

**RESPONSE OF SURVIVORS TO THE EFFECTS OF
DOWNSIZING IN KENYA: A COMPARATIVE
ANALYSIS OF THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE
SECTORS**

**BY
SAMUEL K. KALOKI**

**UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
KOTER KARETE LIBRARY**

**A MANAGEMENT RESEARCH PROJECT
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (MBA),
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI**

SEPTEMBER, 2007

University of NAIROBI Library




0500367 8

DECLARATION

I declare that this project is my original work and has never been presented for academic award in any other University.

SAMUEL K. KALOKI

SIGNED 

DATE 26/10/07

This research project has been submitted for examination with my approval as a University Supervisor

SIGNED 

DATE 26/10/07

Prof. Peter K'Obonyo
Professor of Management
Department Of Business Administration,
School Of Business,
University Of Nairobi

DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to my late grandmother; Elizabeth Wachuka for teaching me that
perseverance pays dividends

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the contributions that were made in the course of this project by several individuals and organizations. I wish to acknowledge gratefully the following people, whose effort influenced the content and direction of this project.

My first thanks go to my Supervisor Prof. Peter K'Obonyo for his constant analytical criticism and encouragement. Thanks a lot. My sincere thanks also go to the following Lecturers in the School of Business: Mr. Stephen Nzuve, Dr. Ogutu and Mr. Maalu.

I wish to thank my friends especially, Simon Sang, Patrick Gichira and Robert Mburu for a lot of support and encouragement to me in pursuit of this goal. My thanks also go to the organisations that despite their busy schedules were available for the interviews.

For all whose names have been indicated and many more who contributed though their names have not been indicated I say God bless you all.

Thank you.

ABSTRACT

Downsizing is a management philosophy with a strategic focus which is used by the management to streamline and shrink the organizational structure and consequently get rid of the personnel employed with a view to improving efficiency, productivity and competitiveness.

It has a devastating effect on both the victims and survivors. However, organizations have concentrated their efforts and resources on how to manage the retrenchment process and not on survivor who are supposed to run the operations of the post-down sized organizations. Yet, they overlook the fact that employees are not emotionally prepared to handle major disruptions.

The aim of this study was to establish the views of survivors on downsizing as well as establish the managements' response to downsizing.

The study used an exploratory research design and the data collection instrument was a self-administered questionnaire, which were distributed to employees of organizations in both public and private sectors.

In conclusion, the objectives of the study were achieved. It is evident from the study that survivors have a host of perceptions regarding downsizing and organizations have done very little to address them.

It is therefore recommended that the management in the two sectors should take a more proactive rather than reactionary when considering downsizing in order to foster positive employee attitude and rebuild employee loyalty after downsizing.

Table of Contents

DECLARATION	II
DEDICATION	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IV
ABSTRACT	V
LIST OF TABLES	VII
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 <i>BACKGROUND</i>	1
1.1.1 <i>Downsizing</i>	3
1.1.2 <i>The Public and Private Sector in Kenya</i>	7
1.2 <i>STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM</i>	14
1.3 <i>OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY</i>	16
1.4 <i>IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY</i>	16
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	17
2.1 <i>INTRODUCTION</i>	17
2.2 <i>DOWNSIZING DEFINED</i>	17
2.3 <i>LEVELS OF ANALYSIS OF DOWNSIZING</i>	19
2.4 <i>MEASURES OF DOWNSIZING</i>	21
2.5 <i>STRATEGIES OF DOWNSIZING</i>	22
2.6 <i>EFFECTS OF DOWNSIZING</i>	23
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHOD	27
3.1 <i>RESEARCH DESIGN AND POPULATION</i>	27
3.2 <i>SAMPLE</i>	27
3.3 <i>DATA COLLECTION METHOD</i>	28
3.4 <i>DATA ANALYSIS</i>	28
CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS.....	30
4.1 <i>OVERVIEW</i>	30
4.2 <i>BACKGROUND AND DEMOGRAPHIC DATA</i>	30
4.3 <i>FACTOR ANALYSIS</i>	32
4.3.2 <i>PUBLIC SECTOR</i>	33
4.3.3 <i>PRIVATE SECTOR</i>	39
4.3.4 <i>COMBINED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS</i>	45
4.4 <i>POST DOWNSIZING ORGANIZATIONL ACTIVITIES</i>	50
4.5 <i>OTHER FACTORS WHICH ORGANIZATIONS SHOUD HAVE GIVEN PRIORITY AFTER DOWNSIZING</i>	69
4.5.1 <i>Public Sector</i>	69
4.5.2 <i>Private Sector</i>	70
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	71
5.1 <i>SUMMARY</i>	71
5.2 <i>CONCLUSION</i>	74
5.3 <i>RECOMMENDATIONS</i>	74
5.3.1 <i>Management</i>	74
5.3.2 <i>Further Research</i>	75
5.4 <i>LIMITATION OF THE STUDY</i>	75
REFERENCES	76
APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SURVIVORS.....	81
APPENDIX 2: LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE DOWNSIZED	86

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 Response.....	30
Table 4.2: Demographic Characteristics of the Survivors	31
Table 4.3 Communalities – Public Sector.....	34
Table 4.4 Factor Extraction – Public	35
Table 4.5 Factors and Their Level of Importance	39
Table 4.6 Communalities – Private Sector.....	40
Table 4.7 Factor Extraction – Private Sector.....	41
Table 4.8: Factors and Their Level of Importance in Private Sector	45
Table 4.9: Communalities – Combined Public and Private	46
Table 4.10: Factor Extraction – Combined Public and Private	47
Table 4.11: Factors and their Level of Importance – Combined Public and Private	50
Table 4.12: Gave employees time to honour and grieve about the past.	51
Table 4.13: Chi-Square Tests	51
Table 4.14: Spoke about the organizations mission, vision and future plans.	51
Table 4.15: Chi-Square Tests	52
Table 4.16: Explained the new culture the organization intended to introduce.....	52
Table 4.17: Chi-Square Tests	52
Table 4.18: Explained my role in the organization's future plans	53
Table 4.19: Chi-Square Tests	53
Table 4.20: Provided an avenue that allowed me to ask questions regarding the organizations future.....	54
Table 4.21: Chi-Square Tests	54
Table 4.22: Communicated facts about the likely effects of downsizing	54
Table 4.23: Chi-Square Tests	55
Table 4.24: Put up a "good news board" where once could post positive information.	55
Table 4.25: Chi-Square Tests	55
Table 4.26: Formed a "small team" composed of group of employees who planned creative activities.	56
Table 4.27: Chi-Square Tests	56
Table 4.28: Started an instant recognition program to reward good performance	57
Table 4.29: Chi-Square Tests	57
Table 4.30: Gave gifts (e.g. shopping vouchers, wedding gifts and delivers flower to those hospitalized.	57
Table 4.31: Chi-Square Tests	58
Table 4.32: Established a management notice board and newsletter to keep employees updated	58
Table 4.33: Chi-Square Tests	58
Table 4.34: Conducted training workshops to create a new culture and emphasize organizations values.	59
Table 4.35: Chi-Square Tests	59
Table 4.36: Organized meetings where employees expressed their feelings without fear of victimization	60
Table 4.37: Chi-Square Tests	60
Table 4.38: Organized meeting to explain what they were doing to help employees who were leaving the organization	60
Table 4.39: Chi-Square Tests	61
Table 4.40: Organized meetings where the management explained how each of the jobs has changed and what my Responsibilities are.....	61
Table 4.41: Chi-Square Tests	61
Table 4.42: Developed performance management system in which managers sit down with their employees to help them manage their roles.....	62
Table 4.43: Chi-Square Tests	62
Table 4.44: Showed you how to develop skills that helped you think of change as an opportunity	63
Table 4.45: Chi-Square Tests	63
Table 4.46: Organized job-holder meetings during working hours where employees could ask sensitive questions	63
Table 4.47: Chi-Square Tests	64

Table 4.48: Organizes meetings where employees are taught to read financial statements and understand strategic planning processes.	64
Table 4.48: Chi-Square Tests	64
Table 4.49: Organized for counselor to visit individual work sites/ drop-in appointments to conduct group counseling sessions.....	65
Table 4.50: Chi-Square Tests	65
Table 4.51: The organization periodically carries out attitude surveys.	65
Table 4.52: Chi-Square Tests	66
Table 4.53: The organization has established equitable pay systems.	66
Table 4.54: Chi-Square Tests	66
Table 4.55: The organization has organized training in stress management.	67
Table 4.56: Chi-Square Tests	67
Table 4.57: Deployed a public relations official to answer telephone enquires from employees.....	67
Table 4.58: Chi-Square Tests	68
Table 4.59: Organized career planning and career advancement workshops	68
Table 4.60: Chi-Square Tests	68

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Throughout the last two decades, organizations have been undergoing major changes. According to Maynard and Mehtens (1993) “virtually all large organizations and mid-sized corporations in the United States and, to a lesser extent, Europe, are “imploding”. Implosion is the process of repeatedly liquidating assets, business units, manufacturing capability, development programmes and people to improve short term earnings (Jackson, 1996).

These changes have basically been occasioned by mergers, acquisitions, and divestitures (Tylczak, 1991), depressed demand for product or service, unanticipated loss of market, corporate complacency (Thornhill, Stead and Gibbons, 1997), global competition (Higginson and Waxler, 1989), limited resources (Lippit and Lippit, 1984), changes in technology (Quin, 1992), the need to stay solvent (Abrahamson, 2000), Secular shift from manufacturing (with its generally larger facilities) to services, entrepreneurship, returning to core competencies and vertical disintegration of big firms (Harrison, 1994). Other factors include economic uncertainty and in the public sector, government expenditure cutbacks (Hardy, 1987)

Many commentators also cite a desire for increased work flexibility, loss of financing, drop in share price, unacceptable administration or overhead costs, unacceptable profit margins and changes in government, regulations and even plain incompetence of managers as important factors.

Downsizing has become an acceptable euphemism for the phenomena where the above changes have resulted in organisations eliminating entire job levels, re-organization and restructuring. Arising from these changes, organizations can no longer sit still, believing that the factors that constituted success so far will necessarily generate sustained levels of profitability (Sahdev, Vinnicombe and Tyson, 1999). Whereas in the past growth was seen to be indicative of profitability and security, this idea no longer applies (Whethen, 1980; Greenhalgh, 1982). At the same time, large bureaucratic organizations are no longer tenable. Professor Littler of the University of Southern Queensland (1997) posits that no matter the downsizing/restructuring concept, all presuppose one thing: workforce reduction. To him, workforce reduction is built in all those restructuring concepts at the present time.

According to Sparrow and Marchington (1998), in the US, during the first 5 years of 1990's, 3.1 million workers lost their jobs through redundancies and re-organization. In the UK, between 1991 and 1995, workforce reductions in companies like Roll Royce, British Telecom, and British Petroleum was estimated to be between 34 and 43.6 percent (Kennedy, 1996). According to Rama (1997), a World Bank report also indicates that between 1991 and 1993 the Bank supported over 40 attempts in third world countries to downsize the public sector, (World Bank Economic Review Vol. 13. No.1). the units targeted included government administration, state owned enterprises and the military.

Kenya has not been spared by the wave of retrenchment. The government launched a retrenchment programme aimed at reducing its workforce by 42,000 in 2 years (Gitu,

2001). In September 2000 the Kenya Government retrenched over 25,000 civil servants. According to the Standard Newspaper of 14th May, 2001 several organizations have laid off their workers; for instance in April, 1990 Kenya Airways laid off 960 employees, East African Breweries in an exercise that started in 1994 retrenched 2200 workers. Kenya Tea Development Authority laid off 2700 workers and Kenya Commercial Bank has retrenched 500 employees. The State Universities not to be left behind had retrenched over 12,227 of their employees by June 2001. The Kenya Railways Corporation will retire 5500 by the end of 2006 while Telkom Kenya will shed off 1100 members of staff.

1.1.1 Downsizing

Although downsizing has been prevalent and has affected millions of workers both in private and public sectors, it has not been precisely defined by many writers. Therefore, one finds concepts, different levels of analysis (Cameron et al 1993). Cameron and others such as Halley (1995) of the Meridian International Institute report that terms taken as synonyms of downsizing include resizing, declining, restructuring, re-organizing, re-engineering, leaning up, streamlining, reduction in force, rightsizing, retrenchment, slimming, researching, non adapting, consolidating, administrative reform, downshifting and many others.

Each of these concepts may share some meanings with downsizing, but each may produce different connotations and criteria for assessment. Downsizing should be clearly defined in order to be precisely understood and measured.

What is organizational downsizing? Organizational downsizing “is a management philosophy that constitutes a set of activities, undertaken on the part of management of an organization, designed to improve organizational efficiency, productivity and/or competitiveness. Downsizing represents a strategy implemented by managers that affects the size of the firm’s work force and its work processes” (Cameron et al 1993). It has become the one most adopted by other authors such as: Freeman and Cameron (1993); Kozlowski; et al; (1993), Cascio (1993); Freeman and Mishra (1991); (Mishra and Mishra, (1994).

However, Hickok (2006) feels that this definition is over extended as it would appear that such organizational efforts like “total quality management” or “re-engineering” which are also undertaken by organizations but are not part of the same as this definition would seem to imply. To him downsizing is simply “a reduction in the size of the workforce”. Thus this does not imply a reduction in the assets of the organization. According to Cameron et al (1993), downsizing constitutes four (4) major attributes that help to define and separate it from related non synonymous concepts such as decline and layoff. This view is also held by Cascio, (1993); Thornhill and Sanders (1998). These four (4) attributes, intent, personnel efficiency and work processes are discussed hereunder:

1. Downsizing is “**intentional**” proactive taken by management to improve overall organizational efficiency and effectiveness. This response may be occasioned by mergers, acquisitions, divestitures, changes in technology or restructuring to better enable the organization meet its mission or fill an environmental niche (Kozlowski, 1991; Thornhill, stead and Gibbons, 1997; Tylczak, 1991).

2. The personnel attributes of downsizing usually involves **reductions in personnel**. However, downsizing is not limited to personnel reductions, additional staff may be added but the overall processes results in fewer numbers of workers employed per unit Vis' a vis' output as compared to some previous level of employment.
3. Downsizing occurs either reactively or proactively to contain costs, **enhances revenue and bolster competitiveness** (Tylczak 1999; Webster, 1994).
4. Downsizing activities may bring about changes in the work processes through **restructuring and eliminating work or some redesign**. After the reduction in the workforce, fewer employees remain to do the same amount of work, and this affects what gets down and how it gets done (Cameron, 1994).

Downsizing has been found to have a profound effect on survivors and organizations. Kozlowski et al (1993); Buch and Aldridge (1990), Quest and Conway (1996) State that employees will respond to reduced organizational trust and commitment, difficult to foster productivity, reduced creativity and innovation, occasioned by a breach by the organization of the psychological contract.

Downsizing may also have unintended negative consequences for individuals and organizations. Cameron (1994); Cascio, (1993); Kozlowski et al (1993) and Brockner et al (1992) state that some managers had reported a negative effect on their subordinates' productivity, morale and overall commitment to the organization.

