International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development
April 2013, Vol. 2, No. 2
ISSN: 2226-6348

Impact of Academic Staff Development Practices on Job Performance in Selected Public Universities in Kenya

Jane Irene A. Dawo
Maseno University; Department of Educational Management and Foundations
E-mail- dawojanei@gmail.com

Dr. Simatwa, E.M.W
Department of Education management and Foundations, Maseno University

Dr. Okwatch, T.O
Department of Education Technology and Curriculum Studies, Maseno University

Abstract

Academic staff development (SD) enhances job performance in educational institutions, universities inclusive. In this regard, there has been noted a shortfall of adequately qualified staff, PhD holders, in Maseno University (MSU) and Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology (MMUST). This denotes a skills, knowledge and attitudinal deficiency which demands counteractive staff development steps. However, despite continued PhD–SD activities, there are still public and stakeholder complaints of poor service delivery hence the need to investigate the impact of SD practices on job performance. For this study, the SD practices considered were, on-the-job PhD-SD and Off-the-job PhD-SD practices. Job performance indicators that were measured for impact were categorized into 3; Research, Publication and Community Service, Actual Teaching Activity and Departmental Supervisory Expectation. The study used saturated sampling technique to select 6 University Management Personnel (UMPs), 11 Deans of Faculties and Directors of Studies (DFDSs), 48 Chairmen of Departments (CoDs), 88 academic staff who underwent off-the-job PhD-SD and 66 on On-the-job PhD-SD practices. Qualitative data was transcribed and analyzed thematically, quantitative data by way of means, frequencies and percentages whereas inferential statistics using Pearson-r. The study revealed that even though there was significant improvement in Research Publication and Community Service, there was insignificant improvement in Actual Teaching Activity and in Departmental Supervisory Expectation following PhD. There was also no significant difference in job performance output based on the selected PhD-SD practices.

Keywords: impact, job performance, university, PhD, staff development practices, Kenya

Background to the Study

In an educational institution, in-service teaching staff development, aims at improving capacities of individuals to play their roles and fit in assignments optimally for higher

International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development
April 2013, Vol. 2, No. 2
ISSN: 2226-6348

achievements resulting from quality service delivery. The programme foci may include classroom management, lesson organization, recording and reporting students work achievement on assessable standards, teaching skills, teacher behaviour, student management and so on (Jamil, Atta, Ali, Balochi, and Ayaz, 2011).Given that teachers are the single most critical input in an educational enterprise (Skinner, 2004) cited in Out (2011), improvement of teaching staff competence is crucial to attain quality university education (Anyamele, 2007). This is more so, considering that employees who value knowledge and skills for their career growth may be more willing to work for a long period for an employer who trains them (Amstrong, 2009; Rosser, 2004).

With regard to university education, Ministry of Education Strategic Plan 2006-2011 focuses on expanded access to education, affirmative action, improved infrastructure, and rationalization of academic programmes downplaying teaching staff development (Republic of Kenya, 2005). Staff quality is invaluable particularly in the prevailing circumstances whereby Kenya is pursuing a new scientific techno-economic development strategy, Vision 2030 (Kairu, 2011). On the whole, university is the pinnacle of education in Kenya, training manpower vital for the economic, social and political pillars of Vision 2030 (Republic of Kenya ,2007),yet apart from addressing access, unlike that of teaching staff training at lower levels, there is no focus on university staff development. Therefore, it becomes critical for individual university managements to fill policy-strategy gaps at the national level by instituting appropriate measures locally, so as to contribute effectively to Vision 2030.

Kenyan public universities must shift their control systems from those that are primarily procedural in nature to those stimulating organizational effectiveness (Walingo, 2010). Though Quick and Nelson (2011) identified employment security, delegation, and high spending on staff training and development among critical people management policies towards excellence in organizations, there have been conflicting results from various studies regarding whether there is substantial value added on teacher effectiveness through on-the-job or off-the-job in-service training given the myriad of challenges alongside it (Jamil et al, 2011). This may be supported by Makerere University chancellor's assertion that quality teaching is still elusive in East African universities despite training staff (Nsindabi, 2006). Currently, a movement towards quality systems, ISO certification, is influencing public universities in Kenya to seek competitive advantage through investment in human capital as a performance management strategy (Walingo, 2010).

