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**ABSTRACT**

The study investigated the relationship between managing drivers and operations performance at World Food Programme(U). The research objectives of the study were to; assess the influence of driver training on operations performance, to find out how driver behavior affects operations performance and to examine how managerial skills affect operations performance. A cross-sectional survey design was used, with data collected from a sample of 80 respondents using questionnaire survey and interviewing methods. Data was analyzed using the statistical package for social scientists (SPSS) 16 for appropriate transformation. The study found a significant relationship between the three dimensions of managing drivers; driver training, driver behavior, managerial skills in improving operations performance. The study concluded that giving additional attention to defensive driving, traffic regulations, health and safety. Plus addressing constraints of motivation, experience, ethics of drivers properly and resolving conflicts amicably, crises skills, time usage properly would result into significant improvements in operations performance at World Food Programme (U). The study recommended that it was mandatory for all drivers to be equipped with the required necessary training in order to be able to fulfill their required obligations of timely delivery, It was further recommended that there is need for ethical training of drivers at World Food Programme (U) to try to mitigate the issue of unauthorized use of organizational vehicles and finally there was need for managers to issue orders to drivers that are easily comprehendible so that they could complete amicably their required task at hand.

**CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

**1.0 Introduction**

Logistics is central to disaster response activities, for years the aid sector’s regard for logistics has been viewed as a necessary expense rather than an important strategic component of their work. Only recently have humanitarian relief organizations began to understand the criticality and importance of relief chain management on the success of disaster relief operations (Beamon., 2004).

This study examined the relationship between managing drivers and operations performance. Managing drivers constituted driver training, driver behavior and managerial skills as independent variables while operations performance constituted speed of delivery, quality, cost, flexibility and dependability as the dependent variables.

This chapter covered the background to the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the objectives of the study, the research questions, the hypothesis, the significance, justification, and the scope of study.

* 1. **Background to the study**

**1.1.1 Historical Background**

New organizational structures and expanding computing options have dramatically changed the nature of managing drivers. Managing drivers is a component activity of logistics management. Logistics management has evolved over the years from the building of the pyramids to the relief of hunger in Africa. Throughout the history of mankind wars have been won and lost through logistics strengths and capabilities or the luck of them ( Martin Christopher, 2005).

Twenty years ago, maintaining organizational equipment i.e. trucks, assets etc was the only responsibility that fleet managers had he/she did this when a budget was allocated to him/her by upper management But today logistics management has expanded from “fleet “only to involve total maintenance, from operations specialists to marketing and communication experts, from hoarding resources to sharing, from a total focus on cost to total customer satisfaction, from focus on downtime to one on reliability, from viewing departments as separate entities to embracing cross-functional responsibilities and outcomes, from total ownership of all equipment to maximization of capital and technology, from owning and operating fuel sites to a combination of strategies and finally from out sourcing warranty work to becoming certified to do it ‘in house’( Kenneth Lycons, 2003).

**1.1.2 Theoretical Background**

The study was informed by the Contingency theory of operations management. Contingency theory according to Jay Galbraith (1973) is an outgrowth of the systems design and states that there is no one best way to organize plus anyway of organizing is not equally effective. This run counters to the optimizing notions of many rational theorists. Jay Galbraith (1973 ) added that in Contingency theory the best way to organize depends on the nature of the environment to which the organization relates. The contingency theory is guided by the general orienting hypothesis that organizations whose internal features best match the demands of their environments will achieve the best adaption and that the amount of uncertainty, rate of change in an environment impacts the development of internal features of organizations. In addition different subunits within an organization may confront different external demands furthermore, the more differentiated the more difficult it will be to coordinate the activities of the subunits and more resources needed to be applied for coordination as argued by Lawrence and Lorsch (1967).

This mindset is further radically different from the influence of the scientific management, which advocated the best method approach, particularly in the task design. Within the realm of management, Contingency theory has progressed into two separate directions, that is approaches in the leadership style and organizational design according to Laster and Parnell, (2007).

Jay Galbaith’s view is similar to systems design in that it stresses information flows but adds that as uncertainty increases the amount of information required for decision making also increases. That is various structural arrangements, such as rules, hierarchy and decentralization are mechanisms determining the information-processing capacity of the system. So the contingency theory was applied to both management and organizational operations in this case managing drivers as a logistical activity and operations performance.

**1.1.3 Conceptual Background**

Employee Management is managing employees in order to achieve operation’s efficiency, that is Managing, like all other practices is an art, it is a knowhow, it is doing things in light of the realities of a situation ( Knootz, 2005).It has been studied before that management may affect performance of organizations. It is a strategic and integrated process that delivers sustained success to an organization (Michael Armstrong, 2003). In this case WFP (U), by improving the operations performance of people who work in them and by developing the capabilities of individual contributors and teams. The concepts in this study relate to operations management which includes *inter alia* layout of facilities/resources, determination of capacity, design of jobs, activity scheduling, quality control, control and planning of inventories. The existing body of knowledge in operations management as reflected in the teaching of the subject largely consists of a number of techniques and practices for problem solving, decision making and analysis in these areas. These are fairly well developed yet there is relatively, a lack of theory and a conceptual framework to allow the practitioner to determine the appropriateness or feasibility of such techniques and practices, to recognize the implications of action in one area for the entire operating system and corporate objectives and to appreciate the constraints on the operations manager which limit his courses of action. The need to develop theories, concepts and to contribute to the development of such a body of basic knowledge is now widely recognized (Barbara Morris, 1978).

**1.1.4 Contextual Background**

The World Food Programme (WFP) is the United Nations frontline against world hunger originally started internationally in 1961. It is the largest and longest serving humanitarian agency in Uganda. Currently WFP Uganda focuses on three priority areas namely; Emergency Humanitarian Action (EHA), Food and Nutrition Security (FNS), and Agriculture and Market Support (AMS) ( World Food Progamme (U) Newsletter, June 2013 ). Many humanitarian organizations are engaged in long term development activities as well as disaster management activities supporting people affected by disasters. Humanitarian operations consist of a diverse range of activities, therefore logistics in this context can have a broader scope that includes security, driver supervision and information technology than in the commercial sector ( Beamon., 2004).

Humanitarian logistics activities are actors in a broader supply chain and this study will try to show how effective management can help build logistics capacity by managing drivers integrate effectively and efficiently into the humanitarian supply chain and in doing so build better links with other logistics activities, this should affect operation’s performance ( Mentzer.,.2001).

Logistics activities have traditionally been marginalized within organizations, logisticians have been “Pigeonholed” in the field. Making it hard to attract ideas towards management this has contributed to a silo mentality in regards to logistics within humanitarian organizations of which World Food Programme (U) is no exception to the rule. Logistics activities are only considered as a function to support humanitarian organizational activities. ( Beamon. and Balcik,2008 ). All these logistics activities have to be properly utilized to impact on the whole organizational operations performance hence this study will show that managing drivers effectively contributes to the organization’s operations performance too like any other logistics activity (Landgren, 2009 ).

* 1. **Statement of the Problem**

World Food Programme (U) is committed to timely delivery of food to refugees for example Karamoja in Northern Uganda. And In 2011 World Food Programme (U) managed to reach 182,000 refugees in Karamoja by distributing 500 tons of food items per week. Unfortunately at the fall of may 2012, refugees in Karamoja started to receive about 400 tons of food items per week due to World Food Programme (U) operational difficulties such as delayed deliveries attributed to quality of drivers (Humanitarian news and analysis, 2012). So with the reduction in tons of food items per week World Food Programme (U) had to reduce daily food rations which are below the minimum daily energy requirements for its refugees. And yet if this situation is prolonged can result into consequences such as poorly malnourished refugees, Camp food thefts , disagreements and camp violence. Despite the fact that operational difficulties varied at World Food Programme (U), this study focused on managing drivers to improve delivery operations.

**1.3 Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between managing drivers and operations performance at World Food Programme(U).

* 1. **Specific Objectives**

The study was guided by the following objectives:

**(i)** To assess the influence of driver training on operations performance at World food programme (U).

(ii) To find out how driver behavior affects operations performance at World Food Programme (U).

(iii) To examine how managerial skills affects operations performance at World Food Programme (U).

**1.5 Research Questions**

(i) What is the influence of driver training on the operations performance at world food programme (U)?

(ii) How does driver behavior affect operations performance at World Food Programme (U)?

(iii) How does managerial skills affect operations performance at World Food Programme (U)?

**1.6 Research Hypothesis**

(i) Driver training significantly influences operations performance at World Food Programme (U).

(ii) Driver behavior significantly affects operations performance at World Food Programme (U)

(iii) Managerial skills significantly affects operations performance at World Food Programme (U).

**1.7 Conceptual Framework**

**INDEPENDENT VARIABLE: DEPENDENT VARIBLE:**

**MANAGING DRIVERS: OPERATIONS PERFORMANCE:**

-Speed of delivery

-dependability

-cost

-quality

-flexibility

**Driver training**

-Defensive driving

-health and safety

-traffic regulations

**Driver behavior**

-motivation

-experience

-ethics

**MODERATING VARIABLE**

|  |
| --- |
| **Vehicle telematics**  -vehicle tracking  -vehicle diagnostics  **Vehicle maintenance**  -breakdown maintenance  -scheduled maintenance  -preventative maintenance |

**Managerial skills**

-conflict resolution

-crisis skills

-time usage

Figure 1.The Conceptual frame shows relationship between the Independent variable and Dependent variable. Adopted from Haddow and Bullock (2004).

The independent variable of study managing drivers, had three dimensions namely driver training with indicators defensive driving, traffic regulations, health and safety. driver behavior with indicators motivation, experience and ethics. Managerial skills with indicators conflict resolution, crisis skills and time usage. Moderating variable that had two dimensions namely vehicle telematics with indicators vehicle tracking and diagnostics, vehicle maintenance with indicators breakdown, scheduled and preventative maintenance. And the dependent variable operations performance with indicators speed of delivery, dependability, cost, quality and flexibility.

**1.8 Significance of the study**

This study is significant because it shows how managing drivers influences operations performance at World Food Programme (U). With this research based information, Techniques of improving operations performance of sister relief humanitarian organizations could be realized. The researcher hopes that this study was able to extend the frontiers of knowledge by contributing to the understanding of the effect managing drivers effectively has on operations performance.

**1.9 Justification of Study**

Although studies have been carried out on management and its effect on organizational performance, in this case managing drivers was considered and tried to reveal its effect on operations performance, for managing drivers is a logistical activity that greatly leads to better delivery-times which is of absolute importance in humanitarian logistics, for human lives in a disaster situations are always at stake.

**1.10 Scope of the Study**

Content scope, the study was limited to managing drivers which emphasized on driver training, driver behavior and managerial skills which form the independent variables. Operations performance was based on speed of delivery, dependability, cost, quality and flexibility which make up the dependent variables. The moderating variables are vehicle telematics and vehicle maintenance.

Time scope, the study aimed at investigating operational difficulties in terms of managing drivers at World Food Programme (U) covering the period of 2008 to 2013 In order to be up-to-date with current circumstances.

Geographical scope, the study focused on the fleet department at World Food Programme (U) from the fleet managers, logistics assistants, fleet supervisors to the drivers.

**1.11 Operational definitions of terms and concepts**

Employee management means managing drivers in order to achieve operation’s

efficiency.

