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ABSTRACT

This research was carried out under the topic, “The Impact of Induction to Employee Productivity at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe)”. The research was centered on the role of employee induction into the organization and how this impacted new employees’ productivity. This was necessitated by observed absenteeism, labour turnover of new staff, complaints over poor performance, confusion over reporting lines, and challenges with ICT systems, policies and procedures.

The research sample was drawn from a population of 90 employees and the sample was determined through the stratified random sampling technique to ensure that all employee groups were represented. The sample category consisted of the Aggreko Dema 200MW Site management (2), and operatives (12), giving a total sample of 14 participants for the research study.

The philosophical underpinning of interpretivism was employed as the basis of the research. The research adopted a mixed method research design which involved the use of both the quantitative and qualitative research techniques. The study employed a case study research strategy, and specifically adopted a single unit case study. The desktop research and self-administered questionnaire techniques were used to gather and collect data. Descriptive, textual and thematic analyses were used in the research to present and analyse the data.

The study established that while the Company has a policy to govern and direct the process of induction, with clear objectives for the same, there is a noted deviance from the set out process in the Induction Policy when it comes to practically carrying out the induction for new hires. There was low job satisfaction, low employee engagement, and low role clarity among the respondents, all of which are critical indices to measure labour productivity. The company lived to its policy position on the mandatory pillars of induction in the policies of Health and Safety, and Ethics, but seemed to ignore the Induction and ICT policies. Respondents indicated that they had not been given job descriptions, which explained the role confusion that existed among employees that participated in the study.

Suggestions were made to improve the induction process through making it mandatory, interactive and have it guided by a checklist among others. There were also suggestions to improve job satisfaction through employee training and development, role clarification and role expansion, and exposing employees to their full job scopes. The research recommended that in order for the company to get maximum productivity from its employees, who are a critical source for sustainable competitive advantage, it should address the issues of job satisfaction so that employees feel they are being fully utilized and challenged to go an extra mile. Outside of induction, other meaningful information was generated which Management can attend to such as factors that can lead to labour turnover as given through identified push factors by respondents.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction
In this introductory chapter of the research, the historical background, statement of the research problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, propositions, significance of the study, assumptions of the study, definition of terms, scope of the study, ethical considerations and research limitations are presented as well as a chapter summary at the end of the chapter.

1.2. Background of the Study
Aggreko International Power Projects Plc, a world leader in temporary power and temperature control solutions, was established in 1962 in the Netherlands, and in 1973 the United Kingdom business was established in Scotland. In 1984, Aggreko became a wholly-owned subsidiary of publicly traded Salvesen Group, after which the company expanded its tentacles through acquisitions and mergers across the globe. In 1986, the company entered the U.S. Power rental market through acquisition of Electric Rental Systems Inc., before penetrating the temperature control rental business through the acquisition of Mobile Air and Pierce Industrial in the USA in 1987. The company entered the Asia Pacific region through the acquisition of Yeow Kong Electrical Company in Singapore in 1989, and eventually de-merged from the Salvesen Group to become a separately quoted public limited company on the London Stock Exchange. In 2006, Aggreko strengthened its footprint on the American market by acquiring GE Energy, and taking over Power Plus Rentals Limited of Canada. By 2009 the company had spread its reach to India where they acquired Cummins India, which became a center for engineering research and development for the manufacture of generators that were supplied in the Asian region.

The company came into Africa in 2010 when they were contracted to supply emergency back-up power for the FIFA 2010 World Cup finals that were held in South Africa. To date, Aggreko’s rentals and emergency power generation has provided power to more than 33 countries across Africa, with over 1300 MW of power on hire across Africa. The company uses the available
resources in an area to generate emergency power, and has a range of diesel generators, gas engines, HFO and biogas options, which can supply between 30 to 2100 Kva. Aggreko plc is listed on the London Stock Exchange (AGK.L) and is a member of the FTSE-100 index, and has been contracted to supply emergency power to other important world events such as the Beijing Olympic Games (2008), Vancouver Winter Olympics (2010), the FIFA World Cup finals in South Africa (2010), and the London Olympics (2012), among others.

The company entered Zimbabwe in April 2016 after it was sub-contracted by Sakunda Holdings to generate emergency power to the amount of 200 megawatts (MW) maximum per day. The plant was set up in the Dema area of Seke District, with 225 by 1 megawatt diesel generators, and 112 by 11kV step-up transformers. Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe) was incorporated in Zimbabwe in August 2016, employing fifty-six permanent local employees at the time, thirty local contract employees and sixty expatriate staff whose main role was to set-up, commission the project and train the local technical employees on the equipment which is only unique to Aggreko.

There has been emphasis by Aggreko International Power Projects on a structured on-boarding programme that makes it mandatory for a full induction programme for new talent into the organization. Significance during the induction process has been attached to the ‘Orange Blood’ culture of the corporate; a compulsory ethics policy training; ICT policy presentation; Health, Safety and Environment; corporate citizenship; organizational background and structure; products and services as well as the new talent’s role in the organization. The induction process or programme can vary from three weeks for technicians to two or three months for supervisors and managers.

However, at the establishment of the Dema Diesel Power Plant, one of Aggreko’s major projects in Africa, there was emphasis on massive recruitment as the project’s approved expatriate labour from Central Operations in Dubai was far below the planned complement. The newly recruited talent, in most cases technicians, were then required to come straight into the plant to augment the expatriate staff that had set-up the power plant. As a result, not much attention was given on the need for a structured, formal and comprehensive induction process for the new hires, save for Health and Safety. Six months down the line, there were still issues of incompetency, high levels of absenteeism, high labour turnover, challenges with ICT policies, processes and procedures,
career paths concerns and confusion over reporting lines, among a myriad of challenges. This research was therefore carried out to establish whether a properly structured and executed new talent on-boarding programme would help new talent into quickly adjusting to their new environment and start contributing immediately to the goals of the organization by enhancing their productivity.

1.3. **Statement of the research problem**

The induction process is a critical part in the hiring process that will determine not only the performance and possible commitment of new talent to an organization, but help the organization derive competitive advantage through its human capital (Torrington et’al, 2014). It has notable benefits when done, and done well; and has equally detrimental effects when overlooked or just glossed over, especially on employee productivity. There have been notable problems of absenteeism in the company; low productivity; high labour turnover for new staff in particular; and confusion over company processes and procedures, among other challenges identified within new employees.

1.4. **Purpose of the study**

This particular research aims to establish the importance or relative worth of the induction process in aiding employee productivity for the benefit of the business. It seeks to investigate the strategic significance of induction in new talent engagement, commitment to the organization and productivity.

1.5. **Research objectives**

i. To analyze the role of induction or onboarding for new talent in the Company

ii. To assess the relationship between induction and employee productivity at Aggreko International Projects Zimbabwe

iii. To evaluate the impact of induction at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe)
1.6. Research questions

In carrying out this research, the following questions were used to guide the process of data collection and help maintain an orientation towards the objectives of the study.

i. How is induction carried out at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe)?

ii. What critical role does the process of induction play to new talent in Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe)?

iii. What impact does the induction programme at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe) have to both the employee and the organization?

iv. Is there a relationship between induction and employee productivity at Aggreko International Projects (Zimbabwe)?

1.7. Propositions

Proposition 1: Induction of new hires helps improve employee productivity.

Proposition 2: Lack of, or poorly executed induction results in low employee productivity, labour turn-over and disengagement by employees

1.8. Research assumptions

The researcher, while delving into this research, upheld the following assumptions:

i. That there is an induction policy within Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe)

ii. That all new hires are taken through a prescribed and structured induction process

iii. That respondents will be honest and objective in responding to the research instruments for purposes of enabling an objective outcome of the research

1.9. Justification of the research

The whole process of talent management has become strategic in nature with organizations seeking to leverage their unique talent for competitive advantage (Armstrong, 2008; Torrington eta’l 2014). In order to achieve this, every management process and activity has therefore to be
equally strategic in order to align well with organizational objectives and goals, the latter two themselves a product of the corporate strategic planning process. According to reviewed literature, a lot of research has been done on this subject matter especially in the western world, and in South Africa, but there is very little evidence of this research having been done in Zimbabwe, except for a few similar researches that have been done in the education sector. When it comes to the energy sector in particular, no such research has been conducted in Zimbabwe. The research methodology employed in this particular research, the subjective measures approach, (SPA), has largely been used to measure employee productivity in knowledge work, and is the one that has been employed in this particular study. This research is bound to inform policy and process changes on new employee induction especially relative to productivity.

1.10. Significance/Importance of the study

The results of this research project are expected to inform policy changes in as far as the induction process is concerned in most organizations. It will inform a holistic review of the strategic approach to talent management, ensuring that every policy, process, programme and procedure is critically examined in terms of its relative worth toward meeting organizational goals through leveraging the available talent, and the starting point is the induction process to foster engagement. Human Resources practitioners and executives will certainly benefit in helping their organizations to take seriously the process of induction and its strategic significance to new talent engagement. It will also benefit the academic community as the research will likely spark interest for further research on the subject matter.

1.11. Delimitations

The study was carried over a period of five months, and it covered employees at the Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe)’s Dema Emergency Power Plant, both new and old, due to time constraints to apply it across a wider geographical scope. It however covered employees of all levels, from operatives to management.
1.12. Limitations

The data collection in this particular research covered a stratified random sample of fourteen (14) employees in the organization, which could make generalization of findings a bit difficult to the whole group as there is no data from other divisions to make comparisons with. The fact that respondents are drawn from just one company in the energy sector creates difficulties of comparison and generalization of outcomes to other organizations in the same sector in Zimbabwe. There could be need to extend the scope of the research in terms of diversity of respondents on basis of represented companies so that results are comparable. There is a possibility for respondents to hide negative induction experiences for fear of victimization by management, thereby creating a false picture of the actual reality, thus misdirecting outcomes of the research.

1.13. Ethics

The research was conducted only after permission had been granted by the Area Operations Manager for Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe). Participants were advised of the purpose of the research, which is purely academic; and were assured that all their responses will be treated with the highest level of confidentiality. There were no experiments that may have resulted in any damage or loss of any nature to respondents, and there were no physical benefits to which anyone could be prejudiced.

1.14. Definition of major terms

Induction - systematic process of combining or integrating the people (new employees) to the processes, culture and technology of the organization in order to optimize the effect that the new hire will have on business outcomes (Snell and Bohlander, 2011). Interchangeably used with onboarding (USA) and orientation.

Productivity – output per unit time of a product or service by an employee. This research is solely concerned with labour outputs per unit time of a product or service (Chartered Institute of Personnel Development, 2015)

Subjective Measures Approach – a qualitative research method that seeks to assess employee productivity by collecting subjective data from target group and basing the productivity analysis
of them. Based on personnel’s subjective assessment of their own personal feelings, experiences and views about their jobs or roles so as to get to a conclusion of whether they are being productive or not (Antikainen & Lonnqvist, 2006)

Talent – top caliber employees with the relevant skills, knowledge, attitude, creativity, aptitude and determination to succeed in their role in an organization and thus guarantee the organization some sustainable competitive advantage through their performance (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2013).

1.15. Summary

In summary, this introductory chapter provided a snapshot or overview of the areas that the research would cover, and the justification of each of the areas focused on. In sequential order, these areas are the historical background, statement of the research problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, propositions, significance of the study, assumptions of the study, definition of terms, scope of the study, ethical considerations and research limitations. The chapter also provided contextual definitions for some key terms that would be used in the research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter presents an outlay of different views by other scholars and researchers on the critical topic of new talent induction and how it impacts employee productivity. It reviews researches conducted both in the academic and organizational development contexts as the role of talent induction is explored, its significance or lack thereof. While Wanous and Reichers (2000), as well as Acevedo and Yancey (2011), bemoan the lack of significant academic research on new employee induction, there is more than ever now a strong business case from a talent management viewpoint to ensure that new talent induction is carried out, and carried out properly. As Bauer (2010) notes: “Research and conventional wisdom both suggest that employees get about 90 days to prove themselves in a new job. The faster new hires feel welcome and prepared for their jobs, the faster they will be able to successfully contribute to the firm’s mission.” This chapter will therefore delver into the already searched facts and arguments on the subject matter under key sub-headings as the definition of ‘induction’; objectives of induction; the process of induction; benefits of induction programmes; implications of failure to carry out new talent induction; and finally the relationship between new employee induction and employee productivity.

2.2. Definition of induction

A number of scholars have sought to define and explain new employee induction in a number of ways, with some relating it to other key talent management processes like socialization (Lockwood, 2006; Ballard & Blessing, 2006; Koontz & Wehrich, 1994; Chao et al., 1994 as cited in Acevedo & Yancey, 2011), while others consider it as part of training or employee development (Snell & Bohlander, 2011; Noe et al., 2011; Klein & Weaver, 2000, as cited in Salau et al., 2014; Stirzaker, 2004; Awan, 2013). Different terms have also been used to refer to new employee induction, and these include on-boarding (Bauer, 2010; Laurano, 2013; Snell and Bohlander, 2011; Hendricks & Louw-Portgieter, 2012), orientation (Acevedo & Yancey, 2011; Snell and Bohlander, 2011; Noe et al., 2011; Ballard & Blessing, 2006; Wanous & Reichers, 2000), while yet others prefer the term organizational socialization (Ballard & Blessing, 2006;
Following are the different selected definitions that have been used to guide this particular research on the subject matter of induction. Stirzaker (2004) however makes a distinctive note to the effect that the terms refer to the same process, with the term induction being more commonly used in the United Kingdom, while orientation and onboarding are predominantly used in the United States of America.

Armstrong (2008) defines induction as “... the process of receiving and welcoming an employee when he first joins a company and giving him the basic information he needs to settle down quickly and happily and start work.” His definition is also shared by other scholars like Anderson (2008) as cited in Awan (2013) as well as Klein & Weaver as cited in Chen’s research on the subject in 2010. Noe et al (2011) and Snell and Bohlander (2011) define orientation as a planned and formal process of familiarising the employee with his/her new work environment, their jobs, work units, co-workers and the organization.

