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ABSTRACT

Organizations today, more than any other period in time, are faced with the continuous need of developing, maintaining, and expanding the knowledge and skills of their workforce. Increased use of a diverse workforce, technology, global competitiveness, multi-skilled positions, work teams, process re-engineering, and pay for performance has created the need for employee training.

Based on a study of the trends in business, technology, and training, P.A. Galagan (1994) identified several changes in the environment for learning in the workplace. Two of the changes have a direct correlation to training. First, more learning is occurring "just-in-time" and directly in the context of a job or a task. Second, the focus of learning activities is shifting away from isolated skill building and information transfer, moving instead to performance improvement and support.

This sought to conceptualize the impact of training in the performance of non-teaching staff in Kenyan public universities. It explores how a Training process can help meet the training needs and challenges facing the Kenyan public universities in today's world of competition. Many organizations have realized that their survival in both national and international markets will only be possible through the pursuit of a competitive edge and the long-term sustainable performance of human resources.

The study was based on descriptive research design while the sampling techniques included stratified sampling and simple random sampling.

Data collection procedure involved questionnaires while Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) was applied to enhance the data analytical process. The conclusions were drawn from the analysis and recommendations were drawn from the conclusions thereof. The conclusion that training has a significant role in the performance of employees was drawn and management must take steps to ensure that this is implemented to enhance efficiency among the staff.
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

OJT - On the job training

HRD - Human Resource Development

Training - formal and systematic modification of behaviour through learning, which occurs as a result of education, instruction, and development and planned experience

On the Job training - One-on-one instruction located at the job site.

Off the job training - Distinct from OJT and normally planned, off-the-job training is usually designed to meet shared learning needs of a group rather than a particular individual’s needs. Classroom training is the most common form of off-the-job training (Rothwell and Kazanas, 1994).

Task - Discrete units of work that is part of a job and have a clear beginning and ending.

Performance - The output in terms of improved customer service
LIST OF FIGURES

1Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework ................................................................. 6
2Figure 4.1b: Responses by gender ................................................................. 18
3Figure 4.1c: Responses by gender ................................................................. 18
4Figure 4.2a: Number of years worked ......................................................... 19
5Figure 4.2b: Number of years worked ......................................................... 20
6Figure 4.2c: Number of years worked ......................................................... 20
7Figure 4.3a: Presence or absence of inductions ........................................ 21
8Figure 4.3b: Presence or absence of inductions ........................................ 22
9Figure 4.3c: Presence or absence of inductions ........................................ 22
10Figure 4.4a: How employees learn about their jobs .................................... 23
11Figure 4.4b: How employees learn about their jobs .................................... 24
12Figure 4.4c: How employees learn about their jobs .................................... 24
13Figure 4.6a: Common Training practices .................................................. 25
14Figure 4.6b: Common Training practices .................................................. 26
15Figure 4.6c: Common Training practices .................................................. 26
16Figure 4.7a Performance of Non Teaching Staff ........................................ 27
17Figure 4.7b Performance of Non Teaching Staff ........................................ 28
18Figure 4.7c Performance of Non Teaching Staff ........................................ 28
19Figure 4.8a Effect of training in staff performance ..................................... 29
20Figure 4.8b Effect of training in staff performance ..................................... 30
21Figure 4.8c: Effect of training in staff performance .................................... 30
22Figure 4.9a: Challenges for the management of universities ...................... 31
23Figure 4.9b: Challenges for the management of universities ...................... 32
24Figure 4.9c: Challenges for the management of universities ...................... 32
25Figure 4.10a: Recommendations by Respondents .................................... 34
26Figure 4.10b: Recommendations by Respondents .................................... 34
27Figure 4.10c: Recommendations by Respondents .................................... 35
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Sample size ........................................................................................................ 16
Table 2: Responses by gender ......................................................................................... 17
Table 3: Number of years worked ................................................................................... 19
Table 4: Presence or absence of inductions ................................................................. 21
Table 5: How employees learn about their jobs ......................................................... 23
Table 6: Common Training practices .......................................................................... 25
Table 7: Performance of Non Teaching Staff ............................................................ 27
Table 8: Effect of training in staff performance ......................................................... 29
Table 9: Management challenges ............................................................................... 31
Table 10: Recommendations by respondents ........................................................... 33
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION ............................................................................................................ II  
DEDICATION ............................................................................................................. III  
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .............................................................................................. IV  
ABSTRACT .................................................................................................................. V  
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS ....................................... VI  
LIST OF FIGURES ...................................................................................................... VII  
LIST OF TABLES ....................................................................................................... VIII  
TABLE OF CONTENTS ............................................................................................. IX  