Individual employees also undergo several responses: feelings of job insecurity, anger, job stress, decreased loyalty and organizational commitment, lowered motivation and increased

resistance to change (Brockner, Davy and Carter, 1985; Cameron et al, 1987; Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt, 1984)

Researchers in management science and psychology have found that survivors suffer from a host of symptoms that have been termed as survivor's syndrome. These symptoms include guilt, anxiety, fear, relieve shocked, insecurity, anger, denial, depression and resentful. It also refers to the way some survivors react when many of their friends and colleagues are forced to terminate their relationship with the organizations. Some of the researchers and psychologists include Noer (1993); Cascio, 1993, Baulmohol (1993) and Mcquire (2000). Downsizing Literature also suggest that post lay off work enviroments can be quite stressful lending to worry, anger, (Brocker et al, 1992) Presenteeism (cooper, 2000) burnouts (Levinson,1989)

Survivors also face problems of role ambiguity and role overload. Pareek (1993) states that, role ambiguity comes about when an individual is not clear about the various expectations that they have for their roles. On the other hand, role ambiguity comes about where there are conflicting demand or expectations by different persons having expectations from the role. According to Gibson, Invanncevich and Donnel, (1994) this may cause biochemical changes, especially elevations of cholesterol. Overload is harmful to those who experience lowest job satisfaction, lowered confidence, increased absenteeism; decrease in quality of decision making deterioration of interpersonal relations and increase in accident rates.

Downsizing itself has also been found to be a source of job stress. Tony Manning et al, (1994) has categorised these into personal behaviour and habits (complaints of headaches, physical slowing, lack of energy and memory loss); interpersonal behaviour (indecisiveness and unreasonable complaints, increased absenteeism and lateness; and emotional disturbance (feeling of boredom, monotony, frustration and poor self evaluation.

In addition to the effects mentioned above, researchers have reported such effects as: unfairness in job layoffs, perceived (procedural) justice, job performance, job insecurity, turnover intentions, coping strategies, supervisor support, optimism, job satisfaction, organizational morale, effectiveness of communication and envy of those taking advantage of separation incentive programmes.

1.1.2 The Public and Private Sector in Kenya

Over the years the core principles and function of Government and its institutions has been hotly debated, especially its pervasiveness and powers. Some political scientists, management writers and researchers feel that it should be everywhere where needs exist. Others see government as having moved beyond its core functions, and consequently it should be rooted out of the space it currently occupies, meaning that some of the space it occupies should be ceded to the private organizations. Others see the two institutions as having distinct and separate roles.

Williams (2003) states that the founders of the US Government established twenty (20) specific federal powers for the purpose of providing protection from invasion, domestic peace, justice under the law; clearly defined public works and interstate relations. Corby

and White (Eds) (1999) posit that public sector organizations exist to provide public goods to citizens, excluding the public corporations. To Bryson (1995) public organizations are established to fill social and political needs. Rosenbloom (1998) contributes to the debate by stating that public organizations are differentiated by the breadth of scope, impact and public accountability or political character. He adds that government agencies exist not for profit but to fulfill their mandates or mission as delegated by parliament, the key measure being mission effectiveness. Osborne and Gaebler (1992) contribute by differentiating the role of government and business organizations. The differences lies in the fact that government get most of its money from tax payers, and that government and its institutions must serve everyone equally regardless of their ability to pay or their demand for service.

On the other hand, business organizations are driven by profit motive; that business gets their money from their customers when they buy products or services. Moore (1995) sees the strategic role of the private sector as competitiveness and general financial goals as profit, growth, market share, creativity and good will. He states that the stakeholders are stockholder owners and markets.

Balogun (2003) differentiates the roles of the two sectors: whereas the private investor is driven by profit motive, public investment decisions are governed by other considerations which go beyond making money. The goods and services supplied promise maximum benefits when provided on a collective basis. He gives the examples of public “goods and services” as defence; minting and currency; conduct of foreign relations; maintenance of internal order and security, management of penal and correctional services and administration of justice.

Here in Kenya the Presidential Circular No.1/64 issued in December, 1964 established twenty three (23) Ministries and Departments. The Ministries and Departments has increased as reflected in the Presidential Circular No.1/207 issued in January 2007 indicate that there were thirty three (33) Government Ministries and Departments whose functions can be collapsed in to 4 major groups using UN Methodology according to Corby and White (1999), which are:

- (i) General Public Service i.e. executive and legislative organs; financial and fiscal affairs; external affairs; defense; public order and safety including police fire services, law courts and prisons.
- (ii) Community and social affairs comprising education, health, social security and welfare, housing and community amenity, recreatimal and cultural.
- (iii) Economic services, comprising fuel and energy, Agriculture, forestry and fishing; industry; transport and communications and other economic services.
- (iv) Other functions, including public debt. As regards private sector organizations, these are established as proprietorships, partnerships and companies and are registered in Kenya under various laws for instance, Foreign Investments Act (cap 518), Trade Licensing Act (cap 497) and the Companies Act (cap 486).

Although downsizing activities cut across the sectors, it is possibly more devastating to the public servants than workers in the private sector. This is because the government jobs are perceived to be secure. In the past, job security was what used to attract people for government jobs and employees were more willing to forego higher salaries in return for the security. The public sector is constrained by such factors as public backlash, budget

limitations, Legislative mandates to maintain certain programmes, Acts of parliament and labour laws. In private companies, boards of directors decide when to downsize their company and when to make alternative approaches to cost reduction.

Governments throughout the developing world are facing significant challenges and are turning to downsizing in an effort to reduce budget deficits and address the inefficiencies engendered by state development strategies that require quality employees in the right numbers and with the right skills mix. If there are more employees than the government needs, the taxpayers do not receive full value for what they pay the government to provide. On the other hand, having too few employees can lead to inefficiencies as well, including program and projects delays, simply not accomplishing the work required to achieve a program's objective.

At independence in 1963 the Kenya Government inherited a relatively small civil service numbering 60,300. The new government adopted ambitious policies that led to state involvement beyond the traditional functions. This was occasioned by larger changes and developments occurring in society and the economy in general. Hyden, Jackson and Okumu (1970); Waweru and Shaw (1998); and Aseto and Okelo (1997) have identified these changes as:

Policy of Africanization: the government felt that there was a need to promote and strengthen local entrepreneurship, encourage broad based economic participation, and intensify development efforts to sustain growth as well as development. In line with this

policy, the government decided to expand them both in scope and content. At the same time it entered into joint ventures with Local and foreign investors.

The need to strengthen the provincial administration: In the pre-independence period the growth of Law and order oriented branches of colonial administration towards the behaviour of the indigenous population in parts of the country. Where they remained peaceful, no special attempt was made to expand the activities. The opposite occurred in those areas where the local population resisted the British rule. Thus Central Province became object of intensive control by the colonial administration in 1950s. Since independence, the Kenya government has made serious efforts to strengthen the provincial administration in those parts of the country where it was left comparatively weak by the colonial government for example in North Eastern and Nyanza Provinces.

Empire building propensities and workload grievances: Many organizations grow because of empire building propensities or workload grievances of personnel within them and the Kenya public service is no exception. This aspect of civil service growth in Kenya is partly due to vulnerability of the Treasury and the Directorate of Personnel Management of demands for staff increases by the ministries.

Guaranteed Civil Service employment: From the beginning the government pursued a policy that guaranteed civil service employment to all university graduates and those from middle level institutions. As populations in those institutions increased, so did the number of civil servants.

Tripartite agreements: As a solution to increasing general unemployment, the government devised "tripartite agreements" under which employers including, the government, were required to employ 10% labour force each year - the first agreement was signed in 1964.

Absorption of staff from public institutions: The government, as a routine, absorbed staff whose jobs had expired in public institutions elsewhere. This was the case with donor funded projects, ex-local authority personnel (1970 - 1972) and ex - East African Community Staff (1977 - 1979).

Balancing of personnel in the civil service: From the 1980s a policy was adopted that not only had the effect of adding more staff to the civil service and which had a demoralising impact; members of ethnic groups considered to have been previously discriminated against, were brought into the civil service.

The desire of government to meet demand for public service: Due to the rapid population growth and the need to undertake employment as a social responsibility owing to the less developed private sector that could not absorb many job seekers on the labour market.

The rapid growth in the civil service became unsustainable in the early, 1990s. Firstly, the growth rate of the civil service between 1963 - 1991 averaging 65% per year surpassed the high average growth in population ratio decreasing from one civil servant to every one hundred and thirty three (1:133) to one civil servant to every eight five members of the

general population (1:85). These staffing gradually created the overstaffing. The wage bill was estimated in 1998 to 63 million shillings or 9.7 of the GDP (Mujera 1998).

According to Aseto and Okelo (1997) the parastatals became a financial burden to the state, which had to allocate huge sums of money to maintain and bail out the ailing and collapsing enterprises. By 1994 the Government subsidies amounted to as much as 5.5% percent of the Gross Domestic product (GDP) (Waweru, Gatheru and Shaw, 1998).

Aseto and Okelo posit further that the state of affairs in the parastatals was occasioned by lack of clear objectives and goals of the enterprise to be attained by management, concentration on political rather than commercial management issues; conflicting instructions on the governance of state owned enterprises; and weak capacity for delegation, training and junior management control; mismanagement by individuals appointed by the state on political patronage and who did not have requisite qualifications to run such enterprises.

In an effort to address the named issues, the government instituted reforms measures both in the civil service and the parastatals. The parastatals reform programme includes the removal of state subsidies, removal of government guarantee of loans given to parastatals and divestation by instituting privatisation measures. The Kenya Government is retrenching to re-engineer the public sector, divest itself of non-core functions, and eliminate duplications and overlaps and to achieve an optimum level of staff to ensure quality service and delivery (Gitu, 2001).

The private sector has not been spared by the changes taking place all over the world. The problem has been made worse by the fact that the protection that the government used to give domestic industries is no longer there. The government has instituted reforms to keep pace with the challenges of globalization competition and trade liberalisation. In order to meet these challenges, the private sector too has, in the circumstances, embarked on downsizing in order to cut costs as well as meet the challenges posed by competition and other environmental changes.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It appears from the background that downsizing has devastating effects both on the victims and survivors. However, organizations have been thinking of how to manage retrenchments and not thinking about how to manage survival. They overlook the fact that their employees are usually not good survivors, in that they are not emotionally prepared to handle major disruptions.

In order to get a better understanding of the downsizing phenomenon it is necessary to examine the views of the survivors in order to understand the whole gamut of feelings they have to confront every day. Moi (2002) strived to identify the nature of responses of survivors to downsizing in the Ministry of Education and also determine the roles these factors play in managing the survivors of downsizing.

Mwingi (2002) sought to find out factors which influence the perception of surviving workers concerning downsizing in banking institutions and how to determine the perception of justice and trust towards retrenchment process within the banking industry.

Guyo's (2003) area of enquiry was towards establishing the reasons why oil firms in Kenya resort to staff downsizing and how the downsizing is undertaken among these organizations. Besides, he also tried to establish if there was any relationship between the practice of downsizing and other characteristics of the firm.

Gacheri (2004) carried out a survey of the criteria used by commercial banks to identify employees to be retrenched as well as to establish the frequency of use each criteria of retrenchment. She also sought to determine association between criterion of retrenchment and size, age and ownership of the bank.

Shivo (2006) examined trauma forms of redundancy programmes on post redundancy survivors in private sector organization and to evaluate deliberate management programmes aimed at addressing post trauma redundancy.

This study therefore seeks to compare the following issues in the public and private sector organizations: **what are the survivors' responses to downsizing? What factors play an important role in survivor perceptions about downsizing?** These questions are particularly important in the context of Kenya given the high levels of unemployment and given the fact that the economy is trying to recover following many years of decline and the reforms being undertaken.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study are:

- i) To establish the perceptions of survivors on downsizing.
- ii) To find out how organizations have addressed problems of survivors of downsizing.

1.4 IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

This study may be useful to:

- i) Organizations that may have downsized and who have plans of carrying out further downsizing.
- ii) Organizations that may have intentions of downsizing in the near future.
- iii) To scholars and researchers who might have an interest in developing the findings further or taking other related fields to downsizing and as a reference source.
- iv) To scholars and researchers who have carried out research in this area in order to enrich their knowledge.
- v) The researcher who would have gained useful skill and experience in carrying out the research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

It has been commented that Literature on downsizing is disjointed and uneven (Kozlowski et.al.:1993). However, over the last decade a substantial body of downsizing literature has accumulated; however this literature has several limitations. Downsizing is associated and often confused with numerous terms such as restructuring, decline, even terms as obscure as census readjustment and recession fatigue. The literature basically provides descriptions of the downsizing activities and prescriptions for solutions that can be taken for improvement. Downsizing theory and research have tended to compartmentalise the phenomenon; it is fragmented by different levels of conceptualization, time frames and content areas. This chapter strives to give a review of the downsizing literature.

2.2 DOWNSIZING DEFINED

Although downsizing has been prevalent and has affected millions of workers both in private and public sectors, it has not been precisely defined by many writers. Therefore, one finds different concepts, different levels of analysis (Cameron et al, 1993). Cameron and others such Halley (1995) of the Meridian International Institute report that terms taken as synonyms of downsizing include resizing, declining, restructuring, re-organizing, re-engineering, leaning up, streamlining, reduction in force, rightsizing, retrenching, slimming, researching, non adapting, consolidating, administrative reform, downshifting and many others. Each of these concepts may share some meanings with downsizing, but each may produce different connotations and criteria for assessment. Downsizing should be clearly defined in order to be precisely understood and measured.

What is organizational downsizing? Organizational downsizing “is a management philosophy that constitutes a set of activities, undertaken on the part of management of an organization, designed to improve organizational efficiency, productivity, and/or competitiveness. Downsizing represents a strategy implemented by managers that affects the size of the firms’ work force and its work processes” (Cameron et al, 1993). It has become the one most adopted by others authors such as: Freeman and Cameron (1993); Kozlowski; et al; (1993); Cascio (1993); Freeman and Mishra (1991); Mishra and Mishra, (1994).

However, Hickok (2006) feels that this definition is over extended as it would appear that such organizational efforts like “total quality management” or “re-engineering” which are also undertaken by organizations but are not part of the same as this definition would seem to imply. To him, downsizing is simply “a reduction in the size of the workforce”. Thus this does not imply a reduction in the assets of the organization.

According to Cameron et al (1993), downsizing constitutes four (4) major attributes that help to define and separate it from related non synonymous concepts such as decline and layoff. This view is also held by Cascio, (1993); Thornhill and Sanders (1998). These four (4) attributes, intent, personnel, efficiency and work processes are discussed hereunder:

1. Downsizing is “intentional” proactive activities taken by management to improve overall organizational efficiency and effectiveness This response may be occasioned by mergers, acquisitions, divestitures, changes in technology or restructuring to better

enable the organization to meet its mission or fill an environmental niche (Kozlowski, 1991; Thornhill, Stead and Gibbons, 1997; Tylczak, 1991).

