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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors affecting motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer (DTT). It was meant to establish the effect of pay, promotion, working conditions, transfer, age, training and gender on motivation and performance of the DTT. The effect of these variables on the Diploma Teacher Trainers’ motivation and performance were to be found out so that ways of improving these variables could be suggested for higher motivation and performance of the concerned trainers.

The population of this study comprised 326 Teacher Trainers in the three Diploma Teachers’ Training Colleges in Kenya i.e. Kagumo, Kenya Science and Kenya Technical. A sample of 50% Teacher Trainers (TTs) was selected from Kagumo and Kenya Science using simple random sampling method. Elements of the sample were given questionnaires to fill.

Data was collected using questionnaires. The data was analyzed using measures of central tendency such as the mean, standard deviation and T-test.

It was found that promotion led to motivation and improved performance by most subjects, especially when done on merit. The majority of the subjects felt that their pay was neither commensurate to their work nor to that of their contemporaries in other professions, thus got de-motivated and performed poorly.

Trainers who were voluntarily transferred were motivated and performed better unlike those who got compulsory transfers. Training only motivated and spurred good
performance if recognized by the employer through promotion to a higher grade or increased pay.

Most males felt that academic and professional qualifications did not affect a teacher's performance while the females' attitude was that the higher the teacher's qualifications, the better the performance. Good working conditions motivated trainers to perform better.

From the data collected, it is recommended that further research be carried out on the effect of the same factors on motivation and performance of private DTT and trainers of personnel in other professions. Reasons for gender difference in attitude towards academic and professional qualifications and its relation to motivation and performance is worth finding out. Moreover, it would be interesting to find out why the working conditions in KSTC and KTC are so different as to make trainers in the former institution more motivated than the latter.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1: BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Generally before independence a bulk of secondary teachers were trained overseas, except for Makerere College which though, the only institution of higher learning in East Africa, continued to train primary school teachers until early fifties.

Principals of primary schools, secondary schools and training centres in a meeting in 1941, strongly expressed feelings that Makerere teachers were not well trained to handle classes effectively and demanded that their course be extended to a period of two years and that they should be qualified to teach English and Mathematics. The Director of Education communicated this resolution to Makerere. The Academic Board at Makerere accordingly reorganized its courses, but sounded a warning that a Makerere teacher was trained to teach in secondary schools (Bogonko, 1992).

In 1945, Makerere was offered a University College status under a special relationship with the University of London. This implied establishing a Faculty of Education and an awarding of postgraduate diplomas and teaching certificates.

Kenya could not continue looking at Makerere alone for a supply of graduate teachers. It started a new training scheme in 1963 when students holding a school certificate began a 3 years course at the Central Teacher Training College in Nairobi to bring out SI teachers. These were later transferred to Kenyatta College.

The other centre for SI teachers was a gift from Sweden which established a Swedish College in Africa to train science teachers, a year before independence.
Kenyatta University College was followed by Kenya Technical Teacher Training College (KTTC) in Nairobi, mainly established originally to train technical teachers for our technical institutions.

The need for science teachers in secondary schools led to the initial plan to establish Kenya Science Teachers College (KSTC) to train SI teachers.

In the early 1980's, it was realized that there was a shortage of arts teachers in secondary schools, a need that saw the change of status of Siriba and Kagumo Teachers' Training Colleges from PI Teachers' Training Colleges to Diploma in Education, Humanities' Teacher Training Colleges in 1982. The form six ("A" level) leavers who had not made it to the university started being trained to teach arts subjects in secondary schools. KSTC was also uplifted to diploma status to train science teachers for our secondary schools.

The mid 1980's saw the birth of Kisii, Moi and Laikipia Diploma Teacher Training Colleges. The teaching staff in many of these colleges was made up of the former tutors in the Primary Teacher Training Institutions.

In the early 1990's, there was a feeling that enough arts teachers had been trained and many of these diploma colleges became affiliates of a number of universities.

The change of the system of education from 7-4-2-3 to 8-4-4 system (Kamunye, 1988) culminated in a re-emphasis of science subjects, and therefore, elimination of the humanity-based teacher training colleges and a shift to training of diploma science teachers. These changes led to massive transfers of the affected Diploma Teacher Trainers (DTTs) to other colleges in the same grade.
Currently in Kenya, of the many Diploma Teacher Training Colleges (DTTCs) mentioned earlier, only two, Kenya Science and Kagumo Colleges exist to train diploma science teachers for secondary schools, plus KTTC for technical teachers.

Prior to the 1990’s teacher promotion was on merit as vacancies arose, but later, the criterion expanded to attendance of interviews for advertised posts with equal opportunities being offered to both the secondary teachers and the teacher trainers both for administrative and professional posts. Currently, a teacher can leave secondary school on promotion to a DTTC or leave a DTTC to join a secondary school in an administrative post.

Several commissions have been set up to address issues affecting teachers and many reports have been written after carrying out investigations.

The “Report of the Presidential Working Party on Education and Manpower Training for the Next Decade and Beyond” (1988) chaired by James Mwangi Kamunge when addressing the issue of promotion of excellence observed in (13.12) that the teaching and research personnel should be provided with incentives and awards which would make intellectual and scientific careers attractive and to encourage young talented and gifted Kenyans to enter and continue with careers in higher education and research.

The Koech Report of 1999 entitled “ Totally Integrated Quality Education and Training”{TIQET} noted in (9.12.11) that lecturers in teacher training colleges were greatly demoralized and demotivated due to a stagnated upward progression. There was therefore high attrition rate to secondary schools where prospects for promotion were high. The commission recommended in (9.59) that appropriate incentives be given to lecturers to attract and retain suitably qualified staff.
1.2: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The participation of teacher trainers in the countrywide teachers’ strikes of 1997 and 2002 demanding for increased pay was evidence of some deep-rooted dissatisfaction. There has been consensus in the research findings of different researchers that secondary school teachers were not satisfied with their remuneration, promotion and working conditions (Kiplagat, J. K & Lukuyani M. 2002 & Kaumbulu C. K. 1994-1999). It is imperative to look at the effect of the same factors plus others on motivation and performance of the DTT in Kenya in order to improve the standards of teaching in the institutions of higher learning. The study’s problem is “Factors Affecting Motivation and Performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainers in Kenya.”

1.3: OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The broad objective of this study was to analyze the factors affecting motivation and performance of DTT in Kenya. Specific objectives were as follows:

1. To analyze the role played by promotion on motivation and performance of the DTT.
2. To find out if pay affected motivation and performance of the DTT.
3. To identify the effect of transfer on motivation and performance of the DTT.
4. To find out if gender affected the motivation and performance of the DTT.
5. To identify the effect of training on motivation and performance of the DTT.
6. To find out if the conditions of the work place affect motivation and performance of the DTT.
1.4: RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What role does promotion play in the motivation and performance of the DTT?
2. How does pay influence motivation and performance of the DTT?
3. What effect does transfer have on motivation and performance of the DTT?
4. To what extent does gender affect motivation and performance of the DTT?
5. To what extent does training affect motivation and performance of the DTT?
6. Does the condition of the place of work affect motivation and performance of the DTT?

