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ABSTRACT

The general objective of the study was to examine the effectiveness of management practices on improving employee productivity at National Bank of Kenya limited, Headquarters branch. The research aimed at evaluating the effectiveness of management practices on employee productivity. To examine the influence of fostering requisite organizational culture on employee productivity, examine the effect of employee induction on employee productivity, and determine the effect of task autonomy on employee productivity at National Bank.

The study adopted the survey research design. The target populations for this study were all the 49 staff based at National Bank, Harambee avenue (Headquarters) branch. The sampling frame for this study came from National Bank, Human Resource department. This study used stratified random sampling technique to obtain the sample size. The sample size for the study was 44 employees. The study was conducted using questionnaires. The data analysis process was conducted by the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics and inferential analysis were used to analyze the collected data. Measures of central tendencies including frequencies mean and standard deviations were used in the study. Inferential analysis like correlations and regressions were used to analyze the relationships between the study variables. Results presentations were in the form of tables and figures.

The study showed that organizational culture affects employee performance and it provides efficiency and stability. Staffs recognize their obligation beyond the simple exchange of labor for a salary and National Bank is committed to experimentation and innovation. The study revealed that the leadership of the organization resides in the person(s) in charge and employees in the organization perform specific functions in order to receive defined rewards. The bank uses its mission to attract and release the personal energy of employees in the pursuit of its goals and it also values employees as human beings and not machines.

The study showed that, employee placement in the organization affects employees’ performance and National Bank relies heavily on its employees for success. Employee placement in the bank entails the use of proper induction where the bank initiates new
employees by acquainting them with details and requirements of the job. The induction process in the bank involves showing new employees how their job performance contributes to the success of the organization, it takes new employee through the organization’s vision, mission, values and it familiarizes new employees with the organization’s policies and standard operating procedures.

The study showed that employees’ task autonomy in the bank resulted in higher productivity and they exercised control of their tasks in order to realize the bank’s goals. The desire for increased task control is focused on innate personal and organizational goals and giving autonomy to the employees had motivated their productivity. The study revealed that employees at National bank were allowed to participate in their job-related decisions when performing their tasks as well as share information between other employees and supervisors.

The study concludes that, the employees of National bank contribute towards the organization out of a sense of commitment mostly because the bank has the ability to sustain its employees’ job satisfaction. The bank has also developed a program that it implements during its induction process and it consists of supplemental efforts that help new employees understand the organization’s culture while fostering the formation of employee relationships between the new and old employees.

The study recommends the organizational managers of National Bank Harambee Avenue to allow employees with better information than them to take the lead in implementing their ideas in the organization. This will facilitate the bank’s ability to take advantage of the knowledge that its employees have, thus driving up the bank's performance while increasing employees’ productivity.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The environments in which organizations operate today are divergent (Aldaibat & Irtaimeh, 2012). Achieving competitive advantage and improving organizational performance relative to competitors are the main goals that business firms should always strive to attain (Rawashdeh & Al-Adwan, 2012). The banking sector globally has been facing unprecedented challenges with the wave of privatization and globalization (Aldaibat & Irtaimeh, 2012). To survive and thrive in a globally competitive marketplace, organizations must adopt a broad strategy that gives them a sustainable competitive advantage. One of the major issues that have gained attention in the recent banking sector reforms in Kenya is the Human Resources Management (HRM). This has been due to the recent developments where people have been considered as a very important source of sustained competitive advantage (Nyamongo & Temesgen, 2013).

The increasing significance of people to organizational success has been observed to have corresponded with the rise of Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) as a field of study on a global scale (Hartel et al., 2014). Since its emergence, SHRM has been the focus of debate over whether it exists in reality or is merely rhetoric (Khatoon, Amin & Hossain, 2013). Research has shown that HRM practices have the ability to create firms that are more intelligent, flexible, and competent than their rivals through the application of policies and practices that concentrate on recruiting, selecting, training skilled employees and directing their best efforts to cooperate within the resource bundle of the organization (Rawashdeh & Al-Adwan, 2012).

People are a firm’s most valuable resource (Cook, 2000). Banks globally are under intense pressure to perform in today’s volatile market place. In the last two decades researches have shown that HRM is one of the most important determinants of organizational performance (Taylor & Francis, 2008). The recent trend of globalized competitive business era focuses on formulation and execution of SHRM practices and its significant effect on the financial performance of the organization (Khatoon, Amin & Hossain, 2013). Steep competition, globalization, growing customer demand and exposure to higher credit risks are forcing the banks to find new ways of providing better
customer service so as to improve profitability and guarantee their survival (Aldaibat & Irtaimeh, 2012).

The implementation of corporate and functional strategies depends on the companies’ resources and particularly on people (Aldaibat & Irtaimeh, 2012). SHRM is one of the ways banks are using to increase their competitiveness in the new organizational landscapes, since managing in a global marketplace, introducing new technology, developing organizational knowledge, improving customer service or product quality, requires considering the “human equation” (Aldaibat & Irtaimeh, 2012; Pfeffer, 1998). There is ongoing debate on how HRM strategies affect the performance of banks. Researchers have built evidence that links HRM practices with corporate performance (Adegorgoye & Moruf, 2012). Current researches have shown that HRM practices are important for enhanced corporate performance (Rawashdeh & Al-Adwan, 2012; Adegorgoye & Moruf, 2012). The human resource (HR) strategy focuses on how the company should manage its staff to assist the organization in the achievement of corporate objectives (Khatoon, Amin & Hossain, 2013).

Efforts have been made by HRM theorists to try to establish a causal link between HRM and employee performance (Cook, 2000). However, little has been reported on the effect of HRM and employee performance in the banking industry. Cook (2000) argues that there is a symbiotic relationship between HR and employee productivity. Other scholars such as Armstrong (2010) argues that HRM practices can improve employee productivity by: increasing employee skills and abilities, promoting positive attitudes and increasing motivation, and providing employees with expanded responsibilities so that they can make full use of their skills and abilities. While there is a growing body of theory and empirical research demonstrating positive relationships between HRM policies, collective employee attributes, and firm outcomes, additional studies in this area are needed (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2012; Purcell & Kinnie, 2007). There is need for a theoretical link on exactly how HRM and employee productivity are related.

The aim of HRM strategy is to devise ways of managing people in order to assist in achievement of organizational objectives. The emerging field of HRM on employee productivity suffers from lack of unity in theory and inconsistency in research methodology hence has led to many opposing findings and rich competing theoretical
perspectives especially among the different sectors of the economy. According to Cook (2000) and Som (2008), most of the work on HRM and employee productivity has been undertaken in the manufacturing sector mainly in the United States (US) and recently in the last decade in United Kingdom (UK) and as such may not be suitable to explain the relationship in a developing economy (Adegoroye & Moruf, 2012). Thus, it is very difficult to generalize findings from one sector to other sectors. Furthermore, there is a great need for additional evidence to support the HRM-performance relationship and show exactly how the different strategies affect each other. The present study is therefore, an attempt to fill part of this gap using the Kenyan Banking sector.

Banks in Kenya have existed since the colonial times (CBK, 2016). During this period the banking sector was dominated by foreign owned banks that were significantly unable to meet the demands of all the Kenyans in need of banking services. The banks were located in the urban centers and also charged exorbitant account opening and maintenance balances which most low-income earners in Kenya were unable to raise (Nyamongo & Temesgen, 2013). As a result, banking continuously remained a preserve of the few rich Kenyans and therefore only had a minor contribution on the economy. The performance of banks then in terms of customer numbers, profits and other performance indicators remained very low (CBK, 2016).

Currently there are 46 banks in Kenya which are categorized as private and foreign owned (CBK, 2015). Large-size banks constitute 46 percent of the industry while medium and small-size banks constitute 35 percent and 19 percent of the banking industry, respectively (CBK, 2016). There are two fully Islamic banks - Gulf African Bank and First Community Bank - which opened their doors in early 2009 and now have nearly 1 percent of gross banking assets (CBK, 2015). In addition to the two Islamic banks other banks have also been able to offer banking services through special accounts created to meet the needs of the Islamic banker. The banks have come together under the Kenya Bankers Association (KBA), which serves as a lobby for the banks’ interests and also addresses issues affecting member institutions (CBK, 2016).

The banking industry in Kenya is generally a highly regulated industry, and government restrictions on financial activities by banks have varied over time and location (CBK, 2015; Nyamongo & Temesgen, 2013). The industry is governed by the Companies Act,
the Banking Act, the Central Bank of Kenya Act and the various prudential guidelines issued by the Central Bank of Kenya (CBK). The Central Bank Act enumerates the core functions of Central Bank and gives it limited autonomy to manage and regulate the Banking sector in Kenya (Nyamongo & Temesgen, 2013).

In the recent wave of globalization, increased technological growth and competition there has been a lot of emphasis on performance in the Kenyan banking sector. Many scholars and researchers have used performance synonymously with productivity, efficiency, effectiveness and competitiveness. According to Bohlander and Snell (2007) organizational performance comprises the actual output or results of an organization measured against its intended outputs (organizational goals and objectives). According to Barney (2010) firms that use resources and capabilities to exploit opportunities and neutralize threats will see an increase in their net revenue or a decrease in their net costs or both and vice versa. Players in this sector have experienced increased competition over the last few years resulting from increased innovations among the players and new entrants into the market.

Although the banking sector in Kenya has experienced problems over the last 25 years, with 37 banking institutions collapsing between 1986 and 1998 (Kithinji & Waweru, 2007), there has been a continued growth in performance over the last eight years, with the banking sector collectively registering impressive performance (Nyamongo & Temesgen, 2013). Under such competitive environments bank employees have had a lot of pressure to try and come up with creative ideas and products that enable them survive in such an extremely turbulent and competitive environment. Such creative innovations include the introduction of the M-Kesho account through partnership between Equity Bank and Safaricom, PesaPap by Family Bank and Kenya Commercial Bank (KCB) Connect by KCB (CBK, 2015). In order to motivate employees to remain creative and innovative the banking sector in Kenya has had to rethink its approach on how it uses its most important resource - the people. This has led banks to adopt SHRM which in turn will lead to increased profits.

According to the CBK (2015) recently the banking sector in Kenya has recorded a very fast growth rate and huge profits. The sector has also experienced growth in profits with most banks reporting very high profits after tax; this further confirms the growth of the
sector despite the global financial meltdown which had a very negative effect on world financial performance especially in the banking sectors (Nyamongo & Temesgen, 2013). According to Central Bank, (2015) over the last few years, the Banking sector in Kenya has continued to grow in assets, deposits, profitability and products offering. The growth has been mainly underpinned by; an industry wide branch network expansion strategy both in Kenya and in the East African Community (EAC) region, and automation of a large number of services and a move towards emphasis on the complex customer needs rather than traditional ‘off-the-shelf’ banking products (CBK, 2016).

Over the last decade labor productivity has been of concern to bankers due to the current competitive environment. The current global trend of deregulation of the banking industry, increased expenditure on development of human resources coupled with technological developments like internet banking and Automated Teller Machines (ATMs) have opened up many new businesses to the banks in Kenya location (CBK, 2016). According to the Central Bank (2015) performance indicators in banks include: financial (profits), market share, efficiency, reliability, flexibility and share value in the stock market. It is commonly accepted that employees create an important source of competitive advantage for firms (Goel, 2008; Pattananayak, 2008).

The banks’ specific characteristics also tend to play a great role in the performance of the banking sector (Nyamongo & Temesgen, 2013). Indeed, the available evidence also tends to link high performance to capital adequacy (Athanasoglou, 2015; Goddard, 2014). There has been substantial growth in the number of banks and branches country wide (CBK, 2016). Other growth indicators include the increase in the number of account holders as well as an increase in the number of banks listed in the Nairobi Securities Exchange (NSE). Share prices of listed banks have continuously gained value showing the current growth trend in the sector.

