PAC UNIVERSITY
JOURNAL OF ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES
VOL. 5, N0. 1, (2023)

University Instructors' personalities and training and their preferences for Online or face-to face teaching: The case of a Public University in Nairobi, Kenya

Stacy C. Bett[1] & Lilian I. Vikiru[2]

[1,2] Department of Communication, Languages and Linguistics

[1] stacy.bett@pacuniversity.ac.ke; [2]lilian.vikiru@pacuniversity.ac.ke

Abstract: - *This study aimed to explore the relationship between instructors' preferences for online or face-to-face modes of teaching on one hand and their personalities and training on the other. The study was conducted at a public University in Nairobi, Kenya. Grounded in the Big Five Theory of Personality, the research used a descriptive approach with a survey design, collecting both qualitative and quantitative data through questionnaires and document analysis. The findings suggested that instructors' personalities had limited influence on their choice of teaching modes, with a majority of respondents favoring blended teaching methods over purely face-to-face or online approaches. Additionally, all participants reported receiving training from the institution to facilitate online classes. Based on these results, the study recommended that regulatory bodies in higher education should develop policies considering technology's role in learning environments. These policies should guide the selection of teaching modes. Furthermore, the study proposed the establishment of effective policies for training university lecturers in emerging teaching modes, advocating for benchmarking and in-house training. In essence, the research underscores the need for comprehensive strategies to align teaching practices with evolving technological advancements in higher education.*

Keywords: Big Five Theory, personality traits, modes of teaching, online teaching

INTRODUCTION

The study addresses the need for a better understanding of how personality factors and training influence instructional leader's choice of the mode of delivery in various teaching environments. The study was carried out in a public university in Nairobi, Kenya. It provides valuable insights in instructor's choices of the mode of delivery in the context of the evolving landscape of online teaching in Kenyan Universities. Ennis (2016) posits that research is an effective way of finding possible ways of improving instructors' effectiveness. One such area of research would be the instructional leaders' personalities which have a significant bearing in their capacity to deliver the expected outcomes in their teaching profession especially on student achievement (Campbell, Kyriakides, Muijs, & Robinson, 2005). Pastorino and Doyle-Portillo (2012) define personality as a unique combination of factors such as one's thinking, emotions, habits, attitudes, and behaviours which influence how a person reacts and behaves across varying circumstances or situations. It is a concept that can be explained and measured using various personality theories including behavioral, humanistic, trait, psychodynamic, and biological theories (Rock, 2013).

This study employed the Big Five Personality theory which many scholars have used for similar studies (e.g. Costa, 1997; Chamorro-Premuzic, & Furnham, 2014). The five factors identified by scholars include openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (Chamorro-Premuzic, & Furnham, 2014). John, Naumann and Soto (2008) add that the Big Five factors are useful predictors of job performance. The authors argue that the outcomes of jobs requiring group work would be best predicted using factors such as neuroticism and agreeableness. According to Fleenor (2023), the emergence of the five-factor

model of personality was an important advance in the creation of an organizing framework for the traits thought to be important for effective leadership. Further, more research shows that four of these four of these factors individually (i.e extraversion, open to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness, emotional stability and openness) are positively related to leadership. From this observation, it is evident that within the evolving field of teaching there are possibilities offered by new educational technologies and emergent changes in roles. This change would require an understanding of instructors' personalities to gauge their fit for the changing roles while finding ways of equipping them with necessary skills to cope and succeed in their teaching responsibilities.

The changing landscape in higher education due to advances in technology is an issue that instructors have to deal with. According to Kentnor (2015), the historical development of online learning is traced from computer-based education in the 1960s to the current era of advanced online education platforms, including Virtual Learning Environments (VLEs), Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), Learning Management Systems (LMS), and the recent integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and virtual reality (VR). These systems provided a centralized platform for course management, assessments, and communication. The 2010s witnessed a move towards blended learning, combining traditional classroom teaching with online elements. Personalized learning experiences, adaptive learning platforms, and the use of analytics for student performance tracking became more prevalent. The COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 accelerated the adoption of online learning globally, bringing about innovations in virtual classrooms and collaboration tools. In Africa and more so Kenya, there is a dynamic growth in the education sector, online learning, technological advancements and the need for flexible access (Adkins, 2013; Baraka & Weiss, 2017). There have been a number of commissions in Kenya that have pointed to the importance, and advocated for the implementation of Open and Distance Learning to supplement face-to-face teaching (Ominde Commission, 1964; 1976 Gachathi Report, the 1981 Mackay Report, the 1988 Kamunge Report, and the 2000 Koech Report; Boit & Kipkoech, 2012).The Commission for University Education (CUE) established in 2012 has also recognised and included guidelines and standards for Open and Distance Learning in the standards guidelines and regulations for universities in Kenya (Sanga, 2017; Commission for University Education, 2014; Universities Act (revised), 2023). These regulations include guidelines such as principles, accreditation thresholds, strategies and objectives for ODL in universities. Although more and more universities are now offering alternative modes of learning apart from face-to-face learning, there are challenges such as including insufficient training for instructors, unclear policies, high implementation costs, and the preference of lecturers for face-to-face teaching. The shortage of teaching staff further complicates the situation, leading to the allocation of online teaching duties without adequate choice or preparation.

Statement of the problem

There is a strain on the teaching staff in Kenyan universities. Boit and Kipkoech (2012) posit that this shortage of teaching staff is because the higher education crisis which dates as far back as 1987 and 1990 led to an explosive growth in enrolment of students in universities. To date, this shortage still exists which means that the available staff has been tasked with the responsibility of taking on the emerging forms of teaching including open and distance learning, a task for which they often do not choose and are not well equipped (Makokha & Mutisya, 2016)..

Extensive empirical research exploring students' personality shows that it has a link with students' academic satisfaction and performance, but fewer studies have explored the relationship between instructor's personality, and their work performance, especially those who facilitate distance learning (Bolliger & Erichsen, 2013; Kirwan & Roumell, 2015). Unfortunately,

psychological sciences do not have an area studying the matter of teachers' personality yet it is a key component of the educational process (Göncz, 2016).

Interestingly, Holland (1997) writes that people choose careers which have an alignment to their personalities and the more the alignment, the higher the level of job satisfaction and performance effectiveness. Kemboi, Kindiki and Misigo (2016) add that people who gain employment in areas that are misaligned to their area of training, interests or personality often encounter frustration and dissatisfaction which manifests through low productivity and demoralization. . Further, studies have also shown that instructors teach based on preferences rather than teaching standards and benchmarks which is a practice that has a significant influence on their effectiveness and performance (Kaplan & Owings, 2010; McKenzie, 2011). Therefore, given the differences in the expectations of instructors teaching face-to-face and online teaching environments, it would be important to investigate the influence of personality and training on instructors' choice of either online or face-to-face teaching within the Kenyan context.

