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### ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD</td>
<td>Human Resource Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTD</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTKL</td>
<td>Unilever Tea Kenya Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Delegation: This involves assigning additional duties to employees empowering them with more responsibility to enable them carry out the activities.

Employee Development: This is the process of making a progression or growths on an existing skill in employees through training, mentoring, participation and delegation.

Mentoring: Is the process of helping people to learn through guidance, advice and continuing support. A more senior and experienced employee is assigned to guide a junior and a less experienced employee.

Participation: It involves allowing employees to have a say in the issues that affect them in the performance of their day to day duties in their daily environment so that they have a sense of belong to the organization.

Organizational Performance: This is the result or the output of the organization that are measure on the goals and objectives measured in term of costs levels, productivity, innovation and task completion levels.

Productivity: Deals with quality and quantity of output in relation to the input required in production.

Training: Is the process whereby an individual is equipped with knowledge and skills of expertise through formal or informal setting. Formal setting includes organized workshops and seminars while informal settings involve imparting of skills through sharing ideas as a problem arise in the work environment.
The study was prompted by the fact that performance is a challenge to many organizations. It is hard to achieve the desired levels of performance hence the need to use human resource tools such as employee development. The study aimed at examining the effect of employee Development on performance with specific reference to the Unilever Kenya limited in Kericho County. The study was driven by the following objectives; to evaluate the influence of training, the effect of mentoring, the influence of participation and the influence of delegation on the organization performance. The findings are to be of great help to: tea firms in formulating employee development policies; it helps employees in the tea sector in their career development and human resource practitioners in formulating human resource development programs. It is to be of great importance to the researchers. The main theory the study used was the Human Relations theory. The study also used Human Resource Management and Resource based view Theories. The research design that was adopted was descriptive research design. The target population was 696 employees of Unilever Tea Kenya limited. Stratified and simple random sampling techniques were used. To obtain primary data questionnaires with both structured and unstructured questions were used. Descriptive and inferential statistics were both used in analysis. The findings indicated that there exist significant effect between employee development and the performance of the organization. Training and mentorship were significant in contributing to the performance and participation and delegation were not significant in affecting the performance. Productivity, cost, innovation and task completion level play significant importance in performance of the organization. In conclusion the performance of the organization is affected by employee development. The study recommends that the organization should input more on training and mentorship in employee development in order to improve overall organization performance.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

According to Dessler (2007), human resource management are rules and practices undertaken in carrying out the human resource features of a management condition which comprises job analysis, planning, selection, hiring, performance appraisal, orientation, training, compensation, development, firing and employment relation. Human resource management is contained of the policies, practices, and systems that affect the management of employees’ attitude, behaviour, and performance.

Sisson (2000), noted that globally the human resource development is crucial for business development and business success. The author observes that there exist no substitute to human resource development and training since it enhance effectiveness of the human labour as well as efficiency. He further affirms that it would be unproductive to select the best employees with high qualification in education level and certification without training them since they will be not efficient and effective in conducting the organization goals.

Bowra (2011) argues that organizations that are successful inclines to be gradually increase knowing that there are volumes of elements that are fundamental to performance of organization. Tharenou, Alan and Celia (2007) argued that the main purpose of HR development was to improve on the effectiveness of the business. They also related employee performance to be highly linked to the organization performance. Aguinis and Kraiger (2009) looks in term of improvement of revenues, productivity, effectiveness and profitability as directly affected by HR development.

Thang and Drik (2008) concur with Bowra that human resource influence the success of an organization and not the non-physical resources but the knowledge, expertise and features of the employees. An argument has been advanced by Evans, Pucik & Barsoux (2002) added that organization are affected by globalization, dynamics in innovation and technology, socio-economic and political environments and HR development is one of the adjustment that increases provide competitive advantage hence enhance the performance of the organization. They further argue that
organization’s responsibility should be to improve the employee performance through training and development in order to achieve organization performance.

Malaolu and Ogbuabor (2013) observe that human resource development is important in organization performance and production. He further noted that education system done not equip people in job skills on one’s employment area. It noted that few persons have the right skills, abilities, knowledge and competencies that fit the job specifications as well as make contribute to performance of the organization. According to Kamoche (2002) the development of manpower in Africa and specifically in Kenya has several problems in finding a matching manpower with the employment requirement. This is contributed by corruption, low education level, political instability, bureaucracy, diseases and low purchasing power.

1.1.1 Employee Development

Barlett (2001) claims development is a non-stop progression that affect the objectives and aspirations of the firm as it nature it in growth as individuals grow. The author affirms that money invested in development is money well invested and that Organizations use HR Practices as important tactical tools for stimulating favourable behaviour of workforces and providing skills, knowledge and abilities which should increase employees’ performance. Gubbins, Garavan, Hogan and Woodlock (2006) support this argument by affirming that it is for this reason that HR Development has been recognized as the most first activity of the human resource system.

Houger (2006) argue in the perspective that human resource is an intellectual property of the organization and is a source of competitive advantage to the organization this can be enhance more through building the competencies of the manpower. The author further observes that the employee should obtain necessary skills to improve in the so as to committing to their task.

1.1.2 Organizational Performance

Al Damoe (2012) claims that organization performance is always indicated by financial scales non-monetary, sales, market share and profit methods such as, commitment and efficiency of employee, organizations’ productivity, employees’ satisfaction, quality of service, and innovativeness. Olaniyan and Lucas (2008) argued that training and development created capacity building that maximize performance of
the organization. Afshan, Sobia, Kamran & Nasir (2012) note that human resource is important in fulfilling the organization objective and act as means of sustainable effective production. The need the manager to ensure that at any moment there should be adequate manpower that offer both technical and social competence and capability in specializing in department or specific managerial position.

Malaolu and Ogbuabor (2013) observe that labour-force development is very important for manpower efficiency and organization performance based on the idea that formal education does not offer adequate manpower skills to the employer. They further note that few individuals might have attain abilities, skills, competencies, and knowledge needed to for specific job undertaking and also make important influence to organizational performance. According to Kamoche (2002) noted that challenge in Africa and Kenya in specific relate both social and economic problems including corruption, poor infrastructure among other social-economic challenges.

1.1.3 Unilever Tea Kenya Limited

Tea is the second drunk liquid after water that employs more than 13 million employees in the world. Tea is produced from Asia and African countries from Sri Lanka, Turkey, Kenya, China and India which contribute for 76 percent of total production. About 85% of global tea is sold by multi-nationals, three of which control 1/5 of the market; Unilever Company 12 %, Tata Global Beverages Company 4% and Twinings Company 3% as cited by Groosman (2011). Kenya, Malawi and India represent the biggest three producers who were compliant in tea volume 2011/2012. The top five producers globally by 2011 were as follows: China 35%, India 21%, Kenya 8%, Sri Lanka 7%, and Turkey 5%. Approximately 577,000 metric tons were standard compliant in 2012, equivalent to 12 % of global production. Tea production has been increasing rapidly and this means very high competition in the world market.

Unilever Tea Kenya Ltd (UTKL), a subsidiary of Unilever, an Anglo-Dutch conglomerate, is involved in the production of tea, mainly for export. UTKL started as Brooke Bond Kenya Ltd (BBKL) in 1925. The name was changed to UTKL in 2004. In a half year period at end of June 2008, Unilever tea had a drop of 18% in sales and loss of Ksh 35 million. In January 2009 UTKL was delisted from NSE after Brooke Bond controlled 97.65% of its share holdings. This was because it did meet the
requirement that the listed organization should have more than a quarter of the equity owned by local shareholders.

Kenya being Africa’s leading tea producer and exporter of the crop while Unilever Tea Kenya Limited is the third biggest tea company. UTKL is the largest private buyer of smallholder tea. Unilever has three priorities for the development of its employees and they are: Build depth of capability and leadership; Live our values and build a performance culture; and to build an agile, flexible and diverse organisation. Through continuous improvement and assessment initiatives, Unilever has programme to address the implementation of continuous improvement. It has focused on ability to address the right personnel and its goal is to become the best employer in the region.

Talent and organization readiness assessment programme was launched in 2009 and was extended to the entire organization by 2010. The employee was the main beneficiary since the programme ensure the right skills and competence was grown and natured. These programme focus on company strategy that are important in developing the employee by ensuring skills, capabilities, right talent, organization and knowledge. The organization focused on revising recruitment strategies, organization structure revision and improve on core ability in decision making. This was done using training and development programs to enhance building capabilities levels.

Unilever envisions on recruiting, developing and training their staffs so that they can nature talent for high production. To ensure the realization of this the company established a learning hub by 2015 and new mobile was developed by 2016.

