EFFECTS OF LEARNING RESOURCES AND LEADERSHIP STYLE ON ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN KENYA: A CASE OF KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

By
Edith Owiso*[1] and Elegwa Mukulu[2]

Affiliation
[1, 2]Department of Entrepreneurship, Technology, Leadership and Management,
College of Human Resource Development
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology,
P. O. Box 62000-00200, Nairobi Kenya.

***Correspondences**
Address; P O Box 59963 – 00200, Nairobi, Kenya.
Email; eowiso@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
Provision of learning resources and leadership styles have been shown to influence organizational learning in private organizations. As Kenyan public universities try to gain competitive advantage, improve performance and to continuously adapt to changing environments there is need to ensure organizational learning is enhanced. This study assessed the effect of learning resources provision and leadership styles on organizational learning in Kenyatta University. Data was collected using questionnaires from 94 staff comprising of teaching and non-teaching staff. Data was analyzed through Chi-square test of independent measures and correlations. There was significant positive correlation between organizational learning and the provision of learning resources (rho=0.421; p<.001), Management leadership style did not show significant relationship (rho=0.122; p>.05) with organizational learning. It is concluded that Kenyatta University promoted organizational learning through provision of learning resources, while management leadership style has not been used effectively in enhancing organizational learning. It is recommended that public universities provide equitable learning resources and re-address their management leadership styles to enhance organizational learning.

Key Words; Organizational learning, learning resources, leadership style, Kenyatta University.

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational Learning is the means by which organizations develop, enhance and manage knowledge and standards within their functions and in their cultures and adjust and improve their efficiency by making better use of the wide range of skills of their employees (Schwandt & Marquardt, 2000). Senge (1990) defined the learning organization as a place where people continually expand their capacity to create results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free and where people are continually learning how to learn together. It is through organizational learning that an organization improves the ability to respond to various business situations and thereby enhance competitive performance by means of generating new knowledge (Robbins, 2000).Through learning, organizations adapt to environmental constraints, avoid the repetition of past mistakes and retain critical knowledge that might otherwise be lost. As the rate of learning becomes a more critical element in gaining competitive advantage, it is generally recognized that organizations must become more intentional about their own learning processes. The ability to implement a strategic change, to respond to a competitive challenge, to move critical knowledge across divisional boundaries - all are closely tied to the organization's ability to learn (Dixon, 1993).

Amabile (1998) points to six general categories of effective management practice in creating a learning culture within an organization i.e providing employees with challenge, providing freedom to innovate, providing the resources needed to create new ideas/products, providing diversity of perspectives and backgrounds within groups, providing supervisor encouragement and   providing organizational support. Ortenblad (2004) described four common aspects of the learning organization: organizational learning, realizing learning at work, developing a learning climate and creating a learning structure. Learning at work is understood as on-the-job learning which focuses on informal and incidental learning. Learning climate means organizational climate that facilitates individual learning, this climate is a positive atmosphere that makes learning easy and natural. The characteristics of flexibility in a learning structure include decentralized, flat and team based. Ortenblad (2004) concluded that when these four aspects are integrated and implemented together in an organization, it creates organizational learning.

Organizations have discovered that human resources really are the most important asset. Success depends on involving the workforce's entire capacity to generate new ideas and ways of working which in turn improve organizational performance. Managers today are challenged by how to change organizations by incorporating new ways of accomplishing work and are therefore advocating for information sharing through direct communication, empowerment and teamwork.

1.1. Organizational Learning in Public Universities

Universities as institutions of higher learning are Learning Organizations. Their primary function is imparting knowledge and facilitating continuous research and innovation activities. The university is made up of people with different backgrounds in terms of needs, skills, talents, status, competencies, knowledge, behavioural styles, interest and perceptions (Nakpodia, 2003). According to Nakpodia (2003), universities as learning organizations are centers of excellence, teaching, research and store houses of knowledge.