CHAPTER ONE ......................................................................................................... 1  
  1.0 INTRODUCTION ................................................................................................. 1  
    1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY ...................................................................... 1  
    1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM ................................................................... 2  
    1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY ...................................................................... 4  
    1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS .............................................................................. 4  
    1.5 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY ........................................................................... 5  
    1.6 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY ........................................... 5  

CHAPTER TWO ........................................................................................................ 6  
  2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW ..................................................................................... 6  
    2.1 INTRODUCTION ............................................................................................ 6  
    2.2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK ..................................................................... 6  
    2.3 MAIN REVIEW ............................................................................................ 7  
        2.3.1 Roles and Relationships of training ..................................................... 8  
        2.3.2 Management’s Role and Responsibility ........................................... 8  
        2.3.3 HRD’s Role and Responsibilities ....................................................... 9  
        2.3.4 Trainer’s Role and Responsibility ...................................................... 9
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Training is the formal and systematic modification of behaviour through learning, which occurs as a result of education, instruction, and development and planned experience Armstrong M (2001). The fundamental aim of training is to help an organization achieve its purpose by adding value to its key resource-the people it employs. Many Organizations seem to view employee training as more optional than essential. A viewpoint that can be costly to both short-term profits and long-term progress.

The primary reason training is considered optional by so many organizations is because it's viewed more as an expense than an investment. This is completely understandable when you realize that in many companies, training is not focused on producing a targeted result for the organization (Clark, 1999). As a result, managers frequently send their people to training courses that seem right and sound good without knowing what to expect in return. But without measurable results, it's almost impossible to view training as anything more than an expense. Training ought to be viewed as a capital investment with thoughtful consideration as to how one is going to obtain an acceptable rate of return on investment and a good place to start is with a needs analysis. As it relates to training, a needs analysis is really an outcome analysis-- "What's going to change in the behavior or performance of my employees as a result of this training that's going to help the organization?"

In many organizations, training budgets are solely a function of whether the organization is enjoying an economic upswing or enduring a downturn. In good times, organizations tend to spend money on training that's not significant to the organization, and in bad times, the pendulum swings to the other extreme and training is eliminated altogether. In any economic environment, the training expense should be determined by the targeted result, not other budget-related factors.
Lack of Training expertise is common in many businesses, which typically have no training departments, and in large organizations where the training department is not working with operating department to design and deliver planned Training. In organizations that lack training expertise, because they have no in-house ability to establish training plans and schedules, implement those plans through structured work experiences, or evaluate results, it is common to find subject matter experts who have no knowledge of instructional design left to their own abilities to establish and carry out training for new workers which may also mean that trainers, human resource professionals, organizational leaders, managers and supervisors have not understood the value of training and the role it can play in improving the performance of employees at workplaces.

Public universities over the years relied on Government funding. Today, they are feeling the crunch of reduced Government funding and competition from private and overseas universities. The Government of Kenya has now become financially hamstrung, and students choose their own courses, and universities they wish to attend. This is an indication that the best institution will survive. The said activities cannot be attractive to the consumers without skilled and knowledgeable employees whose work performance will propel the university to attract students. Kenyatta University has unveiled a 10-year strategic plan to redefine its position in terms of mode of operations to compete with local and international universities for students, lecturers and funds (Nation Newspaper, Monday, February 7th 2005 p. 8). This will only be realized where the right size of labour force with the required competencies is employed.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

According to Sullivan 1995, Learning demands of today’s workforce, organizational restructuring and global competition require organizations to quickly develop, maintain and expand the skill and knowledge of their workforce. Proper training therefore enables employees to be more knowledgeable, skilled, motivated and capable. However implementation of training programs is a big problem in Kenyan Public Universities.
According to Kavulya (2004) Kenyan public universities are among organizations that have been characterized with unproductive break-in time for new workers, high frustration due to the trial and error methods of training upon introduction of new technologies and poor ways of addressing individual learning needs. Many staff members in institutions have not been performing to the required standards because of their poor training and lack of skills, low levels of motivation, lack of orientation and induction into their new jobs (on recruitment or on transfers) among other factors (Peter 1994).

Over the years, Kenyan public universities have enjoyed an almost competition free environment. However they are now facing competition from private and overseas universities. In response to the reduced government funding, Kenyan public universities have introduced self-sponsored programmes as one of the avenues of generating additional revenue. This has led to a competing environment between them, private universities and other overseas universities. The developments therefore have forced the staff to adapt to higher requirements in their stations, increased demands for higher output, more skills and knowledge to discharge their duties among other issues. The management of the universities need also to develop strategic plans, which will necessitate the Kenyan public university management to start thinking and acting in business like manner. This business like approach will be more successful in a case where the labour force is equipped with the required competencies at workplace. The workloads of the non-teaching staff have consequently increased as new challenges crop up in the universities. This has necessitated the need to equip the non – teaching staff with the appropriate skills in order to successfully undertake their added duties.

