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ABSTRACT

There was a growing interest among researchers in education on exploring strategic human resource strategies for faculty retention in universities around the world. A survey of human resource strategies was carried out in private universities in Kenya. It was specifically conducted as a case of Daystar and Pan Africa Christian universities for the purpose of exploring various human resource strategies geared towards retention of full time faculty in these respective universities. The target population was full time faculty, heads of departments and deans in three departments common to both universities, namely, biblical studies, counseling and business; and human resource managers. Data was collected using questionnaire, interview guide and document analysis and analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and descriptive narratives. Standard research ethics were observed. The findings revealed that strategic human resource managers in both universities had some strategies in place for retention of faculty. The participants, especially deans, heads of departments and lecturers without administrative tasks, proposed ways of improving the existing strategies to enhance faculty retention, challenges they considered to be faced by SHRM in their efforts to retain faculty and ways to minimize the same. In summary, monetary challenges were more than non-monetary according to opinions of participants. The strategic human resource managers in both universities therefore needed to utilize expressed dissatisfaction, cited ways of improving retention by facing challenges through their professional expertise, suggestions of research participants. Based on research findings, the researcher concluded that; there were differences of opinions among lecturers, heads of departments, academic deans and strategic human resource managers on the best strategies to retain faculty. A dean had expressed the same thing while referring to heavy administrative responsibilities as a challenge to research. It was therefore necessary for the strategic human resource manager to consider hiring more teaching staff to share extra workload so that the university would grow through research, writing and publication. The management needed to provide a climate which would make exchange of views between lecturers and management on the best strategies each university needed to configure in order to retain their valuable faculty.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) can be defined as the linking of human resources with strategic goals and objectives in order to improve business performance and develop organizational culture that foster innovation, flexibility and competitive advantage (Welbourne, 2003). SHRM was concerned with “the contributions Human Resource Management (HRM) made to organizational effectiveness and the ways in which these contributions are achieved” (Ericksen and Dyer, 2004, p.4). These contributions led to competitive advantage. According to Dadwal (2003), competitive advantage was the benefit that the private universities would get from retaining faculty members who had “high value, are rare and unavailable to competitors, are difficult to imitate and can be organized for synergy” (Dadwal, p. 9). Daystar and Pan African Christian universities would have secured and sustained competitive advantage through the use of SHRM strategies such as recruiting, selecting, training and rewarding personnel (Hollenbeck & Wright 2008, Hollenbeck, 2006). This would have further enhanced faculty retention if applied strategically by SHRM.

Welbourne (2003) and Armstrong (2006) defined a strategy as a two component management tool: strategic objectives (things the strategy was supposed to achieve), and plan of action (means by which it proposed to achieve the objectives). Educational research around the world revealed more on faculty retention, its relationship to SHRM strategies, trends and similar characteristics.
Cascio (2010) defined retention as “initiatives taken by management to keep employees from leaving, such as rewarding employees for performing their jobs effectively; ensuring harmonious working relations between employees and managers; and maintaining safe, healthy working environment” (p.691). Maintaining safe healthy working environment was considered to be of great importance to employee retention as noted by Phillips and Connell 2003. Employee retention was to continue to be an important issue for most groups in the first decade of the 21st century. This was further noted by Pinnington and Edwards (2000) who argued that retention of employees was important because employee influence was the central feature of a HR system. Retention linked work system, rewards and human resource. According to Pilbeam and Corbridge (2006) SHRM was related to retention of faculty through linking HR practices to the achievement of the corporate strategy of the management of private universities. The faculty was therefore not a spectator group of employees in SHRM. They needed to be actively and intentionally involved in the process of achieving the corporate objectives.

It was necessary for SHRM to see this need of working with lecturers as faculty retention strategy and incorporate it into other HR practices to guide lecturers’ contribution and performance in a desired direction. Performance management and culture management in the areas of focus and responsiveness to change were important (Pilbeam & Corbridge, 2006). This integrative approach to SHRM called for retention of faculty in such a way that HR leaders led and valued their own role, strategic partners brought know-how about ways of changing university, human capital developers recognize people as critical assets for a successful future, functional experts bring know-how on implementing HR strategies and employee advocates listen to employee concerns for their wellbeing without jeopardizing objectives of the university.
In plenary 2, Recruiting and Retaining a new Generation of Academics, the summary given by the Applying SHRM principles to education, Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) conference aims addressed the following educational issues in respect of human resource management: balancing public interest and institutional autonomy, increasing dynamics in recruitment, and systemizing staff development, attracting a new generation of staff in years of ageing population as a succession strategy, bridging the gender gaps in senior management as a gender balancing strategy, developing competences in a long-term perspective among the faculty, meeting short term demands on productivity and societal relevance, coping with new features in remuneration systems and performance evaluation. The above recommendations were helpful to SHRM of the private universities being surveyed.

In their study of faculty turnover in private universities in India and Bangladesh referred as “The Tripartite Investigation”, Joarder and Sharif (2000) cited a few issues related to faculty attrition according to Bangi Conference Report. The report indicated that 1500 academic studies have been done in the area of voluntary faculty turnover to investigate on challenges, causes, and opportunities. The report recommended the use of good HR practices to fulfill employee needs in order to retain faculty in private universities in their city. Kiamba (2010) has defined faculty turnover as the rate at which lecturers leave a university, it is expressed as a number of lecturers exiting a university in relation to the lecturers being absorbed in a particular period. A time frame of five years is used to calculate the employee turnover. A rate of 15% or less was regarded as acceptable in a company while a turnover rate more than that was viewed as abnormal. A turnover rate exceeding 25% should signal an existence of a problem to the University management. When it reaches 35%, the management should prepare for an 'overhaul' approach in order to reverse this trend towards faculty retention.
An understanding of evolution of human resource management (HRM) into SHRM was important in the survey as a fairly recent approach to human resource management. Contemporary Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) was the fourth of the four historical perspectives which HRM has gone through in its evolutionary process of being seen as SHRM (Mbongaya, 2006). The first perspective is the traditional or classical system working that work on the presumption that the bigger the organization the better. The organizations were mechanistic, technical and very bureaucratic. Hierarchic structure put owners at the top while managers worked to ensure that employees complied with whatever would maximize profits for the owners. Rigid rules and regulations were used to control of employees. Work was designed as tasks to help to maximize output as the organizational goal. It placed little emphasis on employee welfare. Human Relations was not developed as a science then. Employees survived through basic pay.

The second perspective is the semi-open or Human Relations System which was an improvement on the rigidity of the scientific or closed system. It was semi-mechanistic and retained the hierarchical structure and bureaucracy of the closed system. It sought organizational performance through tasks and control. Negotiation was used to ensure worker’s loyalty or compliance. It therefore merged employee welfare and stood for team based pay (Harington, 2000). Managers were specialists in task and people related training, collective bargaining and trade unionism were key features.

The third perspective was put forward by Beardwell, Holden, and Claydon (2004). It was an open system and it stood for a radical move from the notion that the bigger an organization the better to organic entities interacting with environment. It did not consider employees as any other resource that needed to be acquired cheap and controlled. It sought for the superiority of
human resources as backbone to organizational performance. Therefore, task, employee teams, and individual development were merged into business strategy. The stringent rules of the classical approaches were abandoned for self regulation, business orientation, and proactive measures, so as to achieve competitive advantage. Dessler (2003) emphasized quality as the undertone of employment relations. The role of the human resource manager became long term strategic and focused on performance.

The fourth perspective has been summarized by Guest (1997) as a shift from administrative to strategic approach, from reactive to proactive managerial responses, from ignorance of market dynamics to constant study of market changes, from separate view of influence to integration of personal, organizational and environmental factors, from consensus between employees and employer to mutual commitment between the two, and from efficiency to effectiveness in management. The Harvard Strategic Human Resource Management (HSHRM) was an improvement of this fourth perspective to human resource management.

This study will customize HSHRM strategies to retention of faculty in Christian private universities in Kenya through a survey to be conducted in Daystar University (DU) and Pan Africa Christian University (PACU) universities in Nairobi. Daystar and PACU are different in a number of ways. Daystar is older and bigger in departments, programs, number of faculty and students enrollment. Daystar was started by Americans while PACU was started by Canadians. Daystar has main campus in the city, large campus in Athi and a small campus in Mombasa unlike PACU whose minor campus in town is still small and main campus out of town. These differences may influence faculty retention and SHRM strategies.

A study by Sifuna (1998) indicated that University education in Kenya has been expanding without planning since mid 1980s. Sifuna contended that this rapid increase in
demand was caused by double intakes of 1987/88 and 1990/91 of which the latter was prompted by first 8-4-4 admissions. Due to lack of HRM strategies to absorb negative effects of such a change, there was a sudden increase in demand for faculty to handle additional teaching load, the change created short term demand for faculty in many academic disciplines. Some faculty left other Universities for better salaries and working conditions in Universities that attracted them. This growing trend faculty turnover has created the need to retain faculty in Universities in Kenya. This study is concerned with exploration of various aspects of SHRM strategies for retention of faculty in private universities in Kenya. Chacha (2004) has given a brief historical perspective of growth trends in higher education surrounding the need for retention of faculty in Africa, Kenya included. By 2005, there were 85 private Universities and 316 public universities in Africa. In East Africa, Kenya led in this expansion of private Universities with 16 in 2006 compared with three in 1980. According to a research report presented in a conference of reforming higher education in Kenya, there was a rapid expansion of university education which posed a number of challenges to various stakeholders in education. One of those challenges was retention of existing faculty.

Onat (2005) cited that in Europe, trends in SHRM in educational institutions to emphasize the need for human resource planning in order to retain productive faculty. This goal was to be achieved through provision of opportunities for benchmark-like comparisons and best human resource management practices in private universities.

Online education was one of the fastest growing enterprises in the United States. Statistics reveal that in 2006 there were 3.5 million students enrolled in online courses. This represents a 10 percent increase from 2005 (Sloan, 2007). The summary given by Sloan Consortium indicates the details costs of faculty attrition. Loss of faculty/adjuncts to competitors
due to faculty/adjunct turnover causes poor/declining program reputation. Loss of reputation of the university lead to decrease in student enrollment, decrease in recruitment of students, funding, faculty loss through poor pay, decrease in research, publishing, possible loss of accreditation or probation, decrease in sense of community and decrease in donor contributions and partnerships. This downward spiral can be avoided through implementation of sustainable SHRM strategies specifically aimed at retaining quality faculty and so reverse the spiral.

A study done in According to the report from a survey done in Drexel Private University by Betts (2008) in United States revealed that poor retention of faculty leads to three categories of attrition costs. Direct costs of attrition of faculty include recruitment, application process, hiring, orientation and training, professional development and ongoing support, separation costs associated with reactions such as students leaving the University because their best lecturers left and overtime costs of paying for extra teaching load. Opportunity costs are caused by of loss of business, future enrollment, loss of faculty (intellectual capital), and loss of university reputation. Indirect costs such as decline in morale of students and faculty left, decline in professional value among faculty, low faculty/adjuncts’ motivation, and low student motivation. These costs reduce the overall goal –fulfilling capacity of private universities and the problem may negatively affect other universities that network with them.

Calgary’s report (2000) on faculty recruitment and retention found that increasing enrollment of PhD students with the goal of retaining them as a SHRM strategy for faculty retention. However, such strategies would not apply to private universities in Kenya because of resource constraints. On the other hand, current trends of increasing university programs call for increase in demand for faculty members. The foregoing background findings indicate that faculty retention is a widespread need around the world.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

The two universities, Pan Africa Christian University (PACU and Daystar University (DU) were unique in that they are among faith-based universities that insisted on admitting students and faculty on the basis of profession of Jesus Christ as personal Lord and savior according to scriptures in addition to other requirements professional and academic requirements needed for Kenyan universities.

The researcher was interested in finding out the human resource strategies used in the two universities for the purpose of retention of full time faculty because two lecturers had left Daystar for better opportunities in other universities within a space of four years and it was. With the increase of other universities in the city of Nairobi competing for the same faculty that the two universities needed, could there have been faculty retention problem? The researcher intended to explore this. Decline in student enrollment was a challenge which was likely to create funding problems, paying salaries to lecturers included ((Naris and Ukpere, 2009). The main source of funding for the said universities was the students’ fees. The ongoing trend of decline in student enrollment in the two universities may have led to poor salary for their faculty members in the two universities or inability to maintain current pay rates as already expressed in the strategic plans of the two universities (Daystar strategic plan, 2011-2016 & PACU strategic plan, 2011-2015). The researcher wanted to find out whether there were faculty retention strategies in place or upcoming in response to this trend. In that year alone (2011), six full-time lecturers left PACU. Two of them had HOD status (Faculty Recruitment Memo, August, 2011). In the same year, two lecturers had left Daystar University. According to Daystar’s 2011-2016 strategic plans, the success of the University was dependent on, among other things, availability
of highly skilled and motivated staff that would ensure smooth operation of the University’s activities and programs. Thus, the University needed to attract and maintain adequate and high quality staff capable of supporting the diversified programs and services on offer.

According to views expressed by university management, appropriate human resource strategies, policies and procedures needed to be implemented at all times to meet the need for faculty retention (Daystar strategic plan, 2011-2016). One of the main objectives in Daystar plan was “To attract and retain high quality human capital”, (p.25). Two threats noted would lead to brain drain and competition from emerging universities (Daystar strategic plan, p.27). The Commission of Higher Education (CHE) had insisted that faculty needed to be PhD holders in their teaching areas (Commission of Higher Education handbook on processes for quality assurance in Higher Education in Kenya, 2008). In the light of the foregoing challenges, the researcher wanted to explore the strategies in place to retain existing faculty. Chapter four has details of findings regarding the foregoing concerns.

1.3 Research Questions

The following questions were used to guide this study:

a. Which factors are currently influencing retention of faculty in Daystar and Pan Africa Christian universities?

b. How would the existing retention strategies be improved in Daystar and Pan Africa Christian universities?

c. What challenges are being faced by the SHRM in their effort to retain faculty in Daystar and Pan Africa Christian universities?
d. What recommendations would be helpful to SHRM towards minimizing faculty retention challenges identified by various participants in Daystar and Pan Africa Christian universities?

1.4 Significance of the Study

It was hoped that this research will be beneficial to the universities studied and beyond in a number of ways:

The recommendations given were helpful to SHRM toward their improvement of faculty retention practices. The research findings would further provide information to different stakeholders such as management board, faculty and other interested parties on the need to incorporate retention of teaching faculty through SHRM strategies as an important aspect of educational management by University Management Boards and various educational administrators who directly work with the Board such as Heads of Department, libraries, transport, and community life officers in their decision making responsibilities.

It was also hoped that SHRM, with incorporation of new or improvement of the existing faculty retention strategies, students would perform better academically because of the professional growth, compatibility, research and ownership of the university by faculty. Good relationships between lectures and students as a result of long-term interactions may improve performance of both students and lecturers. Retention of professional lecturers would likely have made the University popular. Through word of mouth, students were likely to talk well about their good lecturers and their reputable university. This process would have increased student retention and enrollment (Robbins and Judge, 2009).

Increased student enrollment was considered to be one of the major causes and indicators of growth of a university. Findings in this area would have been useful to policy makers at
institutional level as educational managers and administrators, especially the SHRM. By making these findings available to interested parties such as other private universities in Nairobi, Kenya and around the world, this research was to become a valuable resource in education. The findings from the survey were to be compared with similar or different findings from the literature review and provide valuable benchmarking information (Torrington, Laura & Taylor, 2008). This research was not intended to explore the multiplier effects discussed in the foregoing about the possible relationship between retaining good faculty, university reputation and student enrollment.