Hendricks and Louw-Potgieter (2012) and Salau et al (2014), use Snell’s (2006) definition of induction (or onboarding, as it is called in the United States of America), as the systematic process of combining or integrating the people (new employees) to the processes, culture and technology of the organization in order to optimize the effect that the new hire will have on business outcomes. It should be noted at the onset that this definition’s reference to business outcomes entails the new employee’s productivity, or positive impact and contribution toward organizational outcomes.

The Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, quoted by the University of Edinburgh on their website, notes that the term ‘induction’ is used to describe the whole process whereby new employees “adjust or acclimatize to their new jobs and working environment." They further assert that “it has been argued that effective induction is viewed to make the transition of new employees in an organization as smooth and trouble-free as possible.” Kavoo-Linge and Kiruri (2013) posit that induction, “… also known as orientation or socialization, is the process of initiating a new employee into an organization and acquainting him or her with the details and requirements of the job… informing new employees about what is expected of them in the job and helping them to cope with stresses of transition” (2013:214). In their exposition, they opine that the process should provide new employees with an understanding of how their job performance contributes to the success of the organization and how the services or products of
the organization benefit the society. To this effect, Nyanga’u (2014) borrowing from Kumar (2000) maintains that the process of induction seeks to integrate new talent into the organization so that they become productive as soon as possible.

Lockwood (2006) defines induction from a socialization perspective as “a process in which an individual acquires the attitudes, behaviours, and knowledge needed to successfully participate as an organization member…”, adding that this is an ongoing process that can even take up to a year. Acevedo & Yancey (2011) accede to this definition as they posit that organizational socialization is the first process toward new employee integration into the organizational pattern while building their own individual identities. They reference the work of Chao et al (1994) who notes that the process entails gaining knowledge on the values, abilities, expected behaviours that are important for assuming an organizational role and participating as a member thereof. Stirzaker (2004), Thompson (1991), Beresford (1995), Wanous & Reichers (2000) and Bauer (2010) emphasise the aspect of enculturation of new employees into the new organizational culture as the major focus of induction. In this research paper, induction is taken to mean the systematic, planned and formal process of welcoming and introducing new employees into the organization, equipping them with the relevant information about their job/role, their department, the organization and its structure and culture, as well as clarifying expectations, with a view to help the new entrant to settle down quickly and contribute to organizational goal.

2.3. Objectives of induction

There seems to be unanimity in the reviewed literature as to the major objectives of the process of induction or orientation. These have been summarised below:

- Help employees to quickly adjust to the new environment, settle down and become productive members of the organization (Stirzaker, 2004; Armstrong, 2006; Bauer, 2010; Lamoureux, 2008; Snell, 2006; Laurano, 2013; Linda Scheckle, 2014)
- Provide a consistent experience for all new employees for social integration and assimilation into the organization and its norms and values – otherwise known as the organizational culture. (Davis, 1994, in Stirzaker, 2004; Armstrong, 2006; Snell, 2006; Lamoureux, 2008; Bauer, 2010; Laurano, 2013)
Equip new employees with the necessary skills, attitudes and knowledge for them to perform their roles, and how these fit into the organization’s outcomes – role clarity (Bailey, 1993, in Stirzaker, 2004; Armstrong, 2006; Vargas-Hernandez, 2016; Acevedo & Yancey, 2011; Hendricks and Louw-Potgieter (2012); Salau et al, 2014; Lamoureux, 2008)

Ensure new employees feel welcomed and valued, and help them to cope with the stress of moving into a new job with a new organization (Armstrong, 2006; Snell and Bohlander, 2011; Lamoureux, 2008; Bauer, 2010; Laurano, 2013; Salau et al 2014; Ballard and Blessing, 2014)

Assist new employees in the utilization of corporate resources, business-specific methodologies and approaches unique to the organization – termed a “signature experience” by Erickson and Gratton (2007), and supported by Lamoureux, (2008)

2.4. Induction Process
From the definitions of induction given above, it is clear that the term denotes a process, and not an activity or an event. While Wanous and Reichers (2000) would consider new employee orientation as an event, Ballard and Blessing, (2006), Stirzaker, (2004), Acevedo and Yancey, (2011), Snell and Bohlander (2011) and Lockwood (2006) all concur that orientation or induction is a process. In fact, Vargas (2013) notes that, “Onboarding fails when it’s viewed as an event instead of a process…”

It is also noted in the reviewed literature that induction comes in two forms – formal and informal (Stirzaker, 2004; Ballard & Blessing, 2006; Bauer, 2010; Noe et al, 2011; Armstrong, 2006). Informal induction is defined by Bauer (2010) as “that process by which a new employee learns about his or her job without an explicit organizational plan”, while formal induction refers to a set of written policies and procedures that assist an employee in adjusting to his or her new job both in terms of its tasks and socialisation. She goes on to indicate that research shows that companies employing the formal orientation programmes for their new talent to teach them about their roles, the organization culture and company expectations in their roles, are more effective than those who do not, a position supported by Noe et al, (2011), Snell and Bohlander (2011), Ballard & Blessing, (2006) and Stirzaker (2004). Armstrong, (2006), however,
advocates for both formal and informal induction processes. He argues that formal induction occurs in the context of disseminating information about the organization, especially when a number of new recruits is considered. This is to allow for consistency of information provided to all new employees coming into the organization; while the socialization aspect should occur informally in the real work setting in the respective new employees’ departments as they interact with their fellow workmates and colleagues from other departments.

It is important to note that most authorities advocate for a formal induction process for purposes of consistency of information given to employees. In this regard, a number of scholars, among them Noe et al. (2011), Snell and Bohlander (2011), Ballard & Blessing (2006), Armstrong (2006), and Laurano (2013) advocate for the use of an induction checklist. This is the guiding compass of the induction programme giving the participants a clue of what information is to be covered, who is responsible for that part of the programme, and the duration of that part of the programme. The content of the programme, referred by Wanous and Reichers (2000) as the “what” of induction, is also fully covered in the checklist. Ballard and Blessing (2006) noted that checklists are repeatedly cited in literature “as a common way to making explicit what needs to be learned, responsibility for teaching what needs to be learned, and what the timeline for learning is…”

Laurano (2013) and Butler (2008, in Hendricks and Louw-Potgieter, 2012) argue for the provision of all relevant papers or forms to be signed by the new hire before they start their first day. By the day they start, they should be welcomed and attended to immediately, and have their forms checked for accuracy of information provided. This administrative work must not take time and that’s why it has to be done before the new employee’s first day. Lamoureux (2008) and Snell (2006) also advocate for taking the new employee through the ICT systems of the organization, and how they will aid the new hire’s success in their role.

After the administrative formalities and completion of paperwork, the new hire is then immediately taken through the organizational induction phase, where he/she is enlightened about the organization’s structure, culture, history, products/services, customers, mission and core values (Bauer, 2010; Armstrong, 2006; Lamoureux, 2008; Nyanga’u, 2014; Lockwood, 2006)). A number of scholars among them Armstrong (2006), Noe et al’l (2011), Hendricks and
Louw-Potgieter (2012), and Acevedo and Yancey (2011) have emphasized that new employees be inducted into the culture of the organization. Acevedo and Yancey (2011) in particular emphasise the person-organization fit element as the determining factor of whether or not an employee will stay and be productive in the organization. Wanous and Reichers (2000) highlight the importance of Safety and Health issues, as well as terms and conditions of employment. Noe eta’l (2011) consider other issues like working hours, services in the organization like canteens and gym, as well as pay policies among others, provisions summarised in the employee handbook according to Armstrong (2006). This presentation can be done by a representative of the Human Resources department after which the new employee is introduced to colleagues in their department. Ballard and Blessing (2006), Stirzaker (2004) and Noe eta’l (2011) also emphasise the need to include a diversity component in the induction programme especially for multi-national and multi-cultural teams that are the hallmark of the current globalized world. This latter element will then certainly apply to all employees, new and existing, who are assigned to work in foreign operations of their respective organizations.

In the new hire’s department, the supervisor takes over the induction process and takes the inductee through the departmental phase of the induction process. He/she introduces the new hire to the departmental team, members’ roles and how they relate to the inductee’s role; have the departmental structure explained to him/her (Thompson, 2015). Once this is completed, the new hire is then inducted by his/her supervisor into their job. Noe eta’l (2011) argues that a critical factor of orientation that affects productivity is training new employees on the proper ways to carry out tasks in the performance of their jobs. Bauer (2010), Wanous and Reichers (2000), Awan (2013) and Stirzaker (2004) put emphasis on the new employee’s role clarity which is the major concern at the time of joining the organization. Lindsay (2011) in Nyanga’u (2014) emphasizes the need for thorough job or role induction by taking the employee through their structured job description”…to ensure that one has a clear understanding of matters such as responsibilities, performance, approaches to performance evaluation and reporting relationships…”. Ongori (2007) notes that role ambiguity is especially high during the initial stages of engagement, and “insufficient information on how to perform the job adequately, unclear expectations of peers and supervisors, ambiguity of performance evaluation methods, extensive job pressures, and lack of consensus on job functions or duties may cause employees to
feel less involved and less satisfied with their jobs and careers, less committed to their organizations, and eventually display a propensity to leave the organization” (2007:50). This has to be addressed during the job induction phase, and ensure that new hires are clear and confident enough to start in their role with the organization.

In order to assist the new employee settle down faster and well in the organization, Stirzaker (2004), Laurano, (2013), and Ballard and Blessing (2006) all concur on the need of assigning a “buddy” or formally “mentor” to a new hire. Buddying has been described by Stirzaker (2004) as a temporary arrangement meant to give the new hire support and in help them in their early days as they find their feet. The role of a buddy is basically to help the new hire understand the detail and unwritten rules of the workplace. Graybill eta’l (2013) in the MAUT-LS Professional Issues Committee report (2014) argues that a buddy or mentor helps with the “informal as well as formal socialization that is a part of becoming oriented within a new organization”. Stirzaker (2004) however cautions that while buddies can be viewed as agents of transmitting the corporate culture, they have to be carefully selected, as they may end up transferring the wrong information to the new hire and teach them a wrong culture that goes against the business’s objectives. According to the MAUT-LS Professional Issues Committee report (2014), the use of peer buddies or mentors, was recommended in fourteen publications at the time, thereby giving credence to this on-boarding strategy.

2.5. Responsibility for induction

According to Laurano (2013), on-boarding programmes “fail due to lack of ownership.” This raises the interesting question of who in the organization should be responsible for the induction or orientation process. Literature reviewed on this area shows that everybody in the organization has a role to play, and the summary by Stirzaker (2004) gives a succinct explanation on the matter:

- Senior Management team – these are argued as conferring status on the process, and it is necessary for them to demonstrate commitment to the programme and show interest in the new staff as this will set the tone for the organization (Stirzaker, 2004). Davis (1994) is quoted in Stirzaker (2004) as defining induction as “…concerned with motivating people to become productive… It is a leadership task.” Vargas-Hernandez (2016) also
concurs when he states that for successful induction, senior management participation is critical.

- Head of Department/Supervisor – this is basically the immediate line manager to whom the employee reports and their participation ensure the relevance of the program. Stirzaker (2004) argues that line managers are better placed to personalize the programme to the new employee as well as follow up on the new employee and monitor performance and progress in adjustment, a view shared by Noe et al.’l (2006), Snell and Bohlander (2011), Thompson (2015) and Hendricks and Louw-Potgieter (2012).

- Buddy/Mentor – this is a knowledgeable, loyal and experienced fellow employee who works with the new employee in the same department. His role is basically to provide support to the inductee, which Snell (2006) refers to as shadowing. This individual has a critical role in ensuring that the correct cultural values of the organization are transmitted to the new employee and directs him/her to the go-to people. (Awan, 2013; Stirzaker, 2004; Ballard and Blessing, 2006).

- Human Resources representative – referred to as ‘administrative staff’ by Stirzaker (2004), this is argued to be the coordinator of the whole induction process, and the first contact person for the new employee. The administrative tasks of completing forms, setting up the work station, processing of email address and requesting for login credentials as well as loading the new employee in the company data base are argued to be an HR role. (Thompson, 2015; Armstrong, 2008; Laurano, 2013; and Noe et al.’l, 2011). Thompson (2015) also adds an IT Team Member to the list as being responsible for setting up the work station for the new employee, setting up the technology they would require for success, assigning them relevant “software and providing login credentials for all line-of-business applications” to the new hire.

However, Stirzaker (2004) and Ballard and Blessing (2006) also argue that all employees in the organization that interact with the new hire have a role to play, especially those that are within the new entrant’s department. They argue that by participating in in the socialization of a new comer into the organization, the insider’s own integration into the organization is completed, besides helping the insiders to view the organization through fresh eyes and revitalizing their commitment to the organization due the trust bestowed upon them by the organization. The
MAUT-LS Professional Issues Committee report (2014) in particular notes that the involvement of current staff in the induction of a new hire is that it makes them feel valued and appreciated.

2.6. Benefits of Induction

With the above in mind, it is equally clear that there are a number of benefits to be derived in a planned, formal and well-conducted induction or on-boarding process. The following benefits have been highlighted in the literature reviewed as the most critical to both the organization and the new employee as noted by Lamoureux (2008), Salau et al. (2014) and Bauer (2010).

A notably critical and important benefit to both the organization and the new hire is the successful integration of the new employee into the way things are done and way of thinking within an organization so that they quickly become part of its DNA. Almost every piece of literature on the benefits and impact of induction or on-boarding has emphasized on ‘socialization’ of the new hire into the organizational culture. Believed by some scholars as the glue of the organization, culture induces the same way of thinking, acting and behaviour within the organization’s citizens. The shared values and beliefs enable the organization to move forward as a collective, meet challenges as a unit and enjoy shared responsibility (Acevedo and Yancey, 2011; Armstrong, 2008; Wanous and Reichers, 2000; Stirzaker, 2004).

