IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature (IMPACT: IJRHAL)
ISSN(E): 2321-8878; ISSN(P): 2347-4564
Vol. 2, Issue 5, May 2014, 147-162

EXAMINING GENDER DIFFERENCE IN WORK PRODUCTIVITY OF ACADEMIC STAFF IN SELECTED PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN CENTRAL UGANDA

EDABU, PAUL & ANUMAKA, IJEOMA BLESSING

College of Higher Degrees and Research, Kampala International University, Kampala, Uganda

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the level of work productivity of different gender of academic staff in selected private universities in Central Uganda. The study sought to find the: (1) level of work productivity of the respondents understudy. (2) Comparison between the male and female academic staff in terms of: level of work productivity. Specifically the descriptive comparative designs and survey designs were utilized in this study. Utilizing the Slovene's formula the actual number of respondents (665) was computed. The purposive sampling technique was employed, data was collected from four private universities which included: 215 academic staff of Kampala International University,77 academic staff from Nkumba University, 65 academic staff from Uganda Christian University, and 37 academic staff from Cavendish University using 2 sets of non-standardized and research devised questionnaires. Data were analyzed using the mean, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The overall mean score on level of work productivity was interpreted as low. There was no significant difference between male and female academic staff in terms of their level of work productivity. The findings concluded that, better outcomes and increased productivity is assumed to be the result of better work place. The study recommended that productivity measures are valuable in monitoring targets for institutional productivity improvement, and performance in order to retain and avoid high labor turnover of the staff.

KEYWORDS: Work Productivity, Academic Staff, Private Universities, Central Uganda

INTRODUCTION

In many African countries, the provision of higher education by private institutions is new but a growing phenomenon. When compared to other parts of the world, however, most African countries have been slow to expand the private higher education sector (Altbach, 1999). Historically, the growth of private universities in Uganda has been fast after liberalization of education in 1988. For example, Makerere University was the only leading institution of higher learning in Uganda, accounting for 95 percent of the total university enrolments till 1988. The remaining five percent of enrolment were shared between six other universities at Mbarara, Ndejje, Nkumba, Islamic University in Uganda, Uganda Martyrs University and Bugema. The enrolments into tertiary institutions over the last 10 years increased by over 90 percent while the number of tertiary institutions increased by 1.8 percent in the same period (Senteza-Kajubi, 1999).

Several researchers have explored staff productivity in different contexts. In the view of Taylor (1947), money (or to take it more broadly, remuneration) is a primary incentive to workers. Sangaire (2007) studied salary payment which had significant effect on the performance of teachers in Central College, Kawempe. Kagubaire in 2006 also studied recruitment and employee performance in private universities in Uganda. The staff of Makerere University complained of the unattractive general terms of service and other conditions of work. Its strategic plan 2001-2005 also

pointed out that one of the weaknesses of the university was its non-competitive terms of service. The levels of remuneration and terms of service were not very competitive in the job market leading to inadequate motivation and poor retention of staff. The above scenario seemed to be duplicated among private universities in Central Uganda. However, all these studies left gaps to be explored which this proposed study will attempt to investigate further to isolate factors affecting employee productivity in selected private universities in Uganda such as employees' benefits, recognition and acknowledgement, work conditions, promotions, work productivity in terms of teacher performance, commitment and resource utilization. Many universities have few professors, senior lecturers, lecturers which implies that the university may not achieve their goals and contribute to national development the way they are expected to do due to lack of qualified teaching staff. There are several factors responsible for the current low level of academic productivity. Some of these factors are not yet well known and documented which this study intends to investigate empirically.

The political climate of the 1970's, coupled with low salaries, drove many of the well qualified academics out of the University for Greener Pastures abroad. There was no academic freedom, making objective teaching impossible. Imprisonment of lecturers, molestation and killings by state security agencies were a common occurrence before 1988 liberalization of education by the government of Uganda. This indicates that there is need for more institutions at tertiary level to absorb the high numbers of students. Over a period of 8 years 10 new private universities have been licensed to operate, through National Council for Higher Education (NCHE).

In recent years, a series of studies have been done which empirically examine the determinants of (as well as the relationship between) worker productivity and earnings (Holzer, 1988). Productivity is defined by Sutermeister (1976) as, "output per employee hour, quality considered". Dorgan (1994) defines productivity as, "the increased functional and organizational performance, including quality". Productivity is a ratio to measure how well an organization (or individual, industry, country) converts input resources (labour, materials, machines etc.) into goods and services. Productivity (the ratio between output and input) is often regarded as an essential part of organizational performance (Hannula, 1999; Tangen, 2005) and as a prerequisite for the wealth and competitiveness of nations (Singh et al., 2000; Sink, 1983). It is therefore, necessary to gather productivity information at the levels of nations, organizations, departments and units. The role of know- how and professional competence is growing. Investigations have shown that the attempts of enterprises to improve productivity with short-term actions, such as personnel turnover and large-scale lay-offs, are not very profitable in the long run (Kari 2007). Improving productivity via employee turnover can even be a handicap as regards work motivation and future competitiveness (Kari 2007).