Commercial banks are coming up with more and more vacancies, and the banking sector now has more new jobs than any other sector. Right from the branch level to the highest level, there is tremendous range of opportunities available in the sector (Goel, 2008). Players in this sector have experienced increased competition over the last few years resulting from increased innovations among the players and new entrants into the market. Under such competitive environments bank employees have had a lot of pressure to try
and come up with creative ideas and products that will enable them survive in such an extremely turbulent and competitive environment (Bohlander & Snell, 2007). It is based on the recent successes and improved performance of the banking sector that this study will be undertaken in order to establish the human resource strategies that affect the employees’ productivity in the banking sector (Goddard, 2014).

The evolution of the banking industry in Kenya makes it very unique. With more banks per head than other major African markets, Kenya is a world leader in mobile money technology. Opportunities beckon across East Africa (EA) and beyond, and capital can be raised swiftly to meet evolving regulatory requirements. Foreign banks still face stiff competition from home-grown contenders, but the scope for future growth means more are keen to enter (CBK, 2016). Key to success in Kenya is the ability to create and grow products (and institutions) that respond to the needs of Kenyans for convenience and efficiency through alternative banking channels such as mobile, internet and agency banking. This opens growth markets in other segments, including Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) and the informal sector, that have traditionally been less involved in formal banking service (Oxford, 2018).

The commercial banks in Kenya are categorized in tiers i.e. Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3. National Bank is a Tier 2 Bank. The banks categorized as tier 2 comprise of medium-sized lenders controlling about 41.7% of the total monetary and fiscal market share in the country. The banks categorized as tier 2 comprise of medium-sized lenders controlling about 41.7% of the total monetary and fiscal market share in the country (Vkenya, 2017). National Bank was incorporated on 19th June 1968 and officially opened on Thursday November 14th 1968. At the time it was fully owned by the Government. The objective for which it was formed was to help Kenyans get access to credit and control their economy after independence. Its current shareholding now stands at National Social Security Fund (NSSF) 48.06%, General Public 29.44% and Kenya Government 22.5% (NBK, 2018).

The banks vision is to be the preferred Bank in the provision of financial solutions in the region. It is engaged in the provision of banking, banc assurance and related financial services. The Bank participates in Corporate Banking, Business Banking, Retail Banking and Islamic Banking with a portfolio of products and financial solutions for corporates,
institutions, businesses and retail customers. The Bank offers a spectrum of products, which include Financing, Trade Services, Mortgages, Account Services, Custody Services, Islamic Banking and Cards Services, among others. Its Personal banking includes accounts, borrowing, and cards and investing; business banking includes business banking accounts, microfinance, working capital finance, trade finance, investments and treasury services; corporate banking includes corporate banking accounts, financing solutions, transactional solutions, custodial services and account relationship management services. The Bank has network of 80 branches outlets across the country, 124 automated teller machines and 1,480 agents (NBK, 2018).

To keep up with the dynamic industry, in 2012 National bank launched a five year transformational strategy which saw it rebrand; changing its logo and colors from the predominately green to yellow and brown, launch a mobile and online banking platform, undertake cost cutting measure e.g. the Voluntary Retiring package which reduced its staff number to 2001 from 1,496 and centralized most of its operations to increase accuracy, efficiency, standardization of service and enhance accountability (NBK, 2018).

The current staff composition of 1,496 consists of 1,285 permanent staff and 214 contract staff. The staff gender composition stands at 746 female and 753 males. The headquarters/flagship branch, known as Harambee avenue branch is located along Harambee Avenue in Nairobi. The branch was founded in 1976. It is the largest branch in the entire branch network in terms of deposits and assets held. It has a staff complement of 49 employees (NBK, 2018).

1.2 Statement of the Problem
The rapid technological growth and increased competition have forced commercial banks in Kenya to aggressively compete for employees in order to remain competitive (CBK, 2016). This trend has created a lot of interest on the effect of HRM strategies on performance. Many studies have shown a positive relationship between HRM strategies and performance (Huselid 2007; Armstrong & Baron, 2009; Katou, 2008; Gardner & Moynihan, 2013). Despite these findings most studies have been characterized by lack of a solid theoretical foundation explaining the mechanisms causing the observed enhanced performance. Available studies do not adequately investigate exactly how a good alignment between HRM and firm strategy leads to improved performance. Researchers
have termed the link between HRM and organizational performance to be a ‘black box’, that is, lack of clarity regarding ‘what exactly leads to what’ (Purcell, 2004; Gerhart, 2005; Katou, 2008).

While investigations have been initiated in emerging markets and in transitional countries (Ahlstron et al., 2015; Zupan & Kase, 2015), available literature shows that most studies examining the relationship between HRM and performance have been conducted in the manufacturing sector mostly in the US (Huselid, 2015; Guest et al., 2013). Without a clearly delineated theoretical model of High-Performance Work Systems (HPWS) and their effects on performance, scholars cannot adequately validate the efficacy of such strategies and provide useful suggestions to practitioners.

There is, therefore, a great need for additional evidence to support the HRM-performance relationship in the Kenyan banking industry, particularly in National Bank of Kenya. It is from this background that this study was conducted to investigate how HRM practices affect the employee productivity in Kenyan commercial banks, with a specific focus on National Bank of Kenya limited.

1.3 Objective of the Study
The study was driven to examine the effectiveness of management practices on improving employee productivity at National Bank of Kenya limited, Headquarters branch.

1.4 Specific Objectives
The research aimed at evaluating the effectiveness of the following management practices on employee productivity:
1.4.1 To examine the influence of fostering requisite organizational culture on employee productivity at National Bank.
1.4.2 To examine the effect of employee induction on employee productivity at National Bank.
1.4.3 To determine the effect of task autonomy on employee productivity at National Bank.
1.5 Significance of the Study
The findings of this study may be significant to the following stakeholders:

1.5.1 The Directors/Executives of the Organization
The study provides a clear picture of the effectiveness of current management practices. The top executives may take the findings in charting the long-term needs of the organization in their strategy formulation.

1.5.2 Management Teams
The management teams are involved with the implementation of the strategy formulated by top executives. This study clearly depicts the effectiveness of their practices on the productivity of their employees. They would be in the best position to take measures stipulated in the findings.

1.5.3 Policy Makers
This study on the effect of management practices on employee productivity in commercial banks may be of significance to policy makers. These policy makers may have a greater understanding of how management practices influence employee productivity, thus, may facilitate their ability to make better policies that govern the financial institutions.

1.5.4 Human Resource Practitioners
Employee productivity is one of the core Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) for HR practitioners. This study may help them chart the way forward for other organizations facing similar challenges as National Bank.

1.5.5 Academicians and Researchers
There could be a number of researchers and academicians who would like to know what management practices are effective in National bank and relate the same to the banking industry. In addition, they may be able to use the findings of this research as a guide to other research areas that have not been covered.
1.6 Scope of the Study

The study focused on National Bank of Kenya limited in Nairobi. It focused on the headquarter office located at Harambee Avenue also known at the Harambee Avenue Branch. The study was carried out on 44 staff members of Harambee Avenue branch (Headquarters branch) at National Bank of Kenya. The study took place between the months of September and December 2018, and it was carried out on the specific targeted organization which was National bank located at Harambee Avenue. The study found challenges in data collection where some respondents declined participating in the study. To overcome this, the researcher ensured that they got an official letter from the university indicating the purpose and validity of the study, thus encouraging participation.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Employee Productivity

Productivity is described as the ratio of what is produced to what is required to produce it. Usually this ratio is in the form of an average, expressing the total output of some category of goods divided by the total input of, say, labor or raw materials (Pattananayak, 2008).

1.7.2 Human Resources Management

HRM is the term used to describe formal systems devised for the management of people within an organization with the purpose of maximizing the productivity of an organization by optimizing the effectiveness of its employees (Gardner & Moynihan, 2013).

1.7.3 Key Performance Indicators

KPIs are measurable values that demonstrate how effectively organizations are achieving key business objectives, as well as evaluate their success at reaching their particular set targets/goals (Purcell & Kinnie, 2007).
1.7.4 Organizational Culture

Organizational culture refers to a system of shared meaning held by members that distinguish one organization from other organizations (Collins & Porras, 2000). Organizational culture is defined as the learned product of group experience which affects the behavior of individuals within an organization (Schein, 1999).

1.7.5 Employee Induction

Employee induction is defined as employee placement which is the determination of the job to which an accepted candidate is to be assigned, which is important in an organization because it affects the employee’s performance (Kumar & Sharma, 2014).

1.7.6 Task Autonomy

Task autonomy refers to giving the individual who performs a task considerable discretion and control in deciding how to carry it out (Cohen & Ledford, 2014).

1.8 Chapter Summary

Chapter one stated the background of the study, followed by the statement of the problem, objective of the study, specific objectives, significance of the study, scope of the study and definition of terms. Chapter two explored the literature review. Chapter three presented the research methodology. Chapter four presented the results and findings of the study while chapter five presented a summary, discussion, conclusions and recommendations from this study.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The study is focused on examining the effectiveness of management practices on improving employee productivity at National Bank of Kenya limited. This chapter provides literature based on past research on the influence of fostering requisite organizational culture on employee productivity, the effect of employee induction in terms of appropriate skill set on employee productivity, the effect of task autonomy on employee productivity.

2.2 Influence of Fostering Organizational Culture and Employee Productivity

Organizational culture was once seen as the perception of how things are done around the organization (Black et al., 2014) but has since evolved into a facet of management with a robust range of literature affording a far deeper understanding. Schein’s definition (1999) remains one of the most often used and can be summed up as the learned product of group experience which affects the behavior of individuals. Organizational culture is differentiated from organizational climate in that it is not as overt. Organizational culture is also differentiated from organization structure in that structure has more to do with the relationships between individuals in an organization (Acar Z. & Acar P., 2014).

Organizational culture has assumed considerable importance in the 21st Century, because of its effect on employee performance and job satisfaction (Higgins & McAllaster, 2012). It is the imperative of every organization to understand its own dynamic culture so that managers can capitalize on the insights generated by the cultural perspective to wield greater control over their organizations (Quinn & Robert, 2011). The culture of an organization has an important impact on its performance. With the ever-changing technology and fast-paced business arena, companies today are grappling to find new and innovative ways of improving performance with the minimal addition of cost (Tseng, 2010). Quinn and Robert (2011) state that many companies have now turned to exploring the sociological aspect of the business in order to improve profitability, and that culture is one aspect that is not tangible, yet it plays a very important role to the success of any business enterprise.
Robbins (2000) postulates that culture, as a concept, has had a long and cheered history. In the last decade, it has been used by some organizational researchers and managers to indicate the climate and practices that organizations develop around their handling of people or to refer to the espoused values and credo of an organization. Schein (1999) defines culture as a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. Collins and Porras (2000) state that organizational culture refers to a system of shared meaning held by members that distinguish one organization from other organizations. Collins and Porras (2000) believe that these shared meanings are a set of key characteristics, and that the organization values and the essence of an organizations culture can be captured in seven primary characteristics. These characteristics are: innovation and risk – taking, attention to detail, outcome orientation, People orientation, Team orientation, Aggressiveness and Stability.

2.2.1 Types of Organizational Cultures
An organization that values formality, rules, standard operating procedures, and hierarchical co-ordination has a bureaucratic culture. Long-term concerns of bureaucracy are predictability, efficiency, and stability. Its members highly value standardized goods and customer service (Acar Z. & Acar P., 2014). Behavioral norms support formality over informality and managers view their roles as being good co-coordinators, organizers, and enforcers of certain rules and standards (Khazanchi et al., 2014). Tasks, responsibilities, and authority for all employees are clearly defined.

