

Academic Staff Development Practices' Influence on Job Performance in Selected Public Universities in Kenya

Jane Irene A. Dawo

Maseno University, Department of Educational Management and Foundations
Email: dawojanei@gmail.com

Dr. Simatwa, E.M.W

Department of Education Management and Foundations, Maseno University

Dr. Okwatch, T.O

Department of Education Technology and Curriculum Studies, Maseno University

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v2-i2/9786>

DOI:10.6007/IJARPED/v2-i2/9786

Published Online: 29 June 2013

Abstract

Academic staff development (S-D) enhances job performance in educational institutions universities inclusive. In this regard, there has been noted a shortfall of adequately qualified staff, PhD holders, in Maseno University (MSU) and Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology (MMUST). This denotes a skills, knowledge and attitudinal deficiency which demands counteractive S-D steps. However, despite continued PhD-S-D activities, there are still public and stakeholder complaints of poor service delivery besides claims by certain authorities that universities engage in some retrogressive work-based or in-built-study S-D practices, as opposed to study leave option, hence the need to examine the influence of S-D practices on job performance. For this study, on-the-job PhD-S-D and off-the-job PhD-S-D practices output were compared. Job performance indicators that were measured were categorized into 3; Research, Publication and Community Service, Actual Teaching Activity and Departmental Teamwork. The study used saturated sampling technique to select 6 University Management Personnel (UMP), 11 Deans of Faculties and Directors of Studies (DFDS), 48 Chairmen of Departments (CoD), 88 academic staff who underwent off-the-job PhD-S-D, 66 on On-the-job PhD-S-D practices and 19 former MSU/MMUST academic staff. Actual response rate was 92%. Qualitative data was transcribed and analyzed thematically, quantitative data by mean rating, frequencies and percentages whereas inferential data using T-test. There was coincidence of job performance output with regard to statistical significance or insignificance based on set alpha at 0.05 for 10/11 parameters that were considered in the 3 identified categories. This led to the conclusion that outcome from on-the-job and off-the-job PhD-S-D practice is 90.9% equivalent, thus disapproved allegations of comparative inferior academic opportunity for on-the-job PhD-S-D practice academic staff that was alleged to translate into inferior job performance output. Universities may therefore

adopt either on-the-job or off-the-job PhD-S-D practice based on their S-D policies, their financial, their manpower, or their circumstantial conveniences.

Keywords: Influence, Job Performance, University, PhD, Staff Development Practice, Kenya

Background to the Study

In an educational institution, in-service teaching S-D, aims at improving capacities of individuals to play their roles and fit in assignments optimally for higher achievements resulting from quality service delivery. The programme foci may include, lesson organization, teaching skills, student management and so on (Jamil, Atta, Ali, Balochi, and Ayaz, 2011). Given that teachers are the single most critical input in an educational enterprise (Skinner, 2004) cited in Otu (2011), improvement of teaching staff competence is crucial to attain quality university education (Anyamele, 2007). This is more so, considering that employees who value knowledge and skills for their career growth may be more willing to work for a long period for an employer who trains them (Armstrong, 2009). However, Anyamele (2007); Ezati and Mugimu (2011) allege comparatively inferior teaching-learning opportunity for on-the-job PhD-S-D academic staff that they claim leads to their poorer job performance than for those on off-the-job PhD-S-D.

On the whole, university is the pinnacle of education in Kenya, training manpower vital for the economic, social and political pillars of Vision 2030 (Republic of Kenya, 2007), yet apart from addressing access, unlike that of teaching staff training at lower levels, there is no focus on university staff development. Therefore, it becomes critical for individual university managements to fill policy-strategy gaps at the national level by instituting appropriate measures locally, so as to contribute effectively to Vision 2030. Kenyan public universities must shift their control systems from those that are primarily procedural in nature to those stimulating organizational effectiveness (Walingo, 2010). Though Quick and Nelson (2011) identified high spending on staff training and development among critical people management policies towards excellence in organizations, there have been conflicting results from various studies regarding whether there is substantial value added on teacher effectiveness through on-the-job or off-the-job in-service training given the myriad of challenges alongside them (Jamil et al, 2011). This may be supported by Makerere University chancellor's assertion that quality teaching is still elusive in East African universities despite massive investment in PhD S-D; some PhDs perform below expectation (Nsindabi, 2006). Currently, a movement towards quality systems, ISO certification, is influencing public universities in Kenya to seek competitive advantage through investment in human capital as a performance management strategy (Walingo, 2010).