Despite the importance of productivity, issues related to the measurement of productivity have still not received adequate attention (Singh el al., 2000). Singh et al. (2000) reviewed studies on productivity measurement, the majority of which were carried out in the manufacturing context with the approach of statistical analysis focusing on macro-level. In recent years, a series of studies have been done which empirically examine the determinants of (as well as the relationship between) worker productivity and earnings (Holzer, 1988).

From managerial perspective, productivity measures are valuable in monitoring the progress of productivity improvement and identifying targets for productivity improvement (Jaaskelainen and Uusi-Rauva, 2010).

Most universities require their academic staff to engage in teaching, carrying out research, publish and render community service. They have defined level of performance on which every staff is judged for employment and

promotion. However, the level of productivity of the academic staff in many private universities is far below. Employee productivity does not seem to have improved overtime (Wangoli, 2010). Armstrong observes that when employees are unhappy, frustrated, uninspired and not motivated, their level of production is low (2007).

Many universities have few professors, senior lecturers, lecturers which imply that the university may not achieve their goals and contribute to national development the way they are expected to do due to lack of qualified teaching staff. There are several factors responsible for the current low level of academic productivity. Some of these factors are not yet well known and documented which this study intends to investigate empirically.

Employee/work productivity is how well an employee does his or her job to achieve organizational goals and objectives (Jack, 2003) and could be perceived as a function of the interaction of ability. Productivity is the standard to which someone does something such as a job. An employee could be performing to the level they are capable of only if there are adequate tools, equipment, materials and supplies and favorable working conditions, helpful co-workers, supportive work rules and procedures, sufficient information to make job-related decisions and adequate time to do a good job. The contrary scenario may yield negative results. The staff/ employee are conceptualized as the people who work for a particular institution.

Work productivity is measured in this study in terms of teacher performance, commitment and resource utilization. Teacher performance and commitment imply effective learning outcomes that necessitates the teacher to be prepared in the following areas: command of theoretical knowledge about learning and human behaviors, display of attitudes that foster learning and genuine human relationships; competence in the subject matter to be taught and control of technical skills of teaching that facilitate student's learning (Smith 2009). For the teacher to perform effectively then, he should promote student's learning through creating a positive learning climate, selecting appropriate instructional goals and assessments, using the curriculum effectively, and employing varied instructional behaviors that help all students learn at higher levels (Ama and Ama, 2004). According to Batey (1953), a school to be an instrument of education it has to be staffed with teachers who have adequate knowledge of the subject matter in their teaching subjects. On the same note, it is believed that in order to achieve pre-determined educational aims, the teacher should make the most efficient use of the available resources (resource utilization) for the students to find meaning in their learning.

In view of George and Jones' (2002) contentions that there are three key elements by which a worker perform or become productive, these are then considered for discussion in this study to impress more on work productivity. The key elements are: (1) direction of behavior (the many potential behaviors a worker could perform that the worker could actually perform); (2) level of effort (how hard does a worker perform); and (3) level of persistence (how hard does a person keep on trying to perform). Managers expect workers to actually perform (direction of behavior) by being motivated to come to work on time, perform their assigned tasks dependably, come up with good ideas, help other workers and avoid paying lip service to quality. Further, the gravity of the workers' performance (level of effort) is also essential to emphasize the need for change for the better even in the midst of obstacles, roadblocks and stonewalls (level of persistence). The above scenario seemed to be the same among private universities in Central Uganda. However, all these studies left gaps to be explored which this study has attempted to investigate. Further, to isolate factors affecting employee productivity in selected private universities in Uganda and to investigate the motivation tools is the main cause of the matter in the study.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Most of the successful people that are around have been proved to be very efficient time managers seen in their productivity (Shadare & Hammed, 2000). Since productivity involves human resources, staff personnel management must be geared to attract, retain and motivate the best human assets available in private institutions. The level of productivity of the academic staff in many private universities in Uganda is far below (Kasozi, 2008; Nambassa 2003). This failure to fully improve on work productivity in the private University may lead to several undesirable outcomes; promotion not straightforward, brain drain due to lack of commitment, unclear policies in remuneration, lack of qualified staff, high labour turnover, unattractive general terms of service and working conditions. Many universities have few professors, senior lecturers, lecturers which imply that the university may not achieve their goals and contribute to national development the way they are expected to do due to lack of qualified teaching staff and inefficient management.

