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Vision

To be the University preferred security team that is disciplined, efficient, adaptive and focused.

Mission

To provide quality security services to meet the expectations of students, staff and the general public.

Core Values

In our Endeavour to render service the department is committed to the following core values:

- Professionalism and integrity
- Respect to rule of law
- Teamwork
- Confidentiality
- Honesty
- Innovativeness
Executive Summary

In an effort to improve service delivery and provide a working environment that is conducive, the Security Section conducted a survey to assess the level of customer satisfaction in April-May 2011. A descriptive cross-sectional survey was curried out among University employees, students and suppliers. The simple random sampling technique was used to select a sample that was proportionally representative of the population within the various campuses.

The Survey Committee formulated a data collection instrument in the form of a questionnaire designed for each category of the above mentioned respondents. Students enlisted with the Work Study Programme through the Special Student Advisor administered the questionnaire at a fee. Prior to field work, the selected students were trained on how to administer the questionnaire. A total of 450 clients were interviewed in targeted areas that deal with client’s satisfaction. The data collected was analyzed and yielded output from each campus in the entire university.

The findings revealed that in terms of performance, the majority of staff views the University as an average organization. The rest of the respondents were either neutral or doubted the objectivity and fairness of the survey. The image of the University and qualifications of the personnel, and their ability to manage, both scored 59%. 75% of staff are aware that the University is waging a war against corruption. However, only 40% think that success is being achieved in the war against corruption. The main concern with regard to corruption has been summed up under the topics
of lack of transparency, lack of information, unfairness in the promotion processes and unfairness in the distribution of funds generated by Module 11 programmes.

Overall Satisfaction Index: Staff attained a satisfaction index of 76.51%, while students managed 67.30%. The joint overall satisfaction index was found to be 69.41%. This is quite good for the security department considering that the university Nairobi’s main satisfaction index has always been at around 64%. The policy informative indices are those that are directly disaggregated to the specific component issues of satisfaction.
## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immune Deficiency Virus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>International Organization for Standardization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITID</td>
<td>University of Nairobi Institute of Tropical Infectious Diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Chief Security Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDCSO</td>
<td>Senior Deputy Chief Security Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Assistant Registrar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Background

The University of Nairobi has undergone tremendous changes over the years in management of its affairs. It is also clear that the University is breaking away from traditional systems of managing activities towards embracing modern management techniques including the results based performance management systems. Among key developments which are indicative of a paradigm shift towards world class excellence, the University has fully embraced the performance management technique and considered the major drivers of change including but not limited to: (i) being ISO certified, launching of the Strategic Plan 2008/2013, Performance Contracting and Staff Performance Appraisals. These, among other developments continue to play a central role in propelling the University towards realising its vision of an institution of a world class excellence, while at the same time keeping track with the Japanese “gemba Kaizen” concept of continuous improvement.

Security department is one of the key departments in the University that fall directly under the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Administration and Finance. It is the security arm of the University charged with ensuring safety of students, staff, vast University Land, Equipments, Motor vehicles and other physical facilities. In delivering its mandate, the department has implemented a number of strategies including its own Strategic Plan to cover the period 2008-2013. The department is guided by several planned
documents including the wider University Mission, Vision and core values (philosophies) all of which are reflected in its Corporate Strategic Plan. The university Performance Contract and the ISO procedures and processes help in operationalizing the University Strategic Plan 2008-2013.

However, against this backdrop lie a number of challenges which include:-

- Planning, organizing, deploying, directing and coordinating security services in the University.
- Ensuring student discipline is sustained and maintained and investigating all reported cases of indiscipline.
- Supervising the outsourced security staff.
- Taking care of a large number of vehicles in the parkings and ensuring security of a larger number of students as a result of introduction of Module II Programme.
- Investigations of all reported incidences.
- Thugs masquerading as students in our Campuses and Halls of residence taking advantage of increased student population and proximity to City Centre.