1.5 Assumptions of the Study

This study was to be conducted with the view of the following assumptions:

1. That some kinds of SHRM strategies regarding retention of faculty existed in the Christian Universities to be studied (DU and PACU).
2. That the faculty and SHRM staff to be interviewed would provide the intended information adequately, accurately and on time.

1.6 Scope and Delimitation

This study was delimited to Daystar and Pan Africa Christian Universities as the institutions of higher learning. The scope was limited to survey of SHRM strategies that existed for the purpose of retaining teaching faculty in the two Universities. The study was delimited to full time lecturers, HODs, deans, human resource managers. Chartered Universities were run by statutes, a document put together by a task force appointed by higher levels of University
management, that is, University Council, Vice Chancellors, Deputy Vice chancellors and other stakeholders.

The theoretical document needed to be implemented on the ground by middle level management, in this case taken to be the strategic human resource manager, faculty deans and heads of departments. The strategic human resource manager recruited teaching staff, gave hired staff job description and formulated strategies to implement content on the statutes that concerned lecturers. Some of the strategies were geared towards retention of faculty. Human resource managers were therefore process owners as implementers on the ground and were therefore selected by the researcher because their strategies directly influence retention of faculty. The researcher was interested in finding out the perceptions of SHRM regarding faculty retention and kind of services they thought they would provide to lecturers to motivate them to stay longer in their respective universities. Varying opinions of lecturers and strategic human resource managers regarding retention were an aspect of interest to the researcher.

Administratively, the lecturers were directly answerable to the head of department who was directly answerable to dean of faculty. Since the researcher was interested in surveying the influence of human resource strategies on retention of full time faculty, other stakeholders were not considered to be directly involved in the daily running of teaching activities in a detailed way as strategic human resource managers, deans, heads of departments and lecturers. Part time lecturers were not selected as research participants since they were hired on semester basis by the heads of departments to handle extra teaching load.

Retention could have been influenced by activities of participants who were at the same level, such as SHRM, lower level such as deans, HODs or faculty simply opting to go elsewhere in spite of retentive strategies of SHRM. Higher level members of the university management
such as vice-chancellor and deputy-vice chancellors might have influenced retention of lecturers but they were not included by the researcher in this research because of reasons explained earlier in this study. The strategic human resource managers were selected as direct employers of academic staff. They had interest in retaining the faculty they attracted and recruited. The researcher was interested in finding out what strategies they had in place to retain faculty. Deans were direct implementers of academic policies through their roles as managers and administrators of education at faculty level. They were selected for the study because their administrative activities, such as service delivery, had potential to influence retention of faculty positively or negatively. Deans were also lecturers and therefore qualified to give suggestions to SHRM on how best to retain them as lecturers. Activities of heads of departments at departmental level influenced retention of faculty. Heads of departments were also lecturers and so their opinions on how best they would be retained were of interest to the researcher.

Experiences and suggestions of teaching staff without administrative responsibility were valuable to the researcher. Their influence on one another in aspects such as collegial support, view of administrative support, teaching load, salary and related aspects had great potential to influence their motivation to remain in the same university. Strategic human resource managers, deans, heads of departments and other full time lecturers were therefore selected for the surveyed. Although students and alumni might have provided valuable information, they were not involved in the study because they were not directly involved in recruitment and retention of faculty.
1.7 Theoretical Framework

In scholarship, a framework provides analytical structure within which to locate a particular form of argument to provide clarity and avoid misconception. The theoretical framework of this study was based on configurational theory (also called resource-based theory) to Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) as identified and advanced by Boxall (1996) and Wright (1998). Configurational theory best fitted this study because it emphasized that SHR practices, also here called strategic human resource management strategies, were considered critical towards achievement of competitive advantage that institutions needed to have so that they would effectively compete with other similar universities in around the world. Further, various studies had found significant increase in productivity and decrease in turnover rates (Becker and Huselid, 1998; Guthrie, 2001) when HR employed this theory in management. The theory promoted a system of SHRM that could be customized to provide both vertical (how top management works with those people down the hierarchy, faculty included) and horizontal fit (how human resource strategies harmonize with the other practices and policies).

Uniqueness of the abilities of SHRM to configure these managerial units in order to retain faculty was a source of competitive advantage potentially. Human resource characteristics that provide a competitive advantage if incorporated strategically would help reduce faculty turnover and at the same time benefit from the good will of the employees to market the institution. It was evident that with the increasing demand of higher education in Kenya and upcoming of private universities to help supplement the government effort to provide quality education, institutions needed to employ strategies to recruit and retain trained quality faculty.
This called for human resource management to both ensure the vertical and horizontal aspects of management were effectively managed. A specific application of Configurational strategies in the said universities meant that universities’ top management divisions such as human resource, finance, academic and research needed to consult frequently, plan certain aspects of faculty retention as a team and harmonize with teaching and learning environment where quality, as well as technical skills were needed and constantly changing. Looking at an application of vertical fit, it meant that the top management would lead together with members of lower ranks in respective universities. Possibly this strategic approach to leadership would have promoted sense of ownership of the universities by more members than otherwise.

Critically looking at configurational theory, it may be said that resources within the universities under study cannot in themselves be the only source of competitive advantage in this time of global exchange. Intervening variables such as e-commerce and impact of media presented challenges of using single theory. Human resource styles of management therefore needed constant review in order to address these changes both vertically and horizontally. Need to provide new directions in the world where competitive advantage was sought would not have been under estimated. Since it was not easy to reduce the current global dynamics into a single theory and research required a single theory for guidance, configurational theory was considered by the researcher to be the best in explaining the different variables in the study.

1.8 Conceptual Framework

In light of the strategic HRM of Harvard University discussed in detail in chapter two and findings of other education researchers in the field under study, the researcher formulated a conceptual framework to help summarize the study. The variables selected in the framework
were based on the concept that effective SHRM strategies which were widely used to enhance retention of faculty and therefore expected to provide university-wide benefits.

Shown below is a representation of the SHRM strategies (independent variables such as staffing, training and development, job designs, job promotion, job security and information sharing and collaborative leadership). These strategies, if well configured by SHRM, would have led to high faculty retention, high employee’s satisfaction, high productivity and proper service delivery.

The variables cited above were explored through the research process to find out the influence they were related to retention of full time lecturers. It was hoped that independent variables such as job security as a SHRM strategy would create a strong sense of ownership in faculty and so make lecturers want to stay long and make positive contributions towards growth of the university.

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a variable is a measurable characteristic that assumes different values among the subjects (p.11). Speaking in terms of cause and effect, independent variable is the characteristic which causes change in behavior of another variable. The characteristic that changes as a result of the causative characteristic, such as retention, is the dependent variable. In this study, some of the common independent and dependent variables regarding faculty retention are diagrammatically shown in figure 1.
Figure 1: Possible Factors Influencing Faculty Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependant variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate staffing</td>
<td>High overall performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training and development</td>
<td>Highly motivated faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance appraisal</td>
<td>High faculty retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper compensation</td>
<td>High quality service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job design</td>
<td>More research and publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotion on merit</td>
<td>Strong sense of ownership of University by faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information sharing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaborative leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher treated activities of strategic human resource manager as independent variables in faculty retention and responses of faculty to SHRM strategies as dependent variables. The selected variables were related to faculty retention. Adequate staff would promote overall in the said universities through reduced workload, more time for research, writing, publication and consultancy. Regular training of staff through skill imparting seminars and workshops would lead to a highly motivated faculty through increased work related confidence. Performance appraisal would possibly lead to faculty retention in that each lecturer would voluntarily set his or her own goals to achieve over time as a stakeholder in respective universities.
Proper compensation would lead to provision of high quality service as most lecturers would value their work more. If SHRM would design jobs in ways that promote research, it would enable upward mobility of the lecturers and promote growth of the university in several ways including increase of university professors. Collaborative leadership would potentially instill a sense of ownership of the universities by their faculty members. It was researcher’s goal to explore existing strategies in the said universities with above strategies in mind.

1.9 Operational Definitions of Key Terms

Faculty: The teaching staff of a university, adjunct and full time

Private university: A university registered by government as a privately owned and managed entity but expected to conform to professional and academic standards of the other universities.

Public university: A university registered by government as a publicly owned and managed entity and expected to conform to professional and academic standards of the other universities in the country.

Faculty retention: For the purposes of this survey, faculty retention refers a voluntary stay of faculty as lecturers in one university through sustainable Human Resource Management (HRM) strategies.

Retention gap: As a working definition, retention gap referred to differences of opinions among various research participants on best SHRM practices for retaining faculty in their respective universities.

Strategies: The methods used by SHRM to retain the deeded faculty as employees of the university.
Strategic Human Resource Management is a branch of leadership that fulfills the tasks of directing, coordinating, ruling, planning, and controlling the employees of the university.

University: This is an organized academic community of students, academic and non-academic staff, governing council, chancellor, vice-chancellor, and other stakeholders, who work together to receive and provide what is considered to be the best quality and highest level of education in major areas of knowledge, research, writing, publication, and community service.

1.10. Organization of the Study

This study had five chapters. Chapter one comprised of introduction, description of the area of study, research problem, research questions, assumptions, significance of the study, scope and delimitation of the study, theoretical framework, and conceptual framework and organization of the study. In chapter two, related literature was reviewed in order to find out what other researchers and scholarly writers had found in similar researches and how SHRM strategies were applied to faculty retention in private universities.

Gaps in knowledge which this study attempted to surface and bridge was also included in the study. Chapter three addressed research design and methodology. Its six parts were: research design and methodology, target population, sample and sampling procedures, description of research instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis techniques. Chapter four covered presentation, discussion, and interpretation of research findings. Findings were presented, discussed, and interpreted. The presentation of findings was done through the use of a variety of tables and descriptive statements. Chapter five gave a summary of findings as guided by the research questions, conclusions the researcher has drawn from findings and
recommendations to other researchers, education managers at various levels and general public that may want to adapt the role of strategies in retention of workers.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Critical Review of Theories

This chapter specifically examined academic works done in educational research in the field of higher education concerning SHRM strategies and faculty retention. Key highlights in each researched work reviewed has focused on purpose, methodology, and data analysis technique, summary of findings and recommendations of educational researchers in the area of Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) strategies for the purpose of retaining talented faculty in higher education with special attention to private universities. Each review indicated gap in knowledge between its specific aspect and the proposed survey. A final summary and the gaps were given. Specific application of SHRM policy was discussed under Harvard SHRM in relation to retention of faculty in private universities in Kenya because of its easy adaptability to higher education in the area proposed for study. SHRM decisions on recruitment, retention and attrition of faculty are guided by HR policy.

SHRM strategies used in various universities (2000-2010) and current (2012) SHRM strategies to see how they are related to retention of two categories of faculty, namely, senior full time faculty, junior full time faculty SHRM strategies to retain talented faculty is viewed as an indicator of commitment of SHRM to faculty retention while faculty’s commitment to teaching was viewed as an indicator of talented faculty. Studies had been done on faculty status over a period of not more than ten years of work in one university and SRHM strategies to improve faculty retention was also reviewed. Senior faculty here refers to senior lecturers with administrative positions.
2.1.1 Harvard Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) and HR Retention Strategies

HRM Guide (2007), presents a valid argument in support of Harvard Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) for its four policy areas are human resource flows (recruitment, selection, placement, appraisal, promotion and termination); reward systems (pay systems and other motivation strategies); employee influence (delegated levels of authority, responsibility and power) and work systems (work design and alignment of people’s welfare with that of the organization). In private universities, these four SHRM policies influence retention of lecturers, for example, creating a sense of ownership of the university by lecturers through delegated level of authority by SHRM would perhaps create sense of ownership of the university by faculty Cascio (2011). Each of the four policy areas influences faculty retention anywhere in the world, including universities of researcher’s interest. More recent strategies are in the market.

A research conducted by Provost’s Committee (2007) on faculty retention in the University of Illinois to find out how faculty was flowing in and out of the University used focus group interviews with faculty with department heads and deans as senior faculty. The committee found that in fiscal years 2005 and 2006, Illinois tenured faculty members received 126 and 124 outside offers, respectively, and more than 50 percent of those who received outside offers resigned (State News, 2006). This brief report indicated that resource flows should be an important aspect of SHRM focus as they develop of strategies to steer fulfillment of educational goals in private universities because each of the components of resource flows influences faculty retention. The researchers used longitudinal survey with no triangulation in that they used only focus group method. Such cases tend to lower validity of findings in that certain aspects of faculty are not touched at all. The study at Daystar and PACU used three methods in the survey
to increase validity and scope of findings. The category of faculty surveyed was only senior faculty. This single group survey did not provide room for comparison between two similar groups but with different ranks. The survey carried out by the researcher in the said universities included senior and junior faculty to provide comparison, contrast among responses to the same variables used in the survey. The study did not survey SHRM strategies as the proposed survey intends. It primarily observed faculty trends.

Reward system as a SHRM strategy is one of the many factors which may motivate faculty and thereby influence retention. Milkovich and Newman (2008) have defined motivation as “an individual’s willingness to engage in some behavior, what energizes behavior, what directs or channels such behavior and how this behavior is maintained or sustained” (p.620). In their methodology, these researchers have cited top eight HR strategies they found using survey questionnaire and called the mix of a total reward system. This bundle of SHRM strategies is useful as a SHRM guide in selection of retention strategies in Kenyan Christian private universities.

The summary of findings of the leading eight SHRM strategies proposed by the respondents were compensation -wages, commissions and bonuses, security -stable, consistent position and rewards, status/recognition -respect/prominence due to work, workload -right amount of work, not too much, not too little, authority/control/autonomy -ability to influence others and control one’s destiny, work conditions -hazard free, development opportunity -formal and informal training to learn new skills and feedback -receiving information that helps to improve work performance (Milkovich and Newman, 2008).

The observation was that the researchers had not made use of triangulation to increase validity. Validity, therefore, refers to the degree to which data provide relevant information about
the research situation being explored. However, these SHRM faculty retention strategies may serve as a useful guide to SHRM in Kenyan private universities. On employee influence as a SHRM faculty retention strategy, researchers in agreement that delegated levels of authority, responsibility and power in the hands of the faculty are important aspects SHRM needs to consider while developing their faculty retention strategies. Work systems as a SHRM faculty retention strategy mainly refers to work design and alignment of people’s welfare with that of the organization in order to influence faculty retention in Christian private universities proposed for study.

2.1.2 SHRM Faculty Retention Strategies in Private Universities: Senior Faculty

A survey report by the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, (COACHE, 2010) on examining the factors that lead to senior faculty retention and attrition reveals six insightful factors that influence retention of senior faculty in American universities. The research team of 150 American universities was formed in 2002 as a consortium committed to making the academic workplace more attractive and equitable for faculty. It was based at Harvard Graduate School of Education in Harvard University. The research work by this consortium provided to SHRM a valuable source of faculty retention strategies which were considered by the researcher relevant to faculty retention in universities and in private universities in Kenya. In this case, the purpose of the survey was focused on influencing workplace while the purpose of study at Daystar and PACU survey was mainly to explore SHRM strategies which might have been used later by the said universities.

A survey conducted by Askeland (2008) in Colorado Community College on factors that lead to senior faculty retention and attrition indicated six top factors from responses of senior
faculty. They were presented as: bureaucratic leadership, resources and support, salary and benefits, autonomy and pursuit of knowledge, culture and collegiality, and workload.

