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Abstract: Extant theories of strategic human resource management (SHRM) practices and cultures have generally adopted on the one hand the assumption that organizations develop a culture of their own that is distinct from the national and industry contexts in which the organization is embedded, thus ignoring the potential impact of external environmental factors on organizational culture. On the other hand, some researchers and scholars have questioned the validity and reliability of national culture-SHRM practices research.

The current paper explores the employee cultural values in the Kenyan multinational companies (MNCs) and the influence of culture on SHRM practices. Hofstede’s cultural dimensions of collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and femininity are applied. These value dimensions reflect human thinking, and feelings of people, which pose basic problems that any society has to cope with but for which solutions differ.
Definition of Terms

Strategic human resource management (SHRM)
Strategic human resource management involves the development of a consistent, aligned collection of practices, programs (strategies), and policies to facilitate the achievement of the organization’s strategic objectives (Mello, 2002).

Strategic human resource management practices
SHRM practices are those decisions and actions which concern the management of employees at all levels in the business, and which are related to the implementation of strategies directed towards sustaining competitive advantage (Miller 1987). Therefore organizations develop a culture of work practices. Examples of SHRM practices are recruitment practices, staff appraisal systems, remuneration systems, and work flexibility arrangements.

National Culture
These are values, beliefs, and assumptions learned in early childhood that distinguishes people in one society from those in another (Beck and Moore, 1995; Hofstede, 1991).

Cultural Value Dimensions
Empirically determined main criteria by which the national cultures differ. There are four such criteria, which are labeled by Hofstede (1980) as dimensions; these are Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism-Collectivism, and Masculinity-Femininity.
OVERVIEW

Of all the factors affecting strategic human resource management (SHRM) perhaps none is more potent than the national culture. This is because the values underlying human resource management (HRM) are not based on individual country’s values. As Kanungo (1995, p. 11) pointed out:

“…because many of our human resource management tools have been developed primarily within a context of economically developed nations, most have never been appropriate for use in developing countries. Traditional US-based HRM theories, in particular, with their lack of contextual embeddedness, their strong individualistic orientation, and their emphasis on freewill… mismatch what is most salient about the nature of work and human systems in developing countries”.

Aycan et al (2000) contend that because of the increasing demands of the globalized and liberalized business environment, both researchers and practitioners have started paying more attention to the study of culture as an explanatory variable. The researchers have also come to realize that the uncritical adaptation of SHRM practices and techniques evolved in the context of Western cultural values may not be effective in other socio-cultural environments.

Extant literature (Gelfand, 2000) reckons that managers in organizations are recognizing that it is impossible to maintain parochial views while doing business across cultures. Cultural knowledge and a global focus are crucial to survive, and to thrive, within today’s business environment. However, the same literature does not give a global focus that is commensurate with the global reality of business. Discussion and empirical assessment of culture and human resource management practices (Aycan, et al, 2000) has been focused on specific developed countries and developing countries have been given little attention (Nyambegera et al, 2000). The current paper intends to analyze the employee cultural values in Kenyan multinational companies (MNCs) and the influence of culture on SHRM practices. Hofstede’s (1980) cultural dimensions of collectivism/individualism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and femininity/masculinity will be applied.
The Concept of Culture

To understand the implications of cultures within an organization it is important to understand the basic concept of culture:

“…the core of culture is composed of explicit and tacit assumptions or understandings commonly held by a group of people; a particular configuration of assumptions/understandings is distinctive to the group; these assumptions/understandings serve as guides to acceptable and unacceptable perceptions, thoughts, feelings and behaviors; they are learned and passed to new members of the group through social interaction; culture is dynamic – it changes over time” (Milliken and Martins, 1989).

The implication of this definition is that culture is a collective social phenomenon (Milliken and Martins, 1989). For instance management communicates organizational work culture through practices of recruitment, staff appraisals, remuneration and flexible work arrangements. All these practices are aspects of social interactions. Organizational culture can, therefore, be created, rather than just inherited by employees. Once in existence, it subtly influences perception, thought, action, and feeling of the employees in ways that are consistent with their cultural reality. It guides the selection, interpretation, and communication of information in ways that are meaningful to the employees. To understand organizational culture, one must understand the basic assumptions of the employees, namely, their national cultural values and beliefs. Culture is not a characteristic of individuals; it encompasses a number of people who were conditioned by the same education and life experience.

