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ABSRACT

The purpose of this research was to determine how perceived voice influences team cooperation at the work place specifically in the banking sector in Kenya. The study sought to investigate organisation based self-esteem affects team cooperation in the banking sector in Kenya, how power distance affects team cooperation in the banking sector and how perceived organisational support affects team cooperation in the banking sector.

This study applied a descriptive research design in order to get information on how perceived voice influences team cooperation at the work place specifically in the banking sector in Kenya. The target population comprised of selected tier one commercial banks in Nairobi where 80 employees were targeted. To ensure representativeness of the sample selected, a proportionate sample of 80% was selected from each group. Questionnaires were used for the data collection and descriptive analysis was done to determine the distribution based on the means and standard deviation. The study also analysed the relationship between the dependent and independent variable through correlation and regression analysis and the results were presented in Tables and Figures.

The first research question of this study was to determine how organisation based self-esteem affects team cooperation. The descriptive findings indicate that respondents agreed on employees are efficient in the organisation which, employees are co-operative in the organisation which, employees are helpful in the organisation; employees make a difference in the organisation. However, respondents could not reach an agreement on employees are trusted in the organisation, the organisation has faith in the employees, employees are valuable in the organisation, in the organisation employees count around other people, in the organisation employees are important and in the organisation employees are taken seriously.

The second research question of the study was to determine if power distance has an effect on team cooperation in the banking sector. The descriptive findings revealed that respondents could not reach an agreement on in work related matters, managers have a right to expect obedience from their subordinates and people at higher levels in organisations have a responsibility to make important decisions for people below them. It was also revealed that respondents disagreed that company's rules should not be broken, not even when the employee thinks it is in the company's best interest and people at lower
levels in the organisation should carry out the requests of people at higher levels without questions.

The last research question of the study was to investigate whether perceived organisational support has a direct effect on team cooperation in the banking sector. The descriptive findings revealed that respondents agreed that employees cooperate to get work done, members of employee’s team are willing to share information with team members about work and the team enhances communication among people working on the same product.

The study concluded that individuals invest their time in tasks they consider important to their self-worth, therefore work becomes an avenue employees seek to project themselves and boast their self esteem. Secondly, the effect of power distance diversity within workgroups lies on the reduction of the work role performance and the organizational citizenship behavior of the employees. The most relevant findings, as support for some of the statements in the review of the literature, include the next three statements. The study also concluded that employees are valued and supported. Employee’s job is made as interesting as possible and the organisation cares about employee’s opinions. The organisation does not disregard employee’s interest and it does not ignore employee’s complaint.

The study recommended that organisation should create a safe work environment where employees are motivated through recognition, managers should create an excellent relationship with their staff, led by example, encourage employees to work as a team, take employees decision seriously and clarify what is expected from employees. Secondly, use of low power distance will create a good relationship between employees and managers. Lower level employees will be given an opportunity to become creative, innovative and challenge the status quo, encourage free flow of ideas, increase interaction between managers and employees. Lastly, it is recommended that the organisation should try to make employees job as interesting by respecting employees, appreciating their good work, instill a culture of teaching and team work, cares about employee’s opinions and consider employees personal goals and values.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The banking sector has been struggling to keep abreast with the continuous changes that take place in the business world. This has since resulted to survival tactics by the banks to stay abreast. In order for the bank to remain relevant in the future they will need to embrace technology and innovative ways to make their processes, solutions more efficient and effective. The study seeks to understand what is holding back the banking sector and what needs to be done so that the rate of team cooperativeness uptake can increase. According to the national innovation systems approach stresses that the flows of technology and information among people, enterprises and institutions are key to the innovative process. Innovation and technology development are the result of a complex set of relationships among actors in the system, which includes enterprises, universities and government research institutes (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1997).

In the last few years work engagement has been one of the most discussed constructs in academic and practitioner literature particularly by management consultants and industrial psychologist. Though there seems to be consensus on the benefits that accrue out of a highly engaged work force, the antecedents of work engagement which management can apply to promote its popular practice at the work place is still at development stages in the academic literature. The global economy has in the recent times integrated in a manner that organizations are presented with both opportunities and threats on equal measures. Only organizations that are competitive enough would survive the market conditions. State enterprises are not spared either; governments are no longer willing to support struggling organizations within its ranks because they no longer make economic and political sense doing so. Many are left to collapse or sold off, others are merged. Kenya, for example has focused on an ambitious program to transform State Corporations into viable entities by gradually implementing reform initiatives that would reduce the current 197 state corporations through mergers and transfer of functions (State Cooperation Advising Comittee, 2015).
The state at which an employee is emotionally committed to his organizations’ goals resulting in the use of discretionary effort characterized by vigour, absorption and dedication in ones tasks is work engagement; it is a positive work performance culture that influence individual employees’ and organizational performance (Truss, Soane, Delbridge, Alfes, Shantz, & Petrov 2014). According to Kenexa Institute, a consultancy body tracking global work performance trends, in their 2011 report, employee engagement was declining globally, a scenario which has been worrying governments as well as corporate. According to Kowalski (2003), the United States economy loses a whopping $300 billion annually in productivity resulting from disengaged employees. In 2012, a Scottish government commissioned study showed work engagement was low globally. Individual researchers have also reported low work engagement among public sector employees compared to their private sector counterparts (Agyemang & Ofei, 2013); besides Quantum consultancy firm reported work engagement levels in the private sector stood at 65% and 45% in the public sector in the United States of America for 2013.

Alarmed by low employee work engagement levels in the public sector, Canada much earlier in 2004 developed an employee engagement model and implemented an employee engagement survey program across the governments’ jurisdictions (Kosuta, 2010). In general North America is among the leading in the levels of work engagement in 2013 at 65% and increasing; with Latin America reported to be the leading continent at 70% but declining fast according to Hewitt Associates (2012), scholars in Europe have advocated for development of the concept work engagement into a major science in order to improve human resource management theory and practice (Truss, Shantz, Soane, Alfes and Delbridge, 2013).

Indeed work engagement is being discussed widely in management and industrial psychology literature in European countries, however Europe is the continent with the least engagement levels at 57% as at 2013 according to Hewitt Associates 2014 report. The concept of work engagement is receiving deserved attention in the Asian academic literature. According to Elloy and Pital (2012), the concept is fast gaining acceptance among companies in Asia Pacific as an attempt to improve human resource performance. Many of them are instituting measures to raise engagement levels. In their report for 2012, Agarwal (2014) reported work engagement rose to 64% in 2012 among companies in the region. A country level analysis showed wide variations; India and Japan witnessed
improvement, whereas Singapore and Hong have had their levels unchanged for the year under review. Nevertheless, recent reports by Hewitt Associates (2014) indicate Asia Pacific witnessed a rise in engagement levels.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The breakdown in the paradigm of mass production, and the emergence of high-performance work practices that deliver quality, innovation and flexibility, has generated widespread experimentation with a multitude of methods for sharing information, consulting with employees, involving employees in workplace decision making, and soliciting feedback (Farndale, Van Ruiten, Kelliher & Hope-Hailey, 2011). According to Gong, Zhou and Chang (2013) for a high-involvement work practice to be effective and to have a positive impact on employee performance, employees must be given some power. Thus employees must have the opportunity to contribute to decisions that are crucial to their performance and working lives.

Truss et al., (2014) believes that direct voice enables managers to respond better to the heterogeneous needs of the workforce, thus generating higher levels of employee engagement and job satisfaction. Moreover, the authors suggest that direct voice arrangement, such as regular meetings between managers and employees, and the existence of semiautonomous workgroups, were positively associated with job satisfaction implying that having more direct voice arrangements has a greater influence on employees' job satisfaction. Opportunities for employee voice may be implemented at different levels in the workplace; for example, between employees and the senior manager, between the employees and their immediate line manager, between team or workgroup members and the leader.

The banking sector in Kenya has been struggling to stay abreast with the ever-changing competitive world as compared to their counterparts globally. As observed, the banking sector is still fixated on the traditional ways of banking and making money therefore losing out to competitors in the telecommunication industry and fintechs (Kosuta, 2010). The study seeks to identify what is causing a blockage in the institutions stopping the employees from becoming innovative.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was to determine how perceived voice influences team cooperation at the work place specifically in the banking sector in Kenya.
1.4 Research Questions
The study sought to investigate:

1.4.1 How does organisation based self-esteem affect team cooperation in the banking sector in Kenya?

1.4.2 Does power distance affect team cooperation in the banking sector?

1.4.3 Does perceived organisational support affect team cooperation in the banking sector?

1.5 Significance of the Study

1.5.1 Banking Industry

The study sought to understand why the banking is struggling with keeping abreast with the continuous changes, specifically in regards to team cohesiveness in the banking sector that are occurring globally. The study will look into ways on how the banking sector can become more adaptable to team cohesiveness so as to keep up with the ever-changing environment of potential competitors such as Mpesa, M-Shwari, Fintech companies that are coming up with cheaper, simpler innovations to meet customer and industry need due to their organisation structures and team cohesiveness and openness.

The study explored whether organisation based self-esteem, perceived organisational support, power distance have a direct effect on team cooperation. The researcher sought input from several tier one and two banks that are leading in the Banking sector in Kenya in an attempt understand their segment better and also see what can be done to address the challenges experienced in the banking sector. The study will not only benefit banks but also work in favour of their current and potential customers.

1.5.2 Government

The study also considered how stakeholders within the context of research have contributed to the current study. These are policy makers such as Kenya Bankers’ Association and bank regulator, Central Bank of Kenya Limited. Lastly, the research also looked at the practice aspect which were the stakeholders within the context of this study namely; Banks and their employees.
1.5.3 Researchers

The study considered the theory aspect of the subject matter. This is with regards to academicians and researchers’ findings in their studies and how it contributed to the study. No similar research has been carried out in the banking sector in Nairobi, Kenya. The findings of this research can be used by other researches for further studies.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study covered 8 banks in the Kenyan market covering both local and foreign banks with a sample size of 60 participants equally distributed between the 8 banks. All the participants were bank employees. The geographical area to be covered was Nairobi and its environs due to budgetary constraints involved with travel. Targeted period for data collection was between August and September 2019 for the sample size that had been selected.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 National Innovations Systems (NIS)

This is the flow of technology and information among people, enterprises and institutions which is key to the innovative process (Agyemang & Ofei, 2013).

1.7.2 Innovation

This is the process of creating a new method, idea, product (Elloy & Pital, 2012).

1.7.3 Perceived voice

It is defined as the opportunity for employees to express concerns, generate ideas and give feedback to the organisation (Work Institute, 2017)

1.7.4 Bank

“A bank is a financial institution licensed to receive deposits and make loans. They also provide financial services, such as wealth management, currency exchange and safe deposit boxes. In most countries, banks are regulated by the national government or central bank (Agarwal, 2014).
1.7.5 Central Bank of Kenya

This is an independent public institution that strives to ensure stability in prices and promote economic growth. They are the approved bank regulators for all the banks in Kenya (Central Bank of Kenya, 2017).

1.7.6 Employee

“An individual who works part-time or full-time under a contract of employment, whether oral or written, express or implied, and has recognized rights and duties” (Kosuta, 2010).

1.8 Chapter summary

For an employee to feel that they are in a work environment that encourages team cohesiveness or cooperation certain measures must be put in place. Currently, the banking sector is struggling to stay abreast with the change in technology and the ever-evolving customer needs due to the selfish nature of the workforce where the employees are too competitive therefore working in silos. The study sought to investigate why the banking sector has been having challenges adopting team cohesiveness and what can be done to address these hurdles while at the same time mitigating against future redundancy. The study observes how perceptions of employee voice, the employee – line manager relationship and trust in senior management and or perceived Organisational support are related to organisation team cohesiveness.

Chapter two provides a review of literature while chapter three provides a discussion of the research methodology that was employed in the research while chapter 4 presents the study results and findings. In chapter five, the results and the findings of the study are provided as well as the conclusion and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This section reviewed empirical literature touching on key variables in the study with the aim of identifying the research gaps. It examined literature on the concept of how perceived voice influences team cooperation at the work place specifically in the banking sector in Kenya. The specific areas covered here are Organisation based self-esteem and team cooperation, Power distance and team cooperation, perceived organisational support and team cooperation.

