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ABSTRACT

Provision of facilities and materials plus establishment of teaching staff are very key in ensuring a university lecturers productivity. There is need to assess top management’s provision of these facilities. This study aimed at establishing the institutional factors influencing lecturers’ productivity at Kenya Methodist University (KeMU). The research objectives for the study were to examine how the top management’s provision of physical facilities, office space, library facilities, establishment of the academic staff and opportunities for personal growth and development influences lecturers’ productivity. The results of this study provide useful data on factors influencing lecturers’ productivity. As KeMU strives to be the University of Choice due to its excellence in ensuring quality through lecturers’ productivity, the study provides guidance to the top management in decision making on provision of the institutional factors influencing lecturers’ productivity. This study was anchored on Herzberg’s Two Factor theory also known as Motivation-Hygiene theory. The study employed descriptive survey design, census and simple random sampling in selecting the sample of lecturers and students respectively from KeMU, Nairobi Campus. The target population was all full time lecturers at KeMU Nairobi campus and students in the School of Business and the school of Computing and Informatics at KeMU, Nairobi Campus. 10% of the total population was used to calculate the targeted sample. The sample size was 97 lecturers and 162 students. The researcher used questionnaires with open and closed ended questions as the main tool for data collection. There were two questionnaires: One for the lecturers and the other one for the students. Data collected was coded, cleaned, categorized and processed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings of the study suggest that top management has provided most of the physical facilities for the lecturers. However, office space for students mentoring and guidance as well as lecturers office sharing were not adequate. The same applied for lecturers’ research/study room. In addition, the findings showed that the majority of lecturers (65.8%) disagreed on existence of progressive periodic salary increment and a majority of them (56%) did not agree to availability of in-house skills training. The study recommends that the university’s management puts measures in place to provide appropriate office sharing which will translate to more space for mentoring and guidance. The top management also needs to create more time for the lecturers through reducing their work-load. This can be achieved through employing more lecturers and proper distribution of the administrative jobs. The study also recommends increased provision and use of modern teaching tools so as to enhance more learning and productivity. Finally and of importance, the study recommends a revamp of the motivational factors available in the university.
1.1 Background to the Study

Education is viewed as a good investment in a nation’s development. The reason for this is that it is expected that the educational system will produce the quality and quantity of human resources required for the economy's growth. In the last two decades, university education in Kenya, as it has been in most of Africa, has expanded, both in the number of institutions and student enrolments. This expansion has been explained in terms of a response to social demand and developmental imperative (Ibrahim & Jowi, 2013). This is mainly due to the expanding number of KCSE candidates that obtain the required grade (C+ above) for admission to a university. Other factors that have contributed to increased demand for university education include the perception that university education guarantees lifelong secure career thereby requiring further education and training and the desire to advance in current employment and create prospects for future careers.

Moreover, individuals who attained lower qualifications are finding universities more flexible than before. This has created the module II group of students which largely comprise the working class, taking studies in the evening or weekend.
In response to this demand, the government has continued to expand public universities by opening several constituent colleges. The latest move by the government was to have a double intake of students (International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2011). At the same time, education has become the passport to accelerated economic growth in every country with competition among private and government-owned institutions all prompting institutions to put numbers and quality teaching on their agenda. Obviously, this expansion has put a lot of weight on institutional facilities and management. With the higher education becoming a major driver of economic competitiveness in an increasingly knowledge-driven global economy, Malik (2009) pointed out that the university education is currently facing challenges it never faced before. These challenges according to him include; increased number of students, use of technology assessment, diverse background of students, globalization-learning corporate style, management etc. put extra pressure and responsibility on the shoulder of the lecturer and it is even worse when the institutional factors are not conducive to the lecturers.

University education occupies a cardinal position in every society all over the world. Indeed, education is the instrument for all-round development and the lecturers being the pivot of the education system, they are the major determinant of any educative process in the universities because on them lies the success or failure
of the education system (Journal of educational and social research Volume 3). As Kyalo C, (2013) puts it, other than having sufficient knowledge of content, pedagogy, context and students needed for the teaching and learning process, lecturers ought to be adequately supported by the department they belong to or teach for and the entire institution for high productivity.

Since lecturers are among other employees spend fifty percent of their lives within indoor environments, which greatly influence their mental status, actions, abilities and performance as Sundstrom, (1994) put it, it is important that the work environment is motivating. According to (Carnevale 1992, Clements-Croome 1997) as cited in Hameed A. & Amjad S. (2009) better outcomes and increased productivity is assumed to be the result of better workplace environment and better physical environment of office boosts the employees and ultimately improve their productivity. Various literature by Hameed A. & Amjad S. (2009) pertaining to the study of multiple offices and office buildings indicate that the factors such as dissatisfaction, cluttered workplaces and the physical environment are playing a major role in the loss of employees’ productivity.

A better workplace environment produces better results. The provision of a suitable physical work environment for employees is one of the contributing factors to employees’ dignity at work and productivity (Gensler, 2006 in the Journal of
Physical work environment refers to offices, cubicles, buildings, and mobile workplaces in which workers perform their work (Davenport, 2005). In the corporate world, it is believed that physical work environment rather than remuneration, accounts for the level of employee’s performance on the job most times. This is because the former is believed to have some bearing on employees’ error rate, innovation level, absenteeism and turnover rate while the latter has a temporary effect on employees (Chandrasekar, 2011). This is not different from the academic world since every employee would require a good working environment for their productivity at work.

Lecturers are among the group of employees classified as knowledge workers whose work uses mental faculty and involves the use of information, creativity and decision making (Mohanta, 2010). According to Davenport (2005), knowledge workers prefer closed/cellular office because it allows them to enjoy uninterrupted concentration required by the nature of their work which open-plan office design does not cater for. Research finding showed that less distractions increases workers’ productivity (Ajala, 2012). According to Journal of Education and Training Vol. 1, No. 1 (2014), academic staff in Botswana tertiary institutions perform teaching and related activities which require concentration such as lesson preparation, drafting and marking of tests and examinations and compilation of marks, and one-on-one consultation with students in open-plan offices. Which according to the said
journal, causes unwanted disruptions which eventually affect the lectures’ productivity in their work which ideally requires a lot of concentration. Therefore, during the academic planning stage of any institution, the planners should ensure lectures are well factored and their needs are well considered. Creating a work environment in which employees are productive is essential to increased profits for any organization; universities included. Therefore, the top management of any university, should focus on the strategies to maximize lecturers’ productivity by ensuring adequate personal motivation and the infrastructure of the work environment.

Part Two of the Universities Regulation 2013 Section 6 (1) of Kenya stipulates that an application for establishing a university should be accompanied with a proposal setting out among others the academic resources, including: land, physical facilities, finances, staff, library services and equipment. All this is meant to ensure smooth running of the institution through ensuring the comfort of the students, lecturers and all other members of staff for the entire institutional productivity. The University Act 2012 Article (10) of Kenya also stipulates that education shall be guided by values and principles in promotion of quality and relevance. Quality in higher education can be achieved through ensuring lecturers’ increased productivity by the management providing the right facilities which enhance productivity.
As higher education systems grow and diversify, institutional top management must be committed to capturing all the dimensions that affect lecturers’ productivity. And since apart from the job scope itself, one factor that significantly influences how lectures feel about work is the environment: everything that forms part of employees’ involvement with the work itself, such as the relationship with co-workers and supervisors, organizational culture, room for personal development, etc. It is paramount that institutions of higher learning provide these factors to the lecturers so as to enhance their productivity. These appropriate factors translate to a positive work environment which makes employees feel good about coming to work, and this provides the motivation to sustain them throughout the day, hence increased productivity leading to goals’ achievement and eventual institutional growth and sustainability. Since the goals of education in any country can only be realized or achieved if the organizational climate and environment be made appropriate for better service delivery of the educators, it is the duty of the top management of any institution of higher learning to ensure that factors that influence lecturers’ productivity are quite conducive for the lecturers.

