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Executive Summary

This survey was conducted during the month of June by Smart Frontiers in the framework of Performance Contracts to assess the quality of work environment offered to the employees of Kenya Forest Service and its constituent college, the Kenya Forest College. In this way, the survey sought to establish whether KFS is meeting its service expectations. The findings presented in this report highlight the key issues emerging, and ultimately, the actions required to enhance employee satisfaction levels with the work environment.

Key highlights of the survey findings are as follows:

Work environment index
The aggregate index for KFS/KFC works out to 63.38. Comparatively, for the three dimensions, satisfaction indices work out to 69.44 (workload), 63.16 (work conditions) and 60.78 (occupational health). Across the ten service delivery dimensions, the index scores are in the range between 52 and 77 points. The dimension of ‘Immediate supervisor’ ranked the highest (77.5), and conversely, the lowest ESI figures apparent in respect to ‘relationship with co-workers’ (52.53) and ‘remuneration and benefits’ (53.42).

Satisfaction gaps
Looking at satisfaction gaps, the results show that, relative to employee expectations, the performance of KFS is deemed to be most weak in respect to working conditions (-1.38) and most strong in respect to work load (-1.00).

Workload
On average, a relatively high positive score of 69% is observed, although this figure masks wide differences across the three attributes, ranging from 63% to 44%. Looking at the results, it is apparent that, whereas there is relative satisfaction with the aspect of ‘work-personal life balance’, this nonetheless does not seem to negate the concerns regarding deadlines, which depicts satisfaction levels below half (44%).
Occupational health
On average, a positive score of 50% was reflected, with the scores on the specific attributes, however, ranging from 61% to 37%. The data indicates a lower degree of satisfaction (below 50%) on three aspects: Preventive mechanism against occupational health, Assurance of compensation in case of injuries while on duty, and Quality of physical working conditions.

Working conditions
On average, a positive score of 49% is observed, with the level of satisfaction on the three aspects ranging from 58% to 43%. Focusing on the aspects depicting lower levels of satisfaction (below 50%), the data suggests relative concerns on two aspects: Hindrances/constraints at the work place that hinder optimal performance and Provision of necessary working materials.

Satisfaction drivers
On the basis of PCA, the data does indicate employee satisfaction is based on three platforms: The first factor is interpreted as Safety and Security. This accounted for the largest proportion (27.22% percent) of the total explained variance. This factor was defined by five attributes and was primarily related to protection from risk. The second factor, interpreted as Facilitation and Support, explained 21.16% of the variance, and was constructed by four attributes items. These were primarily related to equipment and facilities. Consequently, the third factor, interpreted as Work-Social life balance, accounted for 20.08% of the variance and was defined by four items, which were essentially related to aspects workload and working hours.
Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Background

The Government of Kenya (GoK) has embraced the Result Based Management (RBM) as a tool to improving public service delivery. The essence of RBM is to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of public services, and that citizens can hold public servants accountable for the levels of service they receive from public institutions. This is in line with Kenya’s public service accountability initiative known as Performance Contracts (PC), which was introduced in 2003, and which is expected to support the goals and objectives outlined in Kenya’s Vision 2030 strategy. The PC initiative forms the basis of improvement in the public service delivery, which seeks to progressively work towards increasing quality of output within public institutions.

Under these broader public sector reforms, the Kenya Forest Service (KFS) aims to ensure that services are enhanced to the satisfaction of its customers and excellence is attained in its operations. In complement to this Reform Agenda, one pillar in this move is to monitor the level of satisfaction of both the internal and external stakeholders.

Thus, in pursuit of ensuring that services are enhanced to the satisfaction of its customers, KFS commissioned a survey with a view to gain insights into the satisfaction with and perceptions of its services. The outcomes are intended to assist the KFS to align management and directorial processes with employee and customer expectations in order to facilitate greater performance. This survey generally focuses on the KFS Service Delivery Charters on the key performance indicators.

1.2 This survey

Work Environment Survey (WES) is an exercise in which service delivery systems are examined by reflecting on employees’ perceptions and satisfaction levels with their work conditions. In accordance

---

1 Muthaura, F., (2003), Head of Public Service
with the brief set by the KSF, the broader motivation underpinning the proposed survey is to enable the assessment of the quality of service delivery to that regard. In this way, the survey sought to establish whether KFS is meeting its service expectations.