General objective

To study the influence of instructional leaders' personality on their preference of online and face-to-face modes of teaching in Nairobi universities

Specific objectives

i. To investigate instructors' personality traits and their influence on instructional leader's preference of online and face-to-face modes of teaching in the selected University
ii. To establish the preference for online and face-to-face modes of teaching among the instructional leaders in the selected University
iii. To establish the source and nature of training received by instructors to tackle both online and face-to-face teaching in the selected University

LITERATURE REVIEW

The shift from traditional to virtual and blended learning environments is driven by economic demands for specialized skills and socio-political pressures to provide education to diverse groups. ODL plays a crucial role in extending educational opportunities to individuals in various contexts, fostering intercultural awareness. Additionally, the Social Learning Environment emphasizes the significance of social interactions in the learning process (Nguyen, 2020). Traditionally, education relied on social transmission, with knowledge being passed down from older generations or acquired through exploration driven by curiosity. This traditional mode of learning was centred around physical environments. However, the advent of technology and changes in social, political, and economic landscapes have led to transformations in learning environments, incorporating virtual and blended learning approaches (Cutter-Mackenzie et al., 2014; Zawacki-Richter & Anderson, 2014).

Economically, the job market's increasing demand for knowledge- intensive and science-based skills underscores the necessity for high quality education. Socio-politically, universities face pressure to provide education to individuals who be in remote areas where they may not have access to conventional face to face classrooms. Open and Distance Learning (ODL) emerges as a solution to offer education to diverse learners in various geographical and socio-cultural contexts, fostering intercultural awareness and communication (Zawacki-Richter & Anderson, 2014; Nyerere, 2016).

Instructional Modes of Content Delivery

The learning environment in education is closely tied to the mode of delivery, and the relationship is complex, requiring alignment for effective learning. Different learning

environments demand specific modes of delivery, such as virtual labs for online science online learning, distance learning, and blended learning have emerged as alternatives to traditional face-to-face approaches.

Online learning, as defined by Tayebinik and Puteh (2012), occurs when teaching and learning take place using the internet, irrespective of the physical distance between learners and teachers. In contrast, distance learning, or distributed learning, involves separate geographical locations, necessitating technology for communication. Blended learning combines online and face-to-face elements, aiming to capitalize on the strengths of both modes.

Murray and Christison (2017) distinguish these modes based on the percentage of time allocated to each. Traditional delivery involves 0% exposure to web-based technology, while web-facilitated and blended modes includes 1-29% and 30-79% online instruction, respectively. Online mode encompasses 80-100% online instruction. Blended learning offers various benefits, including increased social interaction, more preparation for instructors, deeper understanding through web-based resources, and improved learning outcomes compared to face-to-face or online only approaches. As technology =based education grows, instructors must develop skills to employ diverse teaching modes, regardless of personal preferences.

In Kenya, the rapid expansion of universities over the last decade has created a need for alternative teaching methods, leading to the growth of Open and Distance Learning (ODL). ODL provides advantages such as knowledge creation across geographical distances, flexible learning hours for working students, and cost savings. Unfortunately, there are a myriad of challenges that hamper effective online learning especially in Kenya, such as Kenyans' scepticism concerning the quality of the education on an online platform causing lower than expected enrolment into online courses, unreliable technological infrastructure due to poor funding (Nyerere, 2016), and loss of the human connection which may adversely affect student experiences (Keengwe, Schneller & Kungu, 2014). Therefore , in a bid to improve the provision of distance learning services, schools undertake activities such as training staff, educating people on ODL programmes, improving and expanding student support services (Nyerere, 2016). Notably, even if there was adequate provision and remedies for such issues, the instructional leaders' effectiveness would still be adversely affected by personal matters such as personality.

Instructional Leadership and Teacher Leadership in Education

The landscape of educational leadership encompasses various models, including transformational, instructional, collaborative, and distributed leadership. However, instructional leadership emerges as particularly impactful, demonstrating a robust correlation with student learning outcomes (Hallinger & Wang, 2015). The historical essence of instructional leadership revolves around developing the competence of school principals to effectively lead institutions toward improved performance. Instructional leaders play key roles in facilitating collaboration, guiding content alignment, and promoting a positive learning climate (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). With time, the concept of teacher leadership has evolved, recognizing the potential impact teachers can have in shared leadership scenarios (Wells, Maxfield, & Klocko, 2011).

Teacher leadership, as outlined by Silva, Gimbert, and Nolan (2000), has developed through three phases. The first phase emphasized managerial roles, maintaining hierarchical power structures. The second phase shifted towards collaborative responsibilities, eliminating hierarchies among teachers. The third phase introduced informal leadership, allowing teachers to empower and grow others. This final phase emphasises that teachers can effectively lead each other through shared leadership principles (Barth, 2001).

The benefits of teacher leadership include enhanced school effectiveness, improved teaching

practices through collaboration, increased teacher morale focusing on professionalism, and autonomy through democratic processes (Frost & Durrant, 2003). However, challenges exist, including the need for senior leadership to share power and the necessary kills for effective collaboration and negotiation among teachers.

In the Kenyan context, teacher leadership is seen as a means of democratizing decision-making, ensuring the inclusion of staff in University governing bodies (Mwiria et al., 2007). Challenges include hierarchical management, political interference, strain on teaching staff due to high student enrolment, poor remuneration, and brain drain. These challenges compromise the quality of teacher leadership, particularly in the context of Open and Distance Learning (ODL), where issues such as inadequate qualifications and lack of training for ICT-based learning further compound the problems .Cultural factors with some communities resisting formal education and technology, intensify the challenges faced in implementing effective teacher leadership in the Kenyan education system (Kerubo, 2016; Fox, 2014)

Instructors' Teaching Preferences and Challenges in Kenyan Universities

Instructors' teaching techniques often reflect personal preferences. A study carried out in seven public Universities in Kenya revealed that 34% of instructors preferred virtual teaching, 20% face-to-face 25% blended while 21% had no specific preference. (Makokha and Mutisya, 2016). Reasons given for the preferences included ease of reference with hard copy materials, fear of technology failure and technical challenges in converting materials to digital formats. Notably, the instructors preferring virtual teaching mainly used the platforms for uploading notes and relevant course material (Odhimbo, 2009). According to Nyerere (2016), some also used the platforms for interactive learning.