Tradition, loyalty, personal commitment, extensive socialization, teamwork, self-management, and social influences are attributes of clan culture. Its members recognize an obligation beyond the simple exchange of labor for a salary (Rose et al., 2016). The members understand that their contributions to the organization may exceed any contractual agreements. The individual’s long-term commitment to the organization is exchanged for the organization’s long-term commitment to the individual (Damanpour & Gopalakrishnan, 2014). Individuals believe that the organization will treat them fairly in terms of salary increases, promotions, and other forms of recognition. Consequently, they hold themselves accountable to the organization for their actions (Rose et al., 2016).
High levels of risk taking, dynamism, and creativity characterize an entrepreneurial culture. There is a commitment to experimentation, innovation, and being on the leading edge (Acar Z. & Acar P., 2014). This culture does not just quickly react to changes in the environment it creates change. Effectiveness means providing new and unique products and rapid growth. Individual initiative, flexibility, and freedom foster growth and are encouraged and well rewarded (Damanpour & Gopalakrishnan, 2014).

The achievements of measurable and demanding goals, especially those that are financial and market-based, characterize a market culture. Hard driving competitiveness and a profit orientation prevail throughout the organization (Black et al., 2014). In a market culture, the relationship between individual and organization is contractual. The individual is responsible for some levels of rewards in return. A market culture does not exert much informal, social pressure on the organization’s members (Ogbonna & Harris, 2014). They do not share a common set of expectations regarding management style or philosophy. The absence of a long-term commitment by both parties results in a weak socializing process (Acar Z. & Acar P., 2014).

A power orientated organization is based on inequality of access to resources. In other words, the people in power use resources to either satisfy or frustrate the needs of others, and, by so doing, they control behavior of others (Quinn & Robert, 2011). Leadership resides in the person who is in charge, and rests on the leaders’ ability and willingness to administer rewards and punishments (Ogbonna & Harris, 2014). At best, the power-orientated leader is firm, fair and generous and has loyal subordinates. At worst, the power-orientated leader leads by fear, with abuse of power for personal gains (Black et al., 2014).

In a role culture orientated organization, structures and systems give protection to subordinates and stability to the organization. The duties and rewards of employees’ roles are clearly defined. This is usually defined in writing as a job description (Tseng, 2010). People in these organizations perform specific functions in order to receive defined rewards and, both the individual and the organization, are expected to keep to their parts of the bargain (Wei et al., 2014). The main values of a role-orientated organization are order, dependability, rationality, and consistency and, at best, this type of organization provides stability, justice, and efficient performance (Tseng, 2010). People are protected
in their jobs and need to spend less time looking out for themselves, and can devote more energy to their work (Ogbonna & Harris, 2014).

The achievement orientated organization is known as the aligned organization because it lines people up behind a common vision or purpose (Detert et al., 2014). This type of organization uses the mission to attract and release the personal energy of its employees in the pursuit of common goals (Higgins & McAllaster, 2012). There is an inner commitment within these achievement-orientated individuals. Many people like their work and want to make a contribution to society, thus enjoying an intrinsic reward, and a typical type of achievement-orientated organization would be an intensive care unit in a hospital or voluntary community organization (Schneider et al., 2009).

The support culture may be defined as an organization climate that is based on mutual trust between the individual and the organization (Taormina, 2016). In such organizations, people are valued as human beings and are not just machines. This culture centers on warmth and even love and it makes people want to come to work in the morning, not only because they like their work but also because they care for their colleagues (Khazanchi et al., 2014). Quality and service often show in support-orientated organizations, since successful approaches to quality improvements are often based on small work teams. People contribute towards the organization out of a sense of commitment. Employees feel a sense of belonging and that they have a personal stake in the organization (Damanpour & Gopalakrishnan, 2014).

### 2.2.2 Relationship between Organizational Culture and Employee Productivity

In view of the above, different cultural practices have gained research attention. For instance, a study by Higgins and McAllaster (2012) opined that an innovative-supportive culture is obtained from values, an informed underlying belief structure in addition to strong daily practices. Accordingly, Detert et al. (2014) argue that the values of an organization serve as the foundation of cultures that promote process innovation that permit or hinder performance improvement. It is a system that allows innovation, necessitates a culture of discipline (for example, an attitude and practice that emphasizes the monitoring of quality to be aware of problems), and encourages creativity in the process of solving problems.
A study by Silverthorne (2014) involving a sample of Taiwanese employees argues that a bureaucratic organization has a larger problem in sustaining employee job satisfaction than organizations that have an innovative or supportive culture; thus, emphasizing that an organization that has a bureaucratic culture results in the lowest level of job satisfaction. Taormina (2016) examined 220 Chinese adults working in local organizations in an international port city on the coast of southern China. The result showed that bureaucratic culture is characterized by leaders who favor the use of control rather than flexible behaviors. The result also showed a strong support for a supportive culture and socialization (Taormina, 2016).

A study by Ogbonna and Harris (2014) also established that competitive and innovative cultures had a direct relationship with employees’ performance, while community and bureaucratic cultures had no direct relationship with performance. According to Damanpour and Gopalakrishnan (2014), effective innovation improves organizational effectiveness and responsiveness. However, despite the significant argument on innovative culture, other researchers argue that innovation-supportive culture remains a difficult and unstructured phenomenon (Higgins & McAllaster, 2012). An innovative culture poses great challenges. For instance, Baer and Frese (2013) and Black et al. (2014) argue that an innovative culture is highly disruptive, changes relationships across functional as well as occupational limits or causes adjustments to the organizational structure and climate. These results further indicate that different cultural practices have different effects on employees’ performance.

Furthermore, Khazanchi et al. (2014) found that congruence around control values have no significant effect on plant performance. Similarly, Rose et al. (2016) showed that culture would have a significant relationship with superior performance only if the culture is able to adapt to changes in environmental conditions. In view of this, Acar, Z. and Acar, P. (2014) suggested that due to the differences in organizational culture and the ways in which organizations respond to the external environment, there will always be a difference in performance achievement. Thus, to enhance effectiveness, organizations should enhance their managerial practices such as developing a suitable culture (Wei et al., 2014). Regardless of the multitude of studies on cultural values, there is no agreement as to what culture is and how it should be examined (Schneider et al., 2009). Following this, Detert et al. (2014) argue that the complexity of building theories on organizational
culture is matched by the paucity of empirical studies on innovative, supportive, and bureaucratic cultures.

2.3 Effect of Employee Induction and Employee Productivity

Employee placement is the process of assigning a new employee to a position within his or her sphere of authority where the employee will have a reasonable chance for success (Dessler, 2008). Kumar and Sharma (2014) define placement as the determination of the job to which an accepted candidate is to be assigned. Employee placement is important in an organization because it affects the employee’s performance.

Organizations rely heavily on their employees for their success (Brand & Bax, 2012). As such, organizations should manage employees’ performance for success. One good practice recommended for excellent employee management is effective placement. Dessler (2008) holds that faulty placement can result in poor employee performance which in turn could lead to reduced organizational efficiency, increased attrition, threats to organizational integrity, and frustration of personal and professional ambitions. Conversely, he argues that proper placement fosters personal growth, provides a motivating climate for employees, maximizes performance, and increases the probability that organizational goals will be met.

In support, Kumar and Sharma (2014) suggest that proper placement of workers reduces employee turnover, absenteeism and accident rates, and improves morale, all of which have implications on overall employee performance and productivity in the organization. Employee placement entails executing proper induction by developing an induction plan and implementing it.

2.3.1 Employee Orientation

Orientation or socialization is the process of initiating a new employee into an organization and acquainting him or her with the details and requirements of the job (Grobler et al., 2012). It is the process of informing new employees about what is expected of them in the job and helping them to cope with stresses of transition (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2012). The process should provide new employees with an understanding of how their job performance contributes to the success of the organization and how the
services or products of the organization benefit the society. Induction not only develops the skills of employees but also helps in optimum utilization of human resources to achieve the organizational goals as well as their individual goals (Indradevi, 2014).

A well-done induction process can improve staff confidence and productivity, build employee loyalty and provide a competitive advantage in attracting and keeping good staff. Its purpose, in the work situation, is to enable an individual to acquire knowledge and skills to perform adequately a given task or job (Buckley, 2016). Employee induction may be regarded as the final phase of recruitment and selection, but also as the first phase of learning and development and it aims to set new people off to a good start (Nankervis et al., 2012). Each organization should develop and execute a dynamic orientation and induction policy to provide guidelines for on-boarding new employees.

### 2.3.2 Planning and Monitoring Process

Deb (2012), states that an effective induction process puts together the activities of planning and monitoring the integration and maintenance of employees in an organization. Induction is a process and not an event. During the process, it may be necessary to vary timings, go back over elements depending on the requirements of the individual recipient and the particular circumstances of the work (Bradt & Vonegut, 2014).

The period of induction is determined by the length of time it takes to become effective on the job and to learn and understand the new activities (Grobler et al., 2012). Induction parameters will take the employee through: organization framework and ownership; vision, mission and values; functions (departments/units); physical set up, amenities and recreation; governance, rules and regulations; safety and health issues and organizational philosophy (Bradt & Vonegut, 2014). This means that during induction, new employees are familiarized with policies and standard operating procedures, labor legislation and information about compensation and benefits, occupational safety and health of workers, accident prevention issues and employee relations and workforce issues (rights, responsibilities). The mentioned aspects should constitute the preliminary learning and training a new employee experiences in an organization (Grobler et al., 2012).
Armstrong (2008) observes that resignations and turnover can increase if people are not given opportunities for learning and development, or feel that demands are being made upon them that they cannot reasonably be expected to fulfill without proper orientation. The author posits that new employees can go through an ‘induction crisis’ if they are not given adequate training when they join the organization. To support the need for induction, Nankervis et al. (2012) add that frequently, newcomers suffer feelings of failure because of inappropriate induction to the organization and this can be true for the newly hired experienced employees as for the novice. The same authors suggest that new employees should be inducted through a properly planned induction program.

2.3.3 Employee Integration

Induction planning seeks to formulate all activities intended to integrate the new employee with the organization’s other employees, business process, vision, values and culture (Deb, 2012). Planning entails developing a program to implement the induction. An induction program is a set of information designed by management to accord the new employee the opportunity to settle in her/his job as quickly and smoothly as far as possible. Induction program should emphasize people as well as procedures, materials and equipment that the new employee will work with (Nankervis et al. (2012).

An effective induction program consists of supplemental efforts taken early in a new employee’s tenure to help him build a better understanding of the organization’s culture, his job responsibility, and how they tie into a company and departmental priorities (Royal & Agnew, 2014). Nankervis et al. (2012) argue that an induction program can make an immediate and lasting impression, which may mean the difference between an employee’s success and / or failure on the job.

Nankervis et al. (2012) also posit that the nature of an induction program will be determined by the type of job, traditions and structure of the organization, as well as attitudes towards employee career planning. The authors hold that in small organizations, induction may simply take the form of a conversation with the human resource manager and line supervisor. Given that induction is ideally the first part of a bonding process between the new employee and others in the organization (it requires careful planning,
supportive orientation packages and effective liaison between the human resources department and line management (Deb, 2012; Bernadin, 2014).

2.3.4 Organizational Material and Information

Employee induction would definitely make a significant difference in how quickly an employee can become more productive. The way a new employee is received has a long-term impact on the employee’s performance (Deb, 2012). Induction programs often involve standard formal introductory sessions that provide information about the organization, its structure and objectives and are supplemented by specialist, and often informal, sessions in the new employee’s work area (Nankervis et al., 2012).

People spend a large amount of their lives at work, and forming strong and positive relationships with coworkers is critical not only for job satisfaction, retention and effective teamwork, but is also critical for one’s personal happiness and on-the-job engagement level (Sims, 2014). Companies that understand this include activities in the induction program to foster the forming of employee relationships on the new employees’ first day, helping them join with others so they can do the work together (Bradt & Vonegut, 2014; Sims, 2014).

To enable employees to become productive more quickly on the job, they need to be given information and materials to “get a head start” before their employee’s first day on the job such as the initial paper work, benefits information and company products and brand information (Bradt & Vonegut, 2014). Bernadin (2014) also suggests that a peer or buddy assigned to the new employee, to provide an additional resource person to assist the employee, to answer questions and to communicate the “unwritten rules” of the company should also be made available.

