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ABSTRACT

The study focused on human resource needs and employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between the provision of human resource needs and employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. The objectives that guided the study were: to establish the relationship between the need to provide workplace relations and work productivity of the support staff of Makerere University; to find out the relationship between employee need for development and work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University, and to find out the relationship between need to provide job communication and work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. Primary data was collected from the support staff by use of questionnaires and interviews from the administrators. The sample included 159 potential respondents. Data was collected and entered in the computer and analysed using SPSS Programme.

The hypotheses were verified using the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient to determine whether there were correlations that existed between the variables. There was a significant relationship between need to provide workplace relations and employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. There was also a relationship between employee need for development and work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. There was a relationship between need to provide job communication and employee work productivity of the support staff in Makerere University. The researcher therefore recommended that managers should strengthen employee relations by allowing the support staff to join and be active in clubs and groups,
be able to talk to others, visit other departments and faculties to share knowledge and experience in doing work better. After appraisal, managers should bring back the results to let them know their future level of effort, activities, results and task direction. Finally the researcher recommended that managers should continue using supervisors to pass information to the support staff. The supervisors are more nearer to the support staff and this will help reduce the inadequacies that may exist while communicating.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the background, problem statement, purpose, objectives, research questions, hypotheses, scope and the significance of the study.

1.1 Background

Humans are the core elements of organisations and without people, organisations cannot exist. It is through the efforts people make that organisations achieve their goals and consequently sustain their existence (Beardwell, 2001). But when a worker joins an organisation, he or she expects to have a work environment that is safe, healthy, meaningful and challenging and an opportunity for him/her to become successful in life. But, it is not easy for most organisations including universities to meet the needs of their workers. This background is therefore composed of the historical, theoretical, conceptual and contextual perspective.

1.1.1 Historical perspective

At Makerere University, human resource needs during the past years were more enjoyable among the support staff (Atuhwere, 2003). Such support staff may include secretaries, accountants, library assistants, labourers, technicians and supervisors. At that time, workers were few, the number of students was low and the University Managers found it easy to provide employee needs. However, due to changes in the political and economic nature of the country, several changes have taken place in the University. For
instance, private sponsorship programmes were introduced to enable students who could afford, to pay for their university education. This brought about many changes within the University including the level of the support staff’s work productivity.

Many earlier researchers have attempted to relate work productivity to different factors. Atuhwere (2003) for instance, found out that many factors apart from dissatisfiers have led to a reduction in the performance of the non-academic staff of Makerere University. Kiwanuka (2000) meanwhile, found out that the effectiveness of salary payment in Ugandan Cooperative Banks did not fully inspire performance of employees at their best. To him, something was missing about performance and employees. Kiseesi (1998) revealed that job satisfaction and performance of non academic staff of Makerere did not fully attract the attention of administrators. However, all these studies have not shown how work productivity is affected by employee demands especially in Makerere University where there have been a lot of staff unrests in the recent past. Hence, it was deemed necessary to conduct this study.

1.1.2 Theoretical perspective

Maslow’s Theory suggests that human needs operate at five different levels: from basic physiological needs such as hunger, to higher level needs such as self esteem and self actualisation. This Theory provides a convenient framework for viewing the needs and expectations that employees have and the different motivators that might be applied to employees to produce good results. According to Saleemi (1997), some of the most effective things managers can do to satisfy, develop and sustain employees to improve
work productivity, cost very little or nothing at all. Maslow (1954) also suggested that morale of employees and other employee variables must be examined to explain the variations in performance, hence a need to look at human resource needs.

Alderfer’s theory proposes three employee needs as arranged along a continuum: these are existence, relatedness and growth needs. In this study, if the support staff employee’s growth needs are blocked because the job does not allow sufficient opportunity for personal development, employees would lose confidence and work productivity will reduce. The Theory also explains why people behave in the ways they do, showing their commitment or not. In this study, it is also hypothesised that providing human resource needs determines the extent to which individuals desire to place their knowledge, skills, efforts at work place, and more than that, to shrug off the effects of obstacles and difficulties in so doing. This explains the degree to which work productivity will be enhanced.

1.1.3 Conceptual perspective
Work productivity refers to the state or quality of producing something (Judy, 1998). Work productivity refers to organisations getting better results from the workers (Maicibi and Nkata, 2004). Therefore, productivity in this study will be conceptualised as, organisations effort to have better results through, employees punctuality, regular attendance, working overtime and timely completion of the tasks given to a worker. Human resource needs, on the other hand, refers to anything that is wanted or required by someone (Judy, 1998). It is also a requirement that is necessary for something to be done
so as to achieve another (Brewer, 2000). In this study, human resource needs will refer to employee requirements that managers need to provide to employees, who in this study are the support staff, so as to make them convinced, comfortable and satisfied, such as the need to provide workplace employee relations, employee sense of achievement, compensation for overtime, employee need for development and the need to provide job communication. But the researcher concentrated on; workplace employee relations, employee need for development and need to provide job communication.

Managing human resources is a function that managers perform relative to the organization's employees. Every employee has different reasons for working. Some employees work for love; others work for personal fulfilment. Others like to accomplish goals and feel as if they are contributing to something larger than themselves, something important. Some have personal missions they accomplish through meaningful work. Others truly love what they do or the clients they serve. Some workers like change, challenge, and diverse problems to solve (Saleemi, 1997). The employee’s productivity through punctuality, regular attendance, timely completion of tasks, working overtime depends on how meaningful the job is to that employee. This can be achieved through managers providing workplace employee relations, employee need for development and the need to provide job communication. This will help in creating a work environment in which employees such as the support staff are empowered, productive, contributing, and happy.
1.1.4 Contextual perspective

In Makerere University, employee’s general satisfaction and wellbeing were better in the past than today (Atuhwere, 2003). This helped to improve their work productivity. Work productivity today is not convincing. According to Ahimbisibwe (2007) and Kibuuka (2007), it seems employees of Makerere have less interest in the work they are doing. Many workers at Makerere reportedly carried out poor work practices such as coming late for work, do not work overtime, serve few clients, delay tasks, have poor customer care, leave and close offices before time, and seems there is boredom at the work place. It raises concern however that, these practices do not seem to create the appropriate levels of job satisfaction among the support staff. If the situation is to continue like this, many objectives of the University will not be achieved. Indeed the researcher was aware that several researches have been conducted on the relationship between the different management practices and work productivity. But none has been related to a work environment of providing human resource needs. The researcher therefore sought to close this gap by conducting the study on human resource needs and employee work productivity of the support staff in Makerere University.

1.2 Problem statement

Employees work productivity in an organisation increases with a rise in their satisfaction and morale (Shaw, 1980). Morale can be viewed in terms of the mental attitudes people have towards their tasks and responsibilities and the way human beings feel that their personal needs and objectives are being satisfied by the environment in which they are working. However, there are many complaints against the support staff members of
Makerere University and such complaints raise questions against their work productivity? Such as coming late, serving few clients, not working overtime and poor handling of students. This seems to imply that their human resource needs are more or less of the University support staff; yet, providing human resource needs makes a real difference, such as, the productivity of workers improve and also the organisation becomes a better place to work in. If the situation is to continue like this, the University will not achieve the objectives for which it was formed. While there could be several causes leading to the problem of low staff productivity, one of them could be the human resource needs, hence a need to find out the relationship between human resource needs and employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose was to find out the relationship between the provision of human resource needs and employee work productivity of the support staff of Makerere University.

1.4 Specific objectives

The specific objectives of the research were:

i) To establish the relationship between the need to provide workplace relations and work productivity of the support staff of Makerere University.

ii) To find out the relationship between employee need for development and work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University.

iii) To find out the relationship between need to provide job communication and work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University.
1.5 Research questions

The research questions which guided the study were:

i) What is the relationship between the need to provide workplace employee relations and productivity of the support staff of Makerere University?

ii) What is the relationship between employee need for development and work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University?

iii) What is the relationship between the need to provide job communication and work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University?

1.6 Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study were:

i) The need to provide workplace relations is related with employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University.

ii) Employee need for development is related with work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University.

iii) The need to provide job communication is related with employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University.

1.7 Scope

The study was carried out in Makerere University, targeting the support staff in faculties, schools and halls of residence. The study concentrated on the need to provide workplace employee relations, employee need for development and the need to provide job communication on employee work productivity.
1.8 Significance

The study is expected to benefit the following groups of people, and these are the organisation managers, policy makers, administrators, university planners, researchers, donors and students of management studies, showing them the effect of providing human resource needs towards employee work productivity. The study will add to the already existing literature on human resource needs and employee work productivity for the academic audience, researchers and consultants in these areas.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter deals with theoretical review, conceptual framework and related literature.