2.2. Organisation Based Self-Esteem and Team Cooperation

2.2.1. Supportive Environment and Team Cooperation

Organisational self-esteem (OBSE) is a role-specific form of self-esteem that defines the views of staff as a member of an organisation about their value and skills. The self-concept includes all those components of “the phenomenal field experienced by the person as portion or characteristic of the self” (Rogers, 2003). Self-esteem is one of many aspects of the concept of self. Masoud & Hmeidan, (2013) defined self-esteem as “the assessment that the individual makes and usually maintains in relation to him or herself; it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicates the extent to which the individual believes that he or she is capable, meaningful, successful and worthy. Ultimately, this perception of self-competence manifests itself to the extent that an individual likes him or herself.

According to Work Institute (2017) perceived voice also commonly known as the “voice of employee” is defined as the opportunity for employees to express concerns about policies in the workplace and offer ideas about how to improve conditions in the workplace. It is important that the voice of employees has actual impact and real influence on the organisation. To give employees a voice effectively, organisations must provide structured channels for feedback in the form of surveys, forums, one on one meetings, leadership walking to random staff and having candid conversations with the employees to get an actual and accurate feel of what is happening on the ground (organisation). Organisations should create a culture of acceptance for feedback and
demonstrate that feedback received from the employees influences organisational changes and improvements.

In today's ever changing business landscape, organisations are increasingly looking for proactive input from employees because proactivity is expected to increase organisational functioning. One way by which organisations can access valuable employee input is through voice behavior. Voice is a proactive behavior that relates to the employees' expression of ideas, opinions, or suggestions with the intent to change and improve the current state of affairs (Bashshur & Oc, 2015). Researchers have discovered that employees who engage in voice experience some benefits, such as higher performance evaluations (Fuller, Marler, Hester, & Otondo, 2015), higher job satisfaction, more salary increases and a higher degree of social integration as newcomers. However, organisations also value voice because the benefits of this behavior can affect the outcomes of work units or the organisation (Bashshur & Oc, 2015). For instance, frequent employee voice behavior in work units has been associated with a higher level of task performance (Frazier & Bowler, 2015).

When an employee feels engaged, respected and valued in an organisation their morale is boosted leading to lower staff turnover and as a result leading to increased engagement, job satisfaction and higher performance rating for both the organisation and individual employee (Work Institute, 2017). This in turn leads to increased productivity and innovation at the work place as the employees look for solutions to make the work environment more conducive, while also simplifying already existing processes.

A study done in Iran by Asadollah and Saeed (2016) to investigate the relationship between perceived employee voice and creativity targeted premier dairy companies located in Mazandaran province constituted the statistical population of this research. Results of the data analysis revealed that perception of employee voice has a positive effect on work meaningfulness. Moreover, work meaningfulness has a positive effect on intrinsic motivation. Results also proved that intrinsic motivation significantly affected an individual employee's creativity.

Kenya’s financial journey started in the pre-colonial era. In the beginning, the pioneering banks focused on financing international trade along the Europe - South Africa - India axis. Over time, they diversified operations so as to tap into profitable banking that was shaped by a growing farming settler community and pioneer traders in the local economy.
to whom they provided deposit and credit facilities. (Central Bank of Kenya, 2017). The banking sector is a pivotal contributor to the Kenyan economy and globally. Currently Kenya has 47 licensed banks comprising of 33 domestic and 14 foreign commercial banks with branches, agencies, and other outlets throughout the country.

According to Central Bank of Kenya (2017) more than 10 Kenyan banks, including Kenya Commercial Bank, Commercial Bank of Africa, Equity Bank and Bank of Africa have subsidiaries operating in the East Africa Community and South Sudan. Increasing access to finance has been abridged with the use of innovation such as agent banking, which allows commercial banks and Deposit-Taking Microfinance (DTM) institutions to engage the services of third party outlets to deliver specified financial services on their behalf. The Banking industry is unable to change/ adapt themselves to the changes that are occurring globally. There is need to have more open-minded management and employees who come up with innovative ways to increase profits. Lack of team cooperation may be attributed to lack of motivation by employees as they feel that their ideas are not heard, there may be lack of team effectiveness, lack of team efficiency and risk taking may be shunned due to existing policies and procedures or a rigid management team.

An appealing and supportive working atmosphere is critical to team cohesion, according to Agbozo, Owusu, Hoedoafia and Atakorah (2017). This is because there are countless characteristics in the job setting that can affect workers' physical and mental well-being. In the context of the work and work setting, supporting organisational environment is described. The working environment is widely divided into the framework of job and work. Work involves all the distinct features of the job, such as how the job is performed and finished, involving duties such as task-related practice, control of one's own job-related operations, a feeling of accomplishment from work, a range of duties and the intrinsic value of a task, while operating context, on the other side, involves physical working circumstances and social work conditions.

Empirical evidence has linked perceived organisational support to a variety of attitudes and outcomes related to work. A research by Mohda, Shaha and Zailana (2016) showed that psychological safety was promoted by supporting and trusting interpersonal relationships and supporting leadership. This makes staff and other members of the organisation feel secure in their job settings particularly where organisational members
have openness and mutual collective support. Mohda, Shaha and Zailana (2016), claim that supporting environments enable participants to experiment and try fresh stuff and fail without fear of the implications. In addition, perceptions that the organisation cares for staff have been shown to have a beneficial impact on job attendance, job satisfaction, leadership confidence, and employee results (Masoud & Hmeidan, 2013). Working climate, for example, affects worker commitment (Mohda, Shaha, & Zailana, 2016). Thus, perceived organisational support is seen as a significant variable that determines employees’ achievement and engagement.

In short, a workplace of quality is essential to maintaining employees efficient in their different tasks and work. According to Agbozo, Owusu, Hoedoafia and Atakorah (2017), a healthy workplace is verified by features such as competitive salaries, trusting employee-management relationships, equity and fairness for all, and a reasonable workload with difficult yet achievable objectives. A composite of all these circumstances makes the workstation the best working conditions for highly satisfied staff to work (Agbozo, Owusu, Hoedoafia, & Atakorah, 2017).

2.2.2. Autonomy and Team Cooperation

Autonomy has been described as an imperative in a company setting characterized by elevated level of certainty for long-term organisational achievement and survival. For maintaining development in a difficult company setting, the discovery and execution of fresh and new concepts and goods is very crucial in every organisation (Sia & Appu, 2015). The creative output of an employee relies in part on his or her features, such as domain-relevant expertise, cognitive style, and personality traits, according to Wenjing, Wei and Shuliang (2013). However, since creative performance in the organisation is a mixed function of individual, group, and organisational features, social and contextual variables have a direct impact on the creative performance of a worker (Sia & Appu, 2015). Recent studies have also shown that the degree to which a worker has liberty, autonomy, and discretion in performing his or her work duties has a connection with that.

In this situation, work autonomy relates to the self-governance and independence of staff in carrying out their duties in terms of method, decision-making and time management (Wenjing, Wei, & Shuliang, 2013). Many modern study on employee creativity indicates
that task-related work autonomy provides work-related emotional encouragement, leading to increased employee commitment that contributes to employee commitment. Burcharth, Knudsen and Søndergaard (2017) argue that if staff are encouraged for their creative attempts and do not experience elevated time pressure, they are more likely to continue in their attempts to generate ideas and even begin to invent in their spare time. Studies have shown that people generate more creative job when they feel they have decisions about how to accomplish the duties provided to them. Therefore, enabling employees to pursue their own thoughts during working hours offers time to observe, experiment and speculate with others is essential to the results of innovation (Burcharth, Knudsen, & Søndergaard, 2017).

According to Laursen (2012), it feeds the pursuit of innovative initiatives connected with elevated rates of uncertainty and possibly elevated pay-offs by providing workers liberty to identify how best to accomplish duties allocated. Strict roles, circumstances and low autonomy employment, however, tend to encourage limited views and restrict creative output. This stems from the reality that low autonomy hinders workers’ creative action in discovering fresh applications for specific concepts or techniques (Burcharth, Knudsen, & Søndergaard, 2017). It is apparent that opportunities identified through external search channels are often poorly defined and hardly ever ready to be exploited immediately; hence, they are intrinsically dependent on the individual employee’s creativity to design them and translate or integrate them into local use.

2.2.3. Value

For the individual and corporate value, there are diverse definitions. Bassett (2014) describes the notion of private values as comparatively stable, evaluative convictions that guide the outcome or course of action choices of a person in a variety of circumstances. Hence values are a personal perception of what is good and bad, wrong and right. The values of Olekalns and Travaglione (2010) function as moral compasses for a person, guiding them and their motivations. The values of Olekalns and Travaglione (2010) function as moral compasses for a person, guiding them and their motivations, according to McShane. They argue that people tend to position values in a preferential hierarchy, known as a scheme of values, so that each individual has its own distinctive scheme of
values, where the most significant and meaningful values are positioned above those less appropriate to that individual and situation (Bissett, 2014).

Research on value systems has developed from a variety of models. Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey Value Theory combined measurements of value systems into six groups including religion, politics, and economics, while Rokeach's Values Theory tried to concentrate more on the person, building two value lists: instrumental values and terminal values (Bissett, 2014). Instrumental values are objectives or wishes, whereas terminal values refer to behavioral kinds that will hopefully lead to instrumental values being achieved (Bissett, 2014). The contemporary Schwartz’s values model states that values are concepts or beliefs, pertain to desirable end states or behaviors, transcend specific situations, guide selection or evaluation of behavior and events, and are ordered by relative importance.

The model has two primary dimensions, including self-transcendence vs. self-enhancing and openness to change vs. conservation. In addition, each of the dimensions is split into other primary value structures. For example, Self Transcendence (Universalism and Benevolence); Self Enhancement (Power and Achievement); Conservation (Tradition, Conformity and Security); and Openness to Change (Hedonism, Stimulation, Self-Direction). Empirical proof has shown that organizational values are a significant organizing principle in the design of the organization's strategies for human resource management.

2.3 Power Distance and Team cooperation

2.3.1. Power Freedom

Power distance can be described as ‘the extent to which the less strong members of a community expect and acknowledge that energy is unequally distributed’ (Hofstede 2001). In the presence of distinct social groups, inequality in a community is noticeable. Power distance refers to a nation or society's dependence connection. According to Laursen (2012), a low-power distance (PD) society is better for creativity because it enables more liberty for people and prevents the propensity for rigid hierarchies, centralization, emphasis on laws and regulations, and restricted interaction and thoughts in big PD societies, all of which contribute to restricting creative capacity. Sia & Appu
(2015) argue that in low PD and male societies, R&D productivity is greater because low PD enables people to be exploratory and creative and challenge the status quo. Similarly, Sanyal and Hisam (2018) argue that the small power distance discovered in UK firms enables the free flow of ideas needed for effective research and development. Such generalized viewpoints, however, epitomize a Eurocentric point of view, typical of reasoning using wide dimensional distinction, as in Diab and Ajlouni (2015). that' Individualistic societies value liberty more than collectivist societies and liberty is essential for creativity.' In some literature, the hypothesis that creativity occurs only in cases of autonomy, independence, and liberty is associated with promoting Western culture, ideology, and systems.

For example, the argument of Mohda, Shaha and Zailana (2016) indicate that favourable creative results are more probable in societies with elevated individualism, low energy distance, poor avoidance of uncertainty, and high to moderate masculinity — in other words, cultures discovered almost solely in the West. Arguments like those that uphold American culture and creativity often ignore other cultures ' important creative accomplishments. There are many instances of elevated creativity in various cultural environments, such as the ancient Egyptians or the Mayans, or the Chinese's advanced science and technical achievements; further examples include the Middle Ages Arabs, the 14th-16th century Spanish and Portuguese all examples of high-level development but with very distinct cultural environments.

Wenjing, Wei and Shuliang (2013) take a more random perspective of this, indicating that elevated and low power distance values are applicable to the creativity process, but at distinct phases. Bassett (2014) also claims that independence is moderated by culture as a dimension of creativity and differs depending on whether it concerns independence of individuals or groups. Independence as an individual characteristic of personality indicating a low need for social approval and individual determination is discovered mostly in the West and in this sense is useful to individual creativity. Thus, there is a greater degree of tenacity with regard to achieving objectives in individualistic societies.

However, study by Walsh and Fisher (2015) indicates that there is a greater probability in collectivist societies that organisations will overcome barriers and persevere with activities (including creative duties). In a collectivist context, independence relates to the
group's independence in pursuing creative duties without interference from external factors. In the community from which to explore and experiment with creative concepts, a secure psychological environment is encountered. High energy distance represents the social hierarchy's recognition of inequality and the powerful control of the less powerful (Hofstede, 2001). One should therefore respect one's superiors and acknowledge their power.