Effective induction implementation drives new employee productivity, accelerates delivery of results and significantly improves talent retention (Bradt & Vonegut, 2014). When organizational induction is implemented effectively, individual and organizational goals can be united. Low performance among new recruits has been linked to ineffective implementation of induction programs (Nankervis et al., 2012). Bradt and Vonegut
(2014) observe that when any person takes on a new role, there is a risk he or she will be misaligned with the organization.

2.4 Effect of Task Autonomy on Employee Productivity

The notion of task autonomy - giving the individual who performs a task considerable discretion and control in deciding how to carry it out - is as old as organizations themselves (Cohen & Ledford, 2014). The widespread and organized use of task autonomy in organizations, however, is a relatively modern phenomenon. Rarely used systematically before 1980, by the mid-1990s, task autonomy and related forms of employee participation were used in more than 90% of Fortune 1000 companies (Lawler et al., 2015). Giving task autonomy to employees is generally expected to result in higher motivation, satisfaction, and performance (Loher et al., 2015). Researchers have explored how best to design individual jobs as well as teams (Cohen & Ledford, 2014; Cordery et al., 2014) so as to take advantage of the benefits of increased task autonomy.

Task autonomy is defined as the degree to which an individual is given substantial freedom, independence, and discretion in carrying out a task, such as scheduling work and determining procedures to follow (Hackman, 1980). Task autonomy is more specific than job autonomy. As defined, task autonomy is distinct from participation, which is generally defined as joint decision making among more than one person (usually a job incumbent and a supervisor) (Cohen & Ledford, 2014). Task autonomy is also conceptually distinct from empowerment, which is a psychological state that represents an individual’s orientation with his or her work role (Ryan & Deci, 2010).

For researchers attempting to explore why task autonomy in reality only has a modest effect on performance (Spector, 1986), the level of specificity in the job characteristics model is limiting. The model is a more general theory, focused on several job characteristics, not just task autonomy, and the motivational effects of these job characteristics. The model is silent on other mechanisms by which task autonomy might influence performance.
2.4.1 Trait-Based Determinants

The influence of more enduring traits is expected to potentially moderate the motivating effect of task autonomy on performance. Whereas Hackman and Oldham’s (1976) growth needs strength construct might appear to be a strong candidate for trait-based individual differences to incorporate in the model, the somewhat general nature of the construct (i.e., it applies to enriched jobs more generally, not just autonomy) precludes this. Instead, one can choose variables more appropriate to the level of generality of the theory by being specific to task autonomy (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1972). Conceptually, a desire for independence from team members may not necessarily be derived from a desire for control or other autonomy related needs or drives, as other individual differences may explain why one would want to work independently (e.g., introversion or avoidance of conflict). In addition, responses to measures of this variable did change over a relatively short period of time, suggesting it is perhaps more a state-based than a trait-based concept.

The need for autonomy and needs for achievement are expected to influence the extent to which individuals are motivated by task autonomy. The need for autonomy (Ryan & Deci, 2010) is defined as an innate need that all humans have to some extent, representing the need to be self-determining or self-initiating. Need for achievement (McClelland, 1975) represents an individual’s desire to achieve success through one’s own efforts and to take personal responsibility and credit for outcomes. Empirical evidence has found that both need for autonomy and need for achievement influence individuals’ responses to task autonomy (Orpen, 2015), suggesting a role for these stable trait-like characteristics in the relationship between autonomy and motivation.

2.4.2 State-Based Determinants

To generate a more specific, mid-range theory of task autonomy, it is important to consider more contextually specific individual differences as well. As such, one can incorporate several state-based individual differences. One can largely draw on Bandura’s (1997) framework of social–cognitive theory to propose relationships about how context might influence the motivating effect of task autonomy. Social–cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997) suggests that people exercise control in order to realize benefits. According to Bandura (1997), the ability to secure desired outcomes and to prevent
undesired outcomes therefore provides a powerful incentive for the development and exercise of personal control. This also suggests that if there are no desirable outcomes to gain or undesirable outcomes to avoid, there is no need for personal control. In other words, the desire for increased personal control is not an unfocused innate drive but rather a calculated and goal-specific state. In essence, people exercise control (or want control) for the benefits it can give them.

This more cognitive and situational viewpoint has an important implication, specifically, that the overall utility of task autonomy will influence the motivational effect of actual autonomy. Utility represents the net of expected benefits minus expected costs of a given course of action, event, or transaction (Samuelson & Marks, 2012). In the context of task autonomy, this suggests that the combination of perceived benefits and costs associated with task autonomy from the individual’s perspective will influence his or her perceived utility of being granted autonomy and will subsequently affect the motivational effect that such autonomy will have (Pashler, 2014). Giving autonomy to an employee who perceives great benefit and little cost to autonomy is likely to be motivating, just as giving autonomy to the employee who perceives little benefit but great cost to autonomy is likely to harm motivation (Samuelson & Marks, 2012).

2.4.3 Informational Mechanisms

Beyond motivational mechanisms, autonomy affects individual performance because of issues related to information and decision making. Although not explicitly stated in task autonomy literature, an informational mechanism has been explicitly developed in the related literature on participation (Locke et al., 2015). Specifically, informational benefits are expected from allowing participation in job-related decisions when the individual performing the job has information about the task that is not available to the supervisor (Locke & Schweiger, 1979; Miller & Monge, 2012). For example, the experienced software engineer may have more current and technical knowledge about a particular project she is working on than does the supervisor who oversees not only the software engineer but also a graphics developer and a technical writer. Hence, there will be information related performance gains from allowing the software engineer to participate in decisions regarding the programming of the project, as he or she will be able to take
advantage of that task-specific knowledge when making decisions about how to do the task.

The logic of this informational mechanism is compelling regardless of whether the issue is the sharing of information between employee and supervisor (as in participation) or the employee is being given discretion or decision-making authority (as in autonomy) (Locke et al., 2015). If the software engineer has better information than the supervisor about effectively programming code for that particular project, granting substantial autonomy to her would seem to be a good way to ensure that she can best take advantage of that knowledge (Rubinstein et al., 2014). Taking advantage of that knowledge means that better decisions are made by the employee regarding how and when to complete the task. These informational benefits of autonomy are entirely separate from any motivational benefits (Locke & Schweiger, 1979; Miller & Monge, 2012).

Considering only the informational mechanism, the relationship between autonomy and performance is dependent on the information asymmetry between the subordinate and the supervisor; the more task information the individual has, the greater the potential performance benefit of granting autonomy to that individual (Pashler, 2014). If the individual has no more knowledge about the task than the supervisor, there will be no informational benefits from granting autonomy, as there is no information asymmetry to be exploited (Wickens, 2012).

2.4.4 Dual-Task Processing
The essential difference between a worker with task autonomy and a worker without task autonomy is that the former has the opportunity to make decisions about task implementation, whereas the latter simply carries out the task as instructed (Osman & Moore, 2013). The worker with autonomy is more cognitively distracted from the performance of the task, as he or she is involved in two distinct activities simultaneously. One of these is the activity of performing the task itself (Rubinstein et al., 2014). The other is the cognitive activity involved in evaluating earlier choices and making decisions about future choices. With attention focused simultaneously on task performance and decision making, individuals with autonomy experience additional cognitive activity that distracts them from performance of the task (Temprado et al., 2013). This idea of cognitive distraction is on the literature on dual-task processing.
Dual-task processing refers to the cognitive activity that occurs when someone attempts to perform multiple tasks, either simultaneously or consecutively in rapid alternation (Rubinstein et al., 2014). Research has shown that dual-task processing leads to slowing of performance or loss of efficiency when two tasks are performed at the same time (Levy & Pashler, 2014; Osman & Moore, 2013). The explanation for these performance decrements is attributable to two different cognitive processes: interference and switching costs (Rubinstein et al., 2014). Interference is the reduction of cognitive resources or attention for one task either because two responses cannot be processed at the same time or because the cognitive processing of one task is harmful to the processing of the other (Temprado et al., 2013). Switching costs occur because cognitive resources are spent in the actual cognitive processes required to switch back and forth between tasks. The degradation of performance in dual-task situations has been well documented (Bowers et al., 2014; Pashler, 2014; Temprado et al., 2013). With either interference or switching costs, the performance decrements associated with dual-task processing are heightened when tasks are more complex (Rubinstein et al., 2001).

These findings regarding dual-task processing have been related to the managerial term of multitasking as well (Wickens, 2012). That is, multitasking will result in the cognitive distraction associated with interference and switching costs and will ultimately have negative effects on performance. Although relatively little research in organization settings has been conducted to supplement the considerable laboratory research, at least one applied study found performance decrements of multitasking in an organizational setting (Pesante et al., 2014).

2.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter has provided literature based on past research on the influence of fostering requisite organizational culture on employee productivity, the effect of employee placement in terms of appropriate skill set on employee productivity, the effect of employee induction in terms of appropriate skill set on employee productivity, the effect of task autonomy on employee productivity. The next chapter focuses on the research methodology.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Research methodology is a way to systematically solve a research problem by logically adapting various steps (Scridhar, 2008). This chapter covers the research methodology which encompasses the research design, population and sampling design, data collection methods, research procedures and data analysis methods.

3.2 Research Design

The study adopted the survey research design. Survey research is a widely used data collection method that involves getting information from people typically by asking them questions and collecting and analyzing the answers (Cowles & Nelson, 2015). According to Blackstone (2012), survey research is a quantitative method whereby a researcher poses some set of predetermined questions to an entire group, or sample of individuals. It is an especially useful approach when a researcher aims to describe or explain features of a very large group or groups. This method may also be used as a way of quickly gaining some general details about one’s population of interest to help prepare for a more focused, in-depth study using time-intensive methods such as in-depth interviews or field research (Cowles & Nelson, 2015).

In this case, a survey study helped the researcher identify specific individuals or locations from which to collect additional data. It allows investigation between two variables, the dependent and the independent variable (Bryman, 2016). The survey research was hence appropriate for this study due to the large population and it compared two variables employee productivity (dependent variable) and management practices (independent variable).

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

Population is the group the researcher wants to generalize on or learn about (Malhotra & Birks, 2013). A research population is also known as a well-defined collection of individuals or objects known to have similar characteristics, and these individuals or objects within a certain population usually have a common, binding characteristic or trait.
The target populations for this study were all the 49 staff based at National Bank, Harambee avenue (Headquarters) branch and were distributed as shown on Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Population Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Branch Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Bank (2018)

3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

A sample frame relates to all the specific elements that are contained within a given population that is under study. It normally provides the researcher with a scope that he needs to consider during the study (Bryman, 2016). The sampling frame for this study came from National Bank, Human Resource department.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Techniques

This study mainly used the stratified random sampling technique to obtain the sample size. According to Bart *et al.* (1998) stratified sampling involves dividing the population into groups so that each unit is in exactly one group and the units are then selected from each group according to some sampling plan, in this case simple random sampling. The groups are called strata to distinguish them from the primary sampling unit.

Use of stratification ensured that the sample was distributed throughout the area, permitted heavier sampling in some areas and let the investigator obtain separate estimates for each portion of the study area. National Bank located at Harambee Avenue branch was divided into 6 main departments each with its leader/manager i.e. sales,
customer service, operations, cash and premium making stratified random sampling ideal for the study.

3.3.2.3. Sample Size

According to Garson and Statistical Associates Publishing (2012), a sample size is sub-set of the population drawn to represent the entire population or any combination of sampling units that does not include the entire set of sampling units that has been defined as the population. Using the below formula for a population size of 49 at 95% level of confidence with a margin of error of 5 %, the sample size for this study was 44 employees, and were distributed as indicated on Table 3.2.

\[
SS = \frac{Z^2 \cdot p \cdot (1-p)}{c^2}
\]

Where:

- \(Z\) = Z value (e.g. 1.96 for 95% confidence level)
- \(p\) = percentage picking a choice, expressed as decimal (0.5 used for sample size needed)
- \(c\) = confidence interval, expressed as decimal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Sample Size % of Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Branch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Data Collection Methods

The study was conducted using questionnaires. According to DeVaus (2014), a questionnaire is the general term used to include all methods of data collection in which each person is asked to respond to the same set of questions in a predetermined order. This study used self-completed questionnaires i.e. completed by the respondents, delivered by hand and collected at a later date (delivery and collection questionnaires). Questionnaires are the ideal data collection instrument to collect first hand data for descriptive research (Gill & Johnson, 2010).