2.1 Theoretical review

Theories such as Maslow’s Theory of hierarchy of needs and Alderfer’s Needs Theory, explain why people at work behave the way they do in terms of efforts and directions they take. They also describe what organisations do in order to encourage people to apply their efforts and abilities to achieve the desired goals as well as satisfying individual needs. Maslow suggested that human needs operate at a number of different levels, from basic physiological needs such as hunger, to higher level needs, like self development and self fulfilment (Cole, 2004). For this study, employee’s needs are looked at in form of workplace employee relations, employee need for development and the need for job communication. Numerous other factors such as individual knowledge, skills, nature of the task, freedom, the management style, organisation climate, all play part in the results people achieve.
Figure 1. **MASLOW'S THEORY OF MOTIVATION AND HUMAN NEEDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF NEEDS</th>
<th>MOTIVATION &amp; BEHAVIOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 5 = Self-Actualization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level 5 = Self-Actualization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULFILLMENT OF GOALS &amp; DREAMS</td>
<td>CREATIVITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for self-fulfillment. Desire to realize your full potential and become the best you are capable of becoming.</td>
<td>Be a self-starter, have enthusiasm, be creative, be dedicated, enjoy challenges, love to accomplish results!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 4 = Self-Esteem</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level 4 = Self-Esteem</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF RESPECT &amp; ACCEPTANCE</td>
<td>BRAINPOWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for reputation, prestige, and recognition from others. Contains the desire to feel important, strong and significant.</td>
<td>Display your talents and skills, have self-confidence, appreciate attention and recognition from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3 = Love &amp; Relationships</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level 3 = Love &amp; Relationships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION &amp; RESPONSE</td>
<td>VALIDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to be loved and to love. Includes the desire for affection and belonging.</td>
<td>Join and be active in clubs and groups, be able to talk to others, contribute to society, marry and have a family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2 = Your Family &amp; Work</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level 2 = Your Family &amp; Work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SAFETY &amp; SECURITY</td>
<td>SURVIVAL SKILLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to be safe from physical and psychological harm in the present and future, and trust in a predictable future.</td>
<td>Work, save for future, improve skills and talents, be responsible, and want an organized predictable world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1 = Your Body</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level 1 = Your Body</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL SAFETY &amp; SECURITY</td>
<td>SURVIVAL SKILLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to stay alive! Biological and cultural imperatives to live. Includes having enough healthy food, air, and water to survive.</td>
<td>Eat, sleep, and take care of your bodily needs, provide for clothing, shelter, comfort, be free from pain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [Http://home.earthlink.net/~denmartin/maslow.html](http://home.earthlink.net/~denmartin/maslow.html)
According to Maslow’s theory, the higher needs in this hierarchy only come into focus when the lower needs in the pyramid are satisfied (Cole, 2000). Once an individual has moved upwards to the next level such as self-actualisation, needs in the lower level such as level one will no longer be prioritized. If a lower set of needs is no longer being met, the individual will temporarily re-prioritize those needs by focusing attention on the unfulfilled needs, but will not permanently regress to the lower level (Cole, 2004). Http/en.wikipedia.org/wiki/maslows hierarchy of needs, gives an example of, a businessman at the esteem level who is diagnosed with cancer will spend a great deal of time concentrating on his health (physiological needs), but will continue to value his work performance (esteem needs) and will likely return to work during periods of remission.

Managers in the process of fulfillment of employees needs, need to understand that “Ego needs” are met on the job by “recognition” or “appreciation” given for work well done; by opportunities for accomplishment, achievement, and independence of action (Beardwell, 2001). Cole (2001) suggests that self-actualization is met on the job by giving an individual the opportunity to realize his or her full potential. People at this level of "self-actualization" or "need gratification" are generally engaged in a continual program of self-development and find that the job itself provides its own intrinsic rewards (Maslow, 1954). If managers are in position to provide this, then work productivity among the support staff in Makerere will be enhanced.
2.2 Conceptual framework

How human resource needs influence employee work productivity.

### Human resource needs

(Independent Variable)

- Need to provide workplace employee relations
  - Relations with fellow employees
  - Relations with managers
- Employee need for development
  - Education and mentorship programmes
  - Assessment
  - Job experiences/job rotations
  - Performance appraisal and management
- Need to provide job communication
  - Information about new developments
  - Feedback
  - Transparency
  - Listening, Trust,

### Employee Work productivity

(Dependent Variable)

- Regular attendance
- Punctuality
- Completion of tasks
- Working overtime

**Extraneous Variables.**
- Distance travelled from home to work place
- Physical health of a person
- Nature of the job done
- Education qualifications

---

**Figure 2** A conceptual framework

In Figure 2, the way managers provide human resource needs (independent variable) in an organisation determines the work productivity of employees (dependent variable). The need to provide workplace employee relations, employee need for development and the need to provide job communication, create a very great impact on employees as employees attend regularly to work, are punctual, complete tasks in time and even concentrate on jobs. And this serves as a guide for employees to improve work productivity.

2.3 Related literature

The literature review has been done in accordance with the study objectives.

2.3.1 Need for workplace employee relations and work productivity

Workplace employee relations describe all those activities that contribute formally and informally to the organisation of the relationships between employees and their employers (Cole, 2000). According to Saleemi (1997) in some instances, such relationships are predominantly formalised as a result of collective bargaining between employers and trade unions as to the role, status and working conditions of employees. The workplace employee relations that the researcher was interested in were relations with fellow employees and relations with managers.

Relations with fellow employees. Maslow (1954) outlined the most influential of all the content motivational theories, which assumes that all individuals’ possess the same set of needs. Maslow therefore gave characteristics that need to be present in jobs in order to
motivate workers to relate more and produce more. Maslow suggested that employees will always tend to want more from their organisation and through working together, they produce more. Hence calling the employers to identify employees need and accordingly satisfy them. Many employees started struggling and working together to solve their instructional, behaviour and workers problems (Little, 1987). Those who have tested this system have seen improvements in performance behaviour and attitude. In organisations, when employees are collaborative, they sense the programme coherence and employees are relieved from boredom, end of year burnout and find themselves better equipped for organisation work (Little, 1987). This was then established by this study in Makerere University.

Kakomo (2005) found out that creating good employee relationships help to strengthen individual rights in the workplace, both in respect of the relationship with management and with respect of individual members rights vis–a-vis their union. Employee’s team work makes complex tasks more manageable, stimulates new ideas and promotes coherence in the organisation programmes. According to Little (1987), the accomplishments of well organised groups are widely considered to be greater than the accomplishments of isolated individuals. Organisations become better prepared and organised to examine new ideas, methods and innovations from employees relations. This reduces staff turn over by providing assistance to beginners and by explicitly socialising all new comers (including veterans) to staff values, traditions and resources (Little, 1987, and Schmid, 1992). Yet Kirungi (2006) found out that if managers allow employee relations to exist, this helps to maintain employee motivation, establish a workable and
credible channels of communication and sharing power with employee representatives (not necessarily trade unions) in an organised way. Therefore this study examined whether what Kirungi (2006) and Kakomo (2005) found, exists in the University.

**The managers and workplace relations.** One of the major roles of managers is to understand the existing culture of the institution, the common values and beliefs which are shared by its members (Bush, 1995). “The way we do things here” concept which indicates the heroes and heroines of the system helps individual members to identify themselves with the system. This helps to enforce and sustain team work and group unity between managers and employees (Gamage and Bush, 2001). Team work and management characteristics are key determinants of members of staff, levels, roles and satisfaction. Managers in organisations are expected to share their power with other members in the organisation, they are supposed to be democratic, collaborative, participative and supportive (Kakomo, 2005). Hall (1984) observes that if “the team does not work, not only does the manager lose credibility, but also the potential synergy which is often the result of working with others” (p.216).

The manager is a role model who knows every member of staff individually and is always available to solve staff problems (Saleemi, 1997). Saleemi continues to note that managers should be firm in decision making but always open to suggestions from staff members. This will make the manager feel secure and highly motivated. If managers are role models in Makerere University, then this study helped to examine it. Kiseesi (1998) realised that employees will see employee to employer relationships as management
efforts to win them round to their way of thinking, a “them and us” situation involving management union meetings and frequent wrangles and an opportunity to participate in shop-floor decision making and possibly even at board level. If an organisation takes this approach and the employees are happy to accept it, then the end result seems to be harmony and success. Where existence of separate interests is openly admitted and where arrangements are made to solve possible conflicts, work productivity is highly improved (Saleemi, 1997). This was then be established by this study in Makerere University.

2.3.2 Employee need for development and Work productivity

A solid employee development can mean the difference between a successful company and the company that struggles to compete (Armstrong, 2001). According to Saleemi (1997), employee need for development refers to formal education, job experiences, job rotations, relationships and assessment of personalities and abilities that help employees prepare for the future. Employee need for development permits individuals to leave the day-to-day demand of their jobs behind so that they can concentrate on analysing past behaviours. This enables them to concentrate on what has been successful and what has not. This is in line with Beardwell (2001) who noted that employee need for development is sometimes necessary to get people away from the work environment to a place where frustrations and bustle are eliminated. If this definition is true, then this study helped to establish it in Makerere University.

Jagenu (2000) noted that allowing employees to have discussions gives them an opportunity for learning from experience of others and empowers self-expression.
Birungi (2002) agree that support staff employees should have the opportunity to observe from others, conduct research, plan together and analyse work in groups so as to develop mutual understanding of excellent and acceptable work and share successful methods and job tips. If managers create such an environment, the work productivity will be obtained. Employee need for development that the researcher was interested in were education and mentorship programmes, job experiences, job rotations, and performance appraisal and management.