Operations performance means how efficiently and effectively an organization runs.

Driver training refers to the acquisition of knowledge, skills and competencies that enable drivers to effectively and efficiently perform to their best abilities.

Defensive driving is a form of training for motor vehicle drivers that goes beyond the mastery of the rules of the road but to learning the skills to be able to avoid an accident that could have occurred.

Health and safety refers to the right of any employee regardless of the industry to carry out his daily work in a safe environment in order to minimize accidents, injuries and fatalities. Driver behavior refers to how reliable, responsible and disciplined a driver is at work.

Traffic regulations refer to rules and laws to follow by drivers operating vehicles on the road.

Motivations refers to different incentives applied to employees to in hence their performance.

Experience refers to years of performing a task by an employee.

Managerial skills refer to ways of effectively and efficiently managing drivers to perform to the best of their abilities.

Conflict resolution refers to amicably satisfying parties in disagreement being finding a suitable solution that satisfies both parties.

Crisis skills refers to being able to handle unexpected situations effectively and efficiently.

Time usage refers to adequate and proper utilization of available time.

Speed of delivery means effective and efficient timely delivery of humanitarian relief supplies to a disaster area.

“Pigeonholed” means to be ignored.

“In house” means instead of contracting out organizational operations they are done by the organization itself.

Dependability means relief organizations can deliver relief supplies effectively and efficiently to disaster areas.

Cost means that there is no transport expenditure wastage when delivering humanitarian relief supplies to disaster areas.

Quality means the relief supplies arrive at the disaster areas not damaged and in considerable time span.

Flexibility means how adoptable is the organization to humanitarian disaster situations.

**CHAPTER TWO**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**2.0 Introduction**

This chapter seeks to explore what has been published on the topic at hand, in this case managing drivers and operations performance at World Food Programme (U) . Several publications have been done on management and performance, how they influence each other, and how performance is therefore an accomplished activity, in particular the level of standard to which a task is accomplished, adapted, carried out or achieved within the working environment ( Kerry Thomas, 1995). It is presented from the theoretical review to the themes of the study.

**2.1 Theoretical Review**

The study focused on managing drivers and operations performance which is basically management and operations. So theoretically, contingency theory was applied because it

relates to organizations that make decisions on the go depending on the external

environment.

Traditionally operations management has taken a more of “a one best way” approach to matters related to production processes. This thinking originated from Frederick Taylor’s scientific management approach which advocated a methodological approach to solving production related problems, usually this ended up with a prescribed step by step method for carrying out a procedure. Contingency theory on the other hand takes on “it all depends” approach to analyzing management problems while its implications to operations management appear to be sparse, in actuality; it fits well in the implementation of management improvement programs.“There is one best way to approach a management problem” that is one of the legacies of Frederick Taylor’s scientific management which gained momentum in the early 1900’s. Thanks to Taylor and others, the” one best way” approach has had an important influence on modern day manufacturing and service industries. Perhaps the biggest impact has been in the area of operations management where efficiency and consistency of production methods is necessary.

The Contingency theory has progressed into two separate directions, the approaches to leadership style and organizational design. Hersey and Blanchard (1969), proposed the situational leadership model. This model maintains the leader must adjust his/her style of leading according to the readiness capabilities of the employee. Four styles are possible; telling, selling, participating and delegating. Each style varies according to how able and confident the employee feels about the assigned task. Vroom and yetton (1973), proposed the normative decision tree that asks a series of questions about a particular problem in the work place, the aim of the model is to determine when the leader makes the decision, the leader consults the group and then makes the decision or the leader leaves it to the group to make the decision. House (1971), proposed the path goal theory; this theory maintains four leadership styles which are available to help employees reach their goals; directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented. The appropriate style is contingent on the employee’s personal characteristics indicating locus of control and certain characteristics of the work environment such as task structure.

The Contingency modal offered by Fiedler (1967), takes a different approach to leadership. This modal assumes the leader to have a fixed style of leadership. Therefore that leader must seek out positions that fit the particular style. Fiedler maintains that leaders have one of two leadership styles, task oriented or relationship oriented. Consequently the leader should not seek to adjust their style but adjust the type of leadership assignments they seek. In the area of organizational design contingency theory was an outgrowth of systems theory and a reaction against the one best way of organizing and managing (wren,1987). Joan Woodward (1965) studied technological processes in manufacturing firms in England during the 1950’s. She identified ten categories of technical complexity in these firms and found that organizational structure was contingent on the type of technological production processes used. Luthans (1973), suggested contingency theory would be the unifying management theory. up until its introduction management theories abounded but were separate and competitive. For instance, process theory looked at the four functions of management; planning, organizing, directing and controlling. Operations research theory ( a derivation of the scientific management movement introduced by Frederick Taylor) represented the quantitative approach and evolved into the management science theory, human relations ( an outgrowth of the hawthrone studies by Elton mayo ) evolved into organizational behavior theory and systems theory (from the physical sciences) stressed the need for interrelatedness and the interdependency of all of the component parts. Luthans contended managers could use contingency theory to take the best from each of the other theories and use them as needed.

Lawrence and lorsch (1969), were studying organizations and became concerned with the premise there was one best type of organization, after conducting an extensive study of a multi-division company, they concluded divisions were organized differently in several ways; formality of structure (formal versus informal), interpersonal orientation (task versus personal) and time orientation (short-term focus versus long-term focus).the divisions operated in different environments (stable versus dynamic). The study concluded successful divisions had different types of organizations; however they were successful because their organization structure matched their operating environment.Burns and stalker (1961), outlined the concepts of mechanistic organizations were highly centralized with top management making the main policy decisions. The structure of the organization was tall, meaning there were many managerial levels. Jobs were specialized and rigid policies and procedures were in place. On the other hand, organic organizations were highly decentralized with the main policy decisions being made at the unit level.

The structure of the organization was flat indicating fewer management levels, jobs were broad in scope and contained more skill variety. The jobs existed with more flexible policies and procedures in place. Martin Halm (2007), suggests contingency theory makes it possible to draw from other management theories. Relief organizations like World Food Programme, (U) can use time studies to increase productivity of their drivers (classical management theory). Management may also involve say drivers in improving work methods (behavioral theory) or establish a team of logistics personnel to coordinate fleet management (systems theory) rather than doing all three, contingency theory stresses the need to first determine the true cause of the problem and select the action that will offer the best practice solutions. In other word the best practices must fit the problem. Another study focused on the use of contingency theory in developing organizational flexibility strategies. Flexibility implies managers are using strategies that enable them to best match capabilities with the demands of their operating environmental, variability and predictability demands. The results showed the need for better forecasting (ketokivi, 2006).

**2.2 Driver Training and Operations Performance**

Under this was the actual education level requirement minimum for drivers at world Food programme (U), training of drivers and considerations was put on defensive driving skills requirements to improve performance. Training and development of staff in any organization is of atmost importance as this is known to improve performance (Porter, 2003). Training can produce positive results if it is based on clearly defined needs specific to the required job at hand and it is delivered with a view to those needs (Munby and Ashcraft, 2004). That’s how defensive driving comes in handy it is defined as a driver being able to operate a motor vehicle with the skills to avoid an accident in a situation where one could possibly occur basically used to save lives, time and money. It is also a form of training for motor vehicle drivers that goes beyond mastery of the rules of the road and the basic mechanics of driving. Its aim is to reduce the risk of collusion by articupating dangerous situations despite adverse conditions or the mistakes of others. This can be done through adherence to a variety of general rules as well as the practice of specific driving techniques (Motor vehicle operations brochure, 2013).

The principles of health and safety training are no different from those which apply to any form of training. Health and safety refers to occupational health and safety which is basically the right of any employee regardless of industry to carry out his or her daily work in a safe environment must do to facilitate thus to minimize accidents, injuries and fatalities. Indeed, a good case can be made for the integration of skills training along with safety training wherever possible. Health and safety training which fails to produce positive results is because it is not based on sound analysis. At best a waste of time and money. At worst, such a training may result in false confidence, thus increasing the risk of accidents ( Artherley and Robertson, 2001). Core competencies are required for particular jobs. This would include knowledge; Skills and abilities commonly referred to as KSAs, as well as soft skills or behaviors (McClelland, 1973).Employees who perform highly have acquired the competencies through numerous tailor made trainings. To become a higher performer in an organization or other professional network, competencies must be inclusive or integrated throughout all of the human resources practices (Fulmer and Conger, 2004). The higher level competencies might include systems thinking, personal mastery or willingness to learn, mental modeling, shared visioning. Team learning, self knowledge, short and long term memory, subject matter knowledge, enjoyment of learning, work, flexibility, persistence, confidence, sense of urgency, honesty, giving respect to others and initiative.

According to Delamare le deist and Winterton (2005), A lot of the recent literature on competency models, there are job-related or functional competencies with underpinning behavioral competencies. These models have competency domains broken down into competency groups and further sub-categorized into sub- competencies, as one continues to the next levels in the hierarchy, the competencies become further focused and specific to the industry. Technical competencies can be found in the levels above the intermediate level of the competency modal. A competency framework must be robust, dynamic, fluid and flexible to change with technological, economic and other changes. Work experience is also of at most importance to determine competency of an employee that is the longer one has worked in particular job the more effective and efficient that employee is expected to perform at his or her task.

**2.3 Driver Behavior and Operations Performance**

According to the automotive fleet and leasing newsletter (2013) many fleet managers believe one of the greatest challenges is planning, budgeting and mitigating. A combination of addressing driver behavior such as over speeding, idling, deceleration, acceleration of motor vehicles, misuse of organizational vehicles by drivers making personal journeys that are not authorized, drivers using drugs while on duty that are prohibited by the organization, drivers indulging in unethical activities along routes and drivers carrying unauthorized loads and passengers along routes. In addition managers find it difficult selecting more fuel efficient vehicles, adhering to preventive maintenance schedules and monitoring fuel usage reports. Driver safety will be a huge focus for fleet managers as the mandate to reduce cost and improve productivity continues. In addition to the human safety factor, there’s insurance, maintenance and loss of productivity with downtime of both drivers and vehicles, not to mention administrative costs to process accident related information and the cost of traffic regulation violations.

Then according to Telogis,an International logistics company in their Brochure, Enterprise Fleet Management, (2009 ). Fleet managers face various challenges inclusive:

Avoiding Information overload (Paralysis by analysis) where drivers find it difficult to comprehend Information or directives given to them by managers. Making sure that vehicles are operating efficiently and drivers are responsible enough to inform their superiors of any inefficiency in their vehicles. Managing a geographically dispersed driver team as communicating with remote drivers, locating vehicles in a given area may require endless zooming and scrolling across a map especially for fleet that operate across state lines or even internationally. Controlling unauthorized use of organization vehicles, drivers may use organization vehicles outside of work hours or outside the designated areas. Dangerous driving can result into additional costs to the organization as well as potential litigation risks if drivers don’t follow traffic regulations and yet managers can’t directly have control over a driver over a given route. Drivers may not comprehend proper usage of the installed fleet software in the vehicles and may miss handle or need to be constantly advised how to properly use this technology. All these challenges could have been attributed to motivational issues where drivers are not motivated either financially or otherwise to function as required by the organization, experience requirements in that drivers with longer worked route hours tend to perform better than inexperienced drivers and ethical issues that probably differ from one individual to another individual depending on one’s background.