Kenyatta University is one of the public universities in Kenya which became a fully fledged university in 1985 through an Act of Parliament and currently the university has increased its admission to approximately 60,081 students in December 2012 (KU, 2013). Its mission is to provide quality education and training, promote scholarship, service, innovation and creativity and inculcate moral values for sustainable individual and societal development. The University has a total of 789 teaching staff and 1,770 non-teaching staff. Both groups of staff play a significant role

in organizational learning in the University. (KU, 2005). Kenyatta University as an institution of higher learning embraces organizational learning. This study, therefore, sought to find out whether Kenyatta University's policies support organizational learning through learning resources provision and management leadership styles. The findings from the study benefits the board and top management of Kenyatta University who may use it to make policies that improve organizational learning that translate to improved productivity.   The study findings benefit the university employees' identification of their role in creating a learning organization.

1.2. Previous Studies on Learning Resources in Public Universities

Organizational learning resources have been defined as the organizational characteristics that facilitate the organizational learning process or allow an organization to teach (Chiva *et al.*, 2007). Organizational learning can be increased by improving current capability or developing new capability. New capability necessitates changes in culture; however, current capability needs development in current culture (Dibella *et al.*, 1996). Direkes, *et al.* (2004) emphasize that organizational learning requires both the appropriate structural mechanisms and the cultural conditions that promote habits of inquiry, experimentation and reflection. This reference to structural mechanisms and cultural conditions is very similar to Senge's (1994) suggestion that organizational learning is put to practice within a triangular architectural framework constructed of three elements: guiding ideas (or visions), means and practical resources for application.

Individuals, when given time, opportunity and resources are quite often capable of implementing change expediently when compared to teams or organizations. The lag in time that so often hinders organizational change is called organizational inertia, a situation Starbuck and Hedberg say can arise from "slow sense-making processes and ineffective information systems or when individuals learn without their organizations also learning (Dierkes, *et al.*, 2003). One possible resolve to this dilemma is the Japanese concept of Kaizen – an applied system for implementing continuous improvement through small steps (Maurer, 2004). Starbuck and Hedberg state that continuous improvement, the daily challenging of status quo, supports the notion that everything can be improved and that evolutionary learning in small steps seems to work better than does revolutionary learning, especially during periods of repeated success (Dierkes, *et al*., 2003).

There has been rapid expansion in the higher education sector of Kenya. More people are seeking higher education from the few universities we have. This has overstretched the services of these institutions, compromising the quality of graduates in favor of quantity. It has also increased the costs of running these institutions. As a cost cutting measure, university administration often employs outmoded teaching methods. Rote learning is common, with instructors doing no more than dictating their notes to overcrowded classes. This negatively impacts students, who are frequently unable to afford a text book. These passive approaches to teaching have little value in a competitive world where practicability, creativity and flexibility are at a premium and therefore affect organization learning as well.

1.3. Leadership Style in Public Universities

Leadership is considered as the art of influencing an individual or individuals in a particular direction that involves casting a vision, goal setting and motivating people (Spendlove, 2007). Subsequently, if you want them to trust you and do things for you and the organization, they need to be motivated (Baldoni, 2005).Sadler (2003) opines that in the learning organization, the organizational leader has three distinct functions: designer, steward and teacher. The design work is about creating systems, strategies and policies and making them come together in such a manner that makes the organization effective and efficient. The stewardship function relates to the leader's

responsibility to ensure the organization's long-term survival. The teacher role is manifest by the leader helping others to see the big picture. The leader helps others understand the reality of the current situation and the vision of the organization; filling the gap that lies between these two paradigms and creating a learning environment where that can occur is the focus of effective leaders (Sadler, 2003).

The manager plays a critical role in establishing the learning environment for his or her employees. Creating an effective learning environment will allow people to draw upon resources, make sense out of things and construct meaningful solutions to problems. This will emphasize the importance of meaningful, authentic activities that help the learner to construct understanding and develop skills relevant to solving problems. Applying the concepts of a learning organization to an operating company is difficult for both academics and practitioners (Albert, 2005). The autocratic leadership styles, mechanistic design of organization and authoritarian rules as practiced in most African organizations, are all where decision making is concerned only to top management and employees are just given orders to accomplish different tasks. In these types of organizational environment the employees may suppress innovativeness and their motivation hindered which has a direct negative effect on organizational performance, growth and effectiveness (Constant *et al.,* 2001). Lohman (2005) found the factors of initiative, positive personality traits, commitment to professional development, interest in the profession, self-efficacy and love of learning enhanced the motivation for informal organizational learning. Conversely, an unsupportive organizational culture, others who were unwilling to participate, lack of time and lack of proximity with colleague have negatively impacted organizational learning.