Generally, studies on productivity tend to focus on corporate organizations and scarcely on educational settings. This study therefore, focused on the institutional factors that influence lecturer’s productivity. The findings will be of great
importance to higher institutions of learning and are hoped to improve lecturer’s working environments hence satisfaction and improved productivity, happy and well equipped graduates, mass expansion of the universities and eventual economic and social growth of individuals as well as the country and the world at large.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The demand for university education in Kenya continues to increase and has outpaced supply. Already there has been complaints and protests from lecturers of public universities. The lecturers are of the view that the universities are not ready for the double intake and they have severally threatened to lay down tools if the decision is not reversed (Musembi 2011). This raises questions on the level of preparedness by these universities for the increasing numbers, considering existing exponential growth witnessed in the last decade due to parallel programmes and whether it will not further dilute the quality of university education. KeMU is a private university with several campuses in most of the Kenyan major cities and the Nairobi campus is based at the Central Business District. Therefore, there is need to assess the institutional factors available in institutions of higher learning and how they influence lecturers’ productivity at KeMU, Nairobi Campus.
1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to investigate the factors influencing lectures’ productivity at the Kenya Methodist University.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The following objectives guided this study.

i. To examine how the top management’s provision of physical facilities influences lecturers’ productivity at KeMU, Nairobi Campus

ii. To determine ways in which top management’s provision of office space influences lecturers’ productivity at KeMU, Nairobi Campus

iii. To assess ways in which top management’s provision of library facilities influences lectures’ productivity at KeMU, Nairobi Campus

iv. To establish how the adequacy of the academic staff provided by the top managements influences lecturers’ productivity at KeMU, Nairobi Campus

v. To determine how the top management’s provision of opportunities for personal growth and development influences lecturers’ productivity at KeMU, Nairobi Campus

1.5 Research Questions

The research was anchored in the following research questions.
i. How does the top management’s provision of physical facilities influence lecturer’s productivity at KeMU, Nairobi Campus?

ii. In which ways does the office space provided by the top management influence lecturer’s productivity at KeMU, Nairobi campus?

iii. In which ways do the library facilities provided by the top management influence lecturers’ productivity learning environment at KeMU, Nairobi Campus?

iv. How adequate are the academic staff provided by the top management and how does it influence lecturers’ productivity at KeMU, Nairobi Campus.

v. How does the top management’s provision for opportunities for personal growth and development influence lecturers’ productivity at KeMU, Nairobi campus?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study was helpful to KeMU top management as well as other universities to improve on quality of the factors needed for the productivity of their lecturers. This will lead to much improvement so as to meet the CUE (Commission for University Education) requirements during inspection. It also assisted the top management to formulate more informed strategies concerning academic staff productivity and stop generalizing on all workers hence, increased lecturers’
productivity. The significance of this research cannot be overemphasized because it is a critical quality assurance measure and indicator.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

The study is limited in that the researcher only expected the respondents to give genuine answers which may not be the case- not all people are truthful. Cooperation by some lecturers also constrained the study. At the same time, being a private institution, the respondents involved seemed to withhold some information for fear of victimization. However, the researcher assured them of confidentiality and the fact that the information is for academic work only.

1.8 Delimitations of the Study

Given that KeMU has six campuses across the country, the research was delimited to the Nairobi campus. It was further delimited to the fulltime lecturers, Business Administration and Information Science students of Nairobi campus and not part time or other faculties.
1.9 Basic Assumptions of the Study

The study assumed that:

i. Respondents offered truthful and correct information.

ii. That all respondents were capable of identifying the factors influencing lecturers’ productivity at KeMU, Nairobi campus

1.10 Definition of Significant Terms

The following are the definitions of significant terms used in this study:

**Academic staff** refers to a trained professional who is qualified to teach in an institute of higher learning.

**Institutional factors** refer to lecturers’ working environment: working facilities, institutional location, teaching and learning policies and resources.

**Lecturer** refers to a person who teaches at the institutions of higher learning.

**Lecturer Productivity** refers to what is produced during the time a lecturer spends on their work.

**Library Facilities** refer to a collection of sources of information and similar resources, made accessible to lecturers and students for reference or borrowing.

**Office Space** refers to a room or rooms in a building that provide a suitable environment for office, an area where lectures perform their administrative, guidance and mentoring jobs.
Opportunities for Personal Growth and Development refer to lecturers’ ability to move upward in terms of promotions, salary increment, and knowledge acquisition.

Top Management refers to the most senior staff of the university, including the Vice Chancellor and his deputies.

University refers to an institution of higher learning which grants academic degrees in a variety of subjects and provides both undergraduate and postgraduate education.

1.11 Organization of the Study

This study was organized in five chapters: chapter one consisted of background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations and delimitations of the study, basic assumptions and definition of significant terms of the study. Chapter two dealt with the literature review under the following subtopics: office space and lecturers’ productivity, physical facilities and lecturers’ productivity, library facilities and lecturers’ productivity and adequacy of teaching staff and lecturers’ productivity, summary of literature review, theoretical and conceptual frameworks were also highlighted respectively.
Chapter three consisted of the research methodology which described the research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, instruments validity, instruments reliability, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques. While Chapter four contained the findings, results of statistical analysis and their discussions. While chapter five summarizes the results and findings of the study and provides conclusions and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter reviewed related literature which provided some relevant information required to address the research questions in the previous section. The section included institutional factors influencing lecturers’ productivity reviewed as follows: office space and lectures’ productivity, physical facilities and lecturers’ productivity, library facilities and lecturers’ productivity, adequacy of teaching staff then opportunities for personal growth and development and lecturers’ productivity.

2.2 The Concept of Institutional Factors and Lecturers’ Productivity
Aoki (2001) specifies institutions to cover shared beliefs, endogenous rules and summary equilibrium representations of the policy processes. According to Alverio (2010) institutional factors in institutions of higher learning involve the rules, norms, and routines that guide a behavior- in teaching and learning which the core business is while teaching is the ability to transfer knowledge so that the learners acquire knowledge and skills for themselves. Institutional factors at university level have several factors that need to be addressed. For example, lecturers’ working facilities, working environment, institutional location, teaching and learning
policies, environment, and resources among others. On the other hand, Productivity is a concept that depends on the context in which it employed. It does not have a singular definite criterion measure or operational definition (Wasiams et. al, 1996) as cited in Ali S.,Ali A.,& Adan A.(2013).

According to the Economics dictionary, productivity is the ratio between the output volume and the volume of inputs. In other words, it measures how efficiently production inputs such as labour and capital, are being used in an economy to produce a given level of output. According to Barbara K. and Vicki J. (2007), there is lack of agreement about what lecturers’ productivity means. As they put it, scholars seeking to examine the productivity of four-year College and university faculty typically focus on non-instructional productivity and more specifically on research productivity. When examined, research or scholarly productivity is typically measured by counting the number and type of publications over a specific time period. Barbara and Vicki also indicate that when productivity is defined as what is produced during the time faculty spend on their work, the concept includes such things as credit hours generated or articles published to them, faculty productivity is more appropriately defined in terms of outcomes such as pass rates in certification exams and job placement of graduates. However, they concede that understanding what faculty do that is, how they spend their time, is “the first step in defining lecturers’ productivity.
Lecturer productivity according to Kaniki (2003) is “the efficiency with which lecturers perform their multiple responsibilities of learning (product of teaching), knowledge and scholarship (the product of research and other scholarly activities) institutional, community and professional well-being (the products of shared governance, community service and professional activities’’). Ensuring academic productivity is critical for survival in today’s highly competitive university education environment.