Mentoring, according to Armstrong (2001), is aimed at learning on the job, which must be the best way of acquiring particular skills and knowledge the job holder needs. It also gives employees an opportunity to perform an increasing range of tasks and by helping them to learn from their experiences. This would result into increased effectiveness of the support staff of Makerere. Birungi (2002) cited Sparks and Hirsh (1999) that “the traditional model of isolated, adult, pull out programmes’’ must be replaced with entire focused collaborative learning. According to them, employees such as support staff learn better together and support one another in planning their work and improving the quality of their work and solving day-to–day problems at work. They suggested that the universities should have mentors for new employees who in this study are the support staff and those support staff with difficulties. Whether there were mentoring programmes for support staff within the University to learn together and mentors present in the University was to be established by this study.
Job rotation according to Armstrong (1999) aims at broadening experience by moving people from job to job. When properly planned, it aims at acquiring knowledge and skills in different departments. Beardwell (2001) suggests that when job rotation is properly implemented, it can give an excellent learning experience to develop workers and suitably fits in the human resource concepts of team building and empowerment, when people are encouraged to take greater responsibilities for their work and that of their teams. Managers should therefore provide flexibility among the employees so that boredom in the organisation is reduced (Owolabi, 2000). This will help in developing employees as well as promoting the organisations’ objectives. Whether job rotations are carried out to give the support staff a spirit of team work and flexibility for greater responsibilities was to be established by this study.

Performance appraisal and management in any organisation is very important. Cushway (1994) observes that every employee has a right to know how well he or she is doing all the years round and not just at appraisal time. He further notes that it is an obligation on part of management to let the employee know. Similarly, it is the management’s responsibility to ensure that there are no surprises at appraisal time and this implies that managers should discuss both positives and negatives of employee performance throughout the year. Kamwine (2004) believes that the choice of the appraisal scheme is dependent upon the nature of the organisation, its employees and management approaches as none of the scheme is perfect because there are advantages and disadvantages for it. Desler (2003) points out that if properly conducted, performance appraisal does not only let the employees know how well they are doing but also
influences the employees future level of effort, activities, results and task direction. As suggested by Busingye (2006) that looking to the ideal appraisal system is comparable to looking for the “holy grail”, this was then investigated.

2.3.2 Need for job communication and work productivity

Communication stands so deeply rooted in human behaviours. Who says what? To whom? In what channel? And with what effect? (Lasswell, 1978). It is a base of meaning, interaction, sharing feelings and thoughts, informing, entertaining or instructing (Cole, 2000). According to Kasirye (1992) and Kigundu (1995,) points out that creating an environment in which communication is part, increase ownership and commitment, reduces doubt, retains the best employees and fosters an environment in which people are contributing and to produce good results. With the need to provide job communication, the researcher was interested in feedback, transparency, appreciation, and information about new developments.

Providing feedback enables employees to determine their success or failure in the accomplishment of their tasks and derives satisfaction from their activities. The support staffs are willing to seek feedback from those they respect to attempt to learn new skills and improve their performance (Kasirye, 1992). However, it was not known whether in Makerere, it was the case and this attracted the researcher to find out. It is common that if employees enter into the process willing to defend their own positions in factual and fairways, and if employees are willing to work with managers, then feedback can become more pleasant. Odonga (1991) also argues that employees who receive information
regarding how to do their own work are found to be higher performers than those with little or no information. It is only when feedback is given that a worker can address him or herself to personal professional growth. Odonga believes that failure to provide feedback partly explain why in some cases, employees resign and lose interest in their jobs.

Schuler (1992) suggests that transparency encourages open communication between employees and employers or subordinates and supervisors, which ultimately helps to create effective cohesive work groups and generate actual record of performance which can help in counselling and setting objectives hence improving performance. Desler (2003) observes that the greatest difficulties any manager experiences in providing open communication is being objective about the individual and this is because there is a tendency, naturally to want to give better ratings to people they like than those they are less keen on. Busingye (2006) suggests that some employers are uncomfortable with doing transparency and yet many employees feel that their work plans are motivated when there is transparency at workplace. Tripathi (2004) shares a view that where there is open communications in any organisation, people feel free to express their problems which can be handled amicably for the benefit of both employees and employers. From the above observation, lack of transparency breeds suspicion, eventually leads to misunderstanding and role conflict and is likely to affect performance of employees. So if open communication exists in Makerere, this study helped to investigate it.
Appreciation, better managers will work well with employees to help them do their jobs more effectively but they cannot know how they can help unless employees provide them with good factual information or even better concrete ideas about their performance (Owolabi, 2000). Kamwine (2004) suggests that the support staff seem generally to appreciate the opportunity to reflect their roles on one to one basis with one another’s colleagues. Performance communication and decisions will be interpreted by an employee as feedback and will have a potentially strong impact on an employee’s view of self, for instance self belief or self esteem (Bratton and Gold, 1999).

Information about new developments helps managers to respond to organisations work, develops a spirit of trust and confidence in the managers, helps employees such as support staff to perform their duties as required, and even inspires employees to put in more effort and work more towards the organisations success (Saleemi, 1997). Stoner (1995) gave information quality, information quantity and information timeless as factors which managers need to consider while informing employees about new developments. Stoner continued to illustrate that information provided must be availed to the right person at the right time and for the appropriate action to be taken, if needed. The more accurate information about new developments is, the higher its quality and the more secure managers can rely on. Yet if employees receive more information than what they can productively use, they may overlook this information on serious problems. So adequacy should be observed. If the three factors given by stoner (1995) exist in Makerere, then this study helped establish it.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the research design, population, sampling strategies, data collection methods, instruments, data quality control, procedure and the data analysis techniques employed in the study.

3.1 Design

The study was mainly quantitative but was supported with some qualitative methods. The qualitative method was used in addition because the researcher wanted to obtain more information that could have been otherwise left out by the quantitative approach alone. Quantitative method was employed for collection and analysis of data because it is appropriate for gathering data from a large number of samples at a particular time so as to describe the situation of the problem being investigated. A descriptive, cross-sectional survey research design that involves asking questions and collecting views of respondents at one point in time was used. This is because descriptive study enabled the researcher to describe data collected on a given sample while attempting to generalise to the population from which the sample was taken (Sekaran, 2003:394).

3.2 Population

The study targeted the support staff members who are comprised of secretaries, accountants, library assistants, technicians, and supervisors in the School of Education, School of industrial and Fine Art (Margaret Trowel), Faculty of Technology, Lumumba
Hall, Mary Stuart Hall and School of Education library of Makerere University. These totalled to 271 support staff members. Support staffs were chosen because they do a great job in determining the success, performance and running of University activities at all levels. The administrators of the University were also considered because they are the ones who manage the support staff employees.

3.3 Sampling strategies

Sampling is the technique of selecting a suitable sample, or a representative part of a population for the purpose of determining parameters or characteristics of the whole population (Charles, 1995). Employees were sampled because the researcher had to obtain relevant information from respondents at an equal chance. A sample size of 159 employees was chosen for the study. This was done according to Krejcie and Morgan (1970)’s, table of sample size determination. The selection of the faculties was purposive to ensure that faculties/schools have sufficient sampling framework for adequate information (Gay, 1996). Stratified sampling was also used considering the fact that respondents were drawn from different levels of management and employees section. Simple random sampling was employed too, on the population because it gives all staff an equal chance of being included in the sample. Time allocation observation was also used and this involved the researcher randomly selecting a place and time, and then recording what people are doing when they are first seen and before they had seen the researcher.
Table 1  **Respondents sampled population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Returned questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum building</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Library</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Industrial and Fine art</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Technology</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumumba hall</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Stuart hall</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Data collection methods

Secondary data collection was used, involving the researcher visiting other research reports, Internet, the journal, newspapers and some text books to collect data related to the study. Primary data collection method was also used to get views of respondents as the key information using the questionnaires answered by respondents. Questionnaires were preferred because they give clear and specific response, enable respondents to express themselves freely, and to the researcher, are convenient in terms of financial and time resources. Direct observation method was also used to observe the sites, actions, activities and work environment of the support staff at that time. Observation was done because the researcher wanted to collect a depth of information about a particular
behaviour. The information gathered was compared to secondary data so that the researcher could prove or disapprove it.

3.5 Data collection instruments

1. Questionnaires

Self administered questionnaires were used to collect data. The questionnaires started with a main title; followed by an introductory letter and had sections; Section A with six questions to help give information on the background of the respondents. Section B was on the independent variable in the study; that is, human resource needs namely workplace employee relations, employee need for development (each with five questions) and need to provide job communication with four questions. Section C was on the dependent variable with four questions on employee work productivity. A total of 18 closed ended questions were in the instrument having options strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree. Questionnaires were preferred because they give clear and specific response, enable respondents to express themselves freely, and to the researcher, are convenient in terms of financial and time resources.

2. Interview Guide

The researcher used the interview guide for collecting information from the University administrators. This was because the administrators were in a better position to give additional information that could have been left out in the questionnaires concerning human resource needs and employee work productivity of the support staff in Makerere University.
3. Observation

Direct personal observation was done. The researcher looked at the support staff reading news papers, laughing, sharing jokes, moving in an out of office, playing with their kids and others seriously on their work. Through observation, addition and vital information which would have been left out in the interview and questionnaire was obtained. Observation was done because the researcher wanted to collect a depth of information about a particular behaviour.