According to Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) and Shuster and Finkelstein (2006) tenured faculty gets dissatisfied with their job when routine administrative tasks such as paperwork and committees become the main part of the job as a result of the bureaucratic nature of university leadership. This problem becomes bigger when the senior faculty desires or is required to sustain intellectual growth through research, writing and presenting academic papers but time is mostly spent in bureaucratic activities. To minimize such tasks or provide a healthy balance for the senior faculty is a faculty retention strategy that SHRM needs to incorporate into their management functions in Christian private universities in Kenya.

Gappa, Austin and Trice (2007) and Clark, Corcoran and Lewis (1986) support the findings of Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) that senior faculty places a high value on availability of money for research and teaching. Looking at it from an ethical perspective, Bataille and Brown (2006) suggest that senior faculty is sensitive to equitable, timely and adequate allocation of such funds. Ehrenberg, Rizzo and Jakubson (2003) have proposed that SHRM should provide competitive start-up packages to senior faculty to help them settle in their new positions and therefore minimize chances of their movement to peer universities. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) agree with many researchers who have suggested that competitive salaries enhance faculty retention through motivation, especially when raises are based on recognition for their work.

A survey conducted by the research team of Harvard University on senior faculty indicated that some senior faculty left their university for another or took early retirement because they felt they were not “performing up to their expectations” according to their
academic aspirations (Bateille and Brown, 2006, p.114). SHRM strategies that provide autonomy to senior faculty to explore areas of their interest that also benefit the university in academic works such as publishing would enhance retention of faculty. Data from Harvard survey (2010) indicated that 31% of senior faculty members were considering work outside of the academy because returns from their time investment would pay better with less stress and better personal life (Shuster and Finkelstein, 2006; Turner and Boice, 1987).

Based on their survey, Ambrose, Huston and Norman (2005) asserted that university cultures that foster collegial relationships provide senior faculty with community at workplace. A collegial community helps the faculty to increase productivity through exchange of diverse experiences and competencies. Manageable workload increases job satisfaction that further promotes retention of faculty. Gappa, Austin and Trice (2007) have found out that when faculty members experience frustration due to time constraints, they are significantly more likely to report that they want to leave academia.

The researcher intends to explore existence or non existence of Deal’s assertion that SHRM strategies that promote retention of senior faculty has to provide leadership that interacts with senior faculty to find out what their frustrations are, their aspirations and what their social needs are such as community. Deal adds that balance between work and personal life, funds to promote their research and teaching activities need to be addressed if the University has to keep attracting and retaining its valuable senior faculty (Deal, 1995).

According to the results of “The American Faculty Poll,” the top four reasons that Professors remained on the job were: an opportunity to educate students, the chance to work in an intellectually challenging environment, freedom to teach what interested them, and the freedom to spend time with their families. Among 17 factors included in the poll, the four least
important were: the reputations of their departments and institutions, the physical working conditions on campus, and the opportunity for professional recognition (Sanderson 2000). The researcher wonders whether this research would contribute make similar information available regarding retention of senior faculty in private universities in Kenya.

2.1.3 SHRM Faculty Retention Strategies in Private Universities: Junior Full Time Faculty

A survey was conducted in the University of Washington on Faculty Retention & Department Climate by NSF ADVANCE (2005). The purpose of the survey was to improve the health of a department of the University by developing a Faculty Retention Toolkit for assisting department chairpersons in retaining their faculty across all ranks. The best practices found through this survey were to be applied to all faculty members out of conviction that retention efforts, when applied equitably to all faculty members, can improve the general climate for everyone and can lead to better productivity and greater satisfaction for all faculty members.

The researchers made an observation that faculty retention is critical to the health of a University department both for morale reasons and also for economic reasons, as faculty replacement costs tend to be much higher than retention costs. The leadership skills of the senior faculty, such as heads of departments, in creating an enabling work-life climate for junior faculty, was highlighted as the most influential factor in faculty retention.

The primary survey method used was a closed-ended questionnaire which was given to the entire faculty. The survey instrument had key areas to explore, namely; creating a positive departmental climate: principles for best practices, issues related to collegiality, issues related to departmental or University policies, actions for enhancing department climate, balancing work and life as faculty, and individual selection characteristics of department and group selection.
The findings were very insightful. The highlights on strategies for creating a positive departmental climate to enhance faculty retention as recommended by the respondents included; systematic monitoring of leadership decisions to eliminate unintentional bias, create opportunities for entire faculty, encourage transparency in operations, sharing information equitably with entire faculty, foster a supportive environment, recognize important faculty contributions in all areas including teaching, research, service, and creative activities.

A survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (2000) found that more than 40% of full-time faculty members had seriously considered switching careers (Sanderson, Phua, & Herda, 2000). The research was for finding out turnover intent, not faculty retention in Christian private universities in Kenya. The researcher found that survey responses from 66% (149) of the invited population revealed that lack of organizational support for innovation had the strongest effect on turnover intent. Dee (2010) reported that high rates of faculty turnover can be costly to the reputation of an institution and to the quality of instruction.

Further, Giacometti, (2005) carried out a survey on Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction and Retention of Beginning Lecturers in the University of Virginia and found from participants five top suggestions as top best SHRM strategies. Compensation referred to salaries, benefits, inequalities of skills, education not comparable with other fields, scholarships. School culture comprised of administrative support to lecturers, bureaucracy in service delivery, collegial support, evaluation of progress and staff morale. Motivation to teach comprised of desire to work with young people, desire to teach others, challenge of the profession, professional growth, social status, and commitment to teach. Demographic factors included gender, stage of career, years of experience, and other personal factors. External factors notably job security; social issues such as reputation of the university and availability of alternative jobs were suggested by
many participants. The survey was on dependent variable, job satisfaction, as influenced by five factors which SHRM needed to investigate in order to retain faculty through job satisfaction. This is a weak survey in that it assumes one factor alone causes faculty to leave. The proposed survey will explore various SHRM strategies associated with faculty retention in Christian private universities.

2.2 Gaps in the Theories

2.2.1 Divergence in Perceptions on Faculty Retention between Deans and Faculty

Moratis, Baalen, Teunter, and Verhaegen (2005) reported their findings from a survey of a PhD research project that was conducted in 2003-2004 among European Business Schools on faculty and deans to find out faculty retention factors from each group. The purpose of the research was to study the differences in perception of retention factors between junior faculty and their deans on retention factors for junior faculty. Junior faculty here refers to full time teaching faculty who are neither HODs nor deans. A survey method in which a questionnaire whose category (key areas of HR practices) and factor examples was used.

All the participants were asked to respond to 42 factors and seven broad categories under which related factors were listed and later scored. Individual differences in perception on factor ranks were noted between faculty and deans in their responses to the same items. Classification of questions included categories such as age, gender, background and school characteristics for faculty motivation, which, in turn determines faculty retention. A paper-based survey form was sent to 181 Deans and 69 responded from 18 countries. Online options were used with 243 faculties from 38 schools and the response rate was higher. Top ten retention factors ranked
according to faculty and deans (Table 2.1). Averages of differences were also calculated and first three scores are indicated in the table in each case (for faculty and deans).

Table 2.1. Divergence in Perceptions on Faculty Retention Strategies between Faculty and Deans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Faculty rank</th>
<th>Deans rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic freedom</td>
<td>1 (8.00)</td>
<td>3 (8.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research time</td>
<td>2 (7.7)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location of the schools</td>
<td>3 (7.69)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating peer community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (8.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for professional development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for research achievements</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research climate within the school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for professional activities like conferences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and progress of the school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 (8.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of the school in the academic community</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates retention gaps, here defined as the discrepancies or difference between perceptions deans and faculty on a single item. In this study, gap = rank of deans minus rank of faculty in a single factor. Conditions of employment rated the lowest with deans as a contributor to faculty motivation for retention while research climate rated the highest. The faculty perceived work climate as the lowest motivator and research climate as the highest motivator. Such contradictions or variations in perceptions in one item could lead to distorted decision making and suboptimal resource allocations. The differences in perceptions are a challenge to HRM who
may be influenced strongly by deans’ advice in application of their HRM strategies for retaining faculty. The researcher intends to compare perceptions of full time faculty with those of part time faculty regarding HRM services each category is receiving.

2.2.2 Policy-Related Challenges and Retention of Faculty in Private Universities

A survey report carried out by Tetty, (2006) as a World Bank project through University of Calgary, Canada, on Staff Retention in African Universities: Elements of a Sustainable Strategy indicated a great challenge to retention of faculty in University of Ghana. The University records showed that “59 senior lecturers either on leave of absence or sabbatical, while 69 are on study leave ranging from two to five years. This brings the total to 128 lecturers absent from the classrooms.” (Ghanaweb, 2005. ‘Legon Lecturers Flee Classroom’). This situation called for SHRM retention strategies that would be customized to the University of Ghana to effectively retain the remaining faculty and recruit additional faculty to meet the deficit and retain the same. Implementation of policies regarding leave created faculty retention problems in this case. The study indicated that some strategies can work against others and contradict main quality goals of a university.

Similar surveys done by Tetty and team in various parts of the world indicated similar challenges in retention of faculty as a problem that affects both developing and industrialized countries. The difficulties within Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries are well documented. In the United States, for example, about 7.7% of all full-time academic staff left their institutions for other places within one academic year, fall 1997 to fall 1998. Of these, only 29% were retirees; the remaining 71% left for a variety of reasons (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2001). A 2000 survey of full-time faculty members
in the US showed that more than 40% of them had contemplated changing careers (Sanderson et al., 2000). In Canada, it has been argued that one of the challenges that universities will face over the next decade or so is academic recruitment and retention (Carleton University, 2000; The Laurier Institution, 2000). Similarly, “it has been suggested that early in the 21st century there will be a crisis in Australian higher education with an estimated academic labor shortage of 20,000 if this trend is not addressed” (Mathews, 2003, p. 313). Report from a survey has prioritized present and future faculty retention challenges as change management, compensation and rewards, leadership development, employee retention and talent management, recruitment and availability of quality manpower, institutional relations and outsourcing of HR activities (Chandra, 2009).

2.3 Critical Review of Empirical Studies, Gaps, Contradictions and inconsistencies in the literature reviewed

The Research Gaps

The literature reviewed so far in India, Europe and United States indicates that there is unlimited information on SHRM strategies for retention of faculty in private and public universities. From all the three continents, USA leads in number of e-journals in this area. Based on the literature review done by the researcher, it seems that limited studies have been done on faculty retention in private universities in Africa.

The researcher established several knowledge gaps, such as faith-based effect, CBD university effect and lack of educational research of this type private universities in Kenya, may need to be filled through this study. From the reviewed literature it was clear that there was little evidence on studies done targeting the SHRM strategies in Daystar and PAC universities and
even in other Kenya universities. Thus, there is a need of carrying out a research to establish if Daystar and PACU employ SHRM strategies to help them employ and improve retention of faculty in the respective institutions.

Strategies for improving faculty retention may be categorized into monetary and non-monetary. Non-monetary strategy would be considered to be of no financial cost to the university while monetary strategy would incur spending.

In a case study done by Netswera, Rankhumise and Mavundia (2005) to find out employee retention factors in South African Higher Education Institutions, the researchers found SHRM strategies similar to what most researchers in the same field such as Salopek (2000) have found. The top ones included developing a climate of trust, communicating how each faculty member contributes to the University’s corporate vision and mission, improving skills of faculty supervisors through management training, clarifying needs and roles of faculty, and not burning faculty out through overload. Netswera, Rankhumise and Mavundia (2005) are in consensus with Salopek (2000) that investing in maintaining ongoing commitment by paying the best talent what they are worth as a major SHRM faculty retention strategy.

The case study analyzed human resource turnover data. Researchers surveyed academic managers and employees to find out possible faculty retention factors for a higher education in UNISA, South Africa. They found that managers were more concerned with profits, upkeep of the university and justification for spending while employees were interested in introverted interests such as personal development, monetary rewards and personal fulfillment. However, Salopek (2000) views the following critical elements to be important if private universities have to effectively achieve faculty retention goals. The notable elements, which most researchers call strategies, are further clarified by Netswera, Rankhumise and Mavundia (2005) as how to
communicate contribution of each faculty as recognizing that excellence can be achieved in many areas in the department and other areas of entire University.

On the principles of best practices, participants emphasized that three leadership qualities were necessary for successful and sustainable faculty retention. These practices were transparency (making all kinds of information available and easy to find), uniformity (leveling the field and dealing equitably with entire faculty) and assistance (attending to the needs of faculty such as offering mentoring and other types of help).

A survey conducted by COACHE Consortium, (2002) has added valuable strategies for retention of faculty to SHRM. The Collaboration of Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) is a consortium of over 150 colleges and universities across North America committed to making the academic workplace more attractive and equitable for faculty. The consortium was founded in 2002 with support from the Ford Foundation and Atlantic Philanthropies to respond to the explosion of hiring and turnover costs and to persistent challenges to SHRM in universities across North America, the research work by this consortium has proved helpful to SHRM as a valuable source of faculty retention strategies that work in universities. COACHE is based at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

The two research teams have added other factors that generally improve faculty retention issues related to collegiality have been highlighted. Faculty members pointed out that a sense of community within a department is a key component of job satisfaction. In addition to the mentoring, luncheons, speaker programs, and other events such as faculty picnics are among the best practices that support collegiality and community.

Issues related to departmental or University policies were given attention by respondents. Majority observed that sabbatical leave for faculty members in their fourth year was nurturing.
This leave was an entitlement for everyone, consistent across the college and not dependent upon individual negotiation. It gave all tenure-track faculty members one semester off from university responsibilities, in order to concentrate on their research. Parents with school-going children can be assisted to better manage their schedules to coincide with their children’s schedules. Such a strategy would minimize the level of anxiety of married female employees and in way enhance faculty retention. A university bus service for children of staff. In addition, department administrators may a reasonable time limit for service on time-consuming committees; while at the same time insure that women get a chance to serve on important committees. Department administrators give junior faculty members some priority in teaching assignments. Actions for enhancing department climate are of great value. They include; enhancement of basic manners such as respect, consideration and politeness.

Based on their research findings, Ulrich (1997), Haynes and Fryer (2000) argued that improvement of working environment in three aspects (infrastructure, assigning average of workload and providing secure environment) would improve retention of faculty. Buckingham and Coffman (2009) have pointed out that studies indicate four main paths of turnover, namely, employee dissatisfaction, better alternatives, following personal plan and leaving without a plan. Applying these causes to private universities in Kenya means that the SHRM has to have a constant strategy of monitoring workplace attitudes, being competitive in terms of rewards, development of faculty and providing work environment. It further, means that SHRM has to align family plans such as generous maternity leave with organizational plans through family friendly policy. Negative interactions such as harassment may create conflict that cause faculty to leave without a plan. Conflict resolution procedures could help minimize such trends.
In a research report, Ashiedu (2009), respondents agreed that SHRM could improve faculty retention by enhancing working conditions by using to strategies such as appraisal and performance management, professional development, recruitment and reward. Solving conflicts of interest in academic employment and dealing with ethical aspects may enhance employee retention (Onat, 2005).