**2.4 Managerial Skills and Operations Performance**

One of the more comprehensive studies focused on contingency theory research on operations effective practices. It pointed out the emergence of a number of new management practices over the past three decades such as total quality management and lean thinking. While these practices have been advocated as universally applicable continued study and experience has raised doubts as to their universal validity. The study indicated contingency knowledge is also important for practitioners because the failure to acknowledge the limits of applicability of operations management practices may lead to their application in contexts to which to their application in contexts to which they are not suitable (Souse and Voss, 2008).

Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems represent an approach that requires an organization to adopt best practices but not necessary those best suited to the organization. In this study managerial concerns had dimensions of conflict resolution skills which would imply that managers at World Food Programme (U) are required from time to time resolve confrontational situations between employees in this case drivers, crisis skills were also considered a requirement for managers, as managers are required to respond to an organizational crisis in the required organizational manner and time usage was an important factor for managers to focus on, to insure tasks are completed in the stipulated duration according to organizational goals. Hence the need for organizations to adopt managerial practices that improve on their employee’s performance so in the case of using ERP systems while ERP systems are widespread not all users are satisfied with their results.

Morton and Hu,(2008) argues that despite the tremendous popularity and great potential, the field of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) adoption and implementation is littered with remarkable failures. Though many contributing factors have been cited in the literature, one would argue that the integrated nature of ERP systems, which generally requires an organization to adopt standardized organizational processes reflected in the design of the software, is a key factor contributing to these failures. I would submit that the integration and standardization imposed by most ERP systems may not be suitable for all types of organization and thus the “fit” between the standardized process designs embedded in the adopted ERP system affects the likelihood of implementation success or failure. The authors go on to identify a set of dimensions of organizational structure and ERP systems characteristics that can be used to gauge the degree of fit, thus providing some insights into successful ERP implementations.

Management improvement programs are planned interventions that are usually assigned a spate name to distinguish than from the normal operations of the organization.

They are often identified as an acronym such as Just-in-time (JIT) and Total quality management (TQM). These programs help to improve some part of the organization’s operation such as reducing operations costs, improve product of service quality or shorten relief response time. Usually, they are of a project nature and have a life cycle of their own with a beginning and an end to the program. Management programs usually originate as an attempt to introduce improvement into an organization, they may be original for a particular organization or they may be an adaptation of an existing program that has become popular in another organization.

According to Crandall, (2007) argues that organizations are finding less than satisfactory results in adopting management improvement programs because the original conditions in which the programs were most successful differed from those in the organizations now trying to adopt the programs. The problem appears to be an incorrect fit between the management programs and the specific needs of the organization. As a result, management improvement programs do not operate under the “one size fits all” mindset instead such programs are contingent on the specific area or process in the organization that needs improvement. In the case of this study that falls under supply chain management would correspond to appropriate management improvement programs like Quick Response Systems (QRS) and Collaborative Planning Forecasting and Replenishment (CPFR).

**2.5 Summary of the Literature Review**

The literature reviewed here, seems to indicate that driver training, driver behavior and managerial skills have respective relationships with operations performance. The theoretical approach of the topic was well emphasized in terms of the contingency theory in relation to how effective and efficient management practices could influence significantly operations performance. However, the extents of these relationships, with specific emphasis on operations performance, have not been established in the various studies reviewed by the researcher. It was worth noting however that detailed studies on driver management have been quite rare to come by in the logistics sector. And in addition only established challenges faced managing fleet were discussed and yet in this dynamic world these challenges are constantly changing with the times.

**CHAPTER THREE**

**METHODOLOGY**

**3.0 Introduction**

In this chapter, various steps were explained that were taken to execute the intended study. The chapter contains details of the research design, study population, determination of sample size, sampling techniques and procedures, data collection methods, data collection instruments, quality control mechanisms, procedure of data collection, data analysis, measurement of variables and ethical considerations.

**3.1 Research Design**

The study used a cross-sectional survey design because it enabled collection of information from the field over a short period of time from a sample at a particular time. The research obtained information about preferences, attitudes, practices and concerns of a group of people, as proposed by Amin (2005). A triangulation (mixed method) of the synergies offered by use of different methodologies ( Barifiajjo, Basheka and Oonyu, 2010) and embrace consistency of findings through use of different instruments tested to complement each other, as cited by Sekaran (2003). This research enabled a snapshot study of the relationship between managing drivers and operations performance at World Food Programme (U).

**3.2 Study Population**

The study population comprised of employees in the fleet department at World Food Programme (U). It consisted of the fleet managers, logistics assistants, fleet supervisors and drivers (Source*: primary data*).

**3.3 Sample Size and Selection**

The sample size was determined by reading of mathematical table by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) . The sample size of 80 respondents was selected by adding up 14 informants (purposively selected from the study population) to 66 respondents (selected from the drivers at World Food Programme (U) by simple random technique.

Table 1.

**RESPONDENTS POPULATION SAMPLE SIZE SAMPLE TECHNIQUE**

|  |
| --- |
| Fleet managers 2 2 Purposive Sampling |
| Logistics Assistants 4 4 Purposive Sampling |
| Fleet Supervisors 8 8 Purposive Sampling |
| Drivers 80 66 Simple Random |
| **Total 94 80** |

**Source:** *primary data.*

Table 1 indicates the sample selection frame used to select the sample used in the study; The Target population categories included the fleet managers, logistics assistants, fleet supervisors and drivers. It is from the study population (N) that samples (S) were drawn using purposive and simple sampling techniques.

**3.4 Sampling Techniques and Procedure**

The study used purposive and simple random sampling technique to select the required sample. Oliver (2006), defines purposive sampling as a form of non-probability sampling which decisions concerning the individuals to be included in the sample are taken by the researcher, based upon a variety of criteria which may include specialist knowledge of the research issue or capacity and willingness to participate in the research. Purposive sampling technique was important for the study because of its ability to ensure relevant selection. It gave opportunity for the researcher to actively select the most productive samples to answer the research questions. Elements were handpicked because they were informative or had the required characteristics. Simple random sampling technique was used in the category of drivers whereby their sample was drawn from a known population in such a way that every possible sample of similar size had the same chance of being selected. Garton (2012), defines a simple random sample as a sample of size S drawn from a population of size N in such a way that every possible sample of size S has the same chance of being selected.

**3.5 Data Collection Methods**

Both primary and secondary data was collected utilizing quantitative and qualitative

methods. A study survey was conducted by administering questionnaires, conducting interviews and reviewing documents. (Sekaran, 2003, p.219).

**3.5.1 Questionnaire survey**

According to Bell (1999), A questionnaire is essentially a structured technique of collecting primary data. It is generally a series of written questions for which the respondents have to provide the answer. While authors such as deVaus (1996), sees a questionnaire in a much wider context (namely as a technique in which various persons are asked to answer the same set of questions). If a questionnaire is well designed, it will motivate the respondents to give accurate and complete information; as such, it should provide reliable and relevant data in return. The purpose of using this data collection method is that the targeted respondents are literate people who often prefer privacy and anonymity. Milne (1999), adds that responses are standardized and hence more objective. He identifies some disadvantages as possibility of participant’s forgetting important issues due to occurrence of the questionnaire surveys after the event and difficulty of handling misinterpretation of some questions by participants ( for closed-ended questionnaires).In this study the researcher used this method to collect data from drivers. This was considered appropriate method of data collection because it offered greater assurance of anonymity and it could be filled at the respondent’s convenience thus increasing the chances of getting valid information. Furthermore it’s a cheap way to collect data ( Amin, 2005 ).

**3.5.2 Structured interviews**

Kumar (2005), defines Interviewing as the person-to-person interaction between/among two or more people with a specific purpose. Using face-to-face interviews for collecting information is preferred when social cues of the interviewee are very important information sources for the interviewer, when the interviewer has enough budget and time for traveling or when the interviewees live near the interviewer and standardization of the interview situation is important according to Opdenakker (2006). Some shortfalls of interviewing method include requirements for training and practice for the interviewer, time and confidentiality for the exercise. The interviewer also has a potential to influence cue, bias or distort the interviewee’s responses (Hidayah, 2011).This method was used to collect data from the fleet managers. Logistics assistants and fleet supervisors because of their ability to clarify questions and even possibly explore further into some issues being studied.

**3.5.3 Documentary review**

According to Borthwick (2009), Documents may be regarded as physically embodied texts. Where the containment of the text is the primary purpose of the physical medium. Sources of documentary research include historical documents such as laws, declarations, statutes and people’s accounts of events and periods. In this study various World Food Programme (U) newsletters, journals and brochures were reviewed in relation to the topic at hand.

**3.6 Data Collection Instruments**

The questionnaires and interview guides were used as the tools for data collection. This was in agreement with the nature of data required, time available and objectives of the study.

**3.6.1 Questionnaire**

This tool was used because the study is concerned with variables that could not be directly observed such as views, opinions, perceptions and feelings of respondents. Section A of the questionnaires covered demographics while sections B and C had closed-ended questions. The questionnaire was further used because the designs that were adopted were correlational. This enabled the researcher break down the independent and dependent variables into measurable variables that could be measured on a 5-point scale interval using the likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree (Amin, 2005).

**3.6.2 Interview guide**

The interview guide is mainly to provide in depth data for the research questions and a more generalized inquiry. This instrument was used to conduct interviews with personal believed to have important views for detailed understanding of the subject matter. The guide was intended for the fleet managers, logistics assistants and fleet supervisors.

**3.6.3 Documentary review checklist**

The researcher reviewed World Food Programme (U) newsletters, journals and brochures to capture information on the topic at hand.

**3.7. Validity and Reliability**

**3.7.1 Validity**

Validity is important because it is the extent to which research results can be accurately interpreted and generalized to other populations. It is the extent to which research instruments measure what they are intended to measure. (Amin, 2005).Oso and Onen (2008) further defines validity as the extent to which instruments measure what they are intended to measure. The researcher subjected instruments to two experts to evaluate the relevance of the objectives of the study. The experts then rated each item on a scale of very relevant, VR (1) and not relevant, NR (2). Validity was then determined using content validity index (CVI), which is defined as the average number of items rated very relevant by both experts divided by the total number of items in the questionnaire, mathematically expressed as CVI = n/N, where n is the average number of items rated very relevant and N is the total number of items in the questionnaire.

Table 2: Validity Rating

Category Very relevant Not relevant Total Items in % of Items rated

items (VR) items (NR) questionnaire very relevant

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Expert A | 39 | 3 | 42 | 0.93 |
| Expert B | 41 | 1 | 42 | 0.98 |
| Averages | 40 | 2 | 42 | 0.95 |

*Source; primary data*

Table 2 above shows the validity rating of the research questionnaire by the two experts using the formula above, CVI was obtained as 0.95. Amin (2005) considers an instrument valid if its CVI is greater than 0.7. The instrument was therefore considered valid.

**3.7.1 Reliability**

According to Amin (2005), Reliability is used to measure the degree to which an instrument can produce consistent results if used under the same condition. Instruments were pre-tested with Catholic Relief Fund (U) which is another humanitarian relief organization with similar operations requirements, to determine their reliability. The instrument was pilot-tested on 7 respondents and the scores of the responses from the pre-test analyzed using Chronbach’s Alpha coefficient due to likelihood of options for answers exceeding three, that’s,likert scale of 5 continuums.