To that regard, the specific objectives of the survey comprised the following:

1. Develop a composite measure of Work Environment Index (WEI) and use it to determine the overall rating of the current level of staff satisfaction;
2. Find out staff perception of the work environment;
3. Identify gaps in the workplace;
4. Identify specific areas that require improvement.

1.2.1 Research strategy

The general strategy involved a blend of techniques to maximize exposure to evidence. The preliminary tasks involved a review of existing data and literature. One important goal was to evaluate how KFS has performed in terms of service delivery over the past years. The previous survey approach and findings were partly fed into the primary research in order to allow for tracking and comparison on a number of aspects. The sources reviewed included the following:

- Previous customer and employee satisfaction survey reports
- KFS Service Charter
- Strategic Plan
- Other documents

1.2.2 Target Segments of the survey

As aforementioned, the target segments of this ESS consisted of all employees of KFS, including the employees of KFC.
1.2.3 Geographical scope

It was generally recognized here that in order to obtain breadth of perspectives, the data collected should represent a range of locations across the country. Working with three zones per conservancy (exception being Nairobi, Ewaso North and North Eastern), the survey had a total coverage of 24 zones. While it would be of interest to include more zones, the cost of so doing and the logistical requirements involved would outweigh its potential value. These zones are nonetheless selected to reflect differences in terms of geographical location, socio-economic diversities and size of conservancies, and can thus reflect representativeness to that regard.

1.2.4 Sampling technique

The study population of this survey consisted of all KFS employees, including the staff of Kenya Forest College (KFC). The sampling frame used was therefore constituted a-priori list of employees obtained from KFS to build an estimate of staff distribution.

In distributing the sample, due consideration was given to employee diversity in terms of geographical location (zones). To achieve this, a three-stage cluster sampling design was employed; this entailed the following stages:

i. First stage: census selection of all the 10 conservancies, plus Londiani Kenya Forest College (KFC).

ii. Second stage: Unequal selection probabilities of the Zones, with three Zones being selected in each Conservancy. Technically speaking, it would not be feasible to employee equal selection probabilities of the zones due to the small number of Zones in each conservancy. However, given the relatively higher heterogeneity levels, this was not likely to compromise representation.

iii. Third stage Unequal selection probabilities of the Forest Stations. Again, unequal selection probabilities was undertaken due to the small number of Stations in each Zone, and to ensure that diversity in terms of location and size is reflected

iv. Fourth stage: Census-based approach for selection of survey participants at station level. On this account, the survey provided opportunity to all employees in the respective stations to respond to the questionnaire. However, given that not all employees would be available or willing to
participate in the survey, it was anticipated that at least 50% to 60% would be reached approximately 600 employees. This calculation is determined using hit rates of 60%.

Data collection involved the use of self-completion approach by the employees. To enhance anonymity, personal details (name, employee number etc.) were not be required, but their personal details in terms of age, department, gender and number of years in service were essential. Self-completion approach was deemed ideal since:

- It eliminates interviewer bias as an employee administers the interview to him/herself.
- Eliminates the element of fear from the employees in that their responses cannot be traced back to them.
- It gives the employee more time to think through each question and therefore give more quality responses.

1.2.5 Sample distribution

As shown in Table 1.1, the employee sample was spread across the ten KFS conservancies in addition to the KFC. The highest percentages were drawn from Mau (14%), Central Highlands (11%) and Coast (11%). Conversely, the lowest sample was drawn from North Eastern (2%) and Ewaso North (3%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservancy</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Highlands</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewaso North</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFC</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mau</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Eastern</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rift</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyanza</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.6 Characteristics of the sample

Table 1.2 displays the sample characteristics in terms of gender, years in service and age. In terms of gender, the sample depicts askew in favour of males, depicting 73% against 25%, female. Regarding years in service, it is seen that the bulk of the sample (27%) has worked for over 10 years with KFS, while 10% have worked for 1 year or less. In terms of age, the highest proportion (34%) was in the middle age 31 to 44 years, with a combined proportion of 48% being 45 years and above.

Table 1.2: Sample characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in service</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 yrs</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5 yrs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 yrs</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ yrs</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 30</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-44</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2: The Forest Sector in Kenya

2.1 The Kenya Forest Service

The oversight institution responsible for management of the forest sector in Kenya is the KFS. The KFS was established by an act of Parliament as a body corporate under the Forest Act, 2005, to provide for the establishment, development and sustainable management, including conservation and rational utilization of forest resources for the socio-economic development of the country. Under the existing legislation, the broader mandate of KFS extends to all forests.