1.5: SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The findings of this study will be used by:
1. Policy makers, like the Ministry of Education and the Teachers Service Commission to improve the terms and conditions of work for the Diploma Teacher Trainers to motivate them and have better performance by this cadre of middle-college trainers.
2. Curriculum designers like the Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) in designing and preparing the syllabus to be implemented by the DTT.
3. The Ministry of Labour and Manpower Development in identifying the training needs of this category of teachers.
4. Trade unions like KNUT and KUPPET in representing these trainers’ interests in negotiations of their employment agreements. Membership of the DTT to a trade union like KNUT, originally meant for primary school teachers is a pointer to some dissatisfaction with the conditions of service for the DTT, thus the need to join a body that can fight for their rights. The coming up of a rival union KUPPET strengthens the
fact that there is an unsatisfied need among post primary teachers who include the DTT.

5. Other researchers. Apart from adding to the world of knowledge on motivation and performance of the DTT in Kenya, the study will act as a spring board and provocation from which other researchers could carry further investigation in the field of motivation and performance of middle level college trainers.

1.6: LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The following problems were faced in the course of the study:

i. The factors that the study sought to investigate were nationwide and affected other middle-level or diploma colleges but this study was limited to 3 colleges. The researcher could not conduct it in all middle-level colleges since many do not train teachers.

ii. The study was qualitative, making measurement of factors or various variables difficult, thus, possibility of some errors. Use of measures of central tendency, like the t-test helped minimize these errors.

iii. The research involved colossal amounts of money that were not easily available.

iv. The challenge of time needed to visit respondents and do appropriate sampling as respondents operated with timetables that were not flexible to suite the researcher’s sampling needs.
1.7: THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study was concerned with motivation of the DTT. It focused on the factors affecting motivation and performance of DTTs.

Three diploma colleges- Kagumo Teachers College (99 respondents), Kenya Science Teachers College (95 respondents) and Kenya Technical Teachers College (132 respondents) constituted the colleges under study.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0: INTRODUCTION

In this section, the studies carried out in the past in an attempt to establish factors affecting motivation and performance of the DTT were reviewed as well as committees and commissions set to review different aspects of promotion of the DTT. This was accomplished under the following subheadings:

2.1: MOTIVATION AND PERFORMANCE

Motivation is a human psychological characteristic that contributes to a person’s degree of commitment and it includes the factors that cause, channel and sustain an individual’s behavior. There are many motivation theories, each of which attempts to describe what human beings are and what human beings can become.

A ‘Traditional Model’ of motivation is often associated with Frederick Taylor (1977 reprint) and Scientific Management. According to it, managers determined the most efficient way to perform repetitive tasks and then motivated workers with a system of wage incentives. The more workers produced, the more they earned. He believed that when highly productive employees discover that their pay is the same as for those who are less productive, then the output of high performers would decrease. A legacy of this model is the practice of Curriculum-Based Establishment (C.B.E) for departments in Diploma Teacher Training Colleges where a lecturer is given a work-load of a minimum of 15 hours per week, and a head of department 10 hours per week.
The “Human Relations Model” is often associated with Elton Mayo and his contemporaries who found that the boredom and repetitiveness of many tasks actually reduced motivation, while social contacts helped create and sustain motivation. Managers could motivate employees by acknowledging their social needs and by making them feel useful and important. This approach suggests that productivity is directly related to job satisfaction derived from intrinsic factors such as recognition, a sense of fulfillment and satisfaction of needs, than extrinsic factors such as pay and working conditions. Legacies of this model in DTTIs include departmental offices, staff common rooms and a common tea break accompanied with tea in the staff room.

Douglas McGregor (1960) and other theorists came up with the “Human Resource Model” with Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X style of leaders hold that people have an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it wherever possible. This style of leadership exercises strong controls and direction and wherever necessary punish people if they do not do the work. If people do the work as desired, they may even get monetary or other rewards. Theory Y leaders assume that people will work hard and assume responsibility if they can satisfy their personal needs and the objectives or goals of their organization. Participative management where the Chief Principals in DTTIs delegate to their deputies, registrars, deans of students and heads of department is one way principals use theory Y to provide a climate that gives employees scope for personal improvement.

Maslow’s Hierarchy of needs, developed by Abraham Maslow (1943) viewed human motivation as a hierarchy of five needs, ranging from the most basic physiological needs to the highest need for self-actualization. It was based on four premises:
Behaviour can be influenced exclusively by unsatisfied needs; a satisfied need is not a motivator.

A person’s needs are in order of their priorities; the most critical basic need taking priority.

Once the most basic need is satisfied the person moves to the next higher level.

If a once-satisfied need is not maintained, it becomes a priority need again.

Clayton Alderfer (1972) came up with the ERG theory of motivation that says people strive to meet a hierarchy of Existence (E), Relatedness (R) and Growth (G) needs. His “Existence Needs” include all forms of physiological and safety needs, “Related Needs” include relationship with other people, while, “Growth Needs” are concerned with the desire to be creative and to achieve full potential in the existing environment. If efforts to reach one level of needs are frustrated, individuals will regress to a lower level. The recent introduction of C.B.E. and changes in the DTT curriculum has seen a number of trainers being deployed to secondary schools, thus has affected their motivation.

Frederick Herzberg (1968) came up with “The two Factor Theory of motivation”. According to him, man has two different categories of needs, which are essentially independent of each other and affect his behaviour in different ways. When people are dissatisfied about their jobs, they are concerned about the environment in which they are working. He called these needs, Hygiene factors. They include company policies, administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, wages and allowances, status and security. On the other hand, when people feel good about their jobs, this has to do with the work itself. Herzberg called this category of needs,
Motivators or Job content factors. They include achievement, recognition, increased responsibility, challenging work, growth and development. He concluded that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction arose from two separate sets of factors; Hygiene factors and Motivators (growth factors). Among motivators is advancement, done through employee promotion and/or training, thus applicable to the DTT in our problem. According to Herzberg, both these sets of factors work in one direction only. Absence of hygiene factors may dissatisfy the workers but will not demotivate them. Similarly, in the presence of motivators, workers may be motivated, but their absence does not make them dissatisfied.

Finally, Victor Vroom (1964) came up with the "Expectancy Theory" which hypothesizes that it is the anticipated satisfaction of valued goals which causes individuals to adjust their behaviour in a way which is most likely to lead to their attaining them. According to Vroom, an individual’s level of performance is determined by his preference for particular goals. He refers to level of performance as the "first level outcome" and preference for a goal as "second level of outcome" or Valence. Valence can be positive or negative, or zero, depending on whether the individual prefers to attain the goal, or not, or is indifferent towards the outcome respectively.

Expectancy theory has been developed from Vroom’s early specifications to be expressed very clearly (e.g. Galbraith 1969) as a combination of three factors:

The person’s own assessment of whether performing in a certain way will result in a measurable result, labeled, the Expectancy;
The perceived likelihood that such a result will lead to attaining a given reward, a factor known as *Instrumentality*; and

The person's assessment of the likely satisfaction, or *valence*, associated with the reward.

In practice, if a person sees clearly that performing in a certain way will bring about a reward which he values, then he is more likely to attempt to perform in that way than if the relationship between his effort and measured performance, or measured performance and rewards, is slight or uncertain.