Table 3; Reliability statistics for questionnaire pre-test

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cronbach’s Alpha | N of Items |
| 0.723 | 42 |

*Source: primary data*

Table 3 above indicates the reliability coefficient of the instrument prê-tested on 7 questionnaires. The coefficient was found to be 0.723 using Cronbach’s Alpha. Amin (2005) considers an instrument reliable when its reliability coefficient is greater than 0.7.The instrument was therefore considered reliable.

**3.8. Procedure of Data Collection**

Quantitative data was collected through a self administered questionnaire to staff in the fleet department of World Food Programme (U) that is the drivers. Quantitative data was entered into the computer and analyzed using the statistical package for social scientists (SPSS) 16, to establish relationships between the variables Qualitative data was collected through in depth interviews with key informants in the fleet department at World Food Programmme (U) that is the fleet managers, logistics assistants, and the fleet supervisors. Documents were reviewed on the topic from World Food Programme (U) newsletters. journals and brochure.

**3.9 Data Analysis**

To ensure clarity and completeness of the information collected, data was collected using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Data analysis included identifying the patterns and relationships in the questionnaire and interview responses.

**3.9.1 Quantitative data analysis**

According to Sekaran (2010) guide, In data preparation, first step is data coding involving assignment of a number to the participant’s responses so as to have them entered into a data base, Hence coding sheets were used to transcribe the data from the questionnaire, followed by the data being keyed-in. This method avoided going through all questionnaires for each item, thus minimizing confusion, especially since the questions are many and the number of questionnaires is quite large. Then questionnaire items were coded in respect to the variables in relation. The items were then entered into the (SPSS) 16 computer package for transformation. Data was then summarized using descriptive statistics so that the researcher would meaningfully describe a distribution of scores of measurements using a few statistics (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Descriptive statistics involved computation of frequencies, percentages and means to determine the respondent’s views on each of the study variables whereas the Pearson’s correlation technique was used to determine the relationship and dependence between variables while inferential statistics involved regression analysis and interpretation.

**3.9.2 Qualitative data analysis**

In order to edit the qualitative data from interviews administered, content analysis was used to have the data organized into shorter meaningful statements. This analysis was aimed at collecting information on themes in question from the responses. Responses were then analyzed with the purpose of identifying common trends of agreements or disagreement on the issues being discussed (Amin, 2005).

**3**.**10. Measurement of Variables**

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), Measurement of Variables gives the

researcher information regarding the extent of individual difference on a given variable. The nominal scale of measurement was used in the demographics section of the study to define common trends. In addition nominal scales are assigned only for purposes of identification but do not allow comparisons of the variables being measured. Ordinal scale was used to measure the study variables. A questionnaire was developed as the tool for this research to measure the variable on a 5 point likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The respondents selected the responses that best described his/her reaction to each statement. This scale was suitable for measuring perceptions, attitudes, values, behavior that related to operations performance.

**3.11. Ethical considerations**

The study ensured that respondent’s participation was voluntary. In this case respondents

were clearly informed about the objectives and benefits of the study. This was done

in order to seek their consent or rejection of participation. The study ensured confidentiality and privacy of information given by staff who responded and the respondent’s names were not required. .

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS**

**4.1 Introduction**

In this chapter the presentation of data, analysis of the data and interpretation of the results was explored. It contains the introduction, the response rate, results of the background characteristics of the respondents, plus objective descriptive, correlation and regression results.

**4.2 Response Rate**

Table 4 below shows the response rate.

Collection method Expected respondents Actual Respondents Response rate

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Questionnaire Survey | 66 | 47 | 71.2% |
| Interviewing | 14 | 10 | 71.4% |

*Source; primary data*

Exploring the table, it can be seen that 66 questionnaires were administered to sampled respondents as per the selection frame and 47 questionnaires were received from respondents because the 19 respondents did not return the questionnaires due to their own personal issues and the second collection method, interviewing 14 respondents was planned but 10 were actually interviewed because the other 4 respondents, one fleet manager, one logistics assistant, two fleet supervisors were not accessed due to possibly their busy schedules. Therefore from,

71.2 + 71.4 = 142.6/2 = 71.3 hence the response rate is 71.3%. So according to Amin (2005), a response rate of above 70% is considered a good representation of the survey population.

**4.3 Background Results of Characteristics of Respondents**

The reason for including demographic particulars of respondents was mainly because it may show how different respondents with different gender, age, level of education, work experience and religion affiliation could have been affected in their individual responses.

Table 5; Gender

Frequency Percent

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Male | 47 | 71.2 |
| Female | 00 | 00.0 |
| Missing | 19 | 28.8 |
| Total | 66 | 100.0 |

*Source; primary data*

Table 5 above shows that all the respondents 47(71.2%) were male and none were female. These findings revealed that only male respondents made responses to the questionnaires.

Table 6; Age

Years Frequency Percent

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 20 and below | 00 | 00.0 |
| 21 - 30 | 04 | 06.1 |
| 31 - 40 | 23 | 34.8 |
| 41 and above | 20 | 30.3 |
| missing | 19 | 28.8 |
| Total | 66 | 100.0 |

*Source; primary data*

Table 6 above shows that no respondent was below 20years old, 4 respondents (6.1%) were between 21 and 30years old, 23 respondents (34.8%) are between 31 and 40years old, 20 respondents (30.3%) were above 41years old and 19 respondents (28.8%) did not return questionnaires given to them. These findings revealed that majority of respondents whom in this study are drivers at World Food Programme (U) were above 31 years old (65.1%) and are considered mature enough to answer the questionnaire responsibly.

Table 7; Level of Education

Frequency Percent

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Primary education | 00 | 00.0 |
| Secondary education | 47 | 71.2 |
| University education | 00 | 00.0 |
| missing | 19 | 28.8 |
| Total | 66 | 100.0 |

*Source; primary data*

Table 7 above shows that no respondents have an education up to primary only, 47 respondents (71.2%) have an education up to secondary only, no respondents have an education up to university and 19 respondents (28.8%) did not return questionnaires given to them. These findings revealed that the all of the respondents whom in this study are drivers at World Food Programme(U) had received secondary education meaning that they are literate enough to understand the questionnaires, therefore providing reliable responses.

Table 8; Years worked at WFP(U) of Respondents.

Frequency Percent

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Below 1yr | 07 | 10.6 |
| 2-3yrs | 30 | 45.5 |
| 4-5yrs | 05 | 7.6 |
| 5-6yrs | 03 | 4.5 |
| Above 7yrs | 02 | 3.0 |
| missing | 19 | 28.8 |
| Total | 66 | 100.0 |

*Source; primary data*

Table 8.above shows that below 1year of work experience at World Food Programme (U) there were 7 respondents (10.6%), between 2 and 3years there were 30 respondents (45.5%), between 4and 5years there were 5 respondents (7.6%), between 5and 6years there were 3 respondents (4.5%). Above 7years there were 2 respondents (3.0%) and 19 missing responses (28.8%). The findings revealed that the majority of respondent drivers at World Food Programme (U) had not more than 3years work experience, that is 37respondents (56.1%) meaning that they had minimum work experience hence their responses are limited to the work experience at World Food Programme (U).

Table 9 Religious Affiliation

Frequency Percent

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Catholic | 12 | 18.2 |
| Protestant | 11 | 16.7 |
| Muslim | 15 | 22.7 |
| Others | 09 | 13.6 |
| Missing | 19 | 28.8 |
| Total | 66 | 100.0 |

*Source; primary data*

Table 9 above shows that the respondent drivers who were of catholic religious affiliation were 12(18.2%), Protestants were 11(16.7%). Muslims were 15(22.7%), others or alternative religious affiliation were 9 (13.6%) and missing responses 19(28.8%). The findings revealed that all in all, the respondents were generally of a diversified religious affiliation of almost similar spread.

**4.4 Research Question Number One: The effect of driver training on operations performance**

**4.4.1 Descriptive statistics on driver training**

Defensive driving, traffic regulations, health and safety were considered dimensions of driver training for this study. This was to find out whether training drivers would impact their performance positively. Table 10 below indicates descriptive statistics on driver training.

Table 10; Responses on driver training

1 2 3 4 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Drivers at WFP(U) are trained in safety regulations | 15(31.9%) | 25(53.2%) | 3(6.4%) | 2(4.3%) | 2(4.3%) |
| WFP(U) drivers are trained in defensive driving | 32(68.1%) | 10(21.3%) | 2(4.3%) | 2(4.3%) | 1(2.1%) |
| WFP(U) drivers are trained in health regulations | 16(34.1%) | 24(51.1%) | 2(4.3%) | 3(6.4%) | 2(4.3%) |
| WFP(U) drivers are trained to handle Vehicle mechanics | 29(61.7%) | 13(27.7%) | 3(6.4%) | 1(2.1%) | 1(2.1%) |
| WFP(U) drivers are trained to handle Vehicle diagnostics | 10(21.3%) | 9(19.2%) | 12(25.5%) | 15(31.9%) | 1(2.1%) |
| WFP(U) drivers are trained in traffic regulations | 17(36.2%) | 19(40.4%) | 4(8.6%) | 3(6.45) | 4(8.6%) |
| WFP(U) drivers are trained to use vehicle telecommunications | 14(29.8%) | 16(34.0%) | 5(10.6%) | 10(21.3%) | 2(4.3%) |

*Source: Primary data*

Key: 1- strongly agree, 2-Agree, 3-undecided, 4-disagree and 5-strongly disagree.

Table 10 shows that 40 respondents representing 85.1% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) trained in safety regulations whereas 3 respondents representing 6.4% were undecided and 4 respondents representing 8.6% disagreed. This can be interpreted to mean that a majority of respondents affirmed that drivers had trained in safety regulations. The table indicates that 42 respondents representing 89.4% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) were trained in defensive driving whereas 2 respondents representing 4.3% were undecided and only 3 respondents representing 6.4% disagreed with the statement. This shows that a majority of the respondents affirmed that drivers had trained in defensive driving. Table 10 indicates that 40 respondents representing 85.2% agreed that drivers trained in health regulations whereas 2 respondents representing 4.3% were undecided and only 5 respondents representing 10.7% disagreed. This shows that a majority of the respondents affirmed that drivers had trained in health regulations. It is noted from the table that 42 respondents representing 88.4% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) were trained to handle vehicle mechanics whereas 3 respondents representing 6.4% were undecided and only 2 respondents representing 4.2% disagreed. This shows that a majority of the respondents affirmed that drivers were trained to handle vehicle mechanics..

The table further indicates that 19 respondents representing 40.5% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) were trained to handle vehicle diagnostics whereas 12 respondents representing 25.5% were undecided and 16 respondents representing 34.0% disagreed. This shows that respondents who agreed and disagreed are relatively the same plus the undecided respondents were quiet high so in totality, 28 respondents representing 59.5% were either undecided and disagreed hence the majority were either undecided or disagreed that drivers are trained to handle vehicle diagnostics. The table indicates that 36 respondents representing 76.6% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) were trained in traffic regulations whereas 4 respondents representing 10.6% were undecided and 7 respondents representing 15.05% disagreed. This shows that the majority of drivers at WFP (U) were trained in traffic regulations. The table indicates further that 30 respondents representing 63.8% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) were trained in vehicle telecommunications whereas 5 respondents representing 10.6% were undecided and 12 respondents representing 25.6% disagreed. This shows that a majority of respondents agreed that drivers at WFP (U) were trained in vehicle telecommunications.