As far as higher education in Kenya is concerned, leadership focuses on the rules and mechanisms by which various stakeholders influence decisions, how they are held accountable, and to whom. It specifically refers to the formal and informal exercise of authority under laws, policies and rules that articulate the rights and responsibilities of various actors, including the rules by which they interact (Eurydice 2008). This therefore means that leadership style of an organization highly influences organization learning. An organization learns like an individual or in a collective way (Ortenblad, 2001). Learning at individual level means an individual's access to information, perception, understanding and interpretation of this information, getting experiences with this information and changing his/her behaviour towards the results he/she reached (Koçel, 2003). According to Kim individual learning is very important for organizational learning because, organizations learn only by means of their members. But organizational learning doesn't depend on any specific individuals. Individuals can learn without organizations and all individual learning doesn't have organizational consequences (Kim, 1993).

According to Hedberg (1981) although learning occurs through individuals it is not true to assert that organizational learning is a cumulative of the organization's members. Because organization's members or leaders come and go, but memory, behaviour, cognitive maps, norms and values of organizations are stored (Mark *et al.*, 2000). According to West if learning is accepted as an individual phenomenon then individuals leave the organization and they will take what they learned with them and organization will not benefit from this information (West, 1994). Dierkes *et al.,* (2003) state that, sociologists approach learning not as something that takes place in the mind but as something produced and reproduced in social relations of individuals when they participate in society. This concept opens the realm of integrated learning as a part of our every-day life. It suggests that a large part of our learning comes from the informal source of social relationships. This further introduces the concept of practice as a prominent factor in the sociological discipline. Dierkes *et al.,* (2003) further states, practice is a system of activities in which knowing is not separate from doing and situations might be said to coproduce knowledge through activity. The

sociological discipline presupposes that every activity in life is an opportunity to learn and that learning in casual social settings is as important as formal learning experiences. Some research suggests that situational circumstances constitute an environment that promotes or discourages learning. Those circumstances may be created by organizational structure, positive or negative environmental situations or time constraints. Child and Heavens (2003) suggest, the learning capabilities of organizational members are, at least in part, socially constructed by national, occupational or other institutions. They further suggest that internal boundaries are established by specialties or departments within the framework of organizations that hinder cross-boundary learning.

In public universities network in Kenya, facilitation is an integrative strategy that initiates cohesiveness among employees and superiors within the top-down hierarchy.   The importance of network integration in organizational learning revolves around broadening the scope of professionalism and efficiency. An organization can only maintain a competitive advantage if it is willing to engage in continuous learning within a rapidly changing environment. Organizational learning copes with the problem of balancing the competing goals of developing new knowledge (exploration) and exploiting current competencies (exploitation) in the face of dynamic tendencies to emphasize one or another (Levinthal & March, 1993). Okwach (1999) indicated that about 50% of the teaching staff at the two universities he studied, the University of Nairobi and Kenyatta University, were not working full time at the universities. Some of them were under employed and this affected the quality of learning. The survey also indicated that about 40% of senior academic staff at public universities were performing part time duties in other institutions, including private universities and non-governmental organizations. These staff members were engaged in various duties that included teaching, research, evaluation of programmes and running their own businesses without approval from the university administration, as is normally required. This has resulted in a situation where teaching staff devote little attention to research or improving their teaching, and play little or no role in the life of the institution employing them.

Based on the literature reviewed, organizational learning in public universities is an issue of concern to policy makers, teaching and non-teaching staff. The empirical studies reviewed suggested that the availability of resources, current management and leadership policies affect organizational learning in public universities. However there is limited literature on organizational learning in developing countries like Kenya.

2. METHODS

This study adopted a qualitative approach and specifically the case study method. Kenyatta University was picked because it has the largest student population amongst the public universities in Kenya. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) notes that descriptive research determines and reports the way things are, and may allow for generalization of the findings to a larger population. Stratified sampling method was used to select a representative sample of 95 respondents. A staff list was obtained from the administration division and consent obtained from the Human Resource department to conduct the research.   Data was collected by use of questionnaires on the factors affecting organizational learning. It comprised both open-ended as well as closed-ended questions. The closed-ended questions allowed for specific type of responses while in the open-ended type responses were able to express their opinions. The researcher requested the supervisors to assess the relevance of the content in the questionnaire Pre-testing technique was used to test the reliability of the questionnaire which returned a reliability of 0.8 after test re-test method.

