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Abstract
The objective of this study was to determine the effect of external dimension on performance of academic staff in selected public universities in Kenya. The study was anchored on individual level performance model. Descriptive cross sectional research design was used to obtain data concerning the current status of external dimension and performance of academic staff variables. The target population constituted 7143 academic staff from six purposefully selected public universities that included; University of Nairobi, Moi university, Kenyatta university, Egerton university, Jomo Kenyatta university of Agriculture and Technology and Maseno university. A sample size of 379 academic staff was randomly selected using proportionate random and systematic sampling. A semi-structured questionnaire in Survey Monkey format was used to collect data. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were used. The study hypotheses were tested at 95% confidence level. The results indicate that internal dimension has a statistically significant effect on performance of academic staff. The study suggests that future research should focus on broadening external dimension study to other dimensions that constitute workforce diversity. More research should also be undertaken in other industries for further generalization of findings to broad sectors.
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1.1 Introduction
Technological advancement and growth of the global economy has necessitated the engagement of various groups of employees in public and private organizations. Given this fact, organizations have continuously invested in mechanisms that lead to better performance (Mathis & Jackson, 2010). Further, the need to attract and retain the best pool of talented employees to maintain competitive advantage has made organizations draw from a wide selection of employees leading to workforce diversity (Beardwell, Holden & Claydon, 2004).

Historically, individual employee performance and overall organization performance is affected by the richness of diversity or the lack of it, given that employees provide key resource competences (Armstrong, 2014). As organizations become highly heterogeneous, with a varied composition of employees in terms of age, gender, physical ability and work experience; there are implications towards management practices and policies. Today’s managers have a responsibility to encompass the broad individual characteristics to the needs of customers who are diverse (Ashikali & Groeneveld, 2015). Therefore, excellent employee responsiveness, provision of good quality services and effective support of organizational processes and systems is a major goal for the organization towards being an employer of choice.

Human resource managers are continuously involved in management of workforce diversity to increase productivity of the individual employees, the organization’s groups and the whole organization. Previous literature indicates that proper implementation of human resource practices can be linked to overall organization efficiency and effectiveness (Armstrong 2014, Ployhart & Moliterno, 2011). Moreover, the appropriate execution of workforce diversity initiatives enables employees to rate HR management practices positively by showing corporate citizenship behaviours desired in firms (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004; Wright & Nishii, 2006).

1.1.1 Employee Performace
Organizations eager to work with a diverse workforce pursue internal management and human resource (HR) practices that promote and take advantage of the potency and benefits of workforce diversity. This is done through accounting for performance related aspects of diversity, Ashikali and Groeneveld, (2015) and making use of the knowledge, skills and abilities of a diverse workforce. In
addition, organizations also conscientiously recruit and strive to retain a diverse workforce, implement anti discriminatory policies and practices and undertake diversity management training to reduce the interpersonal tensions and conflicts that often crop up as a result of increased workforce diversity (Edmund, Randall & Liang, 2012).

However, although the performance of academic staff is very important, academic staff might be facing challenges (Selmer, Lauring & Jonasson, 2013). There are many obstructions to research productivity leading to low levels of research outcomes (Lertputtarak, 2008). Research and scientific publishing by faculty over the last few years has dropped sharply due to heavy teaching responsibilities brought about by the ever increasing students joining universities, taking up of part time opportunities to supplement the meager pay and a faculty not particularly enthusiastic in carrying out research or publishing research work (Chacha, 2014). Effectiveness of the performance of academic staff in terms of quality teaching and research is of critical importance to HIL stakeholders. Indeed, HIL are human-capital intensive organizations with 80 per cent of their budgets related to personnel (Chacha, 2014).

In Kenya, academic performance metrics overlap with overcapacity student enrollments, low university funding and staff retention problems all contributing to inefficiency and falling academic standards (Chacha, 2014). Higher education managements find it crucial to take into consideration the shifting staff demographics, new technologies and the commercialization of higher education (Migosi, Muola & Maithya 2012). Therefore to support academic performance in universities, the government ought to increase support towards research activities in terms of budgetary allocations, ICT facilities and training programmes on statistical analysis, integration of research-based evidence in policy formulation and pedagogy and increased participation in applied research in order to improve research activities among the teaching fraternity (Wambua, 2016).