Low distance of authority represents the equality value and the conviction that 'all people are created equal.' The connection between executives and subordinates in hierarchical societies is based on compliance and discipline. The leadership style is empowerment in low-powered communities, encouraging staff to be independent, take accountability, engage in decision-making, and voice their views and thoughts (Cressey, Totterdill, & Exton, 2013). Subordinates in high-power distance societies are used to directing and decision-making based on their managers and communication in high-power distance cultures is mostly top-down (Ziek, 2015).

Consequently, followers are not socialized to think separately and create their own issues alternatives. If asked for their thoughts on how to solve a issue, adherents are likely to comply with the current regulations and processes set and respected by their superiors instead of violating the laws. Their fear of deviating from current standards and being punished for it (Hofstede, 2001) may lead supporters to emphasize their thoughts appropriateness, ensure alignment with the current order, and their superiors accept their ideas. In comparison, individuals in low-power-distance societies are not scared to freely express their thoughts, and they feel less compelled to elaborate on the concepts so that their superiors can accept them.

2.3.2. Leadership Style

According to Hollins (2014), leadership is vital to the organisation at all levels. Leadership relates to the moral and intellectual ability for the business and its staff to apply and work for what we think to be best. Effective management and excellent governance contribute to the development of teamwork and employee integration into group objectives. Many rulers need to maintain efficiency by maintaining present company performance and even increasing with the organisation's varied employees for the future. While maintaining tabs on strong performance indices, the selected leaders promote innovation and creativity, risk-taking, and abilities for future development.
Performance among all staff has to be maintained and positive morale rebuilt over time. The vital function of the leader in such cases is shaping improved performance and wading becomes important to the overall success of the organisation in question.

According to Louise (2012), an organisational chart produced should still be in place as it is the basis for keeping the new culture and maintaining the methods expected to achieve the broader goals. As administration continues to make and communicate the new culture, it must be predictable and follow a well-considered strategy. Fruitful organisational performance requires leaders to give the new organisation's vision to the people responsible for doing so, and they must listen to the issues raised, thereby dispelling rumors, proceeding to set expectations, and cleaning up. In addition, administrations will not be viewed as being serious about the integration of culture and will lose the dedication of the workforce (Hollins, 2014).

As per Berry (2013), through the merged corporate organisation, staff will begin to see and acknowledge the significant efforts and obligations of their partners by seeing familiar and further trusted leaders empowering positive understanding during times. Strong management enhances efficiency while it is reduced by weak management. (Fiore, Levine, 2014). Leadership is connected with the energy range level of the Geert Hofstede dimension. In an organisation that has low power distance, leaders and administrations have assigned power to their representatives hence made a situation of trust where workers can approach administration and have talks on issues identified with the organisation. This is likely to increase the performance of the association.

2.3.3. Collaboration and Coordination

Over three periods between 2001/2002 and 2007/2008, Iqbal (2013) conducted a survey on the connection between top management team culture and organisational results in English acute hospitals (NHS Trusts). He used the Competing Values Framework, a validated tool for evaluating the culture of senior management teams. A broad variety of regularly gathered indices were used to evaluate organisational efficiency. They discovered that with the passage of time, organisational culture differs across hospitals. This variation is at least associated with a multitude of firm features and routine firm efficiency measurements in a coherent and predictable amount of ways. In addition, the
hospitals studied evolved into more competitive archetypes of society that could mirror the current context of policy, though with a greater mix of organisational cultures.

The research given proof in the sampled hospital environments for current connection between performance and culture. Schneider (2004) produced a suggestion that culture within organisations, in relation to the ways and techniques in which individuals interact, lay down guidelines within which employees behave. By knowing the group culture, employees understand precisely what they need in any specified company scenario. Furthermore, if the group culture is obviously understood, rigid control processes and processes become unwelcome as it acts as an essential internal control system that coordinates the efforts of all staff. As culture could be described as 'the manner things are accomplished within a community' setting in movement certain goals and expectations that allow learning and comprehension of significant problems and ultimately identifying activities that can lead to penalty and amplify those that lead to reward.

2.4 Perceived Organisational Support and Team Cooperation

2.4.1. Perceived Organisational Support

In today’s competitive business environment, keeping employees enables the organization to be successful. Employees are viewed as one of the most important assets for most organisations, in particular service-based organisations, because of the benefits of delivering successful performances (Evans, Campbell & Stonehouse, 2003). One of the most important service-based organisations is the hotel industry. The hotel industry is a labour-intensive service industry, dependent on the availability of good quality employees to deliver, operate, and manage the tourist product for survival and for a competitive advantage. Moreover, achieving service quality and excellence and making satisfied and loyal customers depends on the attitudes, performance and behaviour of employees (Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000).

Ghani (2006) stated that employees lead to organisational success. Organisational support is one of the most important organizational concepts that keep employees in the organisation, since organisational support is known as a key factor in increasing job satisfaction and the organisational commitment of employees. On the other hand, organisational commitment and job satisfaction are equally important to customer
satisfaction (Lam & Zhang, 2003). Service-oriented organisations such as airlines and hotels recognise that employee satisfaction will go a long way toward contributing to their goal of having happy customers (Robbins & Judge, 2009).

When examining perceived organisational support as a conceptual, it is expressed as a perception of what degree of importance to contribute to employees by the organisation. Expectations of this perception in the employee’s mind are outcomes such as considering employee goodness by the organisation, appreciation in the organisation and sharing common values between organisation and employee. Employees supported by their organisation feel this support is given because they are valuable employees for their organisations. Employees who feel their organisation value and appreciate them are satisfied with their job and attached to their organisation. Several studies showed that employees who are supported from their organisation are satisfied with their job (Riggle et al., 2009). Previous studies also demonstrated that organisational support given to employees by their organisation engenders improvement of positive behaviours and attitudes like affective and normative commitment (Riggle, Edmondson & Hansen, 2009). Perceived organisational support sometimes has an effect on continuous commitment, either insignificantly or negatively (LaMastro, 2008).

2.4.2 Voice Behavior and Managerial Responses
Employee speech conduct traditionally relates to making creative recommendations for changes and recommending modifications to current normal processes even if others disagree (Burries 2012). It is a type of extra-role conduct and differs from upward impact because the purpose is to profit and enhance the business, not for private gain. Unlike other behaviors of organisational citizenship such as altruism and civic virtue, speech behavior, by questioning the status quo, holds a communication and challenge element. While voice can be directed upward, downward, and horizontally, in this research we concentrated on upward voice conduct towards managers because managers are the ones who have the authority to enforce change and maintain control over the career development of the subordinates. With greater stakeholders engaged, upward voice is mainly a scheduled employee behavior with thorough assessment of the scenario to ensure the behavior is required and welcomed without private hazards (Liang, Farh & Farh, 2012).
The two results that staff are particularly concerned about when they speak are managerial reactions to the speech conduct itself and the individual raising the voice. Since the purpose of the voice is to talk up against the status quo for the organisation's advantage, staff hopes to convince supervisors to endorse their concept and then be prepared to allocate funds to tackle the issue raised. Managerial approval is crucial for any organisational modifications to be made and is evaluated, although not always properly, by the subordinates when they choose to talk (De Dreu & Weingart 2013). In addition to assessing the concept and deciding whether to endorse it or not, managers also form an opinion on the subordinate who increases the voice as reflected in their liking and performance scores of subordinate voice conduct. Employee voice conduct may influence the perceptions of managers of staff as an individual and contribute to the organisation.

Previous study proposed that liking has an indirect impact on performance scores (Morrison & Milken, 2015), and a latest meta-analysis strengthened this by finding a significant overlap between rater liking and performance ratings (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran 2015). Recognizing the capacity (or absence of) of the employee to execute, they are then evaluated by managers. Although these two results may be linked to each other, managers do not always perceive staff with concepts that they do not endorse as lower performers (Burris, 2012).

2.4.3. Promotive and Prohibitive Voice

While most study to date has looked at voice as a single dimension construct De Dreu and Weingart (2013). extension of its definition to include both efforts to initiate positive change and communicate issues calls for the need to examine distinct elements of voice. The expanded structure involves elements of voice that are change-oriented, or promotive, as well as concerns-oriented, or prohibitive. Liang, Farh, and Farh (2012) define promoting voice as an expression of improving job methods and processes, and prohibitive voice as an expression of concern for current practices or behaviors that could damage the organisation. For example, an employee using promotive voice may suggest a new work schedule that can further increase productivity of the work team, while an employee using prohibitive voice may point out the current lack of productivity in the work team instead.
It is logical to predict that managers can view and react differently with their variations in framing and content. Future-oriented voice promoters are conceptualized to be associated with innovation and workplace enhancement (Liang, et al., 2012), similar to the older voice definition. Although it can be seen as challenging by suggesting methods to alter the status quo, it is also constructive in nature, offering alternatives to the problem of interest to executives. As a consequence, it is more probable to lead to managerial approval because if the problem and alternatives raised are valid, the good intention behind it is readily acknowledged and usually viewed as beneficial. Because of the workers’ proactive approach when talking, managers can also give employees a better feeling and regard them as both a skilled worker and a good organisational citizen.

Prohibitive voice, on the other hand, is more past-oriented as it often seeks to prevent damaging workplace practices. By failing to solve the issue, prohibitive speech can be seen as less constructive in nature and more like a complaint that limits the probability of the supervisor endorsing the concept. Unlike promoting voice, the excellent intention behind prohibitive voice may not be so readily identifiable as increasing issues means system failure and may require making those responsible blame (i.e. the managers themselves; Liang et al., 2012). Because of the implicit blame in prohibitive voice, supervisors may perceive this form of voice as a person-based rather than issue-based attack, similar to whistle-blowing.

As a consequence, staff may be viewed more negatively, less receptive to his thoughts, or even retaliated by reduced performance ratings (Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesveran, 2015). Even if prohibitive speech only leads to task conflict (De Drau & Weigant, 2013), the relationship conflict with the manager and the group can readily be negatively spillover. Speaking up in difficult ways can be seen as a threat to collective unity and organisational engagement (Morrison & Milken, 2015) as staff fail to be the product of a healthy sportsman, executives can see these staff as troublemakers and their impression of those who talk up prohibitively can also suffer, leading to reduced liking and performance scores.

2.4.4. Individual and Group Voice

In addition to promoting or prohibiting talking, staff can also talk as individuals or as a group. As social beings, humans have a tendency to conform to the majority influence in attempt to assimilate and fit in. The power of group or social opinion has long been
created to influence individual change of view (Morrison & Milken, 2015), even when the group view may be incorrect (Rajhans (2012). Phenomena like group-thinking demonstrate the group's authority to drown out minority view when the group is highly cohesive (De Drau & Weigant, 2013).

No study has been conducted to date that specifically examines the impacts of group influence in speaking out against the status quo in the workplace, but it is logical to predict that group voice, or talking as a group, carries more weight than individual voice, or talking as a person, because it reflects not only a unique view, but that of various individuals. In turn, it is more probable that supervisors will be persuaded to endorse the concept. Moreover, because of our natural tendency to be a social being, individuals who conform are generally more likable than people who don't (Rajhans, 2012). Provided that the idea raised by the employees is valid, supervisors may also be more likely to perceive the employee as more likable as a team player when they represent not only themselves, but also a group of fellow employees. With the more collective and receptive nature of the group voice, supervisors are more likely to rate the employee who employ group voice higher in performance as well.

2.5 Chapter Summary
The chapter discussed literature related to the research objective. The first was on the Organisation based self-esteem. The second was on Power distance and team cooperation. The third was all about perceived organisational support and teamwork and the last one was on perceived organisational support and team cooperation. The next chapter will be looking at research design, target population and sampling techniques, data collection and analysis of data.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology used to carry out this study that include, the research design, study population and sampling design. Moreover, the chapter includes the data collection methods, research procedures and how the data collected was analyzed.

3.2 Research Design

This study applied a descriptive research design, according to Creswell (2012) a descriptive study provides for an in-depth analysis of a single or a few items which gives the study more information and detail about the target. Thomas (2011) on the other hand observes that descriptive design in social and business studies is important as it provides a detailed analysis of what is happening which can provide important information for decision making. A descriptive study is depicted as a detailed analysis of an entity, event or system that is studied singly to provide detailed information about it. The researcher in a descriptive study is an outsider who only reports things as they are without affecting them in any way (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2012).