Due to the nature of work, the best methods of delivering the questionnaires to the target population was drop and pick method since the branch employees were usually engaged by clients from 8 am to 5 pm. Questionnaires were deemed to be thorough as they gave a researcher the chance to capture some information that would have been hard to capture by other methods such as focus groups. Since they were predetermined, they also captured all areas. They also eased the researcher whilst making the appropriate records for the data that is captured and enable to check if all the responses have been provided while collecting the questionnaires (Denzin, 2017).

To ensure thoroughness in this study, the questionnaire was divided into 4 parts representing the four objectives. Part one focused on demographics, part two focused on influence of fostering requisite organizational culture on employee productivity, part three focused on the effect of employee induction and employee productivity, and part four focused on the effect of task autonomy on employee productivity.

3.5 Research Procedures

After receipt of the study approval, the researcher issued a pretest questionnaire. The aim of the strategy was to ensure that the various questions contained within the research instrument bore a chance to obtain the right forms of results that would be used to make the necessary analysis e.g. does it capture notable insights that are important in making appropriate characterization, can the researcher make notable concepts that he can use to develop appropriate conclusions (Denzin, 2017). It also helped identify questions that would make respondents uncomfortable and uneasy plus issues that could arise during the data collection process (Gill & Johnson, 2010). The researcher then made the decision of
amending the questionnaire appropriately. The ideal size for a pretest should be between 1 to 10% depending on the sample size (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). For this study, a pretest sample size was 10 respondents. Before issuing the pretest questionnaire, the researcher explained to the respondents clearly the nature, purpose and importance of the study, the importance of their participation, assuring the respondents that their answers would remain confidential. This improved the willingness of the respondents to provide more information in relation to the specific questions that they were asked (Denzin, 2017). This was replicated during the main data collection process. The Cronbach’s Alpha test was used to examine the reliability of the questionnaire. The threshold for the Cronbach Alpha was set at >0.7.

The researcher personally handed out the coded questionnaires once appropriate adjustments had been done depending on the results of the pretest. The respondents were each given a week to complete the questionnaire after which the researcher personally picked them checking the questionnaires thoroughly for unanswered questions with the aim of clarifying the question if that was the reason for it being unanswered.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods

Cooper and Schindler (2014), described data analysis as the process of editing and reducing accumulated data to a manageable size, developing summaries, seeking for patterns and using statistical methods. The data analysis process was conducted by the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics and inferential analysis were used to analyze the collected data. Measures of central tendencies include frequencies, mean and standard deviation. Inferential analysis for example correlations and regressions were used to analyze the relationships between the study variables.

For the purpose of this study, inferential analysis of correlations, and regressions were used to analyze the study. This facilitated the researcher in portraying the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variable. The linear regression analysis for the study was as follows and the results presentations were in the form of tables and figures.

\[ Y = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + e \]
Where:

\[ B_0 \] = Point at which Line Crosses the Y Axis
\[ B_1 \] = Organizational Culture
\[ B_2 \] = Employee Induction
\[ B_3 \] = Task Autonomy
\[ e \] = Error Value

### 3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has identified the survey research design as the main research design for this study. The chapter discusses the research design and provides the population and sampling design. The chapter has elaborated on the sampling frame, sampling techniques, and the study’s sample size. The chapter has also discussed data collection methods, while highlighting the research procedures that were adopted. Finally, the chapter provides the data analysis methods and data presentation. The next chapter presents the results and findings of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

The study is focused on examining the effectiveness of management practices on improving employee productivity at National Bank of Kenya limited. This chapter presents the results and findings based on the questionnaires received. The chapter presents results for demographics, influence of fostering requisite organizational culture on employee productivity, effect of employee induction and employee productivity, and the effect of task autonomy on employee productivity.

4.1.1 Response Rate

The data used for analysis was collected from 33 respondents from the targeted 44 employees of National Bank located at Harambee Avenue branch. The remainder 11 were incomplete and were discarded providing the research study with a significant response rate of 75% as provided for in Figure 4.1.

![Figure 4.1 Response Rate](image)

4.1.2 SPSS Reliability Results

Table 4.1 shows that all four questionnaire items (influence of fostering organizational culture and employee productivity, effect of employee induction and employee productivity, effect of task autonomy on employee productivity and employee productivity) were reliable since they all had a Cronbach Alpha of >0.7 which was the required threshold.
Table 4.1 SPSS Reliability Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Section</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Fostering Organizational Culture and Employee Productivity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of Employee Induction and Employee Productivity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of Task Autonomy on Employee Productivity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Productivity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Demographics

4.2.1 Gender

Figure 4.2 represents the gender divide of the respondents at National Bank located at Harambee Avenue branch and it shows that 64% were female and 36% were male. This indicates that majority of the employees within the bank were female.

![Gender Pie Chart](image)

Figure 4.2 Gender

4.2.2 Age Bracket

Figure 4.3 represents the age bracket of the respondents at National Bank located at Harambee Avenue branch and it shows that 54.5% were aged between 31-35 years, 18.2% were equally aged between the years of 36-40 and 26-30 years respectively, 6.1% were aged between 21-25 years and 3% were over the age of 41 years. This indicates that majority of the employees within the bank were young adults who were 30 years of age and over.
4.2.3 Marital Status

Figure 4.4 represents the marital status of the respondents at National Bank located at Harambee Avenue branch and it shows that 69.7% were married, 30.3% were single and none were divorced or widowed. This shows that most of the employees within the bank were married.

4.2.4 Level of Education

Figure 4.5 represents the level of education of the respondents at National Bank located at Harambee Avenue branch and it shows that 63.6% had attained their university degrees, 15.2% had attained their diplomas, 21.2% had attained their diplomas and none had attained a doctorate or a PhD, indicating that all the respondents had a great educational background that allowed their ease of understanding the research questions.
4.2.5 Department

Figure 4.6 represents the departments the respondents at National Bank located at Harambee Avenue branch worked in and it shows that 30.3% worked in cash, 27.3% worked in sales, 18.2% worked in customer service, 15.2% worked in operations, 6.1% worked in premium and 3% were senior branch managers. This shows that all departments within the organization were covered making the study results all-inclusive.

4.2.6 Years with the Organization

Figure 4.7 represents the number of years the respondents had worked for National Bank, Harambee Avenue branch and it shows that 39.4% had worked for the organization for 6-10 years, 33.3% had been with the bank for 1-5 years, 18.2% for 11-15 years and 9.1%
for 16-20 years. This shows that most of them had been with the bank for over 6 years making them the best candidates for the study.

![Figure 4.7 Years with the Organization](image)

**4.3 Influence of Fostering Organizational Culture and Employee Productivity**

**4.3.1 Rating of Fostering Organizational Culture and Employee Productivity**

Table 4.2 shows that organizational culture affects employee performance as indicated by 84.9% of the respondents, 6.1% were neutral and 9.1% disagreed with a mean of 4.18 and a standard deviation of 1.014. The organization culture provides efficiency and stability as indicated by 78.8% of the respondents, 9.1% were neutral and 12.1% disagreed with a mean of 4.03 and a standard deviation of 0.984.

Staffs recognize their obligation beyond the simple exchange of labor for a salary as indicated by 54.6% of the respondents, 30.3% were neutral and 15.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.52 and a standard deviation of 1.004. The organization is committed to experimentation and innovation as indicated by 48.5% of the respondents, 27.3% were neutral and 24.2% disagreed with a mean of 3.24 and a standard deviation of 0.936.

The leadership of our organization resides in the person(s) in charge as indicated by 60.6% of the respondents, 33.3% were neutral and 6.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.73 and a standard deviation of 0.839. Employees in the organization perform specific functions in order to receive defined rewards as indicated by 48.5% of the respondents, 33.3% were neutral and 18.2% disagreed with a mean of 3.39 and a standard deviation of 1.171. The organization uses its mission to attract and release the personal energy of
employees in the pursuit of its goals as indicated by 39.4% of the respondents although majority of them 42.4% were neutral and 18.2% disagreed with a mean of 3.33 and a standard deviation of 1.021.

The organization values employees as human beings and not machines as indicated by 54.5% of the respondents, 27.3% were neutral and 18.2% disagreed with a mean of 3.61 and a standard deviation of 1.059. The employees contribute towards the organization out of a sense of commitment as indicated by 63.7% of the respondents, 27.3% were neutral and 9.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.58 and a standard deviation of 0.830. The organization has the ability to sustain employees’ job satisfaction as indicated by 51.5% of the respondents, 42.4% were neutral and 6% disagreed with a mean of 3.52 and a standard deviation of 0.834.

Table 4.2 Rating of Fostering Organizational Culture and Employee Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture affects employee performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization culture provides efficiency and stability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our staff recognize their obligation beyond the simple exchange of labor for a salary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our organization is committed to experimentation and innovation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership of our organization resides in the person(s) in charge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in the organization perform specific functions in order to receive defined rewards</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization uses its mission to attract and release the personal energy of employees in the pursuit of its goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our organization values employees as human beings and not machines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our employees contribute towards the organization out of a sense of commitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has the ability to sustain employees’ job satisfaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Fostering Organizational Culture and Employee Productivity Correlations

4.3.2.1 Organizational Culture Items and Employee Productivity Correlations

Table 4.3 shows that organizational culture affecting employee performance was important to employee productivity ($r=0.529$, $p<0.01$). The organization culture providing efficiency and stability was inconsequential to employee productivity ($r=0.165$, $p>0.05$). Staff recognizing their obligation beyond the simple exchange of labor for a salary was inconsequential to employee productivity ($r=0.023$, $p>0.05$). The organization being committed to experimentation and innovation was inconsequential to employee productivity ($r=0.094$, $p>0.05$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Culture Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture affects employee performance</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.529**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization culture provides efficiency and stability</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our staff recognize their obligation beyond the simple exchange of labor for a salary</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our organization is committed to experimentation and innovation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership of our organization resides in the person(s) in charge</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in the organization perform specific functions in order to receive defined rewards</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization uses its mission to attract and release the personal energy of employees in the pursuit of its goals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our organization values employees as human beings and not machines</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our employees contribute towards the organization out of a sense of commitment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has the ability to sustain employees’ job satisfaction</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.567
Table 4.3 shows that the leadership of the organization residing in the person(s) in charge was inconsequential to employee productivity (r=0.085, p>0.05). Employees in the organization performing specific functions in order to receive defined rewards was inconsequential to employee productivity (r=0.084, p>0.05). The organization using its mission to attract and release the personal energy of employees in the pursuit of its goals was inconsequential to employee productivity (r=0.129, p>0.05).

The organization valuing employees as human beings and not machines were inconsequential to employee productivity (r=0.092, p>0.05). Employees contributing towards the organization out of a sense of commitment was inconsequential to employee productivity (r=0.182, p>0.05). The organization having the ability to sustain employees’ job satisfaction was inconsequential to employee productivity (r=0.103, p>0.05).