Dai and De Meuse (2007) have claimed that: “There are two key performance indicators of successful on-boarding: time to productivity, and engagement and retention.” This reflects the fact that a formal, well-structured and well-executed programme of induction reduces the learning curve for new employees or as put forward by Lamoureux (2008), reduces the time to productivity for new employees. Moscato (2005), quoted by Hendricks and Louw-Potgieter notes that organizations that successfully reduce the time it takes to integrate new talent will certainly realize some competitive advantage as these new hires will reach their level of full capacity productivity sooner, exhibit higher levels of morale and are therefore more likely to keep their jobs, a view equally shared by Nandi (2015). As noted by Scheckle (2014), a good induction programme will certainly build in the new talent critical attributes such as loyalty, confidence and productivity.
In agreement with Dai and De Meuse (2007), Lamoureux (2008), Salau et al. (2014), and Nandi (2015) argue that a well thought out and well executed induction programme, regardless of how long it takes, will help the organization in two main dimensions; talent retention and performance enhancement. New talent are given time to assess their own work-style preferences, and what’s obtaining in the organization they are joining; and then decide on the basis of a person-organization fit.

Erickson and Gratton (2007) insist that exposing new talent to those elements that makes the organization unique and exceptional to its competitors significantly helps improve new talent engagement and performance. In their words, an organization “…needs to be able to provide a “signature experience” that tells the right story about your company.” Explicitly communicating those distinct practices and competences that the organization has will not only help it attract and retain talent that’s excited about the organization’s culture and values, but who will commit themselves to the organization and reward it with exceptional performance and productivity. In the process, they argue that you will empower the people who share your values and enthusiasm for work to self-select into your firm, thereby creating the foundation for highly productive employee-employer relationships.

Armstrong (2008), Vargas-Hernandez (2016), and Stirzaker (2004) all concur that the induction process quite significantly helps new hires to settle down in their new roles and reduces the amount of stress that comes with settling in a new organization. This further helps cement the new hire’s decision to stay with the organization and deliver value for the business faster. Derven (2008) as quoted in Hendricks and Louw-Potgieter (2012) notes that “induction reinforces a new employee’s decision to join the organization and fosters a feeling of belonging.”

The MAUT-LS Professional Issues Committee report (2014) note that other significant benefits that have been associated with on-boarding, according to literature on the subject are better talent retention, increased job satisfaction and job fit and higher rates of productivity and achievement for the organization. Acevedo and Yancey (2011) take into account particularly the integration and training benefits of induction when they state that: “New employee orientation (NEO) programs have been shown to socialize newcomers and increase their knowledge, skills and
abilities upon completion” This view is also shared by Snell (2006), Noe et al’ (2011), and Armstrong (2008).

A succinct summary of the above benefits is provided by Bauer (2010) who lists increased job satisfaction, organizational commitment which entails talent retention, higher performance levels, career effectiveness and lowered stress. In her summary of objectives and gains of a well implemented induction or on-boarding programme, Lamoureux (2008) provides reduced new hire time to productivity, increased employee retention, improved employee engagement, provision of consistent information about the organization (culture), and understanding of new employee expectations as benefits for the organization; helping employees to become quickly acculturated, as well as being impactful, to the business; providing a consistent experience for all employees as well as making sure that new hires feel welcomed and valued. Awan (2013), Acevedo and Yancey (2011) and Wanous and Reichers (2000) all allude to the achievement of role clarity which helps to direct the new employee in his/her new role with the organization, thereby terminating role conflict with other members of the departmental or organizational team.

2.7. Implications of neglecting induction

Nandi (2015), notes that employee induction is the missing link in most organizations, while Awan (2013) further argues that it is the most neglected functions in many firms. Lamoureux (2008) and Bauer (2010) also share the same view, arguing that the process is ignored because of lack of ownership for it within organizations. In fact, Acevedo and Yancey (2011) state that though most organizations admit to having some induction programme for their new employees, few really utilize them.

The implications of this corporate neglect can best be summarized by statistics given by Thompson (2015), who argued that the cost of poor on-boarding in the USA and Britain alone is estimated at US$3.7 billion as money spent annually on unproductive employees. This corroborates well with JSB Consulting UK’s startling revelations in one of their articles in 2016 to the effect that “UK organizations are losing up to £2 billion a year in employee productivity due to inefficient induction processes.”
Salau et al. (2014) state that levels of turnover and absenteeism increase with poor induction of new hires, as also the level of disengagement will rise, a view supported by Hendricks and Louw-Potgieter (2012). In fact, Armstrong (2008) observes that resignations and turnover can increase if people are not given opportunities for learning and development, or feel that demands are being made upon them that they cannot reasonably be expected to fulfill without proper orientation. He also maintains that new talent may experience an ‘induction crisis’ if they are not given adequate training when they join the organization.

To support the need for induction, Kavoo-Linge and Kiruri (2013) quoting Nankervis et al., (2009) add that frequently, newcomers suffer feelings of failure because of inappropriate induction to the organization and this can be true for the experienced employees as for the novice. In fact, as noted by Stirzaker (2004), Ballard and Blessing (2006); Armstrong (2008) and Noe et al. (2011), despite the absence of a formal induction programme new employees will still become socialized informally by the group, and in ways more often detrimental to the organization. As Ballard and Blessing note:

“Regardless of whether or not a formal socialization programme exists, employees eventually become socialized…” (2006:241)

They go on to encourage creation of systematic induction programmes to give management control and influence over how the new hire settles into their new role, and the relevance and meaning of information given to the new hires. Stirzaker (2004) alludes to organization grapevine as a parallel source of induction that has a destabilizing effect on the new employee, especially if the existing employees have a negative perception of the organization. The overall implication of this would be the inevitable decision by the new hire to leave, making it costly to the organization to re-recruit as well as making the remaining employees unsettled about their positions in the organization. Thompson, (2015), states that:

“An effective on-boarding experience can make or break an employee engagement, productivity and retention. It can play a critical role in how employees perceive an organization and its culture.” (2015:3)
2.8. Related research on induction and productivity

A number of researchers have delved into attempting to establish the relationship between induction and other variables in the employee or workplace environment. Most of these variables are deemed to affect performance, and eventually productivity. These include employee engagement, job satisfaction, turnover and retention, absenteeism and work attendance, motivation, and commitment to the job and organization. For example, Lewis, Thomas and Bradley (2012) established that there is a positive relationship between induction and new employees’ engagement. They argued that an engaged employee has unquestioned loyalty and commitment to the organization, and desire to see the organization do better which makes them highly productive. Arachchige (2014) demonstrated through a qualitative study that lack of induction for new employees result in a significant drop in employee effectiveness and productivity. In an evaluation of an induction programme and its effectiveness on work done by a project team, Atkins and Gilbert (2003) found that the effectiveness of work groups can be positively influenced by a good induction process.

In a research carried out by the Society for Human Resources Management, Lockwood (2006) notes that the orientation or induction programme sought to reduce turnover of new hires in their first three years with the company; shorten or reduce the learning curve of new hires by 17%; and improve productivity. It came out that indeed turnover for new hires reduced by 69% in the first two years. With Lamoureux (2008) arguing that the cost of turnover is estimated at 150% of salary cost, the role of new employee induction in achieving turnover reduction need not be underestimated. In her study on Wachowa Corporation’s Blended Learning Solutions programme, a leading financial institution that introduced a 28 hour course to help reduce time for new hires to productivity, Lamoureux (2008) found that new hire turnover reduced by 3% in the first ninety days; with new hires in the pilot induction programme out-performing their counterpart tellers, with 15% reduction in times out of balance, sales credits improving by 19%, and a 14% reduction in total policy violations. Therefore as evidenced in this particular study, the improved induction programme helped improve new employee productivity and retention of the same.
Sussman (2008), as quoted in Hendricks and Louw-Portgieter (2012), noted in a study that employee satisfaction following a successful and well-organised induction results in more productivity for new employees. In another study by Pollitto (2002), again quoted in Hendricks and Louw-Portgieter (2012), it was found out that customer satisfaction ratings in a United Kingdom major energy provider doubled to 80% following an induction programme for the new hires. Thompson (2015) notes that in a research organizations reported that induction reduced the time for new hires to productivity, and these constituted 60% of the companies surveyed. Reporting on the findings of the Aberdeen Group consultancy, Laurano (2013), noted that 68% of companies had getting their employees to productivity quickly as the major objective of new employee induction. The same consultancy company had found out in a similar study in 2011, that organizations with standardised on-boarding processes had seen a 54% greater new hire productivity and 50% better new hire productivity. Noe etal (2011) established that at Texas Instruments, the induction programme helped new hires reach full productivity levels at least two months sooner. The same authors reported that in a construction company, emphasis during induction was on safety, and this reduced lost time injuries in the new employees significantly; while at Corning Glass, they noted that 70% of new hires rating the induction programme highly were likely to stay with the organization for at least three years, thus significantly reducing turnover and improving productivity. Bauer (2010) gives interesting statistics following a survey in the United Kingdom to the effect that companies that take the induction process for their new employees seriously were gaining marked improvements in retention rates (52%), time to productivity (60%) and overall customer satisfaction (53%). These researches and the accompanying results and statistics point to the importance of the induction process as a critical factor in new employee productivity.

**2.9. The relationship between induction and productivity**

Productivity has been defined in a number of ways by different scholars relative to the subject of study they are undertaking. The Chartered Institute of Personnel Development (United Kingdom) (2015) defines productivity as “how effectively output (value) is produced from inputs (people, capital equipment, land, energy and so on)” (2015:3). Productivity can be measured for various entities and at various levels, ranging from individuals, groups, firms, industries and whole countries. In the same manner, there are also many ways to measure productivity, and most of
these are economic indicators such as gross domestic product (GDP) and gross value added (GVA); but this research focused purely on labour productivity. In essence labour productivity can be measured in two ways, and the CIPD (2015) points to the mostly quoted statistics as output per hour worked and output per worker. Regardless of arguments that maybe raised to the contrary, Krugman (1994), as quoted in the CIPD Report (2015), asserts that:

‘Productivity isn’t everything, but in the long run it is almost everything. A country’s ability to improve its standard of living over time depends almost entirely on its ability to raise its output per worker’ (2015:8).

Thus, the major focus for productivity calculated at whatever level is the individual employee output basis. It certainly follows that the more productive a labour force is, the more productive an organization employing such employees becomes. While some authors have defined labour productivity as a measure relating a quantity or quality of output to the inputs required to produce it, others have defined it as a measurement of the output produced using a quantity of inputs. As this research is looking solely at labour productivity, defined earlier as the amount of goods and services that an employee produces in a given amount of time, the research approach employed in this context will seek to measure labour productivity not through these defined statistical approaches, but through the subjective productivity measurement approach.

This approach, according to Antikainen and Lonqvist (2006), measures an employee’s subjective assessment of their own levels of engagement with the company, confidence in their job, perceived supervisory support, role clarity and job satisfaction among others. A higher index on these dimensions will reflect high productivity for the worker while a low index will demonstrate lower productivity. Bauer (2010) notes that role clarity measures are among the most consistent predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment during onboarding, which translate into higher employee productivity. She also notes on the other hand that high quality relationship with leadership and other team members results in favourable outcomes in terms of performance and job satisfaction, both of which are good indicators of productivity.

Kavoo-Linge and Kiruri (2013) note that a well-done induction process has a positive impact on new talent confidence and productivity as its purpose in the workplace is to enable new talent to acquire knowledge and skills to perform adequately a given task. Nyanga’u (2014) accedes to Juhi (2008)’s assertion that a good induction creates a good impression and that it increases
productivity as some of the notable benefits of the process. He argues that organizations need to customize their induction processes in such a way that right from the onset they are able to derive the competitive advantage of enhancing high productivity.

Ndunguru (2012) notes that “the best onboarding strategies provide a fast track to meaningful, productive work….” To him, introducing new talent to the organization’s culture to enhance an immediate impact in terms of productivity is the whole purpose of induction. As noted earlier, Dai and Meuse (2007) opined that the only two key performance indicators of a successful onboarding or induction process are “time to productivity, and engagement and retention”. Unengaged employees, according to Thompson (2015), normally exhibit a behaviour pattern that includes acting passive, lack of enthusiasm, make many complaints and excuses, are not prepared to help others, resist growth and change, and appear distracted. To give credence to the impact of induction on productivity, Thompson (2015) provide interesting statistics as noted earlier to the effect that “60% of organizations report that effective onboarding reduced time to productivity by new hires” in a study carried out by consulting company Lynda.com.

In the definitions for induction/orientation given in the foregoing, most of the literature is clear that this management process is aimed at ensuring that new employees immediately settle and start contributing to the business bottom line. The statistics provided by Laurano (2013) above on the research by the Aberdeen Group in February 2013 shows that of the 230 organizations studied, 68% had their top and major objective for induction as “getting employees more productive quickly”, a finding which affirms the position of most of the researchers in this area.

2.10. Summary
This chapter reviewed relevant literature relative to employee induction from its definitions and tenets; policy objectives for carrying out induction; the process of induction and how it unfolds; benefits of induction programmes for the organization and the employee; implications of failure to carry out new talent induction; and finally the relationship between new employee induction and employee productivity.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND ETHICS

3.1. Introduction

Central to every research is some underlying philosophical assumptions about what exactly constitutes real scientific research, and which accompanying research methods are appropriate and fitting in the development and generation of knowledge in a given study. These assumptions are the guiding compass for conducting a valid scientific research which will add to, or which may support, approve or disapprove an existing body of knowledge. The foregoing is the focus of this chapter, which shall discuss the research process overview, research design, population focus, sampling, data collection and analysis process, as well as the ethical considerations that had to be observed in carrying out the research.