### 2.2: EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Motivation and performance of the DTT can be traced through Education Commissions and Reports of 1909-1988 that dealt with several aspects pertaining teachers in Kenya. In 1919, the Report of the Education Commission of East Africa Protectorate recommended that teachers be graded by qualifying examinations and their salaries be subsidized. In 1936, the Pim Commission recommended further extension of training facilities and expansion of schools. In 1949, the Beecher Report recommended encouragement of foreign staff teachers and expansion of teacher training facilities. In 1959, the Lawrence Commission was formed to include a report on teachers' salaries. It recommended that salaries were not to be reviewed. KNUT rejected this recommendation and this caused the token strikes and the general strike in 1962. As a result, the government appointed the Pratt Commission in 1963 which recommended new teachers' salaries.

The Ndegwa commission of 1970-1971 was concerned with education and the teaching service. It recommended that the planned expansion of primary teacher training
colleges should be reviewed and increased and that there should be a realistic review of their finances. It also recommended a new salary structure for teachers. In 1971, the Bessey Report emphasized training of teachers through rapid expansion and enrichment of teachers’ colleges.

Sorobea N. Bogonko (1992) noted that by mid-1960, teachers were poorly paid compared to government civil servants in East Africa, therefore, it was difficult for the education systems to get well-qualified recruits for teacher training, especially for middle level colleges and secondary schools. Dependence on expatriates in secondary schools and teacher-training colleges was not a very dignified posture for people who were priding themselves in their newly acquired independence, thus it was being argued that diploma teacher training colleges and graduate teacher training institutions should be increased.

In December 1975, the National Committee on Educational Objectives and Policies (NCEOP) was set up by the Government of Kenya under the chairmanship of Mr. P.J. Gachathi, the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education to evaluate the education system of the time, define the new set of educational goals for the second decade of independence and formulate a specific program of action for achieving those goals. The committee divided its work into task forces and Task force No.2 convened by Mr. K. Mwendwa had a task 2.5 on “Teacher Training”. It was to examine the problems and programs of teacher training and recommend ways of improvement, including those of formal and non-formal systems of education, examine the recruitment, grading and promotion of teachers, with special reference to the recruitment of teacher educators, examine the problem of employment of unqualified...
teachers and examine the structure and length of pre-service and in-service training courses for primary teachers and the related problem of under-utilization of expensive teacher education facilities.

Task force No.3 convened by Prof. S.H. Ominde in T.F.3.4 on, “Teacher training”, was also charged with a similar task in addition to examining the recruitment for secondary level teacher education, including the problem of drop-outs in those subjects with a scarcity of teachers and examining the structure of the Bachelor of Education course for secondary level teachers. Some of the recommendations made included (237) expansion of the post-graduate Diploma in Education to last at least four terms and to include the training of various educational specialists. Recommendation 242 suggested an increase in the number of graduate teachers of Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry by offering those enrolled on the Kenyatta University College non-graduate Diploma in Education course remedial training which would improve their opportunity to qualify for transfer after one year to the B-Ed (Science) programme and modify the diploma course to make this possible.

The TSC code of regulations for teachers (Revised 1986) outlines the grades to which teachers can be promoted. Administrative grades include Principal, Deputy Principal, Senior Headmaster I, Senior Headmaster II, Headmaster, Deputy Headmaster, Head of Department or Senior Master. A teacher appointed by the commission to act in an administrative grade may either be confirmed in such a grade after a period of six months of satisfactory service, have such acting appointment extended by a further period not exceeding six months or acting appointment terminated by the commission.
Professional teaching grades include Principal Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Assistant Lecturer I and Assistant Lecturer II. A DTT may be promoted on merit if he has displayed exceptional ability as a teacher in the performance of his duties provided that the commission shall not consider him for promotion until he has been confirmed in his permanent appointment in accordance with the code, that he, except under exceptional circumstances determined by the Director of Education, should have completed not less than five years' recognized teaching service within a given grade to be considered for promotion under regulation 40 of the code. A teacher who has been suspended by the commission shall not be considered for promotion until he has completed two years teaching service since the end of his suspension. A teacher who has been removed from the register, and/or dismissed and then reinstated by the commission must complete five years teaching service after reinstatement before he may be considered for promotion.

Findings from other researchers and scholars have contributed a lot in this area of motivation and performance of the DTT. Kiplagat Joseph Kandie (U.O.N. 2002) in his, "Study of the Level of Job Satisfaction among Public Secondary Science Teachers in Uasin-Gishu District" found a significant difference between job satisfaction level among science teachers and their age. Older teachers (over 40 years) seemed more satisfied with their jobs (Probably due to promotion) than the younger ones. The data indicated that a good number of science teachers in Uasin-Gishu district were only satisfied with their present job. It revealed gender imbalance with male teachers being more satisfied than females. On academic qualifications he concluded that there was no significant difference between job satisfaction among science teachers and the
professional grade, neither did highly trained teachers find their work more significant than the moderately trained teachers to offer the former a greater sense of achievement.

Teachers appeared to have a low level of job satisfaction with respect to salary, which Kiplagat attributed to teachers comparing their salary with other professionals at the same level. Promotion had the second lowest job satisfaction in terms of chances of its offer and fairness in considering professional qualifications and teaching experience when offering it. Regarding working conditions, low levels of satisfaction were recorded in staff-room facilities and availability of teaching materials and equipment. These denied teachers enough and reasonable working space and facilities, unlike the general layout of the school compound with which they were more satisfied. Kiplagat concluded that science teachers were not satisfied with any of the job factors under study.

Lukuyani Maurice (U.O.N. 2002) in carrying out “A Study of the Factors Contributing to Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Secondary School Teachers in Turkana District” observed that the teachers were dissatisfied with low hardship allowance paid, amount of salary, transfer procedure and lack of proper promotion procedure. There were also low chances of promotion and teaching facilities lacked.

It emerged that gender did not affect job performance among Mathematics secondary school teachers as both gender had the potential to perform well. He found no significant relationship between job performance and educational level among Mathematics secondary school teachers, but there existed a positive relationship between job performance and level of education.

Kaumbulu observed a positive relationship between job performance and the number of years the Mathematics teachers had handled the subject. It was established that majority of the Mathematics teachers were lowly motivated due to poor pay and limited upward mobility thus affecting their performance of the job.

Kivase Julius Mung'asia (U.O.N. 1995-1998) in his research on 'Evaluation of incentives used for Teachers in Secondary Schools in Marakwet District and their Influence on Performance in KCSE" concluded that schools that had instrumental system incentives such as free housing, farm supplies at reduced prices, free transport, free trips and luncheons performed better than those that did not. Instrumental individual incentives like free meals, utensils, pens, watches umbrellas, handbags and money were used to ensure that individual teachers expended their maximum potentials. Schools that spent more money on teachers' incentives were found to have better KCSE results than those that spent little money.

2.3: FACTORS AFFECTING MOTIVATION AND PERFORMANCE OF THE DTT.

The DTT has not specifically benefited from the general promotion procedure followed by the TSC for many years in Kenya as a result of this cadre of trainers mainly coming into operation during the early 1980's. Many of them were tutors in Primary Teacher
Training Colleges without any specific scheme for their level. They have therefore operated at the same level as the secondary school teachers following the same procedure and channels of promotion as outlined in the TSC code of regulations for teachers. They have therefore had to compete for promotion at the same level as secondary school teachers and in fact; some have left colleges on promotion to teach in secondary schools or as administrators.