4.3.2.2 Organizational Culture Factors and Employee Productivity Correlations

Table 4.4 shows that fostering organizational culture was inconsequential to employee productivity (r=0.214, p>0.05). Type of organizational culture was inconsequential to employee productivity (r=0.152, p>0.05). Influence of organizational culture was inconsequential to employee productivity (r=0.066, p>0.05).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employee Productivity</th>
<th>Fostering Organizational Culture</th>
<th>Type of Organizational Culture</th>
<th>Influence of Organizational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Productivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Organizational Culture</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organizational Culture</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Organizational Culture</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.435*</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
4.3.3 Fostering Organizational Culture and Employee Productivity Regressions

Table 4.5 shows the relationship between fostering organizational culture and employee performance and the adjusted R square of 0.015 means that fostering organizational culture affects employee productivity by 1.5%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.63669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Fostering Organizational Culture

Table 4.6 provides the regression coefficient indicating the existing relationship between fostering organizational culture and employee performance. The table forms the regression equation of:

**Employee Performance = 3.593 + 0.186 Fostering Organizational Culture + ε**

From Table 4.6, it can be deduced that fostering organizational culture was inconsequential to employee productivity since its p value was > 0.05. From the equation, it can be deduced that a unit increase in fostering organizational culture would result in an 18.6% increase in employee productivity, even though it was insignificant to employee productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>3.593</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>6.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Org.</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>1.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Productivity
4.4 Effect of Employee Induction and Employee Productivity

4.4.1 Rating of Employee Induction and Employee Productivity

Table 4.7 shows that employee placement in the organization affects employees’ performance as indicated by 81.8% of the respondents, 3% were neutral and 15.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 1.042. The organization relies heavily on its employees for success as indicated by 72.7% of the respondents, 21.2% were neutral and 6.1% disagreed with a mean of 4.18 and a standard deviation of 0.983. Employee placement in the organization entails the use of proper induction as indicated by 63.7% of the respondents, 33.3% were neutral and 3% disagreed with a mean of 3.76 and a standard deviation of 0.751.

The table also indicates that the organization initiates new employees by acquainting them with details and requirements of the job as indicated by 69.7% of the respondents, 21.2% were neutral and 9.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.82 and a standard deviation of 0.882. Induction in the organization shows new employees how their job performance contributes to the success of the organization as indicated by 72.7% of the respondents, 21.2% were neutral and 6.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.97 and a standard deviation of 0.883. The induction process takes employee through the organization’s vision, mission and values as indicated by 84.8% of the respondents, 9.1% were neutral and 6.1% disagreed with a mean of 4.12 and a standard deviation of 0.820. The induction process familiarizes new employees with the organization’s policies and standard operating procedures as indicated by 78.7% of the respondents, 15.2% were neutral and 6.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.97 and a standard deviation of 0.810.

The organization has developed a program to implement during its induction process as indicated by 54.5% of the respondents, 27.3% were neutral and 18.2% disagreed with a mean of 3.61 and a standard deviation of 1.059. The organization’s induction program consists of supplemental efforts that help new employees understand the organization’s culture as indicated by 51.6% of the respondents, 36.4% were neutral and 12.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.55 and a standard deviation of 0.905. The organization’s induction process fosters the forming of employee relationships between new employees and old employees as indicated by 51.5% of the respondents, 33.3% were neutral and 15.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.55 and a standard deviation of 1.063.
Table 4.7 Rating of Employee Induction and Employee Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee placement in the organization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affects employees’ performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization relies heavily on its</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees for success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee placement in the organization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entails the use of proper induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization initiates new employees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by acquainting them with details and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements of the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction in the organization shows</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new employees how their job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributes to the success of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The induction process takes employee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through the organization’s vision,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The induction process familiarizes new</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees with the organization’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies and standard operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has developed a program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to implement during its induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s induction program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consists of supplemental efforts that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help new employees understand the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization’s culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s induction process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fosters the forming of employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships between new employees and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Correlations for Employee Induction and Employee Productivity

4.4.2.1 Correlations for Employee Induction Items and Employee Productivity

Table 4.8 indicates that employee placement in the organization affecting employees’ performance was important to employee productivity ($r=0.490$, $p<0.01$). The organization relying heavily on its employees for success was inconsequential to employee productivity ($r=0.249$, $p>0.05$). Employee placement in the organization entailing the use
of proper induction was inconsequential to employee productivity ($r=0.311$, $p>0.05$). The organization initiating new employees by acquainting them with details and requirements of the job was important to employee productivity ($r=0.468$, $p<0.05$).

**Table 4.8 Correlations for Employee Induction Items and Employee Productivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee placement in the organization affects employees’ performance</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.490** .004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization relies heavily on its employees for success</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.249 .162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee placement in the organization entails the use of proper induction</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.311 .078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization initiates new employees by acquainting them with details and requirements of the job</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.468** .006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction in the organization shows new employees how their job performance contributes to the success of the organization</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.078 .667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The induction process takes employee through the organization’s vision, mission and values</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.162 .368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The induction process familiarizes new employees with the organization’s policies and standard operating procedures</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.303 .086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has developed a program to implement during its induction process</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.270 .129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s induction program consists of supplemental efforts that help new employees understand the organization’s culture</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.105 .562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s induction process fosters the forming of employee relationships between new employees and old employees</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.060 .739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Induction in the organization showing new employees how their job performance contributes to the success of the organization was inconsequential to employee productivity ($r=0.078$, $p>0.05$). The induction process of taking employee through the organization’s vision, mission and values was inconsequential to employee productivity ($r=0.162$, $p>0.05$). The induction process familiarizing new employees with the
organization’s policies and standard operating procedures was inconsequential to employee productivity \( (r=0.303, p>0.05) \).

The organization having developed a program to implement during its induction process was inconsequential to employee productivity \( (r=0.270, p>0.05) \). The organization’s induction program consisting of supplemental efforts that help new employees’ understand the organization’s culture was inconsequential to employee productivity \( (r=0.105, p>0.05) \). The organization’s induction process fostering the forming of employee relationships between new employees and old employees was inconsequential to employee productivity \( (r=0.060, p>0.05) \).

### 4.4.2.2 Correlations for Employee Induction Factors and Employee Productivity

Table 4.9 indicates that employee induction was important to employee productivity \( (r=0.528, p<0.01) \). Employee orientation was important to employee productivity \( (r=0.450, p<0.01) \). Planning and monitoring process was unimportant to employee productivity \( (r=0.136, p>0.05) \). Employee integration was unimportant to employee productivity \( (r=0.310, p>0.05) \). Organizational material and information were unimportant to employee productivity \( (r=0.089, p>0.05) \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employee Productivity</th>
<th>Employee Induction</th>
<th>Employee Orientation</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Monitoring</th>
<th>Employee Integration</th>
<th>Material Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Productivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Induction</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Orientation</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>.450**</td>
<td>.637**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Integration</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.353*</td>
<td>.721**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Integration</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.544**</td>
<td>.711**</td>
<td>.714**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Information</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.428*</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
4.4.3 Regressions for Employee Induction and Employee Productivity

Table 4.10 shows the relationship between employee induction and employee performance and the adjusted R square of 0.256 means that employee induction affects employee productivity by 25.6%.

Table 4.10 Summary for Employee Induction and Employee Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.55343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Induction

Table 4.11 provides the regression coefficient indicating the existing relationship between employee induction and employee performance. The table forms the regression equation of:

Employee Performance = 2.143 + 0.543 Employee Induction + ε

From the table, it can be deduced that employee induction was important to employee productivity since its p value was < 0.01. From the equation, it can be deduced that a unit increase in employee induction would result in a 54.3% increase in employee productivity, since it was a significant factor to employee productivity.

Table 4.11 Coefficient for Employee Induction and Employee Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Induction</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>3.465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Productivity

4.5 Effect of Task Autonomy on Employee Productivity

4.5.1 Rating of Task Autonomy and Employee Productivity

Table 4.12 indicates that the employees’ task autonomy results in higher productivity as indicated by 90.9% of the respondents, 6.1% were neutral and 3% disagreed with a mean
of 4.39 and a standard deviation of 0.747. Employees in the organization exercise control of their tasks in order to realize goals as indicated by 51.5% of the respondents, 39.4% were neutral and 9.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.61 and a standard deviation of 0.899. The desire for increased task control is focused on innate personal and organizational goals as indicated by 57.6% of the respondents, 33.3% were neutral and 9.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.58 and a standard deviation of 0.792.

Table 4.12 Rating of Task Autonomy and Employee Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ task autonomy results in higher productivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in the organization exercise control of their tasks in order to realize goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The desire for increased task control is focused on innate personal and organizational goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving autonomy to employees in the organization has motivated their productivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are allowed to participate in their job-related decisions when performing their tasks</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are in the organization are allowed to share information between employees and supervisors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who have better information than their supervisors are allowed to implement their ideas in the organization</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization takes advantage of the knowledge that its employees have</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in the organization have the opportunity to make decisions about task implementation</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task autonomy has reduced the efficiency of employees’ productivity in the organization</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Giving autonomy to employees in the organization has motivated their productivity as indicated by 69.7% of the respondents, 27.3% were neutral and 3% disagreed with a mean of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 0.805. Employees are allowed to participate in their job-related decisions when performing their tasks as indicated by 63.6% of the respondents, 21.2% were neutral and 15.2% disagreed with a mean of 3.64 and a standard deviation of 1.113.

Employees are in the organization are allowed to share information between employees and supervisors as indicated by 66.7% of the respondents, 27.3% were neutral and 6.1% disagreed with a mean of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 0.914. Employees who have better information than their supervisors are not allowed to implement their ideas in the organization as indicated by 39.4% of the respondents, 27.3% were neutral and 33.3% disagreed with a mean of 2.97 and a standard deviation of 1.212.

The organization did not take advantage of the knowledge that its employees have as indicated by 36.3% of the respondents, 30.3% were neutral and 33.3% disagreed with a mean of 2.97 and a standard deviation of 1.212. Employees in the organization have the opportunity to make decisions about task implementation as indicated by 42.4% of the respondents, another 42.4% were neutral and 15.2% disagreed with a mean of 3.30 and a standard deviation of 0.984. Task autonomy has reduced the efficiency of employees’ productivity in the organization as indicated by 42.5% of the respondents, 21.2% were neutral and 36.3% disagreed with a mean of 3.09 and a standard deviation of 1.284.

4.5.2 Correlations for Task Autonomy and Employee Productivity

4.5.2.1 Correlations for Task Autonomy Items and Employee Productivity

Table 4.13 shows that employees’ task autonomy resulting in higher productivity was unimportant to employee productivity (r=0.098, p>0.05). Employees in the organization exercising control of their tasks in order to realize goals was unimportant to employee productivity (r=0.243, p>0.05). The desire for increased task control being focused on innate personal and organizational goals was unimportant to employee productivity (r=0.279, p>0.05). Giving autonomy to employees in the organization having motivated their productivity was unimportant to employee productivity (r=0.340, p>0.05).
### Table 4.13 Correlations for Task Autonomy Items and Employee Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ task autonomy results in higher productivity</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in the organization exercise control of their tasks in order to realize goals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The desire for increased task control is focused on innate personal and organizational goals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving autonomy to employees in the organization has motivated their productivity</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are allowed to participate in their job-related decisions when performing their tasks</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are in the organization are allowed to share information between employees and supervisors</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who have better information than their supervisors are allowed to implement their ideas in the organization</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization takes advantage of the knowledge that its employees have</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.368*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in the organization have the opportunity to make decisions about task implementation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task autonomy has reduced the efficiency of employees’ productivity in the organization</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employees being allowed to participate in their job-related decisions when performing their tasks was unimportant to employee productivity \((r=0.113, \ p>0.05)\). Employees in the organization being allowed to share information between employees and supervisors was important to employee productivity \((r=0.359, \ p<0.05)\). Employees who have better information than their supervisors being allowed to implement their ideas in the organization was unimportant to employee productivity \((r=0.036, \ p>0.05)\).

The organization taking advantage of the knowledge that its employees have was important to employee productivity \((r=0.368, \ p<0.05)\). Employees in the organization having the opportunity to make decisions about task implementation was unimportant to
employee productivity (r=0.018, p>0.05). Task autonomy having reduced the efficiency of employees’ productivity in the organization was unimportant to employee productivity (r=0.118, p>0.05).