Poor performance of the public sector in the management of public resources led to the introduction of performance contracting in public service in the financial year 2005/2006. A performance contract is a written agreement between the government and a state agency delivering services to the public wherein quantifiable targets are explicitly specified and performance measured against agreed targets (Wambua, 2014). Kenya introduced performance contracting not only to improve service delivery but also to refocus the mind set of public service away from an inward looking culture to a business focused culture (Wambua, 2014). It is postulated that performance can be measured and shortfalls identified, in order for appropriate actions to be undertaken to improve performance (Jones & Thompson, 2007). Several performance measures have been developed by various industries. This study adopted the performance contracting measures for university academic staff that include teaching, research and innovation, community service and administrative work as outlined in their performance contracts.

1.1.2 External dimension
Gardenswartz and Rowe (2008) grouped workforce diversity into four dimensions; personality, internal, external and organizational dimension as indicated in Figure1.1.
As presented in Figure 1.1, external dimension also known as secondary dimension include; geographic location, income, personal habits, recreational habits, religion and spirituality, educational background, work experience, appearance, parental status and marital status.

External dimension comprise of characteristics that can be easily changed by an employee (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 2008), such as income, education and training, communication style, ethnic customs, religious beliefs and/or relationship status. Alexander et al., (1995) (as cited in Muhammad, Metz and Kulik, 2015) indicate that high intensity of education diversity and work experience diversity in organizations lead to high levels of employee turnover and poor performance.

Workforce diversity and especially external dimension, is progressively increasing in many Kenyan organizations (Kinyanjui, 2013). However, external dimension diversity solely doesn’t guarantee higher performance, there is need to also value and manage these diversities (Beardwell & Claydon, 2004). Nyambegera (2002) points out that even with the rigorous efforts to invest in workforce diversity management in order to improve employee performance firms’ rarely achieve the expected benefits.

1.1.3 Public Universities in Kenya
There are thirty chartered public universities in Kenya (CUE, 2017). A public university is a university established, assisted, maintained and run using public funds (CUE, 2017). It is important to point out the rapid growth in universities in Kenya between the years 2010-2015, where numbers of public universities in Kenya significantly increased. There were eight public universities in Kenya by the year 2012. In 2013 an additional fourteen universities were chartered to full public university status (The 2015/16 Kenya integrated household budget survey, 2018). By 2017, there were 30 public universities (CUE, 2017). During this period, the students numbers sky rocketed to 443,783, with Kenyatta University having the highest number of students at approximately 76,000.
students in the different modes of study that is Full time, Part time, Institutional based and Distant learning modes.

The rapid growth through expansion of campuses before the year 2017, led to the increase in recruitment of additional academic staff to cater for the ever growing demand for university education in Kenya (CUE, 2017). To substitute the trained academicians in the academic section, there was an increase in the teaching assistant, graduate assistants and tutorial fellow positions where training and research was emphasized. Most of these positions were filled by young people who in the course of training grow through the ranks to professorship. Universities are also employing a number of its academic staff on contractual basis (Ministry of Education Science and Technology, 2015). In addition, unlike the civil service where the retirement age is 60 years, retirement age for university academic staff is 70 years. Consequently, universities have a large portion of its staff comprising older/senior academic staff. However, this trend changed in late 2017 where students’ numbers dropped significantly leading to closure of various public university campuses due to low capitation and CUE recommendations. In addition, there have been some shortcomings in terms of low academic staff numbers, low quality assurance and minimum university requirement challenges by some of the universities. To counter this, the commission of higher education (CUE) has been inspecting the campuses to check on their viability and to ensure they have equipments and facilities required in the delivery of the universities mandate (CUE, 2017). CUE in 2017 gave various recommendations among others the closure of various university campuses that did not meet the minimum requirements.