 After fieldwork, all the filled up questionnaires were sorted, coded and analyzed. Quantitative data was analyzed frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations .Inferential statistics of chi-

square test of independent measures and spearman's correlation of coefficient were used to analyze the quantitative data. Statistical tool SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science)

3.   RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

Out of the 94 participants, 51 (54.25%) of the respondents were female while 43(45.74%) were male. In regard to age, most 40(42.55%) of the respondents were aged between 31 to 40 years and were followed by those aged between 41 to 50 years 26 (27.66%) while those aged 21 to 30 years were 17 (18.08%) and the least represented were those aged 50 years and above; 11(11.70%). 35(37.2%) of the workers had post-graduate education/qualifications and 24(25.5%) had middle level education. Those with undergraduate qualifications were 16(17 %), and secondary education 18(19.1%), while 1(1.1%) had primary education. 55 (58.51%) of the respondents were members of non-teaching staff, 24(25.53%) teaching staff, while administrative staff were 15(15.96%). The respondents were asked whether their institution promoted organization learning and their responses are presented in the Table 1.

Table 1: Promotion of organizational learning based on category of staff.

Response	Teaching	Non-teaching	Administrator	Total
Yes	15	21	3	39
No	8	30	12	50
Not sure	1	4	0	5
Total	24	55	15	94

Results in table 1 show that 39(41.48 %) of the respondents indicated Yes, 50(53.19 %   ) indicated NO while 5(5.31 %) were not sure on whether the institution promotes organizational learning. Among those whose answer were NO, 8(16 %) were teaching staff, 30(60 %) were non-teaching while 12(24 %) were administrators. For those whose response was Yes, 15(38.46 %) were teaching, 21(53.84%) while non-teaching while administrators were 3(7.69 %). To test on whether the above responses were different among the category of staff, chi.square test of independent measures were significant ($x^2 = 10.26$, $df = 4$, $p = 0.003$) indicating that there were differences in the staff responses. This is evident as 50(53.19 %) had indicated that Kenyatta University does not promote organizational organization learning as opposed to 30(31.19 %) whose responses were on the contrary. The study was interested in finding out whether gender of the respondents influences the promotion of organizational learning in the university and their responses are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Gender and promotion of organizational learning

Gender	Yes	No	Total
Male	18	23	41
Female	21	27	48
Total	39	50	89

Among the males 18(43.9 %) felt that the university enhances organizational learning while 23 (56.09%) felt that the university did not promote organizational learning. For the females 21(43.75%) felt that the university promotes organizational learning while 27(56.25 %) felt that the university did not promote organization learning. Cumulatively 39 (43.82 %) were for Yes while 50(56.17%) were for No. However chi-square results ($x^2 = 0.00$ $df = 1$, $p = 0.057$) were not statistically significant. The duration of work was computed against promotion of organizational learning as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Duration of work and promotion of organizational learning

Duration of work (years)	Yes	No	Total
< 1 year	1	2	3
1-3 year	6	7	13
4-6 years	10	13	13
7-10 years	8	16	24
over 10 years	14	12	26
Total	39	50	89

As shown in Table 3, 39 (43.8%) of the respondents said that the university promotes organizational learning while 50 (56.2%) opined that the university does not promote organizational learning. In regard to duration of work, those who had worked for over 10 years, 53.8% were for Yes while 12 (46.2%) responded No. This was followed by those who had worked for 4 – 6 years 10(43.5%). However the chi-square value of (x^2 = 2.31, df = 4, p = 0.067) was not statistically significant.

Table 4: Terms of service and promotion of organizational learning.

Terms of service	Yes	No	Total
Contract	12	20	32
Permanent/pensionable	27	30	57
Total	39	50	89

Data in Table 4 shows that 39 (43.8%) felt that the university promotes organizational learning while 50(56.2%) opined that the university did not promote organizational learning. Those on contract 12(37.5%) felt Yes while 27(67.5%) responded No, Those on permanent/pensionable terms 27(47.4%) felt Yes while 30 (52.6%) felt No. However, the x^2= 0.81, df = 1, p<0.36) did not return significant differences.