In this study, descriptive research was applied to be able to get information on how perceived voice influences team cooperation at the work place specifically in the banking sector in Kenya. The design enabled the researcher to get information as it is. Descriptive research design further enabled the study to establish how organisation based self-esteem, power distance and perceived organisational support affect team cooperation at the work place specifically in the banking sector. In this study, team cooperation was the dependent variable, while the independent variables were: organisation based self-esteem, power distance and perceived organisational support.
3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

Population of the study is defined as pool of people, items and events from which the researcher draws the individuals and cases for sampling (Creswell, 2013). However, Gillham (2013) advices that such a population should be homogeneous in that it must possess and exhibit the information of interests to the researcher. The research is valid if the findings it generates close links to the opinions, features and characteristic of the population.

The target population of this study was selected tier one and tier two commercial banks in Nairobi. The banks were proposed based on the accessibility and location. It consisted of 80 employees working in selected commercial banks in Nairobi, Kenya as shown in the Table 3.1 below. The choice for the commercial banks was based on issues related to accessibility, time and resource constraints. The researcher chose those target banks because they were easily accessible given time and resource constraints on the part of the researcher. The population of the study consisted of middle level managers and lower level managers.

Table 3.1: Population Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population (N)</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower management</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.3.2 Sampling Design

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) define a sampling design as the framework that will guide the researcher on how the study sample was determined from the entire study population. Sampling Design is the framework, or road map, that serves as the basis for the selection of a survey sample and affects many other important aspects of a survey as well (Derrickson, 2015). For this study a random sample was selected so as ensure accurate representation of the characteristics of the entire population. Each member or case was referred to as a subject or element.
3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

Cooper and Schindler (2003) described a sampling frame as the whole list of the entire case in the population of the study from which the probability sample is drawn. In the study, the sampling frame was a list of 80 employees from listed tier one commercial banks based on issues relating to accessibility time and resource constraints in Nairobi county as listed by the Kenya Bankers Association.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

Stratified random sampling is a variation of random sampling in which the population is divided into significant strata with similar characteristics (Robson, 2014). The sampling frame is divided into a number of subsets of which simple random sample is drawn from each of the strata (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2012). Due to the different categories of the target population, stratified random sampling was employed. This ensured that each population segment got a proportionate sample selected. This also ensured randomness of the selected sample and a representative sample hence findings from the sample were reliable. The three groups are as indicated in Table 3.1.

Babbie (2011) cited that stratified sampling is required when the population has groups that may have different characteristics. In the current study, the different levels of management staffs would have different perceptions about the perceived voice and how it affects team cohesiveness at the work place. This therefore makes it necessary to ensure that the sample is representative of the distribution of the population.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size

Robson (2014) argues that a sample of 10% for a large population (more than 500) and 20% for a small population (below 500) can be adequate for research. However, due to non-response, a larger sample should be selected. In this study a sample of 80% of the population was selected to participate in the study. For this case, the sample size was based on a population of 80 respondents. The total number of respondents sampled with questionnaires was believed to be large enough for the study given the purpose and goals of the research. The sample size of this study was therefore be 66 managers in middle management and low level management as derived from Yemane 1967 formula.
This ensured that a large sample participated in the study. To ensure representativeness of the sample selected, a proportionate sample will be selected from each group, as summarized in Table 3.2.

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N (e)^2} \]

Where \( n \) = Sample Size
\( N \) = Population
\( E \) = Confidence Interval

\[ n = \frac{80}{1 + 80 (0.05)^2} \]

\[ n = \frac{80}{1 + 0.2} \]

\[ n = \frac{80}{1.2} \]

\( n = 66 \)

Table 3.2: Population Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Management</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Data Collection Methods

Data was collected using questionnaires that each selected respondent at the selected commercial banks was required to respond to. A self-administered structured online questionnaire was used, to ensure the researcher maximized on response rate. Gillham (2013) observed that use of questionnaire brings several advantages including efficiency, standardized responses and ease of analysis of the data therein. This made the
questionnaire survey well suited for this study. The nature of the questions did not make the respondent reveal their identity in their response hence maintaining confidentiality of the staff members.

The questionnaire was designed after a critical review of literature in relation to perceived voice and team cooperation. The questionnaire was developed in five sections based on the research questions. The first section requested basic information about the respondent. The other four sections were dedicated to the four research questions relating to organisation based self-esteem, power distance, perceived organisational support and team cooperation. The questionnaire was structured with only closed ended questions. A 5-point Likert type scale questions was used to get responses varying from one extreme point to the other. The study used a five-point Likert scale to ask all respondents to express their opinion on given statements, and they were expected to agree, strongly agree, remain neutral, disagree or strongly disagree. Gathered data and results were stored in an excel sheet and then transferred to carry out analysis in chapter four that examine results and findings.

3.5. Research Procedures

According to Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2012) research procedure is the processes and activities that the researcher undertakes when collecting data. Questions were standardized to minimize interference from interpersonal factors. The respondents were requested for their time prior to sending the actual questionnaire. A pilot test involving 5 respondents was carried out to evaluate the completeness, precision, accuracy and clarity of the questionnaires. This ensured the reliability of the data collection instruments to be used. After the amendment of the final questionnaire, the researcher explained the purpose of the research and seek permission from banks to carry out the actual research. An introduction letter from USIU-Africa was sent to respondents to assist in seeking for the approval. Thereafter, the final questionnaires was distributed to the respondents with the help of research assistants. This enhanced the speed of data collection. Each completed questionnaire was treated as a unique case and a sequential number given to each.

Questionnaires were administered at the various outlet and the study utilizes the drop and pick method whereas those for respondents outside Nairobi central business district
received their questionnaires via mail. The researcher delivered the questionnaires to the respective respondents and collect them after three days.

To ensure validity of the data the researcher utilized the Cronbalch alpha in SPSS to determine the validity of each variable where a pilot study was undertaken and a random sample of 10 managers was selected. To ensure validity of the data the researcher utilized the Cronbalch alpha in SPSS to determine the validity of each variable. The findings showed that organisation based self-esteem had the highest reliability ($\alpha= 0.927$), team cooperation ($\alpha= 0.839$), perceived organisational support had ($\alpha=0.823$), and power distance ($\alpha= 0.736$). The data on the reliability scale indicated that all the variables were reliable $\alpha > 0.7$

Table 4.1: Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation based self-esteem</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power distance</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived organisational support</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team cooperation</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After a successful reliability test results, the questionnaires were distributed to all respondents and the data collected was then entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software for analysis.

3.6. Data Analysis Methods
After collection of data through the online questionnaire, they were sorted to establish that they are correctly filled. Only questionnaires that were correctly filled were considered for analysis. Data analysis involves sorting, inspecting, cleaning and coding of the data ready for analysis through software (Babbie, 2011). The Data collected was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Microsoft Excel.

Data analysis was through descriptive and relational statistics. All the data was subjected to descriptive statistics where frequency and percentile tables was generated showing the response pattern for all the responses in the questionnaire. Further, correlation statistics
that indicate the association of perceived voice and team cooperation at work place were used. Presentation of the output from analysis was done through tables, charts and graphs.

3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the methodology used in the study, including the research design, population and sampling design. The sample size that participated in the study and the sampling technique that was applied have been explained. Moreover, the data collection instruments, data collection procedures and how the data collection instruments were tested for validity and reliability have been explained. Lastly, the chapter presents the data analysis plan. The following chapter presents the results and findings from the study that relates perceived voice and team cooperation at the work place.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents results and findings of data that was collected. Findings are discussed based on the following demographic factors; gender, level of education qualification, current bank employer, number of years worked under current employer, number of years worked in the banking sector and department or segment. The study has also discussed results on research questions being investigated.

4.2. General Information
4.2.1. Response Rate
In this study, the researcher distributed 64 questionnaires and only 60 were filled and returned. This represents a response rate of 94% as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.2 Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filled and collected</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Responded</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Gender of Respondents
Findings from the investigation revealed 52% of the respondents were female and 48% of the respondent were male. Results are shown in Figure 4.1.
4.2.3 Age of Respondents

Findings from the investigation revealed 35 respondents were between age group 25-30 accounting for 58% of the total population, 19 respondents were between age group 30-39 accounting for 32% of the total population, 4 respondents were below 25 years accounting for 7% of the total population and 2 respondents were 40 years and above accounting for 3% of the total population as shown in Figure 4.2.

4.2.4 Level of Education

Findings from the investigation on level of education revealed 50% of respondents have master’s (graduate) degree and also 50% have undergraduate degree. As shown in Figure.
4.2.5 Banks Worked for

Findings from the investigation conducted on banks worked for revealed that 27 respondents are working at standard chartered bank representing 45% of the population, 6 respondents are working at Kenya Commercial Bank representing 10% of the respondents, 6 respondents are working at ABSA representing 10% of the population, 6 respondents are working at Co-operative Bank representing 10% of the population, 5 respondents work at Commercial Bank of Africa representing 8% of the respondents, 1 respondents is working at Equity Bank representing 2% of the population, 1 respondent works at National Bank representing 2% of the population and 8 respondents never answered representing 13% of the population. As shown in Figure 4.4

![Figure 4.4: Banks Worked For](image-url)
4.2.6 Years worked Under Current Employer

Findings from the investigation established that 42% of the respondents have worked under the current employer for 1-3 years, 28% of respondents have worked under the current employer for 4-6 years, 15% of the respondents worked under the current employer for less than 1 year, 8% of the respondents worked under the current employer for 7-9 years and 7% of the respondents worked under the current employer for more than 10 years. As shown in Figure 4.5.

![Figure 4.5: Years worked in the Organisation](image)

4.2.7 Years Worked in the Banking Sector

It was revealed that 25 respondents have worked in the banking sector between 1-3 years representing 42% of the population, 17 respondents have worked in the banking sector for 4-6 years representing 28% of the population, 9 respondents have worked in the banking sector for less than 1 year representing 15% of the population, respondents have worked in the banking sector for 7-9 years representing 8% of the population and respondents have worked in the banking sector for more than 10 years representing 7% of the population. As shown in Table 4.2.
Table 4.3: Years Worked in the Banking Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Organisation Based Self-Esteem and Team Cooperation

The first objective of the study sought to investigate how organisation based self-esteem affect team cooperation in the banking sector in Kenya. Respondents were asked to rate their opinion using a likert scale. The highest was 5= Strongly agree and the lowest was 1= Strongly disagree.

4.3.1 Descriptive Statistics of Organisation Based Self-esteem

The findings revealed that majority agreed that they are efficient in the organisation which had a mean of 4.25 and standard deviation of 0.856, they are co-operative in the organisation which had a mean of 4.25 and standard deviation of 0.773, they are helpful in the organisation which had a mean 4.23 and standard deviation of 0.789 they make a difference in the organisation which had a mean 4.08 and standard deviation 0.926. However, respondents could not reach an agreement on there are trusted in the organisation which had a mean of 3.95 and standard deviation of 0.852, in the organisation they have faith in them which had a mean of 3.85 and standard deviation of 0.988, they are valuable in the organisation which had a mean of 3.82 and standard deviation of 0.948, in their organisation they count around other people which had a mean of 3.75 and standard deviation of 0.895, in their organisation they are important which had a mean of 3.68 and standard deviation of 0.965 and in their organisation they are taken seriously which had a mean of 3.62 and standard deviation of 1.027. As shown in Table 4.3.
4.3.2 Frequency of Organisation Based Self-esteem

The study sought to establish respondents feedback on whether they were taken seriously and the results indicated that 5% strongly disagreed, 10% disagreed while 18.3% were neutral and 51.7% agreed with 15% in strong agreement to the statement. An analysis of employees being trusted in the firm revealed that 3.3% strongly disagreed, 1.7% of the respondents were neutral while 60% agreed with 21.7% in strong agreement. The study also revealed that 48.3% agreed that the organization saw them as important while 16.7% strongly agree. The study also indicated that 51.7% were in agreement that in the organisation they can make a difference, on that point 33.3% strongly agreed to the statement.

The study also revealed that 53.3% agreed that they are valuable in the organization and 20% strongly agreed. The study also established that 35% strongly agreed that they were helpful in the firm and 60% agreed. On the same time, 61.7% agreed that they were co-operative, while 35% strongly agreed. Results also revealed that 56.7% agreed that the organisation had faith in them and 53.3% agreed that they were efficient.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In my organisation I am taken seriously.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In my organisation I am trusted.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In my organisation I am important.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In my organisation I can make a</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In my organisation I am valuable.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In my organisation I am helpful.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In my organisation I count around here.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In my organisation I am co-operative.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In my organisation there is faith in me.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In my organisation I am efficient.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 Power Distance and Team Cooperation

The second objective of the study sought to investigate if power distance has an effect on team cooperation in the banking sector. Respondents were asked to rate their opinion. The highest was 5= Strongly agree and the lowest was 1= Strongly disagree.

