increase their skills set this might cause them to be more likely to leave the organization (M = 4.0; SD = 0.16).

Older generations tend to prefer web-based learning more than younger generations (M = 3.9; SD = 0.18) and that Gen Xers are more likely to display higher levels of learning goal orientation than Baby Boomers and that learning goal orientation can be a retention factor for Gen Xers (M = 3.7; SD = 0.18). The respondents were neutral that Gen Xers’ higher learning goal orientation, development opportunities might be seen as favorable and thus increase their organizational commitment (M = 3.4; SD = 0.18).
Table 4.7: Generational differences Learning Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generational differences in learning styles</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older generations tend to prefer web-based learning</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials do enjoy using technology in learning, they tend to be more satisfied with web-based learning than older generations</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers are more satisfied with web-based learning than any other generation</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Xers are more likely to display higher levels of learning goal orientation than Baby Boomers and that learning goal orientation can be a retention factor for Gen Xers</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Xers’ higher learning goal orientation, development opportunities might be seen as favorable and thus increase their organizational commitment</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Gen Xers do in fact have a higher learning goal orientation, but are not being given adequate opportunities to learn on the job and increase their skills set this might cause them to be more likely to leave the organization.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Generational Differences in Learning Styles and Employee Productivity - Correlation Analysis

The study sought to establish the relationship between Generational differences in learning styles and employee productivity. The results in Table 4.8 show positive and significant relationship between generational differences in learning styles and employee productivity ($r = 0.650; p < 0.01$).

Table 4.8: Generational differences in Learning Styles and Employee Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generational differences in learning styles</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Employee productivity</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.650**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). N = 243
4.4.3 Generational differences Learning Styles and Employee productivity - Regression analysis

Table 4.9 establishes whether employee productivity has a linear dependence on the independent variables. The study established a correlation value of 0.671. This depicts a very good linear dependence between dependence on the independent variables. An R-square value of 0.450 was established and adjusted to 0.401. The coefficient of determination depicts that generational difference in learning styles bring about 40.1% variations in employee productivity. The coefficient of determination (R²) shows a strong relationship as the value of R² is greater than 0.1 (R² < 0.1). Durbin Watson value of 2.239 was established illustrating lack of autocorrelation in the model residuals.

Table 4.9: Goodness of Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.671a</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.25484</td>
<td>2.239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Generational differences Learning Styles
b. Dependent Variable: Employee productivity

Table 4.10: Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.6889</td>
<td>0.5834</td>
<td>4.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational differences in learning styles</td>
<td>0.3434</td>
<td>0.0737</td>
<td>0.2847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study conducted a regression analysis so as to establish the influence of generational differences in learning styles on employee productivity. The regression equation (Y = β0 + β1X1 + α) was:

Y = 2.6889 + 0.3434X2 + 0.25484

Whereby: Y = Employee productivity and X2 = Generational differences in learning styles.

According to the regression equation established, taking generational differences in learning styles constant at zero, employee productivity will be 2.6889. The data findings
analyzed also shows that taking all other independent variables at zero, a 1 percent change in generational differences in learning styles will lead to a 0.3434 percent variation in employee productivity.

4.5 Generational differences in Communication Styles

The study sought to establish the effect of generational differences in learning styles on employee productivity basing on generational differences in learning styles related statements as responded upon in table 13. The study used a scale of 1-5. Where 1-Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree.

4.5.1 Descriptive Statistics of Generational differences in Communication Styles

Table 4.11, majority of the respondents strongly agreed that generation X workers want direct, straightforward communication (M = 4.7; SD = 0.05), the respondents also agreed that baby boomers are relational focused and prefer phone calls and personal interaction (M = 4.2; SD = 0.24). They also agreed that boomers prefer once-a-year performance appraisal and make use of personality assessments which influence communication and team-building (M = 4.2; SD = 0.01).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers are relational focused and prefer phone calls and personal interaction</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomers prefer once-a-year performance appraisal and make use of personality assessments which influence communication and team-building</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The communication styles of X-ers represent a lack of social engagement, as well as a penchant for self-reliance, in terms of their preferences for efficiency and brevity, facts and figures, and use of technology</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials prefer positive, open communication styles and wish to be treated as competent</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials seek authenticity and respect for their achievements, yet rely on sophisticated media and information and communication technologies (ICTs) to get work done</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomers like “face-time,” sitting down with employees is Boomer heaven</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomers’ communication style focuses on personal growth, achievement and political correctness.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Baby Boomers should be participative, inviting their input in the process.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X workers want direct, straightforward communication.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further, the respondents agreed that boomers’ communication style focuses on personal growth, achievement and political correctness (M = 3.7; SD 0.18). The respondents were neutral that Millennials preferred positive, open communication styles and wish to be treated as competent (M = 3.3; SD = 0.14).