Increased demands by the government, through its various arms such as; Commission of Higher Education (CUE), Kenya National Qualification Authority (KNQA) and Ministry of Education (MOE), on public universities has led to increased strain on academic staff. In addition, the need to adopt quality teaching and research systems, pressure to adopt technological teaching methodologies in developing and delivering of curriculums, multiple concurrent programs of study in the universities all mounts increased pressure on the individual lecturers resulting to decreasing performance (KNQA, 2014). Concerns have been raised about the capacity of universities to maintain teaching, research productivity and service to the community (CUE, 2008; Migosi, Muola & Maithya, 2012). Moreover, the commission for university education CUE (2008) points out that there is little attention and effort directed towards quality in terms of research and publication while lots of attention is on commercialization and numbers of graduates produced.
1.2 Theoretical Literature Review

1.2.1 Individual Level Performance Model

Campbell (1990) identified three elements of individual performance that is declarative, procedural and motivation elements as shown in Figure 2.1.

Figure 1.2: Campbell’s Determinants of Job Performance

Source: Campbell, McCloy, Oppler & Sager (1993).

Figure 1.2 shows that declarative elements include goals, principles and task requirements; these are non-task specific behaviors that give an understanding of specific task requirements. On the other hand procedural elements include cognitive skills, psychomotor skills, self-management skills and interpersonal skills. These are task specific behaviours that aid an employee in knowing how a task is to be performed (Motowidlo & Kell, 2012). Both declarative and procedural elements are affected by an employee’s experience, education, training and interests. Both elements are task specific behaviors or substantive tasks that individuals undertake and that differentiate one job from another. Motivation is the third element of individual performance. Thus, performance in each of the behavioral areas described in Campbell’s model can be defined according to the expected values of all the behaviors that fall under the same behavioral category (Motowidlo & Kell, 2012). This model relates to this study as external dimension variables including education, training and experience are highlighted as important components of individual performance.

1.2.2 Empirical Literature Review

Lauring and Selmer (2013); Gardenswartz and Rowe (2008); Kinicki (2008) in their studies highlight the external dimensions as religion, marital status, educational background and work experience. These are characteristics that individuals adopt, drop, or change through conscious choice and purposeful intentions. This dimension is considered less significant in terms of its ability
to lead to employees feeling disadvantaged in terms of employment prospects and relationships in the workplace (Porter et al.; 2008; Tariq, 2010; Lauring & Selmer, 2013).

A study by Mustafa (2013) on U.S. Navy officers who joined between the years 1976 and 1985 found out that married males officers achieve higher performance than single male officers and that male officers performance also increase as the number of dependents increases. An earlier study by Becker (1981) indicated that marriage is economically beneficial since creates greater specialization possible. In that the married workers are able to specialize in the work places while their spouses specialize in domestic activities. Marriage causes the higher earning spouse, mostly the male, to spend more time in the workplace, while the low earning spouse, mostly the wife, spends most time in domestic work.

However, Padmanabhan and Magesh (2016) in their inquiry on the difference between employees’ marital status and performance level in information technology industry, using a sample of 500 randomly sampled employees, found out that married employee’s performance was worse than unmarried employees. This is because married employees have got more commitments to their families and other work life balance issues as compared to their unmarried counterparts. Mustafa (2013) empirical study asserts that women experience lower job participation rates due to the higher responsibilities they have in bearing and raising children. Consequently women have less incentive to devote as much time and energy to work as men. Hoobler, Wayne and Lemmon, (2009) indicate that single women are more suitable for employment compared to married women. However, although single women seem more employable than married women, it might also be a source of prejudice and favoritism toward them, from anticipation that they have fewer social responsibilities outside the workplace and therefore don’t require lots of flexibility (Jordan & Zitek, 2012).

Religion and spirituality brings forth strong communication and interpersonal relationships among employees in organizations. A culture of individual support, connectedness with self and others creates intrinsic motivation, eventually leading to a competitive organization with contented work force (Muli, Muathe & Muchiri, 2014). Dean and Fornaciari, (2009) are in support that humanistic work environment promotes optimal employees productivity. Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2004) indicate that religion in an organization is concerned with a sense of service, connectedness, morality, an inner life recognition, supporting a strong organizational culture, feeling of completeness and joy, thrilling meaning and purpose for work which are important prerequisites in any organizational performing culture (Kinjerski & Skrypenek, 2004).