Some studies have revealed that some lecturers often display poor work ethics, prepare graduates with poor work-life competencies, and have inferior research and publication output. For instance, Gudo, Oanda & Olel (2011) explored the effectiveness of institutional managers in quality assurance at university in Kenya and found that comparatively, private universities were better organized than public ones in terms of management structures, physical facilities and human resources. According to Gudo et al (2011), non-participatory management practices in Kenyan universities resulted in ineffective S-D activities. This agrees with Ezati & Mugimu (2010) findings that from workshop experiences for Makerere University, even with massive investment, teaching staff were still pedagogically deficient. On this note, Nsindabi (2006) claimed that most faculty teaching staff are pedagogically illiterate. They are drawn from various non-teaching backgrounds including laboratories, markets, hospitals and mortuaries, farms, industries, hotels, churches, courts, and from years of

unemployment. In addition, there are persistent allegations that public universities are engaging under-qualified and non-specialist personnel to carry out its teaching functions hence rapidly falling standards (Kairu, 2011) creating public apprehensiveness about realization of Vision 2030 which demands effective teaching, research and community service. This study examined the comparative influence of on-the-job and off-the-job PhD-S-D practices on academic staff job performance in selected public universities in Kenya.

Justification of the study

Modern organizations emphasize on S-D as a critical component of strategic human resource management which removes performance deficiencies and aligns employees to dynamic work-place demands. However, despite Kenyan public university staff continued engagement in S-D activities, there are allegations that they still exhibit certain characteristics that indicate poor job performance. Besides, there are claims of university involvement in retrogressive work-based and in-built-study S-D practices hindering job output. Such are preferred by financially and manpower constrained universities who resort to optimizing staff opportunity 'killing two birds with one stone' by developing their non- PhD academic staff as they continue being on-the-job student cum worker. Such allegation raise doubts about the efficacy of academic S-D practices in addressing public quest for quality education. This is against the fact that universities are investing heavily, materially or otherwise in PhD-S-D. It was therefore necessary to examine the comparative influence of on-the-job and off-the-job PhD-S-D practices on job performance.

Results

Job performance output before and after PhD-S-D were measured using value-numerical job performance index as was indicated by academic staff. Opinions on influence of PhD-S-D academic staff job performance of CoDs, former MSU/MMUST PHD-S-D academic staff respondents and UMPs were also sought to give a wholesome picture of the job performance scenario.

Data was processed based on the following S-D practices:

- i. On-the-job PhD-S-D practices
- ii. Off-the-job PhD-S-D practices

This study relied mainly on PhD-S-D academic staff self report. However, previous studies on validity of teacher self-report present mixed results. Because of their controversial standing, to increase quality, the data collection tools should behold highly detailed measures of practice to capture actual teaching practices (Goer, et al, 2008). For this study, both tangible and intangible aspects of PhD-S-D academic staff job performance- Research, Publication and Community Service, Actual Teaching Activity and Departmental Teamwork- were value-rated for consideration and measured. Though reliability of self-reports are difficult to establish, these self-measure tools can be used for observable factors, besides intentions and beliefs from the perspective of the teacher more accurately than from the stand point of a mere observer, such as a student or supervisor (Axelrod, 2008). On this note, the fact that 22(51%) CoD were not occupying these offices before the onset of PhD-S-D activities among their current PhD-S-D academic staff, reaffirms that self-report was therefore the most appropriate data collection approach for this study.

As reported by Lew (2011), performance indicators have emerged as a method used internationally to manage and assess higher education. However, he argues that too much focus on these performance indicators has many weaknesses. For instance, it may encourage

academic staff to direct their effort away from functional goals to concentrate only on those being measured. Besides, if addressed through self-evaluation, Lew (2011) and 6(60%) DFDS agree that there may be strategic manipulation by dishonest individuals to score highly due to attachment to favourability in comparative results. Even with these weaknesses, self-evaluation was considered to be the most practical method for this study circumstances.