It is clear from the above background that the UTKL has not been able to achieve their desired levels of performance despite the fact that it has HRD programmes in place. The study therefore endeavours to find out what aspects of HRD need to be focussed on as research in the past as proofed that HRD is an effective tool in improving performance.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Performance is a challenge to many organisations. It is hard to achieve desired levels of performance hence the need to use HR tools such as motivation, performance appraisal and Employee Development. Most organizations have employee Development programs in place but despite their presence, the performance of the same organizations has never been up to the company’s desired level. There is low level of performance due to variation in employee Development.

The firms in the tea sector have employee development programmes in place but despite this the costs of production have been rising as argued by Wachira (2002). According to Randy Altman (2001), for a long duration poor revenue has been a challenge, tea management as a result, are now focusing on cost reduction. In real situation if the tea prices rises in internal market the profit increases in greater margin with reduced overall production costs.

A company’s employee development actions should therefore assist it realise its corporate strategy hence improve its performance. Despite the widely applauded effect that Employee development has on employee and organizational performance, not much literature exists on the same in Kenya and specifically in the tea sector. The opportunities and challenges in the tea industry of the producing countries can be grouped together under a common slogan “competitiveness in cost and quality” as pointed out by N. Yogaratnam (2007).

Colombo and Stanca (2008) state that the limiting factor of organization performance is inadequate training. Sometimes employees are provided with all utilities and equipped with right skills but they may still underperform. According to Adenji (2002) he noted that the missing ingredient to performance is knowledge and skill which ensure that the employee is developed.

The literature from (Jackson 2002 Debrah & Ofori 2006, Harvey 2002; Kraak 2005, Kamoche, Debrah, Hortwiz & Muuka 2004, Harvey, Matt & Milord 2002 and Kamoche 2002) provided a rather general human resource focus creating a gap. This study will provide contribution on human resource knowledge that can be incorporated to employee development for it to be an effective tool in improving performance in general and in particular the tea sector.
1.3 Objectives of the Study

It comprise of general and specific objectives.

1.3.1 General Objective

The general objective of the study is to assess the performance of UTKL.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were:-

i. To examine the effect of training on performance of Unilever Tea Kenya Limited in Kericho County.

ii. To establish the effect of mentoring on performance of Unilever Tea Kenya Limited in Kericho County.

iii. To evaluate the influence of employee participation on performance of Unilever Tea Kenya Limited in Kericho County.

iv. To examine the influence of Delegation on performance of Unilever Tea Kenya Limited in Kericho County.

1.4 Research Hypothesis

The following are research hypothesis relating to the study:-

\( H_01 \): There is no significant effect of training on the performance.

\( H_02 \): There is no significant effect of mentoring on the performance.

\( H_03 \): There is no significant influence of employee participation on the organizational performance.

\( H_04 \): There is no significant influence of delegation on the organizational performance.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The findings of the study are significant to the following groups in different ways as discussed below. The findings contribute greatly to the framework on the management of human resource in Tea Firms in Kericho County and among other companies. It provides employee development and how to enhance the performance
of the organization. The study is going to aid organizational management to provide modern programs of developing through training, seminars, workshops and mentorship among many other employee development methods.

It is expected that the findings of this study is going help highlight the ways in which human resource development can be beneficial in developing career for the employees. This will encourage increase of performance of human resource that is required for competitive advantage of the organization to compete well in the competitive environment.

Human resource practitioners will benefit from the findings of the research in terms of development of policies. It provides the guideline on development of programs, strategies development and policies that will assist in increasing organization performance

The findings from this research are also beneficial to researchers who intend to carry out their research in future in the same area. The study provides relevant literature for the researchers and also a base in which they can establish a concept that can be further researched on.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study was done in Unilever Tea Kenya Ltd in Kericho County as at 2016-2017. Kericho County was selected since most tea firms are located in Kericho. UTKL was selected since it has unique employee development program. The study involved all employees in the company from managers, supervisors and supporting staff. The study was limited to only human resource development and organizational performance with the following as the independent variable; training, mentoring, participation and delegation.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

Most companies do not divulge information easily regarding their strategies and policies; limited access to information in Unilever was a big challenge as some employees were hesitant to offer the information freely for fear of victimization. This challenge was over come by assuring the respondents that the research was for purely academic purposes. A letter from Kenyatta University was used as a proof of this.
The study was limited to only one company in the tea sector in a range of so many different organisations. For a more conclusive result, all the organisations should be studied. This was not possible however due to financial, time and other resources’ constraints. The study was limited to only four independent variables; training, mentoring, participation and delegation in a range of so many other variables of employee development.

Since it was not possible to verify if the respondents gave the researcher true responses the study held the assumption that the responses given by the respondents were true.

1.8 Organization of the Study
Chapter one consist of the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research hypothesis, significances of the study, scope of the study and limitation of the study.

On section two comprises of theoretical review, empirical review, research gap and conceptual framework.

Chapter three has research design used in the research, target population, sample design, instruments used in research and data analysis procedures. It enabled the researcher to collect the desired data that is used in the study to conduct findings and conclusion.

Chapter four contains the findings, analysis and its discussion. The analysis contains both descriptive and inferential statistics. The sub section was discussed starting from respondent demographic data, summaries of specific objectives in order and inferential section that uses regression analysis to display the relationship between dependent variable and independent variable.

Chapter five introduces a segment where the conclusions and recommendations concerning the training, mentoring, participation and delegation are discussed. It also gives summary on areas to be considered by future researchers.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review
Theoretical literature discusses the theories that guided the study. Three theories were used to underpin the study namely: Raymond Miles’ human resource management theory, Resource Based Theory by Penrose and Human relations theory.

2.1.1 Human resource Management Theory

The theory of human resource management was developed by Raymond Miles in 1965. It directs that labor force has untapped resources. Miles argued that every employee come into a firm with several different resources that can be tapped by the management to increase overall production. This includes physical energy and skills self-direction, capabilities and creativity to enable the organization to maximize employee performance. The main purpose of the manager is to focus on controlling and directing employees and make major decision based on the human resource skills and capabilities in the organization. Communication was treaded to be crucial and bi-direction between the employee and the employer. It also should provide inclusiveness in decision making and encourage participation. It explained further that most firms have untapped human resource and encouraged participation in order to achieve organizational performance and productivity (Miles & Ritchie, 1971).

This theory is relevant to the study as the organization needs to appreciate the fact that the employees which are human resources are reservoirs of untapped resources and therefore the need to invest heavily on their development using a variety of strategies in order to tap out the resources contained in them and thus improve the performance of the organization. It also supports one of the independent variable, participation.

2.1.2 Resource-based theory

RBV theory, combines the views of organization economics and strategic management by Penrose (1959) and Barney (1991) respectively. Competitive advantage was achievable if the resource of the organization are costly, rare and valuable. RBV enable firms to gain competitive advantage by utilizing all resource available which includes human resource to be able to highly perform. It is then
important to develop major resources to counter futuristic fulfilment of market competition. This gives the organization a super position in order to solve the dynamics of the market and resources available in the organization.

The above theory is applicable to the study as it highlights the need for the organization to enable its resources meet two of the outlined characteristics. For an organization to remain competitive and thus improve its performance, its employees must undergo employee development so as to become valuable and costly to imitate. There is a need therefore for an organization to enable its employees which is the most important resource that they have, to meet the criteria. This can only be achieved through employing of effective employee development so as to make them different and unique from the employees of other organizations.

2.1.3 Human Relations Theory

Human relation theory was established in 1920’s in United State of America to solve social issues and provide policies in labour issues. Human Relations theory developed was to counter the issues of Taylorism that was more scientific management system by introducing socio-psychological technic of solving issues within human resource. As the basis of its new methods of intensifying and increasing labour productivity, theory proposed that human psychological and ethical characteristic like motivation, goals and values were taken into account. According to Human Relations and management theory, it found that there are positive management actions used in improving performance through motivation. These are widely stated in motivation theory that provide employee to play or rest, share vision and mission of the organization and empowerment of the employees through innovation and independency of decision making. It advocates for the training and developing of workforce provides inner synergy of capabilities and high performance. Lastly it advocates for the provision of suitable acknowledgement and incentive when they achieve company objective.

The above theory is relevant as it supports almost all the independent variables and some of the dependent variables of the study. The theory advocates for training and development of employees. Empowerment, innovation and making independent
decisions which require participatory approach as indicated in the conceptual framework. Giving freedom and responsibility is associated with delegation.

2.2. Empirical Review

This section reviews the studies that have been carried out in the topic under study and those that have been carried out on each of the independent variable.