Mandate

To provide for the establishment, development and sustainable management, including conservation and rational utilization of forest resources for environmental protection and socio-economic development of the country

Core Functions

On this account, the specific functions of KFS include the following:

1. To sustainably manage natural forests for social, economic and environmental benefits
2. Increase productivity of industrial forest plantations and enhance efficiency in wood utilization
3. Promote farm forestry and commercial tree farming
4. Promote efficient utilization and marketing of forest products
5. To promote sustainable management of forests in the drylands
6. To protect forestry resources and KFS property
7. To develop and maintain essential infrastructure for effective forest management and protection

Vision

“To be the leading organization of excellence in sustainable forest management and conservation”
Mission

“To enhance conservation and sustainable management of forests and allied resources for environmental stability and socio-economic development”

Stakeholders

In undertaking its functions, KFS works with a broad range of stakeholders (customers). The key customers include but not limited to:

1. Communities and land owners e.g. community forest associations, organized community groups, farmers, pastoralists and commercial tree growers.
2. Private Sector e.g. licensees, concessionaires, saw miller, ecotourism based enterprises, Small and Medium Enterprises and Suppliers
3. Non Government Organizations (local and international)
4. Development partners (governmental and non-governmental)
5. Government agencies: these include local authorities and parastatals
6. The General public
7. Service providers

2.2 Situation analysis of the forest sector

Forests are among the Kenya’s important natural resources as they supply goods and services for socio economic and cultural development. The gazetted forestland is estimated to be 1.7 million hectares. This is just about 2.5 % per cent of the country’s land area. Recent estimates, based on remote sensing, indicate that Kenya has a critical 1.7 per cent of closed canopy forest cover (UNEP, 2001).

The gazetted forests constitute 0.12 million hectares of plantation forest, 1.21 million hectares of indigenous forest, and 0.5 million hectares of protective bush and grassland. A total of 36.7 million hectares of other forest associations exist under other legal frame works that include National Parks, Ranches, Trustlands and forests private ownership. As Water Catchment, forests in Kenya play a vital role as home to the nation’s “Water towers”, i.e. the five main water catchments (Mt Kenya, Cherangani, Aberdare’s, Mau and Mt Elgon) constituting the bulk of Kenya’s high forests.
2.2.1 Economic importance and role towards Vision 2030

Kenya’s Vision 2030 notes that, globally, deforestation and forest degradation accounts for 20% of green house gases (GHG) emissions and that forest conservation can provide 20% of the solution to global warming. It therefore calls for the urgent need to conserve, protect and rejuvenate Kenya’s forests. The Vision 2030 recognizes the importance of forest industries to the national economy - accounting for more than 2% of the GDP.

Forestry business in many African countries is mainly transacted in the informal sector. This is a sector that operates at the interface of the monetized and traditional economies. The types of activities that characterize the sector include subsistence collection of forest products, processing and trade in firewood, charcoal, forest foods and handicrafts. It is assumed that in some countries, business conducted in the informal forestry sector may contribute more to rural livelihoods than that in the formal forestry sector. They provide employment opportunities in various industries, thereby contributing to improved income and livelihoods of many Kenyans. These include: sawmills, pulp and paper industry, woodfuel industry, basketry, charcoal production, marketing and transportation industry, wood curving industry, and non-timber forest products industries.

The Forest Act 2005 and the KFS strategic plan (2006 to 2011) stipulate that Kenya’s forests will be broadly managed for the following purposes:

1) Biodiversity, soil and water conservation and provision of other environmental services;
2) Wood production (timber, pulp, woodfuel and poles) and employment – current and potential;
3) Conservation of wildlife habitats; and,
4) Production of non-wood forest products and ecotourism development. More specifically, the Act clearly states that plantation forests will be managed primarily for the production of wood and other forest products and services for commercial purposes.

The ban on forest timber harvesting which has now been reviewed was for a long time a major constraint to forest management and in particular, it affects the level of royalty collection, the quality of timber products (including exposing plantations to risk of fires and disease/insect infestation), insufficient or lack of raw materials supply, and increased cost of forest commodities.
2.2.2 Challenges

One of the main challenges currently facing the sector is deforestation and degradation. Loss of forest resources, general land degradation and desertification are serious environmental as well as socio-economic problems globally and in Kenya. Three key drivers have been identified as having immensely contributed to this problem in Kenya. These include: Clearing for agriculture, unsustainable utilization and poor governance and institutional failures. Thus, the past two decade has seen decline in the coverage of the sub-total forest land by about 12,050 ha annually.