3.1 Learning Resources
Four questionnaire items were presented to the respondents to ascertain on the provision of learning resources to the employees and how this contributes to organization development. The first item in this section sought to find out whether the learning resources were provided and their responses are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Provision of learning resources

Provision	F	%
Yes	49	52.1
No	3	3.2
Not sure	42	44.7
Total	94	100

From Table 5, it is evident that 49 (52.1%) of the respondents were of the opinion that the university provides learning resources, 3(3.2%) said the university does not provide resources while 42 (44.7%) were not sure on whether the institution provides learning resources. Therefore, it is apparent that the university provides learning resources to the employees if the proportion of those whose responses who said Yes is anything to go by. The participants' opinion on the extent to which learning resources influence organization development is presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Participants responses on the extent to which learning resources influence organization development.

Responses	F	%
Very great extent	20	21.3
Great extent	17	18.1
Moderate extent	46	48.9
Small extent	10	10.6
No influence	1	1.1

Table 6 shows that 46(48.9%) of the respondents felt that provision of resources influence organization development. This was followed by 20(21.3%) who felt that provision of resources has very great extent to organization development. This was followed by 17(18.1%) of great extent 10(10.6%) small extent, and eventually 1(1.1%) which returned no influence. Therefore it appears that the majority of the respondents felt that provision of learning resources affects/influences organization development. After these observations, the study was interested in finding out the perception of the respondents on how learning resources influence organizational learning their responses are presented in table 7

Table 7: Learning resources influence on organizational learning

Item	F	%
Comfortable working environment	15	16.0
Opportunities for further learning	16	17.0
Increased employees performance	27	28.7
Two or all of the above	29	30.9
None of the above	7	7.4

Table 7 shows that 92.6% of the respondents felt that provision of learning resources influences organizational learning in terms of comfortable working environment, opportunities for further learning and increased employee performance. The next item in the questionnaire sought to determine the challenges facing the university in the provision of learning resources as perceived by the respondents and their responses are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Challenges facing the organization in provision of learning resources.

Item	F	%
Large student population	9	9.6
Restricted resources	2	2.1
Lack of prioritization	20	21.3
Limited forms	16	17.0
Lack of cooperation	14	14.9
Large number of staff	4	4.3
Poor coordination	10	10.6
Unbalanced provision	13	13.8
A motivation	1	1.1
Poor planning	1	1.1
Others	2	2.1
Non response	2	2.1

Table 8 shows that majority of 20(21.3%) of the respondents were of the opinion that the challenges facing the institution in the provision of learning resources were mainly lack of proper prioritization followed by limited funds 16(17.0%), lack of cooperation 14(14.9%) unbalanced provision 13(13.8%) and large student population 9(9.6%). The least challenges were a motivation, poor planning and restricted resources. Therefore, the above challenges can be said to be institutional based

3.2 Management leadership Style

This section had a number of items which were out to establish the influence of leadership style in promotion of organizational learning. The perceptions of leadership style exhibited by their immediate supervisors were; Dictatorship 33(35.1%), Democratic 41(43.6%), Laissez faire 12(12.8%), and Combined approach 8(8.5%). This clearly shows that there was no dominant style of leadership exhibited by the supervisors. Asked whether the leadership style affected how they performed their duties 76(80.9%) said Yes, No had 13(13.8%) while 5(5.3%) were not sure. Therefore, it is apparent that the leadership style exhibited by supervisors affected the performance of the respondents. Equally, asked whether availability of opportunities to work without supervision influences organization learning, the respondents 53 (56.38 %) was to a great extent, 29 (30.85%) moderate extent while low extent and no extent had 7 (7.44 %) and 5 (5.31%) respectively.

Another related item asked the respondents on the extent workers involvement in making decisions in the university influence organizational learning Great extent 47 (50 %), moderate extent 28 (29.78 %) low extent and no extent 19 (20.21%). Therefore it is concluded that workers' involvement in decision making influences organizational learning. These aspects were correlated with organizational learning, and the following correlation values (*rho, p)* were returned; Leadership style of supervisor; *rho = 0.013, p =0.89,* Availability to work without supervision; *rho = 0.10, p = 0.32,* and Involvement in making decisions; *rho = 0.12, p = 0.24.* These correlations were not statistically significant indicating that there is no correlation between behaviour leadership style, supervision and involvement in making decisions with organizational learning.