3.6 Data quality control

Validity

For validity of the instrument, it was established using the content validity test. After constructing the questionnaire, the researcher together with the supervisors read through the questionnaire to establish whether items set would measure what they were supposed to measure. Some items were recommended to be removed from the instrument while some other new items were included in the instrument. The content related evidence of validity of the questionnaire was determined by giving the questionnaire to three independent experts who thoroughly examined and accessed the relevance of the questionnaire to the objectives of the study. The researcher made the appropriate adjustments and the instrument were declared valid. The content validity test was established as shown below.

\[
\text{CVI} = \frac{R}{\text{Total number of items}} = \frac{16 + 15}{18 + 18} = \frac{31}{36} = 0.861
\]

Where CVI = Content Validity Index
R = whether each item is relevant

The content validity test given therefore was 0.861 which is on average 86.1% that allowed the researcher to regard the instrument as valid (Amin, 2005).

**Reliability**

A pilot study was carried out in the School of Education library to pre-test the instrument. Fourteen respondents filled the questionnaires. All questions and instructions were found to be clear and easily understood by the respondents. An average of 30 minutes was given to enable the respondents fill the questionnaires. Reliability of the instrument was calculated using the internal consistency method of Alpha Cronbach’s coefficient method to estimate how consistently individuals responded to the items within a scale. The Cronbach’s Alpha method / formula is given below as,

\[
\alpha = \frac{K}{K-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sum SDi}{SDt}\right)
\]

Where \(\alpha\) alpha coefficient.

\(K\) = number of items in the instrument.

\(\sum\) = Summation sign.

\(SDi\) = standard deviation within each item.

\(SDt\) = Total standard deviation

Data collected was entered in the computer and analysed using the SPSS programme which provided the reliability Cronbach coefficient. Following the calculation, the results revealed an Alpha correlation coefficient of 0.854 which meant that the instrument was 85.4% reliable, hence a need for the researcher to use the instrument. According to Sarantakos (2000), if the reliability coefficient is above 50%, then the instrument can be used.
3.7 **Data collection procedure**

An introductory letter was got from the Dean of School of Education seeking permission from the heads of departments to allow the researcher to collect data. A Letter was taken to heads of units and departments in faculty, schools, halls of residence bursars and custodians to enable the researcher access respondents without restrictions. The researcher together with the research assistants who were the heads of units, custodians and halls of residence bursars distributed questionnaires to respondents and then left the custodians to supervise the questionnaire fillings. Emphasis was made on checking information that was filled so that there were no omissions left except where the respondents did not know the answer. After two weeks, the researcher went back to the custodians to collect those answered questionnaires so that the researcher would arrange all data for analysis.

3.8 **Data analysis**

The researcher edited/cleaned the data collected by removing all the incomplete and inconsistently answered questionnaires. Data was coded/ categorised and entered into the computer to derive summaries like frequency tables, graphs as tools of data summary. The analysis was automated using a computer tool of SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Scientists) because it provides a broad range of capabilities for the entire analytical processes. The hypotheses were tested using the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient. Comparison of the p-value with the level of significance (0.05) enabled the researcher to determine the significance of the correlation. Amin (2004) suggests that the purpose of the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient test is to determine
whether there is a relationship between two variables X and Y. In this case, the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used because the researcher wanted to establish whether there was a relationship between human resource needs and employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study. Information collected is presented in three parts where the first part deals with background information of the respondents who participated in the study; the second section deals with responses on the independent variable and the dependent variable and the third section deals with verification of the research hypotheses. This information collected is from the questionnaires and interview administered to the support staff and administrators of Makerere University.

4.1 Background information of the respondents

The researcher was interested in knowing the background information of the respondents because it provides informal characteristics of the sampled population. For the researcher to acquire information on the background of the respondents, concern was put on the respondent’s department, age, sex, marital status, length of service in the University and the respondent’s highest level of education.

4.1.1 Distribution of respondents by department

The respondent’s department was important because the researcher needed to know how managers confidently provide human resource needs to support staff within these departments. The figures in form of a pie chart and tables were used to compare the sizes and show the frequencies and percentages of data collected on human resource needs and
employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. Figure 3 therefore shows the distribution of respondents by their respective departments:
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**Fig 3: Distribution of respondents by department**

Figure 3 reveals that 51 (32.08%) respondents were from the Maintenance Department. This was the highest number of respondents, followed by 45 (28.3%) respondents who were from Administration. Then 32 (20.13%) respondents were from Welfare department, 18 (11.32%) respondents were from Finance department and 13 (8.18%) respondents came from the Estates department. The results indicated to the researcher that the views collected were from a well distributed population that had the capacity of revealing satisfactory and reliable results. Other background information of respondents is presented in Table 2.
Table 2: Characteristics of respondents according to sex, age, length of service, highest level of education and marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>159</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years+</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>159</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 3 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 but &lt; 6 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 6 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>159</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest level of education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’ Level</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’ Level</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On job training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>159</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>159</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 2, the total sampled population was 159 with 57 (35.8%) of them being males and 102 (64.2%) females. This was in agreement with the records of the University secretary which shows that the university employs more women at the lower level of employment such as secretaries, library assistants, cleaners, cooks and the like. The researcher was interested in knowing the age of the respondents. This was because the older a person grows, the more the needs and interests the person develops. The age of the respondents was grouped as: below 30 years of age, between 30 and 39 years and
those above 40 years of age. It was found out that those respondents below 30 years of age were 39 (24.5%), followed by those between 30 and 39 who were 94 (59.1%) and respondents who were above 40 years of age were 26 (16.4%). This shows that the University mostly employs support staff who are middle aged.

Table 2 also shows that the support staff who have worked in the University for less than 3 years were 37 (23.3%) followed by those who have served in the University between 3 and 6 years, who were 69 (43.4%) and those respondents who have worked for above 6 years were 46 (28.9%). However, some support staff did not indicate how long they had served in the University and these accounted for (4.4%) of total respondents. The researcher was interested in knowing the length of service of the support staff because it would give clear information on how the respondents feel their human resource needs have been provided over the years of service; and also to find out whether the respondents have had sufficient time working in the University so that they would be able to tell and predict the challenges the University has gone through and how managers have treated them for long. In this case, the findings indicate that majority employees have served the University between three and six years implying that there were knowledge about the subjects under investigation.

With regard to the respondents highest level of education, respondents who had obtained ‘A’ ‘level certificate as their highest level of education were 53 (33.3%). This was the highest number of respondents followed by ‘O’ level certificate holders who made up 32 (20.1%). The diploma holders were 28 (17.6%), degree holders were 18 (11.3%), the
masters degree holders were 15 (9.4%). and the support staff found on job training were 8 (5.03%). However, those who did not indicate their highest level of education were 5 (3.1%). This means that the University employs qualified staff to help it run its activities. Marital status was categorized as single, married, divorced, separated and others. The researcher found out that those who are married were 86 (54.1%), followed by those who were single with 38 (23.9%) respondents. The respondents that were separated were 14 (8.8%), those divorced were 12 (7.5%) and the rest occupying 9 (5.7%) respondents. This means that the biggest percentage (54.1%) of the respondents working in the University was married. This implied that their needs could be diverse and the married are probably difficult to satisfy.

4.2 Section two: Responses on the independent variable and the dependent variable

This section shows the various responses of the respondents on the various items on the independent variable (workplace employee relations, employee need for development and need to provide job communication) and the dependent variable. Respondents were asked to tick on the option that best described their opinion.

4.2.1 Responses on the independent variable (need to provide workplace employee relations)

To obtain data, respondents were asked to respond to items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 in the questionnaire. The respondents opinions obtained were rated using a four point Likert
Scale ranging from 1 to 4 for strongly disagree to strongly agree respectively. The results obtained are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents by their responses on need to provide workplace employee relations at Makerere University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager allows me to participate decision making</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Am consulted for advice on how to solve problems in my department and improve performance</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager gives me freedom to use my own ideas in doing work</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I relate with fellow employees well in all departments</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I relate with my managers well and at all levels of departments</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 3, concerning responses on need to provide workplace employee relations, 1 (0.65%) support staff strongly agreed that the manager allows him or her to participate in decision making. On the respondents, 12 (7.5%) support staff agreed that they participate in decision making and this gave a total of 13 support staffs accepting that they participate in decision making. However, 78 (49.1%) support staffs strongly disagreed participating in decision making and 68 (42.8%) respondents also disagreed participating in decision making. This gave a total of 146 support staff disagreeing that they do not participate in decision making. This implied that managers are less involving employees in decision making. For those who were consulted for advice on how to solve problems in their department, only 2 (1.3%) strongly agreed. The 34 (20.9%) respondents only agreed that they are consulted for advice on how to solve problems in the department. This gives a total of 36 support staff accepting that managers consult them for advice on how to solve problems in their departments. Yet, about 43 (27.2%) strongly disagreed being consulted for advice on how to solve problems in the department and 80 (50.6%) of respondents too disagreed. A sum of 123 support staff is given indicating that they are not consulted for advice on how to solve problems in the department and improve performance.