A new scheme of service for Graduate / Approved Teachers was implemented with effect from 1st July 1988 where DTT also benefited (Teachers Service Commission 2002). Moreover a further upgrading of graduate teachers from job group ‘K’ to job group ‘L’ with effect from 1st July 1996 gave automatic promotion to many DTT who were still in job group ‘K’ then (Teachers Service Commission 1997). Despite this, many of these DTTs are still members of KNUT, which was originally meant to represent primary school teachers. The KNUT negotiates terms and conditions of service for teachers with the TSC.

Poor morale of the DTT was manifest in their participation in the country – wide teachers strikes of 1997 (Los Angeles Times, 1997) and 2002 (Osewe 2002). The 200% pay award that resulted from the industrial actions also benefited the DTT (Ngunjiri 1998). All these have to some extent motivated the DTT, but he still feels he needs to be a level higher than his secondary school and primary school teacher training counterpart.
2.4: THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Several variables affect motivation and performance of the DTT. The following diagram illustrates how the different variables relate to motivation and performance:

Source: (Author 2009). The arrows indicate that each of the independent variables has an effect on motivation and performance, either directly or via intervening variables.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0: INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the procedures that were used in this study to collect and analyze the data. It is organized under the following sub-headings: Study design, Target population, Sample design, Data collection procedures and instruments and Data analysis.

3.1: STUDY DESIGN

The study used descriptive research design, as it is mainly qualitative in nature, dealing with variables such as motivation and performance, which can only be described and qualified. This design would be useful in investigating the relationship between the DTTs pay, transfer, gender, training, teaching experience and promotion received and their motivation and performance.

3.2: TARGET POPULATION

This consisted of lecturers from Diploma Teacher Training Institutions (DTTIs), which were then KSTC, KTC and KTTC. According to the Ministry of Education report (MOE, 2003), there were 3 public DTTIs in Kenya. There were a total of 326 trainers in these institutions as at December 2006. The table below shows their distribution by gender:
Table 3.1 Population and Sample Distribution of Subjects per Institution and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>No. of Female Trainers</th>
<th>No. of Male Trainers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSTC</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTTC</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (MOE, 2006)

KSTC and KTC were chosen because their courses were basically meant to train teachers who came straight from secondary schools unlike KTTC that had a combination of fresh school leavers and also received already trained students and offered them only the professional element (Education) to make them teachers. KSTC was therefore appropriate in representing an urban institution while KTC, being the only rural institution of its kind represented a rural setting well.

3.3: SAMPLE DESIGN

Using the Ad hoc approach of sample size determination, approximately 50% of the population of Teacher Trainers in Kagumo and Kenya Science Teachers’ Colleges formed the sample. The sample size for the two colleges was 98 trainers. The study used probability sampling method in order to give an equal chance to every DTT to be selected in the sample.
Simple random sampling was used by assigning a single number to each element in the staff list of all teacher trainers in both Kagumo and Kenya Science Teachers Colleges. Using the table of random numbers, a sample of 50 and 48 trainers was selected respectively.

3.4: RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Data pertaining to this study was gathered using a questionnaire, whose advantage was that questions for each respondent were framed the same way, therefore allowing uniformity for all respondents. Section A consisted of 6 items to gather demographic data of trainers such as age, sex, academic qualifications, teaching experience and job group. Section B consisted of 21 items on factors affecting motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer.

3.5: DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

A research permit to conduct the study was sought from the principals of the colleges concerned before the commencement of the main study. The researcher used questionnaires to collect data. A structured questionnaire was used based on the factors under study. The researcher distributed the questionnaires to the selected trainers and gave them one hour to respond. The duly filled questionnaire was collected after the hour.

The researcher personally administered the research instrument for both the pilot and the main study to the trainers of the two colleges, on the agreed date. The researcher gave instructions on how to fill the questionnaires, gave respondents time to fill them and collected them immediately they finished.

Secondary data such as use of education commission reports was incorporated.
3.6: DATA ANALYSIS

Selected descriptive statistics was used to analyze data. Measures of Central Tendency (the mean, standard deviation and T-test) were computed to establish the relationship between variables. For the continuous variables such as promotion, pay and training, a standard T-test was computed and used to establish the difference between the means.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.0: INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results, statistical analysis, interpretation and discussion of the results.

4.1: SUBJECTS’ CHARACTERISTICS

The research data was obtained from 98 Teacher Trainers, out of whom 93 completed the teacher trainers’ questionnaire. This represents a response rate of 94.89%. The summary of their biographical characteristics, academic and professional attributes are shown in Tables 4.1-4.4 below.

Table 4.1 Subject's age versus highest academic qualification] Cross-tabulation (N = 93).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working station [Institution]</th>
<th>KCE/EAC E/KCSE</th>
<th>BA/BSc BA/BSc with PGDESc/BEd Tech</th>
<th>BEd Arts/BEd with PGDESc/BEd Tech</th>
<th>MED/MSc/ MBA/MA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kagumo TTC Subject's age category</td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSTC Subject's age category</td>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 Subject's age, highest academic qualification and gender Cross-tabulation ($N = 93$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>KCE/EAC</th>
<th>BA/BSc</th>
<th>BA/BSc with PGDE</th>
<th>BEd Arts/EdSc/EdTech</th>
<th>MEd/MSc</th>
<th>MBA/MA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>&lt;30 age category</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36 - 40 age category</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Subject's age, Working duration and Institution Cross-tabulation ($N = 93$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Working station [Institution]</th>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KTC</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject's &lt;30 age category</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KSTC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject's 30 - 35 age category</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 Subject’s age and Working duration category [yrs] per gender Cross-tabulation (N= 93).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s age</th>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Subject’s age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Subject’s age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2: RESEARCH VARIABLES DATA ANALYSIS

The research set out to answer the following Research Questions:

1. What role does promotion play in the motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer?
2. How does pay influence motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer?
3. What effect does transfer have on motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer?
4. To what extent does gender affect motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer?
5. To what extent does training affect motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer?
6. Does the condition of the place of work affect motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer?

The data collected from the subjects in form of responses given in the questionnaires are presented, analyzed and interpreted in the following section:
4.2.1: Research Questions 1: role of promotion in motivation and performance

As indicated in the research objective 1, the researcher set out to analyze the role of promotion in the motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer in Kenya.

The responses recorded in the questions related to this variable show that 68.75% of the teacher trainers promoted at least once in KTC were motivated after promotion, while 31.25% were not motivated. Thirty-eight percent of them were satisfied with the TSC promotion criteria, while 56% were not satisfied and 0.6% were not sure of their satisfaction or dissatisfaction (including 1 trainer who had never been promoted at all).

Results obtained are summarized in tables 4.5 - 4.19 and figures 3.1- 3.6.

Table 4.5 Effect of number of times subject had been promoted on motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working station [Institution]</th>
<th>Number of times the subject has been promoted</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not promoted</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KTC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSTC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6 Subject’s Satisfaction With TSC Promotion Criteria Per Number of Promotions

Number of times the subject has been promoted * Are you satisfied with the TSC promotion criteria? * Working station [Institution]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working station [Institution]</th>
<th>Number of times the subject has been promoted</th>
<th>Are you satisfied with the TSC promotion criteria?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSTC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 Effect of Different Promotion Criteria On Motivation

Promotion criteria used * Was the promotion effective in motivating you? * Working station [Institution]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working station [Institution]</th>
<th>Promotion criteria used</th>
<th>Was the promotion effective in motivating you?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC</td>
<td>Interview /Merit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview and</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass Promotion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass Promotion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSTC</td>
<td>Interview /Merit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview and</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass Promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses recorded in the questions related to this variable show that 68.75 % of
the TTs promoted at least once in KTC were motivated after promotion, while 31.25% were not motivated. In KSTC, 72.1% of those promoted at least once were motivated after the promotion, while 27.9% were not.