2.2.1 Employee Development

Barlett (2001) claims development is a non-stop progression that affect the objectives and aspirations of the firm as it nature it in growth as individuals grow. The author affirms that money invested in development is money well invested and that Organizations use HR Practices as important tactical tools for stimulating favourable behaviour of workforces and providing skills, knowledge and abilities which should increase employees’ performance. Gubbins, Garavan, Hogan and Woodlock (2006) support this argument by affirming that it is for this reason that HR Development has been recognized as the most first activity of the human resource system.

Houger (2006) argue in the perspective that human resource is an intellectual property of the organization and is a source of competitive advantage to the organization this can be enhance more through building the competencies of the manpower. The author further observes that the employee should obtain necessary skills to improve in the so as to committing to their task.

Another study was carried out by Asfaw, Argaw and Bayissa (2015) on the effect of employee development on the performance and effectiveness of the employee in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia at District Five Administrative office. Data was collected through systematic technique with a respond rate of ninety four percent indicated that there was correlation and significant relationship between employee development and the performance of employee. The gap that exists in this study since it only focussed on one measure of performance, which is employee effectiveness. The current research intends to focus on four measures of performance which are; reduction in costs, productivity, innovation and task completion level. The research also was conducted in the administrative sector different from the tea sector where the current
study is being carried out. Ethiopia also is a different setting from Kenya where the current study took place.

2.2.2 Organizational Performance

Al Damoe (2012) claims that organization performance is always indicated by financial scales non-monetary, sales, market share and profit methods such as, commitment and efficiency of employee, organizations’ productivity, employees’ satisfaction, quality of service, and innovativeness. Olaniyan and Lucas (2008) argued that training and development created capacity building that maximize performance of the organization. Afshan, Sobia, Kamran & Nasir (2012) note that human resource are important in fulfilling the organization objective and act as means of sustainable effective production. The need the manager to ensure that at any moment there should be adequate manpower that offer both technical and social competence and capability in specializing in department or specific managerial position.

Malaolu and Ogbuabor (2013) observe that labour-force development is very important for manpower efficiency and organization performance based on the idea that formal education does not offer adequate manpower skills to the employer. They further note that few individuals might have attain abilities, skills, competencies, and knowledge needed to for specific job undertaking and also make important influence to organizational performance. According to Kamoche (2002) noted that challenge in Africa and Kenya in specific relate both social and economic problems including corruption, poor infrastructure among other social-economic challenges.

2.2.3 Training and Performance

According to Wright & Geroy (2001) the argued that the competence of the employee is dynamic based on the input of the training undertaken. Through training human capital would not only be improved in performance but also in the effectiveness of the employer in the current position in attitude, knowledge and skills. This leads to high performance in from the employer to the entire organization. Harrison (2000), Guest (1997), and Appiah (2010) agreed that performance was linked to the training and positively associated toe employee performances which benefit the employee through development of competencies, knowledge, ability, behaviour and skills. The benefits are also to the organization in realization of the organization goals and high production.
A study was carried out by Saghir (2014) on the effect of training development on employee performance in supermarket industry research in Karachi, Pakistan. The research took 100 respondents as the sample size and used questionnaires to gather information. The findings indicate a positive and significant association between training and development and employee performance in the supermarket within Pakistan. There is a research gap that exists in this study as the research was done in the supermarket industry. The researcher would thus want to explore if the same exists in the tea industry. The research was also carried out in Pakistan whose setting is different from Kenya where the current research took place.

A study was carried out in Nigeria by Malaola and ogbuabor (2013) on the effects of training and manpower development in employees’ productivity and organizational performance, using First Bank Of Nigeria PLC as a case study. The study applied structured questionnaires to a sample size of 75 drawn by simple random sampling. The data generated was analysed using descriptive statistics. The findings of the study show that majority (70%) of the respondents agreed that training and manpower development has enhanced their efficiency and job productivity. Secondly, Majority (80%) of the respondents agreed that manpower development enhanced organizational performance. A research gap exists in the above study as the researcher only found out that training and development enhances effectiveness and productivity, this research would thus want to find out if it also affects the level of costs, innovation and tasks completion level. The sector, in which the study was done the banking sector, is different from the current sector of study the tea sector. The country of study also differs the above study was done in Nigeria while the current study was done in Kenya.

2.2.4 Mentoring and performance

Hezlett (2005) and Gibson (2007) argue that employees should be able to manage their own career responsibly. This can be done mentorship programme and there is increase in mentoring for realization of continuous learning and ability to develop employment. Bierema and Hill (2005) agree to the fact that mentoring remain to be the cheapest way of improvement and development process in human resource. Researcher recommends that mentoring is one of the important strategy to consider in human resource development process. This would enable organization to attract and
retain organization objective best suited for organization that use it learning as foundation to the company. They further argued that mentoring ensure strategic alignment of programs and practice both with the organization and acquire knowledge from other organization. According to Hegstad and Wentling (2004), other from recent research over 500 companies received human resource development through career development and management training initiative where mentoring is operative technique in changing organization.

De Janasz, Sullivan and Whiting (2003) noted that mentoring network enable employees to dynamically succeed in workplace this characterised by dynamic organizational structures and careers. The effect of mentoring has increase effectiveness as means of coping with the change of the organization. A study carried out by Nyawira and Dr. Iravo (2014) on the role of mentoring programmes on the employee performance in organizations: a survey of public universities in Nyeri County, Kenya. The study used a survey design to collected and analyse university data. The study targeted the top, middle, academic and non-academic staff. The study evaluated the relationship between mentorship and performance and was found to be significant. Mentorship played a role in skills enhancement, transfer of knowledge and career development. There is a research gap in the above study since it was carried out in Nyeri County a Geographical location that is different from Kericho County where the current study is taking place.

A study was conducted by Lankau and Scandura (2002) on how people learned in mentoring relationships. The study surveyed 440 employees in a non-profit hospital in the south-eastern United States on whether they had a mentor, their degree of role ambiguity, level of job satisfaction, intention to leave and aspects of learning in a mentoring relationship. The study found out that mentoring was significantly related to skill development. It also found out that mentoring was related to organizational commitment as well as job satisfaction. The above study shows the relationship between mentoring and organizational commitment and job satisfaction but does not show the effect that mentoring has on service quality, productivity, profitability and innovation thus creating a research gap.
2.2.5 Participation and performance

According to Kearney and Hays (1994) argued that participation of workforce in work place are linked highly to improve organization performance. This is because it leads to employee commitment, morale, satisfaction and motivation. On the same note Jarrar and Zaiziri (2002) affirm that participative decision making results to employee empowerment and allows them to use their full abilities in there undertaking in the organization hence make the organization gain competitive advantage. Murew (1967) suggested by participation one allows the employee to give and provide their view in processes, procedures and policies that affect both direct and indirect the firm and employees.

A study carried out by Ezennaya (2011) on Employee participation in decision making and its impact on productivity in Nigeria presents yet another research gap. The study used three publishing firms in Nigeria in Enugu urban. The study conducted used 105 questionnaires and through interview the study obtained information from manager and employees. The study revealed that there is a positive relationship between participative management and performance. It revealed that investors who practice participation has not yield the desired output to the desired level of production. The above study presents a research gap as it does not investigate the impact that employee participation has on innovation in the organization.

Another study on the influence of participation in decision making of and employee to the commitment among the staff of the university both private and public in Kenya was carried out by Wainaina (2014). The findings indicated that employee participation in making decision affected the university academic staff’s through increasing their commitment and organization performance in Kenya. The statistic was derived from sample16 universities selected randomly from Kenya. The study left a gap as it only shows that employee participation increases organizational commitment of employees thus failing to show its impact on innovation. This research intends to fill in the gap.

2.2.6 Delegation and Performance

According to Al-Jammal (2015) delegation is one of the current trends that manager’s practise and its function stand out as it support the increase of the level of motivation
of workforce. When motivation is elevated the performance of an employee increase. On organization level it leads to increase in productivity, innovation and invention, competitive advantage and speed finalising tasks effectively. Yukl, (2002) argues that there are numerous reasons that can lead to manager delegating where the main reason is to develop the confidence and skills of their junior.

A study was carried out by Hamdan, Akif and Mohammad (2015) on the impact of delegation of authority on employees’ performance at great Irbid Municipality in Jordan. The findings showed that there is a statistically significant relationship between delegations of authority on, empowerment, effectiveness and efficiency of employees’ productivities. There is a research gap in the above study as it was undertaken in Jordan whose geographical location is different from the one of the current study that is taking place in Africa, Kenya.