Some studies have revealed that some lecturers often display poor work ethics, prepare graduates with poor work-life competencies, and have inferior research and publication out-put . For instance, Gudo, Oanda & Olel (2011) explored the effectiveness of institutional managers in quality assurance at university in Kenya and found that comparatively, private universities were better organized than public ones in terms of management structures, physical facilities and human resources. According to Gudo et al (2011), none-participatory management practices in Kenyan universities resulted in ineffective staff development activities. This agrees with Ezati & Mugimu (2010) findings that from workshop experiences for Makerere University, even with massive investment, teaching staff were still pedagogically deficient. On this note, Nsindabi (2006) claimed that most faculty teaching staff is pedagogically illiterate. They are drawn from various non-teaching backgrounds including laboratories, markets, hospitals and mortuaries, farms, industries, hotels, churches, courts ,and

International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development
April 2013, Vol. 2, No. 2
ISSN: 2226-6348

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

Statement of the Problem

Modern organizations emphasize on staff development as a critical component of strategic human resource management which removes performance deficiencies and aligns employees to dynamic work-place demands. It encompasses the fact that changes in employee skills, attitudes and behaviour. However, despite Kenyan public university staff continued engagement in staff development activities, there are allegations that they still exhibit certain characteristics that indicate poor job performance. This raises doubts about the efficacy of academic staff development practices in addressing public quest for quality education. This is in addition to the fact that universities are investing heavily, materially or otherwise in PhD-SD. It was therefore necessary to investigate the impact of staff development practices on job performance.

Results and Discussion

Job performance output before and after PhD-SD were measured using value-numerical job performance index as was indicated by academic staff. Perceptions on impact of PhD-SD academic staff job performance of CoDs, former MSU/MMUST PHD-SD academic staff respondents and UMPs were also sought. Percentage actual response was 92 %.
Data was processed based on the following staff development practices:

i. On-the-job PhD-SD practices
ii. Off-the-job PhD-SD practices

The findings were as shown in the following section Tables 1-6 .

Table 1 Scores for On-the-job PhD-SD Practice Before and After PhD n=54

Job Performance Indicator	Score	Before PhD f	After PhD f
Research and publication output*	0-1	7 (13%)	1(2%)
	2-3	47(87%)	29(54%)
	3-4	00	22(41%)
	Over 5	00	2(3%)
Seminar paper presentation output*	0-1	12(22%)	1(25)
	2-3	40(74%)	45(83%)
	3-4	2(4%)	8(15%)
Conference participation*	0-1	14(26%)	2(3%)
	2-3	40(74%)	45(83%)

	3-4	00	7(14%)
Consultancy output*	0-1	31(57%)	18(33%)
	2-3	23(43%)	27(50%)
	3-4	00	9(17%)
Project/ thesis supervision output*	0-1	53(98%)	17(32%)
	2-3	1(2%)	31(57%)
	3-4	00	5(9%)
Punctuality to class**	2-3	54(100%)	54(100%)
Teacher-learner involvement**	2-3	54(100%)	54(100%)
Examination feedback**	2-3	54(100%)	54(100%)
Team player***	2-3	54(100%)	54(100%)
Alignment to university vision***	2-3	50(93%)	54(100%)
	3-4	4(7%)	0(00%)
Willingness to take extra responsibilities***	2-3	54(100%)	54(100%)

KEY: * Research, Publication and Community Service; ** Actual Teaching Activity: *** departmental Supervisory Expectation.