2.3 Physical Facilities and Lecturers’ Productivity

One of the fundamental job requirements being a working environment that allows people to perform their work optimally under comfortable conditions, it is paramount that university lecturers get supportive and sufficient office facilities which promote productivity. Such working environment may include facilities such as internet enabled computers for research work and online communication with learners, office phones, proper lighting, comfortable desks and seats. Physical facilities such as office phones and office computers are also essential for enhancing lecturers’ productivity thus they should be provided. The working conditions are very important to the organization. If the employees have negative perception of their working conditions, they are likely to be absent, have stress-related illness, and their productivity and commitment tend to be low. On the

The physical facilities can be used to exert a positive influence on the lecturer’s productivity. A study by Hameed and Amjad (2009) on “office design factors” such as furniture, noise, lighting, temperature and spatial arrangements revealed lighting as having the greater impact on staff productivity, followed by spatial arrangements. Leaman (1990) also presented the idea that a possible relationship exists between the quality of the working environment and the productivity of its occupiers. Since productivity is an important factor in every organization, universities are not exceptional for their progress depend to a large extend on how productively lecturers participate in quality teaching and learning as well as their research work. Thus, the physical facilities are tools which can be used to exert a positive influence in that respect. Also, the efficiency of any university system depends to a large extend upon how human resources; lecturers included are motivated and provided with adequate and conducive environment so as to perform their duties. (10th Euro FM Research symposium, 2011.)In essence, decent facilities make additional contributions to lecturers’ productivity. High productivity enhanced by supportive and sufficient physical facilities might be considered as a distinctive feature contributing to the overall quality of the institution.
2.4 Office Space and Lecturers’ Productivity

According to Vischer (2005), office type connotes status marker. A typical office is also designed based on the nature of job or business activities and employees that will work in that office (Mike, 2010). Research by (DeMarco, 2002) indicates that software developers who work in spaces characterized by less noise distractions perform far better (are more productive) compared to their colleagues who work in environments where they could be more easily disturbed by noise. O’Neil (2008) in his study found that more than 50% of the participants asserted that a closed office is a marker of higher status, a place of dignity compared to open-plan workspaces. However, in most institutions lecturers spend their days in open space offices. This has both positive and negative impact on lectures’ productivity.

Despite the positive effects of open-plan office on its occupants, there are significant complaints about open-plan office which include: loss of status, noise, distraction, lack of privacy and health related issues. (Journal of Education and Training, 2014 Vol. 1, No. 1). Brill and Weideman (2001) found that spatial arrangements favoring spontaneous interaction are extremely important to performance and productivity. Haynes (2007) examined how the environmental factors of comfort, office layout, interaction and distraction perceived productivity, either positively or negatively. At the same time, McGregor, J (2004) states that
consideration of the spaces where teachers meet and collaborate is just as important as the design of the classroom.

As Siegel,( 1999) puts it, the arrangement of space has immediate and far reaching consequences for teacher's ability to effectively and efficiently accomplish daily activities, the formation of social and professional relationships, and the sharing of information and knowledge. The provision of an appropriate office will not only increase lecturers’ enthusiasm about their job but it will also give them the opportunity to do one of the major things they require to remain in academia: contribution to knowledge through publications. It is assumed that lecturers who are enthusiastic will go all out to help their students in the acquisition of knowledge; they will provide their students with quality learning materials as a way of improving the prevailing standard of education (Journal of Education and Training 2014). This is increased productivity. Therefore, knowing which aspects of the office environment are most conducive to productivity can help the architects and policy makers to design lecturer’s offices accordingly which will lead to individual lecturer productivity, translating to the improved productivity of the whole university.

2.5 Library Facilities and Lecturers’ Productivity.

Information plays a central role in achieving successful work performance of academic staff. Ideally, no information without proper information sources; library
facilities being one of them. This information is often used by academic staff to make decisions in relation to teaching and research for the achievement of the institutional goal. There are various sources of information that could be useful for academic staff use either for the purpose of lecturing their students or for personal reasons. Scholars, students and faculties actively seek current information from the various media available in libraries, e.g. encyclopaedias, journals and more currently electronic media (Haliso, & Toyosi, 2013). Accessing these information sources may become a hard task if the sources are not available.

According to Research Information Network (2011; 2009), Kyrillo as cited in the International Journal of Education and Development using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDIT) (2012), Vol. 8, Issue 1 universities invest substantially for providing scholars with the digital literature they need for their work, with the idea that improved access to electronic resources will lead to increased scholarly productivity. The number and variety of different sorts of databases ranging from journal, reference to fact databases are increasingly accessible from scholars’ desktops. Therefore, Vakkari (2008) rightly notes that the easier and better access to the literature they need facilitates scholars’ work in several ways. This is because according to Vakkari the transformation of the physical library to the virtual library probably saves time, since one can access publications from one’s desktop. In addition, the extent of
publications available combined with easier access may improve scholars’ ability to keep abreast in their fields, and perhaps inspire new ideas and eventually enhance the quality of their work (Vakkari, 2008). It is evident from literature that access to electronic information resources can immensely improve academics’ research productivity and their pedagogical practices. However, the nagging challenges such as limited access, lack of knowledge and lagging behind in technological advancements can be noted; thus, the need for electronic information resources skills training for lecturers.

According to the Journal of Information Engineering and Application Vol.3, No.11 (2013), the quality of teaching, research and community service of lecturers coupled with their publication in any university system depend on the quality of information sources and services they use. So if lecturers lack library facilities there is likelihood of under-productivity since information availability, accessibility and use are very important to the teaching, research and community service activities of lecturers in the every university system. This lack of adequate library facilities also affects lecturers’ productivity through the learners. One of the critical factors used in determining academic productivity is research output.

According to Joyce (2006), apart from competence in professional duties, research and publications are compulsory indices or indicators of assessment of academic
productivity of lecturers. Haliso & Toyosi (2013) denote that a lecturer’s role in the work environment and in the world of scholarly communication depends on the quality information used. Lecturers need to update their knowledge base regularly by consulting information sources for research, publications, presenting papers, attending conferences and workshops etc. The various roles and functions of lecturers give rise to information needs. Therefore, adequate and appropriate library facilities are a necessity so as to avoid under productivity among lecturers. Based on these studies, one may conclude that library facilities are important factors in the productivity of lecturers.

2.6 Establishment and Adequacy of Teaching staff and Lectures’ Productivity

Generally, teaching has been considered as one of the most interesting challenging professions in human endeavor Yusuf, (2007) as cited in Esuh (2013). Probably because it deals mainly with human beings. It is a fact that people need to teach others in order for them to learn and be educated Bagley (1938) as cited in Esuh. (2013). while those who teach others must possess the right characteristics, competence and teaching qualifications to enable them impart knowledge and education to the people or learners as whatever they teach has a durable effect in the lives of the people they teach Bagley, (1938) as cited in Esuh (2013). Therefore, the impact of lecturer’s qualifications and competence on lecturer productivity cannot be understated. For instance, teaching qualifications and competence
will help lecturers to become more professional rather than just a lecturer (Yusuf, 2007 as cited in Esuh (2013)). Also, it will assist the lecturer to know how to handle and relate to the students (Koledoye, 2000; Lai, Elisabeth & Janvry, 2009). Koledoye (2000); Lai, Elisabeth & Janvry (2009) as cited in Esuh (2013). Esuh further noted that competence will assist the lecturer to master the subject and effectively teach the subject. This will ensure that the quality of education provided is always high and fulfill the university goals.