The findings are presented under the following subsections:

i. Research, Publication and Community Service

ii. Actual Teaching Activity

iii. Departmental Teamwork

Research, Publication and Community Service

With regard to Research, Publication and Community Service, it was necessary to find out from CoD, the day-to-day supervisors of the department about what they thought was the influence of PhD-S-D. They were subjected to a Likert Scale and the responses were as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1.

Responses of CoD on Influence of PhD-S-D on Academic Staff Research, Publication and Community Service Job Performance Output

Job Performance Indicator		SA	A	N	D	SD	T	MR
Increased research & publication	f	1	10	26	4	2	43	
	%	2	23	61	9	5	100	
	Score	5	40	78	8	2	133	3.09
Increased seminar paper presentation	f	3	4	31	5	0	43	
	%	7	9	72	12	0	100	
	Score	21	36	93	10	0	160	3.72
Increased conference participation	f	0	11	21	11	0	43	
	%	0	26	48	26	0	100	
	Score	0	44	63	22	0	129	3.0
Increased consultancy	f	0	9	24	7	3	43	
	%	0	21	56	16	7	100	
	Score	0	36	72	14	3	125	2.91
Increased supervision of thesis/ Project	f	2	3	34	3	1	43	
	%	5	7	79	7	2	100	
	Score	10	12	102	6	1	131	3.04
Average Mean Rate							129.6	3.15

Classification of Influence of PhD-S-D on Job Performance Output

3.75< = Very High Influence; 3.75-3.26= High Influence; 3.25-2.76= Moderate Influence;

2.75- 2.26= Low Influence;>2.25 = Very Low Influence

Research, Publication and Community Service was Mean Rated at 3.15 (moderate influence). One of the CoD said that they may not know how, what or whether their staff may be engaged in private research and other outreach related programmes since their mandate is within the confines of the university. He explained that he only took periodic tally of their publications in journals and books when the situation demanded. However, he admitted that there was a lot of good work going on by lecturers both at public and private levels. This was in agreement with one UMP who said that academic staff are under no obligation to declare their personal

jobs to the university unless there is evident conflict of interest. The 43(100%) CoD were non-committal as to whether those who underwent on-the-job or off-the-job PhD-S-D had better job performance output. However, when asked to rank influence on job performance output in order of priority based on the 3 categories considered, they ranked Research, Publication and Community first, followed by Actual Teaching Activity and lastly, Departmental Teamwork. This concurred with questionnaire response from all the other categories of respondents, except for UMP who were not subjected to this question in interview schedule.

The study sought to compare findings based on on-the-job and off-the-job PhD-S-D respondents to ascertain allegations that those who underwent on-the-job PhD-S-D had inferior job performance output. It subjected respondents in the 2 categories to a uniform questionnaire whereby they were required to indicate job performance output averages in precise quantities (1,2,4,5, etc) in the period before and after attainment of PhD. The findings were subjected to a T-test then compared as to whether there were significant differences in job performance output between them. The findings are as in Table 2.

Table 2.

Paired Samples Test of On-the-job and Off-the-job PhD-S-D Job Performance Index for Research, Publication and Community Service Output Before and After PhD

Paired Samples Test									
Paired Differences				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Job Indicator	Performance	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper			
Pair 1a	On-the-job Research and publication output before PhD & after PhD	S-D: -.59259	1.97645	.26896	-1.13206	-.05313	-2.203	53	.092
Pair 1b	Off-the-job Research and publication output Before PhD & After PhD	S-D: -.19444	.84984	.10015	-.39415	.00526	-1.941	71	.056
Pair 2a	On-the-job Seminar paper presentation output Before PhD & After PhD	S-D: -.70370	1.32650	.18051	-1.06577	-.34164	-3.898	53	.000
Pair 2b	Off-the-job Seminar paper presentation output Before PhD & After PhD	S-D: -.77778	1.07758	.12699	-1.03100	-.52456	-6.124	71	.000
Pair 3a	On-the-job Conference participation output Before PhD & After PhD	S-D: -.70370	1.44887	.19717	-1.09917	-.30824	-3.569	53	.001
Pair 3b	Off-the-job Conference participation output Before PhD & After PhD	S-D: -.45070	1.70536	.20239	-.85436	-.04705	-2.227	71	.029