Osman-Gani, Hashim and Ismail (2013) study that adopted religiosity personality index, spirituality involvement and beliefs scale and performance measures reported that religiosity and spirituality have a significant positive relationship with job performance. Moreover, religiosity and spirituality was found to not only benefit individuals, but also the society in general. Additional research from other theorists has indicated that organizations that embrace and foster spirituality in the workplace experience better productivity levels (Garcia-Zamor, 2003). There is also reduction of stress among employees, improved employee relations, increased job satisfaction and improved performance (Marques, 2007).

Prayer activities reduces labour turnover while increasing employees drive and productivity while reducing employee turnover (McCarty, 2007). These results corroborate earlier researches on the existence of a significant positive relationship between spirituality and employee commitment, ethical behaviour and performance (Estes, 2005). In a review of 140 articles, Karakas (2010) reported that organizational performance is supported by workplace spirituality. Østergaard, Timmermans and Kristinsson (2011) report that greater education diversity increases the chances that the groups will generate new ideas that aid in research and scientific
performance. A broader base of knowledge is created by greater educational diversity leading to improved performance, creativity and innovation. Dahlin et al., (2005) points out that an increase in educational diversity has a positive effect on the decisions made by teams with an exception of the very diverse teams. Østergaard et al., (2011) supports this by indicating that educational diversity enhances information sharing and use while too much education diversity decreases the ability of employees to share and use information in turn increasing costs of coordination and communication.

1.3 Research Design
This study used descriptive and cross sectional research designs. Descriptive research design is used to obtain information concerning the current status of a phenomenon, to describe what exists with respect to variables or conditions in a situation (Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). Cross sectional studies enable the researcher to establish whether significant associations among variables exist at some point in time (Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008).

1.4 Empirical Model
Simple regression analysis was used to determine the influence of internal dimension on performance of academic staff. With resulting model

\[ \text{PAS} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{ED} + \varepsilon \]

Where;

\[ \beta_0 = \text{Constant} \]
\[ \beta_1 = \text{Beta Co-efficient} \]
\[ \varepsilon = \text{Error term} \]

3.6 Target Population
These are the entire individuals to be studied (Kombo, 2006). Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) define population as an entire group of individuals or objects having common observable characteristics. The unit of analysis was 7143 academic staff (from six selected universities) in different strata that included Professors, Associate Professors, Senior Lectures, Lecturers, Assistant Lecturers, Tutorial Fellows, Graduate Assistants and Teaching Assistants as presented in Table 1.1. The researcher targeted academic staff members since they perform the core function of public universities which is dissemination of knowledge through teaching, research and innovation, community service and administrative work thus, possess sufficient knowledge on issues under investigation (Gardiner & Leat, 2001; Bontis, Crossan & Hulland, 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Academic staff Strata</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Senior Lecturers</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>3104</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturers</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tutorial Fellows</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teaching Assistants</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7143</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CUE (2017).1.5 Sampling Design and Procedure
This research adopted multiple sampling techniques. This technique allows a researcher effectively answer the research objectives (Teddlie & Yu, 2007). Six universities that had existed for the past ten years were purposefully selected. These were established institutions that had solid structures related to workforce diversity and performance measurement. They included; Nairobi, Moi, Kenyatta, Egerton, Jomo Kenyatta University of agriculture and technology and Maseno University. To calculate the sample size, this study utilized Yamane (1967) formula as also used by Muli, Muathe and Muchiri (2014) in their study.

\[
n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}
\]

Where

- \( n \) = Sample size
- \( N \) = Population size (7143)
- \( e \) = Level of precision or sampling error (0.05)

\[
n = \frac{7143}{1+ 7143 (0.05)^2}
\]

\[
n = 379
\]