Given the above scenario this study therefore aims at examining the Impact of on-the-job and off-the-job Training on the performance of non-teaching staff in the Kenyan public universities with specific reference to Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology and Kenyatta University.
1.3 Objectives of the Study
The general objective of this study was to examine the impact of training on the performance of non-teaching staff in Kenyan public universities. However, the research specifically aimed at:

1. Establishing the relationship between training practices being offered in Kenyan public universities and employee performance
2. Identifying the changing trends in training being taken by Kenyan public universities to improve the work performance of the non-teaching staff.
3. Determining the potential roles of training in the performance of non-teaching staff in Kenyan public universities.

1.4 Research questions
This study was guided by the following research questions as pertaining to the effects of training on the performance of non-teaching staff at Kenyan Public universities:

1. What is the relationship between training practices and work performance among the non-teaching staff in Kenyan public universities?
2. What changing trends in training are being taken by public universities to improve work performance of the non-teaching staff?
3. What are the potential roles of training in work performance among the non-teaching staff in Kenyan public universities?
4. How does training affect work performance of the non-teaching staff in Kenyan public universities?
1.5 **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine training and its impact on the performance of the non-teaching staff in Kenyan public Universities. The study sought to find out if there were things that were not done in the right manner with regard to training and its contribution to work performance and how to take corrective steps.

1.6 **Scope and limitations of the study**

The study focused on the six Kenyan public universities with a population of approximately 11,000 non-teaching staff. However due to time and financial limitations the study concentrated on the non-teaching staff working in the various departments/sections in two Kenyan public universities i.e. Kenyatta University located 16 kilometers on Thika dual carriage Highway from the capital city, Nairobi with 1629 non-teaching staff and Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology situated in Thika District approximately 20 kilometers on the outskirts of the capital city with 920 non-teaching staff. The findings from the two Public Universities would be taken to be representative of the other four Public Universities given the similarities in the Management structures, employees' terms of service and service delivery of providing Education in the country among others.

Some respondents would censor their actual views for fear of intimidation but anonymity and confidentiality was guaranteed to respondents during the research period.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter focused on related literature. It therefore covered the history of training, its relationship structures, trainer and trainee responsibilities, the training process, motivation, organization culture, technology, benefits of training and barriers to training.

2.2 Conceptual framework

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework

Training

Improved work performance
- Quality work
- Teamwork
- Better management of stress
- Motivated workforce
- Improved problem solving skills

Intervening variables:
- Motivation
- Organization Culture
- Management role
- Technology
- Structured programmes
- Trainer’s Role

‘Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime’ - that is according to a Chinese proverb. Similarly, training is an independent variable, which is function of improved work performance as the dependent variable.
The Figure 2.1 above depicts the relationship between the intervening variables and Training in an organization. As a result of the intervening variables, there is improved work performance, which is characterized by quality work, teamwork, and better management of stress, motivated workforce, and improved problem solving skills.

2.3 Main review

The concept of training has roots tied to the early 1900s. Johann Friedrich Herbart, a German psychologist, outlined a four step instructional process. He believed that the mind receives and assimilates information in a certain pattern. In antiquity, the kind of work that people did was mainly unskilled or semiskilled work that did not require specialized knowledge. Parents or other community members, who knew how to do a job necessary for survival, passed their knowledge on to the children through direct instruction.

During World War I in 1917, the U.S. Shipping Board’s need to build ships created a need for 450,000 skilled workers. With a shortage of skilled workers, C R Allen and members of the Emergency Fleet Cooperation, developed process to train shipbuilders McCord.(1987). Allen’s findings and those of the Army during World War I led to the development of principles for industrial training:

- Supervisors should do training and instructional ability is an important part of a supervisor’s job.
- Supervisors should be trained to instruct.
- The best group size for training is 9 to 11 people.
- The preparation of a job breakdown is an all important step before training.
- Break-in time is reduced when training is done on the job.
- When given personal attention in training, the worker develops a feeling of loyalty.

From Allen’s experience with training shipbuilders, he saw the need for training programs within organizations. He determined that the best process would ensure: each
person was trained to do his or her job in the best possible way; each person was trained
to do his or her job in the least possible training time; and each person’s training
experience was satisfying enough to ensure he or she remained throughout the training
period.

### 2.3.1 Roles and Relationships of training

According to W. Jacobs, (1992), a Training program requires a high level of commitment
from individuals in line and staff positions. The organization must be willing to provide
financial and human resources to assist in development, delivery and evaluation. The
Training program requires one manager and one overall process to maintain
accountability. Responsibility for the program should involve individuals at all levels and
those individuals responsible for conducting individual Training Rothwell & Kazanas
(1994).