Another study carried out by Bogomba on effects of delegation on Employee performance in savings and credit co-operative societies in Kisii County, Kenya reveals another research gap. The target population was 13 SACCOS in Kisii County with 1040 respondents. Four SACCOS which had been in operation for at least 10 years were sampled using descriptive research. A sample of 24 employees from each SACCO was sampled randomly. Questionnaires were used to collect data. The study established that effective delegation in organizations improves employee performance and organizational performance at large. The above study has a research gap as it was carried out in a different county from the one where the current research is being done. The sector under which the study was conducted is different from the tea sector where the current study was done.

2.3 Summary of empirical literature and research gaps

Research gaps exist on the basis of location of study, Measurement of performance in terms of costs levels, productivity, innovation and task completion level. The past studies on the effect of employee development on performance reveals several gaps as summarised in the table below and the various research gaps identified give a justification that the research needed to be conducted so as to fill these gaps.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Topic of the research</th>
<th>Findings of the research</th>
<th>Research Gap</th>
<th>Focus of the current study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saghir (2014)</td>
<td>Employee development on employee performance</td>
<td>The relationship between employee development and performance were significantly positive.</td>
<td>Region where the study was done of study (Carried out in Pakistan in the supermarket industry) while the current study was carried out in Kenya in the Tea industry</td>
<td>Employee development on performance in the tea sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asfaw, Argaw and Bayissa</td>
<td>Impact of employee development on employee performance</td>
<td>Employee development is positively correlated with employee performance</td>
<td>Effectiveness as a measure of performance was used while the current study was Task completion level, Productivity, Costs and innovation as measures of performance</td>
<td>Employee development on performance on task completion level, productivity, costs levels and innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaola and Ogbuabor</td>
<td>Effects of training and manpower development in organizational performance</td>
<td>Training and manpower development enhance organizational performance</td>
<td>Efficiency and productivity were used as measures of performance</td>
<td>Performance was measured using task completion level, costs level and innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lankau and Scandura (2002)</td>
<td>Relationship of learning and mentorship on the performance</td>
<td>Mentoring is positively related to skill development.</td>
<td>Effect of mentoring on organizational commitment and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Mentoring on performance in terms of communication and developed relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezennaya (2011)</td>
<td>Employee participation on decision making and its impact on productivity</td>
<td>There is a positive relationship between participative management and productivity.</td>
<td>Effect of employee participation on productivity</td>
<td>Participation on performance in terms of decision making and representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamdan, Akif and Mohammed (2015)</td>
<td>Impact of delegation of authority on employee performance</td>
<td>There is a statistically significant relationship between delegations of authority on employee performance.</td>
<td>Effect of delegation on employee effectiveness and efficiency.</td>
<td>Delegation of authority on performance in terms of responsibilities held and number of tasks delegated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4 Conceptual framework

Figure indicate the conceptual framework elements of dependent and independent variables. The performance of the firm, measured by the task completion level, productivity, costs or the rate of innovations, is the dependent variable. This is influenced by the human resource development programmes of the organization. The HR development programmes include the training, mentoring, participation, and delegation.
When employees are trained the level of costs is affected which in turn affects the profits of the organization hence affecting organizational performance. Mentoring of employees affects the productivity of the organization in terms of tonnes of tea produced. Participation of employees in decision making on issues that directly affect the performance of their duties, affects innovation in the organization. Delegation of duties and authority to employees affects the time that is required to complete the task in terms of hours.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design

A research design is the main plan used by the researcher that provides solution to the four issues; what questions, relevance, data collection and analysis of the findings (Yin, 2003). Creswell (2004) posits that there are two general types of methodology called qualitative and quantitative research methods. The study used descriptive design and involved use of both primary and secondary data. It provides in-depth description of information concerning attitude, character and norms of specific item, phenomenal and event.

3.2 Target population

Bartony (2001) noted that target population is a group of subject from which information can be extracted for the purpose of collection of data through instrument like questionnaire. These individuals have the desired characteristics where the researcher will source the information needed for the research findings and conclusion Creswell (2004).

The target population in this study involved the total number of employees of Unilever Tea Kenya Ltd. The target population were 696 staff of Unilever Tea Kenya Ltd (Unilever Tea Kenya Ltd Human Resource Record of 2016).

Table 3.2.1: Distribution of Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>POPULATION SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Staff</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Staff</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>696</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher(2016)
3.3 Sampling design

According to Mugenda & Mugenda (2003), sampling is simply the selecting a portion of the population, in your research area, which were a representation of the whole population. Stratified random sampling which is one method of probability sampling was used to divide the staff population into homogeneous subgroups and then do simple random sample in each subgroup.

After the Simple random sampling a percentage were taken to ensure that the sample is representative in proportion to their number in population. For descriptive studies, 10% of the population is adequate for sampling, Mugenda & Mugenda (2003).

Calculation of the sample:

Management: \( \frac{10}{100} \times 48 = 5 \)

Supervisory Staff: \( \frac{10}{100} \times 72 = 8 \)

Support staff: \( \frac{10}{100} \times 576 = 58 \)

Below is tabulation of how the sample was derived.

**Table 3.3.1: The Sampling Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>POPULATION SIZE</th>
<th>SAMPLE (10%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Staff</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Staff</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>696</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2016)

3.4 Data collection

A questionnaire with structured and unstructured questions was used to collect data. According to Kothari (2003), structured questions (closed ended) refer to questions which are accompanied by a list of possible alternative answers from which respondents select the answer that best describes their situation. Closed ended
questions are easier to analyze and administer because of specific alternative answers, however they are difficult to construct and responses are limited. Questions were therefore be standardized to ensure all respondents reply to same questions in a defined manner.

Open ended questions were used in some specific areas that require explanations. The questionnaires were delivered by hand to each subject by the researcher who were then instruct the subject on how to complete the questionnaire and also marked clarifications on issues that required to be clarified.

3.4.1 Validity
Research instruments should measure precisely what they are meant to measure Kathufi and Pals, (1993). Because instruments only produce good results when validated by an expert, the researcher sought the opinion of the supervisor. Opinions of peers were also sought. The experts were asked to give their opinion on clarity, ambiguity, level of language used and any other information on the questionnaire in order to make instruments valid.

3.4.2 Reliability
Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) recommended that the consistency levels of research instruments are vital in determining whether data collected from these instruments is to be reliable. Statistical package for social sciences (SPSS version 21.0) was used to test the reliability of the study and obtained 0.78. Punch (1998) argues that a value of between 0.75 and 1.0 reliability of the instrument is acceptable. The result value of 0.78 obtained was thus acceptable as it is within the range.

3.5 Data analysis
Creswell (2004) describes data analysis as organization, presentation, analysis and interpretation of data extracted from research collection instrument. This is to reduce intelligible and interpretable form in order to give solution to the problem statement. The data obtained was analysed where descriptive and inferential statistics were done with an aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Multiple regression was done using the following formula;
The model as results was given by:

\[ Y = -0.149 + 0.418X_1 + 0.455X_2 + 0.137X_3 + 0.050X_4 \]

Where:
- \( X_1 \) – Training,
- \( X_2 \) – Mentoring,
- \( X_3 \) – Participation,
- \( X_4 \) – Delegation
- \( Y \) – Performance.

**Table 3.5.1: Operationalization and measurement of variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Development</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Costs levels</td>
<td>Rating scale of 1-5 Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge</td>
<td>Number of tasks performed in official hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Productivity in terms of tons of tea</td>
<td>Rating scale of 1-5 Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>Number of formal reports on mentorship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Developed relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Innovations</td>
<td>Rating scale of 1-5 Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Decision making</td>
<td>Number of meetings where employees are involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Tasks completion levels</td>
<td>Rating scale of 1-5 Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assignment of tasks</td>
<td>Number of formal communication on assigned responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational performance</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Costs levels</td>
<td>Profit margins</td>
<td>Rating scale of 1-5 Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>Output levels in tonnes of tea produced</td>
<td>Rating scale of 1-5 Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Innovations</td>
<td>Number of new products</td>
<td>Rating scale of 1-5 Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Tasks completion level</td>
<td>Time in hours</td>
<td>Rating scale of 1-5 Nominal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Ethical Considerations
Informed consent was used by the researcher hence all the respondents was informed that their participation should be voluntary. No respondent were forced to participate against their wish. Participants were assured of anonymity and confidentiality with regard to their responses.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Responses Rate
The respondent rate for the distribution was given by 62 (87.3%) of the respondent.

Table 4.1.1: Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not responded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research (2017)

According to Punch (2003) a good response rate should be over 80%, making the results to be reliable. The result of demographic data indicated the gender distribution, age of the respondent, and management level. The data was presented in the following frequency distribution and charts.