3.2. Research Process Overview

TerreBlanche and Durrheim (1999) argue that the research process is constituted of three basic dimensions, namely ontology, epistemology and methodology. A paradigm therefore according to them is an all-encompassing system of inter-related practice and thinking that define the nature of enquiry along the highlighted three dimensions. Greener and Mortelli (2015) define a paradigm as “a cluster of beliefs which guide researchers to decide what should be studied and how results should be interpreted” (2015:42), while Saunders (2009) explains it as “basic belief system or world view that guides the investigation, not only in choices of method but in ontologically and epistemologically fundamental ways.” (2009: 106)

Ontology is that branch of philosophy that is concerned with articulating the nature and structure of the world, specifying the nature and form of reality and what can be known about it. It is basically the nature of reality as we perceive it by our sensory systems, and the two ontological perspectives are objectivism and subjectivism (Saunders, 2009). Epistemology on the other hand refers to the relationship between the knower, who is the researcher, and the known, which is the subject matter of enquiry. It can also be explained as simply the process of knowing and the relationship between the knower and the known, or rather what exactly in the eyes of the researcher constitute acceptable knowledge. These two, the ontology and the epistemology, constitutes a researcher’s worldview, which has given rise to the two classic worldviews that
have emerged in the business of research, namely the objectivistic and the constructivist approaches. Methodology on the other hand refers to the process of how the researcher practically goes about finding whatever he believes can be known. This research is also based on methodological choices derived from the underlying assumptions of carrying out the nature of enquiry relevant to the subject matter.

3.3. Research Design

A research design can be thought of as a well thought out grand plan to the research topic. This process is concerned with creating a blueprint of the activities to take into account in order to satisfactorily answer the research questions identified. This includes selecting the research method(s), operationalizing constructs of interest, and devising an appropriate sampling strategy (Sekaran, 2003; Singh, 2006). It is a series of rational decision-making choices that deals with such issues as research strategy, methodological choices and time horizon which will enable the requisite data to be collected and analyzed to arrive at a solution. According to Creswell (2003), there are three basic approaches to a research design and these are the qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods designs.

The research design in this study was guided by the ‘research onion’ as given by Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009), which graphically summarises the inter-relationships and sequential flow of activities and processes in the practical conduct of scientific research as a fundamental guide. The research onion guides a researcher on the research philosophy to employ depending on what is intended to be established by the research question, which will also determine the research approach. The four research philosophies are positivism, realism, interpretivism and pragmatism. Depending on the philosophical choice, one would choose either an inductive or deductive approach, the former which normally leads to generation of a theory from data, while the latter is used to prove, test or confirm a theory. The research approaches and philosophy will in turn determine the research strategy that the researcher would employ; the methodological choices as well as the time horizon and data collection and analysis techniques. These are discussed in detail below for this particular study.
3.4. Research Philosophy

This research is based on interpretivism, which is premised on the belief that reality consists of people’s subjective experiences of their external world and the meanings they attach to it (multiple realities), as the study seeks to understand the subjective perspectives of employees in the organization on the induction process in the company and how it impacted their productivity. This means that there may be different understandings and interpretations of reality and interpretive epistemology leads to accessing meanings made by others and describe how they come to make those meanings (Hatch and Cunliffe, 2006). The choice of this philosophy is important because it guides the whole research process and particularly the research design, the research approach, choice of methods, analysis of the findings, and even the presentation of findings. The employees’ subjective views based on their experiences are then used to inform programme, process or content adjustments of the induction programme in Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe).

Source: Mark Saunders, Philip Lewis and Adrian Thornhill (2009)
3.5. Research Paradigm

According to Saunders (2009) a paradigm can be described as “a way of examining social phenomena from which particular understandings of these phenomena can be gained and explanations attempted.” This investigation adopts a qualitative approach. Its aim is to explore the employees’ perceptions and views of induction as a phenomenon, and to understand it within the context of the organization. In this approach the knowledge claims are based primarily on the constructivistic perspective, giving consideration to the multiple realities as experienced by different subjects in the study (Creswell, 2003). As noted by Punch (2005), a major positive for employing the qualitative research approach is its ability to enable study of phenomenon in its naturalistic context, thereby facilitating an understanding of a phenomenon in that natural context. Thus, the qualitative approach would be useful in providing a holistic understanding of the induction experiences of employees at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe).

3.6. Research Approach

In this research an inductive approach is employed, owing to its flexibility and the fact that it allows the researcher opportunities to adjust and modify the research focus or emphasis depending on the accumulated findings throughout the research process (Singh, 2006). It is possible, through findings in the research, to generate or come up with a theory that could be used to explain certain relationships between and among variables; or alternatively render findings amenable to further enquiry or empirical verification.

3.7. Research Strategy

The case study was employed as the strategy of choice. According to Yin, a case study is defined as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (2009:21) He elaborates that the significance of the case study comes in when one wants to understand a real-life phenomenon in depth, and the understanding encompasses critical contextual conditions. Rose, Nigel and Canhoto (2015) exemplify a ‘case’ as ranging from relatively concrete things like an organization, a group or individual; or something that is equally more abstract like a management decision, change program or event.
In an instrumental case study, the particular case is less important than the insight it can provide into a specific issue of theory. Therefore, the goal of this case study is to understand something more general than the case, an outcome that is then generalizable to other contexts. Denzin and Lincoln (2005), however, contend that the case, although it is of secondary interest, plays a supportive role and facilitates the understanding of important concepts. An in-depth investigation of the case has a purpose of pursuing an external interest.

The research will be exploratory because it aims to determine the present facts as well as facts that are not yet explored about the phenomenon (Saunders et al, 2003). Exploratory research will enable the study to look at the problem in both descriptive and exploratory manner. This approach is a preferred way of finding out “what is happening to seek new insights” or “to ask questions or to assess phenomena in a new light” (Saunders et al, 2003; Robson, 2002).

While employing the case study method, defined by Robson (2002) as a “strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence,” the data collection method employed the survey strategy within the case study.

According to Rose, Nigel and Canhoto (2015), the case study strategy is associated with such common features as:

- providing an in-depth study of a small number of cases, often longitudinally, or alternatively, prospectively or retrospectively;
- allows for data collection and analysis for a or about a large number of features of each case;
- cases are studied in their real-life context, providing an opportunity to understand how the case influences, and is influenced by its context
- “cases are naturally occurring in the sense that they are not manipulated as in an experiment”
- their compatibility with multiple sources of data like interviews, archival documents, observations and questionnaires to allow for triangulation of findings

This research employed a single case study approach, as opposed to a multiple-case study approach, since the research was only carried out at Aggreko International Power Projects.
(Zimbabwe). This approach though has the challenge that the chosen case may not be representative enough of similar cases, which brings into question the extent to which generalizability is feasible; vulnerability to confirmation bias as well as the likelihood tendency of collecting and or analyzing data with bias in order to confirm the researcher’s opinion as well as difficulties in carrying out a comparative analysis (Rose, Nigel and Canhoto, 2015). In spite of the noted shortcomings for the single-case approach above, Yin (2009) notes that they remain very important for a number of reasons, and these include:

- the fact that the case may be very critical in some way, like in theory testing;
- it is unique or typical;
- it is revelatory, having been inaccessible to researchers earlier, and that
- it is a longitudinal study that is comparing the case at different points in time.

3.8. Time Horizon

The study employed the cross-sectional time horizon as opposed to the longitudinal one. This is because the research does not intend to analyse variables variances over different points in time, but rather, focuses on an exploration and revelation of new contextual insights in the present (Robson, 2002). The cross-sectional time horizon can be described as a snap shot of events or phenomena at a given point and place in time, and is most suitable for academic research projects which are mostly constricted in terms of time (Saunders, 2009).

3.9. Data Collection Techniques

The primary data for the research was obtained through a structured questionnaire, which had both closed and open-ended questions. These were used to elicit responses from employees, on a pre-determined set of questions that were meant to help answer the research questions and objectives. This research instrument was considered relevant as it was easier to administer since all the respondents were on one plant site, and they could be easily followed upon.

3.10. Population

The population for this research was drawn from employees of Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe) based at the Dema Emergency Power Plant, and included both expatriate
and local employees, permanent and contract. The population distribution is as given by Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Aggreko International Power Projects Power Plant Employee Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Permanent Staff</th>
<th>Contract Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Employees</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriate Employees</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.11. Sampling

The stratified random sampling approach was used, whereby employees were stratified into their different levels, i.e., management and operatives. Within each stratum, 15% of the ninety employees are selected randomly and these will constitute the research sample. A major advantage of this sampling method is that it allows every level of employees in the organization to be represented in the research so that results are generalizable to the whole organization with a credible level of accuracy.

Table 3.2: Sample Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Level</th>
<th>Total Number of employees in the category</th>
<th>Calculated 15% of total number in category</th>
<th>Number in Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of participants therefore was fourteen (14), with two (2) being managerial employees and twelve (12) non-managerial staff. The management bracket included all supervisory level employees and above, i.e., operations supervisors, operations managers and the area operations manager. The non-managerial band on the other hand includes all operatives, i.e., service crew (technical assistants), drivers, administrative staff and contractors.

3.12. Data presentation and analysis process

Qualitative data analysis is a process of organizing field data, breaking it into smaller manageable and understandable units, coding it, and then analyzing patterns from which meaning and relationships can be derived. Relative to case study research, Yin (2003) notes that there is a critical need to search for patterns in the data which can help explain or identify some causal links, if any. The process therefore starts with a concentration on the whole amount of data, before separating and partitioning it into easy to manage smaller units, where after it is reconstructed for meaning. Thus data categorization becomes the initial stage of qualitative data analysis as it allows the researcher to draw comparisons and contrasts between patterns. In this research, the data collected from the field was subjected to some rigorous processing which included:

- Categorization, coding, finding common themes and patterns, and then data entry. This was meant to capture all the feelings and meanings as expressed by respondents, clustering and reducing it from raw data to information that is amenable to analysis.
- Computing some basic descriptive statistics for the data in order to derive some simple relationships, if any could be so established
- Presentation of visual graphics of the data as a summary of findings for each item of the questionnaire
- Narrative descriptions of the common themes and patterns relative to the objectives of this research
3.13. Ethical Considerations

Ethics can be described as what is good and right for the self, as well as the other, based on what is socially considered morally right, which transgression thereof constitutes a wrong. Senkaran (2003) explains ethics as a code of conduct, or rather as an expected societal norm of behaviour that has to be observed while conducting research. He notes that this ethical issue applies to everyone involved with the research process from the sponsors, the organization for which research is being carried out, the researchers in the field and the subjects or participants, and that it pervades every step of the research process.

Thus in this research, due care was taken to ensure that participants’ consent was obtained prior to the research being carried out to respect their right to informed consent. They were also assured that there was no risk or harm whatsoever to their person or otherwise involved in the study, and that their responses and information provided would be treated with utmost confidentiality, thereby preserving their right to privacy, confidentiality and anonymity.

Moreso, only data obtained from participants in the research was used for analysis and making recommendations on the subject matter under study. No data fabrication was made, so that conclusions are drawn typically from the given responses by participants in the study. The data will be accurately and fully collected in order to avoid subjective selectivity in what is recorded.

3.14. Summary

This chapter has outlined the overview of the research methodology that was employed in this research project, as guided by the research onion. It clarified this methodology through a research overview, and proceeded to discuss the research design, population focus, sampling, data presentation and analysis process, and lastly, ethical considerations that were taken into account as the actual research was carried out.
CHAPTER 4

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1. Introduction
The purpose of this research was to analyze the role and evaluate the impact of new employee induction, as well as to assess the relationship between new employee induction and productivity at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe). A sample of fourteen employees was used, with two of them being managerial staff while the other twelve were operatives in different departments of the Company. The employees completed a semi-structured questionnaire, which contained both closed and open-ended items. In this particular chapter, results of the data obtained in the field are presented in three categories, and these are the demographics, the closed-question choice items; and then the open-ended questionnaire responses. Where necessary, alignments and deviations of findings from reviewed literature are commended upon.

4.2. Sample Demographics
The demographic variables statistics presented in this report of the study are respondents’ ages, level of educational qualifications, service with the organization, gender and the departments from which the respondents to the study were drawn.

4.2.1. Sample Age Distribution
The majority of respondents were between 25 to 40 years of age, making 71.4% of the research sample, with the 31 – 35 age group being the modal class, with a frequency of 5. While age has not been viewed or considered in this study as having any effect on the outcome, or responses of participants, it is important to have a glimpse of its distribution across the sample.
4.2.2. Sample Distribution by Gender

The study also sought to ensure that there was fair representation of both males and females, so that the sample is representative enough of the population. It was deemed imperative therefore in the research to take this into account. As illustrated in the diagram below, females constitute 29% of the sample size, while males make up 71% of the sample. Although it was assumed in this research that gender as a variable will not affect the responses of participants, it is important to ensure that the whole population is represented fairly in the sample.

Source: Findings from research data (2017)
Figure 4.2

Source: Findings from field data analysis (2017)

4.2.3. Sample Distribution by Educational Qualifications

Since data in this research was collected through a questionnaire survey, the level of education is critical in that it would impact a respondent’s understanding of the questions being asked. Figure 4.3 shows that 86% of the respondents have received some kind of formal training for which they are certified, and these are mostly technicians that have gone through apprenticeship training from where they acquired national certificates and diplomas; support services staff with higher national diplomas and degrees coming from the specialized fields of Finance, Administration, Supply Chain and Quality, Health, Safety and Environmental management. With this high level of literacy, respondents were expected to understand the expectations of the questionnaire items and respond to them equally competently.
4.2.4. Sample Distribution by Departments

Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe) has got five operational departments within its operations. These include support services departments namely Human Resources, Finance, Supply Chain (Stores, Purchasing and Logistics), and Quality, Safety, Health and Environment management. These constitute 28.5% of the sample. The Operations department is the largest, encompassing such functions as Power Generation (Electrical), Maintenance (Mechanical), Service Crews and Operational Supervision. The department constitutes 71.5% of the research sample as illustrated in Figure 4.4 below.

Source: Findings from research data (2017)
4.3. Questionnaire Responses Analysis

The questionnaire instrument was divided into three basic parts, starting with the demographics which have been discussed above; the closed-question items that were in a Likert-type scale format: Strongly Agree (SA); Agree (A); Neutral (N); Disagree (D); and Strongly Disagree (SD); and the open ended-question items that sought to draw the respondents’ views, comments, feelings and suggestions to the current induction programme that’s being done in the company.