### 2.3.2 Management’s Role and Responsibility

Training requires partnering by the training staff with the line managers. Management
must support, understand and manage the process not only with resources but with
presence. They need to ensure the program remains effective and the organization’s
values, expectations and standards are being applied. To do this managers should observe
supervisors and employees conducting training in the field, critique the process, and
provide feedback.

Line Managers' most important contribution to the competency-based training system
focuses on establishing an environment where training efforts can be successfully
completed as a normal part of day-to-day operations. Although this statement appears to
be simple and straightforward, in reality, it is difficult to accomplish for a number of
reasons:

- Few managers receive formal training in how to train their workers
- Conflicts often arise between normal operations and training activities
- Training activities require resources, such as: time, money, personnel and energy that
  would normally be focused on daily work efforts
Training activities are often considered to be a burden by managers.

### 2.3.3 HRD’s Role and Responsibilities

The HRD staff provides support to the line organization in developing and maintaining the training program. These individuals should have some subject matter expertise and possess skills in:

- Conducting job, task, workplace and training needs analysis to determine the knowledge, skills, and abilities required to perform the job/tasks and any health and safety hazards associated with the work.

- Performing human performance assessments used for determining causes associated with human performance problems and the application of OJT as a corrective training intervention.

- Providing guidance to the line for establishing and developing the goals, objectives, and programmatic elements of a training program.

### 2.3.4 Trainer’s Role and Responsibility

The transfer of knowledge and skill, even from a well analyzed and designed Training program, depends on the knowledge, skills, standards, and values of the trainer. The trainer may be a supervisor, peer, or a professional trainer. The selection of the Training trainer is critical, and poor performers should never be chosen. One primary purpose of Training is to prevent the trainee from developing "bad work habits" Filipczak, (1993). Most often the trainee will exhibit the behaviors, standards and values of the trainer after the training is completed. Poorly conducted Training will likely result in poor performance by the trainee in the workplace, therefore trainer selection is vital Shea, (1981). Individuals selected for the role of Training trainer should be solid performers, possess the necessary technical knowledge and skills, exhibit good communication skills, and have patience (Filipczak, 1993).
2.3.5 Trainee's Role and Responsibilities

Trainees should realize that their responsibility for learning is at least equal to the trainer's responsibility to train Mellander, (1993). At a minimum trainees should understand the training process, confirm his/her scheduled training and evaluation times, complete any prerequisite studying or preparation prior to the training, actively practice all assigned tasks to achieve competency, work in a responsible manner as to promote safety, quality, and productivity, and request assistance from the trainer as needed.

2.3.6 Developing Competency

Employees must have the competency to complete a given task or make decisions. In essence "employees must be properly trained. It does not make sense to empower employees to do things such as make decisions or approve or initiate action if they are not properly trained" (Gandz, 1990, p. 76). Byham (1997) indicates that among the "characteristics of an empowered organization" (p. 25) are, "empowering, leadership/training, job and technical skills/training, interpersonal problem-solving skills/training, frontline customer service skills/training, empowering support groups/training" (p. 28 – 30). Gandz (1990) states that "technical training, decision-making skills, group process skills, are all required in improving the performance of employees" (p. 76). Thus while the literature is not completely consistent we expect that employee competence would be related to effectiveness which is performance related.

Training does not come cheaply. Not only must organizations invest in training materials and facilitators, they must value training sufficiently to release employees from regular work duties to attend.

2.3.7 Evaluating training

The process of evaluating training has been defined by Hamblin (1974) as "any attempt to obtain information (feedback) on the effects of training programme and to assess the value of training in the light of that information". It is important to evaluate training in order to assess its effectiveness in producing the learning outcomes specified when the
training intervention was planned and to and to indicate where improvement or changes are required to make the training even more effective.

2.3.8 Barriers to Training

Barriers to an OJT program can be characterized into the following areas:

**Lack of Knowledge on Training:** Management and supervision unfamiliar with proper training procedures may be unwilling to provide the necessary resources to develop and implement the program Rothwell and Kazanas, (1994).

**Lack of Time:** Lack of time is a common excuse for not implementing a training program. Downsizing has placed more responsibilities on supervisors and workers than ever before and they are stressed out from handling multiple assignments and fighting daily fires. Training then becomes a much lower priority level Rothwell and Kazanas, (1994). Supervisors may tend to focus on production and become reluctant to release their key employees to conduct training Broadwell, (1986).