Table 4.1.2: Reliability table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach C</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research (2017)

The result from reliability was given as follows; training, mentoring, employee participation and delegation with Cronbach constants were 0.783, 0.801, 0.794 and 0.811 respectively produced using SPSS 21.0. According to Punch (1998) who recommended that between 0.75 and 1.0 was reliable for the findings to be done obtained.

4.3 General Information of Respondents
These are information concerning gender, age and management level. As it is presented and discussed in the following table and discussion thereafter.
Table 4.3.1: Gender of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research (2017)

The male and female were equal in distribution with male 31(50.0%) and female 31(50.0%). The proportion as represented showed equal representation of gender as shown in table 4.3.1.

Table 4.3.2: Age of the Respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research (2017)

The data result was represented as follows: 25-35 years were 41(66.1%), 35-45 years were 19(30.6) and 46-55 years were 2(3.2%). The mode statistics is represented by the age between 25-35 years with 41(66.1%). This means that the most highly represented age in the organization was given by young age group which are between 25-35 years. This decreases as one get older hence there is tapping new energy from youth. The data indicated the proportion diminishing with the age. The youth forming the highest representation and the old age reduce with none who was over 55 years represented in the data collected.

Table 4.3.3: Management level of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research (2017)
Table 4.3.3 represents the management level from the management staff, supervisory staff and support staff. The support staff with 47(75.8%) was the highest and supervisory staff at 10(16.1%) and finally the smallest group was from management staff representing 5(8.1%). The mode variable was from the subordinate group which always represents the largest group of individual within a working environment. The higher the management level the lower the representation. The supporting staff represented a large rate from the other management level. It represents the highest respondent in overall.

4.4 Descriptive Statistics on Employee Development

This section covers responses on; training, mentoring, participation and delegation. The responses were rated strongly agree (SA = 5), agree (A = 4), neutral (N =3), disagree (D = 2) and strongly disagree (SD = 1).

Table 4.4.1: Response on Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
<th>5(SA)</th>
<th>4(A)</th>
<th>3(N)</th>
<th>2(D)</th>
<th>1(SD)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training affect level of cost</td>
<td>19(30.6%)</td>
<td>37(59.7%)</td>
<td>4(6.5%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.1452</td>
<td>0.7649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training affect productivity</td>
<td>18(29.0%)</td>
<td>38(61.3%)</td>
<td>4(6.5%)</td>
<td>4(6.5%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.1613</td>
<td>0.6822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training affect automated machines</td>
<td>5(8.1%)</td>
<td>44(71.0%)</td>
<td>6(9.7%)</td>
<td>6(9.7%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>3.7419</td>
<td>0.8085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training affect new products</td>
<td>9(14.5%)</td>
<td>36(58.1%)</td>
<td>12(19.4%)</td>
<td>5(8.1%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>3.7903</td>
<td>0.8575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training skills affects task</td>
<td>12(19.4%)</td>
<td>42(67.7%)</td>
<td>3(4.8%)</td>
<td>3(4.8%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>3.9516</td>
<td>0.8575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training affects performance</td>
<td>12(19.4%)</td>
<td>46(74.2%)</td>
<td>3(4.8%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.1129</td>
<td>0.5464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2017)

Table 4.4.1 represents training analysis which indicated that training affected the level of cost of the organization starting with strongly agreed 19(30.6%), agreed 37(59.7%), neutral 4(6.5%), disagreed 2(3.2%) and strongly disagreed 0(0%) responses respectively. The mean was 4.145, median and mode at 4.00. The
mean indicated that training affected the level of cost to a great extent. The variation in the level of cost due to training is low (standard deviation of 0.76494).

Training was also measured against productivity the data and 18(29.0%) strongly agreed, 38(61.3%) agreed, 4(6.5%) neutral, 4(6.5%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. It was then found that the mean statistics was 4.16, with both mode and median at 4.00. The mean showed that training has higher effect on the productivity. Productivity improves significantly because of training (mean of 4.161). The deviation in productivity due to training is low (standard deviation of 0.682). Training enables individual to acquire knowledge and skills which helps in improvement of personal development that yield high performance in the overall production.

Training did affect the number of automated machines because 5(8.1%), 44(71.0%), 6(9.7%), 6(9.7%) and 1(1.6%) respondent from strongly agreed, agreed, undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. The mean statistics of 3.7419 implied that training moderately affected the number of automated machines. The variation due to training was low (standard deviation of 0.8085).

The results on training measured on new products indicated 9 (14.5%) strongly agreed, 36(58.1%) agreed, 12(19.4%) neutral, 5(8.1%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. The results indicated that training significantly improved the number of new products (mean of 3.79). The improvement in products did vary significantly (standard deviation of 0.792).

Training did affect the number of tasks completed by individuals; 12(19.4%) strongly agreed, 42(67.7%) agreed, 3(4.8%) neutral, 3(4.8%) disagreed and 2(3.2%) strongly disagreed. The mean statistics was given as 3.95 which was not far from both mode and median which was given by 4.00. It was then noted that training did influence to moderately high extend the task completed by individuals. The variation in task completion was low (standard deviation of 0.8575).

About 12(19.4%) strongly agreed that training affect performance 46(74.2%) agreed, 3(4.8%) neutral, 1(1.6%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. Indeed training affected the performance of the organization. Training greatly determined performance significantly (mean of 4.113). The variation in performance due to training was low (standard deviation of 0.54637).
The findings support the findings of the study carried out by Saghir (2014) on the effect of training development on employee performance in supermarket industry research in Karachi, Pakistan. The findings indicate a positive and significant association between training and development and employee performance in the supermarket within Pakistan. The above findings also affirm those of the study carried out in Nigeria by Malaola and Ogbuabor (2013) on the effects of training and manpower development in employees’ productivity and organizational performance, using First Bank Of Nigeria PLC as a case study. The findings of the study show that majority (70%) of the respondents agreed that training and manpower development has enhanced their efficiency and job productivity. Secondly, majority (80%) of the respondents agreed that manpower development enhanced organizational performance.

Table 4.4.2: Response on Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
<th>5(SA)</th>
<th>4(A)</th>
<th>3(N)</th>
<th>2 (D)</th>
<th>1 (SD)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring affects level of cost</td>
<td>14(22.6%)</td>
<td>42(67.7%)</td>
<td>4(6.5%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.0968</td>
<td>0.6455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring affects level of production</td>
<td>9(14.5%)</td>
<td>48(77.4%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>3(4.8%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.0161</td>
<td>0.6138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring influence form of reports</td>
<td>9(14.5%)</td>
<td>46(74.2%)</td>
<td>4(6.5%)</td>
<td>3(4.8%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>3.9839</td>
<td>0.6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring affects automated machines</td>
<td>12(19.4%)</td>
<td>34(54.8%)</td>
<td>11(17.7%)</td>
<td>4(6.5%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>3.6290</td>
<td>0.9449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring affects new products</td>
<td>12(19.4%)</td>
<td>34(54.8%)</td>
<td>11(17.7%)</td>
<td>4(6.5%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>3.8387</td>
<td>0.8720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring affects task</td>
<td>14(22.6%)</td>
<td>40(64.5%)</td>
<td>4(6.5%)</td>
<td>4(6.5%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.0323</td>
<td>0.7459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring affects reports made</td>
<td>8(12.9%)</td>
<td>46(74.2%)</td>
<td>5(8.1%)</td>
<td>3(4.8%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>3.9516</td>
<td>0.6383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring affects performance</td>
<td>9(14.5%)</td>
<td>51(82.3%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.0968</td>
<td>0.4690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2017)
Mentoring was tested in the following areas:

Mentoring was tested in terms of its effect on the level of cost in the organization and 14(22.6%) strongly agreed, 42(67.7%) agreed, 4(6.5%) neutral 2(3.2%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. The mode was represented by agreed with 67.7% and on descriptive statistics the mean statistics was 4.10 which was more than mode and media at 4.00. Mentoring more significantly improved the level of cost in an organization (mean of 4.097). There existed low variation in level of cost after mentoring (standard deviation of 0.6455).

In determining whether mentoring affected level of productivity 9(14.5%) strongly agreed, 48(77.4%) agreed, 2(3.2%) neutral, 3(4.8%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. The statistic on mode and median was given as 4.00 and mean 4.02. Mentoring largely influenced the level of production significantly (mean of 4.0161). The spread level of production considering mentorship was low (standard deviation of 0.6138).