Therefore, employee productivity does not seem to have improved overtime. Armstrong (2007) observes that when employees are unhappy, frustrated, uninspired and not motivated, their level of production becomes low. This situation was also revealed by Aacha, (2010), Sangaire, (2007), Kagubaire, (2006), Nyuakiiza, (2005) Mugeere, (2001); Farrant, (1997), Carron, (1996), Kasaija, (1991), that where teachers pay is very low, there is normally de facto recognition that the labour process‘ in schools has to be organized in such a way that enables teachers, the autonomy to generate additional income. It is persistence is a threat to the survival of the universities, since unproductive staff members cannot enable the universities to pursue their objectives effectively. It is however, not clear whether the cause of the problem is related to academic staff productivity, with a view of suggesting ways of remedying the situation. Thus, the assumed decline in employee productivity and in commitment to high-quality work performance may have a tremendous effect on work productivity as well as overall efficiency. Such scenario has created a major impact in private universities in central Uganda and conceived as leading to poor quality service delivery in terms of low productivity of teachers. Hence the needs for this study investigating the importance of the work productivity as a factor that enhances academic staff performance in private Universities. The question therefore, what is the level of work productivity of the academic staff? Is there a difference caused by gender in the level of work productivity of academic staff in private universities in central Uganda?

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of work productivity of the academic staff, and establish the gender difference in level of work productivity of the academic staff in private universities in central Uganda.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of the study were

- To determine the level of work productivity of the academic staff in the private universities in central Uganda.
- To establish the gender difference in level of work productivity of the academic staff of private universities in central Uganda.

Hypothesis

The study tested the following null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance:

Ho_1: There is no significant difference caused by gender in level of work productivity of academic staff in private universities in central Uganda.

METHODOLOGY

The study design was a descriptive comparative survey design involving ex- post facto design. Descriptive survey was used to discover differences (descriptive comparative) and to provide precise quantitative description and to observe behavior (Treece and Treece, 1973). Utilizing the Sloven's formula the actual number of respondents (665) was computed. The purposive sampling technique was employed, data was collected from four private universities which included: 215 academic staff of Kampala International University,77 academic staff from Nkumba University, 65 academic staff from Uganda Christian University, and 37 academic staff from Canvendish University using 2 sets of non-standardized and research devised questionnaires. Data were analyzed using the percentages, mean, t-test and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 1: Summary Table on Showing Mean on Level of Work Productivity on Respondents

Category	Mean	Std Dev	Interpretation
Syllabus Completion	3.11	0.531	Low
Teaching Preparation	3.04	0.486	Low
Time Management	3.03	0.474	Low
Evaluation	3.00	0.498	Low
Resource Utilization	2.89	0.633	Low
Research and Publication	2.78	0.514	Low
Community Service	2.67	0.534	Low
Commitment	2.59	0.433	Low

The findings in Table 1 indicate that all the respondents merely agreed (all the mean values were below 3.5 but above 2.5). This implies that as far as syllabus completion, teaching, time management, evaluation, resource utilization, research and publication, community service and commitment to the university was concerned, respondents' level of productivity was low.

Table 2: Independent Sample t-Test Results on Difference in Work Productivity of Male and Female Academic Staff, Level of Sig. =0.05

Measures of Work Productivity	Gender	Mean	t-Value	Sig	Interpretation	Decision on Ho
Teaching Preparation	Male	3.05	.680	.497	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	3.02				
Syllabus Completion	Male	3.11	-.074	.941	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	3.12				
Evaluation	Male	3.04	2.044	.042	Significant difference	Rejected
	Female	2.94				
Research and Publication	Male	2.80	1.292	.197	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	2.73				
Time Management	Male	3.05	.743	.458	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	3.01				
Commitment to the University	Male	2.63	1.546	.123	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	2.56				
Resource Utilization	Male	2.93	1.879	.061	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	2.81				
Community service	Male	2.69	.668	.505	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	2.65				

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The results on Table 2, show that since the (t =.680, sig. = .497) is greater than α = 0.05, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in teaching preparation for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 3.05) were better than females (mean = 3.02) at teaching preparations.

The results on Table 2, show that since the (t = - .074, sig. = .941) is greater than α = 0.05, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in syllabus completion for male and female, did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that females (mean = 3.12) were better than males (mean = 3.11) at syllabus completion.

The results on Table 2, show that since the (t = 2 .044, sig. = .042) is less than α = 0.05, then at the 5 % level of significance, reject the null hypothesis and accept the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in Evaluation for the two gender differed significantly; and the sample means, suggest that males (mean = 3.04) were better than females (mean = 2.94) at Evaluation.

The results on Table 2, show that since the (t = 1.292, sig. = .197) is greater than α = 0.05, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in Research and Publication for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.80) were better than females (mean = 2.73) at Research and Publication.