**Lack of Resources** “Resources include items like funding, access to support staff, or experts” (Ward, 1996, p. 22. It is demotivating to be stopped in your tracks because you either do not know how to proceed or lack the tools necessary to carry out effective training (p. 31). Lack of resources lead to poor performance by employees

**Distractions:** An uncontrolled training environment may undermine the effectiveness of training. The amount of noise, interruptions, hazards, and other distractions may prohibit or greatly impact the outcome of training (Broadwell, 1986).

**Ineffective Trainers:** Trainers, who lack the necessary skills to conduct the training, are poor work performers fail to prepare, and deviate from the training materials has a negative impact on the trainee and the outcome of the training process Broadwell, (1986). Trainers must have adequate job knowledge and skills and they must have adequate
training knowledge, skills, and attitudes. The success of training depends on the trainers having the right skills and effectively applying them.

To overcome the barriers listed above managers need to take specific actions in order to establish a successful competency-based training program within their section, department or division. These actions would include setting up a training program that incorporates the following principles:

- **Structure** - Structured programs rely on organisational support and include things like policies, procedures, training records and training performance reports.

- **Objectives** - Training objectives need to be clearly defined and communicated to the trainees, trainers and other folks that may be involved with the training activities.

- **Accountability** - Developees and their trainers both have responsibilities that must be fulfilled to ensure success. The trainees must also be tested against job-related skills that are outlined in their competency-based development plan.

- **Preparation** - Trainers must be given adequate time to prepare for training and the developees must be briefed on things they must do to prepare for training sessions.

- **Consistency** - Training outcomes should not vary by trainer, shift or time of year and the developees should have the same set of job-skills when training is finished.

2.4 **Empirical studies on Training**

The field of on the job training in relation to employee performance has not been fully researched on. However some researches have been done in this field. Muema J. (2004) carried out a study focusing on the practices and performance in public University Libraries in Kenya. In all universities examined, he observed that there is severe shortage of qualified staff both at the management and operation levels. Supervisors admitted that new employees exhibit poor productivity, poor work quality, and ineffective service during the first year or so of employment.
P. A. Galagan (1994), in her study of the trends in business, technology, and training identified several changes in the environment for learning in the workplace. Two of the changes have a direct correlation to Training. First, more learning is occurring "just-in-time" and directly in the context of a job or a task. Second, the focus of learning activities is shifting away from isolated skill building and information transfer, moving instead to performance improvement and support.

Another research carried out by Thapisa (2003) on Developing lasting competencies for a twenty-first century information economy workforce in Africa reported that in organizations that lacked training expertise, resulting from the absence in-house ability to carry out job breakdowns, establish training plans and schedules, implement those plans through structured work experiences, or evaluate results, it is common to find subject matter experts who have no knowledge of instructional design left to their own abilities to establish and carry out training for new workers.

A survey conducted in 2003 by the South African Society for Training and Development provides expected training trends for the next five years in developing countries. First, the data indicate a shift in who will deliver training. Non-trainers such as managers, supervisors, and technical workers will conduct much of the training previously provided by professional trainers. Second, the amount of training delivered locally will change as organizations attempt to reach a balance between centralized and de-centralized training. Third, more training will be delivered just-in-time and in the context of a job or a task.

These studies formed the basis of this research. However, none of them addressed the issues to be investigated by this research since this research aims at examining the Impact of Training on employee performance in Kenyan public universities: A case of non teaching staff in selected public universities.

2.5 Summary of Gaps filled by the study

According to Carnevale 2002, the complex and competitive nature of today's corporate world, has created a craving for increased use of a diverse workforce, technology, global
competitiveness, multi-skilled positions, work teams, process re-engineering, and pay for performance, thus the increased need for an instructional method that easily transfers skill and knowledge which should also be effective, convenient, and economical.

Sullivan 1995 also stated that Learning demands of today’s workforce, organizational restructuring and global competition require organizations to quickly develop, maintain and expand the skill and knowledge of their workforce. Kenyan public universities are now facing various challenges resulting from global competition, restructuring and downsizing as an effort to reduce costs, and the new learning demands for its workforce.

Failure to develop skills that are required for particular tasks at workplace has resulted in People being underutilized in many organizations. The study, by exploring the impact of training in performance of the non teaching staff in Kenyan public Universities, is hoped that more scholars will embark on substantive research addressing other emerging issues in training at work place with regard to other business oriented organizations in the corporate world.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

3.1 Research Design
The study was carried out using descriptive survey. This method was the most appropriate for this research considering the fact that the numerical data that needed to be collected required to be organized and summarized in a manner that would enhance meaningful understanding and communication by using the descriptive statistics to examine the Impact of Training in the performance of non-teaching in Kenyan public Universities.

3.2 Target Population
The targeted population was the non-teaching staff at the two Kenyan public Universities (Kenyatta University and Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology) given the similarities in their management structures, policies and service delivery of providing education to the public.