Mentoring existed in form of reports; 9(14.5%) strongly agreed, 46(74.2%) agreed, 4(6.5%) neutral, 3(4.8%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. The mode and median statistics were (4.00) and (3.98) respectively. Mentorship in form of reports was quite significant in improving the performance of the organization (mean of 3.984). Variation in reporting due to mentoring was low (standard deviation of 0.64).

On mentoring affecting automated machines; 12(19.4%) strongly agreed, 34(54.8%) agreed, 11(17.7%) neutral, 4(6.5%) disagreed and 1(1.6%) strongly disagreed. Mentoring was found to have moderately significant effect on automation of machines (mean of 3.629). The variation of mentoring on automation of machines was moderately low (standard deviation of 0.94494).

Mentoring affecting new products; 12(19.4%) strongly agreed, 34(54.8%) agreed, 11(17.7%) neutral, 4(6.5%) disagreed and 1(1.6%) strongly disagreed. Mentoring significantly affected number of new products produced in Unilever Company (mean of 3.8387). The variation on new products due to mentoring was low (standard deviation of 0.872).

Mentoring affecting the task completion level where; 14(22.6%) strongly agreed, 40(64.5%) agreed, 4(6.5%) neutral, 4(6.5%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly agreed.
Mentoring improved to a great extent the number of tasks completed (mean of 4.0323). There was moderately low variation on number of tasks completed as a result of mentoring (standard deviation of 0.6383).

Mentoring affecting the number of reports; 8(12.9%) strongly agreed, 46(74.2%) agreed, 5(8.1%) neutral, 3(4.8%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. Mentoring affected reports done to great extend (mean of 3.952). The variation of reporting as a result of mentoring was low (standard deviation of 0.63832).

About 9(14.5%) strongly agreed that mentoring determines performance 51(82.3%) agreed, 1(1.6%) neutral, 1(1.6%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. Mentoring affected performance positively to a great extend (mean of 4.09). The variation of mentorship was low on performance of the company (standard deviation of 0.460903).

The above findings support the findings of the study undertaken by Nyawira and Iravo (2014) on the role of mentoring programmes on the employee performance in organizations: a survey of public universities in Nyeri County, Kenya. Mentorship played a role in skills enhancement, transfer of knowledge and career development hence significantly affecting the performance of an organization. The findings of this study equally supports the findings of the study conducted by Lankau and Scandura (2002) on how people learned in mentoring relationships The study found out that mentoring was significantly related to skill development. It also found out that mentoring was related to organizational commitment as well as job satisfaction.
Table 4.4.3: Response on Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
<th>5(SA)</th>
<th>4(A)</th>
<th>3(N)</th>
<th>2(D)</th>
<th>1(SD)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation affects level of cost</td>
<td>9(14.5%)</td>
<td>37(59.7%)</td>
<td>6(9.7%)</td>
<td>6(9.7%)</td>
<td>4(6.5%)</td>
<td>3.6613</td>
<td>1.0549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation affects level of production</td>
<td>17(27.4%)</td>
<td>42(67.7%)</td>
<td>3(4.8%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.2258</td>
<td>0.5254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation affects automated machines</td>
<td>7(11.3%)</td>
<td>38(61.3%)</td>
<td>7(11.3%)</td>
<td>8(12.9%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>3.6452</td>
<td>0.9598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation affects new products</td>
<td>8(12.9%)</td>
<td>39(62.9%)</td>
<td>9(14.5%)</td>
<td>6(9.7%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>3.7903</td>
<td>0.7921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation affects jobs</td>
<td>7(11.3%)</td>
<td>53(85.5%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.0645</td>
<td>0.4387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation affects reports</td>
<td>6(9.7%)</td>
<td>55(88.7%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.0645</td>
<td>0.3996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation reports affects decision making</td>
<td>3(4.8%)</td>
<td>52(83.9%)</td>
<td>7(11.3%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>3.9355</td>
<td>0.3996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation affects performance</td>
<td>5(8.1%)</td>
<td>56(90.3%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.0645</td>
<td>0.3068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2017)

Participation in respect to the influence on level of cost; 9(14.5%) strongly agreed 37(59.7%) agreed, 6(9.7%) neutral, 6(9.7%) disagreed and 4(6.5%) strongly disagreed. It means that participation moderately affected the level of costs in production of tea leaves (mean of 3.6613). The dispersion of levels of costs due to participation was high (standard deviation of 1.0549).

Participation affecting level of productivity showed the following results; 17(27.4%) strongly agreed,42(67.7%) agreed, 3(4.8%) neutral,0(0%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. The participation of the employees significantly improved the level of productivity (mean of 4.2258). There was moderately low variation in level of productivity on participation (standard deviation of 0.5254).
Approximately 7(11.3%) strongly agreed that participation influenced automation of machine, 38(61.3%) agreed, 7(11.3%) neutral, 8(12.9%) disagreed and 2(3.2%) strongly disagreed. The participation of employees moderately improved automation of machines (mean of 3.6452). The spread of participation affecting automation of machine was low (standard deviation of 0.95979).

Participation affecting number of new products; 8(12.9%) strongly agreed, 39(62.9%) agreed, 9(14.5%) neutral, 6(9.7%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. The number of new products was moderately improved by participation (mean of 3.7903). The variation of new product as result of participation was low (standard deviation of 0.79211).

Participation affecting task statistics indicated that; 7(11.3%) strongly agreed, 53(85.5%) agreed, 1(1.6%) neutral, 1(1.6%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. The participation improved the number task done significantly (mean of 4.0645). The dispersion of participation with regards to task done was low (standard deviation of 0.43874).

On participation affecting the reports made, 6(9.7%) strongly agreed that it influence reports made 55(88.7%) agreed, 0(0%) neutral, 1(1.6%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. Participation was found to improved significantly the number of reports made (mean of 4.0645). Reports made variation was low (standard deviation of 0.39963).

Participation reports affecting decision making was shown by the following frequencies 3(4.8%) strongly agreed, 52(83.9%) agreed, 7(11.3%) neutral, 0(0%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. Participation significantly improved decision making (mean of 3.9355). Participation variation was low on decisions made (standard deviation of 0.39963).

Under participation effect on the performance; 5(8.1%) strongly agreed, 56(90.3%) agreed, 1(1.6%) neutral, 0(0%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. Participation significantly improved performance (mean of 4.0645). Variation in performance determined by participation was low (standard deviation of 0.30681).

The above findings support those of the study carried out by Ezennaya (2011) on Employee participation in decision making and its impact on productivity in Nigeria.
The study revealed that there is a positive relationship between participative management and performance. Another study on the influence of participation in decision making of and employee to the commitment among the staff of the university both private and public in Kenya was carried out by Wainaina (2014) supports the findings of the study. The findings indicated that employee participation in making decision affected the university academic staff’s performance through increasing their commitment and organization performance in Kenya.

**Table 4.4.4: Response on Delegation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
<th>5(SA)</th>
<th>4(A)</th>
<th>3(N)</th>
<th>2(D)</th>
<th>1(SD)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegating affects level of cost</td>
<td>19(30.6%)</td>
<td>35(56.5%)</td>
<td>5(8.1%)</td>
<td>3(4.8%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.1290</td>
<td>0.7571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation affects level of productivity</td>
<td>6(9.7%)</td>
<td>53(85.5%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.0161</td>
<td>0.4956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation affect automated machines</td>
<td>8(12.9%)</td>
<td>40(64.5%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>11(17.7%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>3.6935</td>
<td>0.9682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate affect new products</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>44(71.0%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>14(22.6%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>3.5484</td>
<td>0.8811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation affects task</td>
<td>10(16.1%)</td>
<td>50(80.6%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.0968</td>
<td>0.5344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation affect communication</td>
<td>6(9.7%)</td>
<td>51(82.3%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>3.9516</td>
<td>0.6383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation affects performance</td>
<td>7(11.3%)</td>
<td>52(83.9%)</td>
<td>1(1.6%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.0323</td>
<td>0.5111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Research data (2017)*

Delegation done by TMT on level of cost; 19(30.6%) strongly agreed, 35(56.5%) agreed, 5(8.1%) neutral, 3(4.8%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. The mode statistics was given by 4.00 and mean of 4.13. Delegation significantly improved level of cost (mean of 4.129). The delegation variation on level of cost was low (standard deviation of 0.757).

It was noted that 6(9.7%) strongly agreed that delegation affected the level of productivity, 53(85.5%) agreed, 1(1.6%) neutral, 2(3.2%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed.
disagreed. Delegation affected significantly the level of production (mean of 4.0161). Delegation on productivity variation was low (standard deviation of 0.49562).