The results on Table 2, show that since the (t = .743, sig. = .458) is greater than α = 0.05, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in time management for gender did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 3.05) were very slightly better than females (mean = 3.01) at time management.

The results on Table 2, show that since the (t = 1.546, sig. = .123) is greater than α = 0.05, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in commitment to the university for the two sexes differ but not significantly; and even though sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.63) were better than females (mean = 2.56) at commitment to the university.

The results on Table 2, show that since the (t = 1.879, sig. = .061) is greater than α = 0.05, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in resource utilization for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.93) were better than females (mean = 2.81) at resource utilization.

The results on Table 2, show that since the (t = .668, sig. = .505) is greater than α = 0.05, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in community services for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.69) were better than females (mean = 2.65) at community services. The results on Table 2 conclude that there was no significant difference between work productivity and gender a part from Evaluation which had significant difference between the male and female academic staff. The findings conclude that, there was no significant difference between male and female academic staff in terms of work productivity in the four private universities. This implies that work productivity of both male and female academic staff does not affect the way motivation tools are applied in the four private universities.

Ho_1: There is no significant difference caused by sex in the level of academic staff work productivity in private universities in central Uganda.

Table 3: Independent t-Sample Test Results for Significance Difference between Work Productivity of Male and Female Academic Staff, Level of Sig. =0.05

Measures	Sex	Mean	t-Value	Sig	Interpretation	Decision on Ho
Work Productivity	Male	2.91	1.267	206.	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	2.87				

The results on Table 3 show that (t = 1.267, sig. = .206) is greater than α = 0.05, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in work productivity for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 3 above suggest that males (mean = 2.91) were slightly better than females (mean = 2.87) at work productivity when at face value.

Results on Table 3 conclude that, the t-values of work productivity (t = 1.267, sig. = .206) is greater than α = 0.05, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in work productivity for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means of work productivity in Table 3, suggest that males were better (mean = 2.91) than females (mean = 2.87) at work productivity respectively.

DISCUSSIONS

The Level of Work Productivity of the Academic Staff in Private Universities

The study found out that, the level of work productivity was interpreted as agreed which alludes to low productivity (Table 1: Mean = 2.89) indicated that most academic staff's level of work productivity was low suggesting that, there was no commitment in teaching preparation, syllabus completion, evaluation, research and publication, time management, commitment to the university, resource utilization and community service. Generally, Table 1 reveals an overall picture of professionalism in terms of teaching preparation. The findings are most probably suggestive that most academic staff in universities do not prepare their lessons before teaching students as the sub-mean=3.04; interpreted as agreed which alludes to low productivity.

The study found out that on (Table 1**:** mean =3.11; interpreted as agreed which alludes to low productivity of academic staff. The findings were in agreement with Namusoke, (2007) who found out that if appraisal interviews are well carried, they enhance productivity in the public service in Uganda. It was also in agreement with Ssenabulya, (2007) who reported from a study of primary schools in Kampala District that teachers involved in self-evaluation keep on course and hence improve their performance. Kikooma, (2002) found out that unfair evaluation practices breed mistrust, lack of commitment and many other performance implications among district officers in Eastern and Southern regions of Uganda. Theoretically, the findings concurred that most academic staff were motivated with their duties. The finding concluded that, academic staff were motivated to evaluate objectively their tasks assigned to them hence implying that academic staff was intrinsic motivation towards the job assigned to them.

As to commitment to the university, the item rated lowest is that the respondents do not find it too costly to leave the university. The results were in agreement with earlier researchers (e.g. Duska, (2008); Cheng-Fei, Yu-Fang, Liang-Chih, Ing-Chung, (2007); Mosadeghrad, Ewan, Chang, (1999); Mullins, (1999).

The results revealed that the two criterion in job satisfaction "the relationship with colleagues" and "the relationship with the family" significantly influenced employees' learning commitment. However, this was clearly different from managers' subjective expectation.

The findings were also in agreement with Mosadeghrad, Ewan, Duska, (2008); Ubom, (2002); which reveal that results of the paper indicate that hospital employees are moderately satisfied with their jobs and committed to their organization. Employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment were closely inter-related and correlated with turnover intention ($P < 0.001$). The positive correlation between the two was expected, but there was also unexpected correlation with turnover intention.

According to Keun. (1994) in particular, organizational commitment was found to have the highest influence on effort and propensity to leave, presenting empirical support for the eminence of loyalty as a motivational tool in a collectivistic work culture. Occupational mental health has been linked to productivity and other desired organizational outcomes, such as commitment and satisfaction. Occupational mental health has been linked to productivity and other desired organizational outcomes, such as commitment and satisfaction. Spence Laschinger, Heather, Havens, Donna, (1997).