In spite of all the SHRM strategies so far pointed out, there some strategies which are institution specific because of uniqueness of that private university, its immediate and larger environment. SHRM may use the applicable universal strategies to combine with those unique to their university. Palthe (2008) is in agreement with Mike Toffel (2008), who has argued in his report in a global compact network meeting that “there is still plenty of room for management knowledge and practice to work on the implementation” of SHRM at global level, which is highly dynamic and complex (Palthe, 2008, p.2).
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This chapter describes the methodology used in the study. The areas included are; research design, target population, sample and sampling procedure, description of research instruments, reliability and validity of the instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures and ethical issues.

Survey method and naturalistic designs were used in this study. Survey design is where different groups of people are studied at one point in time and hence all observations can be completed relatively quickly (Lerner, 2002). Survey method was the most suitable for this study because it served researcher’s purpose which was to explore faculty retention strategies available in PACU and DU, suggestions for improvement, challenges, and recommendations. Population was fairly large. The design was naturalistic in that it was carried out with participants in their natural working routines and environment. The main purpose of doing survey was to determine the current status of that with respect to variables and acquire information about people’s characteristics, opinions, attitudes, or previous experiences (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003, Leedy and Ormrod (2005). The data collected was to be analyzed using techniques which were largely narrative and visual in nature (Gay, Mills, and Airasian, 2006). Characteristics of such data are quantitative, characteristics of research as naturalistic, descriptive, concerned with
process as well as product and inductive analysis of data (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2006, Melter and Charles, 2008, Creswell and Miller, 2000).

Chris (2009) adds that benefits of survey design as a case of two universities would serve as a good source of ideas about behavior, good opportunity for innovation, good method to study rare phenomena, good method to challenge theoretical assumptions and good alternative or complement to the group focus of psychology.

3.2 Target Population

According to Mugenda (2003) target population is that population to which a researcher wants to generalize the results of a study. The target population of the study consisted Deans, Human Resource Managers, Heads of Departments and full time lecturers in DU and PACU in biblical studies, counseling and business departments.

3.2.1 Universities

The two universities were purposively sampled because of their recruitment procedures that their faculty members must possess and practice the sponsor’s faith.

In their article Statistics Glossary v.11, Easton and McColl (n.d.), Statistics Glossary v1.1, simple random sampling is the basic sampling technique where one selects a group of subjects (a sample) for study from a larger group (a population). Each individual is chosen entirely by chance and each member of the population has an equal chance of being included in the sample. Every possible sample of a given size has the same chance of selection. However, the sampling technique used was non probability sampling.
3.2.2 Deans and HODs

The deans were automatically included because they played leadership roles and duties in the process of implementation of SHRM faculty retention strategies. Their opinions about various variables studied were also useful to the researcher for analysis and recommendations. They were further involved in formulating and implementing academic policies and guidelines. HODs were automatically selected as the immediate supervisors of faculty and mediators between management and faculty. They implemented policies by working with faculty who are actual implementers at classroom level through teaching. The HOD’s position and roles therefore allowed them to be in touch with activities of faculty on daily or weekly basis, an experience which Deans and SHRM may not have. The researcher benefited from such a variety of experiences and opinions on SHRM strategies to be used in data collection and analysis.

3.2.3 Human Resource Managers.

Human resource managers were included because they were only two and each of them played a major role in leading their human resource departments in attraction, recruitment and retain desired employees. They were therefore the most resourceful people to interview. They advised management on the best practices for management of human resource to help the university remain competitive concerning faculty retention strategies.

3.2.4 Lecturers

The lecturers were crucial in implementation of policies and teaching in the university, primarily through their teaching roles. Their views on how they would best be retained were valuable to
the researcher. Out of 120 lecturers in Daystar University, 30 were purposively sampled because they belonged to the three departments available in both Universities. Out of 15 lecturers at PACU, five were selected because they belonged to the selected departments. The part time lecturers were not considered for participation in the research because they had brief contracts of three months. The researcher was not sure of accessing them for data collection, neither were they appropriate to talk about retention strategies which were not applicable to them.

3.3 Description of Sample and Sampling Procedures

Non-probability (purposive type) procedures were used to select the sample size. No basis for probability that each item in the population of interest was to be selected (Kothari, 2009). In this case, the strategic human resource managers in universities the strategic human resource managers, deans, HODs and full time lecturers were all included as the only ones who met the researcher’s requirements. They were the population of interest to the researcher as explained in chapter one. In this study, participants in three departments common to both universities were the subset. As with other non-probability sampling methods, census does not produce a sample that is representative of a larger population, but it can be exactly what is needed in some cases. Specifically, the automatically selected participants consisted of two (2) human resource managers, three (3) deans in Daystar and one (1) in Pan Africa Christian University, three (3) heads of departments in each university, thirty (30) lecturers in Daystar and five (5) in Pan Africa Christian University. According to Gay (1976) a sample size of 10% to 20% of the population is adequate for survey study though the bigger the sample the better. Each of the target groups was automatically selected for its unique contribution to the research. The summary was as shown in table 3.1 below.
Table 3.1. Anticipated participants at DU and PACU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Participants</th>
<th>Sampling</th>
<th>Population in each University</th>
<th>Anticipated Sampling size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universities Deans</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>5 in DU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>1 in PACU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODs</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>14 in DU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODs</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>3 in PACU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR managers</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>1 in each University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>120 in DU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>15 in PACU</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Description of Research Instruments

The researcher obtained official clearance from the Catholic University of Eastern Africa before proceeding to ministry of education for permit to conduct the research in 2011.

Permission from universities where the research was conducted was sought by the researcher and granted. Thirty five self-administered survey questionnaires were distributed to all full time faculty and deans in both universities. They were anonymously completed in hard or soft copies and returned to the researcher directly or through the office personnel at 100% response rate in Pan Africa Christian University and 89% response rate in Daystar University. Questions used
were proofread by a professional in the field of research for clarity and supervisors in order to increase their reliability and validity by correcting any ambiguities before using them with actual respondents. Pre-testing the instruments was not possible because the participants were few.

Document analysis guide was used to enable the researcher to do basic analysis of the documents related to faculty retention through personal interviews with each human resource manager in the two universities. Personal interviews were conducted by the researcher with the Strategic Human Resource Manager, Dean and HODs by use of interview guide in both universities.

Two categories of research instruments were used. They are questionnaire and interview guide. Questionnaire was used for the faculty, one interview guide for Deans and HODs, another interview guide for human resource managers.

3.4.1. Questionnaires

Questionnaire is a collection of questions put together and administered to selected individuals i.e. respondents for data collection (Bryman and Bell, 2003). A non-structured and semi-structured, self-administered questionnaires were used because they were easy to administer to respondents scattered over departments, different time schedules and convenient for collecting more subjective information within a short time. The questionnaire was given to full time faculty.

The questionnaire had five sections. Part A contained items for obtaining general information about lecturers. Part B had questions to probe SHRM strategies influencing faculty retention currently. Part C had questions on strategies for improving faculty retention. Part D has
questions on challenges faced in retention of faculty while Part E was aimed at getting suggestions and recommendations to improve faculty retention from participants’ perspective.

3.4.2. Interview Guide

Interview guide is a written document for use by an interviewer for the purpose of gathering “facts and opinions from someone with expertise and experience in a specific field” Doyle (n.d). A non-directive interview guide was used for to allow flexibility in their expression of feelings, facts, “purposeful behavioral beliefs, expectancies and interpretation of causes” on issues about HRM strategies which may guide retention of faculty in each private university (Becker, 1996). Personal interviews were conducted by the researcher to obtain expert knowledge, values and preferences of Deans, HODs and strategic human resource managers. It has five parts as in questionnaire.

3.4.3 Document analysis

Document analysis list was used to obtain information on availability of faculty mobility and retention records a period of the last decade in each university in order to cross check other related information from interviews and questionnaire. Because of confidentiality issues and sensitivity that goes with the same, the researcher was not to probe content of the available documents in any way. Documents with information on salaries, exit interview reports, some internal challenges within SHRMN department such as discipline of staff needed to remain confidential.
3.5 Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

3.5.1 Validity

As used in scientific measurements, a test or experiment is valid if it measures what it is intended to measure. It is the accuracy of results obtained. In the words of Robson, validity is concerned with whether an item measures or describes what it is supposed to measure or describe (Robson, 2002). In education research, internal validity is achieved by writing clear and relevant instrument items, clear explanation of procedures to participants, selection of relevant and informed participants and analysis. According to Creswell (2003), validity in survey design is achieved through data transformation (coding of qualitative data to make it quantitative data) and exploration of outliers. Outlier is an odd finding such as a participant who says that no faculty member has moved away from PACU for the last one year while facts on the ground indicate six of them have moved away. An outlier is an observation that is numerically distant from the rest of the data. It is an infrequent observation (Basic Statistics, 2011).

Content validity measures the extent to which a research instrument obtains needed content of the population or a randomly selected sample. This type of validity is taken care of by clarity of instrument items, their variety for triangulation purposes, informed and adequate sample through purposive selection and questions asked. In addition, construct and content validity of questionnaire and interview guide was checked by consulting one lecturer from DU and PACU for their opinions in each of the three departments. These lecturers were not to participate in the research later after pre-testing the instruments. The researcher improved the research instruments by deleting, adding or rephrasing questions to make them better understood by research participants. The researcher further improved the validity for HR manager interview guides through seeking input from a qualified HR from another university.
3.5.2 Reliability

Generally, reliability is the consistency of results obtained, “the extent to which any measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials” (Milkovich & Newman, 2008, p. 625). Craig and Wollack (2003) have also defined reliability is a term used to describe the properties of tests and measures. The reliability of a test or measure refers to its degree of stability, consistency and repeatability. In this case, some kind of stability and consistency was taken care of by the researcher by giving different items in the questionnaire for checking whether participants were consistent in providing the same or similar answers to items asking the same thing differently in the same questionnaire. His was more of an internal cross examination of participants to see how genuine they were in their responses. The analysis indicated consistent answers. Strictly speaking, the survey was not to be repeated in order to test whether the questionnaire would provide same results with different participants. Even with the same participants at different time, some would have said different things depending on change of moods and thought patterns.

The researcher was aware of the four main tests of reliability, noted as: Inter-rater, which evaluates reliability among different participants; Test- Re-test, which evaluates reliability across time; Parallel Forms, which evaluates question that seek to assess the same construct with the out most consistency; Internal Consistency, which evaluates individual questions in comparison with one another for their ability to give consistently appropriate results. Out of the four tests, inter rater would have been adopted but this was not a purely psychological research. It was a non-repeatable exploration of SHRM strategies used in the two universities and selected aspects according to the research questions.
It was difficult to measure reliability when looking for perceptions and attitudes of human participants in social science research. Since the research instruments were mainly quantitative in nature, triangulation was employed for dependability and trustworthiness of collected data. Reconfirming test was also done with interview guide participants by allowing each participant to reconfirm whether what the researcher recorded are what they said (Creswell & Miller, 2000). This was done before data analysis to avoid misrepresentation of participants or the university represented.

Triangulation is typically a strategy (test) for improving the validity and reliability of research or evaluation of findings (Nahid, 2003). Mathison (1988) elaborates this by saying: “Triangulation has raised an important methodological issue in naturalistic and qualitative approaches to evaluation (in order to) control bias and establishing valid propositions because traditional scientific techniques are incompatible with this alternate epistemology” (p. 13). This is further affirmed by Creswell and Miller, (2000), who asserted that triangulation is defined to be “a validity procedure where researchers search for convergence among multiple and different sources of information to form themes or categories in a study” p. 126.

3.6 Description of Data Analysis Procedures

Upon completion of the raw data collection, the data was coded to enable data entry into the computer for analysis using Software Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 11.5. SPSS was selected because it is capable of handling a wide range of statistical procedures purposively designed for social sciences (Martin and Acuna, 2002; Mills, Gay and Airasian, 2009). This was necessary to enable the researcher to obtain accurate and clear characteristics of data that can be described, interpreted and generalized form the study. Using SPSS,
summary tables were generated. Qualitative data was transcribed and categorized into emerging themes, descriptions and excerpts from participants. Descriptive data and findings were presented, analyzed and discussed in chapter four.

3.6.1 Ethical Considerations

According to Fritz (Social Research Association, 2003), the researcher needed to consider four groups of people in respect of ethical considerations. First obligation was to participants before and during data collection. Before data collection, the researcher obtained informed consent from each participant through verbal or written form. In the same, he promised to maintain confidentiality of participant and specify that the findings of the research were public material in the future starting with the university where the researcher did his thesis.

The researcher respected the privacy of the participants by providing questions that do not require personal disclosure. The data was therefore be collected to answer questions such as ‘how many?’ or ‘what proportion?’ in order to keep the identity of the participants confidential (Bernardin, 2010). The researcher assured participants of legality of research by showing the legal permission letter from his university.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS

4.1 Presentation of the Findings

This chapter presents research findings, interpretations, analysis and discussions based on the structure of the research questions and responses of research participants. Leedy and Ormrod (2005) have summarized the three tasks of this chapter as synthesis of data by constructing tables, diagrams and hierarchies in the presentation; classification of findings by grouping data into categories or themes, and finding meanings in the data as discussion; perusal by getting an overall sense of the data by jotting down interpretations.

In this study, the findings were founded on the quantitative data collected through questionnaires and in-depth interviews with participants in three departments, namely, Biblical/Theological studies, Counseling and Business studies in Daystar and Pan Africa Christian Universities. The chapter is organized thematically in sections and sub-sections according to sequence of four research questions as follows:

a. Which factors are currently (2012) influencing retention of faculty in Daystar and Pan Africa Christian universities?

b. How would the existing retention strategies be improved in Daystar and Pan Africa Christian universities?

c. What challenges are being faced by the SHRM in their effort to retain faculty in Daystar and Pan Africa Christian universities?
d. What recommendations would be helpful to SHRM towards minimizing faculty retention challenges identified by various participants in Daystar and Pan Africa Christian universities?

The chapter is divided into six parts. Part one consists of response rates of various participants in both universities according to questionnaires distributed and interviews conducted by the researcher. Part two comprises of the presentation, analysis and interpretation of bio data (variables involving opinions, values and attitudes on work) of the study participants, namely; full time lecturers, heads of departments, faculty deans and human resource managers in both universities according to the three departments identified above. Demographic information of participants and possible influence on retention of faculty is analyzed, interpreted and discussed.

Part three presents analysis and interpretation of participants’ responses regarding factors that they considered influential towards faculty retention then. Part four presents participants’ opinions on how retention of faculty would be improved. Part four consist in the participants’ opinions on the challenges faced by human resource manager in an effort to retain faculty in the respective universities. Part five consist in the participants’ opinions on the challenges faced by human resource manager in an effort to retain faculty in the respective universities. Part six is on suggestions and recommendations.

4.1.1 Response Rates on Questionnaire and Interview Guide: Questionnaire

As indicated in chapter three, thirty lecturers were purposively selected as the population of full time lecturers in three departments of researcher’s interest. Twenty five out of thirty anticipated lecturers participated in the research, providing a response rate of 83%. A response rate of 83 % is good. In Pan Africa Christian University, all five full time lecturers in three
departments participated, providing a 100% response rate. The latter response may be attributed to small sample size, respect and the trusting relationship between the researcher and the University. Table 4.1 below shows the difference between the researcher’s anticipated sample and actual sample that participated in the data collection exercise.