Table 1 reveals that job performance output with regard to research and publication output before PhD-SD ,the highest scored was 2-3 by 47(87%) respondents whereas after PhD-SD 24(44%) respondents scored over 2-3 denoting a significant increase in performance output. With regard to seminar paper presentation output, 12(22%) respondents scored 0-1 and only 2(4%) over 2-3 output. It can be noted that there is an increase after undertaking PhD-SD whereby there is only 1(2%) scoring 0-1, and 8(15%) at over 2-3 output. Conference participation output realized 14(26%) at a score of 0-1 and 0(00%) scoring over 2-3 while after PhD-SD, there is a reduction of 0-1 score to 2(3%) and an increase to 7(14%) above 2-3 score. With regard to consultancy output , the score 0-1 before PhD-SD was at 31(57%) and above 2-3 at 0(00%) whereas after PhD-SD, 18(33%) at 0-1 and 9(17%) at above 2-3 after PhD-SD. Supervision of thesis and project was highest at 53(98%) for 0-1 score whereas after PhD-SD there was a decrease to 17(32%) for 0-1 score , 31(57%) for 2-3 score and 6(11%) over 2-3 score. Punctuality to class, teacher-learner involvement, examination feedback, team playing and willingness to take extra responsibilities was the same before and after PhD-SD at 54(100%) at a score of 2-3. Alignment to university vision score of 2-3 was at 50(93%) before PhD-SD and 4(7%) at 3-4 whereas after PhD-SD, 54(100%) respondents scored 2-3. Table 4.6 therefore indicates varied levels of increases across the job performance indicators following PhD-SD practices.

International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development
April 2013, Vol. 2, No. 2
ISSN: 2226-6348

Table 2. Scores for Off-the-job PhD-SD Job Performance Output Before and After PhD n=72

Job Performance Indicator	Score	Before PhD f	After PhD f
Research and publication output*	0-1	3(4%)	1(1.3%)
	2-3	69(96%)	69(96%)
	3-4	00	1(1.3%)
	Over 5	00	1(1.3%)
Seminar paper presentation output*	0-1	21(30%)	3(4%)
	2-3	50(69%)	67(93%)
	3-4	00	2(3%)
Conference participation output*	0-1	22(31%)	16(22%)
	2-3	50(69%)	49(68%)
	3-4	00	7(10%)
Consultancy output*	0-1	11(15%)	32(44%)
	2-3	61(85%)	36(50%)
	3-4	00	4(6%)
Project/ thesis supervision output*	0-1	71(98.7%)	41(59%)
	2-3	1(1.3%)	28(39%)
	3-4	00	3(4%)
Punctuality to class**	2-3	72(100%)	72(100%)
Teacher-learner involvement**	2-3	72(100%)	72(72%)
Examination feedback**	2-3	72(100%)	72(100%)
Team player***	2-3	72(100%)	72(100%)
Alignment to university vision***	0-1	8(12%)	4(6%)
	2-3	64(88%)	64(88)
	3-4	0(00%)	4(6%)
Willingness to take extra responsibilities***	0-1	72(100%)	72(100%)

KEY : * Research, Publication and Community Service; ** Actual Teaching Activity; *** Departmental Supervisory Expectation

Table 2. shows that with regard to Research and Publication output, 3(4%) respondents scored 0-1 and the remaining 69(96%) scored 2-3. After PhD-SD there is a decrease in 0-1 score to 1(1.3%) and for over 2-3 there is an increase of 2(2.6%). Seminar paper presentation realized 21(30%) scoring 0-1 and only 1(1%) scoring 4-5 before PhD-SD whereas after PhD-SD, scoring 0-1 reduces to 3(4%), 67(93%) score 2-3 and 2(3%) score 3-4. On conference participation output before PhD-SD, 22(31%) scored 0-1 and the remaining 50(69%) was at 2-3 whereas after PhD-SD, 0-1 score reduced to 16(22%) and there was 7(10%) scoring over 2-3 denoting an increase in output. With regard to consultancy output, 61(85%) and 0(00%) over 2-3 score before PhD-SD whereas after PhD-SD staff development, there is an increase to 32(44%) for 0-1 score and an increase to 4(6%) in over 2-3 score. For supervision of projects and thesis , scoring 0-1 before PhD were 71(98.7%) respondents while after PhD-SD 0-1 scores had reduced to 41(59%) with

those scoring over 0-1 increasing from (1)1.3% to (31)43%. With regard to actual teaching activity and departmental supervisory expectation, job performance remained the same at a score of 2-3 for punctuality to class, teacher-learner involvement, examination feedback, team playing and willingness to take extra responsibilities both before and after PhD-SD. It is only alignment to university vision that rates at 8(12%) for 0-1 score and 64(88%) for 2-3 whereas after PhD-SD practice , has 4(6%) scoring 3-4.