On the other hand, adequacy of the teaching staff is paramount in ensuring productivity. According to Petterson & Armets, (1998) inadequate staffing is a principal contributor to job-related stress, which is, in turn, a principal factor in turnover. Lecturers in understaffed Universities usually lack a sense of control over their rapidly increasing workload This is seconded by (Derek R Avery, et al., 2010; Galisky, et al., 2001; Kalleberg, 2008) as cited in Yee (2012) who indicate that overloaded employees are mostly easy to make mistakes, have poorer health, experience high level of stress thus frequently offend their coworkers or employers and seek employment elsewhere. An overloaded lecturer is a demotivated lecturer. This hectic environment can lead to declined productivity which can be detrimental to the institution as a whole.
According to Petterson and Armets (1998), increased workload can improve short-term productivity, but it can increase long-term costs. This is because it leads to stress and related illnesses among employees leading to absenteeism, poor judgments and eventual low productivity. Thus, high workload increases short term productivity but it decreases long-term productivity. Therefore, given the many functions lecturers perform (including administrative, research work, teaching loads), their workload should be well distributed to avoid cases of overloading them. In this case, the top management of all universities should ensure adequate teaching staff so as to enable appropriate job sharing. Understaffing not only affects the lecturers, it also has a negative impact on students. For instance, when the teaching staff are inadequate, service delivery to the students is compromised; no adequate time for research to get appropriate teaching and learning information, limited or no time for mentoring and guidance etc.

2.7 Opportunities for Personal Growth and Development and Lecturers’ Productivity

Opportunities for growth and development help employees expand their knowledge, skills and abilities, and apply the competencies they have gained to new situations. Professional workshops and other formally related meetings are a part of the professional development experience (Ganzer, 2000). This coupled with the opportunity to be promoted and salary increment can increase lecturers’ motivation
and job satisfaction and help them become more productive. This can translate into positive gains for the university by enhancing its effectiveness and improving work quality, as well as by helping the university attract and retain top-quality employees.

Peretomode. and Chukwuma (2005) state that institutions of higher learning lecturers’ development programmes are considered very critical. They are planned activities which focus on increasing and enlarging the capabilities, improving the technical and conceptual skills of lecturers so that they can possess the necessary abilities to handle complex situations and better perform their job. Through renewal activities, lecturers avoid becoming rustic for they need to keep abreast of the time and the trends of knowledge development in their discipline so as not to become obsolete and made redundant. The ultimate goal of self-development is the enhancement of individual’s job satisfaction and the optimization of skills, talent and task accomplishment. Similarly, Peretomode and Peretomode (2001) as cited in Peretomode and Chukwuma (2005) have also identified the benefits of training and development of lecturers to include increase in knowledge, skills and the development of positive attitude to work, increased personal and organizational productivity, and quality services. It can bring about improvement in morale, inculcate sense of belongingness, reduce absenteeism and turnover rate among lecturers, and importantly lead to better
coordination of both human and material resources within institutions of higher learning. Jones (1994) as cited in Peretomode and Chukwuma (2005) stressed that manpower development of lecturers in institutions of higher learning should be geared towards acquiring or sharpening the capabilities of lecturers required in performing various obligations, tasks, and functions associated with or related to their present or future expected role.

According to the International Labour Conference, 97th Session (2008) skills development is central to improving productivity. In turn, productivity is an important source of improved standards and growth. Opportunities for employee growth and development include: Continuing education courses, tuition reimbursement, career development or counseling services, Skills training provided in-house or through outside training centers, opportunities for promotion and internal career advancement and leadership development programs. Therefore, if university top managements provide these opportunities to the lecturers, the results will be satisfied lecturers with increased productivity translating to reduced lecturers turnover hence high institutional performance and productivity. Based on the results of this study, it was concluded that manpower development enhances lecturers’ productivity, irrespective of gender, faculty and type of institution.
2.8 Summary of Literature Review.

Literature reviewed shows a number of issues concerning the factors influencing lecturers’ productivity. From the above studies, it is evident that for lecturers to be motivated and productive in their work, the top management has to consider providing them with enabling working environments. This is to include among others: appropriate office space, adequate physical facilities, adequate and appropriate library facilities, adequate teaching staff and opportunities for personal growth and development without which the students as well as the universities stand a chance of losing.

2.9 Theoretical Framework

Herzberg’s Two Factor theory also known as Motivation-Hygiene theory will be used for this study. The two factor theory is basically concerned with job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. In 1959, Frederick Herzberg, a behavioral scientist proposed a two-factor theory or the motivator-hygiene theory. According to Herzberg, there are certain factors in the work place that cause satisfaction and a separate set of factors that can cause dissatisfaction. This theory postulates that motivation has two independent factors that is, Maintenance factors and Motivational factors. The maintenance factors according to Herzberg include: salary, fringe benefits, type of supervision, job security, climate at work, working
conditions, and administration policies (Extrinsic factors). While motivational factors include: achievement, recognition for accomplishment, challenging work, increased responsibility, growth and development. Herzberg (1966) called the maintenance factors dissatisfiers and the motivational factors satisfiers. Herzberg noted that competency, status, personal growth and self-realization make employees happy and satisfied. He referred to these factors as intrinsic variables or motivators.

Empirical studies have shown that extrinsic factors such as competitive salary, friendly working environments, job security and good interpersonal relationships are cited as key motivational factors that influence employee productivity in their work. The implication of this therefore, is that the management should not rely only on intrinsic factors to influence employee management productivity. Rather a combination of both intrinsic and extrinsic factors should be considered as an effective means of improving and ensuring employee productivity.

While Herzberg’s model may have garnered wide interest and stimulated much research, it has not escaped the scrutiny’s eye. Hackman and Oldham (1976) claim that while the foundation of the model may have a methodological artifact, researchers are unable to empirically prove the model reliability. The theory makes a blanket assumption while failing to consider individual differences conversely
predicting all employees will react in an identical manner to changes in motivating/hygiene factors. The theory does not also specify how motivating/hygiene factors are to be measured. The choice of the two factor theory for this study is based on the fact that it recognizes that employees have needs that should be satisfied in order to increase their productivity in an organization. Dissatisfied lecturers are demotivated lecturers which means low productivity.

2.10 Conceptual Framework.

The conceptual framework shown below consists of independent and dependent variables. This study considers lecturers’ productivity as a process of intertwined variable. Thus, it is expected that some behavior on the independent variables such as physical facilities, office space, library facilities, established of teaching staff and opportunities for lecturers growth and development, coupled with intervening variable such as insitutional top management and government in a well established process will influence lectures’ productivity.

Top Management’s Provision
Figure 2.1 Conceptual Framework of the Factors Influencing Lecturers’ Productivity at KeMU, Nairobi campus.
The intent of the study was to provide an assessment of the institutional factors available in institutions of higher learning and establish how they influence lecturers’ productivity at KeMU, Nairobi Campus. The conceptual framework developed shows clearly the linkages between various variables and how inter-link is achieved in increase of lecturers productivity. The independent variables entail; the university physical facilities, office space, staff-lecturers establishment, library facilities and opportunities for growth and development framework. The intervening variables are KeMU top level management and the government through CUE who provide guidelines on university requirements both in soft knowledge and infrastructure, while the dependent variables are the various lecturers’ productivity outcomes. These variables are related to the research questions and objectives of the study and they provide guideline in the development of the conceptual framework.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
In this chapter, the research methods to be used will be discussed. It will include the research design, target population, sampling size and sampling procedure, data collecting procedures, data collecting instruments, instruments validity instrument reliability and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research Design
Research design is defined by Nachmias (2004) as a program that guides the investigator in the process of collecting investigating and interpreting observation. This study will adopt a descriptive survey design. According to Mugenda & Mugenda (2010) descriptive survey determines and reports the way things are in their natural environment. This design attempts to describe systematically a situation, a problem, or phenomenon, or provides information about an issue, or describes attitudes towards an issue. (Kumar, 2005). The design is capable of presenting detailed information about a given social system. It is appropriate for studies that use questionnaires and interview schedules. Therefore, the design will help collect data in order to answer questions on the factors influencing lecturers’ productivity at KeMU, Nairobi campus. The design will be structured in such a manner as to collect data from members of the population in
order to determine the current status of that population with respect to one or more variables.