One significant challenge in the development of Open and Distance Learning (ODL) is the lack of training provided to instructors handling online and distance classes. Makokha and Mutisya (2016) emphasize that instructors' prior experience and training in using technology are crucial for instilling confidence and effective use of ICT tools. The absence of such training can lead to misusing technology or its underutilization. Makokha and Mutisya's (2016) analysis reveals a startling finding that 55% of ODL instructors in Kenya lacked training in facilitating e-learning. Only 17% had undergone formal training, 20% self-trained, and 8% received training from colleagues. Similarly, Nyerere's (2016) study on ODL instructor training in various areas, including ICT application, course module development, assessment of ODL learners, and interactive content creation, found that the majority (44%) had no training in these areas. Further, lack of clear policies particularly at the national level is identified as a factor contributing to scepticism about the quality of distance learning.

Theoretical framework

According to Vorkapic, Vajicic and Cepic (2014), the Big Five Theory of Personality developed by Lewis Goldberg allows for the understanding of an individual as a whole through its integrative framework since it incorporates the most current empirical and theoretical trends thereby delivering relevant data. Secondly, the theoretical framework is one that enjoys consensus concerning its employment of universal personality dimensions as agreed on by various researchers (Costa, 1997; Busato, Prins, Elshout, & Hamaker, 2000; Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2014). Thirdly, since the theory shares a framework and even variables with other theories especially Raymond Cattell's 16 "fundamental factors" of personality from which it was derived, it is possible to replicate and compare studies regarding personality (Cattell, 1990; Chamorro-Premuzic, 2015).

Conversely, some critics fault the Big Five theory as one that lacks concrete explanations

concerning its development the processes that led to the identification of the personality factors (Murphy, 2013). However, its excellent reliability and validity has made most researchers agree on the five dimensions of personality and the advantages of its thorough assessment technique (Beckmann & Wood, 2017). Finally, the Big Five theory is one that allows other systems of personality to translate their data into its five personality dimensions which is advantageous due to its diverse use rather than narrow scope (Chamorro-Premuzic&Furnham, 2014). Notably, there are two other theories which scholars have used to evaluate personality in the educational context: Eysenck's model and Cattel's 16 factors model. However, the Big Five Theory is most preferred since Eysenck's model is said to be "excessively bound with the physiological research data" while Cattel's 16 factors is not sufficiently reliable due to its complexity (Abdelsalam, 2013, p. 60).

The Big Five Personality Theory

Lewis Goldberg advocated heavily for five primary factors of personality (Ackerman, 2017; Cherry, 2019). His work was expanded upon by McCrae & Costa (2001), who confirmed the model's validity and provided the model used today: conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness to experience, and extraversion. Each of these has differing descriptive characteristics which form an inventory. From the Big Five theory arose the Five-Factor Model (FFM) which is a descriptive personality trait model but differs from the former in that FFM describes the Big Five. Also, while the Big Five describes real traits, FFM focus on a person's causal mechanisms that make them behave in a certain way (Engler, 2013).

Personality traits have been found to influence various aspects of teaching, including the preferred teaching mode of instructors. Studies have indicated a significant relationship between teachers' reactions and academic performance. Personality traits, particularly those in the in the Big Five Theory, can reflect the creation and maintenance of a conducive learning environment, influencing instructional leadership (Vorkapic, Vajicic and Cepic , 2014; Northcote, 2010).

Extroverted individuals tend to be social, friendly and spontaneous. While some agree that extroverts may prefer online teaching due to reduced supervision, others suggest that they may opt for face-to-face interactions for instant feedback. The preference might depend on the level of engagement and responsiveness of students in the online environment. This study set out to establish whether extroversion influences choice of mode of teaching ((Moneta, 2014; Clarke et al., 2015; Goldberg, 2015).

Agreeable individuals tend to be kind and accommodating. They prioritize positive interpersonal relationships and conflict resolution. Instructors high in agreeableness may prefer teaching in environments that foster community and social harmony. However, their preferred teaching mode may be influenced more by external factors such as social approval than internal determinants (Matthews, Deary, & Whiteman, 2009; Dumbach, 2014; Mavor, Platow, & Bimuzic, 2017).

Conscientious individuals are characterized by thorough planning and goal-oriented behavior. While conscientiousness is associated with positive work attitudes and performance, the adaptability to dynamic environments, such as online teaching, might be a challenge (Fink & Capparell, 2013). It would therefore be expected that conscientious instructors may lean towards the familiar face-to-face teaching mode due to its stability and predictability. It is also worth noting that conscientious people put a premium on performance (Robbins et al., 2014). In addition, agreeable people also tend to conform, comply and strive to be liked (Robins et al., 2013), they may tend towards attaining social approval and opt to do what they consider acceptable not necessarily their personal preference (Kenrick, Neuberg & Cialdini, 2010; Leary & Tangney, 2012).

Neurotic individuals tend to be anxious and pessimistic and they may doubt their self-

efficacy. High neuroticism correlates with resistance to change and a preference for the status quo. Instructors with high neuroticism scores may be more inclined towards traditional face-to-face teaching, finding familiarity and stability in this environment (Robbins et al,. 2014). However, it is also possible that neurotic people would have anti-social tendencies and therefore be more comfortable teaching online (Barnes, 2018; Rosen et al., 2013).

Individuals with high openness scores are adventurous, curious and open to new experiences. Openness correlates positively with tolerance for ambiguity and exploration. Instructors scoring high in openness may be more inclined to adopt online teaching, embracing technological advancements and exploring new ways of delivering content (Goldenberg, 2013). Age and gender can moderate the relationship between personality and teaching mode preference.

A combination of personality traits contributes to instructors' preference for online or face – to-face teaching. Factors such as technological skill, teaching competencies, professional development, and organizational focus are influenced by different personality traits. For instance, extraversion and openness may drive enthusiasm for online innovations, while conscientiousness may influence the willingness to adapt to change.

Influence of Personality on Instructor's Preferred Teaching Mode

Past studies have evidenced the importance of instructor's personality in determining students' behaviour and achievement. Lorentz and Coker (1977), in a study investigating the relationship between teachers' Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI - a self-help assessment test which helps people gain insights about how they work and learn) and their behaviour, found that teachers' personalities affect their students' reactions in class. Another research by Fisher and Kent (1998) using the MBTI instrument found that there was a relationship between the instructor's personality and the existing classroom environment perceptions. In essence, certain character traits and personality attributes have a significant bearing on the ease or difficulty with which an instructor will create and sustain a learning environment which encourages the development and nurturing of skills such as problem solving and creative thinking (Torrance, 1977; Hamza and Nash, 1996; Meador, 1997; Chan, 2002; Hamza & Griffith, 2006; Zhou, 2017; Mudasir & Ganai, 2017). Bano, Ansari, Ganai (2017). Northcote (2010) argues that personality plays a crucial role in creating and sustaining a conducive online learning atmosphere.