Table 4.1. Anticipated and actual participants at DU and PACU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Participants</th>
<th>Sampling</th>
<th>Population in each University</th>
<th>Anticipated sample size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sample that participated</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>5 in DU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>1 in PACU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODs</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>14 in DU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODs</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>4 in PACU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Managers</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>1 in each</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>120 in DU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>15 in PACU</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The five lecturers who did not participate in Daystar said they were too busy and kept promising they would complete the questionnaire until the time set by researcher to collect data expired. No other reasons known to the researcher for their failure to participate. In Daystar University, the rate was high due to similar reasons. The researcher was an associate faculty in both universities. Perhaps this had earned trust. Costs to the lecturers were minimal since questionnaires were collected from their respective campuses and at their convenient times and places. According to Jacoby, Bamford, Steen et al, (2001) and Roberts, DiGuiseppi, Wentz and Kwan (2002), reduction of costs, responding time and establishment of trust increase response rate. These researchers are in agreement that a response rate above 70% was pretty good. In this case it was 89%.

4.1.2 Response Rate for Interview Guide

The human resource managers in both Universities were interviewed and so were the deans of faculties and departmental heads. All the HODs and deans were also interviewed. The response rate was 100% for PACU and for DU.

4.1.3 Demographic Information of the Participants

Research instruments administered had variables as shown and discussed below. These variables were presented in different ways according to gender, marital status, age, academic qualification and professional qualification.
Distribution of Gender of the Participants in the two Universities

Out of twenty five lecturers (25) who participated in the research in Daystar University, nineteen (76%) were males and six (24%) were females.

The summary for distribution of participants in PACU and DU is shown below in table 4.2

Table 4.2 Distribution of Participants by Gender in DU and PACU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>HODs</th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th>HRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PACU</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>1 (33.33%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PACU</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>2 (66.67%)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td>19 (76%)</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were two males (40%) and three females (60%) in the sample of Pan African Christian University compared with (76%) male and (24%) female composition in Daystar University. Reasons for difference in gender composition between gender compositions were not investigated by the researcher since it was not in the research interests. The researcher attributed the higher composition of female lecturers in Daystar than in PACU to geographical and urban characteristics. Married women (95%) in Daystar and (80%) in PACU) whose husbands worked in Nairobi preferred working within the city to reduce transport costs and enjoy other urban privileges. On the hand, PACU was located in the suburb of Nairobi where there were few opportunities for husbands of married women to work nearby.
Marital Status of the Participants

Out of five lecturers who participated in the research at PACU, four (80%) were married and one was single. In Daystar University, eighteen (95%) were married. Only one participant was single. This suggests that most lecturers were married and perhaps ready to change jobs but within where families would be. It would generally be expected that if respective Universities were either offering the best salary or were the only possible employer near residential areas, that might be a positive factor influencing retention. However, there is no tangible relationship between the two variables because various opinions were expressed regarding salary without marital references. According to Darlington-Hammond and Sclan (1996), married people tended to stay in one location during their child raising ages and move away later for retirement reasons. Unmarried and young lecturers tended to be more mobile.

Distribution of Ages of the Participants within Daystar University

Slightly over half (56%) of lecturers in Daystar University were between 25-45 years of age. It was the modal class in age distribution. This age bracket has a higher motivation to stay in a job available near residential areas of their families (Piskac, 2008). According to the researcher, there was a rural to urban migration in Kenya for better job opportunities after graduation of school going population at various levels. Nairobi attracted more of such a population within the city where Daystar was located than where PACU was located. Although there were no items in the research instruments to investigate the suggested relationship, the findings of Piskac suggest that age of faculty is a predictor of retention but there are other variables such as salaries, working conditions and professional growth. Based on
Piskac’s findings, the researcher predicted that the higher percentage of younger lecturers in Daystar was a predictor of retention which had nothing to do with faculty retention strategies of SHRM.

Within each university, ages of the lecturers differed but the range among the lecturers 40 years (25-65). A coded age range of numerical values assigned as 1 for 25-35 years, 2 for 36-45 years, 3 for 46-55 years, 4 for 56-65 years and 5 for over 65 years was used to create a codebook which the researcher used with SPSS to analyze data. The outcomes of analyses are indicated in table 4.3 below. The percentages represent the number of participants in each age bracket.

Table 4.3 Distribution of Ages of lecturers within each University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturers’ Age Bracket</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th>PACU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Pan Africa Christian University, the modal age was within 46-55 years, a majority of lecturers, (60%), who were one range higher than Daystar University. The researcher attributed the trend to availability of work to some families who preferred to work within the suburban
region of PACU. A minority of 1 (representing 20%) of lecturers were within 25-35 years and 35-45 years, which was lower than majority of Daystar faculty age bracket. According to literature review, Dee (2010) found that retention strategies for older faculty may include health insurance, retirement package and professional growth among others. This insight may be useful to HRM at PACU than at Daystar based on researcher’s views and researched findings of other researchers cited above. The participants did not indicate any association between retention and age. After all, this investigation was not given an item in the research instruments.

Academic Qualification of Lecturers in DU and PACU

There were four (80%) lecturers with master’s degree holders and one (20%) with doctoral degree in PACU. In Daystar University, there were seventeen (68%) lecturers with master’s degree and eight (32%) lecturers with doctoral degrees.

A comparison of qualifications with duration of stay in both Universities as an indicator of academic growth of lecturers in each University is shown in the summary table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4 Distribution of Academic Qualification of Lecturers in DU and PACU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic qualification</th>
<th>DU Sub-total</th>
<th>PACU Sub-total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters level</td>
<td>17 (68%)</td>
<td>7 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral level</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The qualifications of middle level management ranged from first degree (HRM) to PhD holders (Deans and HODs). Among the six participants who worked under HRM as Deans and HODs, three had been recruited as PhD holders while three were sponsoring themselves over 80% towards tuition for PhDs. Their PhDs were ongoing at the time of interviews. Their responses on the issue of research support from “low funding and no time, fair, insufficiency of faculty, more work”.

The lecturers without administrative positions and those in education administration and planning were in consensus that the University’s support on research, writing, publication and doing PhDs as a faculty retention strategy was weak. The SHRM indicated that the strategy was one of the ways to improve faculty retention as supported by statements such as “Daystar needed to encourage retention by sponsoring PhD studies for lecturers.” However, he did not indicate whether it was taking place or not. Evidence from lecturers indicated the strategy was not in effect. Only one HOD who got associate professor position based on individual effort on research and publication. Research and writing was therefore more of policy than practice in Daystar University.

Professional Qualifications

According to reviewed literature, survey conducted by Askeland (2008) in Colorado Community College on factors that enhance faculty retention among senior faculty highlighted autonomy and pursuit of knowledge as one of six factors. In view of the fact that one HOD rose into rank of associate professor and reviewed findings, it seems probable that senior faculty is likely to stay longer in one university than junior faculty as long as they keep moving up the
radar or remain satisfied at their senior position. As earlier pointed out by the researcher, it is unlikely that one single strategy can retain faculty.

The responses of the middle level education managers regarding their professional qualifications, here referring to promotions primarily based on teaching experience and publication is reflected in the table below.

Table 4.5 Summary of Professional Qualifications within each University

Key: Assistant lecturer =1, Lecturer=2, senior lecturer=3, associate professor=4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional qualification</th>
<th>DU</th>
<th></th>
<th>PACU</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(60%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(88.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(32%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight lecturers are senior and fifteen are lecturers, one is associate lecturer and one is associate professor. The participants in both universities expressed that upward mobility was very slow.

4.2 Discussion of the Findings

4.2.1 Retention Gaps among SHRM, Deans, HODs and Lecturers

As defined in chapter two, the working definition of retention gap in this study referred to divergence of opinions among various research participants regarding faculty retention...
strategies. The range of participants discussed below was from human resource managers to lecturers with no administrative position. Two variables among a variety of variables were selected by the researcher to demonstrate research gaps which emerged during data collection among various participants. The two categories, salaries and service delivery, were selected on the basis of high frequencies in responses of participants in both universities.

Position in Education Administration and Retention Gaps

The participants interviewed at middle level management were four deans and six HODs in both universities. Their position of administration and opinion on best strategies to retain faculty had influence on retention of lecturers under their leadership as implementers of SHRM strategies and advisors to higher management in the said universities.

When asked the influence of professional growth and faculty recognition on retention, six participants, majority (80%) indicated the influence was high while two participants, a minority (20%) indicated said it was very high. According to the researcher, this majority (80%) of participants whose views were ‘high’ and ‘very high’ on need for professional growth of lecturers meant that research, writing and publication needed to be promoted by SHRM through Deans and HODs to enable their achievement of academic qualifications, the only criteria for professional growth according to university statutes. The human resource managers in both universities had similar and diverging views on the same strategy. In words of one human resource manager (SHRM) from an interview conducted on May 20th, 2012, “training and development of faculty through sponsoring faculty to pursue PhDs” and “offering competitive salaries to lecturers” were noted to be highly instrumental to retention of lecturers. The other SHRM had similar but more comprehensive proposals on retention strategies. In the in-depth
interview conducted by the researcher on Wednesday, March 29th, 2012, summary given to the researcher included the following retention strategies:

Better terms and conditions of service, improved staff development through doctoral scholarships, better conditions of work through provision of information communication technology, smart classrooms for master’s students, library equipped with current and quality academic materials, rewards for scholarly publication and increased funds to improve research climate.

The foregoing suggestions on how to retain faculty indicated that there was a divergence between SHRM and deans and HODs on the best faculty retention practices.

Retention Gap between Lecturers and Education Administrators (SHRM, Deans and HODs)

The following section provides detailed and interactive discussion on the several factors influencing faculty retention according to SPSS output of these variables as investigated by the researcher through the self-administered questionnaire. The discussion indicates that there were differences of opinions among lecturers in the same university and between the two universities on the same strategy and its influence on faculty retention. The following examples illustrate this finding. As defined before, this characteristic was called retention gap in this study.

Retention gap within faculty of the same level (without administrative positions)

The researcher found that 80% lecturers with no administrative position in PACU rated professional growth and recognition of lecturers moderate and 20 % rated it low as a motivation for them to remain in the university. In Daystar, 4% of lecturers rated the need of better working conditions as high, 60% of lecturers rated it moderate and 32% rated it low. Based on the
foregoing findings, the retention gap in perceived retention strategies between the said education administrators and their lecturers was evident.

The researcher also looked at ratings on salaries and benefits as a retention variable for purposes of contrast. The findings from Daystar lecturers without administrative position were quite revealing. Fifty eight percent (58%) rated the strategy high and five (5%) of the participants rated it very high. In PACU, the ratings by the same category of participants were 40% who expressed ‘very high’ and 60% high. Although ratings in both universities were generally high and very high, it was noted that PACU lecturers considered high salaries and benefits to be highly critical to their motivation to remain in the same university. Considering this strategy on its own, there was a retention gap between views of participants of the same category. However, high percentage in PACU was attributed to small sample whose percentages were one lecturer’s decision was represented by 20% score since they were only five unlike Daystar where a lecture’s decision was represented by about 4% since they were nineteen.

Responding to service delivery, administrative support to lecturers, and progress reports, majority (80%) of PACU lecturers indicated high on retention while 20% indicated moderate. In Daystar University, the same category rated the strategy as low (31%), moderate (21%) and high (42%). Comparing the two sets of participants, the researcher noted that Daystar participants had more divergent views on the same strategy than PACU participants. Rating of 80% as high in PACU compared to 42% in Daystar meant that service delivery to the lecturers was considered more wanting in PACU than in Daystar. In spite of differences in sample sizes among the participants in both universities and retention gap between views of the two categories of participants, the researcher concluded that the strategy was highly instrumental to retention of lecturers.
Retention gap as an indicator of differences of opinion or perception surfaced in the literature review on research conducted in the University of Washington on Faculty Retention & Department Climate by NSF ADVANCE (2005). Systematic monitoring of leadership decisions to eliminate unintentional bias, create opportunities for entire faculty, encourage transparency in operations, sharing information equitably with entire faculty, foster a supportive environment, recognize important faculty contributions in all areas including teaching, research, service, and creative activities, were among the strategies suggested by the junior faculty towards their wanting to remain in the university. The responses of junior faculty of Daystar University are in consensus with similar findings in the University of Washington.

Length of Teaching in the same University and retention gap

Years of experience through teaching in one or many universities scored high and fifteen participants (79%) in Daystar indicated moderate as a factor which SHRM’s choice of strategy positively. From the SHRM’s perspective, the office would want to recruit qualified and experienced faculty in the university and retain such as expressed by his search for “committed Christian professionals.” However, SHRM would do better on retention by listening to faculty more rather than assume that faculty remains in the university that long because they are satisfied with university. This observation is further discussed below.
Length of Teaching by holders of masters’ degree and Retention

When asked to give four practices lecturers liked least, some of the mostly repeated statements regardless of years of service in the same university were; “Poorly defined promotion criteria (42% of the lecturers), rewarding of non-teaching more highly than teaching staff (26% of the lecturers), office space not available (79% of the lecturers), treating of faculty as if they represent an easily dispensable resource’ (31% of the lecturers)”. These statements indicated weak or neglected areas of SHRM regarding faculty retention. The need for work stations for lecturers scored the highest (79%) among the response items presented and selected participants.

Length of Teaching by doctoral degree holders and retention in DU and PACU

The seven lecturers recruited within a period of nineteen years as doctors have remained at that academic level indicating that none had done research, written or published enough in order to qualify for promotions to associate professor and professor positions in Daystar University. The researcher found out from lecturers’ comments and recommendations to the management that research and publication were stated in principle but exited least as a SHRM policy. A key of research support used in the output table for input into SPSS was as follows : 5 for very strong, 4 for strong, 3 for average, 2 for weak, was used to facilitate analyses of the SPSS output and results provided evidence. Majority lecturers (60%) said research support was poor at Daystar University.

Comparing the responses of the same lecturers on the support they got from the University to do research, writing and publication as a strategy to retain them, the findings indicated that support by the University to lecturers toward academic growth ranged from
average (response from 60% of lecturers) to weak (from 40% of lecturers). This explained why the sixteen lecturers remained in the same academic position. Based on comments on other aspects related to workload, too much work had stood in the way of research, writing and publication for many years. To elaborate this observation further, it was noted that two Deans and one HOD who were doing their PhD then had similar responses on research support as expressed by statements ranging from “it depends on how many interested people in the department, it is largely self-sponsored, PhDs not supported, bonded PhDs are very few, no time to study, to do research or to publish”. One dean expressed desire to study but observe that the administrative duties which included meetings presented a great challenge to academic growth of Deans and HODs.

At PACU, the longest serving lecturer had served for seven years as full time faculty and the least had served less than a year. All lecturers expressed they had problems with lack of academic growth. They would only develop through individual’s self-support. Given that the University had been there more years before (since 1976), a high turnover was suggested by these findings, the University needed to apply appropriate retention strategies more urgently than Daystar. The main differences suggested that Daystar had higher salaries to attract and retain PhD lecturers and was visible to a wider public.

Human Resource Manager had stayed for one year, Dean for fourteen years, and three HODs for two, eight and twenty five years. The length of working experience in the University may have contributed to a diversity of views on various aspects surveyed about faculty retention. With this kind of wide range in years of teaching in the same University, SHRM can utilize mentoring among faculty as one of the ways to enhance collegiality among lecturers. The
mentors would feel they are useful in raising the younger lecturers while the mentees would feel they have people who care.