4.5.2.2 Correlations for Task Autonomy Factors and Employee Productivity

Table 4.14 shows that task autonomy was unimportant to employee productivity (r=0.277, p>0.05). Trait-based determinants were important to employee productivity (r=0.387, p<0.01). State-based determinants were unimportant to employee productivity (r=0.254, p>0.05). Informational mechanisms were unimportant to employee productivity (r=0.210, p>0.05). Dual-task processing was unimportant to employee productivity (r=0.083, p>0.05).

Table 4.14 Correlations for Task Autonomy Factors and Employee Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employee Productivity</th>
<th>Task Autonomy</th>
<th>Trait-Based Determinants</th>
<th>State-Based Determinants</th>
<th>Informational Mechanisms</th>
<th>Dual-Task Processing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Productivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Autonomy</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait-Based Determinants</td>
<td>.387*</td>
<td>.841**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Based Determinants</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.694**</td>
<td>.647**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Mechanisms</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.410*</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual-Task Processing</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.373*</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.367*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

4.5.3 Regressions for Task Autonomy and Employee Productivity

Table 4.15 shows the relationship between task autonomy and employee performance and the adjusted R square of 0.047 means that task autonomy affects employee productivity by 4.7%.
Table 4.15 Summary for Task Autonomy and Employee Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.62641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Task Autonomy

Table 4.16 provides the regression coefficient indicating the existing relationship between task autonomy and employee performance. The table forms the regression equation of:

$$\text{Employee Performance} = 3.180 + 0.287 \text{ Task Autonomy} + \varepsilon$$

From the table, it can be deduced that task autonomy was unimportant to employee productivity since its p value was > 0.05. From the equation, it can be deduced that a unit increase in task autonomy would result in a 28.7% increase in employee productivity, although it was an insignificant factor to employee productivity.

Table 4.16 Coefficient for Task Autonomy and Employee Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>3.180</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>4.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Autonomy</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>1.602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Productivity

4.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the results and findings based on the questionnaires received. The chapter has presented the results for demographics, influence of fostering requisite organizational culture on employee productivity, effect of employee induction and employee productivity, and the effect of task autonomy on employee productivity. The chapter has made use of descriptive analysis and inferential analysis. These have been used to provide the results from the collected questionnaires that were analyzed using SPSS. The next chapter presents the discussions, conclusions and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER FIVE
5.0 DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The study is focused on examining the effectiveness of management practices on improving employee productivity at National Bank of Kenya limited. This chapter presents the findings and discussions through various sections that provide the summary of the study findings, the discussions, conclusions and recommendations.

5.2 Summary

The general objective of the study was to examine the effectiveness of management practices on improving employee productivity at National Bank of Kenya limited, Headquarters branch. The research aimed at evaluating the effectiveness of management practices on employee productivity. To examine the influence of fostering requisite organizational culture on employee productivity, examine the effect of employee induction on employee productivity, and determine the effect of task autonomy on employee productivity at National Bank.

The study adopted the survey research design. The target population for this study was all the 49 staff based at National Bank, Harambee avenue (Headquarters) branch. The sampling frame for this study came from National Bank, Human Resource department. This study used stratified random sampling technique to obtain the sample size. The sample size for the study was 44 employees. The study was conducted using questionnaires. The data analysis process was conducted by the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics and inferential analysis were used to analyze the collected data. Measures of central tendencies including frequencies mean and standard deviations were used in the study. Inferential analysis like correlations and regressions were used to analyze the relationships between the study variables. Results presentations were in the form of tables and figures.

The study showed that organizational culture affects employee performance and it provides efficiency and stability. Staffs recognize their obligation beyond the simple exchange of labor for a salary and National Bank is committed to experimentation and innovation. The study revealed that the leadership of the organization resides in the
person(s) in charge and employees in the organization perform specific functions in order to receive defined rewards. The bank uses its mission to attract and release the personal energy of employees in the pursuit of its goals and it also values employees as human beings and not machines. The study showed that, the employees contribute towards the organization out of a sense of commitment mostly because the bank has the ability to sustain its employees’ job satisfaction.

The study showed that, employee placement in the organization affects employees’ performance and National Bank relies heavily on its employees for success. Employee placement in the bank entails the use of proper induction where the bank initiates new employees by acquainting them with details and requirements of the job. The induction process in the bank involves showing new employees how their job performance contributes to the success of the organization, it takes new employee through the organization’s vision, mission, values and it familiarizes new employees with the organization’s policies and standard operating procedures. The study revealed that the bank had developed a program that it implements during its induction process and it consists of supplemental efforts that help new employees understand the organization’s culture while fostering the formation of employee relationships between the new and old employees.

The study showed that employees’ task autonomy in the bank resulted in higher productivity and they exercised control of their tasks in order to realize the bank’s goals. The desire for increased task control is focused on innate personal and organizational goals and giving autonomy to the employees had motivated their productivity. The study revealed that employees at National bank were allowed to participate in their job-related decisions when performing their tasks as well as share information between other employees and supervisors. The study revealed that, employees who have better information than their supervisors were not allowed to implement their ideas in the organization and the bank did not take advantage of the knowledge that its employees had. However, these employees had the opportunity to make decisions about task implementation and to some extent; task autonomy had reduced the efficiency of employees’ productivity in the organization.
5.3 Discussions

5.3.1 Influence of Fostering Organizational Culture and Employee Productivity

The study showed that organizational culture affected employee performance as indicated by 84.9% of the respondents and a mean of 4.18 and a standard deviation of 1.01. The study results identify with Higgins and McAllaster (2012) who observed, that organizational culture has assumed considerable importance in the 21st Century, because of its effect on employee performance and job satisfaction.

The study indicated that organizational culture provided efficiency and stability as indicated by 78.8% of the respondents and a mean of 4.03 and a standard deviation of 0.984. These results are in pact with those of Tseng (2010), that, in a role culture orientated organization, structures and systems give protection to subordinates and stability to the organization. The duties and rewards of employees’ roles are clearly defined.

The results showed that staffs recognized their obligation beyond the simple exchange of labor for a salary as indicated by 54.6% of the respondents and a mean of 3.52 and a standard deviation of 1.004. These results agree with those of Rose et al. (2016) who opine that one of the attributes of clan culture is that, its members recognize an obligation beyond the simple exchange of labor for a salary.

The questionnaire results showed that the organization was committed to experimentation and innovation as indicated by 48.5% of the respondents and a mean of 3.24 and a standard deviation of 0.936. The results of the study are similar to those of Acar, Z. and Acar, P. (2014) who states that, high levels of risk taking, dynamism, and creativity characterize an entrepreneurial culture. There is a commitment to experimentation, innovation, and being on the leading edge.

The study indicated that the leadership of the organization resided in the person(s) in charge as indicated by 60.6% of the respondents and a mean of 3.73 and a standard deviation of 0.839. The results were in tandem with those of Ogbonna and Harris (2014) who in their study also noted that leadership in organizations resides in the person who is
in charge, and rests on the leaders’ ability and willingness to administer rewards and punishments.

The study showed that the employees in the organization performed specific functions in order to receive defined rewards as indicated by 48.5% of the respondents and a mean of 3.39 and a standard deviation of 1.171. The results correspond with annotations made by Wei et al. (2014) that, in a role culture orientated organization, people perform specific functions in order to receive defined rewards and, both the individual and the organization, are expected to keep to their parts of the bargain.

The study indicated that the organization used its mission to attract and release the personal energy of employees in the pursuit of its goals as indicated by 39.4% of the respondents although majority of them 42.4% were neutral with a mean of 3.33 and a standard deviation of 1.021. The study results identify with Higgins and McAllaster (2012) who observed that, in an achievement orientated organization, also known as the aligned organization, managers use the mission to attract and release the personal energy of its employees in the pursuit of common goals.

The results of the study showed that the organization valued employees as human beings and not machines as indicated by 54.5% of the respondents with a mean of 3.61 and a standard deviation of 1.059. The results of this study concur with annotations made by Taormina (2016) that, the support culture may be defined as an organization climate that is based on mutual trust between the individual and the organization, and people (employees) are valued as human beings and are not just machines.

It was revealed from the study findings that the employees contributed towards the organization out of a sense of commitment as indicated by 63.7% of the respondents with a mean of 3.58 and a standard deviation of 0.830. Similar observations were made by Damanpour and Gopalakrishnan (2014) that, in support-orientated organizations, there are successful approaches to quality improvements which make employees contribute towards the organization out of a sense of commitment and a sense of belonging.
The study revealed that the organization had the ability to sustain employees’ job satisfaction as indicated by 51.5% of the respondents, although 42.4% were neutral with a mean of 3.52 and a standard deviation of 0.834. The study results differ with observations made by Silverthorne (2014) involving a sample of Taiwanese employees where they argue that a bureaucratic organization has a larger problem in sustaining employee job satisfaction than organizations that have an innovative or supportive culture; thus, emphasizing that an organization that has a bureaucratic culture results in the lowest level of job satisfaction.

5.3.2 Effect of Employee Induction and Employee Productivity

The results showed that employee placement in the organization affected employees’ performance as indicated by 81.8% of the respondents with a mean of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 1.042. These study results agree with the findings of Kumar and Sharma (2014) who define placement as the determination of the job to which an accepted candidate is to be assigned and note that it is important in an organization because it affects the employee’s performance.

Study results indicated that the organization relied heavily on its employees for success as shown by 72.7% of the respondents with a mean of 4.18 and a standard deviation of 0.983. These results concur with observations made by Brand and Bax (2012) that, organizations rely heavily on their employees for their success, and as such, organizations should manage employees’ performance for success through excellent employee management is effective placement.

The study showed that employee placement in the organization entailed the use of proper induction as indicated by 63.7% of the respondents with a mean of 3.76 and a standard deviation of 0.751. These study results agree with the findings of Kumar and Sharma (2014) who suggest that proper placement of workers reduces employee turnover, absenteeism and accident rates, and it entails executing proper induction by developing an induction plan and implementing it.
Results from the study showed that the organization initiated new employees by acquainting them with details and requirements of the job as indicated by 69.7% of the respondents with a mean of 3.82 and a standard deviation of 0.882. These results are similar to comments made by Grobler et al. (2012) that, employee orientation or socialization is the process of initiating a new employee into an organization and acquainting him or her with the details and requirements of the job.

The study showed that the induction process in the organization showed new employees how their job performance contributed to the success of the organization as indicated by 72.7% of the respondents with a mean of 3.97 and a standard deviation of 0.883. These results are similar to comments made by Grobler et al. (2012) that, employee orientation or socialization process should provide new employees with an understanding of how their job performance contributes to the success of the organization and how the services or products of the organization benefit the society.

The study revealed that the induction process in the organization took employees through the organization’s vision, mission and values as indicated by 84.8% of the respondents with a mean of 4.12 and a standard deviation of 0.820. These results agree with observations made by Bradt and Vonegut (2014), that the induction parameters will take the employee through: organization framework and ownership; vision, mission and values; functions (departments/units); physical set up, amenities and recreation; governance, rules and regulations; safety and health issues and organizational philosophy.

The study results showed that the induction process familiarized new employees with the organization’s policies and standard operating procedures as indicated by 78.7% of the respondents with a mean of 3.97 and a standard deviation of 0.810. These results are similar to comments made by Grobler et al. (2012) that, during induction, new employees are familiarized with policies and standard operating procedures, labor legislation and information about compensation and benefits, occupational safety and health of workers, accident prevention issues and employee relations and workforce issues (rights, responsibilities).
The results of the study showed that the organization had developed a program to implement during its induction process as indicated by 54.5% of the respondents with a mean of 3.61 and a standard deviation of 1.059. These results go hand-in-hand with comments made by Nankervis et al. (2012) that, planning entails developing a program to implement the induction. An induction program is a set of information designed by management to accord the new employee the opportunity to settle in her/his job as quickly and smoothly as far as possible.