During an interview with one manager in the fleet department at world Food Programme (U), he said that;

It was mandatory for all drivers to be equipped with the required necessary training in order to be able to fulfill their required obligations of timely delivery of relief aid to refugees in disaster regions.

The other respondent agreed that:

With drivers equipped with the necessary training and skills they were expected to live to their expected obligations of timely delivery of relief aid to refugees. The respondent further added that WFP (U) drivers are trained to handle relief aid situations

**4.4.2 Correlation Results-Objective One**

**Testing Hypothesis (H1):** Driver training significantly influences operations performance at World Food Programme (U). To test this hypothesis, variables were measured by generating indices called driver training and operations performance by obtaining mean responses. The data was then analyzed using Pearson’s correlation and Regression techniques to respectively determine the relationship between variables and to determine the effect of one variable on another. Table 11 below indicates the correlation matrix between driver training and operations performance at World Food programme (U).

Table 11 Correlation matrix between Driver Training and Operations Performance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Driver Training | Operations Performance |
| Driver Training Pearson Correlation  Sig. (2-tailed)  N | 1  47 | .679\*\*  .000  47 |
| Persons Operations Correlation  Performance Sig. (2-tailed)  N | .679\*\*  .000  47 | 1  47 |

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

*Source: primary data*

Table 11 above shows that Pearson’s Correlation coefficient r = 0.679 between driver training and operations performance, suggesting that the two variables were positively related. The Pearson’s Correlation coefficient r = 0.679 and significance p = 0.000 show that there was a significant relationship between driver training and operations performance at World Food programmme (U). This further shows that 67.9% of operations performance is contributed by driver training.

**4.4.3 Regression Results-Objective one**

Table 12: Regression results on driver training and operations performance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | R | R  Square | Adjusted  R Square | Std. Error  Of the  Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | |
| R Square change | F change | Df1 | Df2 | Sig. F change |
| 1 | .679a | .461 | .422 | .49977 | .461 | 72.663 | 1 | 47 | .000 |

1. Predictors: (Constant), Driver Training
2. Dependent Variable: Operations Performance

*Source: Field research findings, 2014*

Table 12 above shows that driver training has an average significance and affects operations performance as explained by the R square of 0.422. This means that a change in operations performance can be explained by driver training up to 42.2%. Therefore the researcher accepts the null hypothesis that “Driver training significantly influences operations performance at World Food Programme (U)”.

**4.5 Research Question Number Two: The effect of driver behavior on operations performance**

**4.5.1 Descriptive statistics on driver behavior**

Driver motivation, experience and ethics were the dimensions for driver behavior considered in this study.

Table 13 below indicates findings from respondents on various opinions on driver behavior

1 2 3 4 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| WFP (U) drivers follow safety regulations | 5(10.6%) | 5(10.6%) | 20(42.5%) | 15(31.9%) | 2(4.2%) |
| WFP (U) drivers use defensive driving techniques | 5(10.6%) | 25(53.2%) | 10(21.3%) | 5(10.6%) | 2(4.2%) |
| WFP (U) drivers use drugs while driving | 0(0.0%) | 0(0.0%) | 10(21.3%) | 30(63.9%) | 7(14.8%) |
| WFP (U) drivers follow traffic regulations | 30(63.9%) | 10(21.3%) | 5(10.6%) | 2(4.25) | 0(0.0%) |
| WFP (U) drivers misuse organizational vehicles | 0(0.0%) | 0(0.0%) | 11(23.4%) | 33(70.2%) | 3(6.4%) |
| WFP (U) drivers follow organizational goals | 10(21.3%) | 20(42.5%) | 10(21.3%) | 4(8.5%) | 3(6.4%) |
| WFP (U) drivers follow health regulations | 5(10.6%) | 5(10.6%) | 23(48.9%) | 12(25.5%) | 2(4.2%) |

*Source: Field research findings, 2014*

Key: 1- strongly agree, 2-Agree, 3-undecided, 4-disagree and 5-strongly disagree.

Table 13 above indicates that 10 respondents representing 21.2% agreed that drivers follow safety regulations whereas 20 respondents representing 42.5% were undecided because they were unsure whether their follow drivers followed safety regulations and 17 respondents representing 36.1% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 42.5% were undecided about drivers at World Food Programme (U) following safety regulations..

The table also indicates that 30 respondents representing 63.8% agreed that drivers use defensive driving techniques whereas 10 respondents representing 21.3% were undecided because they unsure whether there follow drivers used defensive driving techniques and only 7 respondents representing 14.8% disagreed. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 63.8% agreed that drivers at World Food Programme (U) used defensive driving techniques. Table 13 further shows that no respondents agreed that drivers use drugs while driving at World Food Programme (U) whereas 10 respondents representing 21.3% were undecided because they probably could not tell whether their follow drivers used drugs while driving and 37 respondents representing 78.7% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 78.7% disagreed that drivers at World Food Programme (U) used drugs while driving. From the table, 40 respondents representing 85.2% agreed that drivers at World Food Programme (U) follow traffic regulations whereas 5 respondents representing 10.6% were undecided and only 2 respondents representing 4.2% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 85.2% agreed that drivers at World Food Programme (U) follow traffic regulations.

From the table again no respondents agreed that drivers at World Food Programme (U) misuse organizational vehicles whereas 11 respondents representing 23.4% were undecided because they were unsure about whether other drivers misused organizational vehicles and 36 respondents representing 76.6% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 76.6% disagreed that drivers art World Food Programme (U) misuse organizational vehicles in otherwords they agreed that drivers use organizational vehicles officially. Table 13 shows that 30 respondents representing 63.8% agreed that drivers follow organizational goals at World Food Programme (U) whereas 10 respondents representing 21.3% were undecided because they were unsure about how their co-drivers followed the organizational goals and only 7 respondents representing 14.9% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 63.8% agreed that drivers at World Food Programme (U) follow organizational goals. Table 13 shows that 10 respondents representing 21.2% agreed that drivers at World Food Programme (U) are follow health regulations whereas 23 respondents representing 48.9% were undecided because they were probably unsure about their co-drivers behaviors and only 14 respondents representing 29.7% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 48.9% were undecided about drivers at World Food Programme (U) follow health regulations.

One of the managers in the fleet department at World Food Programme(U) interviewed had this to say:

That he personally found it a challenge controlling unauthorized use of organization vehicles by drivers especially the small vehicles which at times did not have exact scheduled routes and basically moved depending largely on who among the organizational staff was using that vehicle at particular point in time.

On the other hand another manager said that:

The challenge that he faced most was more in the area of trucks delivering relief aid in disaster regions, that it was difficult having control over a driver over a given route especially in circumstances when the relief trucks were operating across stateliness.

**4.5.2 Correlation Results-Objective two**

**Testing Hypothesis (H2):** Driver behavior significantly affects operation’s performance at World Food Programme (U). To test this Hypothesis, the researcher measured the variables by generating indices called driver behavior and operation’s performance by obtaining mean responses. The data was then analyzed using Pearson’s Correlation and Regression techniques to respectively determine the relationship between variables and to determine the effect of one variable on another.

Table 14: Correlation matrix between driver behavior and operation’s performance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Driver behavior | Operation’s performance |
| Driver Pearson’s  Behavior Correlation  Sig. (2-tailed)  N | 1  47 | .544\*\*  .000    47 |
| Operation’s Pearson’s  Performance Correlation  Sig. (2-tailed)  N | 544\*\*  .000    47 | 1  47 |

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

*Source: Field research findings, 2014*

Table 13 shows Pearson’s Correlation coefficient r = 0.544 between driver behavior and operation’s performance, suggesting that the two variables were positively related. The Pearson’s Correlation coefficient r = 0.544 and significance p = 0.000 show that there was a significant relationship between driver behavior and operation’s performance at World Food Programme (U). This shows that 54.4% of operations performance is contributed by driver behavior.

**4.5.3 Regression Results-Objective two**

Table 15: Regression results on driver behavior and operation’s performance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | R | R  Square | Adjusted R  Square | Std. Error of the estimate | Change statistics | | | | |
| R Square change | F Change | Df1 | Df2 | Sig.F change |
| 1 | .544 | .453 | .424 | .45488 | .553 | 104.102 | 1 | 47 | .000 |

1. Predictors: (Constant), Driver Behavior
2. Dependent variable: Operation’s Performance

*Source: Field research findings, 2014*

From table 15 above, it is seen that driver behavior has a substantial significance and its affect on operation’s performance is explained by the R square of 0.424. This means that a change in operation’s performance can be explained by driver behavior up to 42.4%. Therefore the null hypothesis that “Driver behavior significantly affects operations performance at World Food Programme (U)” is accepted.

**4.6 Research Question Number Three: The effect of managerial skills on operation’s performance**

**4.6.1 Descriptive statistics on managerial skills**

Conflict resolution, crisis skills and time usage were considered dimensions for managerial skills for this study.

Table 16 below indicates findings from respondents on various statements on managerial skills.

Table 16: Responses on managerial skills

1 2 3 4 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| WFP (U) Managers resolve driver conflicts fairly | 3(6.4%) | 5(10.6%) | 22(46.3%) | 10(21.3%) | 7(14.9%) |
| WFP (U) Managers respond to crisis situations quickly | 17(36.2%) | 16(34.0%) | 4(8.5%) | 5(10.6%) | 5(10.6%) |
| WFP (U) Managers appreciate drivers | 5(10.6%) | 4(8.5%) | 2(4.3%) | 24(51.1%) | 12(25.5%) |
| WFP (U) Managers advise drivers during disasters | 15(31.9%) | 18(38.3%) | 10(21.3%) | 4(8.5%) | 0(0.0%) |
| WFP (U) Managers guide drivers during disasters | 16(34.0%) | 17(36.2%) | 9 (19.15) | 5(10.6%) | 0(0.0%) |
| WFP (U) Managers discipline badly behaved drivers | 0(0.0%) | 4(8.5%) | 39(82.9%) | 2(4.3%) | 2(4.3%) |
| WFP (U) Managers reward well behaved drivers | 12 (25.5%) | 13(27.7%) | 11(23.4%) | 6(12.8%) | 5(10.6%) |
| WFP (U) Managers make sure drivers keep time | 11(23.4%) | 14(29.8%) | 10(21.3%) | 5(10.6%) | 7(14.9%) |
| WFP (U) Managers allocate drivers fairly | 8(17.0%) | 6(12.8%) | 12(25.5%) | 10(21.35) | 11(23.4%) |

*Source: Field research findings. 2014*

Key: 1- strongly agree, 2-Agree, 3-undecided, 4-disagree and 5-strongly disagree.