However, majority of the respondents showed that they were given the freedom to use own ideas in doing work. Only eight (5.0%) respondents strongly agreed that managers provide the freedom to use own ideas in doing work, 78 (49.1%) agreed that freedom is provided to use own ideas in doing work. When the two percentages are summed up, 54.1% is given. On addition to the freedom they have, these respondents relate with
fellow employees well in all departments and this was shown by majority 113 (71.1%) respondents. Only 75 (47.1%) respondents strongly agreed that they relate with managers well in all departments although 84 (52.8%) respondents were against relating with managers well in all departments.

While in an interview with the administrators, the researcher found out that those managers in Makerere consulted the support staff. This was done through their representatives into the university administration. The administrators also revealed that there were also good working relations as employees in some departments were working hand in hand in order to reach at a goal. And through here, managers consulted the support staff where work may not have been done well and the support staff also consulted the managers where assistance was needed. Basing on the interview, still the administrators accepted that freedom was granted to the support staff in doing their work. Managers did not intervene in employees work except where the supports staff needed assistances. Majority respondents agreed that they were relating with fellow employees well. This was also true with the administrators that employees must have to be together in order to assist each other, share advice where required and this helped to maintain employees performance. From the observation done by the researcher, the researcher saw the support staff freely working in their offices without any interference from the administrators at that time. That implied to the researcher that freedom of doing work was truly given to the workers.
4.2.2 Responses on employee need for development

To obtain data, respondents were asked five elements related to employee need for development, to indicate whether: managers provide new training programs to help me do my job better; the manager carries out assessment programmes about my performance; the manager provides flexibility among employees to reduce boredom at workplace; manager provides the opportunity to talk to others, discuss, share views and plan effectively my job and the manager provides the opportunities to develop new skills for future use (items, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 in the questionnaire). The respondents opinion obtained were rated using a four point Likert Scale ranging from 1 to 4 for strongly disagree to strongly agree respectively. The results obtained are presented in Table 4.
Table 4: Distribution of respondents by their responses over employee need for development as at Makerere University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager provides new training programmes to help me do my job better</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager carries out assessment programmes about my performance</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager provides flexibility among employees to reduce boredom</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager provides the opportunity to talk to others, discuss, share views and plan effectively my job</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager provides the opportunities to develop new skills for future use</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4, concerning the results of the self administered questionnaire, the results were descriptively analysed. From the response of “whether the manager provides new training programmes to help do the job better”, 31 (19.9%) respondents agreed with it. Yet the majority, 128 (80.5%) respondents did not agree that manages provide new training programs to help them do their jobs better. In addition, 99 (62.3%) respondents accepted that assessment programmes about their performance are provided. Many
respondents, at least 118 (75.3%) showed that managers do not provide flexibility among them to reduce boredom. However, 41 (25.7%) respondents were against the suggestion that managers provide flexibility among them to reduce boredom. On the view that managers provide the opportunity to talk to others, discuss, share views and plan effectively their jobs, only 14 (8.8%) of the support staff strongly agreed. The results can be compared to the 109 (68.6%) who also agreed that they talk to others, discuss, share views and plan effectively their jobs, although 36 (22.6%) rejected it. However, many respondents 108 (66.9%) have shown that they have been able to prepare for their future using the skill obtained.

From the interviews and the discussions done with the administrators, it was found out that in some faculty departments, training was necessary. Departments needed people who are experienced and up to date. There was always the aim of bringing new knowledge or making new discoveries in faculties like the recent manufacture of a vehicle from Faculty of Technology of Makerere University. Training was therefore important. However the administrators accepted that not all support staff would receive training at a go. There were workshops and seminars organised where employees participate and get new ideas or friends of whom they would share ideas, discuss, share views and plan effectively their jobs. This was also true with some administrators who showed that they aimed at promoting team work, keep employees together and get good performance out of them. From the observation also, the researcher was able to see some support staff on job training in one faculty of technology. There were also opportunities for those who wanted to upgrade for example from having a certificate to a diploma, from
one degree to another, or to get certificates. The above findings therefore indicated to the researcher that though the managers in the University provided measures to develop employees, need for development on the part of the support staff was limited as the majority of the respondents did not match their interests with what the managers tried to provide.

4.2.3 Responses on need to provide job communication

To obtain data, respondents were asked four elements related to need to provide job communication, to indicate whether: managers provide information about new developments in the department; the manager provides job communication to help them become more confident, transparent and productive; the manager provides feedback about my performance and the manager listens to the problems I meet in my job and provides solutions (items, 17, 18, 19, and 20 in the questionnaire). The respondent’s opinions obtained were rated using a four point Likert Scale ranging from 1 to 4 for strongly disagree to strongly agree respectively. The results obtained are presented in Table 5.
Table 5: Distribution of respondents by their responses on need to provide job communication to the support staff of Makerere University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The manager provides information about developments in the department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The manager provides job communication to help me become more confident, transparent and productive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I get feedback about my performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The manager listens to the problems I meet in my job and provides solutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 5, 56 (34.8%) respondents agreed that managers provide information about new developments in the department, while the majority; that is, 103 (65.2%) respondents did not recognize that managers provide information about new developments. On the result that manager provides job communication to help employees become confident, only 8 (5.1%) of the respondents strongly agreed and 83 (52.5%) respondents agreed. This gave a total of 91 (57.6%) of the respondents accepting that managers provide job communication to help them become more confident. Most of the work of a manager in any organisation is communication but this shows that in Makerere, managers put less effort on communicating to the support staff. Regarding managers providing feedback about the performance, 4 (2.5%) of the support staff strongly agreed,
and 83 (52.2%) of the support staff agreed that managers provide feedback about their performance. This adds to a total of 87 (57.7%) of the respondents who showed that they get feedback about the performance.

However, 22 (13.8%) of the respondents strongly disagreed and 50 (31.4%) respondents disagreed that there is no feedback managers provide. This gives a total of 72 (45.2%) support staffs suggesting that managers do not provide feedback about their performance. Concerning the manager listening to the problems that the support staff have, the majority (105 or 66.1%) of the respondents did not agree that managers listen to employee’s problems to provide solutions. While 54 (33.9%) respondents, for them accepted that, managers listen to the problems they have and provide solutions. The above findings therefore indicated to the researcher that a bigger percentage of the support staff in Makerere was not happy with the way managers communicated with them. Yet if job communication was provided well, it would enable employees to determine their success or failure in the accomplishments of their tasks and also make them derive satisfaction from their activities.

During an interview with the administrators, it was revealed that communication was done well by the administrators. Every thing they did in the university depended on communication. This was done through written notices on the notice boards, through supervisors, through the support staff email addresses and telephone communication was also done. The managers insisted that all employees concerned received the information prepared for them at that time. That this communication mainly came when there were
changes that arose within the departments or call for meetings to have employees informed. From the support staff notice boards in some faculties, hall, and libraries, the researcher saw written communication pinned on the notice boards. This was mostly computer typed and printed work. Therefore the support staff who responded that they do not receive proper communication from the administrators may have given false information. Some administrators showed that it was communication which governed everything in the university. That it improved productivity and in case of any changes, consultation, discussions or problems, it had to be done through communication. Where communication was poorly done, productivity was also poor but in Makerere University, productivity was not poor because students are graduated each and every year.

4.3 Responses on the dependent variable (work productivity)

While obtaining data, respondents were asked four elements related to work productivity, and these were: “When am given accommodation at the University, am regular and punctual.”, “Non-Monetary rewards I receive from Managers motivate me to work more.”, “Desire for achievement and consolidation of my position into my department makes me regular and to work overtime.”, “When my work is appreciated and recognised, it motivates me to attend regularly, be punctual and complete duties in time” (items, 21, 22, 23, and 24 in the questionnaire). The respondent’s opinions obtained were rated using a four point Likert Scale ranging from 1 to 4 for strongly disagree to strongly agree respectively. The results obtained are presented in Table 6.
Table 6: Distribution of respondents according to their responses on work productivity at Makerere University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When am given accommodation at the University, am regular and punctual.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Monetary rewards I receive from Managers motivate me to work more.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for achievement and consolidation of my position into my department makes me regular and to work overtime.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my work is appreciated and recognised, it motivates me to attend regularly, be punctual and complete duties in time.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 6, the support staffs who accepted to be punctual when they are given accommodation by the university; they were 115 (72.1%) respondents. At least a good number of respondents, 128 (81%) accepted that the monetary rewards they receive form the managers motivate them to work more. Regarding other factors, a small percentage (36 or 21.7%) of respondents disagreed that desire for achievement and consolidation of
their positions into the department does not make me regular and to work overtime. However, many respondents showed that when their work was appreciated and recognised, it motivated them to attend regularly, be punctual and complete all duties in time and this gave a percentage of 57.9% of the respondents. Work productivity is a measure of organisations efficiency and effectiveness.