3.3 Sampling Design
Due to financial limitation, a stratified random sampling ratio of 0.1 (10%) was obtained from the total population of 2549 non-teaching staff in the two universities (Kenyatta University and Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology). According to Sekaran (2004), 10% of the accessible population is enough a sample. Given that the population was heterogeneous, stratified sampling was used. These include 247 employees at the academic cadre, 879 at the middle management level and 1423 at the auxiliary level. From these categories a sample was obtained using proportionate sampling on the basis of 10% on each category of the non-teaching staff. Simple random sampling was then applied such that every subject had an equal chance of being selected.
3.4 Data Collection Tools and Procedures
The primary data for the purpose of this study was obtained by the researcher through observation of employees and oral interviews of Union officials for the non-teaching staff union. The secondary data was obtained from books, published and unpublished theses and dissertations, magazines, abstracts, periodicals, computer searches and Internet. The data was collected using questionnaires with open and closed ended questions.

3.5 Data Analysis
Descriptive statistics mainly frequencies and cross tabulation was used to analyze the data. A Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was applied to enhance the data analytical process. Appropriate interpretation, findings and recommendation was done accordingly.

3.6 Expected Output
The anticipated output was the research report on the findings of the study and recommendations emanating from the study, which would indicate the impact of training on employee performance.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter handles the results that were obtained from the respondents through the questionnaires. The chapter also discusses the results vis-a-vis the objectives of the study. The conclusions drawn thereof are explained in the next chapter. Out of the 225 questionnaires distributed, 162 were collected giving a response rate of 63.5%. This means that the conclusions that are drawn from the responses are representative.

4.2 Data Analysis
Of the responses received, the distribution by gender was as represented by table 4.1 and figure 4.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Author, 2007)
Figure 4.1a: Responses by gender
Considering the fact that different employees have worked for different periods, it was prudent to get the views of these different categories of staff. This is because, the practice of training might have been different during some years from the current practice or the
vice versa can be true. Thus their responses with regards to the number of years worked were as tabulated in table 3 and as represented in the figure 4.2.

Table 3: Number of years worked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 yrs</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10yrs</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15yrs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15yrs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Author, 2007)

Figure 4.2a: Number of years worked
It is then evident that majority of the staff (at least 75%) has been in the university as an employee. This is a clear indication that the trend of training for the non-teaching staff has been seemingly the same throughout the periods. It shows that the policy on the
training programs has not changed over the years and since, of all the respondents, none of them indicated to the contrary with regards to the training programs.

When the staff were asked whether they were inducted (introduced to the new workplace) when they joined the university, majority of them (94%) indicated that they were never inducted (Table 4.3) and either learnt about their new jobs through trial and error (91%), or through previous experience in their earlier appointments (8%). The other 1% learnt about their jobs through training manuals. (Table 4.4, Figure 4.4)

Table 4: Presence or absence of inductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Induction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>162</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Author, 2007)

Figure 4.3a: Presence or absence of inductions
Figure 4.3b: Presence or absence of inductions

![Presence or absence of induction graph]

Figure 4.3c: Presence or absence of inductions
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Source (Author, 2007)
Table 5: How employees learn about their jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trial and error</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous experience</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training manuals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Author, 2007)

Figure 4.4a: How employees learn about their jobs

![Pie chart showing how employees learn about their jobs]

- Trial and error: 8%
- Previous experience: 1%
- Training manuals: 91%

Source (Author, 2007)
Figure 4.4b: How employees learn about their jobs

![Bar chart showing how employees learn about their jobs](image)

Figure 4.4c: How employees learn about their jobs

![Bar chart showing how employees learn about their jobs](image)

Source (Author, 2007)

However, when asked on some of the most common training that they are used in the university whether formally or otherwise, they responded as shown in table 4.5 and as represented in figure 4.5. More than half of the respondents (54%) indicated that they learnt on the job (where another member of staff helps the new staff understand and comprehend the concepts of the job and how they are done). Another 25% of them
indicated that they also utilized their previous experiences to learn their jobs. It is noticeable that this is not one of the best methods especially where the staff is joining the job without having some prior experience.

Table 6: Common Training practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training practices</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the Job</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One on One</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars/Workshops</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Experience</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Author, 2007)

Figure 4.6a: Common Training practices
When asked about their view on the performance of the non-teaching staff in the universities, the response was that they perform averagely or poorly (34% and 33%) whereas another 21% indicated that the performance was good.
Table 7: Performance of Non Teaching Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Author, 2007)

Figure 4.7a Performance of Non Teaching Staff

![Performance of Non Teaching Staff](image-url)
The respondents also responded with a resounding yes (97%) when asked whether the training had any influence on the performance of the non-teaching staff. This was a clear indication that the management of the university should consider the use of training as a facility to influence the performance of the non-teaching staff. As seen in table 4.8
and figure 4.8 the other 3% indicated that training did not have the influence on the performance of the staff of the universities.