Giving views on how SHRM would minimize the said challenges in each case, SHRM of PACU recommended that the University needed to grow through increasing enrollment to be able to pay competitive salaries to lecturers and number of market driven programs. Human resource manager of Daystar gave a slightly different view that Daystar needed to do “yearly reviews for equitable pay and an active policy of recruitment”. In response to whether each University had strategies to minimize faculty turnover, both said strategies were in place. SHRM of PACU cited bonded scholarship for lecturers and six months scholarship for lecturer’s child admitted at PACU. In the words of the HRM of Daystar, was to minimize faculty turnover were “enhancing entry point for all lecturers, tuition waiver on dependents of lecturers taking academic programs in the university, and sponsoring PhD studies for lecturers.”

One variable was closely analyzed using its histogram below, Figure 4.1, to illustrate the average response and departures from the mean. In this histogram, each variable had someone who chose it. The implication on SHRM’s strategies to retain faculty was that collaborative leadership was necessary to in order to listen to each other as process owners in the task of retaining faculty that meet university qualifications.
It was noted that ten (52%) of the lecturers felt that working conditions were average. Six, (31%), of the lecturers felt that working conditions were good. Two (10%) of the lecturers rated working conditions poor and one lecturer said working conditions were very poor. This is an illustration of what has been called in this faculty retention gap. The evidence of divergence of opinions meant that SHRM would not improve working conditions to any quality and satisfy every lecturer because they were generally at different levels of satisfaction. The lengthy quote of expressions of various lecturers as indicated above under top five experience they liked least indicated the weaknesses of SHRM or at least the larger group of education managers of middle and higher level categories in being keen on providing an atmosphere that would have been more conducive to faculty retention.
Mean values were tabulated from Likert scales using SPSS to show how close the lecturers were to rating each variable ‘excellent’ since five for excellent represented 100%.

Lecturers in both Universities rated average (working condition with mean of 3.1053 and public relations with employer with a mean of 3.2105) and poor salary received had a mean rating of 2.8947, communication of work related issues had mean rating of 2.7895 and faculty retention in the University was rated at a mean of 2.9474.

The variation of means among different variables indicated that lecturers felt that different variables contributed differently towards their motivation to remain in the university. There was a greater range (highest mean of 3.6 and lowest mean of 2.4) in PACU than in Daystar University (highest means of 3.2 and lowest 2.8). These ranges might have meant several things about retention of faculty. Taken at face value, it indicated faculty at DU was more stable than that of PACU. On the other hand, the faculty at PACU were very few (5) compared with faculty at Daystar (19). The response of one lecturer in PACU influenced the SPSS output more significantly than the response of one lecturer in Daystar University because of differences in sample sizes.

Public relations between lecturers and employer had highest standard deviation of 1.08418, meaning lecturers were extreme in their views on this variable. If public relations were good at professional level between the two parties, faculty would have indicated it with a high mean in their responses and a very low deviation.

According to Leady and Ormrod (2005), interpretation of data include: relating finding to the original research problem and to the specific research questions; relating findings to the pre-
existing literature, concepts, theories and research studies, determining whether the findings have practical significance as well as statistical significance; identifying limitations of the study.

4.2.2 Strategies which Influenced Retention of Faculty

The existing and desired retention strategies were explored as an investigation of the first research question. Views given by various stakeholders are noted and discussed below.

Views SHRM Strategies in the two Universities

When asked whether the university had faith related clauses regarding faculty recruitment and retention policies, the HRM at PACU emphasized that “every faculty must be born again, practicing Christian and active in the local church”. Human resource manager of Daystar University indicated similar requirement but stretched the clause further to include the significance of faith embracing faculty in teaching of every subject as the main rationale for the requirement. The Christian employees were required to write their personal faith testimony by hand and demonstrate sustainable Christian (Biblical) values in life and work in the process of integrating faith with learning once employed. The researcher’s take on this requirement was that the challenge of global demand for universal values, SHRM strategies and ability of lecturers and students to fit in other universities as lecturers or graduates of the said universities was an issue for management to look at.

Responses of Deans and HODs on Faculty Retention Strategies in DU and PACU

The researcher interviewed three deans from three schools to which the selected three departments, Religious, Business and Counseling studies, belonged. Dean at PACU admitted that
salaries at PACU are low but did not consider this as a major factor in retaining faculty. He argued that those in PACU understood that part of service was a calling. However, the response from lecturers indicated that they considered low salaries as one of their major challenges of continuing in the university. Commenting on the University culture, the dean observed that “this is significant and positive though administrative support tends to be weak at times”. The institutional motivation was lower than personal motivation. To him, gender, race, years of experience and tribe did not influence faculty retention. Workload was healthy although committee responsibilities were usually heavy. The researcher noted that there was a retention gap between views of dean and lecturers regarding strategies to retain faculty. Commenting on what he liked best, he said ‘it was the opportunity to impact students’ lives’. The dean least liked low salaries and low sympathy from administration. University values and reputation were positive. The HRM had remarked that reputation of the university was not widespread and the institution needed to be more visible to the wider public. Looking at the contradicting comments, the researcher concluded that retention gap was major, even within the dean himself.

There were similar but slightly different responses to the same issues are summarized in table 4.6 below from deans and HODs from both universities concerning existing strategies to retain faculty.
Table 4.6 Five top Factors suggested by Deans and HODs in DU and PACU for Improvement of Faculty Retention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Summary statements of Deans and HODs in both universities.</th>
<th>Shared views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>‘Average, not as competitive. 5% annual increase was okay.’</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to teach</td>
<td>‘Average efforts are made by HR. Motivation is good. “I motivate my lecturers verbally”.’</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>Overloaded, 9 hours preferable. Heavy, feels overworked’</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research support</td>
<td>‘Low funding and no time. Insufficiency of faculty, more work’</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD scholarship</td>
<td>‘Self-sponsored PhDs, not supported. Few bonded PhDs. No time for study’</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was observed that there was a divergence of opinions between the two groups of HODs in both universities. The HODs at PACU gave a consensus that salaries were low, workload was high, research funds available in principle rather than in practice. On a positive note, they observed that a PhD scholarship of 40% of tuition was available to all lecturers at all ranks. This was a better response in this one strategy compared to Daystar University. The deans, HODs at Daystar did not comment much about salaries as what would cause them to leave. As indicated before, other factors such as lack of teaching facilities which were under service delivery were
more critical. Their only dean was neutral in most of the comments. He emphasized the need to teach as a calling from God.

Responses of Faculty in DU and PACU Regarding Strategies for Faculty Retention

In the report and discussion that follow, responses of lecturers without administrative positions were found to be insightful. The structured and semi-structured questionnaire administered to full time lecturers in three departments in Daystar University provided useful information on their being retained. The responses from semi-structured items were summarized in the same pattern of selecting the top five based on criteria such as frequency and details supplied in the statements made. The top five raised as ‘liked best’ by the participants were: Benefits such as car loan, lap top and Christmas bonus, medical benefits, Sacco’s, Christianity, Christian values, integrating faith with learning. Working relationships and collegiality were appreciated as beneficial to participants. The indicators of existence of strategies were supported by statements of some participants on what needed to be improved, such as; “Clear leadership structure, flexible time schedule, departmental level support, better work-family policies (maternity leave, tuition waiver for lecturers’ dependents).”

The top five ‘you like least’ category were highlighted as follows:

Criteria for promotion is unclear and subjective. Staff appraisal not objective, unfair placement methods, salary review criteria was unclear to the participants. Grapevine rather than official communication often provide distorted messages and lead to different interpretations. Lack of coordination. Lack of dialogue between administration and workers over critical decisions affecting lecturers. Lack of workers’ organization to air grievances. Heavy workload. No room for research. Bureaucracy in decision making. Promotion of lecturers is not a priority to SHRM. Lack of enough offices for faculty and teaching facilities such as projectors and computers.
When invited to evaluate how the services they were receiving from management as lecturers was motivating them to remain in the University, their ratings of service delivery were diverse and rather low as the results obtained from the analysis of the responses based on their experience of various aspects investigated by the researcher’s research instrument is shown in the table below according to SPSS outputs from both Universities.

Table 4.7 Analyses of Lecturers’ Responses in PACU and DU on Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables investigated as indicators of service delivery (SPSS output summary simplified)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>PACU</td>
<td>DU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current salary</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.6000</td>
<td>.89443</td>
<td>3.1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations with employer</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.8000</td>
<td>1.30384</td>
<td>2.8947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer-management relations</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.6000</td>
<td>.54772</td>
<td>3.2105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers’ rating of effectiveness of service delivery</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
<td>.89443</td>
<td>2.7895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Key used in the research instrument to evaluate service delivery to the lecturers was; 5 for Excellent; 4 for Good; 3 for Average; 2 for Poor and 1 for Very Poor= 1. The responses of each lecturer to each variable were fed into SPSS for processing of detailed analyses and results were combined in table 4.7
Based on the average ratings in the summary table of selected variables which were investigated using Likert scale, a general observation was made. Working conditions were rated higher (72%) in PACU than in DU (62%), seconded by public relations between the lecturers and the SHRM as the employer. Retention enhancing relationship between lecturers and the employer was rated third while lowest ratings (58% and below) were assigned to effectiveness of service delivery by management to lecturers and the salaries which the lecturers received then. Generally speaking, ratings were slightly higher in PACU than in DU. Means presented from SPSS output represented the closeness or distance from excellent service delivery in each variable. Standard deviations indicated divergence of opinions among the lecturers over the strength of contribution of each variable towards faculty retention.

Standard deviation measures the spread of individual results around a mean of all the results. In this group of scores, standard deviations in the table reflect measures of dispersion from the average rating meaning that some lecturers gave high ratings and others low ratings on the same variable. Higher values of standard deviation indicated greater the diversity of opinions about the influence of a particular variable from average. The average value was used to give an impression on how the findings were closer to the highest possible score (5) for ‘excellent’ which would have indicated that the variable’s motivation to lecturers’ propensity to stay was a 100%. In such a case, there would have been no need to improve strategies or discussion about SHRM challenges to retain faculty. The SHRM would have worked hard to maintain the existing perfectly retentive variables or strategies.
4.2.3 Strategies towards Improvement of Faculty Retention

The reports and discussion that follow were based on responses of various participants to the second research question. Various participants are analyzed according to their broad categories.

Views of Human Resource Managers on Retention Improvement Strategies

Both human resource managers provided strategies on how their respective Universities would improve retention. Pan Africa Christian University needed; better terms and conditions of service, improved staff development programs such as full doctoral scholarships, better conditions of work such as information computer technology (ICT) smart classroom and library facilities, reward for scholarly publication, increase research funds, management of faculty workload. The manager gave additional strategies, notably, increased ownership of university, identification with university vision, mission, and core values. Corporate ownership of the university by all employees was deemed instrumental towards faculty retention in that each would has a sense of doing his or her best to promote ‘our University’.

Commenting on how often HRM department reviews salaries at Daystar; HRM said it was done once a year. Asked whether there were external factors that influenced the HR department’s policies and practices on recruitment and retention, the officer responded affirmatively, saying there were “new private universities with competitive salaries and other benefits hence need for benchmarking”.

Concerning exit interviews, HRM of Daystar said that the office conducted interviews and they were very useful towards retention of faculty. On strategies to improve faculty retention, the
officer proposed provision for research, conferences and fast tracking promotion of lecturers as well as mentorship of lecturers. He rated the motivation of the lecturers as “above average”. According to the HRM, remuneration, team building activities and freedom for Deans and HODs to grow their departments and schools needed improvement as strategies to improve on faculty retention.

According to HRM at Daystar, selected HR documents, namely, recruitment record, appraisal document file, training and development file, promotion record, policy document file, exit interview document and strategic plan were available. Whether they were used to retain faculty as required or not was beyond the scope of this study due to security and respect for privacy considerations.

Human Resource Manager (HRM) at PACU was asked by the researcher how motivated lecturers in the University were, he rated this strategy “average”. He added that better communication and interaction between faculty and management would increase motivation of faculty as strategy to enhance retention. He recommended regular departmental meetings and greater participation of lecturers in the running of department and programs within the department as an important strategy to increase retention of faculty. He added that all records concerning retention were available and in use in the University.

Summary of Top Five Views of Deans and HODs on Retention Improvement Strategies

Participants were asked about ways of improving retention of faculty according to the structured options given. Deans and HoDs in Daystar commented that; University cultural values were good but could be made better, were improving retention to “some extent, philosophy, vision and mission” enhance retention. University’s reputation was ‘good, renowned as a quality
focus university, high’. Keeping it high will keep improving retention. Employment conditions were “good, fairly good, increase salaries of PhD holders to attract and retain them”.

Professional development was “average, encourage writing and publication, is encouraged”.

Research support needed “improvement, teaching load and research to be balanced, not enough”.

PACU HODs gave the following top five suggestions to the management for improvement of faculty retention; Clarify policies and guidelines on performance management. Clear guidelines for sabbatical leave qualifications, staff development, staff mortgage benefits. Improve communication. Include lecturers up to some healthy level of decision making, collaborative leadership. Recognize talent and area of specialization through appropriate reward system. Welcome recommendations from faculty for discussion in the senate. Take care of the needs of faculty at all levels without discrimination.

Views of Faculty on Retention Improvement Strategies

The faculty was asked to respond to how specific SHRM strategies presented a challenge to management in trying to use them to retain their faculty in their respective universities. The variables give to the lecturers in the questionnaire for response were university culture values, university’s reputation, employment conditions, freedom to communicate grievances, teaching climate and research support. The responses from lecturers in both universities were processed using SPSS software and outputs were merged in a table of descriptive statistics as shown below in table 4.8. SHRM Strategies Evaluated as Instrumental to Motivating Faculty to Remain in their Respective Universities.
Table 4.8 Views of Lecturers in PACU and DU on how to Improve Faculty Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention variables</th>
<th>PACU %</th>
<th>DU %</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unicuva</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.8000</td>
<td>1.09545</td>
<td>4.1579</td>
<td>.68825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unirep</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.8000</td>
<td>.44721</td>
<td>4.2632</td>
<td>.56195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empcon</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>3.4211</td>
<td>.60698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frecomgr</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.74536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachcli</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.8000</td>
<td>.83666</td>
<td>3.6316</td>
<td>.59726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ressup</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.4000</td>
<td>.54772</td>
<td>3.2632</td>
<td>.93346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key used to guide the participants in their responses was; 5 for very strong, 4 for strong, 3 for average, 2 for weak and 1 for very weak. The codebook was as follows; Unicuva= University culture values, Unirep=University’s reputation, Empcon= Employment conditions, Frecomgr= Freedom to communicate grievances, Teachcli= Teaching climate, Ressup = Research support to lecturers by SHRM.

Based on the responses of lecturers at Daystar University, the top three SHRM strategies considered by lecturers to be highly instrumental in motivating them to remain in the University were University culture values ( mean response of 4.1579 for strong motivation), University’s reputation (mean response of 4.2632 for strong motivation and employment conditions (mean
response of 3.4211 for. The first two had a mean response of 4.1579 and 4.2632 which put them in ‘strong’ category while the third was average. The least motivating strategy was research support with a mean response of 3.2632 for fair challenge.

The researcher compared ratings of lecturers with those of middle level managers (Deans and HODs) as outcomes of their interview guides indicated. Their rating was 83% as indicated in table 4.5. They scored highly on research support, suggesting there was retention gap between lecturers and their immediate leaders regarding best strategies to retain faculty. Retention gap is here understood to refer to a difference in decision criteria between two groups of people with collaborative leadership. It is important in that a wider gap concerning major institutional goals can create stress in teamwork between lecturers and their leaders.