This findings are in disagreement with an early review article of studies on turnover by Mobley et al., (1979) which revealed that age, tenure, overall satisfaction, job content, intention to remain on the job, and commitment were all negatively related to turnover (i.e. the higher the variable, the lower the turnover). The study concurred with the findings, that commitment to the university depended on motivation of the staff. The findings conclude that most staff was committed to teaching.

Though not that impressive, consequently reveals that the respondents in an overall picture rated the level of work productivity in terms of resource utilization as high with a mean The findings were in agreement with (e.g. Ibukun, Akinfolarin, Alimi, 2011). The study further reveals that most of the physical resources were well utilized. Time for various activities in vocational and technical education was well utilized except in extracurricular activities and students forum. The findings conclude that most academic staff utilized the university resources wisely and accordingly.

In the same vein, Community service is rated agreed with a mean score as shown in Table 2. The findings suggest that sub-mean =2.67; interpreted as low productivity indicated that most academic staff had time to participate in community service besides teaching.

As to Research and publication is rated agreed which alludes to unproductive with a mean score as shown in Table 2 majority of academic staff carry out research to update their syllabus in class, supervisor student work/research project, publish chapters in edited books, do research towards publishing conference articles, journal articles and books. The study finding further suggest that most lecturers had utilized and conducted research in terms of book publishing, journal articles and student's research. The findings were in agreement with earlier researcher findings such as of Rosanna; & Lindsay(1999). Theory-wise, the findings concludes that, academic staff were productive in conducting research and publish their articles, books, present journals and help students supervisor. The findings conclude that, level of work productivity of academic staff was agreed which alludes to unproductive.

Significant Difference Caused in Level of Work Productivity of Academic Staff

The study found out that there was no significant difference in terms (teaching preparations, syllabus completion and Research and Publication) for the two sexes (Table 2; t =.680, sig. = .497). Infer that mean scores in teaching preparation for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2; males (mean = 3.05) were better than females (mean = 3.02) at teaching preparations. Syllabus completion for the two sexes (Table 2; t = - .074, sig. = .941). Infer that mean scores in syllabus completion for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that females (mean = 3.12) were better than males (mean = 3.11) at syllabus completion. Research and Publication for the two sexes (Table 2; t = 1.292, sig. = .197). Infer that mean scores in Research and Publication for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.80) were better than females (mean = 2.73) at Research and Publication.

The study found out that there was significant difference in Evaluation for the two sexes (Table 2; t = 2 .044, sig. = .042). Infer that mean scores in Evaluation for the two sexes differed significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 3.04) were better than females (mean = 2.94) at Evaluation.

The study found out that there was no significant difference in terms of (time management, Commitment, Resource utilization and teaching preparation) for the two sexes (Table 2; t = .743, sig. = .458). Infer that mean scores in time management for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 3.05) were better than females (mean = 3.01) at time management. Commitment to the university for the two sexes (Table 2; t = 1.546, sig. = .123). Infer that mean scores in commitment to the university for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.63) were better than females (mean = 2.56) at commitment to the university. Resource utilization for the two sexes (Table 2; t = 1.879, sig. = .061). Infer that mean scores in resource utilization for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.93) were better than females (mean = 2.81) at resource utilization. Teaching preparations for the two sexes (Table 2; t = .668, sig. = .505). Infer that mean scores in community services for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.69) were better than females (mean = 2.65) at community services.

The study on Table 2 conclude that there was no significant difference between work productivity and sex a part from Evaluation which had significant difference between the male and female academic staff. The findings conclude that, there was no significant difference between male and female academic staff in terms of work productivity in the four private universities.

Hypothesis (Ho_1)

The study found out that there was no significant difference between the male and female academic staff in terms of extent to which the tools motivate (Table 3: t = 0.188; sig = 0.851). In respect to mean male (mean = 2.48) and female (mean = 2.47) had no significant difference.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings presented, the following conclusions were drawn:

- The level of academic staff work productivity in private universities in central Uganda was low.