From the table 16 above, it is indicated that 8 respondents representing 17% agreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) resolve conflicts fairly whereas 22 respondents representing 46.3% were undecided because they were unsure about how the other follow co-drivers conflicts were amicably resolved and 17 respondents representing 36.2% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 46.3% were undecided about managers at World Food Programme (U) resolve conflicts fairly. It is also noted that 33 respondents representing 70.2% agreed that World Food Programme (U) managers respond to crisis situations quickly whereas 4 respondents representing 8.4% were undecided and 10 respondents representing 21.2% disagreed with this statement. This affirms that the majority of respondents representing 70.2% agreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) respond to crisis situations quickly.

From the table, it is indicated that 9 respondents representing19.1% agreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) appreciate drivers whereas 2 respondents representing 8.5% were undecided and 36 respondents representing 76.6% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 76.6% disagreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) appreciate drivers. It is also noted that 33 respondents representing 70.2% agreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) advise drivers during disasters whereas 10 respondents representing 21.3% were undecided due to the fact that they were unsure about the difference between an order issued and advise given by their managers and 4 respondents representing 8.5% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 70.2% agreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) advise drivers during disasters. It is further also noted that 33 respondents representing 70.2% agreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) guide drivers during disasters whereas 9 respondents representing 19.1% and 5 respondents representing 10.5% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 70.2% agreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) guide drivers during disasters.

From the table, it is indicated that 4 respondents representing 8.5% agreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) discipline badly behaved drivers whereas 39 respondents representing 82.9% were undecided and 4 respondents representing 8.6% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 82.9% were undecided that managers at World Food Programme (U) discipline badly behaved drivers because they probably felt uncomfortable answering the question at hand.

From the table, it is further indicated that 25 respondents representing 53.2% agreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) reward well behaved drivers whereas 11 respondents representing 23.4% were undecided because they were unsure whether their co-drivers kept were rewarded for good behavior and 11 respondents representing 23.4% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 53.2% were undecided that managers at World Food Programme (U) reward well behaved drivers.

From the table, it is indicated that 25 respondents representing 53.2% agreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) make sure drivers keep time whereas 10 respondents representing 21.3% were undecided because they were unsure whether their co-drivers kept good time and 12 respondents representing 25.5% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 53.2% disagreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) make sure drivers keep time.From the table, it is indicated that 14 respondents representing 29.8% agreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) allocate drivers fairly whereas 12 respondents representing 25.5% were undecided because they were unsure whether their co-drivers were allocated fairly and 21 respondents representing 44.7% disagreed with the statement. This shows that the majority of respondents representing 44.7% disagreed that managers at World Food Programme (U) allocate drivers fairly.

One of the managers in the fleet department at World Food Programme (U) said that:

Some drivers found it difficult to comprehend information or directives given to them by managers. That managers were required to explain precisely what they wanted the driver to achieve at the end of the task and in addition advice or directions on how to complete the given task had to be put forward plus multiple tasks were discouraged to insure maximum completion of tasks.

The argument was that due to information overload or giving to many directives to drivers resulted in incompletion of tasks.

**4.6.2 Correlation Results-Objective Three**

**Testing Hypothesis (H3):** managerial skills significantly affects operation’s performance at World Food Programme (U). To test this Hypothesis, the researcher measured the variables by generating indices called managerial skills and operation’s performance by obtaining mean responses. The data was then analyzed using Pearson’s Correlation and Regression techniques to respectively determine the relationship between variables and to determine the effect of one variable on another.

Table 17: Correlation matrix between managerial skills and operation’s performance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Managerial skills | Operation’s performance |
| Managerial Pearson’s  Skills Correlation  Sig. (2-tailed)  N | 1  47 | .647\*\*  .000    47 |
| Operation’s Pearson’s  Performance Correlation  Sig. (2-tailed)  N | 647\*\*  .000    47 | 1  47 |

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

*Source: Field research findings, 2014*

Table 17 shows Pearson’s Correlation coefficient r = 0.647 between managerial skills and operation’s performance, suggesting that the two variables were positively related. The Pearson’s Correlation coefficient r = 0.647 and significance p = 0.000 show that there was a significant relationship between managerial skills and operation’s performance at World Food Programme (U). This shows that 64.7% of operations performance is contributed by efficient and effective managerial skills.

**4.6.3 Regression Results-Objective Three**

Table 18: Regression results on managerial skills and operation’s performance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | R | R  Square | Adjusted R  Square | Std. Error of the estimate | Change statistics | | | | |
| R Square change | F Change | Df1 | Df2 | Sig.F change |
| 1 | .647 | .419 | .412 | .51909 | .419 | 59.747 | 1 | 47 | .000 |

1. Predictors: (Constant), Managerial skills
2. Dependent variable: Operation’s Performance

*Source: Field research findings, 2014*

From table 18 above, it is seen that managerial skills has a substantial significance and affects operation’s performance as explained by the R square of 0.412. This means that a change in operation’s performance can be explained by managerial skills up to 41.2%. Therefore the null hypothesis that “Managerial skills significantly affects operation’s performance at World Food Programme (U)” is accepted.

**4.7 Findings on the dependent variable: Operations performance at World Food Programme (U)**

Speed of delivery, dependability, flexibility, cost and quality were considered dimensions of operations performance of the study.

**4.7.1 Descriptive statistics on speed of delivery**

Speed of delivery was considered a dimension of operations performance. Table 19 below indicates descriptive statistics on speed of delivery.

Table 19; Responses on speed of delivery

1 2 3 4 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| WFP(U) drivers are always on 24hour call | 14(29.8%) | 26(55.3%) | 0(0.0%) | 5(10.6%) | 2(4.3%) |
| WFP(U) drivers have regular health checkups | 0(0.0%) | 5(10.6%) | 12(25.5%) | 20(42.5%) | 10(21.3%) |
| WFP(U) vehicles are always in good mechanical condition | 7(14.9%) | 8(17.0%) | 9(19.4%) | 15(31.9%) | 8(17.0%) |
| WFP(U) responds to a disaster within 48hours | 10(21.3%) | 15(31.9%) | 12(25.5%) | 9(19.4%) | 1(2.1%) |
| WFP(U) drivers are trained to handle disaster situations | 17(36.2%) | 19(40.4%) | 4(8.6%) | 3(6.4%) | 4(8.6%) |

*Source: Primary data*

Key: 1- strongly agree, 2-Agree, 3-undecided, 4-disagree and 5-strongly disagree.

Table 19 shows that 40 respondents representing 85.1% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) are always on 24hour call whereas no respondents were undecided and 7 respondents representing 14.9% disagreed. This can be interpreted to mean that a majority of respondents representing 85.1% affirmed that drivers at WFP(U) are always on 24houp call. The table further indicates that 5 respondents representing 10.6% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) have regular health checks whereas 12 respondents representing 25.5% were undecided and 30 respondents representing 63.8% disagreed with the statement. This shows that a majority of the respondents representing 63.8% disagreed that drivers at WFP(U) have regular health checks. Table 19 indicates that 15 respondents representing 31.9% agreed that WFP(U) vehicles are always in good mechanical condition whereas 9 respondents representing 19.4% were undecided and only 23 respondents representing 48.9% disagreed. This shows that a majority of the respondents representing 48.9% disagreed that WFP (U) vehicles are always in good mechanical condition. It is noted from the table that 25 respondents representing 53.2% agreed WFP (U) responds to a disaster within 48hours whereas 12 respondents representing 25.5% were undecided and only 10 respondents representing 21.5% disagreed. This shows that a majority of the respondents representing 53.2% affirmed that WFP (U) responds to a disaster within 48hours. The table further indicates that 36 respondents representing 76.6% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) are trained to handle disaster situations whereas 4 respondents representing 8.6% were undecided and 7 respondents representing 15.0% disagreed. This shows that a majority of the respondents representing 76.6% affirmed that WFP(U) drivers are trained to handle disaster situations.

**4.7.2 Descriptive statistics on dependability and flexibility**

Dependability and flexibility were considered dimensions of operations performance.

Table 20 below indicates descriptive statistics on Dependability and flexibility.

Table 20; Responses on Dependability and Flexibility

1 2 3 4 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| WFP(U) drivers are not over worked | 2(4.3%) | 6(12.8%) | 15(31.9%) | 23(48.9%) | 1(2.1%) |
| WFP(U) drivers are fairly distributed on different routes | 10(21.3%) | 8(17.0%) | 12(25.5%) | 9(19.4%) | 8(17.0%) |
| WFP(U) vehicles are scheduled in an orderly manner | 7(14.9%) | 18(38.3%) | 9(19.4%) | 5(10.6%) | 8(17.0%) |
| WFP(U) vehicles are checked before being sent to disaster locations | 22(46.8%) | 15(31.9%) | 10(21.3%) | 0(0.0%) | 0(0.0%) |

*Source: Primary data*

Key: 1- strongly agree, 2-Agree, 3-undecided, 4-disagree and 5-strongly disagree.

Table 20 shows that 8 respondents representing 17.1% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) are not over worked whereas 15 respondents representing 31.9% were undecided because they were unsure about their co-driver’s work loads and 24 respondents representing 51.0% disagreed. This can be interpreted to mean that a majority of respondents representing 51.0% disagreed that drivers at WFP (U) are not over worked. The table further indicates that 18 respondents representing 38.3% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) are fairly distributed on different routes whereas 12 respondents representing 25.5% were undecided because they were unsure about their co-drivers routes and 17 respondents representing 36.4% disagreed with the statement. This shows that a majority of the respondents representing 38.3% agreed that drivers at WFP(U) are fairly distributed on different routes.

Table 20 indicates that 25 respondents representing 43.2% agreed that WFP (U) vehicles are scheduled in an orderly manner whereas 9 respondents representing 19.4% were undecided because they were unsure about the co-drivers schedules and only 13 respondents representing 27.6% disagreed. This shows that a majority of the respondents representing 43.2% agreed that WFP (U) vehicles are scheduled in an orderly manner. It is noted from the table that 37 respondents representing 78.7% agreed WFP (U) vehicles are checked before being sent to disaster locations whereas 10 respondents representing 21.3% were undecided because they were unsure about their co-drivers vehicle check logs and no respondents disagreed. This shows that a majority of the respondents representing 78.7% affirmed that WFP (U) vehicles are checked before being sent to disaster locations.

**4.7.3 Descriptive statistics on cost and quality**

Cost and Quality were considered dimensions of operations performance. Table 21 below indicates descriptive statistics on Cost and Quality.

Table 21; Responses on Cost and Quality

1 2 3 4 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| WFP(U) drivers don’t idle vehicles | 7(14.9%) | 10(21.3%) | 15(31.9%) | 9(19.1%) | 6(12.8%) |
| WFP(U) drivers don’t waste fuel | 11(23.4%) | 8(17.0%) | 12(25.5%) | 9(19.4%) | 7(14.9%) |
| WFP(U) relief aid arrives in good condition to a disaster area. | 7(14.9%) | 18(38.3%) | 9(19.4%) | 5(10.6%) | 8(17.0%) |
| WFP(U) vehicles are fuel efficient | 12(25.5%) | 15(31.9%) | 10(21.3%) | 6(12.8%) | 4(8.5%) |

*Source: Primary data*

Key: 1- strongly agree, 2-Agree, 3-undecided, 4-disagree and 5-strongly disagree.