Table 3. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient Data on Relationship Between On-the-job PhD-SD Job Performance Index Before and After PhD-SD

Job Performance Indicators:- On-the-job respondents	No.	Correlation	p-value	df
Research & publication output before & after PhD**	54	.274	.194	53
Seminar paper presentation before & after PhD**	54	.302	.054	53
Conference participation before & after PhD**	54	.296	.031*	53
Consultancy output before & after PhD**	54	.119	.047*	53
Supervision output before & after PhD**	54	.647	<0.001*	53
Punctuality to Class***	54	.621	.200	53
Teacher-learner involvement***	54	.714	.153	53
Examination feedback***	54	.616	.126	53
Team playing*****	54	.723	.063	53
Alignment to university vision*****	54	.486	.211	53
Willingness to take extra responsibilities*****	54	.635	.043*	53

*statistically significant p<0.05

KEY: **- Research, Publication and Community Service; *** Actual Teaching Activity; ****Departmental Supervisory Expectation

The findings in Table 3 reveals that for academic staff who underwent PhD by on-the-job university sponsored mode the relationship job performance outcome following PhD with before PhD was as follows: research and publication output was at 0.274 with a p-value of 0.122 indicating a moderate positive relationship that is statistically insignificant; seminar paper presentation was 0.185 with a p-value of 0.295 indicating a weak positive relationship that is statistically insignificant; conference participation was 0.296 with a p-value of 0.31 denoting a weak positive relationship that is statistically significant; consultancy output was 0.119 with a p-value of 0.047 denoting a weak positive relationship that is statistically significant ; supervision was at 0.647 with a p-value of <0.001 showing a strong positive statistically significant relationship.

With regard to actual teaching activity, punctuality to class, 0.621 with a p-value of 0.200 denotes a strong positive statistically insignificant relationship, teacher-learner involvement at 0.741 with a p-value of 0.156 denoting a strong positive statistically insignificant relationship, and examination feedback at 0.616 with a p-value of 0.126 shows a strong positive statistically insignificant relationship.

With regard to departmental supervisory expectations, team playing had a correlation of 0.723 with a p-value of 0.63 denoting a strong positive statistically insignificant relationship, alignment to university vision at 0.486 with a p-value of 0.211 showing a moderate positive

statistically insignificant relationship, and willingness to take extra departmental responsibilities had a correlation of 0.835 with a p-value of 0.43 indicating a strong positive statistically significant relationship.

Table 4. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient Data Showing the Relationship Between Job Performance Indexes Before and After Off-the-job PhD-SD

Job Performance Indicators:- off-the-job respondents	No.	Correlation	p-value	df
Research & publication output before & after PhD**	72	.128	.506	71
Seminar paper presentation before & after PhD**	72	.190	.267	71
Conference participation before & after PhD**	72	.398	.049*	71
Consultancy output before & after PhD**	72	.021	.022*	71
Supervision output before & after PhD**	72	.547	<0.001*	71
Punctuality to Class***	72	.642	.432	71
Teacher-learner involvement***	72	.514	.421	71
Examination feedback***	72	.702	.511	71
Team playing****	72	.623	.324	71
Alignment to university vision****	72	.486	.231	71
Willingness to take extra responsibilities****	72	.735	.013*	71

*statistically significant p<0.05

KEY: **- Research, Publication and Community Service; ***- Actual Teaching Activity; *****- Departmental Supervisory Expectation

The findings in Table 4 reveals that for academic staff who underwent PhD by off-the-job mode the relationship job performance outcome following PhD with before PhD was as follows:

With regard to research , publication and community service, research and publication output was at 0.128 with a p-value of 0.506 indicating a weak positive statistically insignificant relationship; seminar paper presentation was 0.190 with a p-value of 0.297 indicating a weak positive statistically insignificant relationship; conference participation was 0.398 with a p-value of 0.049 denoting a moderate positive statistically significant relationship; consultancy output was 0.021 with a p-value of 0.022 denoting a weak positive statistically significant relationship; supervision was0.547 with a p-value of <0.001 showing a strong positive statistically significant relationship.

With regard to actual teaching activity these were the findings. For punctuality to class the correlation was 0.642 with a p-value of 0.432 denting a strong positive statistically insignificant relationship. Teacher-learner involvement had 0.514 with a p-value of 0.421 indicating a moderate relationship that is statistically insignificant. Examination feedback had a correlation of 0.702 with a p-value of 0.511 denoting a strong positive statistically insignificant relationship.