Moneta (2014) argues that extraversion goes beyond one's talkativeness and encompasses emotions and behaviours such as "sociability, affection, friendliness, and spontaneity" (p. 114). Holman, Wall, Clegg, Sparrow and Howard (2005) discuss the issue of teleworking and its relationship with personality in light of the minimal or inexistent degree of supervision which is a defining characteristic of online work. It has been observed that extroverted people are very successful at interaction within and outside the organization. As suchm extraverted people would do well in online teaching (Holman et al., 2005, p. 183). Additionally, Hew and Cheung (2012) argue that students were motivated to engage in online discussions when their instructors had a high degree of involvement. Further, extraverted teachers may prefer face-to-face communication where there is instant feedback (Gamble & Gamble, 2013; Kadushin & Harkness, 2014).

Robins, Judge, Millett and Boyle (2013) argue that "agreeable people tend to be kinder and more accommodating in social situations" which then explains why "they are more pleasant to be around" (p.108). Therefore, people who score highly in agreeableness have a tendency to create and sustain positive interpersonal relations and resolve conflicts quickly through "use of compromise, avoidance of physical force and threats" (Matthews, Deary & Whiteman, 2003, p. 229).

In a study aimed at exploring the relationship between motivation, personality and thinking

on students' performance, researchers found that agreeableness played a vital role in the link thereby suggesting "that students place a great deal of importance on cooperation and consideration of others" (Santiago & Nakayama, 2006, p. 522). Similarly, instructors who score highly in agreeableness prefer to work in environments which uphold the spirit of community where people get along well with each other. Since agreeable people conform, comply and strive to be liked (Robins et al., 2015), they may tend towards attaining social approval (Kenrick, Neuberg & Cialdini, 2010; Leary & Tangney, 2012).

Highly conscientious people are those who plan thoroughly for their tasks and have set objectives for what they intend to do as well as the outcomes of their work processes (Robbins et al., 2015). Wilkinson, Bacon, Redman and Snell (2010) note that this kind of attitude towards work is a psychological attribute which is particularly essential when it comes to successful post-training transfer. Further, their inclination to have positive attitudes towards their work through thorough preparation and planning contributes to high levels of self-efficacy which is a characteristic in highly conscientious people (Leary & Hoyle, 2009; Lopez, 2009; Kozlowski & Salas, 2010; Nelson, Quick, Arstrong & Condie, 2012).

Conversely, the problem comes in when the school environment is as dynamic as it is now. Davis and Arend (2013) write that the emergence of online learning and consequent changes in the teaching scene has made it such that "conscientious professors can hardly keep up anymore with what they are supposed to do to be successful" (p. iv). Robbins et al. (2014) add that while conscientious people are very organized in their work, they often face the challenge of adapting to changing situations due to their orientation towards performance rather than learning, which further confounds the negative relationship between conscientiousness and creativity (Mumford, 2012).

Instructors who tend to be neurotic (low emotional stability) often are pessimistic, worry a lot, and doubt their self-efficacy and decision-making capabilities which then makes the overly frustrated or even suffer burnout (Fives & Gill, 2014). Chamorro-Premuzic and Ahmetoglu (2012) write that "people high on neuroticism are generally anxious, stressed, pessimistic, and fearful and tend to have lower self-esteem" while "people who are low on neuroticism are emotionally stable, calm, and optimistic" (p.29). Apart from a low sense of confidence in their work, high levels of neuroticism have a significant positive relationship with the affinity for status quo due to their fear of trying to learn new things (Watjatrakul, 2016). Christiansen and Tett (2013) write that individuals with high neuroticism scores become adversely affected by differences in their training and transfer environments. This would be translated to mean that teachers whose training is based on the traditional face-to-face environment may have a difficult time trying to transfer their acquired skills on an online platform since it is different from what they are familiar with (Charles, 2016).

Instructors who score highly on the openness scale have a high tolerance for ambiguity (Gijbels, Donche, Richardson, & Vermunt, 2014), prefer new experiences, and are intellectually curious (Biles & Flint, 2013). Conversely, "people lower on this dimension tend to have narrower interests and stick to the tried-and-true ways of doing things" (Daft, 2015, p.105). Therefore, people who score highly on openness are dynamic and adventurous in how they carry out their work while people who score lowly here are much more conventional and prefer to maintain status quo (Mondak, 2010). People who score highly in openness prefer to explore new things (Chammoro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2007; Daft, 2015; Cheung, Kwok, Ma, Lee, & Yang, 2017) and exhibit high levels of creativity in their tasks (Zhou, 2017), online learning would, therefore be an avenue through which they can dig into the revolutionary use of technology in teaching.

Although the definition of personality concerns the stability and enduring nature of one's traits, studies have shown that these traits often change as people grow older for various reasons which may include gaining new experience, the nature of one's work, influence of one's social environment, and a more mature sense of self-identity (Hedge & Borman, 2012). Pastorina and Doyle-Portillo (2013) note that while there is a dramatic difference in culture, language and even historical experiences among people in different nations across the world, studies have proved that cultural differences did not affect the manner in which age influenced personality. Foos and Clark (2016) further observe that "[personality] traits are far more stable in older adults than younger adults" with the differences in stability of traits being evident specifically in neuroticism and extraversion in the younger adults while the older ones showed stability in all five traits (p. 181).

Gender plays a vital role in one's personality as well (Hedge & Borman, 2012; Pastorina & Doyle-Portillo, 2013) such that women score higher in extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism compared to the men (Weisberg, DeYoung & Hirsh, 2011; Jarecka-Zyluk & Holz, 2014). Pastorina and Doyle-Portillo (2013) say that although studies have shown that there is a difference in personality based on gender, people of the same gender have been found to have more differences among themselves than people of the opposite genders. However, these differences became fewer as people of both genders aged showing that age is a moderator of the relationship between gender and personality (Weisberg, DeYoung & Hirsh, 2011). As such, an instructor's gender may determine their inclination to either face-to-face or online teaching since gender significantly influences one's personality. Unfortunately, this area may prove difficult to measure to a possible inadequacy in respondents as K'Odipo (2013) argues that women in high decision-making levels are very few in Kenya.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a survey research design since it involved collecting data from a certain number of people about their behaviors and whose responses were generalized to the target population. Through mixed methods, both qualitative and quantitative data were collected. The methods used were questionnaires which had both open-ended and closed questions and document analysis. The target site was public universities where both online and face-to-face modes were used. Further, faculty members who use both online and face-to-face modes of teaching were the specific population. This was a case study of one public university. The university was purposively sampled. It had the longest history in ODeL dating back to 1966, as well as systems and structures much better established as proven in its higher standing than other Kenyan public universities. The university was also well established in terms of access to facilities and computers with eLearning materials… availability of ICT infrastructure… adequate skills to use eLearning platforms… [and] level of interaction between lecturers and students in ODL platforms" (Nyerere, 2016, p.11).