#### 4.4.1 Descriptive Statistics of Power Distance

The findings revealed that respondents could not reach an agreement on in work related matters, managers have a right to expect obedience from their subordinates which had a mean of 3.47 and standard deviation of 1.112 and people at higher levels in organisations have a responsibility to make important decisions for people below them which had a mean of 3.37 and standard deviation of 1.178. It was also revealed that respondents disagreed that company's rules should not be broken, not even when the employee thinks it is in the company's best interest which had a mean of 2.72 and standard deviation of 1.166 and people at lower levels in the organisation should carry out the requests of people at higher levels without questions which had a mean of 2.18 and standard deviation of 1.127. As shown in Table 4.5.
### Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics of Power Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Distance</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People at lower levels in the organisation should carry out the requests of people at higher levels without questions.</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. People at higher levels in organisations have a responsibility to make important decisions for people below them.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Once a top-level executive makes a decision, people working for the company should not question it.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In work related matters, managers have a right to expect obedience from their subordinates.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A company's rules should not be broken, not even when the employee thinks it is in the company's best interest.</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.5 Perceived Organisational Support and Team cooperation

The second objective of the study sought to determine if perceived organisational support has a direct effect on team cooperation in the banking sector. Respondents were asked to rate their opinion. The highest was 5= Strongly agree and the lowest was 1= Strongly disagree.

#### 4.5.1 Descriptive Statistics of Perceived Organisational Support to Employee Voice

The study revealed that majority of respondents agreed that employees cooperate to get work done which had a mean of 4.13 and standard deviation of 0.833, members of employee’s team are willing to share information with team members about work which had a mean of 4.12 and standard deviation of 0.94 and the team enhances communication among people working on the same product had a mean of 4.08 and standard deviation of 0.829.
Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics of Perceived Organisational Support to Employee Voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived organisational support</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Members of my team are willing to share information with team members about work.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The team enhances communication among people working on the same product.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Members cooperate to get work done.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Team Cooperation

The third objective of the study sought to investigate team cooperativeness. Respondents were asked to rate their opinion. The highest was 5= Strongly agree and the lowest was 1= Strongly disagree.

4.6.1 Descriptive Statistics of Team Cooperation

The findings showed that majority of respondents could not reach an agreement on the organisation supports employees in work matters which had a mean of 3.87 and standard deviation of 0.873, the organisation cares about my well-being which had a mean of 3.67 and standard deviation of 0.968 the organisation cares about employees opinions on work matters which had a mean of 3.53 and standard deviation of 0.999 the organisation shows concern for employees as a person which had a mean of 3.5 and standard deviation of 1.05, the organisation values employees as a person and personally supports me which had a mean of 3.47 and standard deviation of 1.081 and the organisation is willing to help when employees need special favour which had a mean of 3.32 and standard deviation of 1.127. It was also established that respondents could not reach an agreement on the organisation tries to make employees job as interesting as possible which had a mean of 3.30 and standard deviation of 1.197, the organisation cares about my opinions on personal matters which had a mean of 3.27 and standard deviation of 1.219, the organisation cares about employees general satisfaction at work which had a mean of 3.27 and standard deviation of 1.071, the organisation strongly considers my personal goals and values which had a mean of 3.23 and standard deviation of 1.155 and the organisation is willing to help when employees need special favour which had a mean of 3.32 and standard deviation of 1.127. The respondents disagreed on the organisation disregards
employee’s best interests which had a mean of 2.43 and standard deviation of 0.981, the organisation would ignore any complaint from employees which had a mean of 2.40 and standard deviation of 1.045 and even if employees did the best job possible, the organisation would fail had a mean of 2.13 and standard deviation of 1.065.

Table 4.8 Descriptive Statistics of Team Cooperation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Cooperation</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My organisation values me as a person and personally supports me.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The organisation cares about my well-being.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My organisation shows concern for me as a person.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My organisation strongly considers my personal goals and values.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The organisation cares about my general satisfaction at work.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My organisation cares about my opinions on personal matters.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The organisation tries to make my job as interesting as possible.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My organisation cares about my opinions on work matters.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My organisation is willing to help when I need special favour.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Help is available from the organisation when I have a problem.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My organisation supports me in work matters.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The organisation would ignore any complaint from me.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Even if I did the best job possible, the organisation would fail.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The organisation disregards my best interests.</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The organisation takes pride in my accomplishments at work.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.2 Correlation Analysis

A Pearson correlation analysis was done to establish the relationship between the organisation based self-esteem, power distance, perceived organisational support and team cooperation. The result established a positive relationship between team cooperation and organisation based self-esteem ($r=0.416$, $p-value=0.001$), Power distance ($r=0.185$, $p-value=0.159$) and perceived organisational support ($r=0.602$, $p-value=0.000$). The study established that organisation based self-esteem had a positive and significant relationship with perceived organisational support ($r=0.445$, $p-value=0.000$) and team
cooperation \((r=.416, p\text{-value}=0.001)\). However, there was positive but insignificant relationship between organisation based self-esteem and power distance.

### Table 4.9: Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OBSE</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>TC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBSE</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.445**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.274*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.274*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.416**</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.602**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

### 4.6.3 Multi Regression Analysis

The research analysed relationship between the dependent variable (Team Cooperation) against organisation based self-esteem, power distance and perceived organisational support. The results showed that the adjusted \(R^2\) value was .389 hence 38.9% of the variation in team cooperation was explained by the variations in organisation based self-esteem, power distance and perceived organisational support as illustrated in Table 4.9

### Table 4.10: Model Summary

<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>.624*</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.60625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), POS, PD, OBSE

An ANOVA analysis was done between team cooperation against organisation based self-esteem, power distance and perceived organisational support at 95% confidence level, the F critical was 11.901 and the P value was (0.000) which was significant. This
implied that there was a significant relationship between team cooperation against organisation based self-esteem, power distance and perceived organisational support.

**Table 4.11: Anova Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>13.122</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.374</td>
<td>11.901</td>
<td>.000^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>20.582</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.704</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TC  
b. Predictors: (Constant), POS, PD, OBSE

As per the coefficient Table 4.11, the equation \( Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 \) becomes:

\[
Y = 1.032 + .197X_1 + 0.013 X_2 + 0.696X_3
\]

Where:

\[
Y = \text{Team Cooperation (TC)}
\]

\[
X_1 = \text{organisation based self-esteem,}
\]

\[
X_2 = \text{power distance}
\]

\[
X_3 = \text{perceived organisational support}
\]

Organisation Based Self Esteem (OBSE) relates positively but not significantly with Team Cooperation (TC) \( (\beta = .197; p\text{-value} = .121) \). Power distance (PD) relates positively but insignificantly with Team Cooperation (TC) \( (\beta = .013; p\text{-value} = .897) \) and Perceived Organisation Support (POS) is insignificant to Team Cooperation (TC) \( (\beta = .696; p\text{-value} = .000) \).

The regression equation illustrated in Table 4.11 has established that all other factors held constant team cooperation (TC) had a positive change of 1.032. The findings presented also showed that with all other variables held at zero, a unit change in organisation based self-esteem led to 0.197 positive change in team cooperation, and a unit change in power distance led to 0.013 positive change in team cooperation. Moreover, the study also showed that a unit change in perceived organisational support led to 0.696 positive change in team cooperation. Only the variable perceived organisational support was significant \( (p<0.05) \), therefore in the equation perceived organisational support was significant in determining team cooperation.
OBSE related positively with team Cooperation but was not significant (β=.197, p-value=.121), in addition PD related positively with team Cooperation but was not significant (β=.013, p-value=.897).

**Table 4.12: Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>1.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBSE</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TC

**4.6.4 Aggregated Means**

A review of the aggregated means revealed that Team Cooperation (TC) had the highest mean of (4.111), and organisation based self-esteem followed at 3.9483 while power distance had a mean of (2.7267) and perceived organisational support had a mean of 3.2544. This indicated that majority agreed that organisation based self-esteem correlates with team cohesiveness.

**Table 4.13: Aggregated Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>4.1111</td>
<td>.75581</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSE</td>
<td>3.9483</td>
<td>.70386</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>2.7267</td>
<td>.79912</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>3.2544</td>
<td>.56053</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.7 Chapter Summary**

The chapter has presented findings based on effect of perceived voice on team cooperation. The first section provided an analysis organisational based self-esteem. The third section has discussed results on power distance, the third section has covered findings on employees cooperating and that last section has explored findings on Perceived Organisational Support to employee voice. The next chapter covers findings, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the summary, discussions, conclusions and recommendations of the study. Results are discussed based on the following research questions; How does organisation based self-esteem affect team cooperation in the banking sector in Kenya? Does power distance affect team cooperation in the banking sector? Does perceived organisational support affect team cooperation in the banking sector?

5.2 Summary of the Findings

The purpose of this research was to determine how perceived voice influences team cooperation at the work place specifically in the banking sector in Kenya. The study sought to investigate organisation based self-esteem affect team cooperation in the banking sector in Kenya, how power distance affect team cooperation in the banking sector and how perceived organisational support affect team cooperation in the banking sector.

This study applied a descriptive research design in order to get information on how perceived voice influences team cooperation at the work place specifically in the banking sector in Kenya. The target population was comprised of selected tier one commercial banks in Nairobi where 80 employees were targeted. Questionnaires were used for the data collection. The Data collected was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Microsoft Excel. Correlation statistics was also done to determine the association between independent and dependent variable. Presentation of the output from analysis will be done through tables, charts and graphs.

The first research question of this study was to determine how organisation based self-esteem affect team cooperation. The descriptive findings indicate that respondents agreed on employees are efficient in the organisation which, employees are co-operative in the organisation which, employees are helpful in the organisation; employees make a difference in the organisation. However, respondents could not reach an agreement on employees are trusted in the organisation, the organisation has faith in the employees, employees are valuable in the organisation, in the organisation employees count around
other people, in the organisation employees are important and in the organisation employees are taken seriously.

The second research question of the study was to determine if power distance has an effect on team cooperation in the banking sector. The descriptive findings revealed that respondents could not reach an agreement on work related matters, managers have a right to expect obedience from their subordinates and people at higher levels in organisations have a responsibility to make important decisions for people below them. It was also revealed that respondents disagreed that company's rules should not be broken, not even when the employee thinks it is in the company's best interest and people at lower levels in the organisation should carry out the requests of people at higher levels without questions.

The third research question of the study was to investigate whether perceived organisational support has an effect on team cooperation in the banking sector. The descriptive findings revealed that respondents could not reach an agreement on the organisation supports employees in work matters, the organisation cares about employees well-being, the organisation cares about employees’ opinions on work matters, the organisation shows concern for employees as a person, the organisation values employees as a person and personally supports employees and the organisation is willing to help when employees need special favour. It was also established that respondents could not reach an agreement on the organisation tries to make employees job as interesting as possible, the organisation cares about employees opinions on personal matters, the organisation cares about employees general satisfaction at work and the organisation strongly considers employees personal goals and values Respondents disagreed on the organisation disregards employees best interests, the organisation would ignore any complaint from employees and even if employees did the best job possible, the organisation would fail. The descriptive findings revealed that respondents agreed that employees cooperate to get work done, members of employee’s team are willing to share information with team members about work and the team enhances communication among people working on the same product.

A Pearson correlation analysis was done to establish the relationship between the organisation based self-esteem, power distance, perceived organisational support and team cooperation. The result established a positive relationship between team cooperation
and organisation based self-esteem ($\beta=.197$, p value=.121), perceived organisational support ($\beta=.696$, p value=0.000) and power disatnce ($r=1.032$, p value=.068).

An ANOVA analysis was done between team cooperation against organisation based self-esteem, power distance and perceived organisational support at 95% confidence level, the F critical was 11.901 and the P value was (0.000) which was significant. This implied that there was a significant relationship between team cooperation against organisation based self-esteem, power distance and perceived organisational support.

The research analysed relationship between the dependent variable (Team Cooperation) against organisation based self-esteem, power distance and perceived organisational support. The results showed that the adjusted $R^2$ value was .389 hence 38.9% of the variation in team cooperation was explained by the variations in organisation based self-esteem, power distance and perceived organisational support.