- There was no significant gender difference in the level of academic staff work productivity in private universities in central Uganda.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The study recommended that productivity measures are valuable in monitoring targets for institutional productivity improvement, and performance in order to retain and avoid high labour turnover of the staff.
- Universities can integrate learning opportunities through setting goals that allow employees to engage in problem solving and knowledge acquisition.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, J.S. (1963*). Towards Understanding of Inequity Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, pp422-436.
2. Adelabu, M. A. (2003) "Motivation and Communication Strategies and their Application in Primary School Supervision" Education Quality Assurance: Ekiti State SPEB Initiative, Ibadan, Gabesther Educational Publishing Co.
3. Ajila. C & Abiola, A (2004) *Influence of Rewards on workers performance in an organization*; Journal of Social Science; 8(1):7-12), Dept of Psychology, Obafem Awolowo University lle-ife; Nigeria.
4. Aluko, M. A. O. (1998). "*Factors that Motivate the Nigerian Workers*" Ife Social Sciences.
5. Aluko, M. A. O. (2001). "*The Impact of Culture on Organizational Performance in Selected Textile Firms in Nigeria*". Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.
6. Amin, M.E. (2003). *Over-viewing methodology of research*. Paper presented at a seminar on the overview of research in Education for teachers of the School of Education, organized by Department of Higher Education, Makerere University, held March5, 2003, Kampala, Uganda.
7. Amin, M.E. (2005), *Social Science Research: Conception, Methodology & Analysis*. Makerere University Printery. Kampala. Uganda.
8. Anon.2004. Five strategies for turning stress into productive energy. *Accounting office management and administration report*, 4(2).
9. Armstrong, M. (1996), *Employee Reward, Institution of Personnel and Development*, London.
10. Armstrong, M. (1997), *A Hand book of HRM Practice*, 10th ed., London & Philadelphia.
11. Armstrong, M. (2007), *A Hand book of HRM Practice*, 10th ed., London & Philadelphia.
12. Aswathappa, K. (2008), *Human Resource Management*, 5th ed, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing co. Ltd, New Delhi.
13. Baike, A. (2002) "Recurrent Issues in Nigeria Education". Tamaza Publishing co, Ltd. Zaria.

14. Bakkabulindi, F.E.K. (2009). *Social correlates of Innovative Adoption: The case of ICT in Makerere*, Unpublished manuscript.
15. Bartel, A. P. (1994). *Productivity gains from the implementation of employee training programs.* Industrial Relations, 33(4), 411-425.
16. Berelson, B & Stainer, G.A. (1964): *Human Behavioral Inventory of Scientific Findings*; New York, Harcourt, Brace and World Inc.
17. Best, J.W. &Kahn, J.V. (1993). *Research in education* (7th ed.)NJ: Prentice-Hall.
18. Bhaga, T 2010, *The impact of working conditions on the productivity of nursing staff in the Midwife and Obstetrical Unit of Pretoria West Hospital*, MSW dissertation, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
19. Byars. L.L & Rue. L. W, (2008). *Human Resource Management*, 9th ed, McGraw Hill Higher Educ, New Delhi.
20. Carr JZ, Schmidt AM, Ford JK, DeShon RP. (2003) Climate perceptions matter: a Meta analytic path analysis relating molar climate, cognitive and affective states, and individual level work outcomes. *J Applied Psychology*. 88:605- 619.
21. Chang E. (1999), *'Career commitment as a complex moderator of organizational commitment and turnover intention'*, Human Relations, vol. 52(10), pp.1257-1278.
22. Cole, G.A. (1991). *Personnel Management*: *Theory and Practice* 2nd Ed. D. P. Publication, London.
23. Cole, G.A, (1997) *Personnel Management* 4th ed Letts Educational Aldine place, London.
24. Cole. G.A (2003), *Personnel Management* (3rd ed), Letts Educational Aldine place, London.
25. Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, qualitative and mixed methods approach* (2nd ed.) London: Sage.
26. Decenzo, D. A. & Robbin, P.S (2003). *Human Resource Management*.7th ed., New York, John Wiley & Son Inc.
27. Dessler. G. (2005) *Human Resource Management*, 10th ed., Prentice-Hall of India, New Delhi.
28. Dickson, W.J. (1973). Hawthorn experiments. In C. Heyel (ed.), *The encyclopedia of management*, 2nd ed. (pp.298-302). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
29. DuBrin, A, J. (2000). *Essentials of Management*. 5thed. Melbourne: South-Western College Publishing.
30. Dweck, C.S. (1999). Self-theories: *Their Role in Motivation Personality, and Development*. Philadelphia. PA Psychology Press.
31. Edwards, D.C. (1999). *Motivation emotion and evolutionary*, physiological, cognitive, and social influences. London: SAGE Publications.
32. Enuku, U. (2003). Unionisation, workers' education, and the 21st century. *Nigerian Journal of Industrial Education and Labour Relations* 5(1): 22.