Table 21 shows that 17 respondents representing 36.2% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) don’t idle the vehicles whereas 15 respondents representing 31.9% were undecided because they were unsure their co-drivers had idling experiences and 15 respondents representing 31.9% disagreed. This can be interpreted to mean that a majority of respondents representing 36.2% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) don’t idle their vehicles. The table further indicates that 19 respondents representing 40.4% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) don’t waste fuel whereas 12 respondents representing 25.5% were undecided because they were unsure about co-drivers wasting fuel and 16 respondents representing 34.3% disagreed with the statement. This shows that a majority of the respondents representing 40.4% agreed that drivers at WFP (U) don’t waste fuel.

Table 21 indicates that 25 respondents representing 43.2% agreed that WFP (U) relief aid arrives in good condition to a disaster area whereas 9 respondents representing 19.4% were undecided because they were unsure about co-drivers delivering relief aid in good condition and only 13 respondents representing 27.6% disagreed. This shows that a majority of the respondents representing 43.2% agreed that WFP (U) relief aid arrives in good condition to a disaster area. It is noted from the table that 27 respondents representing 57.4% agreed WFP (U) vehicles are fuel efficient whereas 10 respondents representing 21.3% were undecided because they were unsure about their co-drivers vehicle fuel efficiency and 10 respondents representing 21.3% disagreed. This shows that a majority of the respondents representing 57.4% affirmed that WFP (U) vehicles are fuel efficient.

**4.8 Overall Purpose Statement: Relationship between Managing drivers and Operations Performance at World Food Programme (U).**

**4.8.1 Multiple Correlation Results-Dimensions of Managing drivers and Operations Performance**

Table 22 below shows a multiple correlation between the study dimensions of Managing drivers and Operations Performance at World Food Programme (U)..

Table 22: Correlation results on managing drivers and operations performance

|  |  | Managing drivers | Operations Performance |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Managing drivers | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .761\*\* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 |
| N | 47 | 47 |
| Operations Performance | Pearson Correlation | .761\*\* | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  |
| N | 47 | 47 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | |  |

*Source: Field research findings, 2014*

Table 22 above shows Pearson’s Correlation coefficient r = 0.761 between Managing drivers and Operations performance at World Food Programme (U), suggesting that the two variables were significantly related.

**4.8.2 Multiple regression Results-Dimensions of Managing drivers and operations performance**

Table 23 below shows a multiple regression between the study dimensions of Managing drivers and Operations performance at World Food Programme (U)..

Table 23: Regression results on managing drivers and operations performance

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R Square Change | | F Change | df1 | | df2 | | | | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .776a | .603 | .588 | .43444 | .603 | | 40.932 | 3 | | 47 | | | | .000 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), driver training, driver behavior, managerial skills | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Dependent Variable: operations performance | | | | | |  | | |  | |  |  |  | |

*Source: Field research findings, 2014*

It can be noted from table 23 above that overall managing drivers (through its dimensions of driver training, driver behavior and managerial skills) has a moderate significance and effect on operations performance at World Food Programme (U) as explained by the R Square of 0.588. This means that a change in operations performance can be explained by effective management of drivers up to 58.8%.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**5.1 Introduction**

This chapter summarizes the findings of the study undertaken, discussion of the results with reference to literature and personal opinions, conclusions on the study and recommendations based on the findings.

**5.2 Summary of the findings**

The findings of this study, laid out objective by objective, were as follows.

On objective one, regression analysis showed that driver training affected operations performance at World Food Programme (U) by 42.2%. The study therefore found a significant relationship between driver training and operations performance at World Food Programme (U).

On objective two, regression analysis showed that driver behavior affected operations performance at World Food Programme (U) by 42.4%. This study thus found a significant link between driver behavior and operations performance at World Food Programme (U).

On objective three, regression analysis showed that managerial skills affects operations performance at World Food Programme (U) by 41.2%. The study hence found a significant relationship found between managerial skills and operations performance at World Food Programme (U).

**5.2.1 Driver training and operations performance at World Food Programme (U)**

The correlation between driver training and operations performance was positive and significant since Pearson’s Correlation coefficient r = 0.679 was high and p value (p=0.000) was less than the p critical (pc=0.050), suggesting a positive relationship between the two variables. From regression analysis, the amount by which a change in driver training brings a change operations performance was found to be 0.422 (R square=0.422). This means that driver training affects operations performance by 42.2%. In qualitative results, it was noted that it was mandatory for all drivers to be equipped with the required necessary training in order to be able to fulfill their required obligations of timely delivery. With drivers equipped with the necessary training and skills they were expected to live to their expected obligations of timely delivery of relief aid to refugees. It was further added that WFP (U) drivers are trained to handle relief aid situations

**5.2.2 Driver behavior and operations performance at World Food Programme (U)**

The correlation between driver behavior and operations performance was positive and significant since Pearson’s Correlation coefficient r = 0.544 was high and p value (p=0.000) was less than the p critical (pc=0.050), suggesting a positive relationship between the two variables. From regression analysis, the amount by which a change in driver behavior brings a change in operations performance was found to be 0.424 (R square=0.424). This means that driver behavior affects operations performance by 42.4%. In qualitative results, It was found that controlling unauthorized use of organization vehicles by drivers and having control over a driver over a given route especially in circumstances when the fleet is operating across stateliness was a managerial challenge at World Food programme (U).

**5.2.3 Managerial skills and operations performance at World Food Programme (U)**

The correlation between managerial skills and operations performance was positive and significant since Pearson’s Correlation coefficient r = 0.647 was high and p value (p=0.000) was less than the p critical (pc=0.050), suggesting a positive relationship between the two variables. From regression analysis, the amount by which a change in driver training brings a change operations performance was found to be 0.412 (R square=0.412). This means that managerial skills affects operations performance by 41.2%. In qualitative results, it was found that some drivers found it difficult to comprehend information or directives given to them by managers. The argument was that due to information overload or giving to many directives to drivers resulted in incompletion of tasks.

**5.3 Discussion of findings**

The following is a discussion of findings of the study:

**5.3.1 Driver training and operations performance**

The first objective of the study was to establish the effect of driver training on operationsperformance at World Food Programme (U). Findings of the study established that there was a positive and significant relationship between the two variables; driver training explained up to 42.2% operations performance World Food Programme (U). Driver training had a substantial effect on operations performance. The qualitative results indicated that it was mandatory for all drivers to be equipped with the required necessary training in order to be able to fulfill their required obligations of timely delivery. With drivers equipped with the necessary training and skills they were expected to live to their expected obligations of timely delivery of relief aid to refugees.

It was further added that WFP (U) drivers are trained to handle relief aid situations. According to porter (2004), training and development of staff in any organization is of atmost importance as this is known to improve performance. Then Accordiing to Mumby and Ashcraft (2004), training can produce positive results if it is based on clearly defined needs specific to the required job at hand and it is delivered with a view to those needs. Aurtherley and Robertson (2001), argued that the principles of health and safety training are no different from those which apply to any form of training. Indeed, a good case can be made for the integration of skills training along with safety training wherever possible. McClelland (1973), identified that health and safety training which fails to produce positive results is because it is not based on sound analysis. At best a waste of time and money. At worst, such training may result in false confidence, thus increasing the risk of accidents. Core competencies are required for particular jobs. This would include knowledge, Skills and abilities commonly referred to as KSAs, as well as soft skills or behaviors. And Fulmer and Conger (2004), explains that employees who perform highly have acquired the competencies through numerous tailor made trainings. To become a higher performer in an organization or other professional network, competencies must be inclusive or integrated throughout all of the human resources practices. Their findings on training as a means to improve performance hence agree with the findings of this study that driver training affects operations performance.

**5.3.2 Driver behavior and operations performance**

The second objective of the study was to establish the impact of driver behavior on operations performance at World Food Programme (U). Findings of this study established that there was a positive and significant relationship between the two variables; driver behavior explained up to 42.4% of operations performance at World Food Programme (U). Driver behavior also had a substantial effect on operations performance at World Food Programme (U). The qualitative results indicated that controlling unauthorized use of organization vehicles by drivers and having control over a driver over a given route especially in circumstances when the fleet is operating across stateliness was a managerial challenge at World Food programme (U).

According to the automotive fleet and leasing newsletter (2013), many fleet managers believe one of the greatest challenges is planning, budgeting and mitigating. A combination of addressing driver behavior ( over speeding, idling, deceleration, acceleration etc ), selecting more fuel efficient vehicles, adhering to preventive maintenance schedules and monitoring fuel usage reports. Driver safety was a huge focus for fleet managers as the mandate to reduce cost and improve productivity. In addition to the human safety factor, there was insurance, maintenance and loss of productivity with downtime of both drivers and vehicles, not to mention administrative costs to process accident related information and the cost of traffic regulation violations.

Then according to Telogis,an International logistics company in their Brochure, Enterprise Fleet Management, (2009 ), Fleet managers faced various challenges inclusive: Avoiding Information overload (Paralysis by analysis) where drivers find it difficult to comprehend Information or directives given to them by managers. Making sure that vehicles are operating efficiently and drivers are responsible enough to inform their superiors of any inefficiency in their vehicles. Managing a geographically dispersed driver team as communicating with remote drivers, locating vehicles in a given area required endless zooming and scrolling across a map especially for fleet that operated across state lines or even internationally. Controlling unauthorized use of organization vehicles, drivers would use organization vehicles outside of work hours or outside the designated areas. Dangerous driving could result into additional costs to the organization as well as potential litigation risks if drivers did not follow traffic regulations and yet managers could not directly have control over a driver over a given route. And that drivers could not comprehend proper usage of the installed fleet software in the vehicles and could miss handle or needed to be constantly advised how to properly use this technology. This was found to be in agreement with the findings of this study that found a significant relationship between Driver behavior and operations performance at World Food Programme (U).

**5.3.3 Managerial skills and operations performance**

The third objective of the study was to establish the effect of managerial skills on operations performance at World Food Programme (U). Findings of the study established that there was a significant relationship between the two variables, meaning that managerial skills explained up to 41.2% operations performance at World Food Pprogramme (U) . Managerial skills also had a substantial effect on operations performance at World Food Programme (U). The qualitative results indicated that it was found that some drivers found it difficult to comprehend information or directives given to them by managers. The argument was that due to information overload or giving to many directives to drivers resulted in incompletion of tasks.

According to Souse and Voss (2008), one of the more comprehensive studies focused on contingency theory research on operations effective practices. It pointed out the emergence of a number of new management practices over the past three decades such as total quality management and lean thinking. While these practices were advocated as universally applicable continued study and experience raised doubts as to their universal validity.

The study indicated contingency knowledge as important for practitioners because the failure to acknowledge the limits of its applicability to operations management practices lead to their application in context not being suitable. Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems represented an approach that required an organization to adopt best practices but not necessary those best suited to the organization while ERP systems were seen to be widespread not all users were satisfied with their results.

Morton and Hu,(2008), argued that despite the tremendous popularity and great potential, the field of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) adoption and implementation was littered with remarkable failures. Though many contributing factors had been cited in the literature, argument was made that the integrated nature of ERP systems, which generally required an organization to adopt standardized organizational processes reflected in the design of the software, was a key factor contributing to these failures. I would submit that the integration and standardization imposed by most ERP systems may not have been suitable for all types of organizations and thus the “fit” between the standardized process designs embedded in the adopted ERP system affected the likelihood of implementation success or failure. The authors went on to identify a set of dimensions of organizational structure and ERP systems characteristics that could be used to gauge the degree of fit, thus providing some insights into successful ERP implementations.