The regression equation established that all other factors held constant team cooperation (TC) had a positive change of 1.032. The findings presented also showed that with all other variables held at zero, a unit change in organisation based self-esteem related to 0.197 positive change in team cooperation, and a unit change in power distance related to 0.013 positive change in team cooperation. Moreover, the study also showed that a unit change in perceived organisational support led to 0.696 positive change in team cooperation. Only the variable perceived organisational support was significant (p<0.05), therefore in the equation perceived organisational support was significant in determining team cooperation.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Organisation Based Self-esteem and Team Cooperation

The findings revealed that employees are efficient in the organisation. In short, a workplace of quality is essential to maintaining employees efficient in their different tasks and work. According to Agbozo, Owusu, Hoedoasia and Atakorah (2017), a healthy workplace is verified by features such as competitive salaries, trusting employee-management relationships, equity and fairness for all, and a reasonable workload with difficult yet achievable objectives. A composite of all these circumstances makes the
workstation the best working conditions for highly satisfied staff to work (Agbozo, Owusu, Hoedoafia, & Atakorah, 2017).

The study showed that employees are helpful in the organisation and according to Burcharth, Knudsen and Søndergaard (2017) argue that if staff are encouraged for their creative attempts and do not experience elevated time pressure, they are more likely to continue in their attempts to generate ideas and even begin to invent in their spare time. Studies have shown that people generate more creative job when they feel they have decisions about how to accomplish the duties provided to them. Therefore, enabling employees to pursue their own thoughts during working hours offers time to observe, experiment and speculate with others is essential to the results of innovation (Burcharth, Knudsen, & Søndergaard, 2017).

The study revealed that employees are co-operative in the organisation and Agbozo et al (2017) supports that an appealing and supportive working atmosphere is critical to innovation and team work. This is because there are countless characteristics in the job setting that can affect workers' physical and mental well-being. In the context of the work and work setting, supporting organisational environment is described.

The findings established that respondents could not reach an agreement on there are trusted in the organisation. Empirical evidence has linked perceived organisational support to a variety of attitudes and outcomes related to work. A research by Mohda, Shaha and Zailana (2016) showed that psychological safety was promoted by supporting and trusting interpersonal relationships and supporting leadership. This makes staff and other members of the organisation feel secure in their job settings particularly where organisational members have openness and mutual collective support.

The results show that Organisation Based Self Esteem (OBSE) relates positively but not significantly with Team Cooperation (TC) (β = .197; p-value = .121). Researchers have explored the link between organizational-based self esteem and work place attitudes and behaviors; there seem to be a popular consensus that employees high in OBSE exhibit positive work behaviour. This study is joining the growing research works affirming the robust relationship between the construct and the many positive work behaviors. Bowden, (2002) observed the relationship between OBSE and job satisfaction. Tinger, Singer & Roberts (2000) observed that OBSE empirically linked to job commitment. Apparently, this study demonstrated evidence that OBSE predict specific aspect of commitment, i.e.
the employees’ ability to work with vigour, dedication and be totally absorbed while working. Employees with this level of commitment are a clear indication of their strong identification with their organization. This assertion was demonstrated by Kark and Shanir (2002) when they reported a positive and significant relationship between OBSE and organizational (i.e. work unit) identification; similar findings was reported by Bowden (2002).

Further, empirical studies have also shown a strong relationship between work engagement and OCB (Soane, Truss, Alfes & Shantz, 2012). Simpson (2009) also observe that there is a relationship between organizational-based self esteem and a key component of OCB. Besides, Tang et al., (2002) reported similar results in a transnational study sample. Therefore, the empirical link between organizational-based self esteem and work engagement is apparent. Work engagement has been linked to enhanced performance (Truss, Shantz, Soanec, Alfesd & Delbridge, 2014). In addition, Wiesenfeld et al., (2000) observe a positive and significant relationship between OBSE and organizationally beneficial managerial behaviours. All these are positive work behaviours characteristic of highly engaged employees.

5.3.2 Power Distance and Team Cooperation

It was disagreed by a majority that people at lower levels in the organisation should carry out the requests of people at higher levels without questions. According to Laursen (2012), a low-power distance (PD) society is better for creativity because it enables more liberty for people and prevents the propensity for rigid hierarchies, centralization, emphasis on laws and regulations, and restricted interaction and thoughts in big PD societies, all of which contribute to restricting creative capacity. Sia & Appu (2015) argue that in low PD and male societies, R&D productivity is greater because low PD enables people to be exploratory and creative and challenge the status quo. Similarly, Sanyal and Hisam (2018) argue that the small power distance discovered in UK firms enables the free flow of ideas needed for effective research and development. Such generalized viewpoints, however, epitomize a Eurocentric point of view, typical of reasoning using wide dimensional distinction, as in Diab and Ajlouni (2015). that' Individualistic societies value liberty more than collectivist societies and liberty is essential for creativity.' In some literature, the hypothesis that creativity occurs only in cases of autonomy, independence, and liberty is associated with promoting Western culture, ideology, and systems.
Majority failed to agree or disagree if people at higher levels in organisations have a responsibility to make important decisions for people below them. Wenjing, Wei and Shuliang (2013) take a more random perspective of this, indicating that elevated and low power distance values are applicable to the creativity process, but at distinct phases. Bassett (2014) also claims that independence is moderated by culture as a dimension of creativity and differs depending on whether it concerns independence of individuals or groups. Independence as an individual characteristic of personality indicating a low need for social approval and individual determination is discovered mostly in the West and in this sense is useful to individual creativity. Thus, there is a greater degree of tenacity with regard to achieving objectives in individualistic societies.

Majority were in strong disagreement that once a top-level executive makes a decision, people working for the company should not question it. Mohda, Shaha and Zailana (2016) indicate that favourable creative results are more probable in societies with elevated individualism, low energy distance, poor avoidance of uncertainty, and high to moderate masculinity — in other words, cultures discovered almost solely in the West. Arguments like those that uphold American culture and creativity often ignore other cultures' important creative accomplishments. There are many instances of elevated creativity in various cultural environments, such as the ancient Egyptians or the Mayans, or the Chinese's advanced science and technical achievements; further examples include the Middle Ages Arabs, the 14th-16th century Spanish and Portuguese all examples of high-level development but with very distinct cultural environments.

There was uncertainty over managers having a right to expect obedience from their subordinates. study by Walsh and Fisher (2015) indicates that there is a greater probability in collectivist societies that organisations will overcome barriers and persevere with activities (including creative duties). In a collectivist context, independence relates to the group's independence in pursuing creative duties without interference from external factors. In the community from which to explore and experiment with creative concepts, a secure psychological environment is encountered. High energy distance represents the social hierarchy's recognition of inequality and the powerful control of the less powerful (Hofstede, 2001). One should therefore respect one's superiors and acknowledge their power. Low distance of authority represents the equality value and the conviction that all people are created equal.' The connection between executives and subordinates in hierarchical societies is based on compliance and
discipline. The leadership style is empowerment in low-powered communities, encouraging staff to be independent, take accountability, engage in decision-making, and voice their views and thoughts (Cressey, Totterdill, & Exton, 2013).

The result established a positive relationship between organisation based self-esteem and power distance. Subordinates in high-power distance societies are used to directing and decision-making based on their managers and communication in high-power distance cultures is mostly top-down (Ziek, 2015). Consequently, followers are not socialized to think separately and create their own issues alternatives. If asked for their thoughts on how to solve a issue, adherents are likely to comply with the current regulations and processes set and respected by their superiors instead of violating the laws. Their fear of deviating from current standards and being punished for it (Hofstede, 2001) may lead supporters to emphasize their thoughts appropriateness, ensure alignment with the current order, and their superiors accept their ideas. In comparison, individuals in low-power-distance societies are not scared to freely express their thoughts, and they feel less compelled to elaborate on the concepts so that their superiors can accept them.

It was disagreed that company's rules should not be broken, not even when the employee thinks it is in the company's best interest. Hollins (2014) notes that leadership is vital to the organisation at all levels. Leadership relates to the moral and intellectual ability for the business and its staff to apply and work for what we think to be best. Effective management and excellent governance contribute to the development of teamwork and employee integration into group objectives. According to Louise (2012) an organisational chart produced should still be in place as it is the basis for keeping the new culture and maintaining the methods expected to achieve the broader goals. As administration continues to make and communicate the new culture, it must be predictable and follow a well-considered strategy. Fruitful organisational performance requires leaders to give the new organisation’s vision to the people responsible for doing so, and they must listen to the issues raised, thereby dispelling rumors, proceeding to set expectations, and cleaning up. In addition, administrations will not be viewed as being serious about the integration of culture and will lose the dedication of the workforce (Hollins, 2014).

5.3.3 Employees Cooperating Culture and Team Cooperation
The findings revealed that the organisation cares about employees opinions on work matters. There is no doubt that communicating between two people is more than
exchanging messages. It has been shown that the predominant perspective of communication merely as the correct and timely delivery of relevant data misses the constitutive nature of communication (Ziek, 2015). Effective communication extends beyond just exchanging data to setting up a debate for the worker and executives to gain views and views as well. Dialog is therefore a cooperative method rooted in notions of action investigation. This generates circumstances in which both executives and their staff boost their mutual consciousness and intent, eventually affecting the organisation's content, direction and outcome (Walsh & Fisher, 2015). Dialog's main function is to generate understanding and thoughts, and to solve joint problems. It provides a chance for participatory workplace collective reflection.

The study also established that the organisation shows concern for employees as a person. This generates a unifying workplace structure through the interaction of employee voice organisational structures on the one side and the active use of the formal and tacit abilities of staff in job and change procedures on the other side (Cressey, Totterdill, & Exton, 2013). Several studies emphasize that positive organisational dialog can improve organisational results Ince and Gül (2011) argue that constructive dialog and employee engagement has a positive correlation with many organisational outputs such as engagement to organisation, achievement, behaviors of organisational citizenship, and job satisfaction. However, in comparison, lack of dialog with staff can trigger functionless outcomes such as stress, work discontent, low confidence, and decline in organisational commitment, severance intent, and absence that can negatively influence the effectiveness of the organisation. Rajhans (2012) opined that organisational dialogue can help motivate, build trust, create shared identity and spur engagement; as well as provide way for individuals to express emotions, share hopes and ambitions and celebrate and remember accomplishments.

The organisation values employees as a person and personally supports them. Development Employee training and development programs are aimed at changing employee abilities, understanding or attitudes needed by the work post (Boadu, Dwomo-Fokuo, Boakye, & Kwaning, 2014). In addition to engagement and collective empowerment, several benefits can be accomplished by developing skills, including enhancing employee satisfaction (Mefleh, Al-Mzary, Al-rifai, & Al-Momany, 2015). Competence growth through training also increases the level of self-awareness, skills and motivation of staff to conduct their work well (Boadu, Dwomo-Fokuo, Boakye, &
A research by Mefleh, Al-Mzary, Al-riifai, & Al-Momany (2015) to investigate the effects of training and its impact on employee performance at Jordanian universities suggested a connection between efficient training and its impact on the performance of staff at Jordanian universities. The findings show that the organisation cares about employees opinions on personal matters. McEwan, Ruissen, Eys, Zumbo and Beauchamp (2017) define teamwork as a range of interactive and interdependent cognitive procedures among team members that transform team inputs such as member features, organisational financing, and team member structure into results such as team results, team member satisfaction. Proponents of team work argue that teamwork has the ability to enable the members of the team to have a higher level of emotional security, self-confidence and the ability to plan and decide with others positively (Sanyal & Hisam, 2018).

It has also been asserted that teamwork increases the use of resources and possibly increases efficiency not only of the person but of the organisation as it can expand employee production through collaboration (Agwu, 2015). In addition, teamwork helps to create a good working atmosphere with workable agendas, creative activities, favourable policies and values (Sanyal & Hisam, 2018). It has also been shown that in instances of lack of teamwork, job failure, disappointment, low morale and bad productivity were the norm if not more likely to happen.

5.4 Conclusions

5.4.1 Organisation Based Self-Esteem and Team Cooperation

Individuals invest their time in tasks they consider important to their self-worth, therefore work becomes an avenue employees seek to project themselves and boast their self esteem. This is possible as long as they perceive themselves as important and valued members of an organization, however if they feel they are not recognised they tend to engage less in their work and are likely to divert their energy to deviant work behaviours including narcissism and dysfunctional interpersonal relationships. Managers therefore ought to have this perspective of work in order to understand work behaviours; it means more than just the physical rewards received in terms of compensation. It is a situation that defines the social being of individuals; people seek and derive psychological and emotional stability and satisfaction in work situations. They should bear with the fact that employees will invest their cognitive and emotional energy in work and behave in a...
manner favourable to work performance in this case be highly engaged whence they feel they matter and valued in an organization.