1.2 History of Security Department

The department owes its inception to a humble background 1968 when the University established a Security Section under the Caretaker Section in Estate department. Security service was provided by a few watchmen at night and by porters during the day. At Main Campus three watchmen were in-charge of the whole Campus at night as crime was relatively low those days.
In 1978 due to increased prevalence of crimes, occasioned by upsurge of students/staff population the department was extricated from Estate department and security department was created headed by Chief Security Officer.

In 1984 the University Management in liaison with the government seconded a Chief Security Officer from Kenya police to help deal with rampant student riots. Thereafter section was strengthened by hiring more security Personnel who were posted to outer Campuses. Security provision however continued to be co-ordinated from Main Campus by the Chief Security Officer. The university had many vacant houses spread all over the campuses which caused hiring of more guards to take care of them.

By 1989 when USAB (University Service Board) was disbanded the department had an establishment of 500 guards and several Officers. The Chief Security was at the time deputised by two deputies who were in-charge of zones:

Zone ‘A’ - Comprising of Kikuyu, Upper Kabete, Lower Kabete, Kibwezi and Machang’a.

Zone “B” - Comprising of Chiromo, Main Halls (SWA) and CHS. Parklands and Main Campus was directly under the Chief Security Officer. In March 2001 the University carried out retrenchment an exercise which negatively affected its operations. At the time of retrenchment, the Department had up to 303 guards against an establishment of 625 and out of the 303, 195 were retrenched.

In realizing the crucial services rendered by the department a Committee under the Chairmanship of Prof. Mukunya was formed
to investigate on status of security and give recommendation. The committee completed its work and made recommendations to the university for Implementation.

1.3 Research Problem

The successful implementation of the strategic plan 2008-2013 is strongly pegged on commitment by the university towards quality and efficient service delivery. Continuous adherence to ISO standards and full implementation of Performance Contracts constitute important milestones in this pursuit. However, these efforts need to be backed by reliable means of obtaining customer feedback, which is the ultimate guideline to service delivery. Customer needs constitute the greatest driving force behind any strategy in the modern organizational setup. The stakeholder baseline survey conducted by the Steadman (synovate) Group in 2007 for the entire University resulted in an employee satisfaction index of 64%. However, the survey did not conclusively address corruption and did not exhaustively examine work environment at various university departments (security department included), hence leading to gaps in knowledge which needs to be addressed. This Study/Survey is set to address these gaps while at the same time attempt to compare the current customer ratings of security department with the results of the University-wide baseline survey. The Study will therefore focus on four key areas: Employee satisfaction, customer (students’) satisfaction, work environment and the corruption index, leading to the following questions:

(i) To what extent are the stakeholder satisfied with services rendered by security department?
(ii) To what extent are the security staff prompt in handling security issues?

(iii) To what extent is security staff corrupt?

1.3 Research Objectives

This section is divided into two sub-sections:

(i) The overall objective section that captures the entire research expectation on a broader perspective.

(i) The specific research objectives which will expound in the first subsection

1.3.1 Overall Objective

The overall objective of the Study is to determine the level of customer satisfaction, in addition to establishing the level of corruption within security operations.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

More specifically, this study sought to;

• To determine the employees’ level of satisfaction with the security department.

• To determine the students’ level of satisfaction with the services offered by the security department.

• To evaluate the staff perception on security department work environment

1.4 Justification of the Study

In an effort to improve service delivery and provide a conducive work environment the University undertook a survey to gauge the level of employee satisfaction with regard to service delivery
and general staff welfare. This baseline survey was conducted by Synovate (Steadman Group) in April 2007 and established a staff satisfaction index of 64% based on survey of representative staff sample from the entire University.

In 2007/2008 University of Nairobi Performance Contract, the University undertook to enhance staff satisfaction index from 74% (June 2007) to approximately 80%. The target of enhancing staff satisfaction was cascaded to and adopted by all colleges and units of the University.

In line with this, the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Administration and Finance) instructed all units of the University to carry out internal survey on levels of client's satisfaction in order to map out strategies of handling the gaps that would be identified by these studies.

The colleges and units were further requested to ensure that the questionnaires captured issues to do with the University efforts towards eradication of corruption and behavioural change among other issues.