4.5.2 Generational differences in Communication Styles and Employee Productivity

The study sought to establish the relationship between generational differences in communication styles and employee productivity. The results in Table 4.12 show positive, and significant relationship between generational differences in communication styles and employee productivity (r = 0.378; p < 0.01).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generational differences in communication styles</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Employee productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generational differences in communication styles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.378**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee productivity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.378**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). N = 243

Table 4.13 establishes whether employee productivity has a linear dependence on the independent variables. The study established a correlation value of 0.666. This depicts a very good linear dependence between dependence on the independent variables. An R-square value of 0.784 was established and adjusted to 0.747. The coefficient of determination depicts that generational difference in communication styles brings about 74.7% variations in employee productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.885a</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.29884</td>
<td>2.669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Generational difference in communication styles

b. Dependent Variable: Employee productivity
The coefficient of determination ($R^2$), however, shows a strong relationship as the value of $R^2$ is greater than 0.1 ($R^2 < 0.1$). Durbin Watson value of 2.669 was established illustrating lack of autocorrelation in the model residuals.

**Table 4.14: Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.646</td>
<td>0.5834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational difference in</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.0737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication styles</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the regression equation established, taking generational difference in communication styles constant at zero, employee productivity will be 2.6469. The data findings analyzed also shows that taking all other independent variables at zero, a 1 percent change in generational differences in communication styles will lead to a 0.370 percent variation in employee productivity.

**4.6 Employee Productivity**

The study sought to establish the respondents opinion based on statements on employee productivity. The results are presented in Table 4.15. Majority of the respondents strongly agreed that most employees lack imitativeness and ability to start new things at work ($M = 4.7; SD = 0.05$). The respondents also agreed that there was high team work among the staff and this has improved employee’s productivity ($M = 4.2; SD = 0.2$), there was a lot of improvement on service delivery ($M = 3.7; SD = 0.18$). The respondents did not give their opinion concerning the question that the production of employees is
determined by the input (M = 3.4; SD = 0.10). They also did not give any opinion regarding the statement that most employees commitment to work has improved greatly (M = 3.3; SD = 0.14).

**Table 4.15: Employee productivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most employees commitment to work has improved greatly</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The production of employees is determined by the input</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lot of improvement on service delivery</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is high team work among the staff and this has improved employee’s productivity</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most employees lack imitativeness and ability to start new things at work</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.1 Regression model summary of the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable

From the results shown in Table 4.16, the model shows a goodness of fit as indicated by the coefficient of determination $r^2$ with value of 0.605. This implies that independent variables explain 60.5% of the variations in employee productivity. 39.5% of variations are brought about by factors not captured in the objectives. Durbin Watson value of 2.220 was established illustrating lack of auto correlation in the model residuals.

**Table 4.16: Goodness of Fit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Durbin Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.65554</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study conducted a multiple regression analysis so as to establish the effect of generational differences on employee productivity in faith-based organizations in Nairobi, Kenya. The regression equation ($Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 +$) was:

$$Y = 1.448 + 0.191X_1 + 0.466X_2 + 0.063X_3$$

Whereby: $Y =$ Employee Productivity

$X_1 =$ Generational differences work life balance, $X_2 =$ Generational differences learning styles, and $X_3 =$ Generational differences communication styles
According to the regression equation established, taking all factors (Generational differences work life balance, Generational differences learning styles and Generational differences communication styles) constant at zero, employee productivity will be 1.448. The data findings analyzed also shows that taking all other independent variables at zero, a 1 percent change in generational differences in learning styles will lead to a 0.466 percent variation in employee productivity, a 1 percent change in generational differences in work life balance will lead to a 0.191 percent variation in employee productivity a 1 percent change in generational differences in communication styles will lead to a 0.063 percent variation in employee productivity.