With regard to departmental supervisory expectation these were the findings. For team playing, the correlation was 0.623 with a p-value of 0.324 denoting a strong positive statistically insignificant relationship. Alignment to university vision realized a correlation of 0.486 with a p-value of 0.231 showing a moderate statistically insignificant relationship. Willingness to take extra responsibilities, the correlation was 0.735 with a p-value of 0.13 that showed a strong statistically significant relationship.

International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development
April 2013, Vol. 2, No. 2
ISSN: 2226-6348

Analysis of Variance of Impact of On-the-job PhD-SD and Off-the-job PhD-SD on Job Performance Academic Staff

One way analysis of variance was done to compare means of responses given by PhD-SD on-the-job academic staff and by PhD-SD off-the-job academic staff about the impact of PhD-SD on job performance. The findings were as summarized in Table 7.

Table 5. ANOVA of impact of on-the-job and off-the-job PhD-SD Academic Staff Job Performance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p-value
Between Groups	1.456	4	0.356	0.721	0.327
Within Groups	71.034	122	0.134		
Total	71.768	126			

It is evident from Table 5 that the F-ratio (between groups mean square) was 1.456 while the p-value was 0.237. The probability of F-ratio(p-value) of 0.327 was higher than the significance level (critical value) of 0.05. using this analysis therefore, the difference in the means of the responses of on-the-job PhD-SD academic staff and off-the-job PhD-SD academic staff was not statistically significant. This indicated that there was no significant difference realized by the two (2) SD practices on job performance. This further implies that regardless of PhD-SD practice, the job performance output is the same.

Table 6. Perception of CoDs on the Impact of PhD-SD on Job Performance in MSU/MMUST

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

International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development
April 2013, Vol. 2, No. 2
ISSN: 2226-6348

							6	
Imp* punctuality to class	f	0	0	20	12	11	43	
	%	0	0	46	28	26	100	
	Score	0	0	60	24	11	95	2.20
Imp.* teacher-learner involvement	f	0	4	31	5	3	43	
	%	0	9	72	12	7	100	
	Score	0	16	93	10	3	122	2.83
Imp.* examination feedback	f	0	0	33	5	5	43	
	%	0	0	76	12	12	100	
	Score	0	0	99	10	5	114	2.83
**Average I* Imp. Actual Teaching **							**110.3**	**2.56**
Better team player	f	0	0	9	11	23	43	
	%	0	0	21	26	53	100	
	Score	0	0	27	22	23	72	1.67
Better alignment to university vision	f	0	0	34	5	4	43	
	%	0	0	79	12	9	100	
	Score	0	0	102	10	4	116	2.69
Willingness to take responsibility	f	1	9	17	10	6	43	
	%	2	21	40	23	14	100	
	Score	5	36	51	20	6	118	2.74
Average I* imp.* Dept Supervisory Exp*							**102.0**	**2.36**
Overall MR								**2.69**

KEY: Inc*- increased output; I*- impact; Imp.- improved output; Dept- departmental; Exp.- expectation; T- total; f- frequency; **- activity; public.- publication and community service

Classification of Impact of PhD on Job Performance as Perceived by CoDs

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

Table 6 reveals that from the perception of CoDs, PhD-SD has a high impact on research, publication and community service Mean Rated at 3.15; research and publication Mean Rated at 3.09(moderate), seminar paper presentation at 3.72(high), conference participation output at 3.0(moderate), consultancy output at 2.91(moderate), and supervision of thesis and projects at 3.04(moderate). The general 'Neutral' response indicates that CoDs are non-committal on whether PhD-SD impacts positively or negatively on job performance or not.

With regard to Actual teaching Activity, CoDs Mean Rate it at 2.56(low impact); punctuality to class at 2.20(very low), teacher learner involvement at 2.83 (moderate), and examination feedback(2.83).Teaching is a core function for which PhD-SD must be in employment in a university setting.

On Departmental Supervisory Expectations CoDs indicate a Mean Rate of 2.36(low); team playing at 1.67(very low), alignment to university vision at 2.69(low impact) and willingness to take extra responsibilities at 2.74(low impact).