In prompt response the chief security officer (CSO) constituted a clients Satisfaction Survey committee vide a memo dated April 15, 2011. Ref: UON/SEC/PC/23/46. The committee conducted the survey in April – May 2011 and compiled this report on the findings.

The committee was constituted as follows:

Mr. Walter Oguta - Chairman
Mr. Simon Mwita - Member
Mr. Reuben Mutai - Member
Mr. John Mutunga - Member
Mr. Michael Makau - Member
Mr. David Kimani - Member
Mr. Wesley Mutai - Joint Secretary
Mr. Fredrick M. Kasomi - Secretary

1.4.1 **Terms of Reference**

- To conduct an internal customer satisfaction survey within various Colleges in the University.
- To develop appropriate tools for collection of data and among other things the questionnaires to capture issues to do with our customers level of satisfaction with our services.
- To analyze the findings of the Survey.
- To prepare a report thereof, complete with recommendations.
- To include any other relevant information to the above TOR.
- To submit the duly completed report to the Chief Security Officer, on or before 15th May 2011.

1.5 **Study Limitations and Weaknesses**

This section was organized into the following sub-sections: missing information, mode of questionnaire delivery, target respondents, respondents’ classification and representation of the student sample.
1.5.1 None Responsiveness

It was noted that most of the members of staff failed to give information regarding their departments simply because they feared that the survey was set to victimize them.

1.5.2 Mode of Questionnaire Delivery

The questionnaires were developed through brainstorming sessions to identify key issues to be included in the questionnaires. Immediately the questionnaires were developed, they were pre-tested to ascertain their validity and reliability. Before the questionnaires were administered, the research assistants who were drawn mainly from students on work study programme through the special students advisor were trained on how to administer the approved questionnaires. In a bid to test the validity of the data collection tool, some of the questionnaires were distributed to the colleges through the research assistants

1.5.3 Target Respondents

The respondents were members of staff, students and suppliers of goods and services.

1.5.4 Organization of the Report

What follows are three broad sections detailing the results of this comprehensive study. Chapter two outlines the research methodology and chapter three reports on the findings of the entire stakeholder groups (staff, students and suppliers) chapter four will give detailed recommendations on the findings of the study.
Chapter Two

Research Methodology

2.1 Research Design

The study used a survey research design because of its low cost and easy access to information that was not available anywhere.

2.2 Population

The population of the study comprised three major stakeholders to the University that included students members of staff and suppliers of goods and services.

2.3 Sampling Methodology

The study adopted simple random probability sampling technique in selecting the respondents for the study. This was the most appropriate for the study so as to avoid bias. It gives all the respondents equal chance of being selected into the sample, hence minimizing biasness. In the case of students and staff, the number of respondents was determined proportionately for each college as well as SWA.

The formula shown below was used to determine the sample size.

\[ N = \frac{Z^2 \cdot p \cdot q}{d^2} \]
Where:

- \( N \) = The desired sample size (if the target population is greater than 10,000)
- \( p \) = The proportion in the target population estimated to have characteristics being measured
- \( q \) = \((1-p)\)
- \( d \) = The level of statistical significance set
- \( Z \) = The standard normal deviate at the required confidence level

2.3.1 Customer Satisfaction

A quantitative approach was adopted for this study with the use of a structured questionnaire to employees, students and suppliers. The exercise was expected to last for three days whereby the research assistants were to distribute the questionnaires on the first day and collect the feedback in the remaining two days. Data was collected through drop and pick method which most researchers confirm to be cost-effective.

2.3.2 Employee Satisfaction Measurements

A quantitative approach was adopted for this study with the use of a structured questionnaire administered by the research assistants who used the drop and pick technique. The study tool was a self-administration type; individual staff members completed the study instruments to minimize any possible bias. Research assistants were available for clarification of issues not clearly understood by the respondents. This was especially useful for the members of staff whose levels of education was low and could not easily understand the contents of the questionnaire. For the members of staff that required assistance in filling the
questionnaires, face-to-face interviewing was applied. The study employed a multi-stage sampling design (using SPSS) with colleges and special departments among others service as the first-stage probability-sampling unit.