Pair 4a	On-the-job Consultancy Before PhD & PhD	S-D: -.38889 output 24	1.816	.24716	-.88463	.10685	-1.573	53	.122
Pair 4b	Off-the-job Consultancy Before PhD & PhD	S-D: .40278 output 65	1.430	.16860	.06659	.73896	2.389	71	.172
Pair 5a	On-the-job Supervision thesis/project Before PhD & PhD	S-D: - of 1.98148 output 75	1.420	.19334	-2.36927	-	-10.249	53	.000
Pair 5b	Off-the-job Supervision thesis/project Before PhD & PhD	S-D: - of 1.04225 output 77	1.126	.13372	-1.30896	-.77555	-7.794	71	.000

KEY: SD- Standard Deviation

*Statistically significant at the 0.05 level

The study adopted a 'single difference approach' whereby every single increase, stagnation or decrease was considered as significant for the study given that there were no specific nor uniform-across-departments or faculties set standards against which PhD-S-D academic staff job performance could be weighted. Out of the 5(100%) job performance indicators considered in this category, 5(100%) of them indicated coincidence of either statistical significance or insignificance (Table 2) leading to the conclusion that their output was the same in all respects.

Actual Teaching Activity

Teaching is incomplete without considering the learner aspect since it is easy to gauge validity of instruction from the perspective of the consumer, the students. According to Goer, et al(2008) in a survey of 12 strategies to measure teaching effectiveness, students were better judges of faculty effectiveness since they could assess the following:

- i. Their increased knowledge and comprehension
- ii. Perceived changes in motivation towards subject taught
- iii. Observed teacher behaviour relevant to competent teaching such as punctuality
- iv. Student consumerism; information not relevant to competent teaching but important to students such as class attendance policy, homework, and text book costs.

In this study, the impracticality of using students to evaluate PhD-S-D academic staff stemmed from the fact that there is high likelihood that the cohort handled by an academic staff before the commencement of his PhD-S-D programme is likely to have graduated by the time he completes the S-D programme. They would therefore not be available to experience the pre-PhD-S-D and post-PhD-S-D teaching scenarios so as to make comparison, more so since the period of inception of MSU in 1990 and MMUST in 2002.

It was necessary to find out from CoD, the day-to-day supervisors of the department about what they thought was the influence of PhD-S-D on job performance. They were subjected to a Likert Scale and the responses were as indicated in Table 3.

Table 3.

Responses of CoD on Influence of PhD-S-D on Academic Staff Actual Teaching Activity Job Performance Output

Job Performance Indicator		SA	A	N	D	SD	T	MR
Improved teaching time management	f	0	0	20	12	11	43	
	%	0	0	46	28	26	100	
	Score	0	0	60	24	11	95	2.21
Improved teacher-learner involvement	f	0	4	31	5	3	43	
	%	0	9	72	12	7	100	
	Score	0	16	93	10	3	122	2.83
Improved examination feedback	f	0	0	33	5	5	43	
	%	0	0	76	12	12	100	
	Score	0	0	99	10	5	114	2.65
Actual Teaching Activity							110.3	2.56

Classification of Influence of PhD-S-D on Job Performance Output

3.75< = Very High Influence; 3.75-3.26= High Influence; 3.25-2.76= Moderate Influence; 2.75- 2.26= Low Influence; >2.25 = Very Low Influence

With regard to Actual Teaching Activity as shown in Table (3), CoD Mean Rate at 2.56(low influence). The general 'Neutral' response indicates that CoD were non-committal on whether PhD-S-D influences positively or negatively on Actual Teaching Activity job performance output. Mwebi (2012) identified the quality of teaching in university as one of the key factors that determine quality of a university and its student completion rates. Ralph (2003) cited in Axelrod (2008) identified 5 criterion upon which quality teaching can be judged. These were; commitment to learners, knowledge of material, organization and management of the environment, desire to improve, and collaboration. He concluded that exemplary university teaching is discernible, and the quality can be assessed using Likert Scales.