All the current MSU and MMUST PhD academic staff respondents were asked to give a self report in quantitative terms their job performance index before they went for PhD-SD and after they graduated. The rates that ranged from 0-7 were correlated besides they were also averaged to attain a score that was used to measure the impact of PhD-SD on Job Performance. For this study, key job performance indicators were identified for measurement of job performance. The study adopted a 'single difference approach' whereby every single increase or decrease was considered as a significant impact for the study given that there were no specific set standards against which PhD-SD academic staff job performance could be weighted. The findings were as shown in Table 1-5. In addition, perception of CoDs were sought and were as recorded in Table 6.

This study relied on PhD-SD academic staff self report. However, studies on validity of teacher self-report present mixed results. Because of their controversial standing, to increase quality, the data collection tools should behold highly detailed measures of practice to capture actual teaching practices (Goer, et al, 2008). For this study, both tangible and intangible aspects of PhD academic staff job performance- Research, Publication and Community service, Actual Teaching Activity and Departmental Supervisory Expectation were valued for consideration and measured. Though reliability of self-reports are difficult to establish, these self-measure tools can be used for observable factors, besides intentions and beliefs from the perspective of the teacher more accurately than from the stand point of a mere observer, such as a student or supervisor(Axelrod, 2008).On this note, the fact that 33(77%) CoDs were not occupying these offices before the onset of PhD-SD activities among their current PhD-SD academic staff, this self-report was therefore appropriate for this study.

Ralph (2003) cited in Axelrod (2008) identified 5 criterion upon which quality teaching can be judged. These were; commitment to learners, knowledge of material, organization and management of the environment, desire to improve, and collaboration. He concluded that exemplary university teaching is discernable, and the quality can be assessed using Likert Scales. This was confirmed by Axelrod (2008) who conducted such a survey in February 2008 and April 2008 whereby the responses remained the same. Based on this position, this study used Likert scales for CoDs and to boost validity of its findings from academic staff self-report to find out whether they thought they had improved in performance following PhD staff development. For this study, actual teaching activity referred to improved punctuality to class, improved teacher-learner involvement, and improved examination feedback.

Academic staff were asked to indicate, based on their experience, whether they thought PhD-SD practices they had undergone had a positive influence on the way they did their job with regard to Actual Teaching Activity. The response was as follows; 46(85%) of those who had undergone on-the-job PhD-SD practice were non-committal, 63(88%) of those who had undergone off-the-job PhD-SD were non-committal. This non-committal position beheld by 109(87%) of the total PhD-SD academic staff respondents can be equated to the Neutral (2.56) position by CoDs as shown in Table.6.

Table 6 reveals that from the perception of the CoDs, PhD-SD influenced job performance as Mean Rated at 2.92(Moderate). It can be noted that PhD influenced job performance in order

of priority; timely CATs feedback, punctuality to class and student teaching-learning involvement Mean Rated at 3.0, recommending reading materials at 2.9 and timely issue of course outlines Mean Rated at 2.7. This Mean Rating of "moderate" implies a non-committal position that PhD-SD does not influence Actual Teaching Activity aspect job performance according to CoDs. According to 3(33%) DFDSs, assessing Actual Teaching Activity of academic staff is in the docket of CoDs who only draw their attention in case of challenges that stand out once in a while, or during regular reporting at meetings. This was in agreement with 2(22%) UMPs who asserted that their work is only to appraise DFDSs and CoDs, who in turn appraise academic staff in their charge.

Ordinarily, CoDs perform a supervisory role whereby they undertake both formative and summative evaluation. Some of the aspects, they focus on may include; leadership, initiative, judgment, customer awareness, decision-making ability, self-discipline, quality of work, diligence and cost-consciousness (Quick & Nelson, 2011). In addition, Torrington et al (2008) assert that the manager feels very uncomfortable playing God given that whatever his perception of his subordinate, he is expected to confront him in an authoritarian way, prescribing courses of actions some which he may neither understand himself nor believe in. Such evaluation is fallible. It is noteworthy that for 43(100%) CoDs, the main use of appraisal results is to enhance CoDs control over their subordinates in the department.

When interviewed, one on-the-job PhD-SD respondent argued.