Delegation was also examined if it affected the automation machine; 8(12.9%) strongly agreed, 40(64.5%) agreed, 2(3.2%), neutral 11(17.7%) disagreed and 1(1.6%) strongly disagreed. The mean statistics 3.69 implied that delegation moderately affected the number of automated machines. The variation of delegation on automation of machines was slightly high (standard deviation of 0.96816).

Delegation affecting new products was analyzed and 2(3.2%) strongly agreed, 44(71.0%) agreed, 2(3.2%) neutral, 14(22.6%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. Delegation was not significant on the improvement of new products (mean of 3.55). The variation of delegation on the number of new products was slightly high (standard deviation of 0.88108).

Delegation affecting the number of task showed 10(16.1%) strongly agreed, 50(80.6%) agreed, 0(0%) neutral, 2(3.2%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. Delegation to a great extend affected the number of tasks completed in Unilever Company (mean of 4.0968). The variation in the number of tasks completed as a result of delegation was low (standard deviation of 0.53438).

Delegation affecting communication; 6(9.7%) strongly agreed, 51(82.3%) agreed 2(3.2%) neutral, 2(3.2%) disagreed and 1(1.6%) strongly disagreed. Delegation was found to moderately affect the communication (mean of 3.95). The variation as result of delegation on communication was low (standard deviation of 0.6383).

Delegation was determined in terms of whether it did affect the performance and 7(11.3%) strongly agreed, 52(83.9%) agreed, 1(1.6%) neutral, 2(3.2%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. The delegation of tasks significantly influenced performance (mean of 4.0323). The variation of delegation affecting performance was low (standard deviation of 0.5111).

The above findings agree with those of the study carried out by Hamdan, Akif and Mohammad (2015) on the impact of delegation of authority on employees’ performance at great Irbid Municipality in Jordan. The findings showed that there is a statistically significant relationship between delegations of authority on, empowerment, effectiveness and efficiency of employees’ productivity. The above
findings of the study also supports those of the study carried out by Bogomba on effects of delegation on Employee performance in savings and credit co-operative societies in Kisii County, Kenya. The study established that effective delegation in organizations improves employee performance and organizational performance at large.

Table 4.4.5: Response on Employee Development and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
<th>5(SA)</th>
<th>4(A)</th>
<th>3(N)</th>
<th>2 (D)</th>
<th>1 (SD)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of cost determine performance</td>
<td>12(19.4%)</td>
<td>48(77.4%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.1613</td>
<td>0.4506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity determines performance</td>
<td>15(24.2%)</td>
<td>45(72.6%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.2097</td>
<td>0.4837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation in new product influence performance</td>
<td>13(21.0%)</td>
<td>47(75.8%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.1774</td>
<td>0.4625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovations in automation influence performance</td>
<td>13(21.0%)</td>
<td>47(75.8%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.1774</td>
<td>0.4625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task completed affect performance</td>
<td>13(21.0%)</td>
<td>47(75.8%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.1774</td>
<td>0.4625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost, productivity, innovation and task affect performance</td>
<td>14(22.6%)</td>
<td>46(74.2%)</td>
<td>2(3.2%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>4.1935</td>
<td>0.4735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2017)

Level of cost determining performance; 12(19.4%) strongly agreed, 48(77.4%) agreed, 2(3.2%) neutral, 0(0%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. The level of cost is important and significantly improved the level of performance with (mean of 4.1613). The variation of level of costs as determinant of performance was low (standard deviation of 0.4506).

Productivity level on its effect on the performance was given by the following; 15(24.2%) strongly agreed, 45(72.6%) agreed, 2(3.2%) neutral 0(0%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. It truly is a significant determinant of performance by measuring the level of productivity (mean of 4.21). The variation of productivity on performance was low (standard deviation of 0.48374).
Innovation was divided into two; one was given by innovation of new products where 13 (21.0%) strongly agreed, 47(75.8%) agreed, 2(3.2%) neutral, 0(0%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. This is just a replica of innovation affecting the number of automated machines with the same mean of 4.18 meaning both were significant determinants of production with equal magnitude. The variation of innovation in new product on performance was low (standard deviation of 0.4625).

Task completed on the affective measure of performance indicated that 13(21.0%) strongly agreed, 47(75.8%) agreed, 2(3.2%) neutral, 0(0%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. The task completed was significant in improving performance (mean of 4.1774). The variation of task completed was low (standard deviation of 0.4625).

The overall measure of cost, productivity, innovation and task was determined as factor that represent performance and 14(22.6%) strongly agreed, 46(74.2%) agreed 2(3.2%) neutral 0(0%) disagreed and 0(0%) strongly disagreed. The mean of 4.19 and mode of 4.00 meaning that all the measures of performance were significantly determining performance. The variation of performance was low (standard deviation of 0.47352).

4.5 Summary of inferential statistics

The data was also analyzed using inferential statistics and the following table was produced from SPSS version 21. The table included correlation, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and regression equation table.

Table 4.5.1: Coefficient of determination using SPSS version 21.0

<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>.724</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.33812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Delegate, Training, Mentoring, Participation.

b. Dependent Variable: Performance (Cost, productivity, innovation and task)

Source: Research data (2017)

The R value representing correlation coefficient was given by 0.724 which means that there was strong positive correlation between the performance (dependent variable) and training, mentoring, participation and delegation (independent variable). R-Square representing determinant coefficient was given by 0.524 meaning that 52.4%
of variation in performance is determined by training, mentoring, participation and delegation but 47.6% is explained by other factors.

Table 4.5.2: ANOVA analysis using SPSS version 21.0

<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>7.161</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.790</td>
<td>15.659</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6.516</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.677</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Performance (Cost, productivity, innovation and task)
b. Predictors: (Constant), training, mentoring, participation and delegation

Source: Research data (2017)

Table 15 represented Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) which was given by \( F_{(p=0.95, 4, 57)} = 15.659, P < 0.05 \) represented that its relationship was significant. There exists significant relation between the dependent variable (performance) and the independent variable (training, mentoring, participation and delegation).

Table 4.5.3: Regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>5.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>4.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Performance (Cost, productivity, innovation and task)

Source: Research data (2017)

Training and mentoring had t statistics of 5.085 and 4.882 respectively with \( P < 0.05 \) hence significant. Participation and delegation were not significant in predicting performance since \( P > 0.05 \). This means that to change performance it is important to improve on mentorship programs and training programs rather than concentrating on participation and delegation. Though all contributed to the overall performance.
$H_01$: There is no significant effect of training on the performance. The null hypothesis was rejected ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$). Hence there was positive and significant effect of training on organizational performance.

$H_02$: There is no significant effect of mentoring on the performance. The alternative hypothesis was accepted ($p (0.000) < 0.05$). This implies that there was positive and significant influence of mentoring on organization performance.

$H_03$: There is no significant influence of employee participation on the organizational performance. The null hypothesis was accepted ($p = (0.357) > 0.050$). There was positive and no significant effect of employee participation on the performance of the organization.

$H_04$: There is no significant influence of delegation on the organizational performance. The null hypothesis was accepted based on the fact that $p (0.570) > 0.05$. It means that there was positive and not significant influence of delegation on the performance of the organization.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary
The data as collected from Unilever Company indicated that there is gender equality and the largest work force came from supporting staff. The data collected noted that the youth of age 25-35 year represented the largest proportion. It implies there is large job turnover and youth are highly considered in employment in the company hence is one of the leading employer of youth in Kericho County. The data has been well distributed with high level of response rate hence passed the validity and reliability test.

5.1.1 Training and performance
The findings pertaining training indicated that it was a positive contributor to the performance of the company. The training mostly contributed to the level of productivity followed by level of cost others that were significant was task, productivity and automation in that order according to the mean. Thirty seven (59.7%) agreed with fact that training affect level of cost (mean of 4.1452). Training affected productivity where a greater extends agreed 38(61.3%) and mean of 4.1613. It was also noted training affect automated machine and new products with highest number of respondent agreeing 44(71.0%) and 36(58.1%) respectively (mean of 3.7419 and 3.7903 respectively). Training affected to greater extends the task done with majority agreeing 42(67.7%) and mean of 3.9516. Hence to improve performance training is considered to be very important aspect. This was indicated by 46(74%) largely agreeing that training affected the performance.