The closed-item questions were set in such a way that they should enable the researcher to establish the coverage of selected productivity indicators as job satisfaction and confidence in the role, perceived value for supervisory and team support, and level of engagement, as well as to assess the coverage of the mandatory pillars of the organization’s induction policy. The Subjective Measures Approach to productivity has got not only a predictive indication of employee productivity, but can also be used to evaluate current productivity of employees based on their own self-assessments. The questions and the elements they intended to ascertain are summarized in table 4.1.
As illustrated above, the mandatory aspects of induction as given by the Company’s Induction Policy include the Induction Policy itself, Ethics Policy, ICT Policy, QSHE Policy, and the Company’s vision, mission statement and values. These are mandatory items for every new employee joining the company, including those that might have been transferred from other operations of the company unless they can demonstrate that they have completed these areas of induction to the satisfaction of their line manager. The next element is confidence in the job, role clarity and job satisfaction, which are assessed through respondent’s understanding of their role and how it fits in the business, perceived utilization of their knowledge and skills as well as satisfaction with both quality and quantity of work. The element of employee engagement and intention to quit are measured by the respondent’s commitment to the company, work time utilization, how well they feel engaged and push factors that may drive them to quit. The last element is perceived supervisory and team support, which is assessed through respondents’ respect for their supervisor, feeling of teamwork and measures on diversity and tolerance. The actual responses provided by respondents to the questionnaire on the closed-item elements are summarized in Table 4.2.
### 4.3.1. Closed Items/Questions Responses

*Table 4.2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the Aggreko Induction Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was inducted on, and am aware of, the Company’s vision, mission and values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was inducted on, and am aware of the company Quality, Safety, Health and Environment policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am well versed with the Company’s IT Policy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was inducted on, and am aware of the Aggreko Ethics Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fully understand my role and how it fits into the overall business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a signed job description that details my role</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My skills and knowledge are being fully utilized in my role</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy with my quality and amount of work every day</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel positive about my long term future at Aggreko</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All my time at work is spent on productive work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel proud working for Aggreko</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received enough training to help me do my job very well</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I respect my manager as a fully competent professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a strong feeling of teamwork and cooperation at Aggreko</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is tolerance for, and understanding of diversity at Aggreko (Zimbabwe)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Findings from field data (2017)*
4.3.1.1. Analysis of responses on the mandatory pillars of induction

As highlighted above, these include induction on the Company’s Induction Policy itself, Ethics Policy, Information, Communication and Technology (ICT) Policy Organizational vision, mission and values; and the Quality, Safety, Health and Environment (QSHE) Policy. As illustrated in Table 4.5, only 35.6%, which is the combined strongly agree and agree responses, admit to be aware of the Company’s Induction Policy. A similar percentage remained neutral, while 28.6% indicated that they are not aware of the induction policy. Lack of knowledge of the induction policy has the effect of making new employees in particular miss out on the objectives and purpose of the induction as well as the areas that they should cover so that they can also take ownership of the process. On other items of this area, respondents indicated high scores on their knowledge and induction on the Company’s QSHE Policy, where 92.6% agreed to have been inducted on, and being aware of the QSHE Policy, with only 7.4% remaining neutral. On the ICT Policy, 28.6% of the respondents, combining the SA and A values indicated that they had been inducted on this item; while 42.9% denied being inducted on this policy, with 28.5% electing to remain neutral. On the Ethics policy, 92.9%, combining the SA and A scores, indicated that they had been inducted on, and are aware of this policy, with only 7.1% of the respondents remaining neutral. The last item on this area was the company vision, mission and values, the anchor of the company’s organizational culture. Here, 85.7% of the employees indicated that they were inducted on, and were also aware of the organization’s mission, vision and values, while 14.3% of the respondents expressed neutrality.

The high scores on the QSHE Policy, Ethics Policy, and Company vision, mission and values, is indicative of antecedents of high productivity. Emphasis on QSHE is likely to reduce productivity loss through lost time injuries thereby benefiting the company as noted by Noe eta’l (2011); while emphasis on the Ethics policy ensures that policy violations, corruption and other unethical forms of business conduct are nipped in the bud, and so help raise employees’ productivity and confidence by customers in the Company. High scores for induction on the company vision, mission and values can point to a high likelihood of acceptance of the company culture as well, and this is likely to raise productivity as employees identify themselves with the organization and what it represents. As noted by Bauer (2010), every company has got a unique culture, and therefore helping employees in navigating and settling in that culture is a critical role of induction. She argues that understanding an organization’s politics, goals and values, and
learning the firm’s unique language are all important indicators of employee adjustment, which are associated down the line with commitment to the organization, job satisfaction and increased retention – factors that drive labour productivity. The role of enculturating new employees in the organization as engendering a same way of thinking and acting, and enabling the organization to move forward as a collective and fight challenges as an entity is also emphasized by Stirzaker (2004); Awan (2013) and Wanous and Reichers (2000).

There is however concern over the low scores on the ICT Policy as violations of such policy unknowingly by employees will result in possible time lost attending to disciplinary issues for such employees, taking them out of productive work and wasting productive time, thus lowering productivity. Employees can also miss out on the value of ICT in adding efficiency in their roles, and this has the likely negative effect of lowering employee productivity. Despite the foregoing, this outcome corroborates well with findings by Torrington et al (2014) that induction provides a forum in which basic information about the organization can be transmitted. They state that a corporate induction provides a suitable occasion to talk about health and safety regulations, fire evacuation procedures and organizational policies, a view also buttressed by Snell and Bohlander (2011) who add ethics training and diversity training as some of the key policies presented during induction.

4.3.1.2. Analysis of Confidence in Role, Job Satisfaction and Role Clarity

In this area, despite 71.4% of the respondents indicating that they did not receive any job description and sign for one, with only 28.6% confirming receiving and signing for their job descriptions; 100% of the respondents expressed confidence in knowledge of their roles, and high understanding of how their roles fit into the overall business. In their assessment of how well their knowledge and skills are being utilized in their current roles, only 35.7% agreed that they were being fully utilizing their knowledge and skills, while 50% indicated that they were not being fully utilized, as given by a combination of the disagree and strongly disagree responses. The remaining 14.3% could not tell whether their knowledge and skills were being utilized fully in their current roles or not. On quality and amount of work, 42.9% agreed that they were happy with their daily quality and quantity of work, while 28.6% of the respondents
remained neutral with a similar percentage indicating that they were not happy with their daily quality and amount of work.

While role clarity in this context is very high, the feeling of underutilization of their knowledge and skills and the low indices on daily work quality and amount are indication of dissatisfaction in the role, and has the negative impact therefore of possibly lowering employee productivity as noted by Bauer (2010). The absence of a job description to new employees is a recipe for failure, as there is no guidance of what is expected of them, which may result in employees doing what they believe in themselves to be right (which may not be), and wasting time waiting to be assigned tasks by their supervisors, which can lower that employee’s productivity. The conceded knowledge of job roles may be a fluke, given the absence of an official job description to detail the role tasks, which would help clarify the role. In fact, as argued by Ongori (2007), “role ambiguity is especially high during the initial stages of engagement, and “insufficient information on how to perform the job adequately, unclear expectations of peers and supervisors, ambiguity of performance evaluation methods, extensive job pressures, and lack of consensus on job functions or duties may cause employees to feel less involved and less satisfied with their jobs and careers, less committed to their organizations, and eventually display a propensity to leave the organization” (2007:50).

According to Torrington et al. (2014), research evidence strongly suggests that organizations stand to benefit from ensuring that new employees gain a ‘realistic job preview’ before taking up a job offer. This is meant to ensure that the new employee enters an organization with their eyes wide open and do not find that the job fails to meet their expectations. A major cause of job dissatisfaction, and hence of high staff turnover and low levels of employee engagement, is the experience of having one’s high hopes of new employment dashed by the realization that it is not going to be as enjoyable or stimulating as anticipated. This has a significant negative impact of lowering employee productivity.

4.3.1.3. Analysis of Engagement and Organizational Commitment

Assessed through four closed items on the questionnaire, this element has been considered as a major indicator of employee productivity (Bradley, 2012). On respondents’ positive feeling
about their long term future with the company, 64.3% were positive as given by the combined scores of the strongly agree and agree responses; while 21.4% were not decided and so remained neutral, and 14.3% indicated that they did not feel positive about their long term future at the company. On whether or not respondents’ time at work was being spent on productive work, 78.6% of respondents, as given by the combined scores of the strongly agree and agree scores, indicated that indeed they spent their time at work on productive work; while 21.4% could neither confirm nor deny that they spent their time doing productive work. 50% of respondents expressed pride in working for Aggreko, while 21.4% indicated that they did not feel proud working for the company. 28.6% of the respondents were undecided, and so elected to remain neutral. With regards training, particularly if respondents had received enough training to help them in their roles, only 42.9% of the sample responded positively, while 21.4% responded negatively. The other 35.7% of the respondents remained neutral.

Research in literature reviewed, as illustrated by Bradley (2012) established that an engaged employee has unquestioned loyalty and commitment to the organization, and desire to see the organization do better which makes them highly productive. The relatively high indices of engagement in the respondents’ answers, which hovers just above the average, can be considered as a red flag indicating that there is some significant disengagement by employees and this will likely lower productivity. Another red flag of negative impact on productivity are the low scores on new employee training. Acevedo and Yancey (2011) note that induction programmes for new employees have been proven to socialize newcomers and increase their knowledge, skills and abilities (KSA) upon completion. Armstrong (2008) observes that resignations and turnover can increase if people are not given opportunities for learning and development, or feel that demands are being made upon them that they cannot reasonably be expected to fulfil without proper orientation, and this negatively affects employees’ productivity. As Ndunguru (2012) stated, commitment and effort toward the organization as well as desire to remain connected with the organization are the most valuable outcomes of the onboarding process.

Wanous and Reichers (2000), and Torrington eta’l (2014) concede that based on extensive research carried out into the nature of ‘psychological contracts’, failing to meet new employees’ expectations, and hence managing them effectively, can have serious de-motivational effects. Employers and employees have a relationship that is much more complex and sophisticated than
is set out in formal contracts of employment. The legal contract sets out the expectations and obligations each side has towards the other in respect of pay and terms and conditions of employment, but the reality of the relationship consists of much more than this. The ‘psychological contract’ can thus be defined as comprising expectations and obligations that the two sides have of one another and their relationship above and beyond what is formally agreed in any legal contract. A breach of the legal contract of employment by either party has legal consequences, and the aggrieved party has recourse to law. However, when the psychological contract is breached the consequences are psychological – reduced commitment and loyalty, lower levels of motivation and reduced levels of trust both individually and collectively. The result is reduced employee engagement and higher levels of unwanted staff turnover. Thus the induction process plays an important role in establishing expectations at the start of the employment relationship. It follows that a timely and well-designed induction programme can play an important part in enhancing employee retention and engagement, factors that guarantee employee productivity.

4.3.1.4 Analysis of Respondents’ Perceived Value for Supervisory and Team Support

This is the last cluster on the closed items of the questionnaire. Regarding their views on their manager as a fully competent professional, 78.6% of respondents confirmed that their managers were competent professionals, with 21.4% not sure of their assessments for their managers. On their perceptions of strong feeling for teamwork and cooperation at Aggreko, 71.4% of the employees in the sample expressed an agreement with this assertion, while 7.1% disagreed, and the remaining 21.4% were neutral. On tolerance for, and understanding of diversity, 85.7% of respondents indicated that there was indeed tolerance for diversity in the company, while 14.3% of the respondents were not sure and thus indicated neutral in their responses. Employees that rate their supervisors highly are likely to benefit from their supervisors’ support, and are not afraid to ask help from such highly regarded professionals in their own opinion. This in turn makes the employee highly productive as they are able to get guidance on how best to go about their tasks, thus minimizing errors in their work. The high indices scores for teamwork (71.4%) and tolerance for diversity (85.7%), are fertile grounds for high employee productivity. Employees rating team work highly are likely never to get stuck as they perceive help to be all over around them, and can therefore always ask for such help as and when needed to help them
deliver. They are also far more likely to quickly rise to helping their colleagues than those rating teamwork on the low, thereby enhancing the productivity of their colleagues as well. High scores on tolerance for diversity is an indicator that there is indeed teamwork regardless of the different cultural and nationality backgrounds of the employees in the organization. This has the net effect of improving employee productivity as employees have respect for each other as professionals, tolerate each other and focus more on the objectives of the organization.

These findings are supported by reviewed literature on the subject, in line with Bauer’s (2010) assertion that research has established that high quality relationships and respect for leaders and other team members are undoubtedly related to favourable induction outcomes that include high performance and high job satisfaction, thus creating fertile grounds for high employee productivity. High perceptions of teamwork and tolerance for diversity are the perfect antecedents to high employee productivity, as they are able to get guidance on how best to go about their tasks, thus minimizing errors in their work (Awan and Tahir, 2015; Ndunguru, 2012). This has the net effect of improving employee productivity as employees have respect for each other as professionals, tolerate each other and focus more on the objectives of the organization. The high perceptions for tolerance for diversity is quite significant especially for a multinational and multicultural company like Aggreko International Power Projects, as it thrives on dynamic expert teams that can be dispatched to any corner of the world, which has become a hallmark of international organizations in the globalized world.

4.3.2. Analysis of open-ended items on the questionnaire

These items were meant to solicit the respondents’ own views on a number of areas to do with new employee induction largely based on their own experiences as this is a qualitative research based on the interpretivistic approach where participants’ views are shaped by their own perceptions of reality and their experiences. The areas of focus in this category of questions were respondents’ suggestions on how to improve both the induction programme and the process of induction at Aggreko; how satisfied respondents are with their jobs, and what can be done to improve job satisfaction; factors that are likely to push respondents out of the company; additional information that can be added to the induction programme, and whether or not it affected respondents’ productivity as they initially settled; and if so, how; and finally, soliciting
for respondents’ suggestions on how the company can get maximum productivity from its employees. These areas have then been analyzed separately in the ensuing discourse, by clustering the respondents’ answers and finding common responses, and then establishing the frequency of the common responses. These are then assessed relative to reviewed literature on that particular question or item of the questionnaire.