> '…there is minimal improvement in Departmental Supervisory Expectations because PhD-SD programmes are not normally designed to create better subordinates…its salient features include the creation of bosses, renowned researchers, community facilitators and opinion leaders. In other words PhD-SD redirects one's focus beyond the boundaries of the institution and therefore, it is outside there that they should be evaluated.'

Th D-SD
re ment
ca 40%)
Ul ff in

departmental activities or how cooperative they are since they rely on overall regular and incidental appraisal reports from CoDs and DFDSs.

Research is inconclusive on the validity of self-evaluation. For instance, several studies cited in Goer, et al,(2008) have varied findings. In a few cases such as Centra(1999) teachers rate themselves higher than student ratings, in Fieldman(1989) they rate themselves equal to student ratings while in Bollinn, Lowman, Pratt and Zhu(2004), they rate themselves lower than students rate them. Despite the discrepancies, most administrators agree that in Liberal Arts Colleges, academic deans, 59% always include self evaluations for summative decisions such as for promotions, dismissals and appointments. From the foregoing, this study employed self-evaluation by PhD-SD academic staff in addition to information from other key players who were CoDs, DFDSs and UMPs, the other players who gave their perception on relevant PhD-SD job performance issues.

Conclusion

There was significant difference in job performance output in Research, Publication and Community Service following PhD-SD practices but not in Actual Teaching Activity and Departmental Supervisory Expectation.

Regardless of the PhD-SD practice, job performance output following PhD-SD was similar implying that the practices do not influence job performance.

Recommendations

Given that universities have job performance output at three (3) levels, studies should be carried to find out ways in which academic staff should be addressed so as to improve Actual Teaching Activity and Departmental Supervisory Expectation for overall quality job performance output to complement the significant improvement in Research, Publication and Community Service.

There should be in-service targeting Actual teaching activity and Departmental Supervisory Expectation such as certification in pedagogy, student assessment strategies, organizational participation and team building.

Universities should be proactive in the appraisal of its academic staff to triangulate results from self-reports to have a more objective outcome; for instance involve students in academic staff appraisal, and institute electronic monitoring strategies.

References

Amstrong,M.A.(2009).*Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. London: Kogan page Ltd.

Anyamele, S.C.(2007). *Managing Professional Competencies of Teaching Staff in the University: Views of Finnish University Leaders.* Vol.5(1)1-7 http:/www.academicleadership.org/article…..

Axelrod, P. (2008).Student Perspectives on Good Teaching: What History Reveals- Academic Matters. The Journal of Higher Education 24(227) http:/www.ocufa.on.ca/AM-Feb08/Feb08p24…..

Ezati, B & Mugimu, C.B. (2010). Possibilities and Challenges of Providing Continuous Staff Training and Development in Pedagogy for Higher Education Staff in Uganda: A case of Makerere University *Comparative and International Higher Education* . vol. (2) 6-9.http://74.238.258/search/srpca..

Goer,L.G., Bell, C. & Little, O.(2008).*Approaches to Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness: AResearch Synthesis.* Comprehensive Centre for Teacher Quality. Washington DC

Gudo, C.O., Oanda, I.O. & Olel, M.A. (2011). Role of Institutional Managers in Quality Assurance: Reflections on Kenya's University Education. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research.* Vol 1(2) 113-124.

Jamil,A., Atta,A.M., Ali, V., Balochi, J. & Ayaz, M.(2011). Effects of in-service Training in Meliorating Teachers' Performance at Secondary School level *International Journal of Academic Research* vol.3 (2) 624-628

Kairu,P.(2011, November 9th). *The Fall and Fall of University Education Standards in Kenya*. Daily Nation –Daily Kenya Living pp. 1-3

Nsindabi, A. (2006).*Challenges Facing University Chancellors in the Globalised World*. The First University Council of East Africa (IUCEA). Chancellors and Vice- Chancellors Conference, Uganda.

International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development
April 2013, Vol. 2, No. 2
ISSN: 2226-6348

Out, J.A.(2011). Teachers in Ghana: Issues of Training, Remuneration and Effectiveness. International Journal of Educational Development, 26(1), 38-51.

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

Republic of Kenya(2005). Ministry of Education Strategic Plan 2006-2011 www.education.go.ke.

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

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