33. Filak & Sheldon, (2003). Students Psychological Need Satisfaction & College Teacher-Course Evaluation. *Educational Psychology*, vol.23, no.3, pp.235-247.
34. Francis, P. (1998) "Hard lesson: Primary Schools Community and Social Capital in Nigeria. The World Bank, Washington D.C.
35. Freiberg, P. *"Surprise-Most Bosses Are Incompetent"*. APA Monitor. (January), 22, 1991, p.23.
36. Gabriella, C. (2005). Training, wage and labor productivity in Italy. Labor Economics, 12(4), 557-576.
37. Gerald. R.F. &, Buckley. M.R. (1996), *Human Resources Management Perspectives, context, function, & outcomes*, 3rded, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
38. Gershon RR, Stone PW, Bakken S, Larson E. (2004) *Measurement of organizational culture and climate in healthcare. J Nurs Adm*.; 34:33– 40.
39. Green, T. (2000). *Motivation management*: Fuelling performance by discovering what people believe about themselves and their organizations. Palo Alto: Davies-Black Publishing.
40. Guidetti, G., & Massimiliano, M. (2007). *Firm level training in local economic systems complementarities in production and firm innovation strategies*. The Journal of Socio-Economics, 36(6), 875-894.
41. Hackett, (1979). *"Success in Management Personnel*; (2nd Ed) John Murray Publishers Ltd.
42. Hackett, R.D., Bycio, P., & Hausadorf, P.A. (1994). Further assessment of Meyer and Allen's 1991 three components model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology 79*, 340-350.
43. Harpaz, I (1990). *The importance of work goals*: An international perspective. Journal of International Business Studies,21.75-93
44. Homans, 1961, Jerald 1961). Social Behavior; Its Elementary form, New York Harcourt, Brace & World. Institute of Medicine Committee on the Work Environment for Nurses and Patient Safety. 2004 *Keeping Patients Safe: Transforming the Work Environment of Nurses.* Ann Page, Editor. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences;
45. Iboma, J. (2008). *How training can turn your business around*. *Punch Newspaper*, Feb. 1: 4
46. Kazeem, S. O. (1999) *Correlates of job motivation of workers in selected public and private secondary schools in Ife-Ijesa Zone, Osun State, Nigeria.* Masters of Arts in Education thesis. Department of Educational Foundations and Counselling, Faculty of Education. Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.
47. Kikooma, F.J. (2005). *Development of a job evaluation scheme for officers using competence profile in Eastern and Southern Regions in Uganda*. Unpublished Masters of Organizational Psychology dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala.
48. Koontz, H *et al*. (1982). *Management*, (7th Ed), MC Graw-Hill International Book Company.
49. Koontz, H. & Weihrich, H. (1998). *Management.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
50. Kothan, C.S. (2007). *Research Methodology, Methods & Techniques*. (2nd ed.), New Delhi.

51. Kovach, K.A. (1987). *What motivates employees? Workers and supervisors give different answers*. Business Horizon, 30.58-65.
52. Krejcie, R.V &Morgan, D.W. (1970). *Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
53. Ladipo-Ajayi, Y. (1994). *A study of the staff development programmes for teachers in selected secondary schools in Ogun State*. (Unpublished) M.Ed. thesis, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago Iwoye.
54. Landy, F.J. & Conte, J.M. (2007).2nd edi. Work in the 21st century: *An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. Singapore: Blackwell Publishing.
55. Lawal. B.O, Awoleye. M.K and Akinsola, M.K (2007). *Motivation as a Determination of teacher's Performance in Secondary School Social Science Subjects*. A case Study of Ibadan South-East Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria.
56. Lindner, J.R. (1998). *Understanding employee motivation*. Journal of extension, 36(3) [Online] Available from: JoeOrg:http://joe.org/joe/1998 June/r63.html.
57. London, C &Higgot, K (1997). *An Employee Reward and Recognition Process*. The TQM, Magazin 9(5) MCB University Press.
58. London, M., & Stumpf, S. A. (1983). *"Effects of Candidate Characteristics on Management Promotion Decisions: An Experimental Study."Personnel Psychology*.
59. Lublin, J.S. *"Rights Laws to Spur Shifts in Promotions."*Wall Street Journal. December 30, 1991, p.B1.
60. Lussier, R.N. (2000*). Management Fundamentals: Concepts, Applications, Skill Development*. New York. South Western College Publishing.
61. Luthans, F. (1998). *Organizational Behaviour*. 8th ed. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
62. Maganda. C.P. (2009). *The Assessments of Motivation on Employee Performance*. A case study of Kakira Sugar Works in Jinja of Uganda.
63. Maicibi N.A. (2007). Human Resource Management Success, The tips for HRM Theorists and Practitioners, Makerere Printery, Kampala.
64. Maicibi, N.A. (2003). *Pertinent Issues in Employees Management*. MPK Graphics (U) Ltd.
65. Maicibi, N.A. (2005). Pertinent Issues in Management; *Human Resource & Educational Management*. Kampala Net Media. Publisher Ltd.
66. Makerere University Graduate School, MUG, 2001).
67. Makerere University. (2000). *Makerere University strategic plan 2000/01 - 2004/05*. Kampala:
68. Makerere University. (2004). *Annua/ report 2003*. Kampala: Author.
69. Maslow, A. (1970), *Motivation and Personality* (3rd ed) New York. McGraw Hill.