In Pan Africa Christian University, the top three were university culture values, university’s reputation and teaching climate, each factor at a mean of 3.8 for great challenge. The least challenging strategy was research support which had a mean of 2.4000 for mild challenge. A conclusion based on the least scores in both Universities is that research support might not motivated lecturers to remain in these universities. A high standard deviation for top responses at PACU suggests that lecturers had highly diverging views or extremes in their opinions on the respective SHRM strategies.

4.2.4 Challenges Faced by SHRM while Applying Strategies to Retain Faculty

The last section deals with challenges faced by participants at different levels concerning faculty retention strategies. The reports and discussions of findings are found below.
Views of Human Resource Managers on Challenges

Daystar University SHRM highlighted three challenges his office faced regarding faculty retention as follows; “Availability of committed Christian professionals, competition from emerging universities, and the balance between cost and quality”. He raised two measures being taken by the university to minimize the effect of these challenges on faculty retention, namely, yearly reviews for equitable pay and an active policy of recruitment.

Asked whether the university had strategies in place towards minimizing turnover of faculty, the HRM cited them as; “enhancing entry point for all lecturers, tuition waiver on dependents of lecturers taking academic programs in the university, and sponsoring PhD studies for lecturers.”

Due to university’s inability to provide competitive salaries, their efforts to attract Christian PhD holders, professors included, and retain them were greatly incapacitated.

In both universities, exit interviews were done and used gainfully towards retention of faculty.

Responding on the challenges faced by the University in their efforts to retain faculty, the HRM cited three challenges namely, low salaries and other terms of employment, lack of stimulating intellectual environment and low visibility of the University. Compared to HRM in Daystar University on the same question, the challenge was “Lack of committed Christian professionals, competition from emerging universities, and the balance between cost and quality”.

Deans and HODs on Challenges Faced in Faculty Retention

The Deans and HODs highlighted five challenges in order of their perceived threat to retention of faculty in both universities as follows;

Competitive salaries from other universities tempting most of them to leave their respective universities. Lack of sponsorship for PhD programs presented blockage to intellectual growth of the lecturers. Declining enrollment threatened pay as sustaining power for lecturers.
As noted earlier, lecturers in both universities indicated that low salary worked against their motivation to remain in their respective universities. Paying less for classes which did not meet break even demoralized both full time and associate faculty. The implications were that it was impossible to start new programs which did not have full classes, which further inhibited the growth of the said universities. Attrition of faculty, “United States International University has picked three of our lecturers within the last four years”, “yes, daystar has lost faculty within the last three years”, observed one of the deans at Daystar University during an interview session. Lack of funds and time to do research, publication and consultancy was expressed.

Views of Faculty on Challenges to SHRM Concerning Faculty Retention

A structured item was given to lecturers to give their opinions on how SHRM faced challenges in using selected strategies as a means to retain lecturers. Based on percentages in table 4.8, two top retention strategies which were rated ‘great challenge’ and ‘moderate challenge’ were better pay in other universities with 53% of lecturers in Daystar, 80% in PACU and declining population with 64% of lecturers in Daystar and 80% of lecturers. This was because declining students was a current trend in the two universities and that meant possibility of lay off in the future if the trend downward continued. The trend therefore pointed to job insecurity because students were the main source of salaries in the two universities. The least rated two strategies as motivating lecturers to stay were study leave and aging faculty with highest. These general ratings in the summary table were very useful to as indicators of diversity of perceptions of lecturers on how each of the seven strategies was a challenge to SHRM to use towards motivating faculty to remain in the university.
From the codebook, SPSS output provided the frequency summaries for DU and PACU as indicated in table 4.9 below.

Table 4.9  Views of Faculty on Challenges to Retention of Teaching Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHRM retention strategy</th>
<th>Lecturers for ‘Great challenge’</th>
<th>Lecturers for ‘Great challenge’</th>
<th>Lecturers for ‘None’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study leave</td>
<td>26% 40%</td>
<td>58% 20%</td>
<td>16% 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical leave</td>
<td>43% 40%</td>
<td>47% 20%</td>
<td>10% 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better pay offers in other universities</td>
<td>53% 80%</td>
<td>42% 0%</td>
<td>5% 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining student enrollment</td>
<td>64% 80%</td>
<td>26% 0%</td>
<td>10% 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of specialization</td>
<td>26% 0%</td>
<td>68% 80%</td>
<td>6% 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement of aging faculty</td>
<td>10% 0%</td>
<td>68% 40%</td>
<td>22% 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of specialization</td>
<td>31% 0%</td>
<td>58% 60%</td>
<td>11% 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.5 Suggestions and Recommendations given at Daystar and Pan Africa Christian Universities

Lecturers

A summary of statements made in the questionnaire filled by lecturers on existing SHRM strategies and how they could be improved indicated a variety of opinions. A summary of more than 50% of the lecturers to the SHRM included:

Use an objective measure of productivity to recognize faculty. Improve payment based on qualification and experience. Make the upward mobility of the faculty clear, objective and operational. Work out a well defined leave policy covering annual leave and sabbatical leave. Make public relations office to reflect university goals. Make motivation of faculty intentional and communicate retention of faculty known to the faculty. Allow employees to form a university-based union. Remove forced worship attendance. Make annual pay raise a reality. Provide clearly defined rates for various categories of employees. Improve university library resources. Provide scholarships for further studies. Improve marketing strategies to increase student population through enrollment and therefore afford to pay competitive salaries. Reduce workload to allow research

Based on the summary of suggestions and recommendations of lecturers to SHRM, it was noted that faculty retention strategies in operation then had room for improvement in various aspects of lecturers’ needs explored in the questionnaire. The researcher has summarized these recommendations in chapter five.

Recommendations made by the lecturers to deans and HODs were fewer but important. The summary of statements which expressed the content of recommendations were:

Practice impartiality in recruitment. Avoid biased application of human resource policies. Treat part time faculty fairly. Avoid talking at faculty. Avoid giving some classes that earn very little to part time lecturers while allocating those that earn more to full time faculty. Effective communication is needed in place of grapevine communication. Consult with lecturers while making decisions that concern lecturers. Take positive action on appraisal results. Recognize talent and area of specialization. Promote innovation and reward it well. Facilitate communication between administration and faculty. Encourage staff-students informal and formal gatherings for exchange of academic ideas and social bonding to promote a better teaching-learning climate. Provide sport facilities for
teaching and non-teaching staff. Check out and discourage ethnic groupings. Support policies on professional advancement and research.

The recommendations given by lecturers reflected their dissatisfaction with their immediate supervisors. The researcher’s take on this observation was that SHRM was not the group responsible for faculty retention. SHRM needed to work with other members of the middle level management in formulating and implementing faculty retention strategies.

Deans and HODs

Deans and HODs had some suggestions and recommendations to make to University’s top management towards improvement of faculty retention. The leading five according to their recurrence were; Increase salary to competitive level. Consider funder funding research, publication and consultancy. Improve on policies for retention of faculty. Involve faculty in marketing the university so that their sense of ownership of the university may grow stronger. Improve on facilitation of promotion of faculty. Lecturers were asked same questions and there was not a research gap on this aspect because the recommendations made by lecturers in included statements as “give education loans to lecturers, give reduced workload to lecturers, and consult with employees in decision making’.

Integrative approach to SHRM called for retention of faculty in such a way that HR leaders lead and value their own role, strategic partners bring know-how about ways of changing university, human capital developers recognize people as critical assets for a successful future, functional experts bring know-how on implementing HR strategies and employee advocates listen to employee concerns for their wellbeing without jeopardizing objectives of the university. Besides human resource manager of PACU admitting that salaries were quite a challenge to
retention, he recommended an increase of seconded faculty in order to improve salaries and hence retention.

4.3 Interpretation of Findings of the Study

The findings of the study provided a variety of meanings to the researcher. There were SHRM strategies for faculty retention but not really clearly communicated to the deans, HODs and lectures by the SHRM as goals of the university. The small group of lecturers, five (5), automatically selected at Pan Africa Christian University gave less reliable percentages for comparison with Daystar’s group of nineteen. The comparison of SPSS outputs between the two universities might therefore have been used as a general indicator of general impression on how faculty retention variables in the two universities impacted different lecturers differently. It further meant that SHRM needed to use different strategies in each university in order to retain lecturers.

The retention gap consultation among members of the management and faculty was necessary in order to determine the best ways of retaining faculty in each university. It also meant that there was no group of SHRM strategies that would have satisfied the lecturers across the board. There would always have been divergence in satisfaction. The SPSS outputs which were generally rated average indicated that retention strategies explored by the researcher had room for improvement. The challenges raised by each group of participants were considered by the researcher to be indicators that SHRM strategies were dynamic and therefore needed constant review, consultation within the said universities and benchmarking with similar universities.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This study was carried out to explore strategic human resource strategies which were used to retain faculty in private universities in Kenya. The special interest of the researcher was to explore strategies which existed in two faith-based universities, Daystar and Pan Africa Christian universities because of their specific demand that faculty be born again Christians for them to qualify for hiring and retention, provided they met academic qualifications. There were challenges of faculty turnover and declining student enrollment, which were perceived by the researcher as the outstanding problems which called for attention by strategic human resource management. This chapter summarizes the findings of the study. The researcher gives recommendations to various possible users of the findings who may find the work useful toward improving retention of faculty in the said universities and other similar universities.

The study used descriptive survey method and naturalistic designs. The sample was selected by the use of census of three departments, that is, religious studies, business and counseling as available departments in both universities. The sample consisted of strategic human resource managers in, deans of schools, heads of departments and lecturers in both universities. Quantitative data was analyzed by the researcher by the use of descriptive method as aided by SPSS version 11.5 to summarize quantitative data into frequencies and means to answers to research questions recorded in summary tables, explained and interpreted in each case.

This summary has briefly captured demographic information of the participants in the research activities, faculty retention strategies used by SHRM, how to improve the strategies, and
challenges faced by SHRM in their efforts to retain faculty and ways perceived to be remedial or sustaining good trends.

5.2 Summary of Findings

Demographic Information of the Participants and Faculty Retention

In the section on demographic information, the participants’ demographic characteristics were investigated and findings discussed in relation to retention of faculty in both universities. Researcher’s variables of interest which featured in questionnaires and interview guide used as research tools were gender distribution, marital status, age distribution, academic and qualifications of human resource managers, deans of faculty, heads of departments and lecturers without administrative responsibilities in the said universities. The variables did not seem to have much influence on faculty retention though the discussions indicated that each variable had some influence. No statistical tests were carried out to establish levels of significance since this approach was not included in the researcher’s methodology.

However, the researcher noted that there were differences of opinions on retention among participants at various levels, which the researcher called retention gap. For instance, human resource managers emphasized policy-related strategies while other participants pointed out remuneration and service delivery strategies as instrumental to retention.

Faculty Retention Strategies used by Strategic Human Resource Management

The research question on strategies used in both universities was thoroughly explored through the research tools. On a positive note, lecturers generally expressed that they had useful working relationships at collegial. On the other hand, they expressed dissatisfaction with less than desired salaries, lack of clear leadership structure, flexible teaching time, heavy workload,
and lack of research support, bureaucracy in decision making, lack of promotion for lecturers and lack of administrative support. The lecturers seemed not to be conversant with the criteria for promotion, which primarily academic growth. The deans and heads of departments had slightly diverging views from those of lecturers without administrative tasks. They emphasized the need for academic growth through research support but they did not recommend much change on workload to allow for viability of their proposals. In general, this group of participants seemed more satisfied than lecturers without administrative tasks.

Strategic Human Resource Management Strategies to Improve Faculty Retention

All participants expressed that various SHRM strategies needed improvement. One lecturer in PACU recommended that “clear policy on faculty promotion was needed” as well as “better remuneration”. Speaking on the same need at Daystar University, one lecturer emphasized what some others were saying that there was need for “continuous salary reviews”. The researcher was quick to note a rare strategy raised by a lecturer for promotion of community building thereby enhancing retention through “sports facilities for faculty and staff”, “encourage staff-student fellowships” and “facilitate communication between faculty and administration”. There was a dean for community life and perhaps such ideas were an eye-opener to that office. The researcher considered this to be a rare yet important strategy toward building a retentive climate not only for lecturers but for non-teaching staff and increased benefits of students-lecturer’s friendships that would enhance learning and potentially promote enrollment. The human resource manager in Daystar recommended “yearly salary reviews for equitable pay” while the human resource manager at PACU proposed a more comprehensive improvement
based on “better terms and conditions of service”. A dean in Daystar proposed “constant review of salaries”

Challenges Faced by SHRM in Retention and ways of minimizing the Challenges.

One HOD in Daystar noted that “salaries were the biggest challenge” and same observation made by dean when he responded during interview that low salaries were “one of the biggest threat” to faculty retention. A lecturer in Daystar observed that salaries were “a major challenge in that the rates were below market rates” for the same quality of faculty and so “one needed a high level of commitment to the university” in order to remain there. The researcher observed that human resource managers in both universities right documents in place regarding faculty retention but implementation was a challenge though none of them raised it. One HOD at PACU submitted that “faculty turnover has been high”. The foregoing excerpts, challenges to faculty retention were varied and numerous cited.

5. 3 Conclusions

Based on the research findings, demographic characteristics were the least influential on faculty retention in both universities while salary was the most influential. The other strategies varied from need for promotion, administrative support, less workload and more funding to allow academic growth.

The research tools were extensive in their demand for information. A number of lecturers did not fill every gap. The survey design was appropriate in that the topic demanded an in-depth and triangulated study exercise. The sample selected was resourceful and therefore adequate. Use of SPSS statistical package was helpful to the researcher in generating tables and appropriate
statistics, especially the means. The means were used to express the majority were saying about a particular SHRM strategy. In response to the research questions, the participants responded very well, briefly but accurately. The research questions were addressed and used as a guide to obtain useful information for the said universities. Research design was appropriate in that the data was for guiding the researcher to explore SHRM strategies according to the views of the participants in their natural setting.

However, the researcher had to deal with challenge of busy lecturers who were highly mobile. All means of contacting them and following up were used, mostly diplomatic persuasion in order to schedule for interviews and complete questionnaires. The researcher was the most important research instrument assisted by the participants. Triangulation was achieved through the use of questionnaire, interview guide and document analysis guide. In summary, the research achieved the intended purpose by answering the research questions adequately as indicated in the foregoing analysis.

5.4 Recommendations

After considering various SHRM strategies suggested in data collection and review of related literature on faculty retention, the research came up with several recommendations, which if implemented, would have enhanced retention of faculty in Daystar and Pan Africa Christian Universities. Lecturers were asked same questions as Human resource managers, deans and HODs although there were additional items unique to each group of participants. There was a retention gap because the recommendations made by lecturers in included statements as “give education loans to lecturers, give reduced workload to lecturers, and consult with employees in decision making’ while those of SHRM at PACU included “improved staff development” and
“reward for scholarly publication” among others. The SHRM in Daystar recommended “fast tracking promotion process for the lecturers” without pointing out much on how to do it.

The researcher’s consolidated recommendations were summarized as shown below. Use of an objective measure of productivity to recognize faculty was needed. Salary rates needed to be based on qualification and experience of each lecturer. It was necessary for SHRM to make the upward mobility of the faculty clear, objective and operational. A well defined leave policy covering annual leave and sabbatical leave may have been there, according to results from interview and document analysis but needed to be implemented.