2. The personnel attributes of downsizing usually involves reductions in personnel. However downsizing is not limited to personnel reductions, additional staff may be added but the overall process results in fewer numbers of workers employed per unit Vis' a vis' output as compared to some previous level of employment.
3. Downsizing occurs either reactively or proactively to contain costs, enhances revenue and bolster competitiveness (Tylczak 1999; Webster, 1994).
4. Downsizing activities may bring about changes in the work processes through restructuring and eliminating work or some redesign. After the reduction in the workforce, fewer employees remain to do the same amount of work, and this affects what gets done and how it gets done (Cameron, 1994).

2.3 LEVELS OF ANALYSIS OF DOWNSIZING

Downsizing has been studied from different levels of analysis, different definitions and approaches. Three (3) levels of analysis include: a global or macro industry level; organization or strategy level; and micro or individual level (Cameron, 1994). At the global level of analysis a large volume of literature exists on divestitures and organizational mergers.

This literature includes market segmentation, reinforcing core competencies, acquisitions and consolidating industry structures. (Cameron and Freeman 1994). The primary thrust at the organizational level of analysis, is to emphasize the need to plan, analyse and

implement downsizing carefully (Cascio, 1993). To Cameron (1994) downsizing issues are concerned with whether to downsize, mechanism to implement downsizing, and the effects of downsizing on the organization's performance.

At this level much or less research has investigated strategies for approaching downsizing (Cameron et al, 1993). Hickok (1995) has identified important insights to be gained both from Literature at the organizational level (i.e. focused on strategy, policy, or decision making) as well as at the Primary level (focused on documenting and ameliorating the effect of downsizing on those who remain within the organization.)

A stream of research, both laboratory and field , has provided documentation of the harmful effects downsizing can have on " survivors" ; these effects have been described in terms of morale (Armstrong -Stassen 1993), high stress (Leana and Feldman, 1992), and a "Syndrome" marked by anger, envy and guilt (Noer, 1993). The perceived fairness of the downsizing is considered a key mediating variable (Brockner, 1992) as is the effectiveness of communication of information (Bridges, 1987) Hickok (1995) has also indicated that at the individual level, downsizing is concerned with impact of individual and group (thoughts, feelings and behaviours on organizational functioning). Research at this level also includes investigations of financial wellbeing, health, personal attitudes, family relationship and other personal factors (Kozlowski et al, 1993; Jackson, 1996).

Earlier studies tended to focus on the antecedents of layoffs (Cornfield, 1983) or the consequences of layoffs for the individuals who were laid off (Jahoda, 1982). Those persons laid off are referred to as victims because they lost their jobs involuntarily due to

any action, such as layoff or reduction in force. The individuals who lose their jobs are explicitly affected by downsizing; therefore, most research on the impacts of downsizing deals with its effects on terminated personnel.

In addition, the majority of research emphasized the negative outcomes of downsizing for individuals who must leave the organization (Kozlowski, et al 1993, Freeman and Cameron, 1993). The commonly held belief is that downsizing is merely about reducing the headcount and increasing the work load and responsibilities of existing staff. Just as important as the victims are, the survivors, who remain with the organization after downsizing the workforce; they are the counterpoint to the victims of layoff.

Survivors react to layoffs in a variety of ways. The survivors' reactions to a layoff can be referred to as the changes in the behaviour of employees (survivors) from a pre-layoff environment to a post-layoff environment. The implications of survivor's reactions to layoffs are viewed as potentially important topic for practitioners, writers and theorists of organizational behaviour.

2.4 MEASURES OF DOWNSIZING

Different measurement criteria have been used in downsizing research; these factors have contributed to progress of downsizing literature. The most common substitutes for downsizing have been evidence of decline or layoffs. Decline refers to an involuntary, unplanned loss of resources. Deadline is seen as a negative consequence of failure to adapt to adverse environmental conditions. Decline does not necessarily produce a reduction in personnel. The major difference between a declining and downsizing literatures is that

organizations can downsize without declining; they can decline without downsizing. Downsizing may be implemented when an organization is growing or declining (Halley, 1995). According to Mclune, Beattky, and Montagno (1988) while laying off workers is the most common action taken in downsizing organizations, downsizing entails a much broader set of actions and connotations. Layoffs refer to a single tactical or reactionary decision used to implement downsizing may be both proactive and strategic and may include a welter of options for reducing the workforce. It may even be exclusive of layoffs (Cameron et al, 1993).

2.5 STRATEGIES OF DOWNSIZING

The literature on downsizing strategy selection is largely prescriptive and is oriented toward minimising the effects of downsizing on terminated personnel (Kozlowski, 1993). Downsizing strategies refer to the methods used to accomplish reduction. These strategies may range from delayering, restructuring, organization redesign and the introduction of systematic change processes (Cascio, 1998). These points suggest that if downsizing is carried out by taking a strategic perspective, with corporate transformation as underpinning reason, then the overall outcome of downsizing should not be detrimental to the company as a whole. Hence, downsizing should lead to lower overheads, less bureaucracy, faster and smoother decision making and overall increase in productivity levels (Cascio, 1993).

However poorly implemented strategies, or just poor strategies, have led to more decreases in productivity, quality, and employee well being than to increases (Cameron, Freeman and Mishra, 1993). Research shows that strategies used to accomplish personnel reductions will also influence the behaviours and attitudes of those who survive (Kozlowski et al, 1993).

Clinical research on the effects of job insecurity has shown that the threat of redundancy can result into anxiety, depression, burnout, poor self reported health status, poor quality of sleep and increased rate of absenteeism because of ill health and heart diseases (Read, 1999).

Practitioners and psychologists explain the kinds of responses that can be expected from survivors of such corporate change. Researchers report such downsizing effects as: feelings of insecurity, anger, job stress, decreased loyalty and organizational commitment, lowered motivation and productivity, increased resistance to change (Cameron et al, 1987; Jackson 1996; Crouch and Wirth, 1991). The current literature on downsizing presents a great variety of dependent variables, such as organizational trust, particularly at the individual and organizational levels. However, these dependent variables do not have any unifying theoretical theme, which contributes to an overall view of the impact of downsizing situations on an organization and its members (Shaw and Barret, 1997).

2.6 EFFECTS OF DOWNSIZING

Current literature on downsizing indicates that most organizations do not accomplish the desired improvements, but instead an escalation in negative consequence (Cameron and Freeman, 1994; Drucker, 1995; Hamel and Prahalad, 1994, Ivancevich and Hermanson, (1992)).

A survey of 1005 firms in US showed that downsized firms between 1986 and 1991 only 46% actually reduced expenses, only 32% actually increased profits, only 22% actually

increased productivity and only 17% actually reduced bureaucracy, although each of these goals were intended (Cameron and Freeman 1994).

Downsizing is viewed as having profound effects on the organization and the personnel, both victims and survivors. Attempt to determine the impact of downsizing, the effects of job insecurity, and economic need to work on employee attitudes Brockner (1992) used work efforts a measure of job attitudes. The study found that high job insecurity coupled with high need to work, resulted in increased work effort following lay off. High job insecurity coupled with low need to work resulted in no change in the level of work effort. This seems to indicate that when there are high levels of job insecurity as would be expected during downsizing, employees with high need to work will increase their work effort, while those with low need to work will have no change in work effort. Brockner also found that the remaining employees' perception of the fairness of the lay off process and their attachment to the layoff victims influenced their views.

Clinical research on the effects of job insecurity has shown that the threat of redundancy can result into anxiety, depression, poor self reported health status, poor quality of sleep and increased rate of absenteeism because of ill health and heart diseases (Read, 1999). Employees may also respond with reduced trust and organizational commitment when the organization breaks its "psychological contract" with them. Organizations no longer have contractual or an understanding with employees that promised a secure job in return for dedicated service. The majority of firms after a period of denial perceive that there is low morale and trust gap (Sparrow and Marchington, 1998).

Researchers have found that survivors have more effects on physical and mental health than those laid off. The employees who survive will experience a high level of depression, anxiety, stress, and loss of self esteem and identity, due to doing their own work and the work of those employees who are downsized (Tang and Fuller, 1995; Lewis 1997; Kozlowski et al, 1993). Literature that examines the survivors of downsizing found that they suffer from survivors' syndrome. Survivors' syndrome describes a set of common negative effects the remaining work force experiences after major organization change. These effects on the work force include: confusion, fear, apathy, depression, anxiety, anger and in more severe cases depression, and other physical ailments.

Others take guilty trips (why not me?). Knowdell et al, (1996) call this the missed bullet syndrome. Others feel anxious, wondering whether they will be next to lose jobs. They worry about next time around. Job security disappears, initiative and creativity disappears as most people lie low after lay offs (Tylczak 1991). Stress literature suggest that post lay off work environments can be stressful, leading to worry, anger and an array of other physical and emotional systems (Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnel, 1994).

The Literature is also replete with examples of burnout, depression, anger, and betrayal as common responses by survivors of lay offs (Noer, 1993). However, not all responses are negative. Researchers have found that downsizing can be a chance to give individuals more control and authority. Many roles of managers are being pushed down to lower levels and workers are being empowered. There is renewed commitment by employees who see the benefits of empowerment (Sparrow and Marchington, 1998). There are also reports of

people getting “charged up” finding new excitement in their work, being challenged by the prospect of “doing more with less” or saving the organization (Noer, 1993)

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN AND POPULATION

This was a survey research design. The population of this study comprised all organizations, both public and private that have undergone downsizing. Being the capital city of Kenya, Nairobi is a hub of social, political, educational and economic activities in the country. Majority of the organizations have their headquarters in Nairobi. Therefore the research will be based in Nairobi. Having no register or organizations that have downsized, the researcher will make use of records maintained by the Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development. As regards the public sector, the Civil Service Reform Secretariat will be a source of the number of ministries and departments which have downsized. The list of the organizations is attached as appendix 2.

3.2 SAMPLE

Using the list compiled from the above cited sources, a sample of forty (40) organizations was drawn using stratified random sampling technique. According to Daniel and Terrell (1979) a sample size of 30% or above is adequate to make inferences about the entire population. The size of forty (40) organizations was deemed to be an adequate representative of the total number of organizations that have downsized. Twenty (20) organizations chosen from the two sectors each were drawn based on their sizes. A stratified random sample based on size was used. Size is defined by the number of employees. Small organizations consist of those that employ up to less than 100 employees. Medium organizations have up to 249 employees while large organizations are those that have employees ranging from 250 and above. From these one hundred and fifty respondents was drawn, seventy five each depending on the length of service. Care was taken to balance different categories of employees, gender, profession and marital status.

Based on the foregoing, four employees were drawn from each organization. Those were survivors from non – management cadre. This was due to the fact that this group was affected most by retrenchment and also the fact that the manager positions were deemed to be more secure. The four were selected through random sampling techniques.

3.3 DATA COLLECTION METHOD

Data was collected from primary sources. Data collection was done using a questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into four (4) sections (A, B, C and D) Section A sought data on profile of the respondents, section B was intended to elicit feelings and responses to down sizing, section C sought data on organizational post downsizing activities and section D sought to solicit suggestions from respondents on what in their views the organizations had done after downsizing.

The respondents were given a questionnaire to fill and the researcher/research assistants collected the questionnaires after 2-3 days. This was to give them enough time to wrestle with their true feelings before completing the forms. The researcher made use of two (2) research assistants. The questionnaire is attached as Appendix 1

3.4 DATA ANALYSIS

After collecting data, it was analysed using descriptive statistics. Tables and percentages were used to analyse sections A and D of the questionnaire. Factor analysis was used to analyse sections B and C. This was because of the large number of variables to be considered. The other reason was that there was no single variable that was designated as solely responsible for explaining the views of survivors on downsizing. Further, this technique helped find out whether there were small number of factors that explain these views.

The data was grouped using the characteristics of the respondents such as Title/designation, type of job, terms of service, length of service, age, gender and marital status. Also organizations were grouped as to whether they are in the private or public sector. Chi-square statistic was used to compare responses from respondents from private sector organizations with those from the public sector. Chi-square statistic was also be used to test for significance differences between group means with respect to their responses to various items in the questionnaire. The groups were based on gender and organization size.

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 OVERVIEW

This chapter presents the findings obtained in the investigations. The sequence follows the research design as outlined in Chapter 3. Most of the analysis in the study was carried out using Statistical Package for Social Sciences. Descriptive statistics were also used. The outputs are shown in the appendices.

A total of 150 questionnaires were sent out to survivors both in the public and private sectors. These were shared equally among two sectors. Out of the questionnaires dispatched to survivors in the public sector 72 were returned and analysed representing 96%. As regards those sent out to survivors in the private sector, 67 questionnaires were returned and analysed representing 89.33%. 11 questionnaires were not returned; 3 for the public sector and 8 for the private sector. This represented 4% and 10.67% respectively.

Table 4.1 Response

Sector	Issued	Rate (%)	Returned	Rate (%)	Non Response	Rate (%)
Public	75	50%	72	96%	3	4%
Private	75	50%	67	89%	8	11%
Total	150	100%	139	93%	11	7%

4.2 BACKGROUND AND DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The employment and demographic data was analysed through frequency counts and descriptive statistics. The data is presented in summary tables below:

Table 4.2: Demographic Characteristics of the Survivors

Job Status	Total	Public	Private
Professional	46%	57%	51%
Support	54%	43%	49%
	100%	100%	100%
Terms of Service	Total	Public	Private
Permanent and Pensionable	97%	93%	95%
Contract	1%	8%	4%
Casual	1%		1%
	100%	100%	100%
Length of Service	Total	Public	Private
1 - 5 Years	11%	24%	17%
6 - 10 Years	22%	33%	27%
11 - 15 Years	28%	25%	27%
16 - 20 Years	13%	12%	12%
21 - 25 Years	15%	5%	10%
26 - 30 Years	7%	2%	4%
31 - 35 Years	4%		2%
	100%	100%	100%
Age Group	Total	Public	Private
Under 25 Years	1%	5%	3%
26 - 30 Years	15%	30%	22%
31 - 35 Years	22%	31%	27%
36 - 40 Years	24%	12%	18%
41 - 45 Years	25%	21%	23%
46 - 50 Years	6%	2%	4%
Over 50 Years	7%		4%
	100%	100%	100%
Gender	Public	Private	Total
Male	64%	45%	55%
Female	36%	55%	45%
	100%	100%	100%
Marital Status	Public	Private	Total
Married	19%	21%	20%
Single	81%	79%	80%
	100%	100%	100%
Academic qualifications	Total	Public	Private
High School	79%	82%	80%
College	14%	12%	13%
University Degree (undergraduate)	7%	6%	7%
	100%	100%	100%
Sector	Total	Public	Private
Professional	51%	57%	54%
Support	49%	43%	46%
	100%	100%	100%

From the demographic data (Table 4.2), the majority of survivors in the public sector are professional staff who account for 57%. A similar situation obtains for the survivors in

the private section which accounts for 51%. The support staff in both sectors comprise 43% and 49% respectively.