Hence culture of a group refers to the collective mental programming that these people have in common; the programming that is different from that of other groups or nations. Culture in this sense of collective mental programming, is often difficult to change. This is so because it is shared by a number of people, and because it has become crystallized in the institutions these people have built together. Hofstede (1980) reckons that most countries’ inhabitants share a national character that is more clearly apparent to foreigners than to the nationals themselves.

Consequently whereas typically, cross-national comparative research has asked “When, and under what conditions do certain cultural identities become salient and more relevant than others?” and
“How do various cultures interact?” (Dahler-Larsen, and Hernes 1997), it may be more meaningful to ask questions such as:

“How do national cultural values affect SHRM practices in less developed African countries?”

THE THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Research (Sonja and Phillips, 2004) assumes that managers in today’s multicultural global business community frequently encounter cultural differences, which can interfere with management practices in organizations. In comparing cultures of different countries, cross-cultural researchers have concentrated effort on an examination of a set of cultural value dimensions developed by Hofstede. Dominant value systems of different countries can be ordered along Hofstede’s set of cultural value dimensions (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede and Bond, 1988). People’s Dominant value systems have been crystallized in the institutions these people have built together: their family structures, educational structures, religious organizations, associations, forms of government, work organizations, law, literature, settlement patterns, and buildings. All of these reflect common beliefs that derive from the common culture. Whereas the value systems affect human thinking, feeling, action, and the behavior of organizations and institutions in predictable ways, the value dimensions reflect basic problems that any society has to cope with but for which solutions differ from country to country (Hofstede, 1983).

Shackleton and Ali (1990) and Chow et al (1991) support the application of Hofstede’s (1980) cultural value dimensions because Hofstede’s empirical results have been replicated at the national level in fifty countries and three regions. On the other hand, unlike Hofstede’s approach, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) value orientations’ approach does not aggregate work preference across a range of discrete psychological variables (attitudes, work values, sources of satisfaction). Hence, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s approach is suitable for a study examining job involvement as an outcome but not appropriate for studies examining work involvement (Nyambegera et al, 2001). Job involvement is a specific belief regarding an individual worker’s identification with his or her current job. Work involvement is a construct, which relates to all employees’ views of work, as it should be or organizational performance. Therefore Hofstede’s approach as opposed to Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck’s value orientations approach is more suitable for this paper, which is examining the relationship between culture and strategic human resource management practices and consequently on work involvement. Triandis (1982) also argues that Hofstede’s cultural framework has been accepted as important and reasonable for describing...
differences among nations. However, little empirical research has used the Hofstede dimensions to investigate the effect of culture on SHRM practices, and hence on performance in different cultural groups (Søndergaard 1994). The cultural dimensions have been grouped into two categories, namely relations between people and motivational orientations (Hofstede, 2000).

**Relations between people**

*Individualism, versus Collectivism.* This is the degree to which individuals are supposed to look after themselves or remain integrated into groups, usually around the family. Positioning itself between these poles is a very basic problem all societies face. Individualism and collectivism have been defined as follows:

> “Individualism stands for a society in which the ties between individuals are loose: Everyone is expected to look after him/herself and her/his immediate family. Collectivism stands for a society in which people from birth onward are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, which throughout people’s lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty” (Hofstede, 2002, p 225).

National differences in Individualism are calculated using Individualism Index (IDV) (Hofstede, 1991, p. 53). The highest IDV scores were found in the United States, Australia, and Great Britain. The lowest IDV scores were found in Guatemala, Ecuador, Panama and East Africa.

**Motivational orientation**

Societies choose ways to cope with the inherent uncertainty of living. In this category, Hofstede identifies three dimensions: *masculinity* versus *femininity*, amount of *uncertainty avoidance*, and *power distance*.

*Masculinity, versus Femininity.* Refers to the distribution of emotional roles between the genders, which is another fundamental problem for any society. The duality of the sexes is a fundamental fact with which different societies cope in different ways. Surveys on the importance of work goals show that almost universally women attach more importance to social goals such as relationships, helping others, and the physical environment, and men attach more importance to ego goals such as careers and money (Hofstede, 1991). However, Hofstede’s data revealed that
the importance respondents attached to such “feminine” versus “masculine” work varied across countries as well as across occupations.