33 members of the faculty use both face-to-face and online modes. The sampling method used to identify the respondents in the study was purposive which Daniel (2012) defines as "a nonprobability sampling procedure in which elements are selected from the target population based on their fit with the purposes of the study and specific inclusion and exclusion criteria" (p. 87). Using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) sample size table, 30 respondents were selected as an adequate sample. From the chosen sample, there was a 66% response rate.

The primary data was collected through questionnaires while secondary data was through document analysis. There was also qualitative and quantitative data. Quantitative data is numeric such as demographic data, while qualitative data is non-numeric for instance, attitudes and opinions (Kuiper, 2009). The closed part of the questionnaire and statistics in document analysis represented the quantitative data, while the open-ended questions and non-numeric information in

the document analysis aimed to collect qualitative data. This study used online questionnaires for data collection. The closed questions had a likert scale with an interval measurement scale used to investigate "the degree to which [respondents] agree or disagree with a statement" (Sullivan & Artino 2013, p. 541). The second method was document analysis, also called qualitative content analysis, which is a method of data collection involving analysis of existing information concerning a particular topic. This study analyzed documents such as books, peer-reviewed articles and journals which contained information about instructional leadership, the Big Five Theory of Personality as well as links between the two concepts. There was also the analysis of online institutional records concerning courses offered and the modes of teaching for these courses.

Secondly, the likert scale measured ordinal data and was the primary instrument used for the collection of data from respondents. An ordinal scale is one whose data has an order such as the one shown in Table 1, but the interval from one value to the next is difficult to determine (Stephens, 2006). Sullivan and Artino (2013) argue that the downside of the likert scale is in its inability to give accurate responses since the intervals of the values are unclear may distort the accuracy of the data collected. For quantitative data analysis the responses were analysed into percentages and the correlations analysed through t-tests and the analysis of variance. These analyses have been found capable to producing non-biased results (Sullivan & Artino, 2013 p. 542).

In all, the information which the researcher collected and analyzed concerned:

i. Age of respondent
ii. Gender of respondent
iii. Number of years as a lecturer
iv. Respondent's level of training received for ODL facilitation
v. Personality of respondent
vi. Respondent's preference for face-to-face, online, or blended modes of teaching
vii. Link between respondents' personality and preference

The qualitative data was analyzed by collating information from various sources (questionnaires and documents). The collated information was analyzed by coding for themes that were deductively determined from the study objectives and related variables. The data under various themes was then reviewed and compiled. The compiled information was then combined with the results of the quantitative analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

On the age of respondents, the majority of the lecturers (10 respondents) were between the ages of 40 and 59 years of age and they accounted for 58% of the respondents. Apart from 2 respondents (12%) who did not state their age, the remaining 30% was shared by 4 respondents (24%) being less than 40 years old and one respondent (6%) who was over 59 years old. The respondents were between the ages of 29 and 67 and the median age of the respondents who stated their age was 47.

From the findings, 82% of the respondents were male while only 18% were female. This finding is sadly expected and in line with K'Odipo's (2013) observation that "women in higher education institutions have been consistently under-represented in teaching, research and academic administrative positions of high status" (p. 43).

The majority of the respondents scored lowly in extraversion (53%), lowly in neuroticism (74%), averagely in openness (59%), averagely in agreeableness (59%), and highly in conscientiousness (71%). Also, no respondent scored highly in extraversion and neuroticism, or score lowly in openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness. This finding was the result of an

analysis of questionnaires that the respondents filled out, whose questions were categorized into five sections representing the five Big Five personality traits. Notably, the simple and practical nature of the questions that investigated day-to-day behavior did not need the respondents to understand the underlying theory of the study.

Respondents above the median age scored significantly higher in extraversion, neuroticism, and conscientiousness. However, the score seemed tied for both age groups in the openness and agreeableness personality traits. Foos and Clark (2016) explain that younger adults tend to score higher in neuroticism and extraversion. The authors note that over time, openness and extraversion decrease while conscientiousness and agreeableness increase. Pastorina and Doyle-Portillo (2013) add that people indeed tend to become more emotionally stable as they age resulting in a decrease in the neuroticism score. This study corroborates these authors' assertions that respondents' extraversion, neuroticism and openness scores were compatible with the authors' analysis but there was a difference in finding in the agreeableness and conscientiousness scores since the former was more or less tied between the two age groups while the conscientiousness score seemed higher in the younger age group than the older one.

In the study, there was a significant disparity in the number of respondents which makes it very difficult to compare personality distribution by gender. The women in particular were very few (3 respondents) which made it difficult to make a proper comparison. Therefore, although Jarecka-Zyluk & Holz (2014) assert that women score higher in extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism compared to the men, it would be difficult to accept or reject this claim given the distribution of this study's respondents.

Preferred mode of teaching

No respondents expressed a preference for face-to-face or online teaching. However, 16 out of the 17 respondents (94%) preferred the blended mode of teaching while only one respondent (6%) had no preference. It would be important to note that the 16 respondents who prefer blended learning range from 29 to 67 years of age. This result shows that unlike studies that have posited that instructors with characteristics such as conscientiousness (Michael & Michael, 2014), extraversion (Oreg & Goldenberg, 2015) and openness (Thompson, 2013) being reasons for which educators preferring online rather than face-to-face modes of teaching, the overwhelming majority of the respondents' preference for the blended mode shows that there may be other factors at play which may not be directly linked to instructors' personality (Arif, M. I., Rashid, A., Tahira, S. S., &Akhter, M. , 2012)..

The personality of a majority of the respondents who preferred blended mode of teaching was average (50%) or low (50%) in extraversion, low in neuroticism (75%), average in openness (56%), average in agreeableness (64%), and high in conscientiousness (69%). Further, none of the respondents neither scored highly in extraversion and neuroticism, nor scored lowly in openness, the one respondent who had no preference for any of the three modes of teaching scored lowly in extraversion and neuroticism, averagely in openness and highly in agreeableness and conscientiousness.

From the analysis, given that 16 out of the 17 respondents preferred the blended mode of teaching, only one who had no preference and none chose online or face-to-face modes, it is evident that an instructors' preference for a specific mode of teaching is not dependent on their personality (Arif . Further, the diverse distribution of the personality traits among the respondents shows that lecturers with significantly different sets of personality traits may opt for similar modes of teaching based on various factors, none of which is their personality. Also, this study shows that rather than purely online or purely face-to-face modes of teaching, respondents preferred to

facilitate partly online and partly face-to-face classes.