The study sought to compare findings based on on-the-job and off-the-job PhD-S-D practices to ascertain allegations that those who underwent on-the-job PhD-S-D had inferior job performance output with regard to Actual Teaching Activity. It subjected respondents in the 2 categories to a uniform questionnaire whereby they were required to indicate job performance output averages in precise quantities (1,2,4,5, etc) in the period before and after attainment of PhD. The findings were subjected to a T-test then compared as to whether there were significant differences in job performance output between them. The findings are as in

Table 4.

Table 4. Paired Samples Test of On-the-job and Off-the-job PhD-S-D Job Performance Index for Actual Teaching Activity Output Before and After PhD.

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences			95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Job Performance Indicator		Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper			
Pair 1a	On-the-job S-D : Teaching time management output Before PhD & After PhD	-.05556	.35907	.04886	-.15356	.04245	-1.137	53	.261
Pair 1b	Off-the-job S-D : Teaching time management output Before PhD & After PhD	-.16667	.58140	.06852	-.30329	-.03004	-2.432	71	.118
Pair 2a	On the-job S-D :Teacher-learner involvement output Before PhD & After PhD	-.05556	.30199	.04109	-.13798	.02687	-1.352	53	.182

Pair 2b	Off-the-job	S-	.02778	.6045	.07124	-.11427	.16983	.390	71	.698
	D: Teacher-learner involvement output			0						
	Before PhD & After PhD									
Pair 3a	On-the-job	S-D:	-.14815	.3585	.04880	-.24602	-.05027	-3.036	53	.004
	Examination feedback output			8						
	Before PhD & After PhD									
Pair 3b	Off-the-job	S-	-.06944	.2559	.03017	-.12960	-.00929	-2.302	71	.024
	D: Examination feedback output			9						
	Before PhD & After PhD									

*Statistically significant at the 0.05 level

The findings revealed that 3(100%) of them indicated coincidence of either statistical significance or insignificance. This revealed that regardless of whether an academic staff underwent on-the-job and off-the-job PhD-S-D job performance output was the same (Table 4). It was concluded that in this regard, it did not matter whether an academic staff attained his PhD by on-the-job and off-the-job mode.

Departmental Teamwork

Ordinarily, CoD perform a supervisory role whereby they undertake both formative and summative evaluation. Some of the aspects, they focus on may include; leadership, initiative, judgment, customer awareness, teamwork, decision-making ability, self-discipline, quality of work, diligence and cost-consciousness (Quick & Nelson, 2011). In addition, assert that the manager feels very uncomfortable playing God given that whatever his perception of his subordinate is, he is expected to confront him in an authoritarian way, prescribing courses of actions some which he may neither understand himself nor believe in. Such evaluation is fallible. It is noteworthy that for 43(100%) CoD, the main use of appraisal results is to enhance CoD control over their subordinates in the department.

It was necessary to find out from CoD, the day-to-day supervisors of the department about what they thought was the influence of PhD-S-D on job performance. They were subjected to a Likert Scale and the responses were as indicated in Table 5.

Table 5.

Responses of CoD on Influence of PhD-S-D on Academic Staff Departmental Teamwork Job Performance Output

Job Performance Indicator		SA	A	N	D	SD	T	MR
Better team player	f	0	0	9	11	23	43	
	%	0	0	21	26	53	100	
	Score	0	0	27	22	23	72	1.67
Better focus on specific work objectives	f	0	0	34	5	4	43	
	%	0	0	79	12	9	100	
	Score	0	0	102	10	4	116	2.69
Willingness to take up extra responsibility	f	1	9	17	10	6	43	
	%	2	21	40	23	14	100	
	Score	5	36	51	20	6	118	2.74
Departmental Teamwork							102.0	2.36

KEY: T- total; f- Frequency

Classification of Influence of PhD-S-D on Job Performance Output

3.75 < = Very High Influence; 3.75-3.26= High Influence; 3.25-2.76= Moderate Influence; 2.75- 2.26= Low Influence; >2.25 = Very Low Influence

On Departmental Teamwork, CoD indicate as shown in Table 5, a Mean Rate of 2.36 (low influence). 1(11%) said that PhD-S-D prepares personnel to be multiple proficient. This was in agreement with one PhD holder who had undergone off-the-job S-D who asserted in relation to their work in an ordinary semester;

Belonging to departmental committees and to faculty committees, to other committees in the university such as quality maintenance...disciplinary engagements, welfare activities and expectations, representing the university outside and within the country, public relations, seeking out students for enrolment, thesis supervision, sourcing funds for university, giving feedback to university management, counseling peers and mentoring junior staff.