Table 2.1: Level of forest coverage between 1990 and 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of forest resource (using FAO definitions)</th>
<th>Area ('000 Ha)</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Annual Change ('000 Ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Indigenous closed Canopy Forest</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indigenous Mangroves</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Open woodlands</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public Plantation Forests</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Private Plantation forests</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub - total Forest land (total of above categories)</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>3,582</td>
<td>2,357</td>
<td>3,467</td>
<td>-12.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Farms with Trees</td>
<td>9,420</td>
<td>10,020</td>
<td>10,320</td>
<td>10,385</td>
<td>+48.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Area of Kenya</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,037</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,037</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,037</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,037</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Section 3: Results of the Quantitative Survey

3.1 Overall Performance

3.1.1 Satisfaction Index

Calculation of the WEI incorporated 3 dimensions - outlined in Table 4.2. As shown in Figure 3.1, the aggregate index works out to 63.38. Comparatively, for the three dimensions, satisfaction indices work out to 69.44 (workload), 63.16 (work conditions) and 60.78 (occupational health).

![Figure 3.1: Customer (student) satisfaction index](image)

Across the ten service delivery dimensions, the index scores are in the range between 52 and 77 points. The dimension of ‘Immediate supervisor’ ranked the highest (77.5), and conversely, the lowest ESI figures apparent in respect to ‘relationship with co-workers’ (52.53) and ‘remuneration and benefits’ (53.42)
Table 3.1: Satisfaction index by service dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Dimension</th>
<th>Satisfaction Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>63.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and lectures</td>
<td>80.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to core values</td>
<td>79.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and delivery of organizational mandate (Vision, Mission, Service Charter)</td>
<td>78.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and delivery of examinations</td>
<td>73.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer focus and continued improvement</td>
<td>69.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular activities and psycho-social support</td>
<td>61.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery standards</td>
<td>54.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount and process of paying fees</td>
<td>53.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and engagement</td>
<td>48.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of facilities and utilities</td>
<td>43.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2 Performance gaps

To measure performance gaps, participants were asked to rate various service delivery attributes, first for expectations and then for satisfaction. This analysis focused on the difference between expectations and how they perceived KFC’s performance. Table 3.2 shows the results. Looking at satisfaction gaps, the results show that, relative to employee expectations, the performance of KFS is deemed to be most weak in respect to working conditions (-1.38) and most strong in respect to work load (-1.00).

Table 3.2: Satisfaction gaps across the service delivery dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and health</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 3.3, the satisfaction gaps with the work environment are presented by the conservancies. Focusing on the key three dimensions, it is apparent that the gaps are more nuanced in specific conservancies. On the three work environment dimension, it is observed that the issues of working conditions, the concern is most strong among the KFC personnel. In respect to safety and health situation, the concerns are most strong in Eastern and North Eastern conservancies. On the other hand, in respect to workload, the concerns are again most strong among the KFC personnel.

Table 3.3: Satisfaction gaps across the service delivery dimensions – by conservancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NRB</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>Coast</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>Mau</th>
<th>WSN</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>NRT</th>
<th>NYZ</th>
<th>KFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and health</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRB (Nairobi); CH (Central Highlands); EST (Eastern); EN (Ewaso North); WSN (Western); NE (North Eastern); NRT (North Rift); NYZ (Nyanza); KFC (Kenya Forest College)

3.2 Employee perceptions of the work environment

3.2.1 Workload

Three attributes were used to evaluate employee satisfaction regarding work load – highlighted in Figure 3.2. On average, a relatively high positive score of 69% is observed, although this figure masks wide differences across the three attributes, ranging from 63% to 44%.

Looking at the results, it is apparent that, whereas there is relative satisfaction with the aspect of ‘work-personal life balance’, this nonetheless does not seem to negate the concerns regarding deadlines, which depicts satisfaction levels below half (44%).
3.2.2 Occupational health

Next, seven attributes were used to evaluate employee opinions on the dimension of occupation health (see Figure 3.3). On average, a positive score of 50% was reflected, with the scores on the specific attributes, however, ranging from 61% to 37%.

The data indicates a lower degree of satisfaction (below 50%) on three aspects:
- Preventive mechanism against occupational health
- Assurance of compensation in case of injuries while on duty, and
- Quality of physical working conditions
3.2.3 Working conditions

Finally, the dimension on working conditions was evaluated using four attributes (Figure 3.4). On average, a positive score of 49% is observed, with the level of satisfaction on the three aspects ranging from 58% to 43%.