Consequently, masculinity stands for a society in which male gender roles are clearly distinct. Men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on material success. Women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life.

Femininity, on the other hand, stands for a society in which gender roles overlap. Both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life. Because the respondents were mostly men, Hofstede suggested calling this dimension the Masculinity Index (MAS) (Hofstede, 1991, p. 84). The list of countries in order of MAS (high gender roles distinction at work) shows Japan at the top. German-speaking countries (Austria, Switzerland, and Germany) scored high; so did the Caribbean Latin American countries, Venezuela, Mexico, Colombia, and Italy. The Anglo countries (Ireland, Great Britain, South Africa, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada) all scored above average. Asian countries, other than Japan, were in the middle. The feminine side (low gender roles distinction at work) includes France, Spain, Salvador, and East Africa among others. At the extreme “feminine” pole were the Nordic countries including Sweden, Norway, and the Netherlands.

Low MAS countries are characterized by cooperation at work and a good relationship with the boss, belief in group decisions, promotion by merit, lower job stress, and preference for smaller companies. Challenge and recognition in jobs, belief in individual decisions, higher job stress, and preference for large corporations characterize high MAS countries.

Although Hofstede (1980) collected data from MNCs based in fifty countries and three regions, he did not include some regions, and countries of Central and Eastern Europe. However, his hypotheses, on countries that were left out, proved right when tested (Bollinger, 1994). For instance, research (Bollinger, 1994; Elenkov, 1998) supports Hofstede’s predictions that Russian employees would be characterized by high power distance, high uncertainty avoidance, medium-range individualism, and low masculinity.

Uncertainty avoidance. Refers to the extent to which a culture programs its members to feel either uncomfortable or comfortable in unstructured situations. Unstructured situations are
novel, unknown, surprising, and different from usual. The basic problem involved is the degree to which a society tries to control the uncontrollable. The countries from Hofstede’s study were each given a score on Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI) (Hofstede, 1991, p. 113). UAI was derived from country mean scores on questions dealing with rule orientation, employment stability, and stress. Hofstede’s research has found UAI values for fifty countries and three regions. The countries rank from Greece, Portugal, Guatemala, and East Africa (highest UAI) to Singapore, Jamaica, and Denmark (lowest UAI).

*Power distance.* This is the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions accept and expect that power is distributed unequally. The basic problem involved is the degree of human inequality that underlies the functioning of each particular society. In Hofstede’s research, power distance is measured in a Power Distance Index (PDI) (Hofstede, 1991, p. 26). The values and attitudes found at the national level contrast “low-PDI countries” with “high-PDI countries”, with some countries placed in between. High PDI countries include Malaysia, Guatemala, Panama, Mexico, and East Africa. Low PDI countries include the US, Austria, Sweden, and Denmark.

From these results, influence of culture on SHRM practices and work performance of organizations in Kenya, an East African country, is analyzed. First the implication of globalization of business is explained. Then, to understand the implications of diversity of cultures within an organization, basic concept of culture and effect of cultural values on SHRM practices are discussed.

**BUSINESS AND GLOBALIZATION**

Globalization of business implies that firms have created international, multinational or global companies (Hamel et al 1989). As a result, multinational companies (MNCs) now have the chance to stay competitive. However, the resultant workforces are diverse in interests, backgrounds, training, and nationalities (De la Torre, 1998). The mosaic of cultural diversity presents a major challenge both in global and domestic work settings, as there is growing recognition that the skills and core competencies required by the home company will also be required in the host company (Tung, 1997).
The major differentiating factors between countries that have an impact on HRM are contextual. They include economic, political, legal and historical environments (Begin, 1992; Sundaran and Black, 1992), employee demographics and labor-market characteristics (Teagarden et al, 1992), socio-cultural characteristics of the workplace and society (Laurent, 1983; Kim, 1999). A number of researches on MNCs have indicated that among these elements culture has generated more interest in the field of comparative HRM because cultures are at the base of people’s behaviors (Brewster and Hegewisch, 1994; Schuler et al., 1993). It is argued (Sonja and Phillips, 2004) that employees in an organization live within a larger complex society. Therefore, while members of a MNC may develop shared sets of assumptions within the organization setting that are special to that organization and which become that organization’s culture, they also bring with them the various sets of assumptions they acquire outside of the organization in the form of national cultures. This theory is supported by Sondergaard (1994) who asserts that national cultures is the most widely cited feature of countries that creates pressures for decentralization in MNCs to operate effectively in a particular country.