4.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the findings and the results achieved of the primary data collected from the field using the questionnaire as a tool with the aim of analyzing the effects of generational difference on employee productivity in Faith-Based Organizations. The first section presents the findings and analysis of the data concerning demographics of the respondents and from there it analyses the various effects of generation differences on employee productivity. The findings of the data analysis are then presented in form of tables, pie and bar charts for easier analysis. The data was analyzed using SPSS. Chapter five discusses the results, shows how they relate to the existing literature, and presents the conclusions made from the study and recommendations for improvement.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

Chapter five provides a discussion of the results and their relation to the existing literature. From the analysis and data collected, the following discussions, conclusions and recommendations were made. The responses were based on the research questions of the study.

5.2 Summary

The purpose of the study was to examine the effect of generational differences on employee productivity in selected faith-based organizations in Nairobi, Kenya. Specifically the study sought to answers to the following questions: How do generational differences in work-life balance affect employee productivity? How do generational differences in communication styles affect employee productivity? How do generational differences in learning styles affect employee productivity?

The study adopted a descriptive study method in examining, deducing, and presenting data. The descriptive research method was the best for this study because it focused on the effect of generational differences on employee productivity in selected faith-based organizations in Nairobi, Kenya, only six faith based organizations were selected while the target respondents were the 907 staffs drawn from various departments from which a sample of 30% was selected to participate in the study. The study used a questionnaire to collect primary data, data analysis was carried out by use of Statistical package for the social Scientists (SPSS) version 22 to obtain descriptive statistics and excel to obtain a summary regression and the linear regression model.

The study examined how generational differences in work-life balance affects employee productivity. The study found that Gen Xers were more concerned on how a decision affects the rest of their life before making a commitment, Gen Xers are work-centric and that Gen Xers held work/life balance, opportunities for growth and development and good work relationships higher in importance than generations before them. Job satisfaction was more important than promotion for Gen Xers than for Baby Boomers and that Gen Xers would accept less desirable promotions if it suited their lifestyle. Gen Xers are more
family-centric than Boomers. Gen Xers were particularly concerned about work/life balance. Further, Boomers reported that work interfered significantly more with their family than Gen Xers, and Gen Xers report higher levels of work-family synergy than Boomers.

The study examined how generational differences in communication styles affects employee productivity. The study found generation X workers want direct, straightforward communication, baby boomers are relational focused and prefer phone calls and personal interaction, boomers prefer once-a-year performance appraisal and make use of personality assessments which influence communication and team-building. Boomers’ communication style focuses on personal growth, achievement and political correctness.

The study examined how generational differences in learning styles affect employee productivity. The study found that baby Boomers are more satisfied with web-based learning than any other generation. Millennials do enjoy using technology in learning, they tend to be less satisfied with web-based learning than older generations. If Gen Xers do in fact have a higher learning goal orientation, but are not being given adequate opportunities to learn on the job and increase their skills set this might cause them to be more likely to leave the organization, older generations tend to prefer web-based learning more than younger generations and that Gen Xers are more likely to display higher levels of learning goal orientation than Baby Boomers and that learning goal orientation can be a retention factor for Gen Xers.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Effect of Generational Differences in Work-life Balance on Employee Productivity

The study found that job satisfaction was more important than promotion for Gen Xers than for Baby Boomers and that Gen Xers would accept less desirable promotions if it suited their lifestyle. The study supports the findings of Ahmad, Mehdi, Ali and Saeed (2016) who contend that Gen Xers are said to hold work/life balance, opportunities for growth and development and good work relationships higher in importance than generations before them. If a promotion is available to Boomers they will tend to take it and figure out how it affects other aspects of their life, whereas Gen Xers will be more
concerned on how a decision affects the rest of their life before making a commitment. Similarly Abdul, Bayu and Mohd, (2014) found that job satisfaction was more important than promotion for Gen Xers than for Baby Boomers and that Gen Xers would accept less desirable promotions if it suited their lifestyle. Gen Xers define their career success in part by how well they are able to balance work and their personal lives.

The study found that older Xers are most likely to want a work/life balance, members of other age groups to varying extent also aspire to the same thing. The findings concur with André, de-Waal, Linde, & Merel (2017) that one characteristic often attributed to younger workers, perhaps more so to Xers, is their desire for balance between work and life. As children, Xers reportedly saw their parents lose their jobs, despite making sacrifices for their careers, and grew up to value a balance between work and life.