The study sought to compare findings based on on-the-job and off-the-job PhD-S-D practice to ascertain allegations that those who underwent on-the-job PhD-S-D had inferior job performance output with regard to Departmental Teamwork. It subjected respondents in the 2 categories to a uniform questionnaire whereby they were required to indicate job performance output averages per year in precise quantities (1,2,4,5, etc) in the period before and after attainment of PhD. The findings were subjected to a T-test then compared as to whether there were significant differences in job performance output between them. The findings are as in Table 6.

Table 6.

Paired Sample Test of On-the-job and Off-the-job PhD-S-D Job Performance Index for Departmental Teamwork Before and After PhD.

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences			95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Job performance Indicator	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper			
Pair 1a	On-the-job S-D: Team playing output Before & After PhD	-.11111	.31722	.04317	-.19770	-.02453	-2.574	53	.013
Pair 1b	Off-the-job S-D: Team playing output Before & After PhD	-.06944	.25599	.03017	-.12960	-.00929	-2.302	71	.024
Pair 2a	On-the-job S-D: Focus on specific work objectives output Before & After PhD	.11111	.6635	.09029	-.06999	.29222	1.231	53	.224
Pair 2b	Off-the-job S-D: Focus on specific work objectives output Before & After PhD	-.27778	.9527	.11228	-.50166	-.05390	-2.474	71	.016

Pair 3a	On-the-job	-.16667	.4233	.05761	-.28223	-.05111	-2.893	53	.06
	S-D	:	7						
	Willingness								
	to take up								
	extra								
	responsibilit								
	ies output								
	Before &								
	After PhD								
Pair 3b	Off-the-job	-.09722	.9217	.10863	-.31382	.11937	-.895	71	.374
	S-D:		2						
	Willingness								
	to take up								
	extra								
	responsibilit								
	ies output								
	Before &								
	After PhD								

*Statistically significant at the 0.05 level

In this regard, there was coincidence of output in terms of statistical significance in 1/3 parameters, statistical insignificance in 1/3 parameters and for the remaining 1/3 ie focus on specific work objectives, on-the-job PhD-S-D noted statistical insignificance whereas off-the-job PhD-S-D realized statistical significance based on a set alpha at 0.05. While academic staff will continue to emphasize on Research, Publication and Community Service, they should spend enough discretionary time on quality processes to keep the improvement ball rolling. A vision lessens internal debate and helps an institution to focus its energy hence significantly reducing organizational conflict. It was also important to note that as revealed by 4(9%) of the CoD staff making judgment on value addition on PhD staff is not a simple task. This is because after graduating with a PhD, they perform tasks unique to the new status such as supervision and teaching of Masters Degree and PhD students alongside belonging to other boards and committees which they could not access without PhD-S-D. In this respect, 1(2%) CoD was in agreement with 3(30%) DFDS that for the evaluation to be objective, then these PhD-S-D graduates may be considered in cohorts, possibly based on graduation dates versus specified expected output.

Conclusion

The study had the following conclusion:

With regard to the influence of on-the-job and off-the-job S-D practices on job performance it was established that the output was largely the same given that 10(90.9 %) of its output parameters measured revealed coincidence of either statistical significance or statistical insignificance level based on set alpha of 0.05. The following had statistically significant influence; for Research, Publication and Community Service- seminar paper presentation, conference participation and supervision of thesis or project; for Actual Teaching Activity- examination feedback; and for Departmental Teamwork- team playing, focus on specific work objectives for off-the-job category of respondents. On the contrary, the following had statistically insignificant influence; for Research, Publication and Community Service- research and publication and consultancy; for Actual teaching Activity- teaching time management and teacher-learner involvement; and for Departmental Teamwork- focus on specific work objectives for on-the-job category of respondents and willingness to take extra responsibilities. The study also established that there was concurrence on the opinion of on-the-job PhD-S-D respondents, off-the-job PhD-S-D respondents, former MSU/MMUST PhD-S-D respondents and CoD on ranking of the influence of PhD-S-D on job performance whereby Research, Publication and Community Service was first, Actual Teaching Activity was second and last was Departmental Teamwork. All respondents exclusive of former MSU/MMUST academic staff, who were not subjected to the interview schedule, were in agreement that regardless of whether one pursued PhD by on-the-job and off-the-job mode, PhD-S-D improved job performance output in MSU/MMUST.