A majority (8 respondents) had facilitated this mode of teaching for less than five years while for online classes, the majority (6 respondents) have taught for between 6 to 10 years. Notably, more respondents have taught for 10 years and below in both online and face-to-face categories (9 and 11 respondents respectively) than those who have taught for 11 years and above (8 and 6 respondents respectively). The results show that the period of facilitation of online and face-to-face classes may not have a link to one's preferred mode of teaching since 94% of the respondents who expressed a preference for blended learning had a varying period within which they facilitated online and face-to-face classes ranging from 1 year to 40 years.

Training received from institution

The majority of the respondents had received 50-100% of the training that is required for them to facilitate their online classes. No respondent claimed that they had 0% training while 5%, 12% and 12% of the respondents stated that they had received 1-10%, 10-20%, and 20-50% training respectively. Comparatively, in a study by Makokha and Mutisya (2016), the researchers found that the level of training was at 0%, 8%, 8%, 44% and 40% in the five respective categories with the highest score being for the 20-50% level of training. This impressive difference in statistics between Makokha and Mutisya's (2016) study and this one may be the reason behind the overwhelming preference for blended learning which may allude to the comfort with which the selected University's instructors can facilitate both online and face-to-face classes since the institution has equipped its lecturers to effectively facilitate a diverse range of modes of teaching.

Song and Kidd (2010) state that the differences in teaching online and face-to-face classes is in the ways through which the instructors can drive the curriculum as well as the skills and tools which would be the most suitable for teaching. This difference brings up the need for training so that there is little or no strain when employing different modes of teaching. Therefore, training may be a significant factor that has brought up the comfort in technological use evidenced by the respondents' choice of the blended mode over all others.

From the results, it was notable that 5 respondents identified more than one means of training, thus the frequency stated is not a representation of the number of respondents of the study but rather the total of different means of training specified by the respondents.

More than half (58%) of the respondents attributed their training to formal training, which the institution facilitates. 21% attributed it to colleagues while self-training took up 21% each. No respondent claimed to have received any training at all. In a study by Makokha and Mutisya (2016), the research showed that 17% had undergone formal training, 8% received training from colleagues, 20% trained themselves and a shocking 55% of ODL instructors had no training at all on how to facilitate e-learning. From the study by Makokha and Mutisya (2016) which paints the sad state of national training levels, this may be a significant contributor to the respondents' comfort with a blended approach to teaching.

CONCLUSION

The findings of the study highlight that although personality may not significantly influence teaching preferences, training in emerging modes of teaching does. Since training emerged as a significant factor determining the preference of mode of delivery, there should be more investigation and investment into the most effective means of training that have been implemented and are succeeding in various universities within and outside the country. The improvement and replication of such training would improve the effectiveness of the changing higher education system. To the universities and other institutions of higher learning, there should

be proactivity when it comes to seeking the best practices and implementing them in training their lecturers to facilitate a diverse range of modes of teaching. Finally, to the lecturers, there would be a need for openness to learning new and better ways of facilitating various modes of teaching, particularly those whose personalities may cause resistance to such learning, for example, those who score lowly in openness. Institutional-based and peer-supported training should be encouraged. In addition, instructional leaders should be well equipped for the three modes to effectively serve the diverse groups of students seeking higher education at the moment.

The findings from this study indicated that there is little or no influence of an instructional leader's personality on their preference for online and face-to-face modes of teaching. These findings stand true despite the significant difference in age, gender, and periods of facilitating both online and face-to-face classes. However, the overwhelming preference for a blended mode of teaching coupled with a relatively high level of training to facilitate teaching online classes may correlate. Investigation into this relationship may uncover means of improving teaching practices in education.

REFERENCES

Abdelsalam, A. A. (2013). *The Personal Characteristics of University Lecturers in LibyanUniversities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved May 25, 2018 from http://irep.ntu.ac.uk/id/eprint/343/1/217161_ABDULQADER%2520ABDELSALAM%252C%25202013.pdf

Adkins, S. (2013) *The Africa Market for Self-paced eLearning Products and Services: 2011-2016 Forecast and Analysis*. Monroe WA: Ambient Insight

Arif, M. I., Rashid, A., Tahira, S. S., & Akhter, M. (2012). Personality and Teaching: An Investigation into Prospective Teachers' Personality, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(17), 161-171

Bano, N., Ansari, M., & Ganai, M. Y. (2017).*A Study of Personality Characteristics and Values of Secondary School Teachers in Relation to Their Classroom Performance and Students' Likings*. Hamburg: Anchor Academic Publishing

Barakat, M. & Weiss, D. N. (2017). Through the Eyes of Student and Faculty: A Conceptual Framework for the Development of Online Courses. In Information Resources Management Association. (Ed.) *Online Course Management: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications.* Hershey: Information Science Reference

Barnes, R. (2018).*Uncovering Online Commenting Culture: Trolls, Fanboys and Lurkers*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan

Barth, R. (2001). Teacher Leader. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 443-449.

Beckmann, N. & Wood, R. E. (2017).Dynamic Personality Science.Integrating between-Person Stability and within-Person Change.In Beckmann, N. & Wood, R. E. (2017).*Dynamic Personality Science.Integrating between-Person Stability and within-Person Change*. USA: Frontiers

Biles, J. B., & Flint, L. J. (2013).*The Creative Imperative: School Librarians and Teachers Cultivating Curiosity Together*. California: ABC-CLIO, LLC.

Boit, J. M. & Kipkoech, L. C. (2012). Liberalization of Higher Education in Kenya: Challenges and Prospects. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 1(2), 33-41

Bolliger, D. U., & Erichsen, E. A. (2013). Student satisfaction with blended and online courses based on personality type. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 39(1), 1-23

Busato, V. V., Prins, F. J., Elshout, J. J., & Hamaker, C. (2000). Intellectual ability, learning style, personality, achievement motivation and academic success of psychology students in

higher education, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29 (5), 1057-1068

Campbell, J., Kyriakides, L., Muijs, D., & Robinson, W. (2005).*Assessing Teacher Effectiveness: Different Models*. New York: Routledge

Cattell, R. B. (1990). Advances in Cattellian personality theory. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 101–110). The Guilford Press Chamorro-Premizic, T. & Ahmetoglu, G. (2012).*Personality 101*. New York: Springer Publishing Company, LLC

Chamorro-Premuzic, T. & Furnham, A. (2014).*Personality and Intellectual Competence*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers

Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2015).*Personality and Individual Differences*.Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2007). Personality and music: Can traits explain how people use music in everyday life? *British Journal of Psychology*, 98, 175–185

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., von Stumm, S., &Furnham, A. (2011). *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of individual differences*. Malden: Wiley

Chan, B. (2002). A Study of the Relationship Between Tutor's Personality and Teaching Effectiveness: Does culture make a difference? *The International Review Of Research In Open And Distributed Learning*, 3(2), 1-21

Charles, L.B. (2016) *Human Diversity: Its Nature, Extent, Causes and Effects on People*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd.