Table 4.8 Subject's Satisfaction with TSC Promotion Criteria

Promotion criteria used * Are you satisfied with the TSC promotion criteria? * Working station [Institution]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working station [Institution]</th>
<th>Are you satisfied with the TSC promotion criteria?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC Promotion criteria used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview /Merit</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview and Mass Promotion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Promotion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not promoted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSTC Promotion criteria used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview /Merit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview and Mass Promotion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-eight percent of the KTC trainers were satisfied with the TSC promotion criteria, while 56% were not satisfied and 0.6% were not sure of their satisfaction or dissatisfaction (including one trainer who had never been promoted at all). 25.6% of the KSTC trainers who had been promoted at least once were satisfied with the TSC promotion criteria, while 74.4% were dissatisfied with the criteria used. Seventy percent of those promoted through mass promotion in KTC and 83.33% of KSTC, were not satisfied, probably due to the feeling of not being individually recognized, but having to use strikes or boycotts to be “appreciated by the employer”.
Table 4.9 Cross-tabulation of Promotion Versus Motivation Per Gender

Subject's gender * Was the promotion effective in motivating you?
Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Was the promotion effective in motivating you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.1 Effect of Promotion on Motivation of the Gender

Table 4.10 T-test Results of the Effect of Promotion on Motivation of the Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the promotion effective in motivating you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variance not assumed</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 T-test Results of the Effect of Promotion on Motivation of the Gender
There is a significant difference in the effect of promotion on motivation of the genders at 95% level of confidence since the t-value is outside the range -0.157 to 0.272.

Table 4.11 Subjects' Satisfaction with the TSC Promotion Criteria Per Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subject's gender * Are you satisfied with the TSC promotion criteria?</th>
<th>Cross tabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are you satisfied with the TSC promotion criteria?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.2 Gender Satisfaction with the TSC Promotion Criteria

From the gender cross-tabulation and figure 2, there was no significant difference in motivation and satisfaction between males (70.8%) and females (69.8%) after receiving promotion.
Table 4.12 T-test Results of Satisfaction of the Genders with the TSC Promotion Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with TSC promotion criteria assumed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variance</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not assumed</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>89.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference between the gender in their satisfaction with the TSC promotion criteria at 95% level of confidence. The t-value is outside the range -0.151-282.

Table 4.13 Effect of Promotion on Motivation of Subjects per Working Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Was the promotion effective in motivating you?</th>
<th>Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This can be summarized in the following figure.
Fig. 3 Effect of Promotion on Motivation of Subjects per Working Duration

Table 4.14 Satisfaction with the TSC Promotion Criteria per Working Duration Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Are you satisfied with the TSC promotion criteria?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following bar chart gives a summary of this information
Subjects who had worked for 16-20 years, (25.8%), seemed more dissatisfied with the TSC promotion criteria than those in the other categories. This category also ranks second among those who were satisfied with the TSC promotion criteria with 20% satisfaction.

Table 4.15 Effect of Promotion on Motivation of Subjects per Age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's age category</th>
<th>Was the promotion effective in motivating you?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is summarized in the bar chart below.
Subjects who were over 45 years were more motivated after promotion (39.1%) and also most demotivated after promotion (63%), probably depending on the number of times they had been promoted.
Table 4.16 ANOVA and Post hoc Test Results of the Effect of Promotion on Motivation per Age Category

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7.023</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td>8.758</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>17.643</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.667</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Was the promotion effective in motivating you?
Tukey HSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(@) Subject's age category</th>
<th>(J) Subject's age category</th>
<th>Mean 95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>-2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>1.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>1.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>-2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>-1.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 4.17 Homogeneous Subsets of the effect of promotion per Age category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Subset for alpha = .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 6.686.
b The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.
Table 4.18 Subjects' Satisfaction with TSC Promotion Criteria per Age Category

Cross-tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's age category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure/Not always</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most subjects (64.5%) were dissatisfied with the TSC's promotion criteria, especially those in the age category of over 45 years. The bar chart below summarizes this information.

Fig 6 Subjects Satisfaction with TSC Promotion Criteria by Age Category
Table 4.19 Satisfaction with TSC Promotion Criteria among Groups

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>24.499</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.161</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is no significant difference in the responses to the question across the age categories.

4.2.2 Research Questions 2—how pay influences motivation and performance

As indicated in the research objective 2, responses were sought on how pay influences motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer. The variable values are shown in Tables 4.20-4.31.

Table 4.20 Cross-tabulation of Pay versus Work Done Per Age Category and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s age category</th>
<th>* Do you feel that your pay is commensurate to the work you are doing?</th>
<th>* Subject’s gender Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.21 Effect of Relationship Between Pay and Work Done on Performance

Subject’s age category * Does the relationship between the amount of pay versus the work done make your performance better or worse? * Subject’s gender Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s gender</th>
<th>Does the relationship between the amount of pay versus the work done make your performance better or worse?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recorded responses on this variable show that 64% (32) of males felt their pay made their performance worse while 34% (17) felt pay had no effect on their performance and 2% (1 person) felt his pay made his performance worse. Fifty and a half percent (23) females felt their pay made their performance worse, 39.5% (17) felt pay had no effect on their performance while 7% (3) felt their pay was commensurate to their work, therefore performed better.

Table 4.22 Gender Evaluation of Current Pay Versus that of Contemporaries Elsewhere

Subject’s age category * Do you feel that your current pay is more or less than your contemporaries in other professions? * Subject’s gender Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s gender</th>
<th>Do you feel that your current pay is more or less than your contemporaries in other professions?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.23 Effect of Pay Increment on Motivation by Gender and Age Category

| Subject's gender | Subject's age category | Would a pay increment motivate you? | | |
|------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                  |                        | Yes | No | Not sure/Not necessarily | Total |
| Male             | <30                    | 2   | 2  |                          | 4     |
|                  | 30 - 35                | 8   | 8  |                          | 16    |
|                  | 36 - 40                | 9   | 9  |                          | 18    |
|                  | 41 - 45                | 10  | 1  |                          | 11    |
|                  | >45                    | 19  | 1  |                          | 20    |
|                  | Total                  | 48  | 2  |                          | 50    |
| Female           | 36 - 40                | 12  | 2  |                          | 14    |
|                  | 41 - 45                | 7   | 2  |                          | 9     |
|                  | >45                    | 21  | 1  |                          | 22    |
|                  | Total                  | 40  | 2  |                          | 43    |