Further, Table 1.2 presents the sample; proportionate stratified random sampling technique was utilized to select a sample of 379 academic staff from the target population of 7143 academic staff. The sample was drawn from various strata. These strata included Professors, Associate Professors, Senior Lectures, Lecturers, Assistant Lecturers, Tutorial Fellows, Graduate Assistants and Teaching Assistants. Systematic sampling was then applied to pick the final respondent where the \( n_{th} \) academic staff was selected from the sampling frame obtained from different universities human resource information management system (HRIMS). The \( n_{th} \) number was obtained by dividing the population from every academic staff cadre by the sample size of that cadre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Academic Staff Position / Strata</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Senior Lecturers</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>3104</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturers</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tutorial Fellows</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teaching Assistants</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7143</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1.6 Research Findings

The regression results are presented in Table 1.3.
Table 1.3: Regression of external dimension on performance of academic staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th><strong>Sum of Squares</strong></th>
<th><strong>df</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mean Square</strong></th>
<th><strong>F</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sig.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>10.354</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.354</td>
<td>31.993</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Residual</td>
<td>86.086</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96.440</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th><strong>Unstandardized Coefficients</strong></th>
<th><strong>Standardized Coefficients</strong></th>
<th><strong>T</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sig.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td><strong>Std. Error</strong></td>
<td><strong>Beta</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.215</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 External dimension</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>5.656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Dependent Variable: PAS  
<sup>b</sup>Predictors: (Constant), External dimension

Source (Author, 2018)

The regression results in Table 1.3 indicate that 10.7% of variance in performance of academic staff was explained by external dimension when all other factors are constant ($R^2=0.107$). This implies that external dimension is a weak predictor of performance of academic staff. The overall model was statistically significant ($F=31.993$, $P<0.05$). The beta coefficients indicate that the influence of external dimension on performance of academic staff was statistically significant ($\beta=0.328$, $T=5.656$, $P<0.05$). This suggests that one unit change in external dimension is associated with 0.328 change in performance of academic staff. We reject the null hypothesis since the results provide evidence that external dimension influences performance of academic staff. This cooperates with Horwitz and Horwitz (2007) study that concluded there was a positive impact of task-related diversity on both quality and quantity of team performance.

The finding concurs with Mustafa (2013); Padmanabhan and Magesh (2016) studies that found out that marital status affects performance. Muli, Muathe & Muchiri, (2014) found that religion and spirituality bring forth strong communication and interpersonal relationships among employees leading to a competitive organization with contented work force. While also Osman-Gani, Hashim and Ismail (2013) study that reported religiosity and spirituality have a significant positive relationship with job performance. McCarty, (2007); Karakas (2010) indicated that prayer activities improve employee morale and productivity. In addition, Østergaard, Timmermans and Kristinsson (2011); Dahlin et al., (2005) are in agreement that educational diversity enhances performance.

Therefore, managers should consider external dimension of diversity such as religion, marital status, education background and work experience as possible avenues that can be utilized to increase performance of employees.
1.7 Conclusion and Recommendation
To establish whether there was a relationship existing between external dimension and performance of academic staff, a Pearson coefficient was established. The correlation analysis showed that there was a positive but weak relationship between external dimension and performance of academic staff. The test of significance also proved existence of a significant statistical relationship between external dimension and performance of academic staff. Therefore performance of employees is affected by their religion, marital status, education background and work experience.
External dimension was found to have an effect on performance of academic staff. This research recommends that external dimensions of workforce diversity are important components in ensuring the optimal performance of individual employees. It should therefore be considered in strategy formulation to ensure optimal performance of employees. Aspects such as religion, marital status, education background and work experience indicators taken into consideration when recruiting selecting and placing employees in organizations for optimal performance.

5.8 Suggestion for Further Research
The researcher proposes that future research ought to be focused on authenticating the findings and conclusions of this inquiry by carrying out related studies using other research designs and by collection of data from other diverse sources in the same sector. Moreover, since this study focused on external dimension in public universities in Kenya only; it is crucial to research on the role of other workforce diversity dimensions in public universities to allow additional generalization of findings in more contexts.
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