Research suggests that different cultural identities and values may mediate the way in which employees within the companies perceive, value, and react to such things as SHRM practices and how much of themselves they invest in their jobs or the organization itself. MNCs must be sensitive to the prevailing values and attitudes in that country. For the manager, then, identifying the existence of cultural values should be an empirical question, not a priori assumption (Pratt and Rafaeli, 1997).

Effect of Cultural Values on Strategic Human Resource Management Practices
Although a review of previous studies reveals that SHRM has gained popularity, specifically, with respect to the debate on HRM and performance, the focus has mainly been limited to the linkage between HR practices and organizational performance. The implication is that SHRM accepts HR function as an important strategic partner in the formulation of the company’s strategies as well as in the implementation of those strategies through HR practices. Majority of work in SHRM (Paauwe and Boselie, 2002; Barney, 1991; Delery, 1998) has adopted the resource-based view (RBV) perspective, which emphasizes the gaining of competitive advantage by means of utilization of the resources of the organization through the employees. The RBV theory caused a change in strategic management thinking from an outside-in approach to an inside-out approach (Wright et al 2001). It is specifically applied to the field of human resource management because it
is people that encompass the properties assumptions of value, rareness, inimitability, and non-substitution, which are the necessary conditions for organizational success (Barney, 1991). However, research using RBV theory tends to neglect the importance of contextual factors, including the organizational setting, an issue that is crucial from HRM point of view. Fields et al (2000) and Nyambegera et al (2000) argue that contextual variables, particularly national culture, have an influence on choice of HRM strategies. Hence, universal generalization of findings from such research has been questioned (Singh, 2003; Budhwar and Katou, 2005).

Focus is drawn on MNCs because extant literature (Youndt et al, 1996) has established that it is common to choose MNCs in any study showing relationships between SHRM practices and performance grounded on the fact that such companies are better placed to use the SHRM practices in their management than local firms. Specifically, Panayotopoulou, et al (2003) support the notion that MNCs, being large, have higher organizational and market performance than small organizations. As less developed countries are given little attention by Western researchers and scholars (Singh, 2003; Hofstede, 1993, 1980), MNCs in less developed countries, in particular Kenya, a sub-Saharan African country, should be given special attention.

KENYAN EXPERIENCE

World Bank (2004) report on Kenya assumes that MNCs in Kenya are large and have a bigger market share than domestic firms. Moreover, Nyambegera et al. (2000) equally argue that MNCs dominate the manufacturing industry in Kenya in terms of turnover because of their large size. Except for the positions of chief executive and financial controller, Kenyans hold most of the positions.

Even though the African countries, Kenya included, have received a large share of multinational companies’ investments, a review of the literature shows that majority of management studies on culture are based on research carried out in the United States, Europe, and Asian countries (Blunt and Jones 1992; Harvey, 1997). The results of these studies have demonstrated that different countries have contrasting cultures, and yet conclusions drawn from them have assumed a universal approach to management (Adler, 1991). It would be worthwhile to carry out research on MNCs in Kenya to establish the effect of culture on SHRM practices. Empirical research (Gray, Marshall, 1998; Nyambegera et al. 2001) indicates that culture influences HRM practices in Kenya. Hofstede’s (1980) cultural dimensions are discussed below with regard to their
applicability to the Kenyan situation. Research on dominant cultures (Hofstede, 1983) was carried out in fifty countries and three regions: East Africa (where Kenya is situated), West Africa, and Arab speaking countries.

Collectivism
Hofstede (1984) affirms that employees in collectivism countries such as Kenya expect organizations to look after them like a family member. They expect organizations to defend their personal interests; belief in group decisions and hiring and promotion decisions are based on seniority, which takes employees’ in-group into account. Employees express emotional dependence on organizations and institutions. Other studies supporting Hofstede’s findings on cultural beliefs in collectiveness countries include Hodgetts and Luthans et al. (1993) which found that in these countries, employees’ compensation strategies are influenced by seniority and family needs.