From the interview with the administrators, it was realised that the performance of some departments was not bad at all because sometimes the departments came up with new discoveries. Many students are graduated every year, new knowledge and new ideas are always created. Managers revealed that the support staffs have managed to work together for long and this had helped them to be punctual and to complete all their duties in time. However, managing time was still a very big problem to many support staff. Apart from the problems of coming late, some support staff made their work to be completed longer than the actual time expected to have it complete. The managers also accepted that very few non monetary rewards are given to the employees. This was because some rewards needed financial assistance which could not be available at sometime. While accommodation was provided to a few employees. This was because of the limited housing facilities which the university had, though allowances for accommodation were given. The researcher therefore realised that more effort would be reinforced to make all employees (support staff) work towards the success of the University and the loopholes that may affect the support staff’s performance should be eliminated.
4.4 Section Three: Verification of hypotheses

This part of the study presents the results of the administered study according to the study hypotheses. The presentation is therefore done in accordance with the research objectives. The composite indices for the independent and the dependent variable were computed by summing up all the varied responses intended to obtain respondents' opinions per each of the four variables (Workplace employee relations, employee need for development, need to provide job communication and employee work productivity). The justification for summing up these responses was that the researcher's method of analysis that is; Pearson product moment correlation coefficient necessitated data which is continuous.

Thus, it was important to turn the categorical data into continuous forms. In view of that, extreme positive responses that is; strongly agree were assigned the value of four and the extreme negative responses that is; strongly disagree were assigned the value of one. Composite indices were computed for the independent variable (human resource needs) and the dependent variable (employee work productivity) for statements of the questionnaire dealing with specific independent and dependent variables. As a result, the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used to measure the degree and direction of the relationship between two variables: human resource needs and employee work productivity. The analysis therefore involved testing the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.
4.4.1 Research hypothesis one

The first hypothesis was derived from the first objective and it was stated that ‘need to provide workplace employee relations is related with employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University’. The null hypothesis that was tested stated that ‘need to provide workplace employee relations is not related to employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. To find out whether the results obtained were significant, the researcher used the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient. The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used because the researcher wanted to establish whether there is a linear relationship between need to provide workplace employee relations and work productivity among the support staff of Makerere. The findings are therefore presented in Table 7.

Table 7: The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient showing the relationship between need to provide workplace employee relations and work productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need to provide workplace employee relations</th>
<th>Work productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.603**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**.correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From, Table 7 above, the results basically indicate a Pearson product moment correlation coefficient given as 0.603 that was calculated at a probability of 0.000 at a 0.05 level of significance. Since the calculated Pearson r. 0.603 is greater than 0.5, this means that
there is a significant relationship between need to provide workplace employee relations and work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. As such, the null hypothesis which states that need to provide workplace employee relations is not related to employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted.

4.4.2 Research hypothesis two

The second hypothesis was derived from the second objective and it was stated that ‘employee need for development is related to work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University’. The null hypothesis states that employee need for development is not related with employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University’. To verify this hypothesis and find out whether the results obtained were significant, the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was again used to find out whether employee need for development was linearly related with employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere. The results of the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient on the relationship between employee need for development and work productivity is presented in Table 8.
In Table 8, the results indicate the calculated Pearson product moment correlation coefficient of 0.615. This Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was greater than 0.5 at 0.05 level of significance. The results imply that there is a significant positive relationship between employee need for development and employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. This therefore implies that the null hypothesis be rejected and the research hypothesis upheld.

4.4.3 Research hypothesis three

The third hypothesis was derived from the third objective and it was stated that “need to provide job communication is related to employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University”. The null hypothesis was then stated that “need to provide job communication is not related with employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University”. To verify this hypothesis and find out whether the results obtained were significant, the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used to find out whether need to provide job communication was linearly related with
employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere. The results of the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient on the relationship between need to provide job communication and work productivity is presented in Table 9.

Table 9: The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient showing the relationship between need to provide job communication and work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Need to provide Job communication</th>
<th>Work productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to provide Job communication</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work productivity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.517**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**.correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From Table 9, the results indicate that the calculated Pearson product moment correlation coefficient obtained was 0.517 at the calculated probability value of 0.000. Since the calculated Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was greater than 0.5 at 0.05 level of significance, it implies that there was a significant positive relationship between need to provide job communication and employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. This therefore implies that the null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis accepted.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction
This chapter presents the discussion of the research findings and the results derived in chapter four. The findings are according to the research hypotheses that were obtained from the objectives. The study intended to find out the relationship between human resource needs and employee work productivity among the support staff. The discussions are done with reference to the research hypotheses and the relevant literature review. The discussion therefore leads to varying conclusions, recommendations and the identification of areas for further research.

5.1 Discussions
The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between human resource needs and employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. The following are the three research hypotheses that guide the study.

5.2.1 Objective one: To establish the relationship between the need to provide workplace relations and work productivity of the support staff of Makerere University

From the first objective of the study, the researcher developed the research hypothesis as ‘need to provide workplace employee relations are related with employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University’. In testing this hypothesis,
the results were verified using the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient. Following the results, the calculated Pearson product moment correlation coefficient of 0.603 was obtained and the probability calculated significance value of 0.000 was obtained. (Sig=0.000, a=0.05 (Table 7). Since the calculated significance value of 0.000 was smaller than the statistical level of significance of 0.05, this implies that the null hypothesis which states that ‘need to provide workplace employee relations is not related with employee work productivity’ is rejected and the research hypothesis is thus accepted. This therefore shows that there is a relationship between need to provide workplace employee relations and work productivity among the staff of Makerere University.

The results are also discussed in relation to the studies of other scholars elsewhere in other organisation environments on the same subject. Following data collected from the questionnaires, majority respondents indicated that they are not allowed to participate in decision making. Managers in Makerere do not involve employees in decision making process. Yet according to Saleemi (1997), employee involvement in decision making creates an environment in which employees have an impact on decisions and actions that affect their jobs. Other scholars like Desler (2003) argue that involving employees in decision making is not a goal nor is it a tool; it is a management and leadership philosophy about how people are most enabled to contribute to continuous improvement and the ongoing success of their work organization. From Desler’s view, it is the duty of the managers in Makerere to ensure that there is increased effectiveness of involving employees in decision making. This is because involving the support staff in decision
making can be a great aid in solving problems and their involvement can help improve relations between managers and the employees.

The larger number of respondents who disagreed that they are not consulted for advice on how to solve problems in the department and improve performance has shown that Makerere University managers had little interest in consulting employees. Saleemi (1997) believes that consulting employees (support staff in this study) keeps them happy at work, will keep them loyal and also keep them interested in the well being of the company. With this, it seemed that the employers in Makerere had not become so focused on the bottom line that they have forgotten that the people who work for them are people. This could be one of the reasons why work productivity among the support staff has reduced. Beardwell (2001) also questions that “if the company does not care about the well being of its employees, why should the employees care about the well being of the company?” Therefore consulting the support staff was much better than promising them.

The findings indicate that the managers in Makerere provided the support staff with enough freedom to use their own ideas in doing work. This was in line with Beardwell (2001) who found out that employers who treat their employees like equipment without regard for their feelings have no rights to demand loyalty, overtime, and dedication from their employees. Little (1987) also argues that employees should be given the freedom to do whatever they want, whenever they want, as long as the work gets done. With this view, Little gave an example that employees need the freedom, need to do their grocery shopping, organise their social life, book their holidays, surf the Internet, pay their bills
and then sit and gossip. All this makes for a happier person at work. The more the managers provide the freedom to the support staff in Makerere; this will increase their interaction, make them make their own decisions about the job and can yield good results at the end. It was also possible that some support staff may not have benefited from the freedom the managers provide to them. That was why some suggested that managers do not provide them with the freedom to use their own ideas.

Taking note from the current study, the support staff relations with fellow employees was positive. This indicated that team building among the support staff has helped to eliminate negative actions by fostering respect among employees. Analysing Kakomo (2005)'s view, that employee relations does not have to be management against staff. It can be a team effort if the employees are kept happy. According to Saleemi (1997), teams should be created to give team members the responsibility and power to solve problems, plan, and make their decisions. Armstrong (1999) argues that a manager creating an environment that fosters employee relations is a feeling of importance that increases morale, improves attendance rates and the employees feel like the company really needs their presence. If support staff in Makerere is allowed to work well as a team and feel as though they are part of an important whole, then they will be self motivated because they will enjoy what they do.

Basing on the findings of the current study, it can be expressed that the support staff relations with managers needs more attention. Although many of the support staff agreed that they relate with managers well, a good number of the support staff was against their
relations with managers. As Brewer (2000) found out that the nature of the relationship between a manager and employee is far more complex than the relationship with customers. Customers simply go off to competitors when the relationship is not working while unhappy employees can remain for long periods in the company. Kakomo (2005) too argues that for employee relations with managers to exist, there must be a relationship between two parties when: they feel close to each other, have rapport with each other, interact well, communicate, are sympathetic, responsive, and feel empathy with each other. If this was to exist in Makerere, then the University would keep happy support staff and who are contributors to the organisation goals. It was therefore true that the relationship between work place employee relations and work productivity among the support staff could never be denied.