The study also found that Gen Xers were particularly concerned about work/life balance, boomers report that work interfered significantly more with their family than Gen Xers, and Gen Xers report higher levels of work-family synergy than Boomers the study findings are in line with Ann (2016) findings that freedom-related work values, such as work-life balance and working hours, were not significantly different for Gen Xers and Baby Boomers. Ann as cited by Ahmad, Mehdi, Ali and Saeed (2017) found that Gen Xers were particularly concerned about work/life balance. Boomers reported that work interfered significantly more with their family than Gen Xers, and Gen Xers reported higher levels of work-family synergy than Boomers.

The study found Gen Xers are work-centric and Gen Xers are more family-centric than Boomers and that Gen Xers are more family-centric than Boomers the findings concur with Becton, Walker and Jones (2014) report also found that more Boomers (22%) than Gen Xers (13%) were work-centric, and Gen Xers (52%) were more family-centric than Boomers (40%). This was true even when only those with children at home were compared and the age of the youngest child was controlled. These findings, along with their finding that Gen Xers had higher marital satisfaction, might suggest that Gen Xers do indeed place more importance on their personal life and value work-life balance more than Baby Boomers. Overall, the research on generational work-life balance differences is still limited and inconclusive, thus warranting further investigation. Specific sub-components of work/life balance, such as flexibility in working hours, have begun to emerge as recent research topics in generational research.
5.3.2 Effect of Generational Differences in Learning Styles on Employee Productivity

The study found that older generations tend to prefer web-based learning more than younger generations, Millennials do enjoy using technology in learning, they tend to be less satisfied with web-based learning than older generations and that Baby Boomers are more satisfied with web-based learning than any other generation this findings are in line with Jacqueline and Jun (2012) while many generational theorists stress the importance of technology for engaging Millennials, other researchers found older generations tended to prefer web-based learning more than younger generations did. While some scholars found Millennials do enjoy using technology in learning, they tended to be less satisfied with web-based learning than older generations.

The study found that Millennials do enjoy using technology in learning, they tend to be less satisfied with web-based learning than older generations, the results are in line with Jacqueline and Jun (2015) findings that the reason Millennials are dissatisfied with web-based learning may be because the web-based learning tools used by the institutions are far behind the technology those students are using in their everyday lives. As a result, the students are not engaged by the web-based learning interface.

The study found that Gen Xers are more likely to display higher levels of learning goal orientation than Baby Boomers and that learning goal orientation can be a retention factor for Gen Xers. The findings concur with Leila, Silva and Abdul (2016) that Gen Xers are more likely to display higher levels of learning goal orientation than Baby Boomers and that learning goal orientation can be a retention factor for Gen Xers. Jacqueline and Jun (2015) indicate that due to Gen Xers’ higher learning goal orientation, development opportunities might be seen as favorable and thus increase their organizational commitment. If Gen Xers do in fact have a higher learning goal orientation, but are not being given adequate opportunities to learn on the job and increase their skills set this might cause them to be more likely to leave the organization.

Gen Xers’ higher learning goal orientation, development opportunities might be seen as favorable and thus increase their organizational commitment. The findings are in line with Muhammad & Mohsin (2014) Gen Xers have a stronger inclination to always be learning on the job, but both cohorts may be equally motivated by specific training programs when they become available. This might explain why Carpenter (2014) didn’t
find that Gen Xers and Baby Boomers differed on motivation concerning training and development opportunities. Or perhaps the underlying construct that influences motivation for training and development opportunities is learning goal orientation. The study findings are also in line with D’Amato and Herzfeldt as cited by Ng, Lyons and Schweitzer (2012) study that examined learning orientation in Gen Xers and Baby Boomers). Their results indicated that Gen Xers expressed higher learning goal orientation than Baby Boomers, though the effect was small. Since D’Amato and Herzfeldt is the only study that has attempted to find a difference between Gen Xer and Baby Boomers in goal orientation, this construct deserves further exploration with these generations.