However, all these studies have not shown the extent to which collectivism influences SHRM practices. This makes it difficult to understand the effect of management practices applied by MNCs in Kenya.

A number of perspectives in relation to individualism and collectivism as presented by various researchers are community relationships, employee security, hiring practices, performance appraisal and training (Kaloki, 2001; Blunt, 1983).

Community Relationships. Blunt (1983) records that Kenyans are known for their communalism. He illustrates this using an example of groups of employees who often pool resources to aid a colleague, and such resources may be provided over time with no obligation on the individual to repay or take second place in the queue on a future occasion. Nzelihe (1986) supports this argument when he asserts that in African communities, the individual is not alone but belongs to the larger community. Therefore an individual’s misfortune is a community affair and Kashima and Triandis (1986) add that collectivism has the effect of emphasizing collective coping, which makes it easier for the individual to cope with unpleasant life events. Study by Blunt and Jones (1986) shows that employees in these societies depend on organizations as a larger community for emotional support. An organization whose SHRM practices bring about cultural friction by ignoring employees’ community relationships is not likely to improve its performance.
In support of Hofstede’s empirical study, Blunt and Jones (1986) point out that in Kenya and Malawi employees expect to be looked after like members of a family by the organizations they work for. They feel left out if their organization is not responsible for their welfare and development. Nzelibe’s (1986) observations found similar results for many African countries. Employees in many African countries expect management practices and policies to be changed according to interpersonal relations because the employees are more community conscious and value group harmony (Blunt and Jones, 1986; Nzelibe, 1986). Blunt and Jones (1986), and Nzelibe (1986) confirm Hofstede’s collectiveness in Kenya and some African countries but their studies have not shown the extent to which employee community relations perspectives influence SHRM practices.

Job security. Research by Blunt (1983), Jones (1986) and Leonard (1991) show that employees in collectivist countries such as Kenya regard job security at the workplace as very important. The employees attach a lot of importance to job security needs and avoid behaviors that can threaten their job security. The researchers however fail to show how job security perspectives affect SHRM practices.

Hiring practices. Hofstede’s (1980) findings show that the hiring process in a collectivist society takes the in-group into account. He notes that the first preference is given in hiring relatives of the manager and other employees. Hofstede, further remarks that hiring people from a family known by the workers increases motivation and reduces employee turnover problems. His study also indicates that employees are concerned with the reputation of their company and help correct the undesirable behavior of a family member in the organization. Hofstede (1980) supports this with the argument that in collectivist cultures, the relationship between employer and employee is compared with the relationships in a family where there are mutual obligations of protection in exchange for loyalty. Hence, poor performance of an employee is not a major reason for dismissal, because the employee is a family member and one does not dismiss one’s child.

The acceptance of SHRM practices of hiring workers in collectivist countries such as Kenya shows that employees’ willingness to perform is affected by influence of culture on SHRM practices. However, this hypothesis requires testing for validity in MNCs in Kenya.
Performance appraisal. Another area of HRM practice affected by collectivism is performance appraisal. The main aim of the activity is to provide information to determine promotion, transfers, salary increases, and to supply data to the management on performance of the employees to determine training needs (Harrison, 1993). There is potential and covert resistance to evaluating and discussing individual performance in developing countries (Kanungo, 1995). Evaluating the work of groups, sections, or departments is more acceptable than evaluating the performance of an individual worker in a collective society. The tendency for collective as opposed to individual evaluation is not entirely contrary to the HRM model. The idea for self-managing teams and participation advocated by some proponents of HRM assumes collective evaluation of performance. However, individual evaluation is sometimes necessary in order to determine training and development needs of employees. Collectivist values, however, sometimes militate against this.

Training and development. Training and development is also another area of HRM practice affected by values of collectivism. Scholarships are granted to employees as per their request, not based on organizational need. This practice can be considered a form of reward to employees who have served the organization for a long time. The tendency of maintaining relationships by granting scholarships regardless of organizational needs is considered important as reported by Kanungo (1995).