Employees in the public sector serve mostly on permanent and pensionable terms (representing 93%). A significant number in the private sector also serves on permanent and pensionable terms, representing 95%. A small number however, serve on contract terms of service comprising 8% and 4% respectively. 1% in the private sector are casuals. The majority of survivors in both public and private sectors have served between 6 – 10 years, comprising 33% and 27% respectively.

The respondents in both the public sector are male (65%) aged between 25 and 45 years while in the private sector they are female (55%) of the same age bracket. Majority of the employees are single. This represents 81% for the public sector and 79% for the private sector. Those who are married in both sectors represents 19 % and 21% respectively.

In the highest educational level attained, majority had 'O' level. These comprise 82% in the public sector and 80% in the private sector. Those who had attained degree level of education in both sectors comprise 6% and 7% respectively.

4.3 FACTOR ANALYSIS

This Section used factor analysis to get the factors considered critical that need to be addressed by organizations (i.e. those that the respondents felt explained their feelings, behaviours and attitudes regarding downsizing). This was done in order to achieve the second object of the study. Factor analysis was preferred because of the many variables that are thought to influence the survivors' response.

Factor analysis method was used in analyzing the data. The Eigenvalues are the initial value loadings of components in a factor. The Eigenvalues are used to extract the factors from the components given. All components with Eigenvalues greater than 1 are extracted using principal component analysis. That means all the principal components form the factors. A method called rotation of the components is used to maximize on the components suitability to a factor. This is done using Varimax (that is variable maximizing). These then result in components with a percentage of factor loading. All factors will therefore be comprised of a certain number of components, which in the matrix maybe negative or positive. A negative value of a component means that the reading is negated. The extracted factors are then given a name suitable to the characteristics of the components comprising it.

The analysis was done in three (3) parts: the public sector, private sector and the two sectors combined. This was done in order to see whether or not there any differences amongst the survivors regarding their feelings towards downsizing. The combined results were meant to establish whether they compare or differ with the individual cases (sectors).

4.3.2 PUBLIC SECTOR

On communalities, the respondents indicated that they hold a common view on issues but on varied degree. 61% indicated that they hold common view that they have not had relevant training for their current role in the service while 83% indicated that their supervisors went out of their way to assist them.

Table 4.3 Communalities – Public Sector

	Initial	Extraction
I have autonomy and do my work independently.	1.00	0.61
I fear that I may be the next victim.	1.00	0.63
There is little scope for advancement in my job.	1.00	0.64
I have not had relevant training for my current role.	1.00	0.66
I get immediate feedback on my performance	1.00	0.66
I feel guilty that those laid off were better than me.	1.00	0.68
I am not able to satisfy conflicting demands of various people at the workplace.	1.00	0.68
I wish I had been assigned more challenging tasks.	1.00	0.68
The jobs held by many of the employees who lost their jobs were similar to mine.	1.00	0.69
I am not learning enough in my present job to prepare me take higher responsibility.	1.00	0.69
There is need to reduce my duties and responsibilities.	1.00	0.69
I feel guilt for the loss of friends and colleagues.	1.00	0.71
The work I do is challenging and worth while.	1.00	0.71
I get recognition for the work I do.	1.00	0.71
My boss is harsh and shouts at me.	1.00	0.71
Several aspects of my responsibilities are not clear.	1.00	0.72
I experience conflict between my values and what I do in my role.	1.00	0.72
The quality of my work has improved.	1.00	0.73
My current salary is little compared with what I do.	1.00	0.73
There are frequent unpredictable changes of the work assigned.	1.00	0.73
I knew many of those who lost their jobs.	1.00	0.74
I work under pressure to meet deadlines.	1.00	0.74
The criteria used for retirement was fair.	1.00	0.75
My work does not allow me to have quality time for myself, family and friends.	1.00	0.75
I cannot cope with the responsibilities of my work.	1.00	0.75
I am not able to utilize my training and expertise in my job.	1.00	0.76
My duties have recently been reduced in importance.	1.00	0.76
My current workload is too heavy.	1.00	0.76
The expectations of my seniors conflict with those of my juniors.	1.00	0.76
The activities of my work are satisfying and rewarding	1.00	0.76
I feel that I do not have capability to handle my duties and responsibilities.	1.00	0.77
I do not know what my colleagues expect of me.	1.00	0.77
Those who lost their jobs were friends of mine.	1.00	0.77
I am angry for the loss of friends and colleagues.	1.00	0.78
My workmates treat me with suspicion.	1.00	0.78
I have been given too much responsibility.	1.00	0.78
I wish I could get another job elsewhere.	1.00	0.78
Whenever I take problems to my supervisor I am asked to work them out myself.	1.00	0.78
My immediate supervisor goes out of his way to assist me.	1.00	0.78
I do not get the necessary information to carry out my duties and responsibilities.	1.00	0.79
I am not sure as to the priorities in my role.	1.00	0.79
I share my feelings and emotions with other people.	1.00	0.79
I do get time off due to personal or family illnesses	1.00	0.79
My duties and responsibilities are not clear.	1.00	0.80
I would like to take more responsibility than I am handling.	1.00	0.80
Members of the organization are sensitive, perceptive, and help one another.	1.00	0.81
I always stay in the office even when I may have urgent personal problems to attend to.	1.00	0.81
The work I do is not related to my training.	1.00	0.83
There is a sense of belonging among members of the organization.	1.00	0.83

As regards the public sector the results of the total variance explained (Table 4.4) show that the principal component analysis extracted sixteen (16) factors.

Table 4.4 Factor Extraction – Public

Component	Total Variance Explained								
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	8.06	16.45	16.45	8.06	16.45	16.45	3.91	7.98	7.98
2	4.07	8.30	24.75	4.07	8.30	24.75	3.64	7.43	15.41
3	3.00	6.12	30.87	3.00	6.12	30.87	2.71	5.53	20.94
4	2.83	5.78	36.65	2.83	5.78	36.65	2.55	5.21	26.15
5	2.42	4.93	41.58	2.42	4.93	41.58	2.38	4.86	31.01
6	2.10	4.28	45.86	2.10	4.28	45.86	2.26	4.61	35.62
7	1.91	3.90	49.76	1.91	3.90	49.76	2.26	4.60	40.22
8	1.75	3.57	53.33	1.75	3.57	53.33	2.18	4.44	44.67
9	1.74	3.55	56.88	1.74	3.55	56.88	2.16	4.40	49.07
10	1.43	2.93	59.81	1.43	2.93	59.81	2.07	4.22	53.29
11	1.36	2.77	62.58	1.36	2.77	62.58	1.93	3.95	57.24
12	1.25	2.54	65.12	1.25	2.54	65.12	1.88	3.85	61.08
13	1.22	2.49	67.61	1.22	2.49	67.61	1.78	3.63	64.72
14	1.13	2.30	69.91	1.13	2.30	69.91	1.57	3.21	67.92
15	1.04	2.13	72.04	1.04	2.13	72.04	1.55	3.15	71.07
16	1.03	2.09	74.13	1.03	2.09	74.13	1.50	3.06	74.13
17	0.91	1.85	75.98						
18	0.86	1.76	77.74						
19	0.81	1.65	79.39						
20	0.75	1.53	80.92						
21	0.70	1.43	82.35						
22	0.69	1.41	83.76						
23	0.66	1.34	85.10						
24	0.64	1.30	86.40						
25	0.59	1.21	87.61						
26	0.53	1.07	88.68						
27	0.51	1.04	89.73						
28	0.49	1.01	90.74						
29	0.47	0.95	91.69						
30	0.44	0.90	92.59						
31	0.38	0.78	93.37						
32	0.34	0.70	94.07						
33	0.31	0.63	94.70						
34	0.29	0.58	95.28						
35	0.27	0.56	95.84						
36	0.25	0.50	96.34						
37	0.24	0.49	96.83						
38	0.22	0.44	97.27						
39	0.20	0.40	97.67						
40	0.19	0.39	98.06						
41	0.16	0.32	98.37						
42	0.15	0.30	98.67						
43	0.13	0.27	98.94						
44	0.12	0.24	99.17						
45	0.11	0.23	99.40						
46	0.10	0.20	99.60						
47	0.09	0.18	99.78						
48	0.07	0.14	99.92						
49	0.04	0.08	100.00						

These factors explain 74% of the total variation with factor 1 contributing the highest variation, i.e. is 16% of the total variation. The accumulated percentage variance of 74% indicates that the remaining percentage of variance is accounted by other factors other than those identified by the model. The sixteen factors extracted are: -

Factor 1: Job Stress and Role stagnation

- a) I am not learning enough in my present job to prepare me take higher responsibility.
- b) My duties have recently been reduced in importance.
- c) I am not able to utilize my training and expertise in my job.
- d) I am not sure as to the priorities in my role.
- e) There is little scope for advancement in my job.
- f) I wish I could get another job elsewhere.
- g) I wish I had been assigned more challenging tasks.
- h) Several aspects of my responsibilities are not clear.

Factor 2: Job Satisfaction

- a) The quality of my work has improved.
- b) I get recognition for the work I do.
- c) The activities of my work are satisfying and rewarding
- d) The work I do is challenging and worth while.
- e) I share my feelings and emotions with other people.
- f) I have autonomy and do my work independently.
- g) I get immediate feedback on my performance

Factor 3: Too Much Workload

- a) I have been given too much responsibility.
- b) My current workload is too heavy.

- c) There is need to reduce my duties and responsibilities.

Factor 4: Job Motivation

- a) There are frequent unpredictable changes of the work assigned.
- b) My current salary is little compared with what I do.
- c) I work under pressure to meet deadlines.
- d) The criteria used for retirement was not fair.

Factor 5: Job Involvement

- a) I cannot cope with the responsibilities of my work.
- b) My boss is harsh and shouts at me.

Factor 6: Role Ambiguity

- a) I feel that I do not have capability to handle my duties and responsibilities.
- b) I do not get the necessary information to carry out my duties and responsibilities.
- c) My duties and responsibilities are not clear.
- d) I have not had relevant training for my current role.

Factor 7: Job Insecurity

- a) I knew many of those who lost their jobs.
- b) Those who lost their jobs were friends of mine.
- c) The jobs held by many of the employees who lost their jobs were similar to mine.

Factor 8: Job Inadequacy

- a) My workmates treat me with suspicion.
- b) I would like to take more responsibility than I am handling.

Factor 9: Role Expectations Conflict

- a) The work I do is not related to my training.
- b) I experience conflict between my values and what I do in my role.

Factor 10: Relationship with the Victim

- a) I feel guilt for the loss of friends and colleagues.
- b) I am angry for the loss of friends and colleagues.
- c) I feel guilty that those laid off were better than me.

Factor 11: Personal Inadequacy and Satisfaction

- a) My work does not allow me to have quality time for myself, family and friends.
- b) I do not know what my colleagues expect of me.
- c) I am not able to satisfy conflicting demands of various people at the workplace.

Factor 12: Fear

- a) I fear that I may be the next victim.
- b) The expectations of my seniors conflict with those of my juniors.

Factor 13: Organisational Support

- a) Members of the organization are sensitive, perceptive, and help one another.
- b) There is a sense of belonging among members of the organization.

Factor 14: Commitment to Work

- a) I always stay in the office even when I may have urgent personal problems to attend to.

Factor 15: Supervisor Support

- a) My immediate supervisor goes out of his way to assist me.
- b) I do get time off due to personal or family illnesses

Factor 15: Supervisor's Insensitiveness

- a) Whenever I take problems to my supervisor I am asked to work them out myself.

Table 4.5 Factors and Their Level of Importance

Factor	Level of Importance
Job Stress and Role stagnation	16
Job Satisfaction	8
Too Much Workload	6
Job Motivation	6
Job Involvement	5
Role Ambiguity	4
Job Insecurity	4
Job Inadequacy	4
Role Expectations Conflict	4
Relationship with the Victim	3
Personal Inadequacy and Satisfaction	3
Fear	3
Organisational Support	2
Commitment to Work	2
Supervisor Support	2
Supervisor's Insensitiveness	2
Total	74

4.3.3 PRIVATE SECTOR

On communalities, the private sector respondents indicated that they hold a common view on issues but on varied degrees. Sixty four percent, 64% indicated they hold a common view that there was little scope for advancement in their jobs while 90% indicated that members of the organization were sensitive, perceptive, and helped one another.

Table 4.6 Communalities – Private Sector

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
There is little scope for advancement in my job.	1	0.642
I have autonomy and do my work independently.	1	0.666
I knew many of those who lost their jobs.	1	0.742
I work under pressure to meet deadlines.	1	0.744
My workmates treat me with suspicion.	1	0.747
I am not able to satisfy conflicting demands of various people at the workplace.	1	0.748
My current workload is too heavy.	1	0.755
The quality of my work has improved.	1	0.755
I get immediate feedback on my performance	1	0.756
I feel guilty that those laid off were better than me.	1	0.758
I have not had relevant training for my current role.	1	0.762
I feel guilt for the loss of friends and colleagues.	1	0.773
I do not get the necessary information to carry out my duties and responsibilities.	1	0.776
I am not learning enough in my present job to prepare me take higher responsibility.	1	0.786
There are frequent unpredictable changes of the work assigned.	1	0.791
I am not sure as to the priorities in my role.	1	0.801
I experience conflict between my values and what I do in my role.	1	0.809
I feel that I do not have capability to handle my duties and responsibilities.	1	0.817
I would like to take more responsibility than I am handling.	1	0.819
Several aspects of my responsibilities are not clear.	1	0.82
I wish I had been assigned more challenging tasks.	1	0.821
The work I do is challenging and worth while.	1	0.823
I do not know what my colleagues expect of me.	1	0.824
I get recognition for the work I do.	1	0.824
I am not able to utilize my training and expertise in my job.	1	0.826
There is need to reduce my duties and responsibilities.	1	0.827
The criteria used for retirement was fair.	1	0.828
The work I do is not related to my training.	1	0.828
The activities of my work are satisfying and rewarding	1	0.829
My current salary is little compared with what I do.	1	0.83
My boss is harsh and shouts at me.	1	0.832
I always stay in the office even when I may have urgent personal problems to attend to.	1	0.832
The jobs held by many of the employees who lost their jobs were similar to mine.	1	0.835
I share my feelings and emotions with other people.	1	0.835
My duties have recently been reduced in importance.	1	0.836
The expectations of my seniors conflict with those of my juniors.	1	0.842
I wish I could get another job elsewhere.	1	0.843
I cannot cope with the responsibilities of my work.	1	0.843
Whenever I take problems to my supervisor I am asked to work them out myself.	1	0.843
I am angry for the loss of friends and colleagues.	1	0.847
My work does not allow me to have quality time for myself, family and friends.	1	0.847
My immediate supervisor goes out of his way to assist me.	1	0.848
My duties and responsibilities are not clear.	1	0.857
I fear that I may be the next victim.	1	0.875
I do get time off due to personal or family illnesses	1	0.878
Those who lost their jobs were friends of mine.	1	0.887
There is a sense of belonging among members of the organization.	1	0.892
I have been given too much responsibility.	1	0.899
Members of the organization are sensitive, perceptive, and help one another.	1	0.901

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

As regards the private sector, results of the total variance explained (Table 4.7) shows that the principal component analysis extracted twelve (15) factors. These factors explain 81.22% of the total variation with factor 1, contributing the highest variation i.e. 18.42% of the total variation. Factor 15 contributed the least, i.e. 2.10% of the total variation.