4.3.2.1. Respondents’ suggestions to improve the induction programme

Figure 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents' suggestions on improving induction programme</th>
<th>Percentage Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It must be structured, with a checklist for participants</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be comprehensive, covering everything about the Company</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should have prepared standard presentation slides for all new employees</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for tour of plant and get to have the processes explained to new employees</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must be comprehensive on safety issues, and high risk areas</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should provide for every department’s presentation</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to include overview of the industry and our competitors</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Findings from field data (2017)*

The induction programme is the agenda or plan that should be followed or guide the induction process. It is considered significant in this research as it allows for the standard process to be followed in the event of any new employees joining the organization. As illustrated in Figure 4.5, it can be noted that a staggering 92.9% of the respondents suggested that the programme must
provide for a tour of the plant so that they get to understand the processes that take place in the organization. This will help the new employee to understand the organizational workflow, and how they contribute to that flow; which relates well with the “signature experience” proposal by Erickson and Gratton (2007), which focuses on the core and fundamental areas of the business, and its major processes. The need for a structured induction programme, guided by a checklist issued to participants, was suggested by 71.4%; a similar number that also suggested that the programme must be comprehensive on safety and high-risk areas of the business operations. The checklist will ensure that all areas for induction are covered, and provides for a standard guide of items to be covered by all new employees, thus ensuring all new employees have got similar information as they start with the organization, much in line with Ballard and Blessing’s (2006) review on induction literature that checklists are repeatedly cited in literature “as a common way to making explicit what needs to be learned, responsibility for teaching what needs to be learned, and what the timeline for learning is…” A comprehensive safety presentation is meant to reduce lost time for productivity through injuries and/or fatal accidents, a benefit noted by Noe et al. (2011) at one Construction Company they surveyed. 64.3% of the respondents suggested that the induction programme should be comprehensive enough so as to cover everything about the company, while 57.1% suggested that there must be readily prepared presentation slides given to all new employees coming in for the induction. Arguments for the latter would be probably so that the new employees can read the information in advance, prepare questions on areas that may require clarification, which will make the process interactive. Another 50% of respondents suggested including individual departments’ presentations, so that inductees can understand the inter-links of the departments, and possibly get to know where to go and get information. Lastly, 35.7% suggested that there was a need to include an overview of the industry and the company’s competitors, as well as how the company was faring relative to these identified competitors.
4.3.2.2. Suggestions to improve the induction process

A process in this particular research has been considered as the sequential procedure of executing a programme or plan, and this question sought to draw respondents into giving their personal views out of their induction experience with the company, on the sequence of events regarding induction in Aggreko. As illustrated in Figure 4.7 above, a common suggestion, given by 85.7% of the respondents was that the process must be interactive, allowing new employees to ask questions regarding any area they needed clarity. If induction is taken in the context as part of the

Source: Calculations from field data findings (2017)
initial learning for the new employee into the organization, as attested to by Armstrong (2008), then indeed this point is critical. 71.4% of the respondents considered it important for new employees to be exposed to all the processes in the business so that they have an appreciation of what the organization is all about. Some respondents noted that it was imperative that all new employees receive induction as a mandatory pre-requisite before they enter the plant, and these constituted 64.3% of the sample. Given the dangers of electrocution and other risks associated with the business of power generation, this suggestion is spot on. A similar number of respondents, 64.3%, indicated that the process must be guided by an induction checklist that is signed by both the inductee and the presenter in that particular area of the induction programme, to confirm that it has been covered. 57.1% of respondents indicated that the paperwork associated with new employee joining, eg employment contracts and job descriptions, must be signed on the first day of reporting for duty, probably to allow for an uninterrupted flow of the induction process, and thereafter, the new employee to focus on his/her job. A further 50% of the respondents sample suggested that the induction period must be specified, so that the process is neither too short nor too long; which the researcher believes can be provided for in the suggested checklist. 35.7% of the sample indicated that there was need to break down the information provided during induction into small doses so that there is no overload of information. The argument for this is probably what Stirzaker (2004) alludes to as limited retention of information during a period of high stress for the new employees, so the information that makes sense to them at this stage is that concerning their new roles.

4.3.2.3. Responses on job satisfaction by participants

Job satisfaction was cited in most of the literature as an antecedent to higher productivity by employees (Bauer, 2010). It therefore follows that those employees indicating high job satisfaction are more likely to be more productive than their counterparts. The responses by participants in this research are illustrated in the pie-chart below (Figure 4.8). As demonstrated here, an outright 36% of the sample participants indicated that they were satisfied with their jobs, while 43% responded that they were not satisfied. The remaining 21% could not tell whether they were satisfied, or not. These statistics alone can make one draw the conclusion that these respondents are, in the main, likely to be unproductive as they do not enjoy their jobs to be motivated enough to perform well.
4.3.2.4. Respondents’ suggestions to improve job satisfaction?

This question sought to elicit respondents’ personal suggestions on what can be done to improve their job satisfaction. Since a number of factors can influence job satisfaction, most of which may seem to have nothing to do with the induction variable, yet the subjects’ views can point to other factors that would motivate them to be more productive. As illustrated on Figure 4.9, 71.4% of the respondents indicated that roles and expectations must be clear, and this was cited in the literature as one key objective of induction - role clarity. 64.3% of the respondents needed more responsibilities, which is equally tied to the other 57.1% who argued that they needed more challenging work so that they can fully utilize their knowledge, skills and expertise. Related to these two is the claim by 50% of the respondents that more exposure into their actual job processes to enable them do the work confidently by themselves will do much to enhance their job satisfaction. Another 57.1% indicated that there was need for training new employees on the unique equipment, systems, and processes of the Company to equip these employees with the skills and knowledge of working with these systems and equipment. 35.7% of respondents
suggested continuous assessments for new employees for the initial six months so that they are closely guided in the ways of the company’s business processes; while 14% of the sample of participants indicated that more benefits and incentives are central to motivating employees and make them productive.

**Figure 4.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Respondents' suggestions to improve job satisfaction</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need more training on the unique equipment, systems and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more challenging work to fully utilize my knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation for more responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more exposure to processes in my job area so that I am able to do them confidently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation for more responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Findings from field data (2017)**

**4.3.2.5. Factors likely to push respondents out of Aggreko**

This item was meant to elicit likely push factors as given by participants, in order to establish those that could have been, or that in future can, be addressed through new employee induction. A summary of these perceived push factors are illustrated in Figure 4.10.
As shown above, 78.6% of the respondents indicated that they would be tempted to leave the organization due to the prevailing poor salary and benefits structure. Highlighted before as a cause for poor job satisfaction, it is important to note how this can lead to employee disengagement and result in lower productivity. 64.3% of the participants showed that unclear contracts of employment and unfulfilled promises are likely to push them out of the company; with a similar percentage citing job insecurity. The latter was true for expatriates, contract and permanent local employee respondents alike, probably anxious about the Company’s contract which runs for only three years at the current project. 50% of the participants felt that their job scopes are limited and that they are being under-utilized in the company; while 50.9% revealed that a significant push factor for them is the fact that there is no room for career development in the company. It is important to note that employees’ concern for their future affects their level of engagement, and coupled with low job satisfaction, is a sure factor to lower employee satisfaction.
productivity. Such employees will spend the company’s productive time looking for better opportunities elsewhere using company resources, like the internet and computers, for example.

4.3.2.6. Suggested further information that can be added to the current induction programme

Table 4.3 Summarized additional information to be added to current induction programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested information to be added into Induction Programme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural induction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition in the industry and how we are performing relative to the competition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide new employees with their job descriptions right at the onset</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should provide induction programme, HR Policies, and Code of conduct</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear job scope, performance targets and method of performance evaluation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR must clarify bonuses and incentives</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should provide end of induction evaluation form to allow for input by inductees into the programme</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for clear on the job induction by supervisors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculations from field data (2017)

As illustrated in Table 4.3, this is a summary of additional information that respondents felt should be added to the current induction programme in Aggreko. It is interesting to note that the need to provide new employees with their job descriptions from the onset as they join the organization tops the list of suggestions, at 85.7%, a view supported by Lindsay (2011) and Ongori (2007). This was followed by the need for Human Resources to clarify bonuses and incentives offered by the company, suggested by 78.6% of the participants. Cultural induction was suggested by 71.4% of the respondents, with another 64.3% opining that there is need to
provide inductees with the induction programme, Human Resources policies, and the Code of Conduct to be used by the company. The need for a clear job scope, performance targets and method of performance evaluation was suggested by 57% of the respondents, with a similar number indicating that there is need to provide an end of induction evaluation form to allow for input from inductees and to assess how successful or otherwise the induction programme was. These findings are consistent with literature on this subject matter as these issues indeed have a bearing on employee productivity, e.g., Stirzaker (2004) makes a case for cultural induction especially for new employees being deployed in foreign cultures, and this can’t have any better meaning than in a multi-national and multi-cultural organization like Aggreko International Power Projects.

4.3.2.7. Respondents’ views on whether or not the absence of the information above during induction affected employees’ productivity.

The above question was generated to establish if at all the information indicated as missing in the current induction programme at Aggreko International Power Projects affected respondents’ productivity. As demonstrated in Figure 4.11, 72% of the respondents indicated that indeed the absence of this information during induction affected their productivity; while 21% indicated that the absence of this information did not affect them, with 7% electing to remain neutral. Interestingly, the respondents indicating that the absence of this information during induction did not affect their productivity are all expatriates whose induction was not done at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe) operation.

Figure 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses on whether or not missing information during induction affected productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72%
21%
7%

Source: Calculations from field data (2017)
4.3.2.8. How missing information during induction affected respondents’ productivity

Figure 4.11

How missing information during induction impacted respondents' productivity

Source: Calculations from field data (2017)

Figure 4.11 is a summary of responses provided by participants on how the absence of the information or activities in Table 4.5 affected their productivity. As can be seen above, almost 80% of the respondents revealed that the absence of a job description during their induction meant they lost time trying to figure out their role by themselves. Related to this is the response by almost 50% of the participants alluding to the fact that they found themselves doing too many things, some of which were outside their scope, thereby losing their productive time on things not meant to be done by them. 70% of these respondents highlighted that the absence of cultural induction meant they spent time engaging in cultural clashes between expatriates and local employees over perceived superiority of the former over the latter, hence losing productive time and defeating teamwork. A further 60% indicated that policies and procedures were not clear,
therefore could have lost more productive time trying to figure out for themselves how to do the right things, which slowed their rate of work, and probably resulting in less being achieved over a set period of time. About 57% of the respondents explained that they were demotivated by the absence of clear information on benefits and incentives, which differed significantly from what they had been told during their recruitment interviews. A similar number expressed that the absence of performance targets made them feel unaccountable, and so their productivity declined. Lastly, the absence of on the job induction by the supervisors meant that the respondents, as new employees, had to observe their expatriate colleagues do the work, and learn how to do the work from them, and these constituted about 47% of the respondents. Productivity time was lost observing others do the work, and it was worse when the observed expatriate worker did the work wrongly, as the observing new employee could not tell whether what was being done was the correct thing or otherwise. These findings are indeed consistent with the reviewed literature, particularly the last point where assigning new employees a mentor to help guide them was considered as critical to enable the new hire to settle in their role. (Ballard and Blessing, 2014; Laurano, 2013; Stirzaker, 2004).

4.3.2.9. Respondents’ suggestions on what else Company can do to derive maximum productivity from employees

The above question was designed to elicit respondents’ suggestions on what they feel the Company can do to make them more productive. The researcher was looking for consistency of information, particularly on those issues that can be addressed by the induction programme; and those that can be corrected in the first three months of employment for new employees. Factors pointed earlier as affecting job satisfaction, those whose absence affected employee productivity, as well as those given as suggestions for improving the programme and process of induction, were expected to feature in one form or another at this stage of the questionnaire. It would be interesting to note the level of consistency, or the absence thereof.
As illustrated on Figure 4.12 above, 92.9% of the respondents pointed out that paying market-related salaries and incentives can motivate them to be more productive. 78.6% noted that there is need for guaranteed job security, with provision of clear information on the project, while another 64.3% indicated that there was need for equal opportunities for training and development. Access to relevant business and job information on the company intranet and Virtual Learning Service (VLS), an online training portal for the company was cited by 50% of the respondents as likely to increase employee productivity. Clear succession planning and career growth opportunities was indicated as important in ensuring maximum productivity by 50% of the respondents; with 57% of respondents suggesting that clarifying roles, and ensuring full utilization of employee skills and expertise will make employees highly productive. Another
43% indicated the need to embrace a participatory approach in all matters relating to employees in the organization.

4.5. Summary
This research employed basically qualitative methods of data analysis. The different responses by respondents were first clustered together, common themes or responses identified, and summaries of these made. In some instances, descriptive statistics were used to explain some relationships between and among variables. Graphs and tables were used to present summaries of the data for ease of analysis. The analysis of the data was sequential, following the order of the questionnaire, and as alluded to in the introduction to this chapter. The closed items of the questionnaire were analyzed under four elements; while the open-ended items were analyzed question by question, with responses graphically presented for easy analysis. Therefore this chapter focused on the data presentation, discussion and interpretation of the research findings. The analysis of data focused on accurate descriptions, clarity and ability to condense the data. The research results were then linked to, where necessary, the literature review in order to make sense of the findings and deriving meaning of the same as this indicated similarities and differences with theory and previous research findings on the topic. All the research questions were discusses and practical implications of the results were stated relative to induction and employee productivity. The findings on the research questions were each stated, analyzed and discussed, so that the researcher could come up with recommendations for the study and other researches to follow.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction
This research sought to establish the impact of induction to employee productivity at Aggreko International Power Projects – Zimbabwe, evaluate the impact of the induction programme, and finally assess the relationship between induction and productivity at the company. The need for this study was premised on the background of high levels of absenteeism, high labour turnover, high number of reprimands and written warnings to staff, confusion over company policies and procedures, all which are robbers of productivity; and which can be addressed by a well thought-out and well-implemented induction programme. The first chapter introduced the research topic overview; the second chapter presented a review of the literature around the subject matter; chapter three gave an expose of the research methodology, and the fourth chapter presented an analysis of the collected data. In this chapter of the research project report, focus is on three key areas namely a summary of the major findings, the research conclusions and recommendations. In the major findings summary, a brief synopsis of the implications of the findings in terms of the research objectives is given. The research conclusions are the summed up answers to the research questions and have been drawn directly from the findings. The recommendations state the actions that should be taken to solve problems identified by the study, and suggestions are made for future research on the study.