5.3.3 The Effect of Generational Differences in Communication Styles on Employee Productivity

Baby Boomers are relational focused and prefer phone calls and personal interaction. The findings concurs with Rocky and Dwyer (2016) that Baby Boomers are relational focused and prefer phone calls and personal interaction. Managers should plan conversations over coffee or lunch, integrating mutual interests into the dialog. Linking the conversation to the team or individual vision, mission, and values will have an impact on Baby Boomer workers. Communication with Baby Boomers should be participative, inviting their input in the process. By contrast, Generation X workers want direct, straightforward communication. An email or voicemail with specificity and clarity will suffice. Millennials have redefined “timely” as it relates to feedback. The high expectations of this cohort extends to performance related feedback and they want it in an instant. Managers should communicate with a positive tone, delivering messages face-to-face or via text messaging. Tie the message to the worker’s personal goals will make the connection to these achievement-oriented individuals. Millennials will have higher regard for managers who are not condescending, cynical, or sarcastic.

The study found that Boomers like “face-time,” sitting down with employees is Boomer heaven. The findings are in line with Goudreau (2013) older generations as a whole prefer face-to-face communication or phone calls in order to accomplish items at work. On the other hand, the millennial generation is much more prone to utilizing email and text messages to communicate. Frustration may occur when having to communicate in a style that an individual does not like, which could contribute to negative perceptions of the
other member of the conversation. When left unchecked, and without ways for groups to monitor and potentially remedy this issue, flaming could likely occur unless discussed.

Boomers like “face-time,” sitting down with employees is Boomer heaven. The findings are in line with Robinson and Stubberud (2012) Beekman (2015). The baby boomer generation is, as a whole, much more accustomed to a more “standard” environment when it comes to communication- memos, face-to-face meetings, and phone calls are the common approach to reaching out to peers in the workplace. On the other hand, the millennial generation is comfortable with CMC mediums being used to more casually send messages back and forth. Because of the millennial worker’s comfort and familiarity with CMC, this means that they are also more familiar with using emoticons from a young age. Conversely, the baby boomer generation can very easily see emoticon usage as unprofessional and not suited for work (Sean, Lyons, Schweitzer & Ng, 2015). There is some common ground between both generations, however, when it comes to using emoticons at the workplace. While older generations such as the baby boomers are much more against the idea of using emoticons at work compared to millennials, a common shared value between both is that overusing emoticons is very possible.

5.4 Conclusion

5.4.1 Generational Differences in Work-life Balance and Employee Productivity

With regard to the effect of generational differences in work life balance on employee productivity, the study concludes that Gen Xers were more concerned on how a decision affected the rest of their life before making a commitment, they were work-centric and they held work/life balance, opportunities for growth and development and good work relationships higher in importance than generations before them. Job satisfaction was more important than promotion for Gen Xers than for Baby Boomers and Gen Xers would accept less desirable promotions if it suited their lifestyle. Gen Xers were found to be more family-centric than Boomers and were particularly concerned about work/life balance. This findings corroborate with Abdul et al., 2014) findings that job satisfaction was more important than promotion for Gen Xers than for Baby Boomers and that Gen Xers would accept less desirable promotions if it suited their lifestyle. Gen Xers define their career success in part by how well they are able to balance work and their personal lives.
5.4.2 Generational Differences in Learning Styles and Employee Productivity

The study concludes that baby Boomers were more satisfied with web-based learning than any other generation; they also enjoyed using technology in learning and tend to be less satisfied with web-based learning than older generations. The study showed that older generations tend to prefer web-based learning less than younger generations and that Gen Xers are more likely to display higher levels of learning goal orientation than Baby Boomers and that learning goal orientation can be a retention factor for Gen Xers.

5.4.3 Generational Differences in Communication Styles and Employee Productivity

The study concludes that generation X workers want direct, straightforward communication; baby boomers were found to be relational focused and preferred phone calls and personal interaction. Baby boomers preferred once-a-year performance appraisal and made use of personality assessments which influenced communication and team-building. Further, boomers’ communication style focused on personal growth, achievement and political correctness. Communication with Baby Boomers should be participative, inviting their input in the process. By contrast, Generation X workers want direct, straightforward communication.