4. DISCUSSION

The high number of respondents aged between 31 to 40 years is attributed to the fact that both teaching and administrative staff require some levels of experience before they start working in the university. This is supported in Rintaugu (2013) assertions that universities require personnel with adequate experience as they don't want to invest in their training. The low number of respondents aged over 50 years may indicate that there is higher turnover rate of university employees due to different reasons bordering on job satisfaction, working conditions and promotional opportunities. This is not remote as Kenyan universities are characterized by low number of professors and senior lecturers (Tettey, 2010; Onsongo, 2012).

Findings indicate that majority of the respondents felt that Kenyatta University provides learning resources. However an equally significant proportion of respondents were not sure on whether the university provides learning resources. If these were taken to mean that the university does not provide adequate learning resources then these findings are supported by studies which have indicated that universities are constrained in the provision of learning resources (Sifuna, 2012; Wanzala, 2013). Sifuna (2012) observed that teaching effectiveness in universities is limited by inadequate facilities, laboratory equipment comprising infrastructure while student access is limited due to insufficient classrooms and accommodation. Wanzala (2013) was more equivocal when she observed that poor quality of higher education is attributed to poor learning environments

characterized by dilapidated infrastructure. Owino, Ogachi and Olel (2011) opined that Kenyan public Universities suffered from insufficient teaching and learning resources. Therefore it is apparent that the learning resources provided in Kenyatta University are far from being adequate and concerted efforts need to be part in place to increase and improve the number of lecture halls, laboratories, offices and general university infrastructure.

The study was interested in establishing the extent to which learning resources influence organization development. Results showed that over 80% of the respondents felt that learning resources affect organization development. These findings are in consonant with Olayo (2005) that unavailability of resources demotivated employees and did not enhance work performance. Agui (2013) and Obure (2013) had found that organizational learning has an influence on motivational levels of public secondary school teachers and same seems to be replicated in Kenyatta University.

The results of the study showed that provision of learning resources leads to comfortable working environment, opportunities of further learning and increased employees performance. In a study in secondary schools Obure (2003) found that work environment had influence on teachers stress, job satisfaction and motivation. Equally, Ravangard *et al*., (2014) had found that a positive and significant correlations between the dimensions of employees empowerment and organizational learning among staff in a medical university.

The findings of the study reveal that universities face numerous challenges in their efforts to provide learning resources. These challenges as espoused by respondents include lack of prioritization, limited funds, lack of cooperation, unbalanced provision and large student population. These challenges have been reported in previous studies (Ndegwa, 2007; Owino *et al.*, 2011; Sifuna, 2012;Wanzala, 2013).

Wanzala (2013) opined that the poor situation of teaching staff in Kenyan universities are compounded with low payments, disproportionate student/staff ratio, high rate of conversion of middle level colleges to universities; administrators and managers who formulate poor university policies. Sifuna (2012) observed that many universities have resorted to fee paying or parallel students taught during evening classes or usually during holidays. This has resulted into overloaded teachers reducing the university to a labor market production role. Unequivocally, Wanzala (2013) opined that university education quality is low, academic fraud is rampant, efficiency is weak, relevance is questionable and wastage is noticeably significant. Consequently, if universities want to enhance the provision of learning resources, then new interventions have to be put place. These could border on reduced student enrolment, alternative funding approaches and prioritization of their expenditures.

Different styles of leadership are used in different organizations. Indeed, certain leadership styles have been associated with work performance. Findings of this study revealed that over 40% of the respondents felt that their supervisors were democratic. As much as this is appreciable, more studies in Kenyan Universities reveal that the management utilizes authoritative form of leadership (Owino *et al.,* 2011;Sifuna, 2012;). Owino *et al.,* (2011) found that management of public universities did not effectively involve staff in decision – making. This lack of involvement of staff in decision making results in reduced work performance (Olayo, 2005). This is buttressed by the finding that 80% of the respondents observed that leadership style of the management affected on their work performance. The results also showed that the respondents were not given opportunities to work without supervision and this influenced the organization. However there was no significant correlation between leadership style, supervision and decision – making with organizational learning. This is contrary to Owino *et al.,* (2011) observations that lack of effective communication was a hindrance to implementation of future plans and projects. Ravangard *et al.,* (2014) has observed that active participation and involvement of employees in decision-making is one of the