Cherry, K. (2019, October 14). *What Are the Big 5 Personality Traits? Verywell Mind*. Retrieved 12 June 2020, from https://www.verywellmind.com/the-big-five-personality-dimensions-2795422

Cheung, S. K. S., Kwok, L., Ma, W. W. K., Lee, L. K., & Yang, H. (2017) *Blended Learning. New Challenges and Innovative Practices: 10th International Conference on Blended Learning*, ICBL 201, Hong Kong, China, June 27-29, 2017, Proceedings

Christiansen, N. &Tett, R.(2013) *Handbook of Personality at Work*. New York: Routledge

Clarke, S., Probst, T. M., Guldenmund, F. W., & Passmore, J. (2015).*The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of The Psychology of Occupational Safety and Workplace Health*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992).*Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa: Psychological Assessment Resources

Costa, P., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. (2001). Gender Differences in Personality Traits Across Cultures: Robust and Surprising Findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81* (2), 322-331. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.2.322

Cutter-Mackenzie, A., Edwards, S., Moore, D., & Boyd, W. (2014).*Young Children's Play and Environmental Education in Early Childhood Education*. New York: Springer

Daft, R. L. (2015).*The Leadership Experience*. Stamford: Cengage Learning

Daniel, J (2012).*Sampling Essentials: Practical Guidelines for Making Sampling Choices*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Davila, T., Epstein, M. J. & Shelton, R. (2006).*Making Innovation Work How to Manage It, Measure It, and Profit from It*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Davis, J. R. & Arend, B. D. (2013).*Facilitating Seven Ways of Learning: A Resource for More Purposeful, Effective, and Enjoyable College Teaching*. Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC

Dumbach, M. (2014).*Establishing Corporate Innovation Communities - A Social Capital Perspective*. Wiesbaden: Springer Gabler.

Engler, B. (2013).*Personality Theories*. Belmont: Wadsworth

Ennis, C. D. (2017).*Routledge Handbook of Physical Education Pedagogies*. Oxon: Routledge

Fisher, D. L., and Kent, H. B. (1998). Associations Between Teacher Personality and Classroom Environment, *Journal of Classroom Interaction,* 33(1), 5 – 13.

Fives, H., & Gregorie, G. M. (2014).*International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs*. New York: Routledge

Foos, P. W. & Clark, M. C. (2016).*Human Aging*. New York: Routledge

Frost, D. and Durrant, J. A. (2003). Teacher leadership: rationale, strategy and impact. *School Leadership & Management*, 23 (2). pp. 173-186

Gamble, T. K. & Gamble, M. W. (2013).*Interpersonal Communication: Building Connections Together.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Gijbels, D., Donche, V., Richardson, J. T. E., & Vermunt, J. D.(2014).*Learning Patterns in Higher Education: Dimensions and Research Perspectives*. Oxon: Routledge

Goldberg, L. R. (2013).*Personality Topics in Honor of Jerry S. Wiggins: A Special Issue of Personality Topics in Honor of Jerry S. Higgins*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers

Göncz, L. (2016). Teacher personality: a review of psychological research and guidelines for a more comprehensive theory in educational psychology, *Open Review of Educational Research*, 4(1), 75-95

Hallinger, P & Wang, W. C. (2015).*Assessing Instructional Leadership with the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*. Dordrecht: Springer

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986).The Social Context of EffectiveSchools.*American Journal of Education*, 91 (3), 328-355

Hamza, K., and Nash, W. R. (1996).*Creating and Fostering a Learning Environment That Promotes Creative Thinking and Problem Solving Skills*. Research Report. ERIC Document ED 406435.

Hamza, M. K. & Griffith, K. G. (2006). Fostering problem-solving and creative thinking in the classroom: cultivating a creative mind. *National forum of applied educational research journal-electronic,* 19(3), 1-32

Hedge, J. W., & Borman, W. C. (2012).*The Oxford handbook of work and aging*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc

Hew, K. F. & Cheung, W. S. (2012).*Student Participation in Online Discussions: Challenges, Solutions, and Future Research*. Springer: New York

Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making Vocational choice: A theory of personality and Work environment*. Odessa FL: Psychological Assessment Resource

Holman, D., Wall, T.D., Clegg, C., Sparrow, P. and Howard, A. (2005).*The Essentials of the New Workplace: A Guide to the Human Impact of Modern Working Practices*, Chichester: Wiley

Jarecka-Zyluk, M. &Holz, O. (2014).*Gender and Education from Different Angles*. Berlin: Lit Verlag

John, O. P, Naumann, L. P.& Soto, C. J. (2008).Paradigm Shift to the Intergative Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement and Conceptual Issues. In John, O. P., Robins, R. W., &Pervin, L. A. (Eds.) *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*. New York, NY: Guilford Press

K'Odipo, W. O. (2013). Gender Disparities in Decision Making Levels in Universities in Kenya.

Gender Disparities in Universities, 2(2), 39-53
Kadushin, A. & Harkness, D. (2014).*Supervision in Social Work*. New York: Columbia University Press
Kaplan, L., & Owings, W. (2010).*American Education: Building a Common Foundation*. Belmont: Wadsworth
Keengwe, J., Schneller, G. & Kungu, K. (2014).*Cross-Cultural Online Learning in Higher Education and Corporate Training*. Hershey: Information Science Reference
Kemboi, R. J. K., Kindiki, N. & Misigo, B. (2016). Relationship between Personality Types and Career Choices of Undergraduate Students: A Case of Moi University, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(3), 102-112
Kenrick, D. T., Neuberg, S. L..& Cialdini, R. B. (2010).*Social Psychology: Goals in Interaction*. New York: Allyn & Bacon
Kerubo, I. P. (2016). *AfricanIndigenousEducation as Practiced by the Maasai of Kenya* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