5.5 Recommendations

From the study findings the following recommendations were made:

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 The Effect of Generational Differences in Work-life Balance on Employee Productivity

The study established that generational differences in work-life balance affected employee productivity in faith based organizations in Kenya. The study recommends that organizations should initiate work life balance program to improve employee productivity. When employees feel a greater sense of control and ownership over their own lives, they tend to have better relationships with management and are able to leave work issues at work and home issues at home. Balanced employees tend to feel more motivated and less stressed out at work, which thereby increases company productivity and reduces the number of conflicts among coworkers and management.
5.5.1.2 The Effect of Generational Differences in Learning Styles on Employee Productivity

The study established that generational differences in learning styles affected employee productivity in faith based organizations in Kenya. The study recommends that since generational differences in training needs and training styles do exist. Although most employees prefer to learn ‘soft skills’ on the job, when formal training is needed, the use of multiple modes of teaching is recommended to address the needs of most workers. Workers from all generations like on the job learning, discussion groups, peer interaction and feedback, and one-on-one coaching to learn ‘soft skills’. Some methods are preferred by members of one generation and not others. For instance, younger workers do not favor learning ‘soft skills’ through classroom instruction. Similarly, while younger workers favor assessment and feedback to learn ‘soft skills’, this is not the case for older workers. Managers and trainers should consider possible age-related preferences when teaching ‘soft skills’. Since workers of different generations have similar preferences for learning hard skills, it may not be necessary to differentiate that type of training for workers of different ages. Younger workers identified different training needs than their older counterparts. For instance, older generations like skills training in their areas of expertise, whereas younger workers prefer leadership training. Since training needs differ, employers and HR managers should match training to specific needs, as opposed to providing ‘blanket’ training to all employees.

5.5.1.3 The effect of Generational Differences in Communication Styles on Employee Productivity

The study established that generational differences in communication styles affected employee productivity in faith based organizations in Kenya. The study recommends that generational conflict is more likely to arise from errors of attribution and perception, than from valid differences. Therefore, effective communication is critical in dealing with generational conflict. This study proposes using aggressive communication to create a successful intergenerational workforce, as this method pre-empts and uncovers generational conflicts and other potential conflicts. Similarly, employees and employers alike need to figure out why people are asking questions, as opposed to assuming that employees asking questions are causing trouble, being disrespectful or trying to make the person in authority look bad or a combination of these. Managers and other employees
should identify possible reasons why someone might be asking questions rather than jumping to the wrong conclusions. Employers should give people the benefit of the doubt and avoid making decisions based on assumptions. Furthermore, if unsure of a person’s motive: ask. Remember that members of different generations view respect differently and never assume that disrespect is intended. Assume that respect, however shown, is the norm.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

While this study successfully examines the variables, it also presents rich prospects for several other areas to be researched in future. This study only was confined to three variables namely: generational differences in work-life balance, generational differences in learning styles and generational differences in communication styles. Future research should consider other generational differences which affect employee productivity. Furthermore, an inclusion of moderating characteristics such as organizational structure and culture should also be incorporated in such studies. It would be useful to carry out the same type of research in other organizations and across East Africa and beyond and see whether the same results would be replicated.
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APPENDIX 1: INTRODUCTION LETTER

Rutto Audrey Chepkirui,
United States International University - Africa
P.O Box 14634 - 00800,
Nairobi
17th January 2018

Manager

.............,
P.O. Box ...........
Nairobi, Kenya.

Dear Sir,

RE: PERMISSION TO COLLECT DATA FOR ACADEMIC RESEARCH

I am a Masters of Business Administration student at United States International University – Africa. As a prerequisite of my degree, I should complete a research study planned to take care of an issue inside my zone of specialization. I subsequently plan to do a study on "Effect of generational differences on employee productivity in selected faith-based organizations in Nairobi, Kenya” The data gave will exclusively be utilized to finish this scholastic objective. I in this way ask for you to enable me to accumulate data on ventures inside your region of locale. Yours Faithfully,

Rutto Audrey Chepkirui
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION 1: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Please tick in the most appropriate box. [ √ ]

1. Organization (optional) __________________________________

2. Kindly indicate your gender:

   Male [ ] Female [ ]

3. What is your age bracket?

   18 to 24 Years [ ] 25 to 29 Years [ ]
   30 to 34 Years [ ] 35 to 39 Years [ ]
   40 to 44 Years [ ] Above 45 Years [ ]

4. What is your level in the organization?

   Non-management [ ] Lower management [ ]
   Mid-management [ ] Senior management [ ]

5. How long have you served in this organization?

   3-5 years [ ] 6-10 years [ ]
   11-15 years [ ] 16-20 years [ ]
   21 years or more [ ]

PART A: GENERATIONAL DIFFERENCES IN WORK-LIFE BALANCE

6. In the Table below, Please indicate your appropriate response to the statements given by ticking in the correct box.

Key: Strongly disagree – SD, Disagree – D, Neutral – N, Agree – A and Strongly agree – SA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WLB1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Xers hold work/life balance, opportunities for growth and development and good work relationships higher in importance than generations before them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Xers are more concerned on how a decision affects the rest of their life before making a commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction was more important than promotion for Gen Xers than for Baby Boomers and that Gen Xers would accept less desirable promotions if it suited their lifestyle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Xers are most likely to want a work/life balance,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
members of other age groups to varying extent also aspire to the same thing

WLB5  Gen Xers were particularly concerned about work/life balance

WLB6  Boomers report that work interfered significantly more with their family than Gen Xers, and Gen Xers report higher levels of work-family synergy than Boomers.