Table 4.24 Gender evaluation of Pay Versus Work Done per Academic Qualification

| Subject's gender | Subject's highest academic qualification | Do you feel that your pay is commensurate to the work you are doing? | | |
|------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                  |                                          | Yes | No | Not sure/Do not know | Total |
| Male             | KCE/EACE/KCSE                            | 2   | 1  |                        | 3     |
|                  | BA/BSc                                  | 1   | 28 |                        | 29    |
|                  | BA/BSc with PGDE                         | 3   | 1  |                        | 4     |
|                  | BEd Arts/Ed                              | 14  | 1  |                        | 15    |
|                  | Sc/EdTech                                | 1   | 14 |                        | 15    |
|                  | MEd/MSc/MA                               | 1   | 48 |                        | 49    |
|                  | Total                                    | 1   | 48 |                        | 49    |
| Female           | BA/BSc with PGDE                         | 1   | 1  |                        | 2     |
|                  | BEd Arts/Ed                              | 1   | 20 |                        | 21    |
|                  | Sc/EdTech                                | 1   | 20 |                        | 21    |
|                  | MEd/MSc/MA                               | 1   | 1  |                        | 2     |
|                  | PhD                                      | 1   | 42 |                        | 43    |
Table 4.25 Effect of Pay versus Effort on Performance Per Academic Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Does the relationship between the amount of pay versus the work done make your performance better or worse?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's highest academic qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCE/EACE/KCSE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc/BE Ed Tech</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd/MSc/MA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's highest academic qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc/BE Ed Tech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd/MSc/MA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven percent (3) of the respondents felt their pay was commensurate to their work, therefore performed better while 59.1% felt underpaid, thus performed poorly regardless of gender. No relationship was seen between pay and work done by 36.6% of the subjects, thus these variables had no effect on their performance.

Table 4.26 Effect of Gender Qualification on Evaluation of Current Pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's highest academic qualification</th>
<th>Do you feel that your current pay is more or less than your contemporaries in other professions?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's highest academic qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCE/EACE/KCSE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc/BE Ed Tech</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd/MSc/MA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's highest academic qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc/BE Ed Tech</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd/MSc/MA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.27 Effect of Pay Increment on Motivation per Academic Qualification

Subject's highest academic qualification * Would a pay increment motivate you? * Subject's gender Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Would a pay increment motivate you?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's highest academic qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCE/EACE/KCSE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc/BEd Tech</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd/MSc/MBA/MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's highest academic qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc/BEd Tech</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd/MSc/MBA/MA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority, 88 subjects (94.6%) agreed that increased pay would motivate them, regardless of gender, while 5 (5.3%) were either not sure or felt increased pay wouldn’t motivate them.

Table 4.28 Cross-tabulation of Pay Versus Work Done Per Working Duration Category

.Working duration category [yrs] * Do you feel that your pay is commensurate to the work you are doing? * Subject's gender Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Do you feel that your pay is commensurate to the work you are doing?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working duration category [yrs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working duration category [yrs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More experienced trainers (up to 30 years experience) felt that their pay wasn’t commensurate to the work they did, just like age. As a result of this, their performance was worse as seen in table 4.29 below.

Table 4.29 Effect of Pay Versus Work Done on Performance per Working Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Does the relationship between the amount of pay versus the work done make your performance better or worse?</th>
<th>Subject’s gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>No effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents (59.1%) felt that their pay was not commensurate to the work they did, thus, performed poorly regardless of gender.
Eighty-eight (94.6%) of the respondents felt that their pay was below their contemporaries in other professions. Only 2 were not sure whether their pay was better or worse, while one male believed he was better paid.
Table 4.31 Effect of Pay Increment on Motivation by Working Duration Category and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Would a pay increment motivate you?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working duration category [yrs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All subjects who believed that their pay was worse than their contemporaries in other professions felt they could be motivated by a pay increment while the remaining 4 didn’t seem to be motivated by pay increase, probably because they had worked long enough to maintain the status quo or they had other motivational needs other than money.

4.2.3: Research Questions 3 - effects of transfer on motivation and performance

As indicated in the research objective 3, responses were sought on the effect of transfer on motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer in Kenya. The values recorded in the variable shows that voluntary transfer seemed to motivate most subjects regardless of age or gender (66% males and 96.9% females). The variable values are shown in Tables 4.32-4.40.
Table 4.32 Number of times the Subject had been Transferred per Age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's age category</th>
<th>Number of times the subject has been transferred</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>5 1 2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2 1 3 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>2 2 3 3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>1 1 5 7 4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4 10 14 11 7 2 2 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table, it is evident that the older the trainer, the more the number of times he/she had been transferred.

Table 4.33 Cross-tabulation of Nature of Transfer per Age Category and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's age category</th>
<th>Was the transfer/s voluntary?</th>
<th>Subject's gender Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some Yes and some No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>5 1 2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>4 1 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>4 3 4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>10 3 6 1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24 8 14 4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's age category</th>
<th>Was the transfer/s voluntary?</th>
<th>Subject's gender Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some Yes and some No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>4 1 6 2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16 4 14 7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty four (48%) males had been transferred voluntarily compared to thirty two (74.4%) females.
Table 4.34 Effect of Transfer on Performance Per Age Category and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's age category</th>
<th>How was your performance after the transfer/s?</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>Not transferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance seemed to improve for 33 men (66%) that were transferred, implying that those whose transfers were both voluntary and compulsory must have also improved their performance. Almost all the 32 females (31 or 96.9%) who had been voluntarily transferred performed better after the transfers. Six males’ (12%) performance was worse after compulsory transfer while 7(14%) maintained a status quo after transfer(s). Seven females (16.3%) got compulsory transfers out of whom 4 (9.3%) performed worse after the transfers, while the others’ performance remained consistent.
### Table 4.35 Gender Transfer(s) Per Highest Academic Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Subject's highest academic qualification</th>
<th>Number of times the subject has been transferred</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>KCE/EACE/KCSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/BSc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sc/BE Ed Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEd/MSc/MBA/MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sc/BE Ed Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEd/MSc/MBA/MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.36 Nature of Transfer Per Subject's Highest Academic Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Subject's highest academic qualification</th>
<th>Was the transfer(s) voluntary?</th>
<th>Some Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not transferred</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>KCE/EACE/KCSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/BSc</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sc/BE Ed Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEd/MSc/MBA/MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Female           | BA/BSc with PGDE                         |                               | 1        |   |                 | 1     |
|                  | BEd Arts/BEd                             |                               | 15       | 1 | 5               | 21    |
|                  | Sc/BE Ed Tech                            |                               | 15       | 3 | 2               | 20    |
|                  | MEd/MSc/MBA/MA                           |                               | 1        |   |                 | 1     |
|                  | PhD                                      |                               | 32       | 4 | 7               | 43    |
Table 4.37 Effect of Transfer on Performance Per Highest Academic Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s highest academic qualification</th>
<th>How was your performance after the transfer/s?</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCE/EACE/KCSE</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BED Arts/BEd</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc/BEd Tech</td>
<td>Med/MSc/MBA/MA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic qualifications had no influence on the effect of transfer on performance as 68.8% of the trainers performed better after the transfers regardless of their academic qualifications and gender.

Table 4.38 Gender Transfer(s) Per Working Duration Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Number of times the subject has been transferred</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Most transfers took place after 11-25 years of experience for men i.e. 31 men (62%) and 16-30 years experience for females i.e.32 females (74.4%) probably due to settling down in readiness for retirement.

Table 4.39 Nature of Transfer Per Working Duration Category and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Was the transfer/s voluntary?</th>
<th>Subject’s gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some Yes and some No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 0-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 6-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 11-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 16-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 21-25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male &gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 6-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 11-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 16-20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 21-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 26-30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female &gt;30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More females (74.4%) opted for transfers than males (48%). Four males had not been transferred at all while all females had been transferred at least once.
Most respondents’ performance got better after the transfers (66% of the males and 72% of the females).