5.2. Research objectives
The objectives of this research are summarized below:

i. To analyze the role of induction or onboarding for new talent in the Company

ii. To assess the relationship between induction and employee productivity at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe)

iii. To evaluate the impact of induction at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe)
In order to achieve the above stated objectives, the following questions were considered as the guiding compass for both the research and the researcher:

i. How is induction carried out at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe)?

ii. What critical role does the process of induction play to new talent in Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe)?

iii. What impact does the induction programme at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe) have to both the employee and the organization?

iv. Is there a relationship between induction and employee productivity at Aggreko International Projects (Zimbabwe)?

5.3. Summary of findings

In undertaking this research, the researcher benefitted very much from the deep insights that it revealed, and some significant underlying pressures, feelings, and concerns expressed by respondents as employees that may otherwise remain inaccessible to management with regards company processes and programmes like new employee induction. Literature reviewed indicated that there is a significant relationship between new employee induction and productivity. This assertion can be corroborated by findings of this research in a way that make it imperative to consider the process of induction as of strategic significance in achieving the organization’s goals through leveraging talent for competitive advantage. Failure to run the induction process properly will certainly result in decreased productivity by employees. It should be noted that the major objectives of induction according to the Aggreko International Power Projects Induction Policy are to ensure that new or promoted employees quickly settle in their positions, and start being productive; convince new employees to commit unreservedly to the organization; introduce new employees to the organization, their roles, and their team colleagues; and eventually, indoctrinate new employees into the company culture by informing them the key policies that drive the business, its vision, mission and values.

The research managed to establish that induction is being carried out at Aggreko International Power Projects, albeit differently from what is presented in the company’s Induction Policy. On the mandatory aspects of induction, the company appeared to be doing well given the high score indices for coverage of the Quality, Safety, Health and Environment Policy; Ethics Policy and on
the company’s vision, mission and values, which represent the organizational culture, as illustrated by Table 4.2. There is however little attention paid to the company’s ICT Policy and supplying employees with the Company’s Induction Policy. The latter may not be very necessary to deliver to new employees, as it is a management guide on how to conduct the induction process and its objectives.

Despite not having signed job descriptions, all the respondents in the study indicated that they were aware of their role and how it fits with the overall business objectives. It was also noted in the research that there is low job satisfaction in the company, and role clarity is very low, despite participants’ confirmation that they know their roles and how they fit in the overall business. This is because participants were never given their job descriptions when they joined the organization as new entrants, which is a document that is supposed to guide them on their role tasks, where they report to, and their subordinate(s) as well, if any. There is a deep feeling of under-utilisation of employees’ skills and knowledge, and significant dissatisfaction with the amount and quality of work by participants at the end of the day. These are dangerous robbers of productivity as they demotivate employees in their attempt to focus on their work roles and deliver in them.

Despite the foregoing, a significant number of the respondents noted that they spent their time at work productively, and were happy to commit themselves and their future to the organization. While engagement was relatively high as measured by positive responses on commitment to the company, there were notable variances on identification with the company brand when respondents were asked of their pride in working for Aggreko International Power Projects. Major positive observations were made on perceived supervisory competence, team work and tolerance for diversity, all of which are antecedents to high employee productivity.

The shortcomings of the current induction programme and process were identified through the research as respondents expressed how these could be improved so that they are better able to meet new employees’ expectations and help them to understand the company, their roles and expectations upon them better, as given in Figures 4.5 and 4.6. Respondents also presented their suggestions and opinions for improving satisfaction in their jobs and roles, and as noted, some of
them had nothing to do with induction, but form a critical package of managerial information for insights into the workforce feelings and perceptions (Figure 4.8). Possible push factors that are perceived as most likely to drive employees out of the company were noted as given by respondents (Figure 4.8), and these were observed to be easily addressed through the induction programme. There were also suggestions of further information that could be added to the induction programme, and how absence of this information affected respondents as new employees (Table 4.3 and Figures 4.11). This information was perceived critical for the recommendation that will be made to the organization with regards its induction programme so as to improve it for the benefit of both the new employees and the organization. Figure 4.12 gives an insight into respondents’ views on what the company can do to spur productivity by its employees, and this revealed other factors considered relevant by employees to make them become more productive in their roles, aside those that can be addressed via the induction programme.

In view of the foregoing, the research therefore managed to establish the presence of an induction policy in the company and a programme to guide the induction process. The research findings corroborated information established through the literature review, and managed to confirm that the process of induction is important to increase employee productivity in a number of ways in the company. The research questions, employed to aid the researcher toward the objectives of the research, were successfully answered and the propositions were confirmed.

5.4. Conclusions

Following this research, a number of observations were made, and some conclusions were reached at, and these are summarized below.

From the research, it was concluded that new employee induction was being carried out in the Company, though differently from the Induction Policy provisions in terms of content and procedure, which resulted in lack of sufficient information being provided to employees. The absence of this information to employees led to low employee productivity.

There are some possible combinations of factors that make determination of productivity through the Subjective Measures Approach (SMA) difficult. For example, there was low job satisfaction
among employees in the Company, and role clarity was found to be equally very low, despite the high level of engagement of employees according to responses provided by participants. This unlikely scenario makes it difficult to determine the impact this combination of factors will have on productivity as high engagement is supposed to promote high productivity while low job satisfaction and low role clarity are antecedents of low employee productivity.

It was also concluded that the deep feeling of underutilization of employees’ skills and knowledge, led to employee demotivation thereby negatively impacting their levels of productivity. The same was true with the significant dissatisfaction with the amount and quality of work, which is also a cause of low employee productivity.

Another interesting conclusion deduced from the research was that it is indeed feasible to employ the process of induction as a strategic tool with the capacity to improve employee productivity if done well. This derives from the notion that new employees are given sufficient information about the organization, their roles and expectations for them which points them the direction they should take in their course of duty. Absence of critical information for whatever reason during the induction process will affect employees’ levels of productivity.

The research also concluded that participants, as employees themselves, know what should be covered in their induction programmes in order to equip them with the relevant information they need to become more productive, hence the need to involve them in programme content design and process evaluation.

Lastly, the research concluded that the Subjective Measures Approach (SMA) proved to reach the underlying feelings and experiences of employees, key in identifying factors that make them more or less productive, although it may not be on its own conclusive as it is open to self-biases by respondents who may tend to give answers they feel they researcher is looking for, or that reflect positively on them.

5.5. Recommendations
While the research managed to elicit a number of positives concerning the induction programme in Aggreko, respondents who participated in this research also pointed out to a number of areas that required attention to make both the programme more valuable and the process an engaging and memorable one. These are discussed in this section, with supporting literature from previous
works on the same subject matter. Induction, being a management process, need not be under-
estimated in terms of the gains to be derived when done properly; and equally so, its negative
consequences when done otherwise. What is more critical is that the recommendations are
coming from the experiences and perceptions of employees who have had an induction
experience with the Company, and some who may be comparing the current induction with
others they have experienced before in their career.

5.5.1. Improve induction programme and process
The purpose of an induction programme is to ensure that all the necessary and critical
information for the new entrant into the organization is disseminated clearly, and all that they
need to know at this stage (Armstrong, 2008; Stirzaker, 2004). There is need for the organization
to ensure that the induction programme is structured, so that it allows for uniformity and
consistency of information given to all new employees as they join the organization. This is
supported by findings in the literature review where Bauer (2010); Noe etal, (2011), Snell and
Bohlander (2011), Ballard & Blessing, (2006) and Stirzaker (2004), all advocate for a structured
formal induction to achieve the above stated goal. As suggested by respondents in this research,
the research programme must be guided by a checklist, which is argued by Ballard and Blessing
(2014) as repeatedly cited in literature, “as a common way to making explicit what needs to be
learned, responsibility for teaching what needs to be learned, and what the timeline for learning
is…” In like manner, respondents suggested that checklists should not just be used as a guide of
what should be covered by who, but that there was also need to provide end of induction
evaluation forms so that inductees can rate the programme and to what extent it met their
expectations over the induction process, just like any other training programme would require
evaluation at the end (Armstrong, 2006; Torrington etal, 2014; Snell and Bohlander, 2011). The
specific suggestions to do with the induction programme in the company are summarized in
Figure 4.5 in Chapter 4.

There is also need for the company to make the induction process very interactive, which was a
highly recommended aspect to improve the process by respondents during the research. If
induction is considered as learning, as presented by Noe etal (2011), Stirzaker (2004) and
Armstrong (2006), it has to be interactive so that the new employees can participate in the
learning process than being passive recipients of information. Armstrong (2006) in particular advocates for a formal process as an opportunity to present messages about the company’s products and services, vision, mission and values to a group of new employees, which allows for use of a range of media such as videos, group discussions and other visual aids to bring meaning to the induction process.

The induction process itself must be made mandatory for every new employee before they set their foot into the plant, so that the comprehensive coverage of safety and high risk areas is done to inform the new employees of the critical dangers that are within the power generation plant as lack of such knowledge and information can lead to fatal accidents, which has a negative impact on both employee productivity and reputation of the company’s brand (Noe et al., 2011). It is also important to ensure that the induction process allows for exposure of new employees to all the operations of the company, provided they are handed over to the qualified guides of each and every department or area that they tour. This allows providing them with the real goings-on in the business, and makes them appreciate how their role will fit in the process flow of the business. As noted by Erickson and Gratton (2007), exposing new talent to those elements that makes the organization unique and exceptional to its competitors significantly helps improve new talent engagement and performance.

It is also important for the company to ensure that all relevant paperwork be done and completed on the first day of the employee’s engagement, while some forms and other documents like the job description can even be sent to the employee prior to their joining so that they familiarise themselves with the contents thereof. This should be done in order to reduce the amount of time wasted attending to paperwork when the employee is supposed to be undergoing their induction training, or doing productive work for which they are employed (Armstrong, 2006; Stirzaker, 2004). Another important recommendation in this area, which was also given as a suggestion by respondents, and has support in the literature reviewed, is the need to provide information during induction in small doses. Stirzaker (2004) warns against information overload, hence the need for the company to ensure that the process is properly structured and paced. It is noted that at this early stage into the organization inductees are most concerned with information concerning their new roles, and therefore retention for any other information is significantly low. It therefore
follows that there is wisdom in scheduling information and thereby spreading the induction period over a period as some information will only assume relevancy later on when the employee is now doing their job (Stirzaker, 2004).

5.5.2. Address factors leading to low job satisfaction.
As noted in section 5.2.2 above, a significant number of respondents indicated that they were not satisfied with their jobs. Figure 4.8 provides a summary of these factors that were indicated as causing low job satisfaction. The role of job satisfaction in fostering new employee engagement and subsequent productivity need not be under-estimated (Bauer, 2010). As respondents indicated, there is need for training of new employees in the unique equipment, systems and processes of the organization so that they are confident enough to execute their roles, which are clarified to them prior to starting the actual work. This can be achieved through induction training in the employee’s departments, as suggested by Armstrong (2006) in his clamour for a formal on-the-job induction programme. Thompson (2015) noted that 62% of employees in a survey in the United Kingdom stated that training and professional development contributed significantly to their job satisfaction. Role clarity and role expansion are also important considerations to mitigate role confusion and the feeling of underutilisation by employees. Wanous and Reichers (2000) note that role ambiguity is at its highest during the early days of employment, and it is the role of induction to ensure that the new employee has had their role clearly explained and delimited for them. This will help them to focus their energies on their particular role, and do it well; while expanding job responsibilities allows employees to exercise their minds wider as they put their knowledge and skills to use for productive work. The company can also utilize its established teams of excellence to assign specialized teams to relevant tasks, responsibilities or even bigger project assignments so that there is a feeling of practical application of the employees’ knowledge and skills. This will make such employees more productive, and the organization can benefit more from that.

And as with any other training programme, there is need for continuous assessment of new employees especially during their initial three months of probation. This has the effect of stretching the induction period to that time, which will help the organization to focus on the full integration of the new employee into the organization’s system. Bauer (2010) and Thompson
(2015) agree that the longer the induction or onboarding programme, the more successful it becomes.

5.5.3. Reviewing and updating the induction programme and neutralize its impact
The need for reviewing the induction programme is one of the major suggestions that were made by respondents. There was significant information that employees considered missing, and yet very important in helping them to settle well quickly and become very productive in the organization (Table 4.3) and the implications of this missing information on the respondents’ productivity was summarized in Figure 4.11. While the issue of job descriptions was discussed significantly under sections 5.2.2 and 5.3.1, it was a major concern for respondents on key missing information in the induction programme, hence there is need to prepare employees’ job descriptions before they come into the organization, and have them signed right on the first day of reporting for duty.

Though tolerance for diversity scored high in the research, respondents noted that it was one key missing aspect of the induction programme, especially given the fact that Aggreko International Power Projects is a multi-cultural and multi-national organization. The recommendation to include diversity and cultural induction in the current programme is in line with literature reviewed on the subject. Snell and Bohlander (2011) actually noted that two out of three companies in the United States of America have increased and broadened their diversity training programmes due to increasing globalization. They observed that aside increasing globalization, the varied dynamics of the workforce, dynamics of stereotyping, changing values of the workforce and the potential competitive payoffs from multi-cultural, multi-national and mixed gender work teams, have been other driving factors toward diversity training. In support of this view, Walton (1994) as quoted by Stirzaker (2004) applauds diversity in as far as it “leads to a more interesting, innovative and productive work environment.” Stirzaker (2004) also observed that it is important to create and develop cultural awareness within work teams, emphasizing more on the similarities than differences, but the differences must be identified and discussed so as to understand that they are not important. The divisive nature of cultural variances must not be underestimated; hence the need to build an organizational culture that transcends individual national cultures. The induction process therefore should seek to encourage a cultural synergy
that derives from cooperation and collaboration with people who are different, and this is best achieved through teamwork.