Table 8: Effect of training in staff performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Author, 2007)
When the respondents were asked about the challenges faced by the University in regards to training of non-teaching staff, they cited 4 major factors, which were:

i  Political

ii  Financial
iii Lack of management will and
iv Lack of trainers

When the data was tabulated (table 9), the following was achieved.

Table 9: Management challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Trainers</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Management will</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>298</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, (2007)

The data was also presented in a pie chart (Figure 4.9) and the following was achieved.

Figure 4.9a: Challenges for the management of universities
Source: Author, (2007)

It was the concerns of the respondents that lack of management will (35%) that was the main challenge towards the training and development of the non-teaching staff. However, the respondents regarding these challenges also cited other reasons. These
included Political reasons (26%), Financial (22%), lack of trainers (15%) whereas other reasons accounted for only 2%.

It is then evident that, even though may not seriously absolve itself from the blames of lacking will, for training, it is the feeling of all the non teaching staff that the management did not bother about the need to train them.

When the respondents were asked on what they could recommend to the management regarding what can be done to enhance the training and development of teaching staff, they cited the tabulated recommendations. Chief among these were the provision of study leaves for these staff so that they could go out and learn off the job (98 respondents), another 68 needed a provision of career development whereas another 56 needed to be facilitated for seminars. 43 respondents recommended that the non teaching staff who are qualified to be lecturers, should be transferred to these teaching positions to maximize their potential (table 4.10)

Table 10: Recommendations by respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide study leaves</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide career development</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate them for seminars</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide transfers to teaching positions</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, (2007)
Figure 4.10a: Recommendations by Respondents

Recommendations by respondents

- Provide study leaves 36%
- Provide career development 24%
- Facilitate them for seminars 15%
- Provide transfers to teaching positions 20%
- Others 5%

Figure 4.10b: Recommendations by Respondents

Recommendations by Respondents

- Provide study leaves: 98
- Provide transfers to teaching positions: 34

Figure 4.10c: Recommendations by Respondents

Source: Author, (2007)
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter deals with the conclusions from the study as derived from the preceding chapter. It entails the conclusions that can be drawn from the research and the recommendations that can be drawn from it.

5.2 Conclusions
From the responses, it can be concluded that majority of the staff, (75%) have worked in the university for at least 5 years and thus they have a relative good experience with regards to training facilities and practices that the university provides. Their responses with regards to the training programs within the university were unanimous that they do not have any training and they learn their jobs on- the – job. They also indicate that no induction process was done for them when they joined the university but rather indicated that they learned through trail and error (91%), and another 8% learned through their previous experiences. This is a sorry state and in general it can be traced as the root cause of the poor workmanship and work ethics identified as being rampant within the university.

Of the training practices available at the Universities, on the job (54%), previous experience (25%) and one on one (13%) were indicated as the major practices available though informally. This indicates that the university must do something regarding training even if the on the job method is formalized. The lessons that new staff will learn on the job may not be the correct and truly they may learn unethical lessons, which will ruin their work ethics.

The respondents also indicated that the performance of the non-teaching staff was poor (33%) and 34% average. This is a clear indication that not all is well at the university. The resulting image is that the non-teaching staffs are inefficient, non-effective, do not
like work and procedures will act further to delay any activity or work. This is a picture that will also ruin the public image of the university rendering it mandatory for the university to institute training and other facilities to improve the work ethics of the non-teaching staff. The entire respondents (97%) were in agreement that the training had a significant role in their work in the university. Indeed only 3% of the respondents indicated on the contrary (that training has no effect on the performance of staff).

Lack of management will (35%) was cited as the major challenge that universities face with regards to the training of non-teaching staff. Other challenges were political (26%) and financial (22%). The respondents recommended that the management should provide study leaves (98), provide career development for the staff (68) and facilitate the non-teaching staff to attend seminars and other training avenues (56).

5.3 Recommendations

i. From the conclusions draw above, the management should:

ii. Develop training programs

iii. Facilitate induction, which is very crucial since it provides a basis for new employees to understand and learn the job he/she is to do.

iv. Formalize on the job training as a tool of enhancing training for the non-teaching staff. This will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the staff and in the long run, it will improve the public image of the university.

v. The management must show their will in training and facilitating the training of the non-teaching staff so that they can also acquire skills that will boost their performance in their place of work.

vi. Provide study leaves, enhance career development and facilitate them for seminars.