2.4 Quality Controls in the Field

Quality control measures that were applied across the whole survey process included but not limited to the following:

2.4.1 Recruitment of Research Assistants

The Survey Team recruited the students on work study programme to collect data from their respective campuses. There were ten campuses and ten students were chosen from each campus for convenience purposes. In addition ten members of staff were also sampled. The survey team had a total of forty (40) Research Assistants who were supervised by members of staff from security department.

2.4.2 Piloting

All questionnaires were piloted to enhance validity and reliability of the instrument, while at the same time, dummy analysis was performed.

2.4.3 Supervision of Research Assistants

The Survey Team appointed two members who went round to confirm that what the research assistants were doing was within the agreed rules and regulations governing the research. The monitoring and evaluation systems put in place by the Survey Team proved effective and data collection was done according to the agreed research procedures.
2.5 The Data Collection

A quantitative approach was adopted for this study with the use of a questionnaire. The study was of a self-administered type; individual clients completed the study instruments. There could have been fear of victimization for airing honest opinions, especially where such opinions reflected negatively on security management however these fears were deflecting in the introduction of the questionnaire. The students on the other side expressed themselves freely without any fear, while the suppliers responded favourably.

2.6 Data Management

2.6.1 Signing in Questionnaires

On receiving questionnaires from the field, checks were done to establish the sample size based on the questionnaires received and their respective quotas on the sampling frame. There were no glaring inconsistencies found.

2.6.2 Coding Frame Development

Coding frames were developed by the research executive in-charge of the project. The coding team was then trained by the Research Executive, who also kept a check on the coding process until all the questionnaires had been fully coded.

2.6.3 Statistical Checks.

This ensures that correct and accurate data capturing into its respective or designated design format as per the quotas/skip routines and filters are observed. Preliminary statistical checks were done on frequencies, particularly on obligatory questions.
All questionnaires were physically checked by the research assistant and confirmed by the Supervisors who also performed and ran the preliminary reports. To facilitate these, a suspense database was created.

2.6.4 Exporting Data

After checking the data for any possible errors, data was then exported to SPSS. Thereafter comparisons were made between formic data and SPSS data. After analysis, tables and pie chart were checked for logic before passing them on for reporting.
Chapter Three

Data analysis

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the findings of the survey. It is organized as follows: The initial section addresses the background information of the respondents. This is then followed by a presentation of customer satisfaction categorized by strata. The final section summarizes the foregoing by presenting the satisfaction indices for each of the major clients dealt with.

3.2 Distribution of respondents by Campus

The survey sought to ensure that there was equitable representation for each of the campuses locations including SWA. From the table below, all the campuses received near equal representation, with SWA having the highest proportion (12.1%) and Chiromo having the lowest at 8.2%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Kabete</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Science</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kabete</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiromo</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS-Kenyatta</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklands</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>354</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Relationship with the University

Majority of the respondents (77%) were students. This was followed by staff (21%), while suppliers and other each had 1%. The combined proportion of students and staff was 98%, thus the study concentrated on the two major clients since the other three categories were negligible in the sample achieved. The chart below presents this information in detail.

![Chart showing distribution between different categories.]

3.4 Gender

Among the staff, majority of the respondents (54%) were female, while 43% were male. 3% of the staff failed to respond to this questions. The converse was true among students with majority (63%) being male and only 36% being female. This is presented in the diagram below.
3.5 Resolution of client issues

The study sought to determine whether the clients had ever sought any assistance from security department. A great majority of the staff (71%) had sought assistance from the security department while only 29% had never had such an interaction. The converse was true among students as a simple majority (50%) had never sought assistance from security.

Of those who had ever sought assistance among staff, majority (70%) felt that their issue were solved expeditiously while only 30% felt otherwise. Among the students, majority (61%) felt that their issues had been addressed expeditiously while only 39% felt they had not. The pie charts below illustrate these findings.
3.6 Rating of rating security staff in terms of their responsiveness to client’s problems

The survey also sought to determine the extent to which the clients felt the security team was responsive to their needs. Majority of the staff respondents (55%) as well as student respondents (41%) rated security staff responsiveness to their needs as Good. Overall, majority of the respondents (44.2%)
rated responsiveness as good and 33.6% rated it as fair. These points to quite high responsiveness indicating that clients are more likely to have high satisfaction levels. Responsiveness is one of the five major attributes of customer perception as advanced by Parasuraman (1988). The table below presents this finding in detail.