70. Mathauer. I & Imhoff. I (2006), *Health worker motivation in Africa; the role of non-financial incentives & Human Resource Management tools. HR for* Health,4:24

71. McClelland, B & Burnham, C. (1959). *Power is the great Motivator*, Harvard Business Review.

72. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

73. Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review 1*, 61-89.

74. Miner, J.B., Ebrahimi, B., & Wachtel, J.M. (1995). How deficiency in management contributes to the United States' competiveness problem and what can be done about it? *Human Resource Management*. Fall, p. 363.

75. Mobley W.H., Griffeth R.W., Hand, H.H. & Meglino, B.M. (1979) '*Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process*', Psychological Bulletin vol.86 (3), pp.493-522.

76. Mugenda, O.M. & Mugenda, A.G. (2003). *Research methods, Quantitative & Qualitative Approaches*, Kenya ACTS Press.

77. Mullins, L.J. (1999). *Management and Organizational Behavior. 5 New Vision.* June 19.

78. Neuman, L.W. (2006). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches.* (6th ed.) New oxford dictionary.

79. Nnamusoke, A. (2007). *Human resource management practices and implementation of performance appraisal schemes in Public Service Headquarters in Uganda*. Unpublished Masters of Science, Human Resource Management in Education dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala.

80. Obanya P.A.I (1999) 10 Questions Nigerians Want Answered About UBE. Punch Newspaper December 4.

81. Olupot, M (2000). *"Museveni Warns Private Varsities Against Poor Standards"* in Planning and Development Department 3th *Ed.* London, Financial Times, Pitman Publishing.

82. Omole, M. (1991). *Origin and development of union education.* Ibadan: Industrial Relations Services. *OOU Library Record* (2008). OOU Library, Ago Iwoye Ogun State.

83. Ramlall, S. (2004). *A review of employee motivation theories and their implications for employee retention within organizations*. The Journal of American Academy of Business, September: 52-63.

84. Rao. P.S, (2009). *Essentials of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations*. [Text, cases and Games]3rd ed. n Himalaya Publishing House, New Delhi.

85. Robbins, D. (2001), *Fundamentals of Management*, 3rd (Ed.), Prentice hill.

86. Robbins, P.S & Decenzo, D.A. (2000). *Fundamentals of Management* 3rded, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

87. Robbins, S.P. (2005). *Organisational behavior*.11thed. Pearson Educational International.

88. Sangaire. E.M. (2007). *Motivation and Performance of Teacher's in Private Secondary schools.* Case study of central college. Kawempe.

89. Sanusi, B.Y. (1998) Teachers Job Performance stress as a correlate to job satisfaction in selected secondary schools in Ife Central Local Government Education Zone of Osun State. Masters of Arts Education Thesis submitted to the Department of Educational Administration and Planning. Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria

90. Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business*, John Willey & Sons, Inc. U.S.A Shauna & Tony, (1997),

91. Shore, L.M., & Wagner, S.J. (1993). Commitment and employees behaviour. Comparison of affective commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology 78*, 774-780.

92. Spector, P.E. (2000). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and Practice*.2nd ed. Chichester: John Wiley & sons. Inc.

93. Ssenabulya, G.J. (2007). *Management of appraisal practices and performance of teachers in primary schools in Kampala*. Unpublished Masters of Arts, Education Management dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala.

94. Staff association report. (07/03/2011), *Kampala International University General senior staff Association Meeting*, Main Hall.

95. Stone PW, Harrison ML, Feldman P, etal. (2005) *Organizational Climate of Staff Working Conditions and Safety-An Integrative Model. Advances in Patient Safety*: From Research to Implementation. Volumes 1- 4, AHRQ Publication Nos.050021 (1– 4). February, Concepts and Methodology, pp 467-481. System Performance: The Veterans Health Administration Experience, American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine

96. Sutherland, J. & Canwell, D. (2004). *Key concepts in human resource management*. Hampshire: Palgrave, Macmillan.

97. Tella, A., & Popoola, S. (2007). Work motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment of library personnel in academic and research libraries in Oyo State. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/tella2.htm.

98. Uganda Government, (2008). *Government White Paper on Report of the* (McGregor, 2007) Visitation Committee to public universities in Uganda. Kampala: Ministry of Education.

99. Vlachos, I. (2008). *The effect of human resource practices on organizational performance*: evidence from Greece. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19(1), 74-79.

100. Warren, Hodgson, M, & Craig, T. (2007). *Employee Working condition and Healthcare*.

101. Wayne. F.C. (2006) *Managing Human Resources Productivity, Quality of work life, Profits*, 7th ed., Tata McGraw-Hill, New Delhi.

102. *Weihrich & Koont, (2001), Management; A global Perspective*, 10th ed, Tata McGraw Hill, India.