5.2.2. Objective two: To find out the relationship between employee need for development and work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University

From the second objective of the study, the researcher developed the research hypothesis. The hypothesis stated that ‘employee need for development is related with employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. To test the hypothesis, the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used. From the calculated results, the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient of 0.615 was given and the probability calculated; that is, the significance value of 0.000 was obtained (Table 8). Since the calculated significance value of 0.000 obtained was smaller than the statistical significance p-value of 0.05, then, this implies that we reject the null hypothesis (which state that employee need for development is not related with employee work
productivity among the support staff of Makerere University) and accept the research hypothesis. This implies that there is a significant relationship between employee need for development and work productivity among the support staff in Makerere. Having obtained the results on employee need for development and work productivity of the support staff in Makerere, the results are discussed in relation to the findings of other researchers in other fields. In the study, it was revealed that majority of the support staff is not provided with new training programmes to help them do their jobs better. Amadro (2006) cited Morgan (1988) who found out that, managers should provide ways of developing and mobilizing the intelligence, knowledge and creative potentials of human beings at every level of the organisation so that their full potentials may be developed for better adaptations and flexibility. Basing on the current study, it is the duty of the manager at Makerere to ensure that there were development programs organised for the support staff. Saleemi (1997) also argues that if the support staff’s potentials are not fully developed, how then can they be as excellent as expected or as good as their counterparts in other departments?

Beardwell (2001) believes that employee need for development is an increasing focus of firms that are seeking to strategically sustain a competitive advantage. From Beardwell’s view, helping the support staff polish their crafts is one of the many things managers in Makerere could do to enhance their competitive advantage. Birungi (2002) encourages managers to consider employees need for development in connection with jobs that entail specialized skills or advanced degrees, to encourage organisation growth. If this is done in Makerere, then work productivity is likely to be enhanced.
The fact that managers in Makerere carry out assessment programmes about the support staff, it is also supported by Saleemi (1997) who argues that managers can not determine a person’s strengths and weaknesses simply by looking at him or her. And can not fully understand their own strengths and weaknesses without making the effort to recognize exactly what they are. Desler (2003) also believed that managing employee performance does not have to be an unpleasant experience. It could be a growing, rewarding experience for both the manager and the employee. While talking about assessment, Birungi (2002) found that attitudes, values, and capabilities are the most important elements to look for in an employee; it may be easier for managers in Makerere to polish knowledge and skills through support staff development programs than to polish a person's values and attitude. If there was a poor performance of the support staff, then the managers need to understand the problem first and then work through a process with the support staff so that the manager and the support staff can achieve a successful resolution.

The results also indicated that managers do not provide flexibility among employees to reduce boredom in the work place. Scholars like Cole (2001) argue that job rotations and delegating work to employees, increases employee’s experiences that appear to be growth in personal and interpersonal leadership, skills, knowledge and values. Owolabi (2000) argues that the outcomes from flexibility at work most typically include improvement in communication (listening, speaking, and writing) skills, sensitivity to and respect for others, team building skills, appropriate use of leadership styles, self-confidence, networking, planning, organizing, decision making and to broaden one's perspective
about the organisation. Owolabi also adds that such experiences can be got through job rotations and delegating work. Since experience is one of the best teachers, managers in Makerere should not find difficult in delegating work, providing job rotations / flexibility to the support staff so that they are able to develop their skill and broaden their opportunities. However, those support staff who disagreed that managers do not provide flexibility at work, Desler (2003) argues that they should never underestimate their abilities due to a lack of experience. Every great person in any field had to start somewhere without experience.

The study findings indicate that managers provide employees with the opportunity to talk to others discuss share views and plan effectively for their jobs. These findings are in line with the findings of Beardwell (2001), and Little (1987) who suggested that the best way to get and keep good employees is to treat them well. Letting the support staff make their choice is more profitable than deciding for them, and can yield good results.

A key lesson was that preparing for the future was a responsibility that organizations can discharge effectively if they combine insights with practical knowledge of executive leadership and the dynamics of policy change (Cushway, 1994). The support staff of Makerere showed that managers provide the opportunity to develop new skills for future use. This is in line with Saleemi (1997) who suggested that it was important for managers to encourage employees to learn what he or she needs to know in order to plan for a successful transition. Since career success was important, Saleemi argues that all employees (support staff) want jobs that develop their skills and advance their careers. As
such, the support staff and the managers should agree on a personal development plan to increase their skills and effectiveness. The conclusion could therefore be drawn that employee need for development was related with work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. This was because basing on the findings of the study and other scholars, continuous growth is necessary for each individual, as accomplishment of performance goals without completion of a development plan does not constitute adequate performance by either the support staff or their managers.

5.2.3 Objective three: To find out the relationship between need to provide job communication and work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University

From the third objective of the study, the researcher developed the research hypothesis. The hypothesis states that ‘need to provide job communication is related with employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. To test the research hypothesis, the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used. From the calculated results, the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient of 0.517 was given and the probability calculated, that is, the significance value of 0.000 was obtained (Table 9). Since the calculated significance value of 0.000 obtained was smaller than the statistical significance of 0.05, then, this implies that the null hypothesis be rejected (which states that need to provide job communication is not related with employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University) and accept the research hypothesis.
The results are related to the findings of other researchers in other fields. It was found out that need to provide job communication is considered to be the most important function of the manager. Effective management was a function of effective communication. Majority of the respondents showed that managers rarely listen to employee’s problems, yet Cole (2001) suggests that effective listening was a learned skill. It is not inherited. Managers therefore need to be good listeners. Desler (2003) believed that elements such as employees avoiding the manager, change of behaviours of workers and when employees begin to write anonymous documents can show that a manager is not a good listener. Owolabi (2000) argues that organisations require successful communication of information between employees, supervisors and managers. While Saleemi (1997) suggests that delivering effective feedback enables employees to determine their success or failure in the accomplishment of their tasks and derives satisfaction from their activities. The University managers should also understand that it is through feedback that workers become aware of their own duties and responsibilities as well as instructions from the upper levels of management. This is true with Kigundu (1995) who argued that employees who receive information regarding how to do their own work are found to be higher performers than those with little or no information.

Communication was always a problem in many organisations mainly because the theme of communication is always underrated. Worth while communication aims at improving industrial climate and also reduces suspicion, distrust and antagonism (Desler, 2003). Communicating to support staff is the activity that managers could do a better job. Desler also states that informed employees make better decisions. If communication is done well
in Makerere among the support staff, then there would be better customer service, morale, productivity and ultimately increased development. Saleemi (1997) argues that the option that may be the most crucial to managers is showing appreciation for a job well done. Bratton (1999) noted that many managers are quick to be critical of employee mistakes, but slow to give praise. About 80% of communication with an employee should be praise. To Bratton, giving praise to employees in front of a group is something most employees love. The number one thing that most employees look for in a job is appreciation for a job well done. Many managers give criticism to the employees in their office. The problem with this is that any time the employee is called to the office, they know ‘what is coming’. Managers should make sure that employees are given praise in the office or wherever they receive criticism. Kigundu (1995) also believes that communication if provided well improves productivity by developing and maintaining good human relations in the organisation.

From the views of different scholars that have been expressed above in relation to the findings of the study, the researcher therefore calls for managers to continue improving communication to employees as it is related with employees work productivity. Proper communication eliminates delays, misunderstanding confusion, distortions and bottlenecks and improves coordination and control.
5.3 Conclusion

From the data collected and the discussion done, the following conclusions have been made. These have been guided by the hypotheses of the study.

1. From the summary of findings, need to provide workplace employee relations are related with employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. This meant that managers have tried to create an environment that fosters employee – employer relations and relations with fellow employees. Although some employees were unhappy about the relations within the departments, work productivity was still achieved.

2. Responses from the participants showed that there was a relationship between employee need for development and work productivity among the support staff. This showed that managers in Makerere University have upgraded the employee's knowledge, skills, and abilities, through having development programmes like training, assessment, job rotations, attending workshops and seminars; which have enabled the support staff to develop new skills, confidence and gain experience that helps them to improve productivity.

3. Need to provide job communication was related with employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. This meant that managers have taken employees into confidence, making them more knowledgeable about problems and policies of the organisation and keep the organisation trouble free.
Therefore employees such as the support staffs had obtained the necessary information about the different aspects within their departments.

5.4 Recommendations

1. It was recommended that managers should strengthen employee relations by allowing the support staff to join and be active in clubs and groups, be able to talk to others, visit other departments and faculties to share knowledge and experience in doing work. This would help in achieving more results from the employees.

2. Some support staff do not know well they have been performing all the years. After appraisal, managers should bring back the results to let them know their future level of effort, activities, results and task direction. Where performance exceeds expectations, the performance management system could include rewards or incentives that will motivate the support staff to perform better.

3. Managers should continue using supervisors to pass information to the support staff. The supervisors are more nearer to the employees and this will help reduce the inadequacies that may exist while communicating.
5.5 **Areas of further research**

1. There is need to find out how each level of Maslow’s theory is being applied to gain job satisfaction among employees.

2. More study should be carried out to find out the level of employee development programmes among the support staff in Makerere University.