WLB7  Gen Xers are work-centric

WLB8  Gen Xers are more family-centric than Boomers

PART B: Learning Styles

7. In the Table below, Please indicate your appropriate response to the statements given by ticking in the correct box.

**Key:** Strongly disagree – SD, Disagree – D, Neutral – N, Agree – A and Strongly agree – SA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS1</td>
<td>Older generations tend to prefer web-based learning more than younger generations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS2</td>
<td>Millennials do enjoy using technology in learning, they tend to be less satisfied with web-based learning than older generations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS3</td>
<td>Baby Boomers are more satisfied with web-based learning than any other generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Orientation, Preferences for Learning Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS4</td>
<td>Gen Xers are more likely to display higher levels of learning goal orientation than Baby Boomers and that learning goal orientation can be a retention factor for Gen Xers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS5</td>
<td>Gen Xers’ higher learning goal orientation, development opportunities might be seen as favorable and thus increase their organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS6</td>
<td>If Gen Xers do in fact have a higher learning goal orientation, but are not being given adequate opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to learn on the job and increase their skills set this might cause them to be more likely to leave the organization

PART C: Communication styles

8. In the Table below, Please indicate your appropriate response to the statements given by ticking in the correct box.

Key: Strongly disagree – SD, Disagree – D, Neutral – N, Agree – A and Strongly agree – SA

| CS1 | Baby Boomers are relational focused and prefer phone calls and personal interaction | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| CS2 | Boomers prefer once-a-year performance appraisal and make use of personality assessments which influence communication and team-building | | | | | |
| CS3 | The communication styles of X-ers represent a lack of social engagement, as well as a penchant for self-reliance, in terms of their preferences for efficiency and brevity, facts and figures, and use of technology | | | | | |
| CS4 | Millennials prefer positive, open communication styles and wish to be treated as competent | | | | | |
| CS5 | Millennials seek authenticity and respect for their achievements, yet rely on sophisticated media and information and communication technologies (ICTs) to get work done | | | | | |
| CS6 | Boomers like “face-time,” sitting down with employees is Boomer heaven | | | | | |
| CS7 | Boomers’ communication style focuses on personal growth, achievement and political correctness | | | | | |
| CS8 | Communication with Baby Boomers should be participative, inviting their input in the process | | | | | |
| CS9 | Generation X workers want direct, straightforward communication. | | | | |
**SECTION C: Employee productivity**