5.4.2 Power Distance and Team cooperation
The outcomes led to determine that power distance diversity, within workgroups does have an effect on the individual performance of the employees. Particularly in this study, the effect of power distance diversity within workgroups lies on the reduction of the work role performance and the organizational citizenship behavior of the employees. The most relevant findings, as support for some of the statements in the review of the literature, include the next three statements. First, workgroups were identified as heterogeneous, or very diverse, in terms of the power distance cultural dimension. Second, on the basis of this power distance diversity within the workgroups, the research found that such diversity influences in a negative way the performance of altruism and civic virtue, two dimensions of OCB. Third, the power distance diversity affects the employee’s work role performance in a negative way. Therefore, it is possible to infer that power distance diversity within workgroups negatively influences employees’ actions, behaviors, and outcomes, within the organizational that was analyzed.

5.4.3 Perceived Organisation Support and Team Cooperation
It is in conclusive that employees are not supported in issues related to work. Organisation cares for employee’s well-being. The organisation is concern for employees as a person. Employees are valued and supported. Employee’s job is made as interesting as possible and the organisation cares about employee’s opinions. The organisation does not disregard employee’s interest and it does not ignore employee’s complaint. Through team cooperation they are able to get their work done. Team work helps employees share information with their team members; it also increases communication among employees who are working to develop the same product.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendation for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Organisation Based Self-Esteem and Team Cooperation
The organisation should create a safe work environment where employees are motivated through recognition, managers should create an excellent relationship with their staff, led by example, encourage employees to work as a team, take employees decision seriously
and clarify what is expected from employees. This will create a sense of belonging amongst employees, they will feel valued, increase their faith and trust towards their managers thus increase creativity and team cooperation or cohesiveness.

5.5.1.2 Power Distance and Team Cooperation

The use of low power distance will create a good relationship between employees and managers. Lower level employees will be given an opportunity to become creative, innovative and challenge the status quo, encourage free flow of ideas, increase interaction between managers and employees. This will increase communication in the organisation and managers will be respected and obeyed.

5.5.1.3 Employees Cooperating Culture and Team cooperation

It is recommended that the organisation should try to make employees job as interesting by respecting employees, appreciating their good work, instill a culture of teaching and team work, cares about employee’s opinions and consider employees personal goals and values. It should also create an environment where employees are able to freely communicate with their top level managers. This will build employees trust, level of engagement and team cohesiveness in the long run and in turn result to improved performance, team spirit and team work as the staff are more self-fulfilled leading to increased revenue and happier satisfied clientele and staff.

5.5.2 Recommendation for Further Research

The purpose of this research was to determine how perceived voice influences team cooperation at the work place specifically in the banking sector in Kenya. The study was based on commercial banks in Nairobi. The main area of focus was to establish how organisation based self-esteem, power and organisational support affect team cooperation in the banking sector. This study recommends that there is a need to undertake a similar study to other areas in the country in order to generalize the findings.
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# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX I: LIST OF BANKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Bank of Kenya Directory of Licensed Commercial Banks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address: P.O Box 38610-00800, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: +254-20- 4263000, 4447352, 4442382, 4443482, 44447358, 22251540/1, 0722207386, 0735611223, 0719015000,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: +254-20-4447354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:headoffice@abcthbank.com">headoffice@abcthbank.com</a>; <a href="mailto:talk2us@abcthbank.com">talk2us@abcthbank.com</a>, Website: <a href="http://www.abcthbank.com">www.abcthbank.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Licenced: 8th December, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches: 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branches: 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Bank of India</strong>&lt;br&gt;Postal Address: P. O. Box 30246 - 00100 Nairobi&lt;br&gt;Telephone: +254-20-2221414 /5 /6 /7, 0720606707, 0734636737&lt;br&gt;Fax: +254-20-2221417&lt;br&gt;E-mail: <a href="mailto:cekenia@boikenya.com">cekenia@boikenya.com</a>&lt;br&gt;Website: <a href="http://www.bankofindia.com">www.bankofindia.com</a>&lt;br&gt;Physical Address: Bank of India Building, Kenyatta Avenue, Nairobi.&lt;br&gt;Date Licenced: 5th June, 1953&lt;br&gt;Peer Group: Medium&lt;br&gt;Branches: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Barclays Bank of Kenya Limited</strong>&lt;br&gt;Postal Address: P. O. Box 30120 – 00100, Nairobi&lt;br&gt;Telephone: +254-20-4254000, 4254601&lt;br&gt;Fax: +254-20-2213915&lt;br&gt;E-mail: <a href="mailto:barclays.kenya@barclays.com">barclays.kenya@barclays.com</a>&lt;br&gt;Website: <a href="http://www.barclayskenya.co.ke">www.barclayskenya.co.ke</a>&lt;br&gt;Physical Address: Barclays Westend, Waiyaki Way, Westlands, Nairobi.&lt;br&gt;Date Licenced: 1916&lt;br&gt;Peer Group: Large&lt;br&gt;Branches: 108&lt;br&gt;Sales Centre: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Charterhouse Bank Limited UNDER - STATUTORY MANAGEMENT</strong>&lt;br&gt;Postal Address: P. O. Box 43252 -00100 Nairobi&lt;br&gt;Telephone: +254-20-2242246/47/48/49&lt;br&gt;Fax: +254-20-2219058, 2223060, 2242248&lt;br&gt;E-mail: <a href="mailto:info@charterhouse-bank.com">info@charterhouse-bank.com</a>&lt;br&gt;Website: N/A&lt;br&gt;Physical Address: Longonot Place, 6th Floor, Kijabe Street, Nairobi&lt;br&gt;Date Licenced: 1st August 1998&lt;br&gt;Peer Group: Small&lt;br&gt;Branches: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Chase Bank (K) Limited IN RECEIVERSHIP</strong>&lt;br&gt;Postal Address: P. O. Box 66015-00800 Nairobi&lt;br&gt;Telephone: +254-20- 2774000, 0732174100, 0703074000, 0736- 432025, 0703074101.&lt;br&gt;Fax: +254-20-4454816/4454800-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Citibank N.A Kenya
   Postal Address: P. O. Box 30711 - 00100 Nairobi
   Telephone: +254-20-2754000/ 2711221
   Fax: +254-20-2714810/1
   E-mail: Kenya.citiservice@citi.com
   Website: http://www.citibank.co.ke
   Physical Address: Citibank House, Upper Hill Road, Upper Hill, Nairobi.
   Date Licenced: 1st July, 1974
   Peer Group: Medium
   Branches: 3;
   Agencies: 1

9. Commercial Bank of Africa Limited
   Postal Address: P. O. Box 30437-00100 Nairobi
   Telephone: +254-20-2884000, 2884444, 0711056000, 0732156000, 0734600234, 0732156444
   Fax: +254-20-2734599
   E-mail: iqueries@cbagroup.com ; contact@cbagroup.com
   Website: www.cbagroup.com
   Physical Address: CBA Building, Mara / Ragati Road, Upper Hill
   Date Licenced: 1st January, 1967
   Peer Group: Large
   Branches: 36;
   Agencies: 5

10. Consolidated Bank of Kenya Limited
    Postal Address: P. O. Box 51133 - 00200, Nairobi
    Telephone: +254-20-340208/340836, 340551, 340298, 340747,340298,211950, 0703016000
    Fax: +254-20-340836
    E-mail: headoffice@consolidated-bank.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Postal Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Co-operative Bank of Kenya Limited</td>
<td>P. O. Box 48231 - 00100 Nairobi</td>
<td>+254-20-3276000, 2776000, 0711049000, 0732106000</td>
<td>+254-20-2245506</td>
<td><a href="mailto:customerservice@co-opbank.co.ke">customerservice@co-opbank.co.ke</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.co-opbank.co.ke">www.co-opbank.co.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-operative House, 4th Floor Annex, Haile Selassie Avenue, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date Licenced: 1st July, 1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Credit Bank Limited</td>
<td>P. O. Box 61064-00200 Nairobi</td>
<td>+254-20-2222300/2220789/222317,2283000, 0728607701, 0738222300</td>
<td>+254-20-2216700</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@creditbankltd.co.ke">info@creditbankltd.co.ke</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.creditbank.co.ke">www.creditbank.co.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercantile House, Ground Floor, Koinange Street, Nairobi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date Licenced: 30th November, 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Development Bank of Kenya Limited</td>
<td>P. O. Box 30483 - 00100, Nairobi</td>
<td>+254-20-3340401 /2 /3, 3340416, 2251082, 3340198, 3340478, 3317449, 3344184, 2250143, 3317449, 3340416 0724253980/1, 0735046336</td>
<td>+254-20-2250399</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbk@devbank.com">dbk@devbank.com</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.devbank.com">www.devbank.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance House, 16th Floor, Loita Street, Nairobi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date Licenced: 20th September, 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Diamond Trust Bank Kenya Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Postal Address: P. O. Box 61711 – 00200, Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: +254-20-2849000, 0732121000, 0719031000, 0732121000, 0719031000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: +254-20-2245495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:info@dtbafrica.com">info@dtbafrica.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.dtbafrica.com">http://www.dtbafrica.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address: DTB Centre, Mombasa Road, Nairobi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Licenced: 15th November, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group: Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches: 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. DIB Bank (Kenya) Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address: P.O Box 6450-00200, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Centre Tel: +254-20- 5131300, +254 709 91 3000 Switch Board Tel: +254-20-5131311, +254 709 91 3111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:contactus@dibkenya.co.ke">contactus@dibkenya.co.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.dibkenya.co.ke">www.dibkenya.co.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address: Upper Hill Building, Bunyala, Lowerhill Road Junction, UpperHill, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Licenced: 13th April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Ecobank Kenya Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address: P. O Box 49584- 00100 Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: +254-20-2883000, 4968000, 0719098000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: +254-20- 2249670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:info@ecobank.com">info@ecobank.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.ecobank.com">www.ecobank.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address: Fortis Office Park – Off Waiyaki Way, Muthangari Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Licenced: 16th June, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group: Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches: 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. Spire Bank Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address: P. O. Box 52467-00200, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: +254-20- 4981000, 4981202, 4981301, 4981405, 0713600724, 0733333780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:letstalk@spirebank.co.ke">letstalk@spirebank.co.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.spirebank.co.ke">www.spirebank.co.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address: Equatorial Fidelity Centre, Waiyaki Way, Westlands, Nairobi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Bank Kenya Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Bank Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Commercial Bank Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **21. First Community Bank Limited**  
Postal Address: P. O. Box 26219-00100., Nairobi  
Telephone: +254-20-2843000-3, 07202843000, 0738-407521,  
Fax: +254-20-344101  
E-mail: info@fcb.co.ke  
Website: www.firstcommunitybank.co.ke  
Physical Address: Prudential Assurance Building, 1st Floor, Wabera Street, Nairobi.  
Date Licensed: 29th April, 2008  
Peer Group: Small  
Branches: 15 |
| **22. Guaranty Trust Bank (K) Ltd**  
Postal Address: P. O. Box 20613 – 00200, Nairobi  
Telephone: +254-20-3284000, 073084000  
Fax: +254-20-342024  
Website: www.gtbank.com  
Peer Group: Medium Branches: 16 |
| **23. Guardian Bank Limited**  
Postal Address: P. O. Box 67681 – 00200, Nairobi  
Telephone: +254-020-2226771, 2226774, 2226341, 2226483, 0722- 282213, 0733-888060  
Fax: +254-020 -2216633  
Website: www.guardian-bank.com  
Physical Address: Guardian Centre, Biashara Street, Nairobi. Date Licensed: 20th December, 1995  
Peer Group: Small Branches: 10 |
| **24. Gulf African Bank Limited**  
Postal Address: P. O. Box 43683 – 00100, Nairobi  
Telephone: +254-20-2740000, 2718608/9, 2740111, 0711075000  
Fax: +254-20-2715655  
Website: www.gulfafricanbank.com  
Physical Address: Geminia Insurance Plaza, Kilimanjaro Avenue, Upper Hill, Nairobi.  
Date Licensed: 1st November 2007  
Peer Group: Small  
Branches: 17 |
| **25. Habib Bank A.G Zurich**  
Postal Address: P. O. Box 30584 – 00100, Nairobi  
Telephone: +254-20-3341172/76/77, 3340835, 3310694, 0720208259  
Fax: +254-20-2217004 /2218699 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26. Habib Bank Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address: P. O. Box 43157 – 00100, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: +254-20-226433, 2222786, 2226401/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: +254-20-2224636, 2214636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:hblro@hblAfrica.com">hblro@hblAfrica.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.hbl.com">www.hbl.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address: Exchange Building, No.17, Koinange Street, Nairobi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Licenced: 2nd March, 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group: Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches: 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27. Imperial Bank Limited IN RECEIVERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address: P. O. Box 44905 – 00100, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: +254-20-2874000, 3343416, 0711-019000, 0732-119000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: +254-20-2719705/2719652, 3342374, 2719498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:info@imperialbank.co.ke">info@imperialbank.co.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.imperialbank.co.ke">www.imperialbank.co.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address: Imperial Court, Westlands Road, Westlands, Nairobi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Licenced: 8th January, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group: Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches: 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28. I &amp; M Bank Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address: P.O. Box 30238 – 00100, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: +254-20-3221000, 3271375/27, 0719088000, 0753221000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: +254-20-2711994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:invest@imbank.co.ke">invest@imbank.co.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.imbank.com">www.imbank.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address: I &amp; M Bank House, 2nd Ngong Avenue, Off Ngong Road, Nairobi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Licenced: 27th March, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group: Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches: 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. Jamii Bora Bank Limited
Postal Address: P. O. Box 22741 – 00400, Nairobi
Telephone: +254-20-2224238/9, 2214976, 2219626, 2210338/9, 0722-201112, 0734600682
Fax: +254-20-341825
E-mail: info@jamiiborabank.co.ke
Website: www.jamiiborabank.co.ke
Physical Address: Jamii Bora House, Koinange Street, Nairobi. Date Licenced: 2nd March, 2010
Peer Group: Small
Branches: 27