4.2.4: Research Question 4 - effect of gender on motivation and performance

As indicated in the research objective 4, responses were sought on the effect of gender on motivation and performance of the DTT in Kenya. The values recorded in the variables show that there is no significant difference in the motivation and performance of the genders, regardless of age, academic qualifications and working experience. The variable values are shown in Tables 4.41-4.46.
Table 4.41 Effect of Gender on a Teacher’s Performance Per Age Category and Gender

Subject’s age category * Does gender affect the performance of a teacher? * Subject’s gender Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Does gender affect the performance of a teacher?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many males (62%) felt that gender did not affect the performance of a teacher, while 69% of the females felt the same.

Table 4.42 Effect of Gender on Motivation per Age Category and Gender

Subject’s age category * Which gender is more motivated than the other? * Subject’s gender Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Which gender is more motivated than the other?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the few respondents (27) who acknowledged a difference in motivation between the genders, each considered the opposite gender to be more motivated. However, the majority of the respondents (64% males and 62.8% females) did not see any difference in motivation between the genders, irrespective of age.
Table 4.43 Effect of Gender on Performance per Subject’s Academic Qualification

Subject's highest academic qualification * Does gender affect the performance of a teacher? *

Subject's gender Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Does gender affect the performance of a teacher?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not sure/Do not know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s highest academic qualification KCE/EACE/KCSE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So/BeEd Tech</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med/MSc/MBA/MA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s highest academic qualification BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So/BeEd Tech</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med/MSc/MBA/MA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of academic qualifications, the majority of trainers, (62% males and 69.8% females) felt that gender did not affect a teacher’s performance.

Table 4.44 Effect of Gender on Motivation per working Duration Category and Gender

Subject's highest academic qualification * Which gender is more motivated than the other? * Subject's gender Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s gender</th>
<th>Which gender is more motivated than the other?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>Not sure/Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s highest academic qualification KCE/EACE/KCSE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So/BeEd Tech</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med/MSc/MBA/MA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s highest academic qualification BA/BSc with PGDE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd Arts/BEd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So/BeEd Tech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med/MSc/MBA/MA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents (64% males and 62.8% females) in all categories of academic qualifications were of the view that there was no difference in motivation of the gender.
### Table 4.45: Effect of Gender on Performance per Working Duration Category and Gender

**Working duration category [yrs]** *Does gender affect the performance of a teacher?*  
*Subject's gender Crosstabulation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Does gender affect the performance of a teacher?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 6-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 11-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 16-20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 26-30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male &gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 6-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 11-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 16-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 21-25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 26-30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female &gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of the working experience, the majority of trainers (62% males and 69.8% females) felt that gender did not affect the performance of a teacher.

### Table 4.46: Level of Motivation of Gender per Working Duration Category and Gender

**Working duration category [yrs]** *Which gender is more motivated than the other?*  
*Subject's gender Crosstabulation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Which gender is more motivated than the other?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 0-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 6-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 11-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 16-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male 26-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male &gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 6-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 11-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 16-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female 26-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female &gt;30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Just like age, academic qualifications and work experience, there was a general feeling that no gender was more motivated than the other. Only 32% of the males and 30.2% of the females saw a difference in motivation between the genders.

4.2.5: Research Question 5 – effect of training on motivation and performance

As indicated in the research objective 5, responses were sought on the effect of training on motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer in Kenya. The values recorded in the variable shows that most of the respondents who had gone for further studies were motivated to perform better. This could be attributed to the employer’s recognition of the training.

There was a significant difference in attitude towards the relationship between high academic qualifications and performance and between high professional qualification and performance between the genders. While most males did not see a correlation, most females saw it as seen in the discussion below. The variable values are shown in Tables 4.47-4.65.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working station [Institution]</th>
<th>Have you gone for further studies?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagumo TTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s gender Male</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s gender Female</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s gender Male</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject’s gender Female</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both genders in both institutions had gone for further studies (72% males and 67.4% females).
Table 4.48 Variance Analysis and t-test of Subjects attendance of Further Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you gone for further studies?</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>F = .877, Sig. = .351</td>
<td>t = -4.73, df = 91</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) = .637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>F = .472, df = 87.610</td>
<td>t = .638</td>
<td>(.238, .147)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 2-tailed test showed a 0.637 level of significance.

Table 4.49 Variance Analysis and t-test of Subjects' Exposure to Further Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you gone for further studies?</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>F = 3.142, Sig. = .080</td>
<td>t = .877, df = 91</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) = .383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>F = .882, df = 90.531</td>
<td>t = .380</td>
<td>(.105, .27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.50 Subject’s Attendance of Further Training per Age Category and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s age category</th>
<th>Have you gone for further studies?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the trainers who had gone for further studies were in the age categories, 36-40 years (22.6%) and over 45 years (25.8%).

Table 4.51 Recognition of Further Studies by Employer per Age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's age category</th>
<th>Were the undertaken studies recognised by the employer?</th>
<th>Subject's gender Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of those who went for further studies had their studies recognized by the employer (77.8% of males and 86.2% of females). Recognition was in form of improved grades and increased pay.

Table 4.52 Effect of Further Studies on Motivation and Performance per Age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's age category</th>
<th>Were you motivated to work/perform better after the studies?</th>
<th>Subject's gender Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further studies motivated most subjects (69.4% of the males and 75.9% of the females), probably because their training was recognized and rewarded by the employer as shown in table 4.51 above.

Table 4.53 Gender View about Opportunities for Staff Development per Age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s age category</th>
<th>Are there opportunities for staff development (further training) in teaching profession?</th>
<th>Subject’s gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty (66.67%) of the subjects felt there were opportunities for staff development in the teaching profession, especially those above 45 years.
### Table 4.54: Subjects that had gone/ not gone for Further Studies per Working Duration

**Working duration category [yrs] * Have you gone for further studies? * Subject's gender Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Have you gone for further studies?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most men (27.78%) who had gone for further studies were in the category of 11-15 years’ working experience while females were in the 16-20 (37.9%) year category.

### Table 4.55 Recognition of Undertaken Studies by Employer per Working Duration

**Working duration category [yrs] * Were the undertaken studies recognised by the employer? * Subject's gender Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Were the undertaken studies recognised by the employer?</th>
<th>Not gone for further studies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 4.56 Effect of Further Studies on Motivation and Performance per Experience**

**Working duration category [yrs] * Were you motivated to work/perform better after the studies? *
Subject’s gender Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s gender</th>
<th>Working duration [yrs]</th>
<th>Were you motivated to work/perform better after the studies?</th>
<th>Not gone for further studies</th>
<th>No effect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>Yes 1, No 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>Yes 4, No 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>Yes 7, No 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>Yes 5, No 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>Yes 3, No 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>Yes 5, No 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>Yes 1, No 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Yes 25, No 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>Yes 2, No 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>Yes 3, No 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>Yes 10, No 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>Yes 2, No 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>Yes 3, No 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>Yes 2, No 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Yes 22, No 6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most subjects (50.5%) were motivated to perform better after further studies, regardless of gender.
Table 4.57 Gender View about Opportunities for Staff Development per Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Are there opportunities for staff development (further training) in teaching profession?</th>
<th>Subject's gender Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working duration category [yrs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working duration category [yrs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both gender (64.5%) acknowledged availability of opportunities for staff development, while 26.9% felt there were none. Eight subjects (8.6%) were not sure of the existence of opportunities for staff development.