Focusing on the aspects depicting lower levels of satisfaction (below 50%), the data suggests relative concerns on two aspects:

- Hindrances/constraints at the work place that hinder optimal performance
- Provision of necessary working materials
Fig 3.4: Satisfaction with provision and availability of equipment and facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am provided with basic working tools</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFS is making appropriate use of technology to improve efficiency</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am provided with the necessary working materials</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing at the work place hinders (constrains) me from doing my best everyday</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Factors driving satisfaction

3.3.1 Factors that underlie satisfaction with the work environment

To explore the factors driving employee satisfaction with the work environment, Exploratory Factor Analysis using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used to identify service constituents at which satisfaction levels are highest. The purpose of PCA is to reduce the data by identifying the patterns of correlation between different attributes.

The analysis extracted three factors, with the measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) against all attributes was found at 0.913, with significance level (BC) found at \( p = 0.00 \). The three factors extracted collectively covered 12 attributes, which cumulatively explained 68.45% of the variance in the data. The estimates of the variance in each item were < 0.60. On account of this analysis, the factors that underline employee satisfaction with the work environment, in order of importance, can be interpreted as follows:

The first factor is interpreted as *Safety and Security*. This accounted for the largest proportion (27.22% percent) of the total explained variance. This factor was defined by five attributes and was primarily related to protection from risk.
The second factor, interpreted as *Facilitation and Support*, explained 21.16% of the variance, and was constructed by four attributes items. These were primarily related to equipment and facilities.

Consequently, the third factor, interpreted as *Work-Social life balance*, accounted for 20.08% of the variance and was defined by four items, which were essentially related to aspects workload and working hours.

**Table 3.4: Factors that underline employee satisfaction with the work environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor (% of variance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical working conditions are satisfactory (e.g. good ventilation, temperature)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am assured of compensation in cases of injuries while on duty</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have adequate working space</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work area is a safe place to work in</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The physical location of my work place is reasonably convenient</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am provided with the necessary working materials</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am provided with basic working tools</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFS is making appropriate use of technology to improve efficiency</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing at the work place hinders me from doing my best everyday</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workload is reasonable</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can keep a reasonable balance between work and personal life</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadlines at KFS are realistic</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am entitled to sick leave</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safety and security (27.22%)
Facilitation & support (21.16%)
Work-social life balance (20.08%)
Fig. 3.5 shows the relative contribution of each component to overall satisfaction. The variance explained indicate that aspects related to ‘Safety and Security’ account for the highest share of satisfaction – 40%. On the other hand, the aspects related to ‘Facilitation and Support’ and ‘Work-Social life balance’ account for 31% and 29% of satisfaction levels respectively.

Fig. 3.5: Contribution of factors to overall satisfaction
Conclusion

The survey results in this report provide a broad overview of the situation of work environment in KFS and KFC. The main question addressed by this survey was to find out assess the quality of service delivery to the employees and consequently which actions are required to enhance continued organizational success.

Based on the level of satisfaction index (63.36), results show that the employees are moderately satisfied with their work environment. From the analysis, it emerged that satisfaction with work environment is associated with a broad range of aspects, broadly clustered under three clusters, namely: 

- Safety and Security
- Facilitation and Support
- Work-Social life balance

In essence, this suggests relative approval by employees on all the dimensions of the work environment the aspect of work-social life balance.

Looking at satisfaction gaps, there are some concerns, although at a lower degree, with regard to both working conditions and safety and health issues. More specifically, on the former, there are notable concerns on the aspects of working materials, whereas on the latter, concerns are more nuanced on the aspect of preventive mechanisms against occupational risk. Given the weighting of these dimensions, relative to employee expectations, improvements in these areas remain prerequisite for achieving a good work environment and consequently influencing satisfaction in the work environment.

1. Occupational health: Enhance staff occupational health, in terms of safety equipment and training on emergency response
2. The Service should adopt new technology in their regional offices and field stations and to enhance employees’ proficiency
3. The question of equipments and facilities deserves greater emphasis than it is probably receiving. The Service should facilitate employees to do their work effectively by providing adequate tools and conducive facilities
4. It appears achieving deadlines remain an area of concern for the employees. Where this is an issue of Human Resources function related to work distribution, then it would be useful to address it at that level.

5. There is need to address the physical working conditions, especially with regard to work space. To avoid discontent it is important to bring harmony in work conditions by addressing prevailing differences.