most effective mechanisms of empowerment that can lead to an increase in employee motivation, job satisfaction and ultimately their empowerment. Similarly, Owino *et al.,* (2011) observed that Kenyan universities have leadership that did not satisfactorily engage its stake holders in decision-making.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the findings of the study, it is concluded that Kenyatta University has attained gender parity in the recruitment of employees and most of the employees have worked in Kenyatta University for over 4 years. This indicates that the University has strived to retain its employees. Secondly, Kenyatta University has promoted organizational learning with no differences based on the employee's gender, age, category and duration of work periods. Thirdly, Kenyatta University has provided learning resources to her employees. However, the main challenges faced by Kenyatta University in this effort of provision of learning resources were lack of prioritization, limited funds and lack of cooperation

Based on the conclusions of the study, the following recommendations for policy formulation and practice are made. Firstly, Kenyatta University needs to provide more learning resources to the employees. This can be done by innovating new ways of raising funds such as seeking collaborations with the corporate sector. Secondly, there is compelling urgency to have open days or open forums where managers meet with the employees to address pertinent social issues. This may go a long way in enhancing organizational learning. There is every need for the university to bridge the perceived work related differences between teaching and non-teaching staff. This can be done by harmonizing the differences in the autonomy, work schedules and other benefits. Further studies, can be done to establish the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational learning. Equally, other studies can be done to determine the possible drawbacks in the enhancement of organizational learning.

REFERENCES

Abagi, O. (1999). Resource utilization in public Universities in Kenya: Enhancing efficiency and cost recovery measures. New Delhi, McGill Publishers.

Agui, D. K. (2013). Organizational learning and motivation among public secondary schools teachers in Nairobi County. *International Journal of current research,* 5(4) 765-772

Baldoni, J. (2005). *Motivation Secrets*. Great Motivation Secrets of Great Leaders [WWW page]. URLhttp://govleaders.org/motivation_secrets.htm

Chiva, R. Alegre, J., & Lapiedra, R. (2007). Measuring Organisational Learning Capability among the Workforce, *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(3/4), 224-242.

Chiva, R. & Alegre, J. (2009). Organizational Learning Capability and Job Satisfaction: an Empirical Assessment in the Ceramic Tile Industry, *British Journal of Management*, 20(323D340).

Dibella, A. J., Nevis, E. C., & Gould, J. M. (1996). Understanding Organizational Learning Capability: *Joumal of Management Studies*, 33(3), 361-379.

Dierkes, M., Child, J. Berthoin Antal, A., & Nonaka, I. (2003). Organizational learning knowledge: Reflections on the dynamics of the field and challenges for the future. In M. Dierkes, A. Berthoin Antal, J. Child & I. Nonaka (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational learning and knowledge* (pp. 921-939). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Dierkes, M., Berthoin, A. Antal, J., & Child I. (2004). Leadership and organizational learning.*Handbook of organizational learning and knowledge* (415-427). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Dixon, P. (1993). The Concept of Learning Organization, *Journal of European Industrial Training,* 18(1), 15D21.

Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 71, 78-91.

Gephart, M. A., Marsick, V. J., & Van Buren, M. E. (1997). Finding common and uncommon ground among learning organizations. *Proceedings of the Academy of Human Resource Development 1997 Conference,* Atlanta, GA.

Government of Kenya (2006). Transformation of Higher Education and Training in Kenya to

Secure Kenya's Development in Knowledge Economy: Report of The Universities Inspection Board (Kinyanjui Report), Nairobi: Government Printers.

Hare, D., Howard, E., & Pope, M. (2005). Enhancing technology use in student teaching: A case study. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 13(4):573.

Kamalian, A. R., Yaghoubi, N. M., & Moloudi, J., (2010). Survey of Relationship between Organizational Justice and Empowerment (A Case Study). *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 24, 165-171.

Kenyatta University Data Office (2013).

Kiganda, C. (2009). East Africa Universities Vice chancellor urged to shift student roles to centre and make the partners and responsible stakeholders. *Inter university council for East Africa (IUCEA). Newsletter,* 39: 8 – 16.

Kim, D. H. (1993). The Link between Individual and Organizational Learning, *Sloan Management Review*, Fall, 37-50.