Kirwan, J. R. & Roumell, E. (2015).Developing Repertoire of Practice: Online Instructor Dispositions and Personalities. In Holtz, J. K., Springer, S. B. & McGill, C. J. B. (Eds.) *Building Sustainable Futures for Adult Learners*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D.W. (1970).Determining sample size for research activities .*Educational and Psychological Measurements*, 30, 607-610.
Kuiper, S. (2009). *Contemporary Business Report Writing*. Mason: South-Western Cengage Learning
Leary, M. R. & Hoyle, R. H. (2009).*Handbook of Individual Differences in Social Behavior*. New York: The Guilford Press
Leary, M. R. & Tangney, J. P. (2012).*Handbook of Self and Identity*. New York: The Guilford Press
Lopez, S. J. (Ed.) (2009). *The Encyclopedia of Positive Psychology*.Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell
Lorentz, J. L., & Coker, H. (1977). *Myers-Briggs Types as Predictors of Observed Teacher Behaviour*. Paper Presented at Second National Conference on the Use of the MBTI, Michigan State University, East Lansing. ERIC Document
Makokha, G. L. & Mutisya, D. N. (2016).Status of E-learning in Public Universities in Kenya.*International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17 (3), 341-359
Matthews, G., Deary, I. J. & Whiteman, M. C. (2003).*Personality Traits*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Mavor, K. I., Platow, M. J., & Bimuzic, B.(2017).*Self and Social Identity in Educational Contexts*. New York: Routledge
McKenzie, R. B. (2011). *The political economy of the educational process*. Netherlands: Springer
Meador, K. S. (1997). *Creative Thinking and Problem Solving for Young Learners*. Colorado: Teacher Ideas Press
Michael, M G. & Michael, K. (2014).*Uberveillance and the Social Implications of Microchip Implants: Emerging Technologies*. Hershey: Information Science Reference
Mondak, J. J. (2010). *Personality and the Foundations of Political Behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press
Moneta, G. B. (2014). *Positive Psychology: A Critical Introduction*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

Mudasir, H. & Ganai, M. Y. (2017).*Personality Characteristics, Attitude and Emotional Intelligence among Secondary Level Teachers*. Hamburg: Anchor Academic Publishing

Mumford, M. D. (2012) *Handbook of Organizational Creativity*. London: Academic Press

Mwiria, K., Ng'ethe, N., Ngome, Ch., Ouma-Odero, D., Wawire, V., Wesonga, D. (2007). *Public and private universities in Kenya* . Oxford, UK: James Curry Limited

Nelson, D. L., Quick, J. C., Arstrong, A. &C ondie, J. (2012).*ORGB*. Toronto: Nelson Education Ltd.

Northcote, M. T. (2010). Lighting up and transforming online courses: Letting the teacher's personality shine. *Education Papers and Journal Articles*, Paper 33.

Nyerere, J. (2016).*Open and Distance Learning in Kenya: A Baseline Survey Report Commissioned by the Commonwealth of Learning*. Nairobi: Commonwealth of Learning

Odhimbo, O. O. (2009). Comparative study of the e-learning platforms used in Kenyan Universities: Case study of Jomo Kenyatta University of agriculture and technology and United States international university. Unpublished MSC thesis, Strathmore University.

Oreg, S. & Goldenberg (2015).*Resistance to Innovation: Its Sources and Manifestations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

Pastorino, E. & Doyle-Portillo, S. (2013).*What is Psychology? Essentials*. Belmont: Wadsworth

Robbins, S., Judge, T. A., Millett, B., & Boyle, M. (2013). *Organisational behaviour*. Pearson Higher Education AU.

Robbins, S. P, Bergman, P., Stagg, I., & Coulter, M. (2015). *Management*, 7th edition, Sydney: Pearson Australia

Rock, A. J. (2013). *The Survival Hypothesis: Essays on Mediumship*. North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers

Rosen, L.D., Whaling, K., Rab, S., Carrier, L.M., & Cheever, N.A. (2013). Is Facebook Creating "iDisorders"? The Link Between Clinical Symptoms of Psychiatric Disorders and Technology Use, Attitudes and Anxiety. *Computers in Human Behavior* 29, 1243-1254

Sanga, P. L. (2017). Challenges and Opportunities for Quality Assurance of Cross-Border Higher Education in East Africa. In Ssempebwa, J., Neema-Aboki, P, &Muzaazi, J. C. S. (Eds.) *Innovating University Education: Issues in Contemporary African Higher Education*. Kampala, UG: Fountain Publishers

Santiago, R. & Nakayama, M. (2006).*Understanding E-Learners' Characteristics and Performance in Online Courses* in Mizoguchi, R., Dillenbourg, P. & Zhu, H. (Eds.) (2006) Learning by Effective Utilization of Technologies: Facilitating Intercultural Understanding. Amsterdam: IOS Press

Silva, D. Y.Gimbert, B.& Nolan, I. (2000).Sliding the doors: Locking and unlocking possibilities of teacher leadership. *Teacher College Record*, 102 (4), 779-801

Song, H. & Kidd, T. (2010).*Handbook of Research on Human Performance and Instructional Technology*. Hershey: Information Science Reference

Sullivan, G. M. & Artino, A. R. (2013) Analyzing and Interpreting Data FromLikert-Type Scales. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 5(4):541-542

Tayebinik, M., & Puteh, M. (2012). Blended Learning or E-learning? *International Magazine on Advances in Computer Science and Telecommunications*, 3(1), 103-110.

Thompson, L. (2013).*Creative Conspiracy: The New Rules of Breakthrough Collaboration*. Massachusetts: Harvard Business Review Press

Torrance, E.P. (1977). *Creativity in the classroom: What research says to the teacher*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Vorkapic, S. T., Vajicic, L. & Cepic, R. (2014).Pre-school Teacher Identity.InBreen, P. (Ed.) *Cases on Teacher Identity, Diversity, and Cognition in Higher Education*.Hershey: Information Science Reference

Watjatrakul, B. (2016). Online learning adoption: effects of neuroticism, openness to experience, and perceived values, *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 13(3), 229-243

Weisberg, Y. J., DeYoung, C. G., & Hirsh, J. B. (2011). Gender Differences in Personality across the Ten Aspects of the Big Five.*Frontiers in Psychology*, 2, 178

Wells, C. M., Maxfield, C. R., & Klocko, B. A. (2011). Complexities inherent in the workload of principals: Implications for teacher leadership. In Alford, B. J., Perrerault, G., Zellner, L., Ballenger, J. W. (Eds.), *2011 NCPEA yearbook: Blazing trails: Preparing Leaders to improve access and equity in today's schools*. Lancaster, PA: DEStech

Wilkinson, A., Bacon, N., Redman, T. & Snell, S. (Eds.) (2010) *The SAGE Handbook of Human Resource Management*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Zawacki-Richter, O. & Anderson, T. (2014).*Online Distance Education: Towards a Research Agenda.* Edmonton: AU Press

Zhou, C. (2017). *Handbook of Research on Creative Problem-Solving Skill Development in Higher Education*. Hershey: IGI