Recommendations

- i. Universities may adopt either on-the-job or off-the-job PhD-S-D practice based on their S-D policies, their financial, their manpower or their circumstantial conveniences. This is based on the fact that this study disapproved allegations of comparative inferior academic opportunity for on-the-job PhD-S-D academic staff that was alleged to translate into inferior job performance output given the 90.9% equivalence.

- ii. Universities should restructure PhD-S-D cost-effectively so as to prepare academic staff better for enhanced job performance output. This is based on the fact that regardless of S-D practice there is statistically insignificant increase in output, based on a set alpha of 0.05, in five job performance indicators negating the intentions for PhD-S-D which should achieve significant increase in job performance output given massive investment by individuals, families, and private and public organizations.

Suggestion for Further Research

A comparative study on students' perception of job performance output by PhD and non-PhD academic staff in universities. This should focus on student appropriate aspects such as lesson attendance, lesson preparedness, teacher-learner involvement and content delivery to ascertain allegations that some PhDs perform below par.

References

- Anyamele, S. C. (2007). *Managing Professional Competencies of Teaching Staff in the University: Views of Finnish University Leaders*. Vol.5 (1)1-7
<http://www.academicleadership.org/article>. Retrieved 12-6-2011 at 10.00am
- Armstrong, M. A. (2009). *Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. London: Kogan page Ltd.
- Axelrod, P. (2008). Student Perspectives on Good Teaching: What History Reveals- Academic Matters. *The Journal of Higher Education* 24(227) Retrieved 13-10-2011 at 6 pm.
<http://www.ocufa.on.ca/AM-Feb08/Feb08p24>.
- Ezati, B., & Mugimu, C. B. (2010). Possibilities and Challenges of Providing Continuous Staff Training and Development in Pedagogy for Higher Education Staff In Uganda: A case of Makerere University *Comparative and International Higher Education*. vol. (2), 6-9.
<http://74.238.258/search/srpca>. Retrieved 10/6/2011 at 12.30 pm.
- Goer, L. G., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness: A Research Synthesis*. Comprehensive Centre for Teacher Quality. Washington DC
- Gudo, C. O., Oanda, I. O., & Olel, M. A. (2011). Role of Institutional Managers in Quality Assurance: Reflections on Kenya's University Education. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*. Vol 1(2) 113-124.
- Jamil, A., Atta, A. M., Ali, V., Balochi, J., & Ayaz, M. (2011). Effects of in-service Training in Meliorating Teachers' Performance at Secondary School level *International Journal of Academic Research* vol.3 (2) 624-628.
- Kairu, P. (2011). *The Fall and Fall of University Education Standards in Kenya*. Daily Nation – Daily Kenya Living pp. 1-3
- Lew, T. Y. (2011). *Affective Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention of Academics in Malaysia*. Paper Presented at the International Conference on Business and Economics Vol. 1. IACSIT Press, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Mwebi, B. (2012). Expansion of Private Universities in Kenya and Its Implication on Student Characteristics, Access, Quality and Completion Rate. Unpublished PhD Thesis: Maseno University.
- Nsindabi, A. (2006). *Challenges Facing University Chancellors in the Globalised World*. The First University Council of East Africa (IUCEA). Chancellors and Vice- Chancellors Conference, Uganda.
- Otu, J. A. (2011). Teachers in Ghana: Issues of Training, Remuneration and Effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 26(1), 38-51.

Quick, J. C., & Nelson, D. L. (2011). *Principles of Organizational Behaviour: Realities and Challenges*; South Eastern Cengage Learning, Singapore.

Republic of Kenya. (2007). *Vision 2030 Blue Print*. Nairobi: Ministry of State, Planning and National Development, Kenya.

Walingo, K. M. (2010). Assessment of the Balanced Score-card for performance Management in Public Universities in Kenya. Unpublished MBA Project, Maseno University.