3.3 Target Population

Mugenda & Mugenda (2010) define population as an entire group of individuals, events or objects having common observable characteristics. The target population will be all the full time lecturers at KeMU Nairobi Campus. It will also consist of students in the full time mode of study at the Bachelors level of education from the School of Business and Economics and Faculty of computing and Informatics at KeMU Nairobi Campus. The total number of lecturers at KeMU Nairobi Campus is Ninety Seven (97). School of Business and economic studies students are Nine hundred and fifty three (953) while the Faculty of Computing and Informatics has Six hundred and sixty nine (669) Students in the fulltime mode at bachelors level of study.

3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

It is important to select a representative sample from the accessed population that can easily be studied and inferences made to the larger population (Mugenda & Mugenda 2010). The researcher will use census method on the lecturers in the campus while simple random sampling will be used to sample the students in the full time mode of study in the schools of Business and Computing and Informatics.
According to (Mugenda & Mugenda 2010), a sampling percentage of 10-30% is considered adequate for a descriptive study. Therefore, a sample of 10% of the students from each of the two targeted schools (That is; school of Business and Economics and Faculty of Computing and Informatics) will be made as shown in the table.

### Table 3.1 Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1719</strong></td>
<td><strong>259</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 Research Instruments

The research instruments used in the study for data collection were questionnaires and observation schedule. It was logical to use a questionnaire to sample a large number of populations. Therefore, the researcher used questionnaires with open and closed ended questions as the main tool for data collection. There were two questionnaires: One for the lecturers and the other one for the students.

Questionnaires were used in this study because they gave the respondent an opportunity to answer questions willingly and with an open mind (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2010). The questionnaire used had structured questions giving the
respondents the liberty to elaborate their opinions where applicable. It also consisted of close-ended questions which was mainly multiple choice questions. Further, questionnaires were designed to provide genuine answers to questions. This was due to the fact that the respondents did not have to provide their names in the documents. It allowed uniformity of answers hence making the researcher’s analysis of data easy. It saved on the time and energy that would have otherwise been taken up interviewing the whole population.

3.6 Validity of Instruments

Validity is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the element under study. Validity therefore refers to the degree to which the instrument truly measures what it is intended to measure. In other words, validity ensures content, construct and criterion related validity in the study (Kothari, 2005). Mugenda & Mugenda (2008) advocate that the pre-test sample should be 1% to 10% depending on sample size.

3.7 Reliability of Instruments

Kothari, (2005) defines reliability as the consistency of measurement, or degree to which an instrument measures the same way each time it is used under the same conditions with the same subjects. In this study, test-retest method will be used to estimate the degree to which same results could be obtained with a repeated
measure. To gauge reliability, the instruments will be administered twice within a time interval of two weeks. The respondents used during pre-testing exercise will not be included in the final sample. Questionnaires were then reviewed on the basis of the responses obtained.

3.8 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher obtained an introduction letter from the University of Nairobi (UoN) and a research permit from the National Council of Science and Technology (NCST). The Registrar Academic Affairs, KeMU was also informed of the study to be carried out in the University. The researcher issued questionnaires and also observed Lecturers make use of the different facilities. Everyone involved in the study was be given some time to fill in the questionnaires. The questionnaires were later collected for data analysis after the time limit.

3.9 Data Analysis Techniques

After data collection, filled questionnaires were cleaned of vague responses and any information not relevant to the research questions. This data assisted in the tabulation of information. The data was presented using descriptive statistics such as percentages, frequency tables and graphs for quantitative data while narrative summary was used to analyze qualitative data. It was achieved through the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) which offers extensive data handling
capabilities and numerous statistical routines that can analyze small and very large statistical data. The analyzed data was presented using tables and charts as appropriate.

### 3.10 Ethical Considerations

Protecting the rights and welfare of the participant is a major ethical obligation of all the parties involved in a research study (Mugenda, 2010). Research ethics refers to the type of agreement that the researcher enters into with his or her research participants. The researcher sought the consent of respondents. Moreover, the researcher reached agreements with them about the uses of the data, and how its analysis will be reported and disseminated. The researcher also observed privacy and confidentiality by ensuring that the respondents don’t give their names in the questionnaire and that the analysis done will not be for individual respondent but a combined responses of all the respondents.

Also a researcher should ensure that they treat human participants as collaborators rather than subjects by ensuring principles of democracy and humanity within research such as; respect for persons participating in the research, a duty of care to vulnerable participants, an effort to limit risk and maximize participants’ collective and individual benefits, opportunities for self-representation, address ongoing responsiveness to the needs of the research partners, frequent review by those who
are involved in the research, continuous reflection about potential ethical dilemmas by the academic researcher and reciprocity. Therefore the researcher should strive to be socially responsive, compassionate and reflexive, at all stages of the research process.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the results, discussions and presentation of the findings of the study. The study targeted all the Nairobi Campus lecturers and the students from the School of Business and Economics and Faculty of Computing and Informatics. Two sets of questionnaires were used. The first set was administered to the lecturers while the second set was administered to the students. In order to simplify the discussions, the researcher provided tables that summarize the collective reactions of the respondents.

4.2 Instrument Return Rate

Table 4.1 Instrument Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>categories</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Return Rate</td>
<td>Percent on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Per Category</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 shows a sample size of 97 lectures and 162 students’ respondents, from the target population of 1719 as shown in table 4.1. However the returned respondents were 76 lectures and 116 students, representing 78.4 and 71.6 percent respectively. The aggregate return rate percent of the two categories was at 74.2%. This response rate was good and representative as it is within the minimum 70% response rate for statistical analysis as prescribed by Mugenda and Mugenda (2010).

4.3 Demographic Information of Respondents

The study sought to establish the background information of the respondents including their gender, age, highest education level of lectures, students’ years of study, and lectures experience at KeMU.
4.3.1 Gender of Respondents

The researcher asked respondents about their gender. Results are as indicated on table 4.2

Table 4.2 Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in table 4.2 show that a majority of the lecturers 57.9% were males while 42.1% were females. However, the opposite was true for the students’ respondents with a majority 53.4% females and 46.6% males. This provides an indication that gender parity among the lecturer’s fraternity has not been attained while the students’ gender parity is well balanced.
4.3.2 Age of Respondents

The researcher asked respondents about their age. Results are as indicated on table 4.3

Table 4.3 Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellow 20 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings indicate that majority of the lecturers were between age between 31-40 years with a few exemptions of 41-50 years and 51-60 years. While the majority of the students 78% were aged between 20-24 years with a few exemptions of below 19 years and 40 years and above. This is an indication that most of the KeMU community (Lecturers and students) mainly consists of mature lecturers and youthful students.
4.3.3 Academic Qualification of Lecturers

The lecturers were requested to indicate their highest academic levels. Results for the lecturers were as indicated in table 4.4

Table 4.4 Academic Qualification of Lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in table 4.4 show the majority of the lecturers are Master’s Degree holders accounting for 75% and 18% are PhD holders with exemptions of 7% Bachelors’ holders. This is could be an indication that most of KeMU lecturers are still doing their PhDs and for the bachelor’s holders they could be awaiting their graduation otherwise the researcher noted a need to upgrade the lecturers’ qualifications.
4.3.4 Students and Lecturers Duration in a University

Table 4.5 Students and Lecturers Duration in a University

The lecturers were requested to indicate their duration of stay in a university.