5.4 Suggestions for further research

From the research, it is suggested that other researchers should carry out the following:

i. The effects that other factors identified, other than training, have on employee performances in the universities.
ii. The extent to which training influence efficiency and effectiveness of staff within the university settings

iii. The effects of training and induction on the performance of staff in other institutions not the universities.
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APPENDIX I

LETTER TO RESPONDENT

Faith Kosgei
Kenyatta University
School of Business
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI

Dear Respondent,

RE: RESEARCH PROJECT FOR MBA

My name is Faith Kosgei, a student at Kenyatta University carrying out a research on the impact of Training on employee performance: A case of non-teaching staff in Kenyan public universities.

I would be very thankful if you sacrifice your time to provide information relating to the questions below. Note that the information you give will be treated with strict confidentiality and for the purpose of this research only.

Your co-operation is highly appreciated.

Thanks in advance,
Yours faithfully,

FAITH KOSGEI
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR NON-TEACHING STAFF

QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE ANSWERED BY KENYAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITY NON-TEACHING STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART 1**

**PERSONAL DATA**

Please tick (✓) appropriately and indicate responses as required.

1. Name: (Optional) __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Age: Below 25 years ☐

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 – 30 years</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 45 years</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55 years</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 55 years</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Designation; ____________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff category:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How long have you worked in this University?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long:</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. What is your highest level of education?

- Primary
- Secondary
- Tertiary (College)
- University
- Other (please indicate)

PART 2

INFORMATION ON TRAINING OF THE NON TEACHING STAFF

Please tick (✓) appropriately and indicate other responses as required.

8. On your appointment to the university or when transferred, were you inducted to your job?

- Yes
- No

9. If No, how did you learn about your job?

- Trial and error
- Previous experience
- Training manuals

10. How does your current placement compare with your skills or competence?

- Excellent
- Very good
- Good
- Average
- Poor (mismatch)

11. List the training practices in the university.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

43
12. Under what circumstances are the training practices listed in '11' above implemented?

New employee
Change in management
New technologies
Change in policies
Others (specify)

13. How would you rate your performance in the last two years?

Excellent
Very good
Good
Average
Poor

14. Do you think that your performance has been affected by the presence /or absence of training? (Give reasons)

Yes
No

15. In your own view, does training have a role in employee performance?

Yes
No

16. If yes, give a brief explanation

17. In your own opinion, has the management played its role in enhancing employee Performance through training?
18. What recommendations do you have for the management regarding OJT?
APPENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MANAGEMENT STAFF

QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE ANSWERED BY KENYAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT STAFF

Questionnaire No. ____________________________
University: ________________________________

PART I

PERSONAL DATA

Please tick (✓) appropriately and indicate responses as required.

1. Name: (Optional) ____________________________

2. Gender: MALE □ FEMALE □

3. Age: Below 25 years □ 25 – 30 years □ 36 – 45 years □ 47 – 55 years □ Above 55 years □

4. Designation: ________________________________

5. How long have you worked in this University?
   Below 5 years □ 5 – 10 years □ 10 – 15 years □ Over 15 years □

6. What is your highest level of education?
   Tertiary (College) □ University □
PART 2
INFORMATION ON TRAINING OF THE NON-TEACHING STAFF
Please tick (√) appropriately and indicate other responses as required.

7. Are the non-teaching staff given induction training on appointment to the university? or when transferred?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. If No, how do they learn about their jobs?
   Trial and error [ ]
   Previous experience [ ]
   Training manuals [ ]

9. List the training practices in the university.

10. Under what circumstances are the training practices listed in ‘9’ above implemented?
    New employee [ ]
    New technologies [ ]
    Change in policies [ ]
    Others (specify) [ ]

11. How would you rate the performance of the non-teaching staff in your institution?
    Excellent [ ]
    Very good [ ]
    Good [ ]
    Average [ ]
    Poor [ ]

12. Do you think that their performance has been affected by the presence/or absence of training? (Give reasons)
    Yes [ ] No [ ]
13. In your own view, does training have a role in the performance of the non-teaching staff?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

14. If yes, give a brief explanation

15. List the challenges that face your institution’s management team in regards to the training of the Non-teaching staff.

16. What recommendations do you have for your fellow managers concerning training of the non-teaching staff in your institution?

THANKYOU
## APPENDIX IV

### WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drafting of the proposal</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Compilation and Submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX V

### PROJECT BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>Cost of proposal</th>
<th>Amount Ksh. (Estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Typing and printing</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Photocopying</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>3000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Internet Browsing</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Traveling expenses</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8900.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>Cost of project</th>
<th>Amount Ksh. (Estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>5000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Typing and Printing</td>
<td>5000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>10000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>5000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,900.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>