Table 4.7 Factor Extraction – Private Sector

Component	Total Variance Explained								
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.06	18.48	18.48	9.06	18.48	18.48	5.4	11.03	11.03
2	3.99	8.15	26.63	3.99	8.15	26.63	3.97	8.1	19.13
3	3.85	7.86	34.49	3.85	7.86	34.49	3.77	7.69	26.82
4	3.54	7.23	41.72	3.54	7.23	41.72	3.09	6.31	33.12
5	3.02	6.16	47.88	3.02	6.16	47.88	2.65	5.42	38.54
6	2.4	4.91	52.79	2.4	4.91	52.79	2.53	5.16	43.7
7	2.18	4.45	57.24	2.18	4.45	57.24	2.51	5.12	48.82
8	2.07	4.22	61.46	2.07	4.22	61.46	2.45	5	53.82
9	1.71	3.48	64.95	1.71	3.48	64.95	2.26	4.61	58.43
10	1.66	3.39	68.34	1.66	3.39	68.34	2.05	4.17	62.6
11	1.54	3.15	71.48	1.54	3.15	71.48	2.02	4.11	66.71
12	1.39	2.84	74.32	1.39	2.84	74.32	1.92	3.91	70.62
13	1.2	2.44	76.76	1.2	2.44	76.76	1.79	3.66	74.28
14	1.15	2.35	79.12	1.15	2.35	79.12	1.79	3.65	77.93
15	1.03	2.1	81.22	1.03	2.1	81.22	1.61	3.29	81.22
16	0.93	1.89	83.11						
17	0.87	1.78	84.89						
18	0.81	1.66	86.55						
19	0.7	1.43	87.97						
20	0.68	1.38	89.36						
21	0.59	1.2	90.56						
22	0.57	1.17	91.73						
23	0.5	1.03	92.76						
24	0.49	0.99	93.74						
25	0.43	0.88	94.62						
26	0.38	0.77	95.39						
27	0.35	0.72	96.11						
28	0.3	0.62	96.73						
29	0.25	0.51	97.24						
30	0.22	0.45	97.69						
31	0.19	0.38	98.07						
32	0.16	0.33	98.4						
33	0.15	0.32	98.71						
34	0.12	0.25	98.96						
35	0.1	0.21	99.18						
36	0.1	0.2	99.37						
37	0.07	0.15	99.52						
38	0.06	0.12	99.64						
39	0.05	0.11	99.75						
40	0.05	0.09	99.84						
41	0.04	0.08	99.92						
42	0.02	0.04	99.96						
43	0.01	0.02	99.98						
44	0.01	0.02	100						
45	0	0	100						
46	0	0	100						
47	0	0	100						
48	0	0	100						
49	0	0	100						

The accumulated percentage of variance i.e. 81.29% implies that the remaining percentage of variance i.e. 18.71% is accounted for by other factors apart from those identified by the Model. The 12 factors extracted are:

Factor 1: Turnover Intention, Role Ambiguity and Role Inadequacy

- a) I am not able to utilize my training and expertise in my job.
- b) I wish I could get another job elsewhere.
- c) The work I do is not related to my training.
- d) I experience conflict between my values and what I do in my role.
- e) Several aspects of my responsibilities are not clear.
- f) There is little scope for advancement in my job.
- g) I do not know what my colleagues expect of me.
- h) I am not learning enough in my present job to prepare me take higher responsibility.
- i) I am not sure as to the priorities in my role.
- j) I wish I had been assigned more challenging tasks.

Factor 2: Job Satisfaction and Intention to remain

- a) I get recognition for the work I do.
- b) The activities of my work are satisfying and rewarding
- c) The work I do is challenging and worth while.
- d) Members of the organization are sensitive, perceptive, and help one another.
- e) The quality of my work has improved.
- f) There is a sense of belonging among members of the organization.
- g) I share my feelings and emotions with other people.

Factor 3: Identification with the Victim

- a) Those who lost their jobs were friends of mine.

- b) The jobs held by many of the employees who lost their jobs were similar to mine.
- c) I knew many of those who lost their jobs.
- d) I feel guilty that those laid off were better than me.
- e) I am angry for the loss of friends and colleagues.

Factor 4: Motivation in relation to Productivity

- a) I work under pressure to meet deadlines.
- b) There are frequent unpredictable changes of the work assigned.
- c) I am not able to satisfy conflicting demands of various people at the workplace.
- d) My current salary is little compared with what I do.
- e) I feel that I do not have capability to handle my duties and responsibilities.

Factor 5: Job Stress and Role Expectation

- a) My workmates treat me with suspicion.
- b) I would like to take more responsibility than I am handling.
- c) The expectations of my seniors conflict with those of my juniors.

Factor 6: Procedural Fairness

- a) I do get time off due to personal or family illnesses
- b) I cannot cope with the responsibilities of my work.
- c) I get immediate feedback on my performance

Factor 7: Supervisor and Job Involvement

- a) I always stay in the office even when I may have urgent personal problems to attend to.
- b) My work does not allow me to have quality time for myself, family and friends.
- c) I feel guilt for the loss of friends and colleagues.

Factor 8: Role Erosion and Inadequacy

- a) My duties and responsibilities are not clear.
- b) I do not get the necessary information to carry out my duties and responsibilities.

Factor 9: Role Overload

- a) There is need to reduce my duties and responsibilities.

Factor 10: Work Distribution Fairness and support

- a) Whenever I take problems to my supervisor I am asked to work them out myself.
- b) My current workload is not too heavy.
- c) My duties have recently been reduced in importance.

Factor 11: Job Autonomy and Relevance

- a) I have autonomy and do my work independently.
- b) I have not had relevant training for my current role.

Factor 12: Role Overload

- a) I have been given too much responsibility.

Factor 13: Fear of Retrenchment

- a) I fear that I may be the next victim.

Factor 14: Supervisor Support

- a) My immediate supervisor goes out of his way to assist me.
- b) My boss is not harsh and does not shout at me.

Factor 15: Fairness in Retrenchment

- a) The criteria used for retirement was not fair.

Table 4.8: Factors and Their Level of Importance in Private Sector

Factor	Level of Importance
Turnover Intention, Role Ambiguity and Role Inadequacy	1
Job Satisfaction and Intention to remain	2
Identification with the Victim	3
Motivation in relation to Productivity	4
Job Stress and Role Expectation	5
Procedural Fairness	6
Supervisor and Job Involvement	7
Role Erosion and Inadequacy	8
Role Overload	9
Work Distribution Fairness and support	10
Job Autonomy and Relevance	11
Role Overload	12
Fear of Retrenchment	13
Supervisor Support	14
Fairness in Retrenchment	15

4.3.4 COMBINED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS

On combined communalities, both the private sector respondents indicated that they hold a common view on issues but on varied degrees. Fifty six percent, 56% indicated they hold a common view that they have not had relevant training for their current roles while 83% indicated that their immediate supervisors go out of their ways to assist them.

Table 4.9: Communalities – Combined Public and Private

	Initial	Extraction
I have not had relevant training for my current role.	1.00	0.56
There is little scope for advancement in my job.	1.00	0.56
My work does not allow me to have quality time for myself, family and friends.	1.00	0.61
Several aspects of my responsibilities are not clear.	1.00	0.62
Whenever I take problems to my supervisor I am asked to work them out myself.	1.00	0.62
I get recognition for the work I do.	1.00	0.64
There are frequent unpredictable changes of the work assigned.	1.00	0.65
There is need to reduce my duties and responsibilities.	1.00	0.66
Those who lost their jobs were friends of mine.	1.00	0.66
I have autonomy and do my work independently.	1.00	0.66
I always stay in the office even when I may have urgent personal problems to attend to.	1.00	0.66
I am not learning enough in my present job to prepare me take higher responsibility.	1.00	0.67
I wish I could get another job elsewhere.	1.00	0.67
The work I do is challenging and worth while.	1.00	0.68
I get immediate feedback on my performance	1.00	0.68
I do not know what my colleagues expect of me.	1.00	0.69
I wish I had been assigned more challenging tasks.	1.00	0.70
The quality of my work has improved.	1.00	0.70
I knew many of those who lost their jobs.	1.00	0.71
I experience conflict between my values and what I do in my role.	1.00	0.71
My current salary is little compared with what I do.	1.00	0.71
I would like to take more responsibility than I am handling.	1.00	0.72
I am not able to satisfy conflicting demands of various people at the workplace.	1.00	0.72
The activities of my work are satisfying and rewarding	1.00	0.72
I have been given too much responsibility.	1.00	0.73
I am not sure as to the priorities in my role.	1.00	0.73
My boss is harsh and shouts at me.	1.00	0.73
There is a sense of belonging among members of the organization.	1.00	0.74
My duties have recently been reduced in importance.	1.00	0.75
I cannot cope with the responsibilities of my work.	1.00	0.75
The expectations of my seniors conflict with those of my juniors.	1.00	0.76
I work under pressure to meet deadlines.	1.00	0.76
The work I do is not related to my training.	1.00	0.77
Members of the organization are sensitive, perceptive, and help one another.	1.00	0.77
I do get time off due to personal or family illnesses	1.00	0.77
My current workload is too heavy.	1.00	0.79
I share my feelings and emotions with other people.	1.00	0.79
My immediate supervisor goes out of his way to assist me.	1.00	0.83
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

The combined results of the two sectors show that Table 4.10 the Principal Component Analysis also extracted twelve (12) factors which accounts for 70.08% of the total variation. Factor 1 contributed the highest variation i.e. 17.31% of the total variation. Factor 12 contributed the least i.e. 2.79% of the total variation.

Table 4.10: Factor Extraction – Combined Public and Private

Component	Total Variance Explained								
	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.58	17.31	17.31	6.58	17.31	17.31	3.84	10.09	10.09
2	4.06	10.68	27.99	4.06	10.68	27.99	2.79	7.34	17.43
3	2.6	6.85	34.85	2.6	6.85	34.85	2.6	6.83	24.26
4	2.18	5.73	40.58	2.18	5.73	40.58	2.41	6.33	30.59
5	1.97	5.2	45.77	1.97	5.2	45.77	2.25	5.92	36.52
6	1.77	4.65	50.42	1.77	4.65	50.42	2.25	5.92	42.44
7	1.53	4.01	54.43	1.53	4.01	54.43	2.08	5.47	47.91
8	1.39	3.66	58.09	1.39	3.66	58.09	2.01	5.28	53.19
9	1.25	3.29	61.38	1.25	3.29	61.38	1.77	4.67	57.86
10	1.14	2.99	64.37	1.14	2.99	64.37	1.68	4.41	62.27
11	1.11	2.93	67.3	1.11	2.93	67.3	1.6	4.22	66.49
12	1.06	2.79	70.08	1.06	2.79	70.08	1.37	3.59	70.08
13	0.92	2.42	72.51						
14	0.89	2.34	74.85						
15	0.8	2.09	76.94						
16	0.73	1.93	78.87						
17	0.7	1.85	80.72						
18	0.67	1.77	82.48						
19	0.62	1.62	84.1						
20	0.61	1.61	85.71						
21	0.57	1.49	87.2						
22	0.51	1.35	88.55						
23	0.48	1.26	89.81						
24	0.47	1.23	91.04						
25	0.42	1.09	92.13						
26	0.38	1.01	93.14						
27	0.35	0.93	94.07						
28	0.31	0.81	94.89						
29	0.29	0.76	95.65						
30	0.27	0.72	96.36						
31	0.23	0.6	96.97						
32	0.22	0.59	97.56						
33	0.2	0.53	98.09						
34	0.19	0.5	98.59						
35	0.16	0.42	99						
36	0.15	0.4	99.4						
37	0.14	0.36	99.76						
38	0.09	0.24	100						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

The Table 4.10 above shows that there is full contribution of the variables to the factor.

The Eigen values show the twelve (12) factors extracted. The twelve factors extracted are:

Factor 1: Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement and Optimism

- a) There is a sense of belonging among members of the organization.
- b) Members of the organization are sensitive, perceptive, and help one another.
- c) The activities of my work are satisfying and rewarding
- d) I get recognition for the work I do.
- e) The quality of my work has improved.
- f) The work I do is challenging and worth while.
- g) I share my feelings and emotions with other people.

Factor 2: Role Erosion, Role Inadequacy and Role Expectations Conflict

- a) My duties have recently been reduced in importance.
- b) I am not learning enough in my present job to prepare me take higher responsibility.
- c) I am not sure as to the priorities in my role.
- d) I would like to take more responsibility than I am handling.
- e) Several aspects of my responsibilities are not clear.

Factor 3: Role Overload

- a) I have been given too much responsibility.
- b) My current workload is too heavy.
- c) There is need to reduce my duties and responsibilities.

Factor 4: Job Stress and Lack of Support

- a) I cannot cope with the responsibilities of my work.
- b) My boss is harsh and shouts at me.
- c) Whenever I take problems to my supervisor I am asked to work them out myself.

Factor 5: Job Demands and Personal Expectations Conflict

- a) I am not able to satisfy conflicting demands of various people at the workplace.
- b) I work under pressure to meet deadlines.
- c) My work does not allow me to have quality time for myself, family and friends.

Factor 6: Relationship with the Victim

- a) I knew many of those who lost their jobs.
- b) Those who lost their jobs were friends of mine.

Factor 7: Role Challenges and Intention to Move

- a) The work I do is not related to my training.
- b) I experience conflict between my values and what I do in my role.
- c) I wish I could get another job elsewhere.
- d) I wish I had been assigned more challenging tasks.

Factor 8: Motivation and Job Predictability

- a) There are frequent unpredictable changes of the work assigned.
- b) My current salary is little compared with what I do.

Factor 9: Job Autonomy and Relevance

- a) I have autonomy and do my work independently.
- b) There is little scope for advancement in my job.
- c) I have not had relevant training for my current role.

Factor 10: Role Expectations Conflict

- a) The expectations of my seniors conflict with those of my juniors.
- b) I do not know what my colleagues expect of me.

Factor 11: Supervisor's Assistance and Support

- a) I do get time off due to personal or family illnesses

b) My immediate supervisor goes out of his way to assist me.