Results were as indicated in table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Lecturers Frequency</th>
<th>Lecturers Percent</th>
<th>Students Frequency</th>
<th>Students Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 6 months</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 shows the majority 66% of the student respondents in KEMU had stayed between 1-2 years hence they were either first or second years, while only 30% were in their 3-4 years (3rd and 4th year students) with only 2% over 4 years.
4.3.5 Lecturers Job Experience in a University

Table 4.6 Lecturers Job Experience in a University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellow 10 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.6, majority of the lecturers 76% were noted to have a work experience of below ten years and 17% have worked between 11-20 years with a limited number 7% having worked between 31-40 years. Since KeMU, Nairobi campus started in 2009 (Seven years ago), this explains why majority of the lecturers’ experience at KeMU in the university is below ten years. However, lecturers may have also transferred from main university which currently celebrated 15 years since inception.
4.4 Lecturers Physical Facilities that Influence Productivity at Kemu, Nairobi Campus

This objective of the study sought to examine how the top management’s provision of physical facilities influences lecturers’ productivity at KeMU. In this regard, the study sought to establish rating from the students and Lecturers on the specific physical facilities provided to their lecturers. The respondents were presented with statements on the various available facilities and were required to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the stated statements in the facilities provision. A five-point likert scale comprising of Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided/Neutral, Disagree and Strongly Disagree was used whereby the percentage responses, and percentages from the students’ data were computed. The responses were interpreted and the findings presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.7 Aggregate Response on Provision of Physical Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Facilities</th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university has modern and comfortable chairs</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university has modern and comfortable lecturers desks</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate internet enabled computer labs</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are reliable and adequate office phones provided by the university</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lecturers’ offices are well ventilated/lit.

The findings shown in table 4.7 indicate that most of the lecturers and students agreed with the availability of the following facilities; adequate printing papers 55.3% disagreed (22.4 % strongly disagreed, 32.9% disagreed), and adequate safe lockers 55.3% disagreed (18.4% strongly disagreed and 36.8 disagreed) as accounted by their percentages. Hence from the findings its evident printing papers and safe lockers are not adequate.

The findings showed there is a strong agreement between the students and the lecturers on the well ventilated lecturers’ offices. 39% of the students agreed that the offices were well ventilated, while 12.9% disagreed with the statement; however 18.1% of the students were undecided. While 31.5% (3.9% and 27.6%) lecturers disagreed and 52.6% (34.2 and 18.4%) agreed that the lecturers’ offices were well ventilated. This is an indication that ventilation of the KeMU lecturers’ offices is adequate.

Asked on whether the Lecturers have adequate Space for Students Guidance and Mentoring, 56.6% of the lecturers noted the space is not adequate with (44.7% disagree and 11.8% strongly agree) while 32.9% noted there is adequate space for students guidance and mentoring. Among the students majority 32.6% agree and
strongly agree that there is adequate space for mentoring while 25.9% disagree and strongly disagree with the statement. Hence there is a contradiction between the lecturers and students.

Asked on whether lecturers office sharing is appropriate, 40.8% of the lecturers disagree with the statement and 10.5% strongly disagree while 29% agree and strongly agree with the statement. Hence office sharing is inadequate.

### Table 4.8: Provision of Adequate Office Stationary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate Office Stationary</th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate white board makers</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate printing paper</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate foolscaps</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate staplers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate paper punches</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate biro pen</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9 Ways in Which Top Management’s Provision of Office Space Influences Lecturers’ Productivity at Kemu, Nairobi Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturers Office Space</th>
<th>Lecturers Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Students Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have adequate space for guidance and mentoring of students</td>
<td>43 32.9</td>
<td>43 56.5</td>
<td>57 57.8</td>
<td>30 25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ample office space for sharing</td>
<td>22 29</td>
<td>39 51.3</td>
<td>66 56.9</td>
<td>28 24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office layout favours interaction</td>
<td>38 50</td>
<td>27 35.5</td>
<td>70 60.4</td>
<td>23 19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asked on whether the Lecturers have adequate Space for Students Guidance and Mentoring, 56.6% of the lecturers noted the space is not adequate with (44.7% disagree and 11.8% strongly agree) while 32.9% noted there is adequate space for students guidance and mentoring. Among the students majority 32.6% agree and strongly agree that there is adequate space for mentoring while 25.9% disagree and strongly disagree with the statement. Hence there is a contradiction between the lecturers and students.

Asked on whether lecturers office sharing is appropriate, 40.8% of the lecturers disagree with the statement and 10.5% strongly disagree while 29% agree and strongly agree with the statement. Hence office sharing is inadequate.

In addition respondents were asked whether office layout favours spontaneous interaction, majority of the lectures seem to be comfortable as shown by their
responses whereby 50% agreed (40.8% and 9.2%) and 35.5% (27.6% and 7.9%) disagreed, while 14.5% were neutral. This was also confirmed by the students despondence with 60.4% in agreement (30.2 strongly agree % and 30.2% agree). These statistics show that the KeMU top management’s provision of office space needs to be improved for good lecturers’ productivity although the office sharing and office interaction seems adequate.

4.5 Ways in Which Top Management’s Provision of Library Facilities Influences Lectures’ Productivity at Kemu, Nairobi Campus

Lecturers were asked to rate the availability of adequate and relevant books, availability and accessibility of digital materials, adequacy of relevant journals and availability of a designated Lecturers’ research/study room. The findings are presented in table 4.10.
Table 4.10 Adequate Provision of Library Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern Library Facilities</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library have adequate and relevant books</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a designated lecturers research centre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate and accessible digital material</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the lecturers (50%) agreed that there are adequate and relevant books for research work. When asked on the availability and accessibility of digital materials, majority of the lectures seem to get enough (57.9% agreed) while 34.2 do not seem to have enough (26.3% disagree and 7.9 strongly disagree). This is supported by 67.2% and 62.1% students who agree on the statement that lecturers present current information and well researched lessons respectively.

However, the university does not seem to have enough (if any) isolated research/study room(s) for the lectures’ personal studies as evidenced by 71.1% disagreement and 6.5% agreement and 22.4% being neutral on the statement by the lecturers. At the same time on availability of adequate and relevant journals,
42.1% disagree (39.5% disagree and 2.6% strongly disagree) while 39.5% (38.2% agreeing and 1.3% strongly agreeing) and 18.4% being neutral. In this case, there is a need for the top management to provide isolated research/study rooms as well as relevant journals for the lecturers so as to enhance their productivity. As Haliso & Toyosi (2013) put it; scholars, students and faculties actively seek current information from the various media available in libraries, e.g. encyclopedias, journals and more currently electronic media. This current information is quite necessary for a lecturers’ productivity.

4.6 How Adequacy of the Academic Staff Provided by the Top Managements Influences Lecturers’ Productivity at the University

The respondents were asked whether the university has adequate teaching Staff, adequate Research and Mentoring time, and whether lecturers attend all respective lessons. The findings are provided on table 4.11
Table 4.11 Adequacy of the Academic Staff and Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy of teaching staff</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university has adequate teaching staff</td>
<td>21 27.7</td>
<td>17 22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers have adequate research time</td>
<td>16 21.1</td>
<td>39 51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers have adequate mentoring time</td>
<td>20 42.1</td>
<td>41 53.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings of Table 4.6 it is evident from the lecturers that it is unclear whether there are adequate full time lecturers, further there similarity between the aggregate of those who agreed and disagree with the statement at 27.7% and 23.7% respectively.

When asked whether lecturers have adequate research time majority of the lecturers disagreed with the statement at 51.3% while majority of the students were undecided on the adequacy off time spent on research. There is a possibility that lecturers are overloaded with administrative duties and teaching which would limit their research time.
Asked on whether lecturers have adequate time for mentoring students 53.9% disagreed with the statement while most of the students 46.6 percent agreed while 41.4% were undecided. However students may not clearly have knowledge on the work load of lecturers hence the differing perspectives.

The study also sought to establish whether lecturers attended all their respective lessons where 56% of the students were in agreement with the statement. Productivity of a lecturer is portrayed in the ability of a lecturers to attend his/her lessons.