The study revealed that the organization’s induction program consisted of supplemental efforts that helped new employees understand the organization’s culture as indicated by 51.6% of the respondents, although 36.4% were neutral with a mean of 3.55 and a standard deviation of 0.905. Similar observations were made by Royal and Agnew (2014) that, an effective induction program consists of supplemental efforts taken early in a new employee’s tenure to help him build a better understanding of the organization’s culture, his job responsibility, and how they tie into a company and departmental priorities.

The study results showed that the organization’s induction process fostered the forming of employee relationships between new employees and old employees as indicated by 51.5% of the respondents, although 33.3% were neutral with a mean of 3.55 and a standard deviation of 1.063. The results of this study are in agreement with observations made by Bradt and Vonegut (2014) as well as Sims (2014) that companies that understand this include activities in the induction program to foster the forming of employee relationships on the new employees’ first day, helping them join with others so they can do the work together.

5.3.3 Effect of Task Autonomy on Employee Productivity

The study showed that employees’ task autonomy in the organization resulted in higher productivity as indicated by 90.9% of the respondents with a mean of 4.39 and a standard deviation of 0.747. This study results confirm what Loher et al. (2015) had observed that, giving task autonomy (substantial freedom, independence, and discretion in carrying out a task) to employees is generally expected to result in higher motivation, satisfaction, and performance.
The study revealed that employees in the organization exercised control of their tasks in order to realize goals as indicated by 51.5% of the respondents, although 39.4% were neutral with a mean of 3.61 and a standard deviation of 0.899. These results confirm Bandura’s (1997) social-cognitive theory that suggests that people exercise control in order to realize benefits. The ability to secure desired outcomes and to prevent undesired outcomes therefore provides a powerful incentive for the development and exercise of personal control.

The study showed that desire for increased task control for employees in the organization was focused on innate personal and organizational goals as indicated by 57.6% of the respondents, although 33.3% were neutral with a mean of 3.58 and a standard deviation of 0.792. These results are similar to observations made by Bandura (1997) that, the desire for increased personal control is not an unfocused innate drive but rather a calculated and goal-specific state. In essence, people exercise control (or want control) for the benefits it can give them.

The study indicated that giving autonomy to employees in the organization had motivated their productivity as shown by 69.7% of the respondents, although 27.3% were neutral with a mean of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 0.805. These results agree with those of Pashler (2014) who states that, in the context of task autonomy, this suggests that the combination of perceived benefits and costs associated with task autonomy from the individual’s perspective will influence his or her perceived utility of being granted autonomy and will subsequently affect the motivational effect that such autonomy will have.

The study results showed that employees were allowed to participate in their job-related decisions when performing their tasks as indicated by 63.6% of the respondents, although 21.2% were neutral with a mean of 3.64 and a standard deviation of 1.113. These results concur with those of various authors (Locke & Schweiger, 1979; Miller & Monge, 2012) who observed that, informational benefits are expected from allowing participation in job-related decisions when the individual performing the job has information about the task that is not available to the supervisor.
The study showed that employees in the organization were allowed to share information between employees and supervisors alike as indicated by 66.7% of the respondents, although 27.3% were neutral with a mean of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 0.914. This study results confirm what Loher et al. (2015) had observed that, the logic of informational mechanism in an organization is compelling regardless of whether the issue is the sharing of information between employee and supervisor (as in participation) or the employee is being given discretion or decision-making authority (as in autonomy).

Results from the study findings showed that employees who had better information than their supervisors were not allowed to implement their ideas in the organization as indicated by 39.4% of the respondents, although 27.3% were neutral and 33.3% disagreed with a mean of 2.97 and a standard deviation of 1.212. The results of this study disagreed with comments made by Rubinstein et al. (2014), that, if a software engineer has better information than the supervisor about effectively programming code for that particular project, granting substantial autonomy to her would seem to be a good way to ensure that she can best take advantage of that knowledge.

The study revealed that the organization did not take advantage of the knowledge that its employees had as indicated by 36.3% of the respondents, 30.3% were neutral and 33.3% disagreed with a mean of 2.97 and a standard deviation of 1.212. These results vary with those of various authors (Locke & Schweiger, 1979; Miller & Monge, 2012) who state that, taking advantage of employees’ knowledge by organizations means that better decisions are made by the employee regarding how and when to complete the task. These informational benefits of autonomy are entirely separate from any motivational benefits.

Results of the study showed that employees in the organization had the opportunity to make decisions about task implementation as indicated by 42.4% of the respondents, another 42.4% were neutral and 15.2% disagreed with a mean of 3.30 and a standard deviation of 0.984. The study results coincide with observations made by Osman and Moore (2013) that, the essential difference between a worker with task autonomy and a worker without task autonomy is that the former has the opportunity to make decisions about task implementation, whereas the latter simply carries out the task as instructed.
The study showed that task autonomy had reduced the efficiency of employees’ productivity in the organization as indicated by 42.5% of the respondents, 21.2% were neutral and 36.3% disagreed with a mean of 3.09 and a standard deviation of 1.284. These results concur with those of Temprado et al. (2013) who state that, when an employee’s attention is focused simultaneously on task performance and decision making, individuals with autonomy experience additional cognitive activity that distracts them from performance of the task. Research by (Levy & Pashler, 2014; Osman & Moore, 2013) has also shown that dual-task processing leads to slowing of performance or loss of efficiency when two tasks are performed at the same time.

5.4 Conclusions

5.4.1 Influence of Fostering Organizational Culture and Employee Productivity

The study concludes that organizational culture affects employee performance and it provides efficiency and stability. Staffs recognize their obligation beyond the simple exchange of labor for a salary and National Bank is committed to experimentation and innovation. The study concludes that the leadership of the organization resides in the person(s) in charge and employees in the organization perform specific functions in order to receive defined rewards. The bank uses its mission to attract and release the personal energy of employees in the pursuit of its goals and it also values employees as human beings and not machines. As a result of this, the employees contribute towards the organization out of a sense of commitment mostly because the bank has the ability to sustain its employees’ job satisfaction.

5.4.2 Effect of Employee Induction and Employee Productivity

The study concludes that employee placement in the organization affects employees’ performance and National Bank relies heavily on its employees for success. Employee placement in the bank entails the use of proper induction where the bank initiates new employees by acquainting them with details and requirements of the job. The induction process in the bank involves showing new employees how their job performance contributes to the success of the organization, it takes new employee through the organization’s vision, mission, values and it familiarizes new employees with the organization’s policies and standard operating procedures. The study concludes that the bank has developed a program that it implements during its induction process and it
consists of supplemental efforts that help new employees understand the organization’s culture while fostering the formation of employee relationships between the new and old employees.

5.4.3 Effect of Task Autonomy on Employee Productivity

The study concludes that employees’ task autonomy in the bank resulted in higher productivity and they exercised control of their tasks in order to realize the bank’s goals. The desire for increased task control is focused on innate personal and organizational goals and giving autonomy to the employees had motivated their productivity. The study concludes that employees at National bank were allowed to participate in their job-related decisions when performing their tasks as well as share information between other employees and supervisors. The study concludes that, employees who have better information than their supervisors were not allowed to implement their ideas in the organization and the bank did not take advantage of the knowledge that its employees had. However, these employees had the opportunity to make decisions about task implementation and to some extent; task autonomy had reduced the efficiency of employees’ productivity in the organization.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Influence of Fostering Organizational Culture and Employee Productivity

The study recommends the managers of National Bank Harambee Avenue to establish a competitive and innovative culture that will have a direct relationship with its employees’ performance. These managers should discard the bureaucratic cultures found in most financial institutions so as to improve employee productivity in the bank.

5.5.1.2 Effect of Employee Induction and Employee Productivity

The study recommends the managers of National Bank Harambee Avenue to create an induction program that has its emphasis on people (employees) as well as focus on procedures (company guidelines) that would ensure new employees quickly fit in the system and feel comfortable enough to use their skills and talents to enhance their productivity.
5.5.1.3 Effect of Task Autonomy on Employee Productivity

The study recommends the organizational managers of National Bank Harambee Avenue to allow employees with better information than them to take the lead in implementing their ideas in the organization. This will facilitate the bank’s ability to take advantage of the knowledge that its employees have, thus driving up the bank’s performance while increasing employees’ productivity.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

This study's concentration was on the effectiveness of management practices and how they improve employee productivity. The emphasis of the study was on National Bank of Kenya limited in Nairobi, particularly the one located at Harambee Avenue also known at the Harambee Avenue Branch. The study therefore recommends that similar studies be conducted on other National Bank branches nationwide in order to understand completely how the management practices of these banks affects employee productivity. The study may also be conducted on other financial institutions for a wide-range understanding of how management practices influence employee productivity in financial institutions.
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APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questionnaire aims to examine the effectiveness of management practices on improving employee productivity at National Bank of Kenya limited, Headquarters branch. This is for academic purposes and you are therefore requested to provide your honest opinion. Please fill the following questionnaire appropriately.

Part A: Demographics
1. What is your gender?
   Male [ ]   Female [ ]

2. What is your age bracket?
   21-25 Years [ ]   26-30 Years [ ]   31-35 Years [ ]
   36-40 Years [ ]   41 Years and Over [ ]

3. What is your marital status?
   Single [ ]   Married [ ]   Divorced [ ]   Widowed [ ]

4. What is your level of education?
   Diploma [ ]   Degree [ ]   Master’s Degree [ ]
   Doctorate [ ]   PhD [ ]

5. Which department do you work in?
   Senior Branch Management [ ]   Operations [ ]   Customer service [ ]
   Cash [ ]   Sales [ ]   Premium [ ]

6. How long have you worked for the organization?
   1-5 Years [ ]   6-10 Years [ ]   11-15 Years [ ]
   16-20 Years [ ]   21 Years and Over [ ]
Part B: Influence of Fostering Organizational Culture and Employee Productivity

7. Please rate the following statements using the scale 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture affects employee performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization culture provides efficiency and stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our staff recognize their obligation beyond the simple exchange of labor for a salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our organization is committed to experimentation and innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership of our organization resides in the person(s) in charge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in the organization perform specific functions in order to receive defined rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization uses its mission to attract and release the personal energy of employees in the pursuit of its goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our organization values employees as human beings and not machines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our employees contribute towards the organization out of a sense of commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has the ability to sustain employees’ job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part C: Effect of Employee Induction and Employee Productivity**

8. Please rate the following statements using the scale 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee placement in the organization affects employees’ performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization relies heavily on its employees for success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee placement in the organization entails the use of proper induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization initiates new employees by acquainting them with details and requirements of the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction in the organization shows new employees how their job performance contributes to the success of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The induction process takes employee through the organization’s vision, mission and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The induction process familiarizes new employees with the organization’s policies and standard operating procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has developed a program to implement during its induction process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s induction program consists of supplemental efforts that help new employees’ understand the organization’s culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization’s induction process fosters the forming of employee relationships between new employees and old employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part D: Effect of Task Autonomy on Employee Productivity

9. Please rate the following statements using the scale 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ task autonomy results in higher productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in the organization exercise control of their tasks in order to realize goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The desire for increased task control is focused on innate personal and organizational goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving autonomy to employees in the organization has motivated their productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are allowed to participate in their job-related decisions when performing their tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are in the organization are allowed to share information between employees and supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who have better information than their supervisors are allowed to implement their ideas in the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization takes advantage of the knowledge that its employees have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees in the organization have the opportunity to make decisions about task implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task autonomy has reduced the efficiency of employees’ productivity in the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part E: Employee Productivity

10. Please rate the following statements using the scale 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizations need to adopt strategies that give them sustainable competitive advantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources management practices have the ability to create firms that are more intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources management practices have the ability to create firms that are more flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources management practices have the ability to create firms that are more competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market forces are compelling banks to find new ways of providing better customer service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic human resource management is one of the ways banks are using to increase their competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources management practices are important for enhanced corporate performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources management practices are important for enhanced employee productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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