Factor 12: Work Performance and Commitment to the Organization

a) I always stay in the office even when I may have urgent personal problems to attend to.

b) I get immediate feedback on my performance

Table 4.11: Factors and their Level of Importance – Combined Public and Private

Factor	Level of Importance
Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement and Optimism	1
Role Erosion, Role Inadequacy and Role Expectations Conflict	2
Role Overload	3
Job Stress and Lack of Support	4
Job Demands and Personal Expectations Conflict	5
Relationship with the Victim	6
Role Challenges and Intention to Move	7
Motivation and Job Predictability	8
Job Autonomy and Relevance	9
Role Expectations Conflict	10
Supervisor’s Assistance and Support	11
Work Performance and Commitment to the Organization	12

4.4 POST DOWNSIZING ORGANIZATIONL ACTIVITIES

This section concerns activities that organizations ought to carry out to support survivors to cope with survivors’ syndrome. Respondents were required to indicate the frequency of activities which their organizations have been involved after downsizing. This aspect was administered to survivors in the two sectors. The logic behind it is to establish how the management has dealt with the psychological problems experienced by survivors and how the survivors perceive the various approaches used by management. The results from the respondents are as show hereunder:

Table 4.12: Gave employees time to honour and grieve about the past.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	75.40%	82.50%	78.60%
Once	4.30%	5.30%	4.80%
Occasionally	10.10%	7.00%	8.70%
Regularly	10.10%	5.30%	7.90%
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

From the above table, on average 75.4% of organisations in both public and private sector (82.5% in the public sector and 78.6% in the private sector) confirmed that their organizations never gave employees time and space to grieve about the past and re-orientate their commitment to the future.

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that managements' response is not significant with a value of 1.542 and Asymptote of 0.673.

Table 4.13: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.542(a)	3	0.673
Likelihood Ratio	1.582	3	0.663
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.375	1	0.241
N of Valid Cases	126		

Thirty five 35% of the respondents from the public sector and 23% from the private sector stated that their organizations never spoke about the desired future organizations mission, vision and future plans after downsizing while 29% from the public sector and 32% from the private sector indicated that their organizations occasionally spoke about the new organizations vision, mission and future plans.

Table 4.14: Spoke about the organizations mission, vision and future plans.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	11%	35%	23%
Once	14%	18%	16%
Occasionally	35%	29%	32%
Regularly	39%	18%	29%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view managements' action as a very significant occurrence with a value of 14.495 and Asymptote of 0.002.

Table 4.15: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.495	3	0.002
Likelihood Ratio	14.975	3	0.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.232	1	0
N of Valid Cases	137		

Twenty three percent (23%) of the respondents from the public sector and 18% from the private sector stated that their organizations never talked about new culture the organization intended to introduce. However, 31% of the respondents from the public sector and 34% from the private sector stated that their organizations regularly talked of the new culture and values intended to introduce.

Table 4.16: Explained the new culture the organization intended to introduce.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	13%	23%	18%
Once	16%	19%	17%
Occasionally	35%	27%	31%
Regularly	36%	31%	34%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view managements' action as not a very significant occurrence with a value of 3.111 and Asymptote of 0.38.

Table 4.17: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.111	3.00	0.38
Likelihood Ratio	3.129	3.00	0.37
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.252	1.00	0.13
N of Valid Cases	133		

Thirty four percent 34% of the respondents from the public sector and 36% from the private sector stated that their organizations never explained to the employees about the

employees' major roles in the organisations' future plans while 33% each from the public sector and the private sector stated occasionally the organisations strived to explain their new roles.

Table 4.18: Explained my role in the organization's future plans

	Total	Public	Private
Never	37%	34%	36%
Once	14%	19%	16%
Occasionally	33%	33%	33%
Regularly	16%	14%	15%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view managements' action to have no significance at all to their work life with a value of 0.538 and asymptote value of 0.91.

Table 4.19: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	0.538	3.00	0.91
Likelihood Ratio	0.538	3.00	0.91
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.001	1.00	0.98
N of Valid Cases	134		

Fifty six (56%) of the respondents from the public sector and 53% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never provided avenues where survivors could ask about the 'organizations' future (the big picture) and company progress. Only 18% of the respondents from the public sector and 20% from the private sector said that their organizations occasionally availed such opportunities.

Table 4.20: Provided an avenue that allowed me to ask questions regarding the organizations future

	Total	Public	Private
Never	49%	56%	53%
Once	14%	17%	15%
Occasionally	23%	18%	20%
Regularly	14%	9%	12%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view managements' action as not significant to them with a value of 1.494 and asymptote value of 0.68.

Table 4.21: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.494	3.00	0.68
Likelihood Ratio	1.505	3.00	0.68
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.272	1.00	0.26
N of Valid Cases	137		

Fourty one percent (41%) of the respondents from the public sector and 35% from the private sector indicated that their organization never communicated facts about the likely effects of downsizing, the number affected, the timetable for separation, and resources made available for victims. Twenty three percent (23%) of the respondents from the public sector and 26% from the private sector indicated that their organizations occasionally provided information about the likely effects of downsizing.

Table 4.22: Communicated facts about the likely effects of downsizing

	Total	Public	Private
Never	30%	41%	35%
Once	17%	21%	19%
Occasionally	30%	23%	26%
Regularly	24%	15%	20%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents managements' action as not significant to them with a value of 3.541 and asymptote value of 0.32.

Table 4.23: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.541	3.00	0.32
Likelihood Ratio	3.564	3.00	0.31
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.322	1.00	0.07
N of Valid Cases	137		

Sixty nine percent (69%) of the respondents from the public sector and 65% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never put up 'good news' boards' notice boards where survivors could post positive information to nurture creativity, innovation and imagination. Only 11% of the respondents from the public sector and 16% from the private sector indicated that their organization regularly put up such boards.

Table 4.24: Put up a "good news board" where once could post positive information.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	61%	69%	65%
Once	9%	9%	9%
Occasionally	10%	11%	10%
Regularly	20%	11%	16%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view this as not a significant occurrence to them with a value of 2.197 and asymptote value of 0.53.

Table 4.25: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.197	3.00	0.53
Likelihood Ratio	2.239	3.00	0.52
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.645	1.00	0.20
N of Valid Cases	135		

Seventy two percent (72%) of the respondents from the public sector and 70% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never formed 'smile teams' composed of groups of employees who planned creative activities help repair and strength employee morale, self esteem and provide employees with a sense of camaraderie. An insignificant number of respondents comprising 11% from the public sector and 13% from the private sector indicated that their organizations regularly encouraged the formation of these teams.

Table 4.26: Formed a "small team" composed of group of employees who planned creative activities.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	68%	72%	70%
Once	3%	11%	7%
Occasionally	16%	6%	11%
Regularly	14%	11%	13%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Person indicates that the respondents view this as a fairly significant occurrence to them with a value of 6.332 and asymptote value of 0.10.

Table 4.27: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.332	3.00	0.10
Likelihood Ratio	6.617	3.00	0.09
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.205	1.00	0.27
N of Valid Cases	136		

Sixty three percent (63%) of the respondents from the public sector and 61% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never started "instant recognition programmes" to reward post downsizing "organizational champions." Nineteen percent 19% of the respondents from the public sector and 17% from the private sector only once affirmed that their organizations regularly rewarded such champions.

Table 4.28: Started an instant recognition program to reward good performance

	Total	Public	Private
Never	59%	63%	61%
Once	16%	19%	17%
Occasionally	18%	14%	16%
Regularly	7%	5%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view the management's response as not significant occurrence with a value of 1.02 and asymptote value of 0.80.

Table 4.29: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.02	3	0.80
Likelihood Ratio	1.027	3	0.80
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.658	1	0.42
N of Valid Cases	136		

An average number of respondents comprising 59% from the public sector and 53% from the private sector indicated that their organizations and delivered gifts (e.g. flowers) to the sick to foster a caring attitude. 23% of the respondents from the public sector and 26% from the private sector indicated that their organizations regularly strived to engage in the above activities.

Table 4.30: Gave gifts (e.g. shopping vouchers, wedding gifts and delivers flower to those hospitalized).

	Total	Public	Private
Never	47%	59%	53%
Once	4%	6%	5%
Occasionally	29%	23%	26%
Regularly	19%	12%	16%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view that the management's response as not significant occurrence with a value of 2.866 and asymptote value of 0.41.

Table 4.31: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.866	3	0.41
Likelihood Ratio	2.887	3	0.41
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.605	1	0.11
N of Valid Cases	138		

Some 48% of the respondents from the public sector and 39% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never established notice boards and news letters to keep employees updated. Only 25% of the respondents from the public sector and 23% from the private sector indicated said that their organizations occasionally established boards and news letters to keep them updated of current developments to safeguard their reliance on the almighty grapevine.

Table 4.32: Established a management notice board and newsletter to keep employees updated

	Total	Public	Private
Never	31%	48%	39%
Once	7%	8%	7%
Occasionally	21%	25%	23%
Regularly	41%	20%	31%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view that the management's actions as a fairly significant occurrence with a value of 7.406 and asymptote value of 0.06.

Table 4.33: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.406	3	0.06
Likelihood Ratio	7.555	3	0.06
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.173	1	0.01
N of Valid Cases	136		

Only 32% of the respondents from the public sector and 28% from the private sector indicated that their organization never conducted training to create new culture and emphasized organizations' values. A similar number of the respondents comprising 29% from the public sector and 32% from the private sector indicated that their organizations regularly conducted workshops on new corporate culture.

Table 4.34: Conducted training workshops to create a new culture and emphasize organizations values.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	24%	32%	28%
Once	14%	12%	13%
Occasionally	35%	29%	32%
Regularly	28%	27%	28%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view the management's response as not a significant occurrence with a value of 1.308 and asymptote value of 0.73.

Table 4.35: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.308	3	0.73
Likelihood Ratio	1.31	3	0.73
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.585	1	0.45
N of Valid Cases	138		

Forty two percent (42%) of the respondents from the public sector and 41% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never organized meetings where survivors and management discussed all matters affecting the organization as whole and matters affecting them without fear of victimization. A significant number comprising 24% of the respondents from the public sector and 27% from the private sector indicated said that their organizations regularly endeavored to organize such meetings.

Table 4.36: Organized meetings where employees expressed their feelings without fear of victimization

	Total	Public	Private
Never	39%	42%	41%
Once	18%	26%	22%
Occasionally	30%	24%	27%
Regularly	13%	8%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view the management's response as not a significant occurrence with a value of 2.172 and asymptote value of 0.54.

Table 4.37: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.172	3	0.54
Likelihood Ratio	2.189	3	0.53
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.075	1	0.30
N of Valid Cases	137		

A good number comprising 52% of the respondents from the public sector and 48% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never organized meetings to explain what they were doing to help employees who were leaving the organization in order to maintain survivors' company commitment. Only 28% of the respondents from the public sector and 27% from the private sector indicated that their organizations once organized these meetings.

Table 4.38: Organized meeting to explain what they were doing to help employees who were leaving the organization

	Total	Public	Private
Never	44%	52%	48%
Once	27%	28%	27%
Occasionally	19%	15%	17%
Regularly	10%	5%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view the management's actions as not a significant occurrence with a value of 1.974 and asymptote value of 0.58.

Table 4.39: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.974	3	0.58
Likelihood Ratio	2.018	3	0.57
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.753	1	0.19
N of Valid Cases	135		

A significant number comprising 49% of the respondents from the public sector and 47% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never organized meetings where the management explained to the management how each of the jobs had changed and what their responsibilities were. Only once as indicated by 27% of the respondents from the public sector and 23% from the private sector did their organization organize the meetings.

Table 4.40: Organized meetings where the management explained how each of the jobs has changed and what my Responsibilities are.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	45%	49%	47%
Once	20%	27%	23%
Occasionally	24%	20%	22%
Regularly	11%	5%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view management's actions as not so significant occurrence with a value of 3.128 and asymptote value of 0.37.

Table 4.41: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.128	3	0.37
Likelihood Ratio	3.212	3	0.36
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.513	1	0.22
N of Valid Cases	137		

Fifty percent (50%) of the respondents from the public sector and 50% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never developed performance management systems where managers sat down with their employees to help manage their new developed Performance Management Systems in which managers sat down with their employees. A significant number comprising 26% from the public sector and 22% from the private sector indicated stated that organizations regularly organized meetings between managers and employees.

Table 4.42: Developed performance management system in which managers sit down with their employees to help them manage their roles.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	51%	50%	50%
Once	18%	20%	19%
Occasionally	18%	26%	22%
Regularly	13%	5%	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view that the management's response as not so significant occurrence with a value of 3.486 and asymptote value of 0.32.

Table 4.43: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.486	3	0.32
Likelihood Ratio	3.622	3	0.31
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.21	1	0.65
N of Valid Cases	137		

A significant number comprising 52% of the respondents from the public sector and 51% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never showed them how to develop skills that helped them think of change as an opportunity for personal growth. Another 24% of the respondents from the public sector and 21% from the private sector indicated

said that their organizations occasionally showed them how to view change as an opportunity to be seized and not to be detested.

Table 4.44: Showed you how to develop skills that helped you think of change as an opportunity

	Total	Public	Private
Never	51%	52%	51%
Once	21%	18%	20%
Occasionally	18%	24%	21%
Regularly	10%	6%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view that the management's response as not significant occurrence with a value of 1.338 and asymptote value of 0.72.

Table 4.45: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.338	3	0.72
Likelihood Ratio	1.348	3	0.72
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.02	1	0.89
N of Valid Cases	137		

A significant number comprising 58% of the respondents from the public sector and 55% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never organized job holder meetings during working hours where they could ask sensitive questions about the operations of the organization. 18% of the respondents from the public sector and 20% from the private sector indicated that their organization occasionally organized these meetings.

Table 4.46: Organized job-holder meetings during working hours where employees could ask sensitive questions

	Total	Public	Private
Never	52%	58%	55%
Once	17%	18%	18%
Occasionally	22%	18%	20%
Regularly	9%	6%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view the management's actions as not significant occurrence with a value of 0.721 and asymptote value of 0.87.

Table 4.47: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	0.721	3	0.87
Likelihood Ratio	0.724	3	0.87
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.675	1	0.41
N of Valid Cases	135		

A large number comprising 75% of the respondents from the public sector and 68% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never organized meetings where employees were taught how to read financial statements and understand strategic planning processes and how they contributed to the bottom line as ; pointer to how they appreciated their contributions . Only once according to 12% of the respondents from the public sector and 14% from the private sector indicated that their organisations did organize meetings where employees were taught how to read financial statements and understand strategic planning processes.

Table 4.48: Organizes meetings where employees are taught to read financial statements and understand strategic planning processes.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	61 %	75 %	68 %
Once	16 %	12 %	14 %
Occasionally	16 %	9 %	13 %
Regularly	7 %	3 %	5 %
Total	100 %	100 %	100 %

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view the management's response as fairly significant occurrence with a value of 3.652 and asymptote value of 0.30.

Table 4.48: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.652	3	0.30
Likelihood Ratio	3.716	3	0.29
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.565	1	0.06
N of Valid Cases	134		

A large number comprising 74% of the respondents from the public sector and 72% from the private sector indicated that their organizations never organized for counselors to visit individual worksites and drop -in appointments conduct group meetings at the departmental level. Only 14% of the respondents from the public sector and 15% from the private sector indicated such meeting was regularly organized.