5.1.2 Mentoring and performance
Mentoring also was positive contributor of performance in the sense that it contributed highly in the areas of level of production, level of cost, tasks completed, reports, new products and automation of machines in that descending order (mean of 4.1613, 4.1452, 3.9516, 3.7903 and 3.7419 respectively). Mentoring was also highly considered to be the reason to performance of Unilever Company (mean of 4.1129). Its contribution was more than that of training as shown in the regression analysis.
5.1.3 Participation and performance
Thirty seven (59.7%) agreed that participation affected the level of cost (mean of 3.6613). Participation affected the level of production where 42(67.7%) agreed (mean of 4.2258). About 38(61.3%) agreed that participation affected automated machine the organization (mean of 3.6452). The mean of 3.7903 indicated that participation affected new products as 39(62.9%) agreed. A greater number of responded 53(85.5%) agreed that participant of employees affected jobs task done in the organization (mean of 4.0645). It was noted that participation affected significantly decision making with 52(83.9%) representing the greatest respondents (mean of 3.9355). Participation affected performance with about 56(90.3%) agreeing. Participation was not a very significant causal of performance though was considered to have effect on performance. It was noted that it would affect level of productivity and reports and task completion even more. Participation was considered a positive contributor to general performance.

5.1.4 Delegation and performance
Delegation being one of the factors in development was noted not to be significant contributor of performance. It was identified to contribute to level of cost, productivity and task more than other measures of performance. Thirty five (56.5%) agreed that delegation affected level of cost (mean of 4.1290). Delegation affected level of cost with greater number agreeing 35(56.5%) and mean of 4.1290. The mean of 3.6935 indicated that delegation affected the level of production with majority agreeing 53(85.5%). Majority of respondent 44(71.0%) agreed that delegation affected new products (mean of 3.5484). Also majority number of respondent with 50(80.6%), 51(82.3%) and 52(83.9%) agreed that delegation affected task, communication and performance (mean of 4.0968, 3.9516 and 4.0323).

The findings of the study support the views of Human Relations Theory which advocates for training employees so as to improve the organizational performance. The study found that training significantly affects organizational performance. The study also found that innovation as a measure of productivity and performance is significant. The theory advocates for the empowerment of employees to innovate.

The study addressed the statement of the problem in that it stated that many organizations are unable to achieve the desired levels of performance. The study thus
found out that for the desired level of performance, training and mentoring should be emphasized while participation and delegation should only be considered in career development of individual employees. The study also addressed all the research gaps that had been identified and summarized in Table 1.

5.2 Conclusion
In general performance was highly determined by productivity level rather than innovation, level of cost and task completion level. On the overall understanding it was noted that among the most significant development aspects of employee, mentoring and training should be considered highly. Training and mentoring significantly improved performance of organization. Participation and delegation were found to be insignificant in developing employee so that performance can be improved though they provided positive prediction of organization performance. The company should also improve on productivity level since it provided the highest count in determining performance. The productivity determined a lot in tea production based on market competition of tea from other countries like India and Sri Lanka whose tea has value added qualities hence fetch high prices in international market. Innovation also played a key role in determining the level of performance. Hence an organization needs to take this two measures of performance into consideration.

5.3 Recommendations
The firm should put more effort in mentoring and training new staff for high productivity and performance. Participation and delegation can be considered at other times but firms should not waste much resource in them. Participation and delegation are important in personal career development rather than as a tool of improving organizational performance.

The performance of the company is seen from the productivity level more than the innovation, task completed or level of costs. It is therefore important that the company should look into improvement of productivity level more but also innovation, task completion and level of cost are significantly important as measures of performance of a company.
5.3.1 Suggestions for Further Study

Further studies should be considered in the following areas; Employee development and employee performance, considering other independent variables other than the ones in the study like employee empowerment and coaching. The same topic under study could be undertaken in other tea firms in the tea industry other than UTKL.
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APPENDIX V: Questionnaire

Dear respondent,

I am a student at the Kenyatta University and I am currently researching on “Employee development on organizational performance in the tea sector” The research is a fulfillment of the requirement of masters’ degree in business administration. I am requesting you to provide me with the necessary information pertaining to the research. All the information given will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will be used for academic purpose.

SECTION A

Instruction: Please tick (√) where appropriate.

1. Gender Male □ Female □

2. Age
   - 25 – 35 years □ 36 – 45 years □
   - 46 – 55 years □ above 56 years □

3. Position held
   - Management Staff □
   - Supervisory staff □
   - Support Staff □
SECTION B

The responses in this section will be based on Likert scale rated 5-1 as follows;


1. Training which equips employees with knowledge, affects the level of costs in the organization.
   - Strongly agree □
   - Agree □
   - Undecided □
   - Disagree □
   - Strongly disagree □

2. Training that leads to acquisition of knowledge, affects the level of productivity in terms of tons of tea produced.
   - Strongly agree □
   - Agree □
   - Undecided □
   - Disagree □
   - Strongly disagree □

3. When training is carried out:
   (a) It affects the number of automated machines being used in the factory.
   - Strongly agree □
   - Agree □
   - Undecided □
   - Disagree □
   - Strongly disagree □

   (b) It affects the number of new products being released to the market.
   - Strongly agree □
   - Agree □
   - Undecided □
   - Disagree □
   - Strongly disagree □
4. Training of employees which equips them with skills affects the number of tasks completed within the required number of hours.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

5. Training determines the level of organizational performance.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

6. In what other ways does training affect the organizational performance?
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

7. I believe that mentoring done through proper communication affects the level of costs in form of profit margins.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

8. Mentoring done through proper communication affects the level of productivity in terms of tons of tea produced.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
9. Mentoring done through communication in form of reports, exist in my organization.
   Strongly agree □
   Agree □
   Undecided □
   Disagree □
   Strongly disagree □

10. When mentoring is carried out through proper communication:
   (a) It affects the number of automated machines being used in the factory.
       Strongly agree □
       Agree □
       Undecided □
       Disagree □
       Strongly disagree □
   
   (b) It affects the number of new products being released to the market.
       Strongly agree □
       Agree □
       Undecided □
       Disagree □
       Strongly disagree □

11. Mentoring which leads to developed relationship, affects the completion of tasks within the determined number of hours.
    Strongly agree □
    Agree □
    Undecided □
    Disagree □
    Strongly disagree □

12. Mentoring in form of Reports of relationship that exists between the mentor and mentee exist in my organization.
    Strongly agree □
    Agree □
    Undecided □
    Disagree □
    Strongly disagree □
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

14. In what other ways does mentoring affect the performance of the organization?
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________

15. When I am given opportunity to participate in decision making on issues that affect my job, the level of costs in the organization is affected.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

16. Participation of employees through decision making, affects the level of productivity in terms of tons of tea produced.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

17. When employees are given a chance to participate through active involvement:
   (a) There is an effect on the number of automated machines used in the factory.
       - Strongly agree
       - Agree
       - Undecided
       - Disagree
       - Strongly disagree
   (b) There is an effect on the number of new products being released to the market.
       - Strongly agree
18. Participation of employees done through participation leads to completion of tasks in a determined period of time in terms of hours required to complete the task.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

19. Participation in terms of reports of meetings in which the organization actively involves employees on issues that affect their jobs exist in the organization.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

20. Reports on employee involvement in decision making on issues affecting them exist.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

21. Participation plays a crucial role on the level of organizational performance.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
22. In what other ways does participation affect the performance of your organization?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

23. When there is delegation of responsibility, there is an effect on the level of costs in the organization.

Strongly agree [ ]
Agree [ ]
Undecided [ ]
Disagree [ ]
Strongly disagree [ ]

24. Delegation of tasks affects the level of productivity in terms of tons of tea produced.

Strongly agree [ ]
Agree [ ]
Undecided [ ]
Disagree [ ]
Strongly disagree [ ]

25. When there is delegation of responsibility:
   (a) It affects the number of automated machines being used in the factory.

Strongly agree [ ]
Agree [ ]
Undecided [ ]
Disagree [ ]
Strongly disagree [ ]

   (b) It affects the number of new products being released to the market.

Strongly agree [ ]
Agree [ ]
Undecided [ ]
Disagree [ ]
Strongly disagree [ ]
26. Delegation of tasks to employees affects the number of tasks completed within a determined period of time in terms of hours.
   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Undecided [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]

27. Delegated tasks are officially communicated.
   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Undecided [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]

28. Delegation of tasks and responsibilities is linked to the performance of an organization.
   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Undecided [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]

29. In what other ways does delegation of tasks and responsibilities affect the performance of the organization?

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

30. The level of costs in terms of profit margins plays a key role in organizational performance.
   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Undecided [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]
31. Productivity and output levels in terms of tonnes of tea produced affect organizational performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

32. Innovation in terms of new products that are released to the market influence the organizational performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

33. Innovation in terms of the number of automated machines that are used in the factory plays a crucial role in organizational performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

34. Tasks completion levels in terms of number of hours, affect organizational performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

35. Costs, productivity, innovation and tasks completion levels impact positively on performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>