The rationale of collectivism and its link with job security, hiring practices, performance appraisal, and training and development require further discussion.

Masculinity-Femininity
Low MAS countries are characterized by cooperation at work and a good relationship with the boss, belief in group decisions, promotion by merit, lower job stress, and preference for smaller companies (Hofstede, 1980). Kenya, a high feminine country is given a low masculinity ranking (Hofstede, 1980). Several studies have validated masculinity and femininity on job stress (Newman and Nolen, 1996; Abudu, 1986).

Job Stress. Feminine management practices emphasize the quality of interpersonal relations and quality of working life issues, for example, manufacturing according to customer specifications (Newman, 1996). There is low stress in the workplace because workers are given a
great deal of freedom and thus employees are motivated to work (Abudu, 1986). On the other hand masculine national cultures, such as the US favor performance-contingent rewards to produce higher performance in work units.

Research by Blunt and Jones (1992) indicates that in Africa management practice that appeals to employees rests in management capacity to facilitate the realization of employees’ personal ambitions beneficial to the employees’ community; this in turn serves to lower employee job stress levels in the individual. Bjerke and Al-Meer (1993), also reveal that feminine societies place a great deal of emphasis on concern for others and friendly relationships among people, which serve to lower the stress levels. To what extent does concern for others reduce stress in MNCs?

**Uncertainty avoidance**
This relates to norms, values, and beliefs regarding tolerance for ambiguity. A strong uncertainty avoidance culture seeks to structure social systems where order and predictability are paramount, and rules and regulations dominate (Hofstede, 1980). There is likely to be a conflict of interest among Kenyan employees whose celebrations like marriages, baptisms and funerals are given a lot of importance (Blunt, 1983). This is because multinational companies’ management practices fail to take these traditional values into consideration. For instance, Hofstede (1980) notes that applications for leave to attend a funeral of a relative or a friend would be denied because the reason given is not justified. This would negatively impact the performance of the employees concerned because they will perceive that the SHRM management practices do not consider their cultural values. To what extent do cultural values affect flexible work arrangements which do not take into consideration employees’ interests?

**Power distance**
This pertains to how cultures deal with inequality. Kenya is a high power distance country. It has norms, values, and beliefs, which assume that people have their station in life and inequality is fundamentally acceptable (Blunt and Jones, 1986). It is also acceptable that Kenyans should be dependent on the privileged and powerful.

In line with high power distance, most organizations are characterized by hierarchical decision-making systems. In Kenya (Kamoche, 1992) there is a sense of “them and us” between managers and employees which brings about a dependency attitude. Managers are reluctant to delegate to
the subordinates or engage them in decision-making and employees have learned to accept this position. To what extent are employees involved in decision making in Kenya?

To address the questions raised in this paper the following conceptual framework is drawn:

**Suggested Conceptual Framework for Research**

![Conceptual Framework Diagram]

**CONCLUSION**

Collectively, research on diversity of national cultures and their influence on employees’ behavior inspire much optimism about emerging perspectives on culture and SHRM practices. There is a growing amount of research that illuminates differences in the way organizations around the globe make decisions, allocate resources, negotiate, manage and motivate employees, and train and develop employees. These studies make it clear that culture is an important determinant of many facets of organizational behavior. At the same time, they provide a “wake-up call” to the field of HRM to take heed of existing theoretical and methodological pitfalls, and of the need for increased attention to cross-cultural issues in HRM. There is also evidence that the USA and Western Europe have been given more attention (Triandis, 1994) by researchers. Thus, while organizations increasingly operate in a global work environment, their management practices are still primarily Western.

**SUGGESTIONS**

While progress has been made in the field of HRM, this paper illustrates that much remains to be done to make culture a global discipline. In this spirit the paper offers unexplored questions and presents a new framework and approaches to make SHRM practices more inclusive of cultures around the globe, but particularly in Kenya. It is hoped that this paper will stimulate new dialogues and new debates making cross-cultural issues more of the norm, and less of the
exception in the field of HRM. There is also the need for further research on the moderating influence of culture on relationships between SHRM practices, motivation and organizational performance in Kenya. Research on this field (Budhwar and Katou, 2005) has been more concerned with relationships between SHRM practices and organizational performance mediated by HRM outcomes.
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