To what extent have generational differences affect the following aspects of employee productivity in each of the work areas below? Use the scale of: 4 = Very great extent; 3 = Great Extent; 2 = Moderate Extent; 1 = Low extent. If you are unable to make the assessment, indicate N/A (Not applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EP1</td>
<td>Most employees commitment to work has improved greatly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP2</td>
<td>The production of employees is determined by the input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP3</td>
<td>There is a lot of improvement on service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP4</td>
<td>There is high team work among the staff and this has improved employee’s productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP5</td>
<td>Most employees lack imitativeness and ability to start new things at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX III: LIST OF FAITH BASED HUMANITARIAN ORGANIZATIONS
### IN KENYA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION NAME</th>
<th>ACRONYM</th>
<th>WEB ADRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AIDS Care Education and Training</td>
<td>ACET</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acet-international.org">www.acet-international.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Action by Churches Together</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adventist Development and Relief Agency</td>
<td>ADRA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.adra.org">www.adra.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Aga Khan Development Foundation</td>
<td>AKDF</td>
<td><a href="http://www.akdn.org">www.akdn.org</a>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. All African Conference of Churches</td>
<td>AACC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aacc-">www.aacc-</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Anglican Communion</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.anglicancommunion.org">www.anglicancommunion.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Catholic Agency for Overseas Development</td>
<td>CAFOD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cafod.org.uk">www.cafod.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Catholic Medical Missions Board</td>
<td>CMMB</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cmmb.org">www.cmmb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Catholic Relief Services</td>
<td>CRS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.catholicrelief.org">www.catholicrelief.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Christian AID</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.christian-aid.org.uk">www.christian-aid.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Christian HIV/AIDS Alliance</td>
<td>CHAA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.chaa.info">www.chaa.info</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Christian Health Association of Kenya</td>
<td>CHAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Christian Health Association Platform</td>
<td>CHAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Christian Relief and Development Agency</td>
<td>CRDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Church Mission Society</td>
<td>CMS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cms-uk.org">http://www.cms-uk.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Church of Sweden AID</td>
<td>CMS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.svenskakyrkan.se">www.svenskakyrkan.se</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Church World Service</td>
<td>CWS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.churchworldservice.org">www.churchworldservice.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 DanChurchAid</td>
<td>CWS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.danchurchaid.org">www.danchurchaid.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Ecumenical HIV/AIDS Initiative in Africa</td>
<td>EHAIA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wcccoe.org/wcc/what/m">www.wcccoe.org/wcc/what/m</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Ecumenical Pharmaceutical Network</td>
<td>EPN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.epnetwork.org/en/access">www.epnetwork.org/en/access</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Emmanuel Healthcare</td>
<td>EMMS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.emms.org/about/index.p">www.emms.org/about/index.p</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Federation of Islamic Medical Associations</td>
<td>FIMA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fimaweb.net/main/index">www.fimaweb.net/main/index</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 German Institute for Medical Mission</td>
<td>DIFAEM</td>
<td><a href="http://www.difaem.de">www.difaem.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Global AIDS Interfaith Alliance</td>
<td>GAIA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.thegaia.org">www.thegaia.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 IMA World Health</td>
<td>IMA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.interchurch.org">www.interchurch.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Inter-Church Organisation for Development</td>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icco.nl">www.icco.nl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 International Dispensary Association</td>
<td>IDA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.idafoundation.org">www.idafoundation.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Islamic Relief Worldwide</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td><a href="http://www.islamic-relief.com">www.islamic-relief.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Lutheran World Federation</td>
<td>LWF</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lutheranworld.org">www.lutheranworld.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assistance Program, International</td>
<td>MAP</td>
<td><a href="http://www.map.org">www.map.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicus Mundi International</td>
<td>MMI</td>
<td><a href="http://www.medicusmundi.org">www.medicusmundi.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildmay International</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.mildmay.org.uk">www.mildmay.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ Union</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td><a href="http://www.themotherunion.org">www.themotherunion.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Church Aid</td>
<td>NCA</td>
<td>//english.nca.no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan African Christian Women Alliance</td>
<td>PACWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian Church USA – International PC USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army: International</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>www1.salvationarmy.org/ihq/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaritan’s Purse</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td><a href="http://www.samaritanspurse.org">www.samaritanspurse.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secours Catholique</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.secours-">www.secours-</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving in Mission</td>
<td>SIM</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sim.org">www.sim.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish Evangelical Mission</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td><a href="http://www.efs.nu">www.efs.nu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tearfund</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.tearfund.org">www.tearfund.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Episcopal Relief and Development</td>
<td>ECUSA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.er-d.org">www.er-d.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Evangelical Mission</td>
<td>UEM</td>
<td><a href="http://www.vemission.org">www.vemission.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Methodist Committee on Relief</td>
<td>UMCR</td>
<td>//new.gbgm-umc.org/umcor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Society for the Propagation of theUSPG</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.uspg.org.uk">www.uspg.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Conference of Religions for Peace</td>
<td>WCRP</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wcrp.org">www.wcrp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Council of Churches</td>
<td>WCC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wcc-coe.org">www.wcc-coe.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Faiths Development Dialogue, The</td>
<td>WFDD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wfdd.org.uk">www.wfdd.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Federation of Catholic MedicalFIAMC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fiamc.org">www.fiamc.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Hope International</td>
<td>WHI</td>
<td><a href="http://www.worldhope.org/countries">www.worldhope.org/countries</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Relief</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wr.org">www.wr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wvi.org">www.wvi.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Men’s Christian Association</td>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ymca.int">www.ymca.int</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Women’s Christian Association</td>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.worldywca.org">www.worldywca.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>