4.7 How Opportunities for Personal Growth and Development Provided by the Top Management’s Influences Lecturers’ Productivity

The study sought to establish how different opportunities for personal growth and development influence lecturers productivity. Issues addressed include whether the university has clear and established promotion opportunities, established study leaves given on request. Progressive periodic salary increment, in-house skills trainings and attendance of workshops and conferences and whether full time lecturers often leave KeMU for other universities. The findings are presented in Table 4.11.
Table 4.12 Lecturers Opportunities for Personal Growth and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities for Personal Growth and Development</th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university has clear and established promotion opportunities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are established study leaves given on request</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There exists a progressive periodic salary increment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are in-house skills trainings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings it's majority of the lecturers indicated that there are no clear and established promotion opportunities, there exists no progressive periodic salary increment and no in-house skills trainings. Meanwhile respondents were in agreement that established study leaves are given on request. Majority of the students responses were undecided on the whether lecturers are given study leaves, promoted, attend conferences and workshops and whether the lecturers leave the university for other universities. A greater students respondents 41.8% also noted that lecturers leave KeMU for other universities.
Asked on their involvement in the university decision making management plans on productivity, majority of the lecturers (69.7%) noted they are not involved. When asked on willingness to be involved all (100%) confirmed their willingness to take part in decision making.

**4.8 Other Factors that Would Influence Lecturers Productivity**

Lecturers and students were further questioned on other factors that would influence lecturers’ productivity, majority of the respondents cited academic, leadership, and motivation, technological and social. Lecturers noted reduction of teaching load, provision of modern teaching equipment’s, staff development programs and facilitation to attend academic conference and workshops. On Leadership they requested to ease communication between staff and management. On Motivation they requested common coffee house for social interaction, fully paid study leave, and exchange programme with students and staff.

On the same the students pin pointed academic factors such as advanced training opportunities, offering more practical lessons especially the computing department, increased pay and allowances, strict policy for students attendance of lectures and limiting the number of classes per lecturer which concurs with earlier requests from lecturers on reduced work load. On technology the pointed modern teaching and learning equipment’s and increased internet speed. Other factors were frequent
performance appraisals, capacity and teambuilding for lecturers and more consultation time with the students. This suggestions concurs with the findings from the study as well as students and teachers suggestions.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the conclusions and recommendations from the study. Key areas addressed in this chapter include; summary, conclusions, recommendations on research findings and suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of the Study

This study aimed at establishing the factors influencing lecturers’ productivity at KeMU. This is because education is viewed as a good investment in a nation’s development the reason being that, it is expected that the educational system will produce the quality and quantity of human resources required for the economy's growth. University education being the instrument for all-round development occupies a cardinal position in every society all over the world and as it is a fact the lecturers are the pivot of the education system, they are the major determinant of any educative process in the universities because on them lies the success or failure of the education system (Journal of educational and social research Volume 3). Therefore, for them to be productive the top management of any university needs to ensure adequate personal motivation and the infrastructure of the work environment for them. Since the demand for university education in Kenya
continues to increase and has outpaced supply it raises questions on the level of preparedness by these universities to cater for the increasing numbers. Therefore, the need to assess the factors available in institutions of higher learning and how they influence lecturers’ productivity at KeMU, Nairobi Campus being at the Nairobi’s CBD (Central Business District) and away from the main campus(Meru). That is why the researcher sought to find out how KeMU top management’s provision of physical facilities, office space, library facilities, adequate teaching staff and opportunities for personal growth and development influences lecturers’ productivity at the university. This study was anchored on Herzberg’s Two Factor theory also known as Motivation-Hygiene theory. This theory is basically concerned with job satisfaction and dissatisfaction since a satisfied lecturer is a productive one while dissatisfaction mostly translates to poor or non-productivity.

The main finding of the study showed that the majority of the lecturer respondents were males while majority of students respondents were females accounting for 58.0% and 53.4% respectively. Statistics on the age of respondents indicated that most of the KeMU community (Lecturers and students) mainly consists of youthful lecturers and youthful students since the majority of the students 77.8% were aged between 20-24 years. While the majority of lecturers 71.1% were aged between 30-40 years with a few exemptions of below 30 years 19.7%. The study also found that the majority of the lecturers are master’s holders accounting for 75.0% with a few
18.4% PhD holders. At the same time, the majority lecturers 76.3% have a work experience of below ten years at KeMU.

This section also summarizes the study based on the various themes explored in the study. The section is further organized as per research objectives of the study. The findings showed that according to both students and lecturers the top management has provided most of the physical facilities: lecturers have modern and comfortable chairs and desks, adequate internet enabled computers, adequate and reliable office phones, well lit offices, adequate fool scalps, biro pens, office staplers and paper punches. However, availability of printing papers and safe lockers was rated low by majority of lecturers. The lecturers’ findings showed that office space for students mentoring and guidance as well as lecturers office sharing were not adequate. However, findings showed that their office layout favours spontaneous interaction. On the other side, students’ findings showed a different opinion. According to them, lecturers’ office space for students mentoring and guidance plus office sharing are adequate.

On the management’s provision of Library facilities the findings showed that lecturers have adequate and relevant books and digital materials. However, they did not agree to have adequate and relevant journals. They also indicated research and study rooms were not adequate. Student’s findings showed that, lecturers present
well researched lessons with updated current information. On adequacy of the academic staff, a good number of lecturers’ findings show that they were neutral. The same findings showed that they do not have adequate research and mentoring time. Students’ findings showed that most lecturers attend respective lessons although they were neutral about lecturers having adequate time for mentoring and guidance. As far as top management’s provision of opportunities for personal growth and development is concerned, the findings showed that the majority of lecturers (65.8%) disagreed on existence of progressive periodic salary increment and a majority of them (56%) did not agree to availability of in-house skills training. However, lecturers were neutral on study leaves given to lecturers on request. They were also neutral on the university having clear and established promotion procedures. On the other hand, students were neutral on top management’s provision of opportunities for personal growth and development.

5.3 Conclusions

Findings on how top management’s provision of physical facilities influences lecturers’ productivity, the study showed that KeMU top management has provided lecturers with adequate and comfortable physical facilities. This is other than few items like printing papers and safe lockers. This implies that as far as physical facilities are concerned most of the lecturers are satisfied though, the top
management should ensure provision of more printing papers and safe lockers so as for the lecturers to have full satisfaction with the physical facilities.

On the how top management’s provision of lecturers office space influences lecturers’ productivity, it appears that lecturers do not have adequate office space for students guidance and mentoring. At the same time, office sharing is not appropriate. This implies that, learners do not get maximum guidance and mentoring as a result, this may affect lecturers’ productivity since learning does not end at the classroom and sometimes students require extra coaching and mentoring which may be compromised. Thus, a need to create more time for lecturers.

On determining how top management’s provision for Library facilities influences lecturers’ productivity, the study found that there are adequate and relevant books as well as digital materials which have led to lecturers presenting well researched lessons and providing necessary current information as indicated by student’s responses. This is an indication of increased productivity.

5.4 Recommendations

i. The University management needs to put measures in place and provide appropriate office sharing which will translate to more space for mentoring
and guidance. The management should also ensure adequate printing papers and safe lockers for the lecturers. It is my considered opinion that this would go a long way in making the lecturers more productive.

ii. The study recommends that the lecturers be provided with adequate isolated research rooms with less disruptions for personal studies as well as add more relevant journals in the library. By so doing, the lecturers who are not yet done with their PhDs will be able to do more research to complete their studies and even publish their research articles.

iii. The study also notes that the amount and quality of time left for lecturers’ personal research as well as for guidance and mentoring is wanting. Therefore, a need to create more time for them through reducing their workload. This can be achieved through employing more lecturers and proper distribution of the administrative jobs.

iv. The study recommends increased provision and use of modern teaching tools so as to enhance more learning and productivity.

v. The researcher also recommends a revamp of the motivational factors available in the university. This can be done through ensuring progressive periodic salary increment, staff development programmes as well as lecturers involvement in decision making.
5.5 Suggestions for Future Research

Further study can be done in other universities and institutions of higher learning to ensure lecturers have adequate and appropriate facilities so as to promote productivity and quality.