Public relations office reflected university goals, mission and vision. Treatment of customers (primarily students in this case) was instrumental to reputation of the universities studied and a marketing strategy for the university. Motivation of faculty needed to be intentional, clearly and regularly communicated to the faculty. Policy guidelines on how to effectively resolve conflicts between lecturers and middle level management was necessary. Worship attendance needed to be optional while efforts to inculcate Christian values for integration of faith and learning would have helped towards university communities want to attend chapel services. Annual pay raise policy and processes might have been in place but lecturers indicated that SHRM needed to information and educate some lecturers on their compensation rights. University library resources needed to be updated and added. It was necessary for SHRM to provide scholarships for further studies for their lecturers.

SHRM needed to see the need of working with lecturers as faculty retention strategy and incorporate it into other HR practices to guide lecturers’ contribution and performance in a desired direction. This integrative approach to SHRM called for retention of faculty in such a way that HR leaders would and value their own role, strategic partners would bring know-how
about ways of changing university and human capital developers would recognize people as critical assets for a successful future.

Retention gaps were noted by the researcher in perceptions between HODs and deans after responding to the same SHRM strategy through interview guide and questionnaires in the said universities. Having earlier defined retention gap as divergence of views among research participants concerning which retention strategies would work best to effectively enhance retention, a disagreement challenge among these implementers would be minimized by holding regular consultative planning meetings among SHRM, deans, HODs and full time lecturers as a collaborative leadership strategy. If this recommendation was implemented, other related concerns such as “lack of open office approach” voiced by a lecturer in Daystar, would be addressed.

The research findings provided evidence that the leading challenge to faculty retention was low salaries. Bench marking with other surrounding to negotiated. The recommended that constant bench marking on salaries and other retention-related strategies in order to make informed decisions on remuneration policies and procedures.

Many recommendations were proposed by different participants on how the retention of faculty was to be enhanced. The summary included provision of research funds. The researcher therefore recommended that the SHRM leadership of the two universities hold regular meetings with their lecturers to dialogue on various grievances raised by lecturers. This forum would be educational to both SHRM and lecturers on matters related to retention.

The findings of the study provided a variety of meanings to the researcher. There were SHRM strategies for faculty retention but not really clearly communicated to the deans, HODs and lectures by the SHRM as goals of the university. The small group of lecturers, five (5),
automatically selected at Pan Africa Christian University gave less reliable percentages for comparison with Daystar’s group of nineteen. The comparison of SPSS outputs between the two universities might therefore have been used as a general indicator of general impression on how faculty retention variables in the two universities impacted different lecturers differently. It further meant that SHRM needed to use different strategies in each university in order to retain lecturers. The retention gap consultation among members of the management and faculty was necessary in order to determine the best ways of retaining faculty in each university. It also meant that there was no group of SHRM strategies that would have satisfied the lecturers across the board. There would always have been divergence in satisfaction. The SPSS outputs which were generally rated average indicated that retention strategies explored by the researcher had room for improvement. The challenges raised by each group of participants were considered by the researcher to be indicators that SHRM strategies were dynamic and therefore needed constant review, consultation within the said universities and benchmarking with similar universities.

5.4.1 Areas for Further Research (research gap)

The study surfaced other areas of educational research through literature review and findings. First, the human resource managers would have been interrogated further to find out why strategies were in place but according to the comments given by lecturers, implementation was minimal. Probably there were some factors beyond the human resource managers’ ability to implement. Second, the idea of retention gap was not included in the research instruments but it came up as a discovery of the researcher through close scrutiny of the differences in opinions among various participants. Third, the faith-based element and its possible influence on retention can be investigated further. Fourth, variables included in the demographic information of the
participants may need further investigation by including related items in the questionnaire and interview guide. Fifth, this research was not intended to explore the multiplier effects that would flow out of the possible relationship between retaining good faculty, university reputation and student enrollment.

An illustrative example was the decision to pay faculty according to the number of students they taught, having normal teaching load as sixteen students for a new class to be considered cost-effective. In such a case, a declining enrollment in a University would be a message to teaching faculty that they needed to look for the next university to go to since number of students in each intake positively or negatively influenced faculty retention.

It was not clear to the researcher whether the SHRM retained master’s degree holders for economic reasons or the lecturers did not have much ambition to pursue PhD. Other researchers may investigate the reasons behind lecturers staying in Daystar University at one academic level. There might have been other factors which outweighed their lack of opportunity to pursue PhDs.

Based on definition of faculty retention by Cascio (2010), “initiatives taken by management to keep employees from leaving, such as rewarding employees for performing their jobs effectively; ensuring harmonious working relations between employees and managers; and maintaining safe, healthy working environment” (p.691) were considered urgent and necessary in both universities. In the light of this observation, the researcher noted that HRM of Daystar University needed to be more strategic in his practical dealings with the faculty that had wide variations on how they needed to be retained than was the case in PACU, based on service delivery variable alone. However, one variable in a multivariate study cannot be used on its own to make decisions without considering in role played by other variables. It is highly recommended that the SHRM in the two universities interact more with their lecturers with a
goal of building up a collaborative leadership in which lecturers become more of faculty
retention process as process owners rather than reactors to SHRM placed upon them.

According to literature review, Dee (2010) found that retention strategies for older faculty may
include health insurance, retirement package and professional growth among others.

Future researchers in this area may need to investigate the possible correlation between age of
faculty and retention of the same as a single detailed study.
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Dear participant,

I am a post graduate student at Catholic University of Eastern Africa (CUEA). To fulfill the requirements for the degree of Master of Education, I am carrying out a research to find out the possible influence of human resource strategies on retention of faculty in private universities in Kenya, a case of Daystar and Pan Africa Christian Universities.

Kindly respond objectively, accurately and in good time to assist me in this process. Information gathered will be treated with confidence in accordance with academic research ethics.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Simon Nderitu
APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FULL TIME LECTURERS

PART A: Biographical Information

1. Gender: □ Male  □ Female

2. Marital Status: □ Single  □ Married

3. Age: 25-35 □ 36-45 □ 46-55 □ 56-65 □

4. Which is your highest academic qualification? Masters ( ) Doctorate ( )

5. Which is your highest professional qualification

   Tutorial fellow □
   Assistant Lecturer □
   Lecturer □
   Senior Lecturer □
   Associate professor □
   Professor □

   Any other? Specify________________. University-----------------------------------------------
   -School-------------------------------------------Department--------------------------------------

6. How long have you been teaching in this university? ---------------years.

PART B: Factors Influencing Faculty Retention Currently

7. In your opinion, to what extent do the following SHRM strategies contribute towards your motivation to remain in this university? Please tick ( ) the following aspects of your university in relation to faculty retention by indicating the level of your agreement or disagreement. 5= very high; 4= high; 3= moderate; 2= low; 1= none
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHRM strategy</th>
<th>Very high, 5</th>
<th>High 4</th>
<th>Moderate 3</th>
<th>Low 2</th>
<th>None 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery, administrative support to lecturers, collegial support, progress reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth, recognition of performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, years of experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of lessons per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please tick ( ) the following aspects of your university in relation to faculty retention by indicating the level of your agreement or disagreement. 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Undecided; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment procedures are clear and helpful in retention of faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and job development programs are available and helpful in faculty retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appraisal process is open, fair and helpful in faculty retention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion procedure open, clearly and helpful in faculty retention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Christian foundation and commitment helps in faculty retention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. In order of priority, list five other practices you like best in your current university, which are used to retain faculty.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

10. List four other practices you like least in your current university in order of priority regarding faculty recruitment and retention.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

11. Use the key provided to express how services you are receiving motivate you to remain in the university. Use the key as follows. Excellent=5; Good= 4; Average=3; Poor=2; Very Poor= 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions as a lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary you are receiving currently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations with your employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your ability to communicate work related issues with management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty retention in your university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART C: Strategies of Improving Faculty Retention

13. In your opinion, how strongly have the following raised your motivation to stay in this University? Tick the option that best expresses your opinion in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHRM strategy</th>
<th>Very strong, 5</th>
<th>Strong 4</th>
<th>Average 3</th>
<th>Weak 2</th>
<th>Very weak 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University’s reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to communicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grievances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What other five suggestions would recommend to management in order to improve faculty retention in this university?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
PART D: Challenges Faced in Faculty Retention

13. In your opinion, how do the following SHRM strategies present challenges to the University’s efforts to retain faculty? Tick the option that best expresses your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHRM retention strategy</th>
<th>Great challenge</th>
<th>Moderate challenge</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study leave</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better pay offers in other universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining student enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of specialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement of aging faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of specialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What other challenges do you face in this university that can prompt you not to stay for long as you wish?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
PART E: Suggestions and Recommendations on Retention Strategies

In the space below, suggest any recommendations on policy and practice you would like to add concerning faculty retention in this university.

15. Policy recommendations to human resource regarding viable retention strategies

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

16. Suggestions to HODs regarding practice

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

17. Suggestions to Deans regarding best SHRM practices

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

18. Suggestions to human resource manager on policy improvement regarding faculty retention.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
Thank you so much for answering these questions.
**APPENDIX II**

**INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR DEANS AND HODS**

**PART A: Demographic Information**

1. Gender: [ ] Male [ ] Female

2. Marital Status: [ ] Single [ ] Married

3. Age: 25-35 [ ] 36-45 [ ] 46-55 [ ] 55-65 [ ]

4. Which is your highest academic qualification? Masters (  ) Doctorate (  )

5. What position do you hold as a faculty leader? Dean (  ), HOD (  )

6. Which is your highest professional qualification?
   - Tutorial fellow [ ]
   - Assistant Lecturer [ ]
   - Lecturer [ ]
   - Senior Lecturer [ ]
   - Associate professor [ ]
   - Professor [ ]
   - Any other Specify__________University-----------------Department-----------------

7. How long have you been teaching in this university? ---------years.

8. How long have you held this position in this university? ------years.

**PART B: Factors Influencing Faculty Retention**

9. In your opinion, what contribution is made by the following SHRM strategies regarding retention of your faculty in your university currently?

   a. Compensation (salaries and benefits)---------------------------------------------
   -----------------------------------------------------
b. School culture (service delivery, administrative support to lecturers, collegial support, progress reports).

c. Motivation to teach (professional growth, recognition of performance)

d. Demographic factors (gender, years of experience, tribe, race)

e. Workload (right amount)

f. What other practices do you like best in your current university in order of priority regarding your motivation to stay?

g. What other practices do you like least in your current university in order of priority regarding faculty retention?
PART C: Strategies of Improving Faculty Retention

10. In your opinion, how have the following conditions and practices improved retention of your faculty?

   a. University culture values

   b. University’s reputation

   c. Employment conditions

   d. Professional development

   e. Teaching climate

   f. Research support

   g. Personal development

   h. Besides practices and conditions indentified above, what other steps are you taking to improve faculty retention in this university?

PART D: Challenges Faced in Faculty Retention

11. In your opinion, how do the following SHRM strategies present challenges to your efforts to retain your faculty?

   i. Study leave
ii. Sabbatical leave

iii. Better pay offers in other universities

iv. Declining student enrollment

v. Area of specialization

vi. Area of specialization

vii. Aging faculty

viii. Level of specialization

ix. Apart from the above cited practices and conditions, what other challenges are you facing in this university in your efforts to retain faculty in your department?

x. What are some the challenges the university is facing which may prompt lecturers not to stay for long as they wish?
PART E: Suggestions and Recommendations on Faculty Retention Strategies

12. Suggest any recommendations you would like to add concerning faculty retention in this university for consideration by human resource manager.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thank you so much for answering these questions.
APPENDIX III

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGERS

Section A: Demographic Information

1. Gender: [ ] Male [ ] Female

2. Marital Status: [ ] Single [ ] Married

3. Age: 25-35 [ ] 36-45 [ ] 46-55 [ ] 56-65 [ ] Above 65 [ ]

4. Academic qualification:
   - Degree [ ]
   - Masters [ ]
   - Doctorate [ ]
   - Any other? Specify________________

5. I have worked in my present position in this university for ____________years.

Section B: Human Resource Manager’s input towards Faculty Retention

6. How often do your review salaries
   - After 6 months
   - After 1 year
   - After 2 year
   - After 3 years
   - Over 3 years

7. Do you have policies on retention of faculty that are faith-related? Yes ( ) No ( )
   - If yes, which are these policies and how do they affect faculty retention?
9. Are there any external factors that influence the way you recruit and retain faculty?
   Yes (   ) No (   )
   b. If yes, how do these factors influence faculty retention?

11. Do you formally conduct exit interviews with faculty that leave the university? Yes ( ) No ( )
12. If yes, how can you rate these exit interviews?
   Very useful (   ), Useful (   ), Not useful (   )
13. What are challenges you face in regard to recruitment and faculty retention in this University?
14. How do you overcome these challenges?
15. Do you have any formulated strategies that you have developed to help reduce lecturers’ turnover? Yes (   ) No (   )
   b. If yes, which are these strategies?
16. List some improvement you would like to make toward faculty retention better in this university.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

17. List in the space below anything else you would like to add concerning faculty retention in this university.

______________________________________________________________________________

18. How would you rate lecturer’s motivation in this university?

Above average ( ) average ( ) below average ( )

19. What would you like management to improve on in order to motivate lecturers

______________________________________________________________________________

20. Give your honest opinion about lecturers treatment in this organization and what would you like see changed? ____________________________________________________________
APPENDIX IV

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Kindly assist with verification of availability some of the documents you use faculty retention records and whether they are in use or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>Yes/ No</th>
<th>Faculty retention emphasis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment record</td>
<td>It is available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It contains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Job analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Screening and selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sourcing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal document file</td>
<td>It is available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It contains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance analysis &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of training needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification of qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; development file</td>
<td>It is available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion record</td>
<td>It is available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy document file</td>
<td>They are available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit interview document</td>
<td>It is available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan</td>
<td>It is available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V

UNIVERSITY AUTHORIZATION LETTER

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN AFRICA
A. M. E. C. E. A.
P. O. Box 62157
00200 Nairobi - KENYA
Telephone: 891601-6
Fax: 254-2-891260
admin@cuca.edu

Department of Postgraduate Studies in Education

23rd February 2012

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Re: Simon Nderitu MED/1016167: Master of Education Degree Thesis Research

I am writing to introduce to you Simon Nderitu, a final year Master of Education Degree student at the Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Nairobi – Kenya; and to request you to assist him to accomplish his academic research requirements.

Simon’s Master of Education Degree specialization is Administration and Planning. He has completed all course work requirements for this Programme. However, every student in the Programme is required to conduct research and write a report/thesis submitted during the final years of studies.

Accordingly Simon’s proposal for research has been approved. He will conduct research on the following topic:


Thanking you in advance for any assistance you will offer Simon.

Sincerely

Dr. Robert Kamau
Coordinator, Curriculum Studies
APPENDIX VI

RESEARCH PERMIT

IS TO CERTIFY THAT:

G. Nderitu

has been permitted to conduct research in

The Catholic University

BOX 62157, Nairobi


for a period ending 30th August 2012.

Applicant’s Signature

Secretary

National Council for Science & Technology

CONDITIONS

1. You must report to the District Commissioner and the District Education Officer of the area before embarking on your research. Failure to do so may lead to the cancellation of your permit.

2. Government Officers will not be interviewed without prior appointment.

3. No questionnaire will be used unless it has been approved.

4. Excavation, filming and collection of biological specimens are subject to further permission from the respective Government Ministries.

5. You are required to submit at least two (2) copies of your final report for Kenyans in-country and Kenyans abroad.

6. The Government of Kenya reserves the right to modify the conditions of this permit including its cancellation without notice.

(Conditions—see back page)