Lohman, M. C. (2005). A survey of factors influencing the engagement of two professional groups in informal workplace learning activities. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 16(4), 501-527.

Mama, A. (2001). On differences between Organizational Learning and Learning Organization, *The Learning Organization*, 8(3), 125-133.

Matthew, J., Grawhich, & Barber, L. K., (2009). Are you focusing both Employees and Organizational Outcomes. *Organizational Health Initiative at Saint Louis University* (ohi.slu@edu), 1-5.

Maira, A., & Scott-Morgan, P. (1997). The accelerating organization: Embracing the human face of change. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mugenda, O.M., & Mugenda, A.G. (2003). *Research Methods*: Quantitative & Qualitative Approaches, Nairobi: Act Press.

Nakpodia E.D. (2003). Managing Conflict in Nigerian Universities. *West African Journal of* Resource Development, 9(2), 79-87.

Ndegwa, R. M. (2007). A comparative study of factors influencing equal employment opportunity practice in public universities: A case of Non-teaching staff in UoN, KU and JKUAT. *Unpublished MBA Thesis,* Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya

Nzuve, S. N. M. & Omolo, E. A .(2012). A study of the practice of learning organization and its relationship to performance among Kenyan commercial banks. *Problems of management in the 21ˢᵗ Century*, 4, 45 – 52.

Obure, A. F. (2003). Primary school teachers' perceptions of prevalence and severity of teachers stress factors. A case of Eldoret Municipality. Unpublished *Master of Philosophy (Psychology) thesis*, Moi university, Eldoret, Kenya.

Olayo, J. O. (2005). The impact of employee empowerment on work performance: case study of selected universities in Kenya. Unpublished *Master of Business administration (MBA) Thesis*, Kenyatta

Owino, C. G., Ogachi, I. O., & Olel, M. A. (2011). Role of institutional managers in quality assurance: Reflections on Kenya's university education. *Australian Journal of business and management research*, 1, 2: 113 – 124.

Ortenblad, A. (2004). The learning organization: *Towards an integrated model. The Learning Organization.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Ravangard, R., Sajjdnia, Z., Farman, M. & Bahadori, M. (2014). Relationship between organizational learning and employees empowerment. A case study among medical sciences staff. *Health scope,* 3(2): 1 – 6

Republic of Kenya. (2005c). Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005 on a Policy Framework for Education, Training and Research: *Meeting the Challenges of Education, Training and Research in Kenya in the 21*st *Century.* Nairobi: Government Printer.

Republic of Kenya. (2005b). *Kenya Education Sector Support programme 2005-2010*: Delivering quality education and training to all Kenyans. Nairobi: Government Printer.

Rintaugu, E. G. (2013). The social demographic factors and causes of stress among sports personnel in Kenya universities. *Human resource management research*, 3 (4): 166 – 172

Robbins, S. P. (2000). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Robinson, S. (2002). *Research Methodology*. Washington D. C.: National Academies Press.

Sifuna, D. N. (2012). Leadership in Kenyan Public Universities and the challenges of autonomy and academic Freedom: An overview of Trends since independence. *JHEA/RESA,* 10(1):121 – 135.

Schwandt, D., & Marquardt, M. (2000). *Organizational learning.* New York: St. Lucie

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: *The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday-Currency.

Suh, T. (2002). Encouraged, motivated and learning oriented for working creatively and successfully: A case of Korean workers in marketing communications. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 8(3), 135-147.

Swanson, R. A., & Holton, E. F. (2001). *Foundations of human resource development*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Tettey, W. J. C. (2006). Staff retention in Africa Universities Elements of a sustainable strategy. *World bank report*, 2006

Tsang, E. W. K. (1997). Organizational learning and the learning organization: A dichotomy between descriptive and prescriptive research. *Human Relations*, 50, 73-89.

Thompson, L. (2003). Improving the creativity of organizational work groups. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(1), 96-111.

Wanzala, W. (2013). Quest for quality and relevant higher education training and learning in Kenya: An overview. *Educational Journal*, 2(2): 36-49.

Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1997). Dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire. Warwick : *Partners for the Learning Organization.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Webster, R. S. (2001). *Action learning*: *What, how, why- what next?* Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED449336

Yazdani, B. O., Yaghoubi, N. M., & Giri, E. S., (2011). Factors affecting the Empowerment of Employees. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 20 (2), 267-274.