3. Further research should be done to investigate how other factors part from providing human resource needs have affected performance of the support staff in Makerere University.
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APPENDIX A

TIME FRAME

The table below shows the chronology of events and the period of carrying out the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the proposal</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconnaissance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data entry and tabulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation report writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the final report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

### BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pens</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencils</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ream of papers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter books</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diskettes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfing</td>
<td>60 hours</td>
<td>50/= per minute</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparations for the proposal</td>
<td>8 copies</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing 1st draft proposal</td>
<td>1 copy</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing final proposal</td>
<td>3 copies</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing 1st copy of questionnaire</td>
<td>1 copy</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying questionnaires</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot test and pre test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and tabulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport to and from in faculties, schools and halls of residence</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and synthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing first draft dissertation</td>
<td>1 copy</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing second draft dissertation</td>
<td>2 copies</td>
<td>6,5000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing final copy</td>
<td>6 copies</td>
<td>60,000 each</td>
<td>360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport to and from Masaka to Kampala</td>
<td>8 trips</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding while in Kampala</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>532,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation while in Kampala</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 x 3 months</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport of research assistant to and from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation + Travel expenses to and from consultants office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up keep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,990,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All amounts are in Ugandan Shillings.
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE ON HUMAN RESOURCE NEEDS AND EMPLOYEE WORK PRODUCTIVITY FOR SUPPORT STAFF OF MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

Dear respondent,

I am a student conducting an academic study as a partial requirement that leads to the award of a degree. This questionnaire is seeking answers on human resource needs and employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. You have been chosen because you do a great job in determining the success, performance and running of University activities at all levels. You are kindly requested to honestly put a tick or fill in your answers where appropriate. All answers in this questionnaire will be kept very confidential and used only for academic purposes. I therefore kindly request you to truly answer this questionnaire within two weeks so that I may proceed with my study. Thank you.

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

GITTA ERIC,

The researcher.

Section: A. Personal information

Please tick your appropriate choice

1. Department.
   
   Administration ☐  Finance ☐  Welfare ☐  Maintenance ☐  Estates ☐

2. Sex . Male ☐  Female ☐
3. Age, below 30 years ☐, 30 but below 40 years ☐, 40 years and above ☐.


5 Length of service in Makerere University.
   Below 3 years ☐, 3 years but below 6 years ☐, above 6 years ☐.

6 Your highest education level. Certificate, O’ level ☐, A’ level ☐, on job training ☐.
   Diploma ☐ Degree ☐ Masters ☐

Section B: Independent Variable: Human resource needs

Please tick the appropriate choice in the answer box provided

B 1. Need to provide workplace employee relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 The manager allows me to participate in decision making at all levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Am consulted for advice on how to solve problems in my department and improve the organisations performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The manager gives me the freedom to use my own ideas in doing work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I relate with fellow employees well in all departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I relate with my managers well and at all levels of departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# B 2 Employee need for development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 The manager provides new training programmes to help me do my job better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 The manager carries out assessment programmes about my work performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 The manager provides flexibility among employees to reduce boredom at workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Manager provides the opportunity to talk to others, discuss, share views and plan effectively my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 The manager provides the opportunities to develop new skills for future use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# B 3 Need to provide job communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 The manager provides information about new developments in the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 The manager provides job communication to help me become more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
confident, transparent and productive

| 19 | I get feedback about my performance |
| 20 | The manager listens to the problems I meet in my job and provides solutions |

**Section C: Dependent Variable: Work productivity**

C1 Please tick the appropriate choice in the answer box provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 When am given accommodation at the University, am regular and punctual.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Non-Monetary rewards I receive from Managers motivate me to work more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Desire for achievement and consolidation of my position into my department makes me regular and to work overtime.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 When my work is appreciated and recognised, it motivates me to attend regularly, be punctual and complete duties in time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW GUIDE ON HUMAN RESOURCE NEEDS AND EMPLOYEE WORK PRODUCTIVITY FOR SUPPORT STAFF OF MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

Interview guide for the administrators and managers

Dear respondent,

I am a student conducting an academic study as a partial requirement that leads to the award of a degree. This interview is seeking answers on human resource needs and employee work productivity among the support staff of Makerere University. You have been chosen because you are the one managing these support staff. You are kindly requested to honestly answer my questions through an interview. All answers in this interview will be kept very confidential and used only for academic purposes.

GITTA ERIC,
The researcher.

Questions

1. Comment on the relationship between employees and employers. Then employees and fellow employees.

2. Comment on the productivity/performance of the support staff in your unit/department.

3. What is the relationship between workplace employee relations and productivity?
4. What is your response of employees as regards to training, orientation, other development initiatives?

5. What is the relationship between employees need for development and productivity?

6. Comment on the communication between managers and employees.

7. What is the relationship between communication in your department and employees productivity?

END
APPENDIX E

ANALYSIS

Fig: Distribution of respondents by department
Table...: Background information of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>count</th>
<th>Col %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years+</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 3 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 but &lt; 6 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 6 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest level of education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O' Level</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A' Level</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On job training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variation in work productivity in relation to gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work productivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.2632</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9.4314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effect of age on work productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F-static</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.6923</td>
<td>3.120</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>9.6596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years+</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.3462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>9.3711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The effect of marital status on work productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F-static</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.2432</td>
<td>2.24110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9.6706</td>
<td>1.80204</td>
<td>1.686</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0909</td>
<td>1.64040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.6923</td>
<td>2.17503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3750</td>
<td>2.87539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>9.4481</td>
<td>2.01641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effect of length of service on work productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>length of service</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>F-static</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 3 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.0270</td>
<td>2.20462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 but &lt; 6 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.4348</td>
<td>1.99616</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 6 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.7391</td>
<td>1.89074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2546</td>
<td>2.88542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>9.4276</td>
<td>2.02174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effect of education level on work productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F-static</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O' Level</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.2500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A' Level</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9.3019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On job training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.6429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0556</td>
<td>2.242</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.1333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>9.4481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Col %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager allows me to participate decision making</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Am consulted for advice on how to solve problems in my department and improve performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager gives me freedom to use my own ideas in doing work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I relate with fellow employees well in all departments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I relate with my managers well and at all levels of departments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Responses on employee need for development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>count</th>
<th>Col %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager provides new training programmes to help me do my job better</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager carries out assessment programmes about my performance</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager provides flexibility among employees to reduce boredom</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager provides the opportunity to talk to others, discuss, share views and plan effectively my job</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager provides the opportunities to develop new skills for future use</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Responses on need to provide job communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Col %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The manager provides information about developments in the department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager provides job communication to help me become more confident, transparent and productive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get feedback about my performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager listens to the problems I meet in my job and provides solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responses on work productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Col %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carry out all my duties normally through out the week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always punctual at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I complete all my duties in time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dedicate extra hours to my job every week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F
CORRELATIONS

Table...: Relationship between need to provide Work place employee relations and Work productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Need to provide Work place employee relations</th>
<th>Work productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to provide Work place</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.603**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee relations</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work productivity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.603**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**.correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table...: Relationship between employee need for development and Work productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employee need for development</th>
<th>Work productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee need for development</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.615**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work productivity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.615**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**.correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table...: Relationship between need to provide job communication and Work productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Need to provide Job communication</th>
<th>Work productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to provide Job</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.517**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work productivity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.517**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**.correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
## APPENDIX G
### RELIABILITY OF THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

#### Reliability Statistics of the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.854</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Item Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager allows me to participate decision making</td>
<td>1.2143</td>
<td>.42582</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am consulted for advice on how to solve problems in my department and improve performance</td>
<td>1.7143</td>
<td>.72627</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager gives me freedom to use my own ideas in doing work</td>
<td>2.9286</td>
<td>.73005</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I relate with fellow employees well in all departments</td>
<td>3.1429</td>
<td>.53452</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I relate with my managers well and at all levels of departments</td>
<td>2.7143</td>
<td>.72627</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager provides new training programmes to help me do my job better</td>
<td>1.3571</td>
<td>.49725</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager carries out assessment programmes about my performance</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>.75955</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager provides flexibility among employees to reduce boredom</td>
<td>2.9286</td>
<td>.73005</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager provides the opportunity to talk to others, discuss, share views and plan effectively my job</td>
<td>2.9286</td>
<td>.61573</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager provides the opportunities to develop new skills for future use</td>
<td>3.0714</td>
<td>.73005</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager provides information about developments in the department</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>.75955</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager provides job communication to help me become more confident, transparent and productive</td>
<td>2.7857</td>
<td>.69929</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get feedback about my performance</td>
<td>2.7857</td>
<td>.57893</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager listens to the problems I meet in my job and provides solutions</td>
<td>2.2143</td>
<td>.69929</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out all my duties normally through out the week</td>
<td>2.7857</td>
<td>.42582</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always punctual at work</td>
<td>3.1429</td>
<td>.36314</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I complete all my duties in time</td>
<td>3.2143</td>
<td>.42582</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dedicate extra hours to my job every week</td>
<td>2.2143</td>
<td>.97496</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary Item Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Means</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Maximum / Minimum</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.563</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The formula to be used will be as follows:

$$\alpha = \frac{K}{K-1} \left[1 - \frac{1}{\sum SD_i} \right]$$

Where $\alpha$ alpha coefficient.

$K$ = number of items in the instrument.

$\sum$ = Summation sign.

$SD_i$ = standard deviation within each item.

$SD_t$ = Total standard deviation.