Respondents also noted that it is equally crucial that the company provides employees with the information on the induction programme, Human Resources policies and the Company Code of Conduct applicable to the new employees. Armstrong (2006) observed that these items can be summarised in an employee handbook which contains such aspects as a brief company description, in terms of its history, products, organizational structure and management; basic conditions of employment; types of leave applicable, and procedures for applying for leave; company rules; disciplinary, training, grievance and promotion procedures, as well as facilities available and their locations. The company must also ensure that policies on bonuses and incentives are very clear as these are significant motivators in driving employee productivity, and when they are misunderstood, there arises challenges with regards commitment and engagement by employees to the organization.

It is important to note that other issues raised as information missing, for example, the need for a clear job scope, need for performance targets and methods of performance evaluation should really be basic and central to any new employee joining the organization. However others were noted to do more with the psychological contract issue. As noted earlier, Torrington et al. (2014) observed that the induction process can be used to convey to new starters important cultural messages about what the organization expects and what employees can expect in return. It thus potentially forms an important stage in the establishment of the psychological contract, leaving new employees clear about what they need to do to advance their own prospects in the organization.

5.5.4. Address push factors to foster employee engagement and productivity

Figure 4.9 summarised the commonly highlighted factors that respondents considered as likely to push them out of the company. This will inevitably result in high labour turnover, whose implications are reduced employee productivity. Lamoureux (2008) argued that the cost of turnover is estimated at 150% of salary cost, therefore the role of new employee induction in achieving turnover reduction need not be underestimated. It was highlighted by respondents that
poor salary and benefits structure are a key potential factor to drive them out of the organization. As noted earlier in the discussion on job satisfaction, there is need for the company to pay market-related salaries, with a clearly explained benefits structure in order to motivate staff to be productive. The company must also ensure that the employment contract is comprehensive and clear enough to the employee so that they do not develop unrealistic expectations from the organization.

The issue of limited job scope and feeling of underutilisation of skills and knowledge by employees has been discussed before as affecting employee job satisfaction; and was indicated by respondents as among the key push factors. This is tied to the one on lack of room for career growth as respondents indicated that they were not sure of their career paths. These are serious factors that can trigger discomfort in employees as they are unsure of their future with the company, and are quick to jump on the next opportunity that comes their way. The induction programme in the company must be able to address this during job induction in the employees’ departments. The statistics provided by Thompson (2015) in this regard are frightening as a trigger of turnover. She noted that employees who feel that they cannot achieve their career goals with their current employer are 12 times more likely to consider leaving; and that this figure rises to 30 times more likely when it comes to new employees. With millennials, who are becoming the mainstay of most organizations’ labour demographics, the propensity to leave was found to be prevalent in 52% of them if career progression is not guaranteed in the workplace. Besides, research by Lynda.com as quoted by Thompson (2015) established that 78% of the employees in a survey attested to the fact that a clear career path would compel them to stay with an organization longer, thereby promoting retention, engagement and subsequently, productivity.

5.6. Suggestions for future research on study
While this particular study employed a research design that would help answer the research questions set for this study, there are still opportunities to better this research in certain areas so that more accurate results can be obtained. Firstly, further studies can be conducted encompassing a bigger cross-section of organizations in a multi-case study design. It can be company-wide, where the same study is done across all projects in all countries the company is operating; or it can be industry-wide, so that consistency of findings can be evaluated. This will
allow for a comparative analysis to be made between cases and measure the degree of correlation in terms of case findings, which will allow for improved generalisability. Secondly, there is need to employ methodological triangulation through use of interviews to elicit more clear information and deliver deeper into issues generated in the questionnaire that may not be very clear. In this case, the interview will complement the questionnaire, so that one will make up for weaknesses in the other, which will allow for more comprehensive, clear and meaningful data being generated. There may be issues that respondents to a questionnaire may not be very clear on, and their responses may be further clarified on such areas through an interview. Furthermore, it is also quite feasible to conduct a longitudinal study to evaluate the role of new employee induction in aiding productivity over time, and note any possible dynamics that may occur over time especially in factors that determine employee productivity like engagement, job satisfaction, role clarity and perceived team and leadership support. Future research can also focus on organizational culture adaptation of new employees through induction, that is, to what extent induction can be used as a method to ensure cultural adaptation by new employees in a new organization. Finally, research can be done on a comparative approach to methodology, i.e., subjective measures assessment of productivity versus objective measures and see if they can achieve the same results. These are all possible areas of further enquiry from which theory can be generated with regards new employee induction and productivity.

5.7. Summary
In summary, this study managed to establish previous research with regards new employee induction and how it impacts employee productivity. Employing the subjective measures approach to measuring both potential and actual productivity through assessing the factors that affect employee productivity, the research was able to assess how respondents rated these factors as applying to them, with the researcher interpreting these responses relative to productivity. In this context the research managed to show that indeed new employee induction plays a significant role as an informational, educational and pre-work training process in determining employee productivity. The research also managed to analyse the role and benefits of the induction programme at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe), and how it impacts employee productivity. A summary of the major findings was given, followed by the conclusions made from the data analysis, then recommendations were made to improving both the induction
process and programme, as well as areas to attend to in order to improve employee engagement, job satisfaction, and employee retention as key drivers of employee productivity. The final item was on suggestions for future research on the study and the areas to focus on, which can still be improved on by willing and interested future researchers.

5.8. Conclusion of the whole research

This qualitative, exploratory and descriptive research sought to establish the role of new employee induction toward employee productivity as confined to Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe). The need for this arose out of the observed high levels of absenteeism, high labour turnover, high number of reprimands and written warnings to staff, confusion over company policies and procedures, all which are robbers of productivity; and which can be addressed by a well thought-out and well-implemented induction programme. To this effect, the researcher was interested in finding out if and how the induction programme was being carried out at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe) by assessing the employees’ perceptions and subjective opinions of the employees out of their experience. It was established through the research that while the company has got an Induction Policy that clearly spells out who should be inducted, and the key areas forming the pillars of the induction programme, the programme was not fully being followed. The Induction Policy clearly states the objectives and expected outcomes of the induction programme, which however were in contrast to the findings of this research.

The outcome of this research established that despite the availability of a guiding induction programme, the actual induction process tends to be divergent from the programme. The unavailability of an induction checklist and an evaluation procedure at the end of the induction period is a serious anomaly in as far as it contradicts with the reviewed literature. The absence of a clearly laid out cultural induction provision in the induction programme is also contradictory to literature on the subject. It was also noted that employee engagement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and role clarity were very low, which is a recipe for low employee productivity, as literature points to these being predictors of high labour productivity. While perceived supervisory competence, team work and tolerance for diversity were shown to be quite high, these cannot guarantee high employee productivity when dissatisfaction with the job,
company policies, salary and benefits is high. The fact that there is low job satisfaction, low role clarity, discontent about the psychological contract, and illusions about career growth, assuming that there is high employee productivity on the basis of moderate employee engagement and expressed commitment to the organization is a fallacy. For new employee induction to bear a positive influence on productivity, the recommendations presented in this discussion must be pursued and implemented. The following words by Thompson, (2015), will always ring true:

“An effective on-boarding experience can make or break an employee engagement, productivity and retention. It can play a critical role in how employees perceive an organization and its culture.” (2015:3)
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APPENDICEES

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RESPONDENTS

Questionnaire No:________

NEW EMPLOYEE INDUCTION AND PRODUCTIVITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Hi, thank you for participating in this survey. My name is Nevermind Chingwena, and I am a student at Bindura University of Science Education (BUSE), studying toward a Master’s Degree in Business Leadership (MBL). I am carrying out a research on “The Impact of Induction to Employee Productivity at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe)”, as a requirement of the study programme. This research is purely academic, although the findings could be shared with Company management so that they can also use the information in the report to improve on their operations. Please kindly answer the following questions as honestly as you can and this will take about ten (10) minutes of your time.

SECTION A – DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Please tick the box that corresponds to your choice answer with an X

1. Age
   - 18 – 24
   - 25 – 30
   - 31 – 35
   - 36 – 40
   - 41 – 45
   - 45+

2. Sex
   - Male
   - Female
   - Don’t know

3. Marital status
   - Married
   - Single
   - Divorced

4. Please state your nationality:________________________________________________________

5. Your highest education qualification
   - Grade 7
   - ZJC
   - O-Level
   - A – Level
   - National Certificate
   - Diploma
   - HND
   - Degree
   - Masters
   - None
SECTION B – JOB/WORK INFORMATION

6. How long have you been with Aggreko International Power Projects (Pvt) Ltd?
   - Less than 1 year
   - 1 – 4 years
   - 5 – 8 years
   - 9 – 12 years
   - 13 years plus

7. Employment type
   - Permanent Local
   - Contract Local
   - Permanent Expat
   - Contract Expat
   - Other (Specify)_________

8. Department
   - Operations
   - Supply Chain
   - Finance
   - QSHE
   - Human Resources

9. Job area__________
   - Mechanical
   - Electrical
   - Stores/Purchasing
   - Accounting
   - Driving
   - Cleaning
   - Other (Specify)_______________

SECTION C – INDUCTION AND PRODUCTIVITY

10. I am aware of the Aggreko induction policy
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Neutral
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

11. How long after joining the Company, were you inducted?
    ______________________________________________________________________________________

12. I was inducted on, and am aware of, the Company’s vision, mission and values
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Neutral
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

13. I was inducted on, and am aware of the company Quality, Safety, Health and Environment policy
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Neutral
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree
14. I am well versed with the Company’s IT Policy from my induction
   - (Circle) Strongly Agree
   - (Circle) Agree
   - (Circle) Neutral
   - (Circle) Disagree
   - (Circle) Strongly Disagree

15. I was inducted on, and am aware of the Aggreko Ethics Policy
   - (Circle) Strongly Agree
   - (Circle) Agree
   - (Circle) Neutral
   - (Circle) Disagree
   - (Circle) Strongly Disagree

16. I fully understand my role and how it fits into the overall business
   - (Circle) Strongly Agree
   - (Circle) Agree
   - (Circle) Neutral
   - (Circle) Disagree
   - (Circle) Strongly Disagree

17. I have a signed job description that details my role
   - (Circle) Strongly Agree
   - (Circle) Agree
   - (Circle) Neutral
   - (Circle) Disagree
   - (Circle) Strongly Disagree

18. My skills and knowledge are being fully utilized in my role
   - (Circle) Strongly Agree
   - (Circle) Agree
   - (Circle) Neutral
   - (Circle) Disagree
   - (Circle) Strongly Disagree

19. I am happy with my quality and amount of work every day
   - (Circle) Strongly Agree
   - (Circle) Agree
   - (Circle) Neutral
   - (Circle) Disagree
   - (Circle) Strongly Disagree

20. I feel positive about my long term future at Aggreko
   - (Circle) Strongly Agree
   - (Circle) Agree
   - (Circle) Neutral
   - (Circle) Disagree
   - (Circle) Strongly Disagree

21. All my time at work is spent on productive work
   - (Circle) Strongly Agree
   - (Circle) Agree
   - (Circle) Neutral
   - (Circle) Disagree
   - (Circle) Strongly Disagree

22. I feel proud working for Aggreko
   - (Circle) Strongly Agree
   - (Circle) Agree
   - (Circle) Neutral
   - (Circle) Disagree
   - (Circle) Strongly Disagree

23. I have received enough training to help me do my job very well
   - (Circle) Strongly Agree
   - (Circle) Agree
   - (Circle) Neutral
   - (Circle) Disagree
   - (Circle) Strongly Disagree

24. I respect my manager as a fully competent professional
   - (Circle) Strongly Agree
   - (Circle) Agree
   - (Circle) Neutral
   - (Circle) Disagree
   - (Circle) Strongly Disagree
25. There is a strong feeling of teamwork and cooperation at Aggreko

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. There is tolerance for, and understanding of diversity at Aggreko (Zimbabwe)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

27. What suggestions can you make to improve the induction programme at Aggreko (Zimbabwe)

______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________

28. What can the company do to improve the induction process?

______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________

29. Can you comment on how satisfied you are with your job, and what can be done to make it more satisfying?

______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________

30. If you would you consider leaving Aggreko for another Company, what could be the push factors in your opinion?

______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________

31. What additional information do you think the Company should include in its induction programme to ensure that new employees are well informed of their roles that you did not receive?

______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
32. Do you think the absence of the information in (31) above affected your productivity? Explain your answer
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
33. What can be done for employees at Aggreko (Zimbabwe) so that the Company can get maximum productivity from them?
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
Thank you for your cooperation and precious time.
Appendix B: Letter of Introduction (Questionnaire)

16 St. Lucia Drive
Marlborough
Harare

24th April 2017

Dear Respondent.

RE: REQUEST FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN COMPLETING A RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

I am a student at Bindura University of Science Education, studying toward a Master’s in Business Leadership (MBL) Degree.

As part of the requirement for the MBL Programme, it is mandatory that I carry out a practical research project which will culminate into a dissertation, and would like to sincerely request for your participation in this research by completing the attached questionnaire. The research project is based on The Impact of Induction to Employee Productivity at Aggreko International Power Projects (Zimbabwe).

Please note that your selection has been purely based on a random selection of participants based at the Dema 200MW Site. The research is purely academic, though valuable information could be shared with the Company to enable improvement of systems around the subject matter. In light of this, be assured that your identity will remain anonymous and you are not required to disclose it on the questionnaire. May I kindly ask you to respond to all the questions as fully, as competently and as honestly as you can.

All the data and information that I will receive from you shall be solely used for academic purposes of the research and shall be kept confidential.

May I take this opportunity to thank you in advance for your anticipated cooperation and participation in this research.

Yours sincerely

Nevermind Chingwena
Student Number: B1027993
Cellphone number: +263 775 781 487
Email address: nmchingwena.78@gmail.com