![Chart showing client satisfaction ratings]

3.7 Perceptions on etiquette

The survey sought to examine client perceptions on issues of ethics and etiquette among security officers. The perceptions were measured on a scale of 1 – 4 with 1 as poor and 4 as excellent. The mean ratings were converted into percentage as displayed in the table below. All the attributes considered were rated between 64% and 66% which is quite high since in this scale, a rating of 55% and above is considered good.
3.8 Customer satisfaction

3.8.1 Overall customer satisfaction for each indicator

The survey sought to examine the perception of respondents on various issues related to security staff. Positive statements were posed to respondents and they were required to state their level of agreement on a five-point likert scale. The table below illustrates the condensed form of their responses. From the table below, it was observed that majority of the respondents were in agreement with all the questions posed.

This indicates that majority of the clients were satisfied with all the attributes being examined. The attributes included: promptness of response to problems, security staff availability, and extent of resolution of issues raised, helpfulness, confidentiality, transparency, openness and trustworthiness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respond to clients' problems promptly</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff are readily available to handle student problems</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients issues are conclusively addressed</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly in handling clients matters</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff provide relevant and helpful information to all enquiries</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uphold the principle of confidentiality and privacy in handling clients matters</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate in an open, fair and transparent manner</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive to human dignity and observes human rights</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be trusted to provide sufficient guidance in case of personal problems</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8.2 Customer satisfaction index

The survey sought to determine an index representing customer satisfaction. This was obtained by converting the mean ratings for the various indicators into a percentage scale. From the findings, it was established that staff are more satisfied with security department than students. Staff had a satisfaction index of 76.51%, while students had 67.30%. The joint satisfaction index was found to be 69.41%. This is quite good for the security department considering that the University of Nairobi’s main satisfaction index has always been at around 64%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer satisfaction index</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.41%</td>
<td>67.30%</td>
<td>76.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 Corruption indicators

3.9.1 General rating

The survey also sought to examine the existence of corruption among security staff. A few possible cases were put forward to respondents and asked to what extent they applied to the security department. The lowest point of the scale was “Not at all” indicating no corruption of the kind whatsoever, while the highest was “Great extent” indicating widespread corruption. Among the three attributes examined, majority of the clients rated them as applying to a small extent or not at all. However, the fact that some clients still rated some of the attributes as applying to a moderate and great extent warrants concern since the ideal situation should be that there are absolutely no instances of bribery.
3.9.2 Corruption index

By converting the mean ratings for the various corruption ratings into percentage scale, the following indices were obtained. It must be noted that these indices are merely indicative of possible existence of corruption and not conclusive prove that corruption exists at the levels indicated. From the results, students seem to have experienced more corruption than staff among the security staff. The overall index stands at 24.9% which is quite high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corruption index</td>
<td>24.90%</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Four
Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Overall Stakeholder Perception

From the findings of this study, Overall, security department is perceived positively by both staff and students (i.e. 67.30% and 76.51% respectively). This is quite good for security department considering that the University of Nairobi’s main satisfaction index has always been at around 64%. However, it is perceived negatively by 31% of students who are actually the key stakeholders (customers) which means there is room for improvement. Despite the differences, the overall satisfaction index was 69.41% which is above the satisfaction index in the baseline survey conducted by the Steadman Group Synovate (2007).

4.2 Employees

Areas identified as priority or would have immediate impact on satisfaction of employees are: security department be encouraged to operate in an open, fair and transparent manner, and staff were resentment in entrusting security staff to handle personal problems.

It is recommended that these areas be addressed in the next financial year so as to enhance employee motivation and confidence.
4.3 Students/Customers

Students’ satisfaction will have a significant impact if the following areas are addressed: Clients issues are conclusively addressed, and if security staff would become more friendly in handling clients matters. This could be because the study was carried out on the eve of SONU election.