Table 4.49: Organized for counselor to visit individual work sites/ drop-in appointments to conduct group counseling sessions

	Total	Public	Private
Never	70%	74%	72%
Once	9%	11%	10%
Occasionally	16%	14%	15%
Regularly	6%	2%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearsonian indicates that the respondents view the management's actions as not a significant occurrence with a value of 1.907 and asymptote value of 0.59.

Table 4.50: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.907	3	0.59
Likelihood Ratio	2.032	3	0.57
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.864	1	0.35
N of Valid Cases	137		

Sixty two percent (62%) of the respondent from the public sector and 56% from the private sector indicated that their organization never carried out attitude surveys to gauge employee satisfaction. Only 18% of the respondents from the public sector and 22% from the private sector indicated that their organizations undertook such surveys occasionally.

Table 4.51: The organization periodically carries out attitude surveys.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	49%	62%	56%
Once	17%	15%	16%
Occasionally	25%	18%	22%
Regularly	9%	5%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view the management actions as not a significant occurrence with a value of 2.632 and asymptote value of 0.45.

Table 4.52: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.632	3	0.45
Likelihood Ratio	2.655	3	0.45
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.566	1	0.11
N of Valid Cases	135		

Sixty Seven percent (67%) of the respondents from the public sector and 61% from the private sector indicated that no equitable pay systems were established. Only 16% of the respondents from the public sector and 19% from the private sector indicated that their organization regularly gave an indication of their establishment.

Table 4.53: The organization has established equitable pay systems.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	57%	67%	61%
Once	17%	16%	17%
Occasionally	22%	16%	19%
Regularly	4%	2%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view the management actions as not a significant occurrence with a value of 2.024 and asymptote value of 0.57.

Table 4.54: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.024	3	0.57
Likelihood Ratio	2.074	3	0.56
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.913	1	0.17
N of Valid Cases	132		

Sixty six percent (66%) of the respondents from the public sector and 64% from the private sector indicated their organization never organized training in stress management and development of good coping skills. A small number of respondents comprising only 17%

of the respondents from the public sector and 19% from the private sector indicated the management occasionally organized training on stress management.

Table 4.55: The organization has organized training in stress management.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	63%	66%	64%
Once	14%	14%	14%
Occasionally	20%	17%	19%
Regularly	3%	3%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view the management's actions as very insignificant occurrence with a value of 0.239 and asymptote value of 0.97.

Table 4.56: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	0.239	3	0.97
Likelihood Ratio	0.24	3	0.97
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.149	1	0.70
N of Valid Cases	135		

Sixty seven percent (67%) of the respondents from the public sector and 69% from the private sector indicated that no efforts were made by their organizations to deploy public relations officials to answer enquiries from employees regarding their job security and the future. Some 17% of the respondents from the public sector and 15% from the private sector indicated that such officers were once deployed.

Table 4.57: Deployed a public relations official to answer telephone enquires from employees.

	Total	Public	Private
Never	71%	67%	69%
Once	14%	17%	15%
Occasionally	13%	12%	13%
Regularly	1%	5%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view the action of the management as not a significant occurrence with a value of 1.373 and asymptote value of 0.71.

Table 4.58: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.373	3	0.71
Likelihood Ratio	1.419	3	0.70
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.525	1	0.47
N of Valid Cases	136		

Sixty two percent (62%) of the respondents from the public sector and 59% from the private sector indicated that no career planning and career advancement workshops were organized to help individuals feel that the skill they had or were obtaining would like them feel that they had capacity and capability to contribute and master the changed work environment. Some 23% of the respondents from the public sector and 20% from the private sector indicated that such career planning and advancement workshops were held.

Table 4.59: Organized career planning and career advancement workshops

	Total	Public	Private
Never	56%	62%	59%
Once	16%	9%	12%
Occasionally	18%	23%	20%
Regularly	10%	6%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%

The Chi-Square test using Pearson indicates that the respondents view the action of the management as not a significant occurrence with a value of 2.265 and asymptote value of 0.52.

Table 4.60: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.265	3	0.52
Likelihood Ratio	2.294	3	0.51
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.256	1	0.61
N of Valid Cases	137		

4.5 OTHER FACTORS WHICH ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD HAVE GIVEN PRIORITY AFTER DOWNSIZING

This section concerned other factors which the organizations should have given consideration after downsizing. The respondents were required to list in order of priority, what they felt the management should have done after downsizing. The priorities for the public and private sectors are shown below:

4.5.1 Public Sector

- a) Payment of good salaries
- b) Relevant training
- c) Better working conditions
- d) Motivation of remaining employees
- e) Promotion of remaining staff
- f) Equipping and computerization of offices
- g) Review of work programmes
- h) Re-organization and equitable distribution of remaining staff
- i) Matching work efforts with pay
- j) Giving incentives to hardworking employees
- k) Harmonization of salary and house allowances
- l) Improvement of retirement benefits
- m) Learning each employees backgrounds
- n) Giving accurate information on future downsizing
- o) Job security
- p) Matching of qualifications with right jobs
- q) Frequent revision of Schemes of Service

- r) Clear guidelines on future downsizing
- s) Career planning and career advancement
- t) Revision of Code of Regulations to keep up with the times
- u) Organizations of counseling sessions for survivors
- v) Appraisal of all employees

4.5.2 Private Sector

- a) Payment of good salaries,
- b) Training,
- c) Motivation of the remaining staff
- d) Restructuring the organizations
- e) Computerizing the organizations
- f) Rewarding management and employees
- g) Improvement of staff welfare
- h) Assurance of remaining staff
- i) Improving marketing of organizations services
- j) Re-organization of work and change set ups
- k) Harmonization of relationships
- l) Promotion on yearly basis
- m) Refurbishment of business with savings from downsizing
- n) Reduction of senior management allowances
- o) Assessment of workloads to see whether the remaining staff can cope
- p) Equity in pay structure
- q) Consulting O.D. Specialists

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 SUMMARY

It appears from the background that downsizing has devastating effects both on the victims and survivors. However, organizations have been thinking of how to manage retrenchments and not thinking about how to manage survival. They overlook the fact that their employees are usually not good survivors, in that they are not emotionally prepared to handle major disruptions. The study examined both public and private organizations thus bringing a complete picture of the situation. The objectives of the study were: to establish the perceptions of survivors on downsizing and to find out how organizations have addressed the survivors of downsizing.

Under objective one: to establish the perceptions of survivors that need to be addressed by the management both in Public and Private Sectors, Job Stress, job satisfaction, work overload, motivation, job involvement, role ambiguity, job insecurity, role conflict, relationship with the victim, personal inadequacy, fear, organizational support, commitment to work, supervisor support and supervisor insensitivity.

As regards the private sector the following were identified: fairness in retrenchment, supervisor support, fear of the next phase, role overload work distribution fairness and support. Others were Role erosion and inadequacy, supervisor and job involvement, procedural fairness, job stress and role expectation, motivation in relation to productivity, identification with the victim, job satisfaction and intention to remain, turnover intention and role ambiguity.

The common factors for the two sectors that are important were, work performance and commitment to the organization, survivor assistance and support, Role conflict, Job autonomy and relevance, motivation and job predictability, role challenges and turnover intention, relationship with the victim, job stress and lack of support, Role overload, role erosion, role inadequacy, job satisfaction, job involvement and optimism.

As regards objective two: how organizations have addressed the problem of survivor downsizing the following were determined based on the Chi-square test the changes instituted by the management were not found to be significant. The findings can be summarised as follows:

Significant

- (1) The organizations had organised training in stress management
- (2) They spoke about organization mission, vision and future plans.

Fairly Significant

- (1) Involvement of employees in planning creative activities. Establishment of management notice boards and newsletters to keep employees updated.
- (2) Organized meetings where employees were taught to read financial statements and understand strategic planning processes.

Not significantly addressed

Out of the issues the management should have addressed after downsizing the following were not significantly addressed:

- I. giving employees time to honour and grieve about the past
- II. explaining the new culture the organization intended to introduce
- III. explaining ones role in organizations future plans

- IV. Providing an avenue for employees to ask questions regarding the organizations future.
- V. communicating facts about the likely effects of downsizing
- VI. Putting up “good news board” where one could post positive information.
- VII. Starting recognition programmes to reward good performance
- VIII. Giving gifts to employees.
- IX. Conducting training workshops to create new culture and emphasise organizational values.
- X. Organizing meetings where employees could express their feelings without fear of victimisation.
- XI. Organizing meetings to explain what the organizations were doing to help employees who were leaving the organizations.
- XII. Organizing meetings where the management explained how each of the jobs had changed and what the employees new responsibilities were.
- XIII. Developing performance management system in which managers sit down with their employees to help them manage their roles
- XIV. Show how to develop new skills that could help them look at change as an opportunity
- XV. Developing performance management systems in which managers sit down with their employees to help them manage their roles
- XVI. Showing employees how to develop skills that help employees to think of change as an opportunity.
- XVII. Organizing jobholder meetings during working hours where employees could ask sensitive questions.

- XVIII. Organizing for counsellor to visit individual work site/drop in appointments to conduct group counselling questions
- XIX. The organization carrying out periodic attitude surveys
- XX. Establishment of equitable pay systems
- XXI. The organization organizing training in stress management
- XXII. Deployment of a public relations official to answer phone enquiries from employees
- XXIII. Organizing career planning and career advancement workshops.

5.2 CONCLUSION

The study achieved its objective. It identified the views of the survivors on downsizing. It can be concluded that the management both in the public and private sectors did not address pertinent issues that affect survivors. The findings indicate that the organisations both in Private and the Public Sector are more interested in the mechanisms of downsizing, that is, to reduce staff costs and numbers while ignoring the ultimate objective of improving quality of service through well motivated and well remunerated staff. The organisations significantly addressed issues that first impact on the organisation while those that impact on the employees were not significantly addressed in downsizing.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.3.1 Management

The problems affecting survivors of downsizing should be a key concern of management. The result of the study shows that organizations both in the public and private sectors have done little regarding the problems employees face everyday.

It is therefore recommended that organizations should:

- I. Proactively plan work to be eliminated and/or re-designed to fit or correspond to the organization's mission.
- II. Target employees using viable criteria such as skills performance value adding and span of control.
- III. Provision of employee assistance after downsizing
- IV. Foster positive employee attitudes
- V. Rebuild employee loyalty

5.3.2 Further Research

- I. This study can be carried out among managers and implementers of downsizing. It would be worthwhile to investigate differences between professions and job categories.
- II. Other possible areas for further research are aspects raised in the findings of this project, for instance why some factors featured highly in the two sectors.

5.4 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

This study was constrained by a number of factors:-

- I. Time was a major constraint that limited the depth and scope of the study
- II. Organizations, especially in the Private sector were unwilling to allow distribution of questionnaires citing such as wrong timing and sensitivity of the information sought.
- III. There was also the limitation of measurement. Feelings and circumstances change and respondents may have given biased answers.

REFERENCES

- Abbassi, S. M., and Hollman, K. W., (1989) "Incompetent Bosses" Industrial Management, 3b (1): 18-19.
- Abrahamson, E. (2000), "Change Without Pain": Harvard Business Review, July-August: 75 - 79.
- Arvesson (1999) <http://www.balancedscorecard.org/metrics/translating.html>
- Aseto, O. and Okelo, J. A. (1997), Privatization in Kenya, Nairobi: Basic Books Ltd.
- Armstrong, S.M. (1993). "Survivors reactions to a workforce reduction: A comparison of Blue collar workers and their sponsors" Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences 10(4): 334-343
- Belogun, M.J. (2003) "Making Performance Real - Customer based initiatives in the public sector in Africa" African Journal of Public Administration and Management Vol. XIV No. 142 January and July.
- Brockener, J. (1992). "Managing the effects of lay offs on survivors". Californian Management Review, 34 (2): 9-28.
- Buch, K. and Aldridge, J. (1990), "Downsizing Challenges and OD Interventions: A Matching Strategy". Journal of Managerial Psychology, 5(4): 32-37.
- Bryson J.M. (1995) Strategic Planning for Public and non-profit organizations, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass
- Cameron, K. S. (1994): Strategies for successful Organizational Downsizing: Human Resource Management, 33(2), 189 (23).
- Cameron, K. S.; Freeman, S. J. and Mishra, A. K. (1993). "Downsizing and redesigning organizations". In Huber G. P. and Glick W. H. (Eds), Organizational Change and Redesign: Ideas and insights for improving performance, New York: Oxford University press.
- Cameron. K. S. and Freeman, S. J. (1994), The Downsizing of an army organization: An investigation of downsizing strategies, processes and outcomes. Technical report. United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioural and Social Sciences. Defense Technical Information Centre (DTIC), 1003, (94 - 284 238).
- Cascio, Wayne (1993). "Downsizing: What do we know? What have we learned" Academy of Management Executive, (7): 95 - 104.
- Cascio, W.F. (1998), Managing Human Resources, New York: Irwin

- Cascio, W. "Downsizing: What do we know? What have we learned? *Academy of Management Executive* 7(1): 95 - 104
- Cooper, C. (2000), "Rolling with it". *People Management*, September: 32 -34.
- Cornfield, D. B (1993). "Chances of Lay off in a corporation: A case study. " *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28:503 -20.
- Crouch, A. and Wirth, A. (1986) "Managerial Responses to Mergers and other job changes". *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 6 (2): 3-8. February 10
- Daniel W.W. and Terrell, J.C. (1979) Basic Statistics, Basic Concepts and Methodology, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Freudenberg, H. J. (1974). "Staff Burnout", *Journal of Social Issues*, 30 (1) quoted in Levinson, H, (1981) "When executives Burnout", *Harvard Business Review*, May-June: 73-81.
- Gacheri J. (2004): A survey of the criteria used by commercial banks in Kenya to determine employees to retrench. Un-published MBA thesis, University of Nairobi
- Gatheru W. and Shaw, R. (1988) Our Problems, Our solutions: an economic and public policy agenda for Kenya, Nairobi: Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M. and Donnel, J. H. (1994), Organizations, Boston: Irwin Publishers.
- Gitu, K. W. (March 2001) "Kenya's Human Resources: is Retrenchment the Answer?" Professional Management.
- Greenhalgh, L. (1982), "Maintaining Organizational Effectiveness during Retrenchments" *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 18: 155-70.
- Guest, D.E. and Conway, M. (1996) "Employee Motivation and the Psychological contract" Issues in *People Management*, Institute of Personnel and Development, London.
- Guyo, C.H. (2003) "A survey of the practices of staff downsizing among major oil firms, Un-published MBA Thesis, University of Nairobi
- Halley A. A. (1995) "Downsizing In cooperative Project Alliance for Redesigning Government, National Academy of Public Administration
- Hardy, C. (1987), "Investing in Retrenchment: Avoiding the hidden costs". *California Management Review* xxxix (4); 111:125

- Harrison, B. (1994) Lean and Mean, New York: Harper Collins Publishers
- Hayden, G., Jackson, R. and Okumu, J (1970) Development Administration, the Kenyan Experience: Nairobi, Oxford University Press.
- Hermanson, R., Ivancevich, D. and Hermanson, D (1992). Corporate Restructuring in the 1990's: The Impact of Accounting Incentives. The Corporate Growth Report: 14-18
- Hickok, T (1995) the impact of Work Force Reductions on those who remain: A study of civilian workers at two Departments of Defense bases. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, US. California, Los Angeles (A)
- Higginson, H.J. and Waxler, R.P, (1998), "Developing a Trust Culture: To Survive in the 1990s". Industrial Management, 31 (6): 27-32.
- Jackson, G.B; (1996), Beyond Survivor Syndrome, [http; //members; tripod.lycos.co.ke/jbk/o-beyond.htm](http://members.tripod.lycos.co.ke/jbk/o-beyond.htm)
- Jahoda, M. (1982). Employment and Unemployment: A social Psychological Analysis, New York: Academic Press.
- Jenks, J.M. and Zevnik, B.L. (1988), Managers Caught in the Crunch, New York: Franklin Watts
- Kennedy, C. (April 1996) "The Incredible Shrinking Company" Director: 49
- Knowdell, R.L., Branstead, E. and Monravec, M. (1996), From Downsizing to Recovery, Palo Alto, California: Davies Black Publishing.
- Kozlowski, S; Chao, G., Smith, E., and Hedlund, V (1993). Organizational downsizing; Strategies, interventions, and research implications, "International Review of Industrial and organizational Psychology 8: 263 - 332
- Leana, C. and Feldman, D.C. (1992) Coping With Job Loss: How Individuals, Organizations, and communities respond to layoffs. New York: Lexington Books.
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., Chao, G. T., Smith, E. M. and Hedlund, J. (1993) Organizational Downsizing": Strategies, Interventions and Research Implications". In cooper
- C. L. and Roberson, I.T (eds), International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 8:263 - 332.
- Levinson, H. (1981), "When Executives Burnout". Harvard Business Review, May-June: 73-81.