With technological evolution, online learning is quickly gathering pace. In an effort to guide KeMU and other universities, the study notes that it would be of interest to explore ways in which lectures can manage teams of students located in various parts of the country or even outside our borders.
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LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

JOCCYLYN MWIKALI NZOKA
P.O BOX 45240-00100
NAIROBI
DATE MAY 15TH 2015

THE REGISTRAR (ACADEMIC AFFAIRS)
KENYA METHODIST UNIVERSITY
C/O NAIROBI CAMPUS
P.O BOX 45240-00100
NAIROBI

Dear Sir,

RE: LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL OF DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

This is to inform you that I will be carrying out a research study leading to the award of master of Education (Corporate Governance) from the University of Nairobi.

The study focuses on Institutional factors influencing lecturers’ productivity at Kenya Methodist University (KeMU), Nairobi Campus. When the research is successfully completed; I presume the finding to enable the KeMU top Management, to improve on lecturers’ welfare, in regard to their productivity. The input is therefore important in determining the success of this study. The questionnaire requires provision of information by answering the questions honestly.

Any information obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential. In case of any questions about the research, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Joccylyn Mwikali.


APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LECTURERS

Introduction:

I am a Masters student at the University of Nairobi, Conducting a research study on Factors influencing lecturers’ productivity at KeMU Nairobi campus. I am kindly requesting you to give answers to these questions as accurately and precisely as possible. The information collected will be treated with confidentiality. Your assistance in facilitating this study will be highly appreciated.

Instructions:

• Do not write your name anywhere in this questionnaire

• Place a tick where appropriate.

Part A: Bio Data

1. What is your gender? Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. What is your Age?

   Under 30 years [ ]

   31-40 years [ ]

   41-50 years [ ]

   51-60 years [ ]

   61-65 years [ ]

   65-70 years [ ]

3. What is your highest education level
PhD level [   ]
Master’s Degree [   ]
Bachelor’s Degree [   ]

4. How many years have you been teaching?
   Under 10 years [   ]
   11-20 years [   ]
   21-30 years [   ]
   31-40 years [   ]
   Above 40 years [   ]

**Part B: How do you Rate the Following Factors that Influence Your Productivity?**

On a scale of 1-5, please indicate your agreement/disagreement levels with the following statements. The rating scale indicates agreement levels as follows:

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Not sure, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree
Section I – Lecturers’ Physical Facilities Provision and its Influence on Lecturers Productivity

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>The university has modern and comfortable lecturers’ chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>The university has modern and comfortable lecturers’ desks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>There are adequate internet enabled computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>There are reliable and adequate office phones provided by the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>The lecturers’ offices are well ventilated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section II Adequate Office Stationary Provision and its Influence on Lecturer’s Productivity.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>White board markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Printing papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Foolscaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Staplers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Paper punches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Biro pens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Lecturers have safe lockers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III - Lecturers’ Office Space Provision and its Influence on Lecturer’s Productivity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td>The university has provided adequate office spaces for guidance and mentoring students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
<td>Office sharing is appropriate (not too squeezed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c</strong></td>
<td>The office layout favors spontaneous lectures interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section IV - Modern Library Facilities Provision and Its Influence on Lecturer’s Productivity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section V - Adequacy of Teaching Staff And Its Influence on Lecturer’s Productivity.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>The university has adequate teaching staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Lecturers have adequate research time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Lecturers have adequate mentoring time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section VI Opportunities for Personal Growth and its Influence on Lecturer’s Productivity.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>The university has clear and established promotion opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>There are established study leaves given on request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>There exists a progressive periodic salary increment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>There are in-house skills trainings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part C

**Q13.** Other than the factors mentioned above suggest other factors that you require for your productivity.................................................................

**Q14.** Are lecturers involved in decision making on management plans related to their productivity? Yes ( ) No ( ). If NO, would you wish to be involved?

*Thank you for your participation and God bless you*
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

Introduction:

I am a master’s student at the University of Nairobi, Conducting a research study on “Factors influencing lecturers’ productivity at KeMU Nairobi campus”. I am kindly requesting you to give answers to these questions as accurately and precisely as possible. The information collected will be treated with confidentiality.

Your assistance in facilitating this study will be highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Joccylyn Mwikali Nzoka

- Do not write your name anywhere in this questionnaire
- Place a tick where appropriate.

Part A: Bio Data

1. What is your gender? Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. What is your year of study 1st ( ) 2nd ( ) 3rd ( ) 4th ( )

3. Which is your department?
   Department of Business Administration [ ]
   Department of Computing and Informatics [ ]
Part B: How do you Rate the Following Factors That Influence Productivity of Your Lecturers?

On a scale of 1-5, please indicate your agreement/ disagreement levels with the following statements. The rating scale indicates agreement levels as follows:

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3= Not sure, 4= Disagree, 5= Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section I –Lecturers’ Physical Facilities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a  Lecturers’ offices are well ventilated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b  Lecturers’ offices are well lit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c  Lecturers have modern comfortable chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d  Lecturers have modern comfortable desks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section II- Lecturers’ Office Space</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a  Lecturers have adequate space for guidance and mentoring of the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b  Office sharing is appropriate (not too squeezed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c  Office arrangements favors spontaneous interaction of lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section III - Library Facilities

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td>Lectures present well researched lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
<td>Lecturers have isolated study research/ study room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c</strong></td>
<td>Lecturers provide necessary current information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section IV - Adequacy of Teaching Staff

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td>Lecturers are well facilitated in all respective lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
<td>Lecturers have adequate research time schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c</strong></td>
<td>Full time lecturers have adequate time for guidance and mentoring of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section V - Opportunities For Personal Growth

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong></td>
<td>Lecturers have clear upward mobility order (promotion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
<td>Lectures frequently go on study leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c</strong></td>
<td>Full time lecturers rarely leave KeMU for other universities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lecturers frequently attend workshops and conferences.

1. Other than the factors mentioned above, suggest other factors that may be of importance for your lectures’ productivity.

Thank you for your participation and God bless you.
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RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE,
TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Telephone: +254-20-2213471,
2241349, 310571, 2219420
Fax: +254-20-318245, 318249
Email: secretary@nacost.go.ke
Website: www.nacost.go.ke
When replying please quote
Ref: No.

NACOSTI/P/15/2148/7184

Jocelyn Mwikali Nzoka
University of Nairobi
P.O. Box 30197-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Factors influencing lecturers productivity at Kenya Methodist University,” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Nairobi County for a period ending 4th December, 2015.

You are advised to report to the Vice Chancellor, Kenya Methodist University, the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Nairobi County before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

DR. S. K. LANGAT, OGW
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:

The Vice Chancellor
Kenya Methodist University.

The County Commissioner
Nairobi County.
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RESEARCH CLEARANCE PERMIT

This is to certify that:
MS. JOCCYLIN MIWIKALI NZOKA
of UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI, 0-100
NAIROBI, has been permitted to conduct research in Nairobi County

on the topic: FACTORS INFLUENCING LECTURERS' PRODUCTIVITY AT KENYA METHODIST UNIVERSITY

for the period ending:
4th December, 2015

Director General
Signature

National Commission for Science,
Technology & Innovation

CONDITIONS

1. You must report to the County Commissioner and the County Education Officer of the area before embarking on your research. Failure to do that may lead to the cancellation of your permit.
2. Government Officers will not be interviewed without prior appointment.
3. No questionnaire will be used unless it has been approved.
4. Excavation, filming and collection of biological specimens are subject to further permission from the relevant Government Ministries.
5. You are required to submit at least two (2) hard copies and one (1) soft copy of your final report.
6. The Government of Kenya reserves the right to modify the conditions of this permit including its cancellation without notice.

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

National Commission for Science,
Technology and Innovation

RESEARCH CLEARANCE PERMIT

Serial No. A 6029

CONDITIONS: see back page