Management improvement programs were considered to have helped to improve some part of the organization’s operation such as reducing operations costs, improve product of service quality or shorten relief response time. Management programs were further considered to usually originate as an attempt to introduce improvement into an organization, they were seen to be original for a particular organization or they possibly an adaptation of an existing program that became popular in another organization. Organizations found it less than satisfactory results in adopting management improvement programs because the original conditions in which the programs were most successful differed from those in the organizations now trying to adopt the programs (Crandall, 2007). The problem appeared to be an incorrect fit between the management programs and the specific needs of the organization. As a result, management improvement programs did not operate under the “one size fits all” mindset instead such programs were contingent on the specific area or process in the organization that needed improvement.The findings above seem to be in agreement with the study that managerial skills significantly affects operations performance at World Food Programme (U).

**5.4 Conclusions**

The following are conclusions drawn from the study:

**5.4.1 Driver training and operations performance**

It can therefore be concluded that giving additional attention to defensive driving, traffic regulations, health and safety (dimensions of driver training) would result into significant improvement in operations performance at World Food Programme (U).

**5.4.2 Driver behavior and operations performance**

The study proved that driver behavior affects operations performance at World Food programme (U). This also followed an adequate consideration of various dimensions of driver behavior during the study. It can therefore be concluded that addressing constraints of motivation, experience and ethics of drivers at World Food programme (U) (dimensions of driver behavior) properly would result into significant improvement in operations performance.

**5.4.3 Managerial skills and operations performance**

The study proved that managerial skills affects operations performance at World Food Programme (U). This also followed an adequate consideration of various dimensions of managerial skills during the study. It can therefore be concluded that addressing conflict resolutions, crises skills and time usage (dimensions of managerial skills) properly would result into significant improvement in operations performance.

**5.5 Recommendations**

Findings of this study may guide managers in the fleet department of World Food Programme (U) and similar humanitarian relief organizations in Uganda.

**5.5.1 Recommendation on driver training and operations performance**

The study results revealed that there was a significant relationship between driver training and operations performance at World Food Programme (U). it was noted that it was mandatory for all drivers to be equipped with the required necessary training in order to be able to fulfill their required obligations of timely delivery. With drivers equipped with the necessary training and skills they were expected to live to their expected obligations of timely delivery of relief aid to refugees. It was further added that WFP (U) drivers are trained to handle relief aid situations. There is therefore a need for World Food Programme (U) drivers to be well trained to affect positively on its operations performance.

**5.5.2 Recommendation on driver behavior and operations performance**

The study results revealed that driver behavior impacted operations performance at World Food Programme (U). It was found that controlling unauthorized use of organization vehicles by drivers and having control over a driver over a given route especially in circumstances when the fleet is operating across stateliness was a managerial challenge at World Food programme (U). Therefore there is need for ethical training of drivers at World Food Programme (U) to try and mitigate the issue of unauthorized use of organizational vehicles.

**5.5.3 Recommendation on managerial skills and operations performance**

The study results revealed that managerial skills affected operations performance at World Food Programme (U). it was found that some drivers found it difficult to comprehend information or directives given to them by managers. The argument was that due to information overload or giving to many directives to drivers resulted in incompletion of tasks. Therefore there is need for managers at World Food Programme (U) to issue orders to drivers that are easily comprehendible so that they can complete amicably their required task at hand.

**5.6 Limitations of the study**

This study faced the following two major limitations. The first limitation noted was reservation of opinions by some potential respondents because the research seemed to target performance of the organization and some of its individual actors by extension. This limitation was mitigated by clear assurances to respondents that their information was for academic purposes only. The second limitation of this study was non-return of questionnaires by various sampled respondents in the course of data collection.

**5.7 Contributions of the study**

The study results revealed that driver training, driver behavior and managerial skills were all significantly linked to operations performance at World Food Programme (U). This study has therefore added to the body of knowledge and it has emphasized the need to dedicate resources to the dimensions of the variables studied in order to expect better operations performance as a result of improved ways of managing drivers..

**5.8 Areas Recommended for Future Research**

This study established that managing drivers only explains upto 58.8% of the operations performance at World Food Programme (U). This implies that the remaining 41.2% is explained by other factors. There is therefore need to explore on the issue with related humanitarian relief organizations.

The study concentrated on only three dimensions of the independent variable (Managing drivers). Other dimensions of managing drivers can be studied further.

The geographical scope of this study was only limited to World Food Programme (U). Other humanitarian relief organizations can also be studied for purposes of comparison as well as in-depth understanding of managing drivers.
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**APPENDICES**

**Appendix 1: Questionnaire**

Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire is prepared for a research leading to the award of a Masters Degree in Management Studies (Logistics and Transport) of Uganda Management Institute.

I kindly request you to answer the questions .This information will only be used for academic purposes and it will be treated with maximum confidentiality.

Thank you for your kind cooperation.

Yours truly,

Gerald Mwandha Baliddawa.

**SECTION A: Demographic particulars**

Please tick the response you feel is appropriate.

1) What is your sex?

a) Male b) Female

2) What is your age bracket?

a) Below 20 b) 20-30 c) 30-40 d) Above 40

3) What is your level of education?

a) Primary education b) Secondary education c) University education and above

4) How long have you worked at WFP (U)?

a) Below 1yr b) 2-3yrs c) 4-5yrs d) 5-6yrs e) Above 7 yrs.

5) What is your religion?

a) Catholic b) Protestant c) Muslim d) Others.

**SECTION B: Managing Drivers:**

In this section tick how much you agree or disagree with the statement on management at

WFP (U).

Using the rating scale below. Tick one space for each statement.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly agree |

**1)Driver Training:**

**Opinion**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | WFP (U) drivers are trained in safety regulations. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | WFP (U) drivers are trained in Defensive driving |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | WFP (U) drivers are trained in health regulations |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | WFP (U) drivers are trained to handle vehicle mechanics |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | WFP (U) drivers are trained in vehicle diagnostics |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | WFP (U) drivers are trained in traffic Regulations |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | WFP(U) drivers are trained to use vehicle telecommunications |  |  |  |  |  |

**2) Driver behavior:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | WFP (U) drivers follow traffic regulations |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | WFP (U) drivers use defensive driving techniques |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | WFP (U) drivers use drugs while driving |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | WFP (U) drivers follow traffic regulations |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | WFP (U) drivers misuse organizational vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | WFP (U) drivers follow organizational goals |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | WFP (U) drivers follow health regulations |  |  |  |  |  |

**3)Managerial Skills:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | WFP (U) Managers resolve driver conflicts fairly |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | WFP (U) Managers respond to crisis situations quickly |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | WFP (U) Managers appreciate drivers |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | WFP (U) Managers advise drivers during disasters |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | WFP (U) Managers guide drivers during disasters |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | WFP (U) Managers Discipline badly behaved drivers |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | WFP (U) Managers reward well behaved drivers |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | WFP (U) Managers make sure drivers keep time |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | WFP (U) Managers allocate drivers fairly |  |  |  |  |  |

**4) SECTION D: Operations Performance:**

**Speed of Delivery:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | WFP (U) drivers are always on 24hour call. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | WFP (U) driver have regular Health checkups. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | WFP (U) vehicles are always in Good mechanical condition. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | WFP (U) responds to a Disaster within 48hours. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | WFP (U) drivers are trained to handle disaster situations. |  |  |  |  |  |

\\\

**Dependability and Flexibility:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | WFP (U) drivers are not over Worked. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | WFP (U) drivers are fairly Distributed on different routes. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | WFP (U) vehicles are scheduled in an orderly manner. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | WFP (U) vehicles are checked Before being sent to disaster locations. |  |  |  |  |  |

**Cost and Quality:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | WFP (U) drivers don’t idle vehicles. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | WFP (U) drivers don’t waste fuel |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | WFP (U) relief aid arrives in good condition to a disaster area. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | WFP (U) vehicles are fuel efficient. |  |  |  |  |  |

**Appendix 2: Interview guide**

**Answer the following questions below**.

**1) Driver training and operations performance:**

1. As a WFP(U) manager, When do you advise drivers on the importance of time keeping?

………………………………………………………………………………….

………………………………………………………………………………….

1. As a WFP(U) manager, How do you discipline drivers who misbehave?

………………………………………………………………………………….

………………………………………………………………………………….

1. As a WFP(U) manager, How do you resolve conflict between drivers fairly?

………………………………………………………………………………….

……………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, How do you make sure that drivers are available at short notice?

……………………………………………………………………………………….

…………………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, Why do you consider experience when recruiting drivers?

………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, How do you reward drivers who perform well?

………………………………………………………………………………..

………………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, When do you make your drivers feel important?

………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………….

1. As a WFP(U) manager, When do you advise drivers on the importance of vehicle safety?

……………………………………………………………………………………….

…………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, When do you encourage drivers to regularly check their health?

…………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, do you keep driver’s performance records?

…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………..

1. As a WFP(U) manager, do you correct your drivers when they make a mistake?

………………………………………………………………………………..

………………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, What information overload do your drivers find hard to comprehend ?

……………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, how often do your drivers check there vehicles?

………………………………………………………………………………..

……………………………………………………………………………………

**2) Driver behavior and operations performance:**

1. As a WFP(U) manager ,how often do your drivers need to be constantly advised on the proper use of installed fleet (software?.................................................................................

……………………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, to what education level are the majority of your drivers?

…………………………………………………………………………………….

………………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, how do you manage geographically dispersed driver teams?

………………………………………………………………………………………..

………………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, how do you ensure that drivers follow traffic regulations?...

…………………………………………………………………………………….

……………………………………………………………………………………..

1. As a WFP(U) manager, how do you ensure that drivers are responsible enough to inform the superiors of any vehicle problems in time?........................................................

………………………………………………………………………………………….

……………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, how do control unauthorized use of organizational vehicles?

…………………………………………………………………………………….

………………………………………………………………………………………

**3) Managerial skills and operations performance:**

1. As a WFP(U) manager, what is involved in your fleet management program?

…………………………………………………………………………………….

……………………………………………………………………………….

1. As a WFP(U) manager, what risk management practice do you use?

………………………………………………………………………………..

…………………………………………………………………………….

1. As a WFP(U) manager, what types of auto-liability coverage does your organization have?.........................................................................................................................

…………………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, how are drivers compensated incase the organization down sizes?

…………………………………………………………………………………………….

……………………………………………………………………………………………..

1. As a WFP(U) manager, what driver repercussions are there for untimely reporting of accidents?...................................................................................................................

………………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, what procedures are there for contracting drivers?

………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, what operation requirements for drivers does your organization have?......................................................................................................................

……………………………………………………………………………………..

1. As a WFP(U) manager, what type of in house training for drivers is available in your organization?.............................................................................................................
2. As a WFP(U) manager, what operation standards are required for your drivers to uphold?

………………………………………………………………………………….

……………………………………………………………………………………

1. As a WFP(U) manager, what safety regulations are in place for drivers?

………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………..

1. As a WFP(U) manager, how do you keep your drivers motivated?

………………………………………………………………………………….

…………………………………………………………………………………….

…………………………………………………………………………………….

**Appendix 3: krejcie and Morgan, 1970**