- Lewis, D. (1997). Researchers find that Downsizing can adversely affect Employees health, [Knight – Ridder Tribune Business News](#).
- Lippitt, R. and Lippitt, G. (1984). “Humane Downsizing: Organizational Renewal versus Organizational Depression” [SAM Advanced Management Journal](#), 49 (3): 18 – 20
- Littler, C. (1997), “Downsizing Dilemmas – Managing the Process” www.psmpc.gov.au/media/Littler.htm
- Manning, T. (1994) “Stress Management and the Management of Change” in Lovell, R. (Ed). [Managing Change in the New public Sector](#), Essex: Longman.
- Maynard, H. and Mehterns, S., (1993), [The Fourth Wave](#), San Francisco: Berret – Koehler Publishers. McGraw-Hill
- Mclune, J.T, Beatty, R.W, and Montago, R.V. (1988) “Downsizing in manufacturing firms”. [Human Resource Management Journals](#), 27:145-161
- McGuire, T (2001), “Looking after the survivors”. [Chartered Secretary](#), February 2001
- Moi, D (2002) [The nature of responses of survivors of downsizing. The case of Ministry Of Education Science and Technology in Kenya](#) Unpublished MBA Thesis, University of Nairobi
- Moore, F.J. (1996), [The Death of Competition](#), New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Moore, M. (1995) [Creating Public Value](#), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Mujera, B. (1998), [Staff Retrenchment Procedures](#), a speech delivered at a seminar of Human Resource Training held at the Mid-West Hotel, Kericho on 8th December, 1998
- Mwangi, E.N.K (2002). [A survey of factors that influence the attitudes of survivors of downsizing towards management and job security in banking sector](#) unpublished MBA Thesis, University of Nairobi
- O’Neil, M., Hugh, M., Lenn D. J., and Caimano V. F. (1995), “Voices of Survivors: Words that Downsizing Chief Executive Officers should Hear”. [The Academy of Management Executive](#), 9 (4)
- Osborne, D; and Gaebler, T. (1993) [Reinventing Government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector](#), New York: Penquin
- Pasternack, B.A., and Viscio, A.J. (1998) [Centreless Corporation](#), New York: Simon and Schuster.

- Pralahad, C.K. and Hamel, G. (1990). "The Core Competencies of the Corporation" The Harvard Business Review, May/June
- Quin, J.B. (1992), The Intelligent Enterprise; New York: Free Press.
- Rama, M. (1997) "Efficient Public Sector Downsizing" A Research Project, the World Bank Development Research Group
- Read, S. (1999), Work Shift, London: Judy Piatkus Publishers, Ltd.
- Rosenbloom, D.H. (1998) Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics and Law in the Public Sector: New York, The McGraw Hill Companies Inc.
- Sahdev, K., Vinnicombe, S, and Tyson, S. (1999), "Downsizing and the Changing Role of Human Resource." International Journal of Human Resource Management, 10(5): 906-923.
- Shivo, T.S. A Survey of Work Trauma on Post Redundancy Survivors in Kenya, Unpublished MBA Thesis, University of Nairobi
- Soukup W.R., Rothman, M. and Brisco D.R. (1987) "Outplacement Services: A Vital Component of Personnel Policy" SAM Advanced Management Journal, 52 (4): 19 - 23.
- Sparrow, P. and Marchington, M (1998), Human Resource Management, London: Financial Times Professional. Ltd.
- Tang, T. and Fuller, R. (1995) Corporate Downsizing: What managers can do to lessen the negative effects of lay offs" SAM Advanced Management Journal: 56-60.
- Thomas A. Hickok (1995), "Downsizing and Organizational Culture" <http://www.pamij.com/hickok.html>
- Thornhill, A., Stead, J. and Gibbons, A. (1997), Managing Downsizing and Redundancy, London: Publishing.
- Tylczak, L. (1991) Downsizing Without Disaster, London: Kogan Page
- Tyson, S. and Doherty, N. (1991) "Redundant Executive: Personality and the Job Change Experience". Personnel Review, 29 (5): 3-10.
- Whetten, D.A. (1980). "Sources, Responses and Effects of Organizational Decline" In Kimberley, J.R. and Miles, R.H. (eds). The Organization Life Cycle, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- William, B. (2003) "Determining Governments' Core Functions" www.effwa.org

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SURVIVORS

SURVIVOR RESPONSE TO DOWNSIZING

For the purpose of analysis only, please answer the following questions about yourself. Your answers will remain **anonymous and strictly confidential**. This information is important to this study.

SECTION A: PERSONAL DATA

Please answer the following questions

1. What is your current title/designation.....
2. Please tick one to indicate your type of Job.
 - i. Professional ()
 - ii. Support ()
 - iii. Other (please specify)
3. What are your terms of service? (For example permanent and pensionable).....
4. How long have you been with the organization? years
5. Please tick where your age falls
 - i. Under 25 ()
 - ii. 36 - 40 ()
 - iii. Over 50 ()
 - iv. 31 - 35 ()
 - v. 46 - 50 ()
6. Gender:
 - i. Male ()
 - ii. Female ()
7. Marital status:
 - i. Single ()
 - ii. Married ()
 - iii. Other (please specify)
8. No. of Children (If any)
9. Children's Ages: Oldest Youngest.....
10. What is the highest academic qualification you have attained? (e.g. B.Com)
.....
11. Please specify any professional/technical qualifications you have (e.g. CPA III).....
12. Please specify the sector where your organization falls:
 - i. Public ()
 - ii. Private ()

SECTION B

In this section, please tick the number that best reflects the degree to which the particular statement expresses your true feelings and responses regarding the downsizing exercise carried out by your organization. Please use the following scale.

1. *If you never or rarely feel this way.*
2. *If you occasionally (a few times) feel this way.*
3. *If you frequently feel this way.*
4. *If you always feel this way.*

	1	2	3	4	5
1. The criteria used for retirement was fair.					
2. I am angry for the loss of friends and colleagues.					
3. I feel guilt for the loss of friends and colleagues.					
4. I feel guilty that those laid off were better than me.					
5. My workmates treat me with suspicion.					
6. I fear that I may be the next victim.					
7. I feel that I do not have capability to handle my duties and responsibilities.					
8. My duties and responsibilities are not clear.					
9. I do not get the necessary information to carry out my duties and responsibilities.					
10. The jobs held by many of the employees who lost their jobs were similar to mine.					
11. I am not able to utilize my training and expertise in my job.					
12. I do not know what my colleagues expect of me.					
13. My work does not allow me to have quality time for myself, family and friends.					
14. I would like to take more responsibility than I am handling.					
15. I am not learning enough in my present job to prepare me take higher responsibility.					
16. I am not able to satisfy conflicting demands of various people at the workplace.					
17. My duties have recently been reduced in importance.					
18. My current workload is too heavy.					
19. I have been given too much responsibility.					
20. I knew many of those who lost their jobs.					
21. I have not had relevant training for my current role.					
22. The work I do is not related to my training.					
23. Several aspects of my responsibilities are not clear.					
24. There is little scope for advancement in my job.					
25. There is need to reduce my duties and responsibilities.					
26. Those who lost their jobs were friends of mine.					
27. The expectations of my seniors conflict with those of my juniors.					
28. I wish I had been assigned more challenging tasks.					

29. I wish I could get another job elsewhere.					
30. I am not sure as to the priorities in my role.					
31. I experience conflict between my values and what I do in my role.					
32. The work I do is challenging and worth while.					
33. I have autonomy and do my work independently.					
34. I share my feelings and emotions with other people.					
35. I get recognition for the work I do.					
36. The quality of my work has improved.					
37. The activities of my work are satisfying and rewarding					
38. There is a sense of belonging among members of the organization.					
39. Members of the organization are sensitive, perceptive, and help one another.					
40. I work under pressure to meet deadlines.					
41. My boss is harsh and shout at me.					
42. I cannot cope with the responsibilities of my work.					
43. My current salary is little compared with what I do.					
44. There are frequent unpredictable changes of the work assigned.					
45. I get immediate feedback on my performance					
46. I always stay in the office even when I may have urgent personal problems to attend to.					
47. I do get time off due to personal or family illnesses					
48. Whenever I take problems to my supervisor I am asked to work them out myself.					
49. My immediate supervisor goes out of his way to assist me.					

SECTION C

From the following activities, please indicate what the manufacturers of your organization have been involved in after the last downsizing, using the following scale: *1. Never, 2. Once, 3. Occasionally, and 4. Regularly*

	1	2	3	4
1. Gave employees time to honour and grieve about the past.				
2. Spoke about the organizations mission, vision and future plans.				
3. Explained the new culture the organization intended to introduce.				
4.Explained my role in the organization’s future plans				
5. Provided an avenue that allowed me to ask questions regarding the organizations future.				
6. Communicated facts about the likely effects of downsizing.				
7. Put up a “good news board” where once could post positive information.				
8. Formed a “small team” composed of group of employees who planned creative activities.				
9. Started an instant recognition program to reward good performance.				
10. Gave gifts (e.g. shopping vouchers, wedding gifts and delivers flower to those hospitalized.				
11. Established a management notice board and newsletter to keep employees updated.				
12. Conducted training workshops to create a new culture and emphasize organizations values.				
13. Organized meetings where employees expressed their feelings without fear of victimization.				
14. Organized meeting to explain what they were doing to help employees who were leaving the organization.				
15. Organized meetings where the management explained how each of the jobs have changed and what my Responsibilities are.				
16. Developed performance management system in which managers sit down with their employees to help them manage their roles.				
17. Showed you how to develop skills that helped you think of change as an opportunity.				
18. Organized job-holder meetings during working hours where employees could ask sensitive questions.				
19. Organizes meetings where employees are taught to read financial statements and understand strategic planning processes.				
20. Organized for counselor to visit individual work sites/ drop-in appointments to conduct group counseling sessions.				
21. The organization periodically carries out attitude surveys.				
22. The organization has established equitable pay systems.				
23. The organization has organized training in stress management.				
24. Deployed a public relations official to answer telephone enquires from employees.				
25. Organized career planning and career advancement workshops.				

SECTION D

Please list in order of priority the things which you feel the organization should have done after downsizing.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please write below any other comments you wish to include that are relevant to this subject.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

APPENDIX 2: LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE DOWNSIZED

(A) PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANIZATION

- 1) Office of the President.
- 2) Office of the Vice-President and Ministry of Home Affairs.
- 3) Ministry of Finance.
- 4) Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Co-operation.
- 5) Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development.
- 6) Ministry of Planning and National Development.
- 7) Ministry of Transport.
- 8) Ministry of Energy.
- 9) Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources.
- 10) Ministry of Agriculture.
- 11) Ministry of Trade and Industry.
- 12) Ministry of Roads and Public Works.
- 13) Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Department.
- 14) Ministry of Health.
- 15) Ministry of Local Government.
- 16) Ministry of Lands and Settlement.
- 17) State Law Office.
- 18) The Judiciary.
- 19) Public Service Commission.
- 20) Kenya National Audit Office.
- 21) Inspectorate of State Corporations.
- 22) National Assembly.
- 23) Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife.
- 24) National Cereals and Produce Board.
- 25) Kenya Broadcasting Corporation.
- 26) Kenya Reinsurance Corporation.
- 27) Kenya Pipeline Company Ltd.
- 28) Agriculture Development Corporation.
- 29) Kenya Wildlife Service.
- 30) Kenya Airports Authority.
- 31) Kenya Industrial Estates.
- 32) Kenya Sugar Authority.
- 33) Kenya Revenue Authority.
- 34) Catering Levy Trustees.
- 35) National Hospital Insurance Fund.
- 36) Coffee Board of Kenya.
- 37) Kenya Industrial Development Bank.
- 38) National Bank of Kenya.
- 39) Agricultural Finance Corporation.
- 40) Electoral Commission of Kenya.

(B) PRIVATE SECTOR ORGNIZATIONS

- 1) Kenya Airways.
- 2) East African Breweries.
- 3) Standard Chartered Bank.
- 4) Barclays Bank.
- 5) Pan African Insurance.
- 6) Dawa Pharmaceuticals.
- 7) Block Hotels (Fairmount Hotels and Resorts).
- 8) Associated Battery Manufacturers.
- 9) Unga Limited.
- 10) International Casino.
- 11) Kenya Bus Management Services.
- 12) Kenya Planters Co-operative Union.
- 13) Co-operative Bank.
- 14) Boots International.
- 15) Farmers Choice.
- 16) Africa Online.
- 17) Nairobi Hospital.
- 18) Jos Hansen (E.A.) Ltd.
- 19) Central Glass Industries.
- 20) Aga Khan Hospital.
- 21) Housing Finance Company.
- 22) Hilton Hotel.
- 23) Simba Colt Motors.
- 24) Fintech Limited.
- 25) Trust Bank Ltd.
- 26) Bata Shoe Company.
- 27) General Motors.
- 28) Blue Shield Insurance.
- 29) Madison Insurance.
- 30) Mastermind Tobacco.
- 31) Cooper Motors Corporation.
- 32) Toyota Kenya.
- 33) Kenya Times Ltd.
- 34) Unilever Kenya Ltd.
- 35) Smithkline Beecham Ltd.
- 36) Howse McGeorge.
- 37) Associated Motors Ltd.
- 38) British American Tobacco.
- 39) Trufoods Ltd.
- 40) Crown Paints Ltd.