30. KCB Bank Kenya Limited
Postal Address: P. O. Box 48400 – 00100, Nairobi
Telephone: +254-20-3270000, 2851000, 2852000, 0711012000, 0734108200
Fax: +254-20-2242408' 2216405
E-mail: kcbhq@kcb.co.ke
Website: www.kcbbankgroup.com
Physical Address: Kencom House, 8th Floor, Moi Avenue, Nairobi.
Date Licenced: 1st January 1896
Peer Group: Large
Branches: 199

31. Middle East Bank (K) Limited
Postal Address: P. O. Box 47387 - 0100 Nairobi
Telephone: +254-20-2723120/24, 2722879, 2723124, 2723130, 0722- 205903, 0733-333441, 0731001310, 0717531448
Fax: +254-20-343776 / 2256901
E-mail: ho@mebenya.com
Website: www.mebkenya.com
Physical Address: Mebank Tower, Milimani Road, Milimani, Nairobi.
Date Licenced: 28th November, 1980
Peer Group: Small
Branches: 5

32. National Bank of Kenya Limited
Postal Address: P. O. Box 72866 - 00200 Nairobi
Telephone: +254-20-2828000, 0711-038000
Fax: +254-20-311444/2223044
E-mail: info@nationalbank.co.ke
Website: www.nationalbank.co.ke
Physical Address: National Bank Building, 2nd Floor, Harambee Avenue, Nairobi.
Date Licenced: 1st January, 1968
Peer Group: Medium
Branches: 81
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank Name</th>
<th>Postal Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Physical Address</th>
<th>Date Licenced</th>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>Branches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. NIC Bank Limited</td>
<td>P. O. Box 44599 - 00100 Nairobi</td>
<td>+254-20-2888000, 4849000, 0711041000, 0732141000</td>
<td>+254-20-2888505/13</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@nic-bank.com">info@nic-bank.com</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.nic-bank.com">www.nic-bank.com</a></td>
<td>N.I.C House, Masaba Road, Upper Hill, Nairobi</td>
<td>28th September, 1995</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. M-Oriental Bank Limited</td>
<td>P.O BOX 44080-00100, Nairobi</td>
<td>+254-20-2228461/2, 0734333291, 0722209585</td>
<td>+254 20 2219469</td>
<td><a href="mailto:headoffice@moriental.co.ke">headoffice@moriental.co.ke</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.moriental.co.ke">www.moriental.co.ke</a></td>
<td>Finance House, 7 Koinange Street, Nairobi</td>
<td>8th February, 1991</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Paramount Bank Limited</td>
<td>P. O. Box 14001 -00800 Nairobi</td>
<td>+254-20-4449266/7/8, 446106 /7, 4441528, 4441527, 0723564254, 0734258020, 0728-606652, 0735445506</td>
<td>+254-20-449265</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@paramountbank.co.ke">info@paramountbank.co.ke</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.paramountbank.co.ke">www.paramountbank.co.ke</a></td>
<td>Sound Plaza Building, 4th Floor, Woodvale Grove, Nairobi</td>
<td>5th July, 1995</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Prime Bank Limited</td>
<td>P. O. Box 43825 – 00100, Nairobi</td>
<td>+254-20-4203000 /116 /148, 4450810, 0722205491</td>
<td>+254-20-4451247</td>
<td><a href="mailto:headoffice@primebank.co.ke">headoffice@primebank.co.ke</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Name</td>
<td>Physical Address</td>
<td>Date Licensed</td>
<td>Peer Group</td>
<td>Branches</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Bank</td>
<td>Prime Bank Building, Chiromo Lane/Riverside Drive-Junction, Westlands, Nairobi.</td>
<td>3rd September, 1992</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidian Bank Limited</td>
<td>7th Floor K-Rep Centre, Wood Avenue, Kilimani, Nairobi.</td>
<td>23rd March, 1999</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanbic Bank Kenya</td>
<td>CFC Stanbic Centre, Chiromo Road, Westlands</td>
<td>1st June 2008</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Building-Westlands Road Chiromo Lane, Westlands, Nairobi.</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches</td>
<td>Agencies</td>
<td>Sales Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans-National Bank Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address: P. O. Box 34353 - 00100 Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: +254-20-2252216/19, 2224235/6, 2252188/90/91, 0720-081772, 0733-505656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: +254-20-2252225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:info@tnbl.co.ke">info@tnbl.co.ke</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.tnbl.co.ke">www.tnbl.co.ke</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address: Transnational Plaza, City Hall Way, Nairobi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Licenced: 8th January, 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group: Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches: 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. UBA Kenya Bank Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address: P. O. Box 34154 - 00100 Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: +254-020-3612000/1/2,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: +254-020-3612049, 0726-926367, 0735-500196/180/175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:ubakenya@ubagroup.com">ubakenya@ubagroup.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.ubagroup.com">www.ubagroup.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address: Apollo Centre, 1st Floor, Ring Road / Vale Close, Westlands, Nairobi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Licenced: 25th September, 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group: Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Victoria Commercial Bank Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address: P. O. Box 41114 - 00100 Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: +254-20-2719499, 2719815, 2710271, 2716108, 2719814.2713208, 2716196, 0721328183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: +254-20-2713778/2715857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail: <a href="mailto:victoria@vicbank.com">victoria@vicbank.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website: <a href="http://www.victoriabank.co.ke">www.victoriabank.co.ke</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address: Victoria Towers, Mezzanine Floor, Kilimanjaro Avenue, Upper Hill, Nairobi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Licenced: 11th January, 1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Group: Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II: INTRODUCTORY LETTER

Bank X Ltd, Kenya
P.O Box 123 – 0000
BankX@BankX.com
Nairobi, Kenya

United States International University – Africa
Off USIU Road, Off Thika Road (Exit 7),
P. O. Box 14634 - 00800,
+254-730-116414
csb@usiu.ac.ke
Nairobi, Kenya,

RE: REQUEST FOR DATA COLLECTION IN YOUR ORGANISATION

Annette Irungu is a graduate student pursuing her Master of Science in Organisational Development at the Chandaria School of Business. She is currently working on her research paper which is examining the effect of perceived voice on team cooperation in the Banking sector. This is a requirement for partial fulfilment of her degree of Master of Science in Organisational Development.

We would appreciate your participation in the attached questionnaire. The questionnaire will require approximately twenty minutes to complete. There is no compensation for responding nor is there any known risk. In order to ensure that all information will remain confidential, please do not include your name. If you choose to participate in this project, please answer all questions as honestly as possible and return the completed questionnaires promptly. Participation is strictly voluntary and you may refuse to participate at any time. In the event that you have queries and or concerns, please contact the student, Annette Irungu on Annetteirungu@gmail.com or Chandaria School of Business on csb@usiu.ac.ke. Thank you for taking the time to participate in the research questionnaire.
APPENDIX III: QUESTIONNAIRE
EFFECTS OF PERCEIVED VOICE ON TEAM COOPERATION IN THE BANKING SECTOR

Effect of Perceived Voice on Team cooperation in the Banking Sector in Kenya

This questionnaire is designed to collect information on employee voice and innovation in the Banking sector specifically focusing on Kenya. The purpose of this study is purely academic and is a requirement for partial fulfillment of my degree of Master of Science in Management and Organisational Development.

The questionnaire will take no more than 10 minutes to complete. All individual responses will be held in the strictest confidence and only group data will be reported. Kindly be honest with your answers so as to ensure accuracy and also precise information.

If you’d like any further information about the survey, please contact:
Annette Irungu: annetteirungu@gmail.com

Section A

1. What is your gender?
   □ Female
   □ Male

2. In which age bracket do you lie?
   □ Below 25 years
   □ 25 – 30 years
   □ 31 – 40 years
   □ 40 years and above

3. What is your highest level of education?
   □ Certificate
   □ Diploma
   □ Undergraduate
   □ Graduate
   □ Doctorate

4. Which institution do you work for?
   □ Standard Chartered Bank Limited Kenya
   □ ABSA (formerly Barclays Bank of Kenya)
5. How long have you worked at your current organisation?

☐ Less than 1 year
☐ 1 – 3 years
☐ 4 – 6 years
☐ 7 – 9 years
☐ More than 10 years

Section B

For Section B to section E of this questionnaire we will use the below metric or Likert scale to gauge our level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with regards to how things are done in your organisation.

1 – strongly disagree
2 – disagree
3 – neutral
4 – agree
5 – strongly agree

1. In my organisation I am taken seriously.
   ☐ Strongly disagree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Neutral
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Strongly agree

2. In my organisation I am trusted.
   ☐ Strongly disagree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Neutral
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Strongly agree

3. In my organisation I am important.
   ☐ Strongly disagree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Neutral
4. In my organisation I can make a difference.
   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Disagree
   □ Neutral
   □ Agree
   □ Strongly agree

5. In my organisation I am valuable.
   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Disagree
   □ Neutral
   □ Agree
   □ Strongly agree

6. In my organisation I am helpful.
   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Disagree
   □ Neutral
   □ Agree
   □ Strongly agree

7. In my organisation I count around here.
   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Disagree
   □ Neutral
   □ Agree
   □ Strongly agree

8. In my organisation I am co-operative.
   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Disagree
   □ Neutral
   □ Agree
   □ Strongly agree

9. In my organisation there is faith in me.
   □ Strongly disagree
   □ Disagree
   □ Neutral
   □ Agree
   □ Strongly agree
10. In my organisation I am efficient.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

**Section C**

1. People at lower levels in the organisation should carry out the requests of people at higher levels without questions.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

2. People at higher levels in organisations have a responsibility to make important decisions for people below them.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

3. Once a top-level executive makes a decision, people working for the company should not question it.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

4. In work related matters, managers have a right to expect obedience from their subordinates.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

5. A company's rules should not be broken, not even when the employee thinks it is in the company's best interest.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
Section D

1. My organisation values me as a person and personally supports me.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

2. The organisation cares about my well-being.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

3. My organisation shows concern for me as a person.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

4. My organisation strongly considers my personal goals and values.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

5. The organisation cares about my general satisfaction at work.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

6. My organisation cares about my opinions on personal matters.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Agree
7. The organisation tries to make my job as interesting as possible.

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Neutral
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree

8. My organisation cares about my opinions on work matters.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Neutral
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree

9. My organisation is willing to help when I need special favour.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Neutral
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree

10. Help is available from the organisation when I have a problem.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Neutral
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree

11. My organisation supports me in work matters.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Neutral
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree

12. The organisation would ignore any complaint from me.

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Neutral
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly agree

13. Even if I did the best job possible, the organisation would fail.

☐ Strongly disagree
14. The organisation disregards my best interests.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

15. The organisation takes pride in my accomplishments at work.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

**Section E**

1. Members of my team are willing to share information with team members about work.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

2. The team enhances communication among people working on the same product.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

3. Members cooperate to get work done.
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Strongly agree

Thank you for taking time to answer this questionnaire.
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