It is therefore, recommended that security department should take drastic measures be address these drawbacks across the board.

4.5 Work Environment

The overall employees’ satisfaction index on work environment is 77%. This shows that the employees are satisfied with their working environment. Further, at least 1 in every 2 employees rated communications equipment and furniture & fittings as being below average. Which is an area that if addressed would improve on the morale of employees.

The survey sought to establish the preparedness of staff to deal with emergencies. A majority of the respondents (71%) said that they had been trained on how to offer first aid on fire related emergencies.

4.6 Corruption

Going by the mean ratings for the various corruption ratings into percentage scale, an overall index of 24.9% was found which is a clear indication that there exists corruption among members of security department. Students seem to have experienced more corruption than staff among the security
staff. The major contributor to the high indices in corruption rating include: Guardians use their public/political influence to have their children who are students be pardoned for breach of regulations. Clients bribe officer in order to be pardoned for breach of regulations. From these It is recommended that sensitization be done at this level for corruption to be lowered to acceptable margins (e.g. 15%) because the rating has an effect on our corporate image. In addition, the findings is not in line with the University wide policy of Zero (0) tolerance to corrupt practices.
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Appendix 1

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
SECURITY DEPARTMENT

Customer Satisfaction Survey
Questionnaire to Clients

April 2011
Security department is committed to ensuring safety of clients and University Property. This questionnaire is intended to collect information about client’s satisfaction levels for services delivered by security department. Please do not indicate your name in the questionnaire. The information collected will be treated with strict confidentiality and shall not be used against the respondent. It is purely for the purpose of assisting security department in setting priorities for continuous improvement in security provision.

This is to kindly request you to give an honest response to the questions here under

1) What is your relationship with the University?
   Student [ ]   Staff [ ]   other [ ]
   specify ..............................eg parent, supplier etc

2) What is your Gender (Tick Appropriately)
   Male [ ]   Female [ ]

3) In one above if student or staff, state your department or College

4) If student what is your year of study?  1st [ ]        2nd [ ]
   3rd[ ]     4th[ ]      5th[ ]      6th[ ]      7th[ ]

(The following questions 5, 6, & 7 are to be responded to by members of staff)


5) If staff state your Length of service in the University (years) 3 and below [ ] between 4 – 15 [ ] between 16 – 25 [ ] Over 25 [ ]

6) What are your terms of employment? Permanent [ ] Contract [ ] other e.g. casual [ ]

7) What is your Position/Designation?

8) Have you ever sought assistance from security staff?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

9) If yes in 8 above was the problem solved expeditiously?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

10) How would you rate security staff in terms of their responsiveness to client’s problems? Excellent [ ] Good [ ] Fair [ ] Poor [ ]

11) How would you rate security staff with regard to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) Do you think security staff condones corrupt practices in any way? Yes [ ] No [ ]
13) To what extent do you think the following forms of corruption exist in security department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corruption Indicators</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clients bribe an officer to get services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardians use their public/political influence to have their children who are students be pardoned for breach of regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients bribe officer to be pardoned for breach of regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14) Please specify any major corruption complaint in security department other than what is highlighted above

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
for more space use the back of the questionnaire

15) Would you like us to contact you in future?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

16) If yes above give us your contacts through which to contact you.................................
17) To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding security staff responses to clients’ problems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Staff Responsiveness</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respond to clients problems promptly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff are readily available to handle student problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients issues are conclusively addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly in handling clients matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Provide relevant and helpful information to all enquiries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uphold the principle of confidentiality and privacy in handling clients matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate in an open, fair and transparent manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive to human dignity and observes of human rights in the course of duty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be trusted to provide sufficient guidance in case of personal problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18) Suggest how you would want security staff to respond to your problems so as to improve our services …………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………

19) Which category of officers, if any, do you consider less responsive to clients issues (e.g. University Security Guards, Contracted Guards, Senior Security Officers etc)
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
Extra space in case you may need
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………
                                                                                       ………………………………………