Table 4.58 Subject’s Vulnerability to Career change per Age Category and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's age category</th>
<th>Given a chance, would you change your career?</th>
<th>Subject's gender Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty seven (54%) of the males felt they could change their careers if given a chance, especially those above 45 years of age. Twenty- two (51%) of the females wished to change their career, especially those between 36-40 years of age.

Table 4.59 Relationship between Academic Qualifications and Motivation Per Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's age category</th>
<th>In your opinion, do you think a teacher with higher academic qualifications is more motivated?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the males, 52% felt that a teacher with higher academic qualifications was not any more motivated than those with lower qualifications as opposed to 30.2% of the females. Conversely, 65% of the females agreed that a teacher with higher academic qualifications was more motivated. This difference could be attributed to the culture that ties females to many domestic responsibilities which deny them the opportunity to fully exercise their potential, thus the association of excellence with higher education that their male counterparts achieve easily.
Table 4.60 Relationship between Professional Qualifications and Motivation per Age

Subject's age category * Is a teacher with higher professional qualifications more motivated? * Subject's gender Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Is a teacher with higher professional qualifications more motivated?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both genders still maintained their differences with the males (56%) seeing no relationship between professional qualifications and motivation, while most females (56%) felt that a teacher with higher professional qualifications was more motivated.

Table 4.61 Effect of Teaching Experience on Performance per Age Category and Gender

Subject's age category * Does teaching experience influence a teacher's performance? * Subject's gender Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Does teaching experience influence a teacher's performance?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all respondents (95.7%), regardless of age and gender agreed that teaching experience affected a teacher's performance.
Table 4.62 Vulnerability to Career Change per Working Duration and Gender

Working duration category [yrs] * Given a chance, would you change your career? *
Subject's gender Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Given a chance, would you change your career?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>category [yrs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>category [yrs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of TTs (53%) felt they could change their career if given a chance, while 43% were satisfied with the teaching career. Younger teachers (below 21 years experience) felt that they could change their careers if given a chance, especially in the working duration category, 11-15 years’ experience for males and 16-20 years for females.
Table 4.63 Relationship between Academic Qualifications and Motivation per Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>In your opinion, do you think a teacher with higher academic qualifications is more motivated?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most males (52%) felt that there was no relationship between academic qualifications and motivation, while 65.1% of the females felt otherwise. The working duration category, 16-20 had more females (35.7%) feeling that a teacher with higher academic qualifications was more motivated as compared to those in the other categories with a combined proportion of 64.29%.
### Table 4.64 Relationship between Professional Qualifications and Motivation

**Working duration category [yrs] * Is a teacher with higher professional qualifications more motivated? * Subject's gender Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's gender</th>
<th>Is a teacher with higher professional qualifications more motivated?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong> Working duration category [yrs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong> Working duration category [yrs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just like academic qualifications, most males (56%) felt that there was no relationship between professional qualifications and motivation, while most females 55.8% felt otherwise.
Most of the respondents (95.7%) agreed that teaching experience influenced a teacher’s performance.

4.2.6 Research Questions 6 -the effect of work place conditions on motivation and performance

As indicated in the research objective 6, responses were sought on the effect of work place conditions on motivation and performance of the DTT in Kenya. The values recorded in the variable shows that a spacious and well- lit office motivated trainers to perform better. Where trainers liked the supervision received as seen in both institutions, they were motivated and performed better, whether in a rural setting like KTC or an urban setting as in KSTC and regardless of respondents’ working experience. The variable values are shown in Tables 4.66-4.75 and figure 7.
Eighty-four percent (84%) of trainers in KTC felt that their office was neither spacious nor well-lit, especially those aged over 36 years. This could be attributed to their expectations as senior officers requiring decent and spacious offices. Conversely, 58% of trainers in KSTC were satisfied with their office space and lighting, save for 42% that were dissatisfied.

Gender did not affect the subjects’ satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the space and
lighting in their offices as the same trend observed with age was maintained in both institutions. The following bar chart summarizes the observations in the two institutions.

Fig.7 Subject’s View about his/her office Space and Lighting Per Institution

[Bar chart showing percentage of subjects' views on office space and lighting for KTC and KSTC institutions.]

Group Statistics of Subject’s View about Office Space and Lighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Statistics of Subject’s View about Office Space and Lighting</th>
<th>Working station [Institution]</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is your office spacious enough and well lit?</td>
<td>KTC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KSTC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.68 T-test for Equality of means from subjects’ responses on office Lighting and Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equality of Variances</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your office spacious enough and well lit?</td>
<td>Even variances assumed</td>
<td>29.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>4.561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.69 Effect of Working Conditions on Motivation and Performance per Age

Subject’s age category * Is the current state of your work place motivating to you to perform better? * Working station [Institution] Cross-tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working station [Institution]</th>
<th>Subject’s age category</th>
<th>Is the current state of your work place motivating to you to perform better?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSTC</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority (92.9%) of the KTC trainers who were dissatisfied with the office space and lighting were de-motivated and had a worse performance, while 88% of those satisfied in KSTC performed better. Six trainers (6.5%) in the two colleges were neither sure nor affected by the state of their work place.
Majority of the trainers (66% for KTC and 74% for KSTC) liked the supervision received at work, especially those above 45 years of age.

Most of the trainers who liked their supervisors (76% in KTC and 88% in KSTC)
were motivated to perform better. A few trainers who liked their supervisors still did not perform better. 9.7% of the trainers were either not affected or not sure of the effect of supervision on their performance.

Table 4.72 State of office Space and Lighting per Working Duration Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Is your office spacious enough and well lit?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working station [Institution]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KSTC seemed to have spacious and well-lit offices (for 48.1% of respondents) compared to KTC (16% only).
Table 4.73 Effect of Working Conditions on Motivation and Performance per Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working station [Institution]</th>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure/no effect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KTC</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSTC</td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The poor spacing and lighting for KTC (84%) led to poor performance by 78% of its trainers as opposed to better performance by 51.2% of KSTC trainers.
Table 4.74 Attitude towards Supervision received per Working Duration

Working duration category [yrs] * Do you like the supervision you receive at work? * Working station [Institution] Cross-tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working station [Institution]</th>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Do you like the supervision you receive at work?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSTC</td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.75 Effect of Supervision on Motivation and Performance per Working Duration

Working duration category [yrs] * Does the supervision you receive at work motivate you to perform better? * Working station [Institution] Cross-tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working station [Institution]</th>
<th>Working duration category [yrs]</th>
<th>Does the supervision you receive at work motivate you to perform better?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSTC</td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0: INTRODUCTION

This chapter outlines the summary, conclusions and recommendations relating to the factors affecting motivation and performance of DTT in Kenya.

5.1: SUMMARY

The study analyzed the factors affecting motivation and performance of the DTT in Kenya. The objectives of the study were to analyze the role played by promotion on motivation and performance of the DTT and find out if pay, transfer and gender affected their motivation and performance.

The findings indicate that promotion plays a big role in the motivation of most DTT regardless of gender, working duration and age, each variable showing that 68.8% of the respondents were motivated by promotion. Most males, 64%, became effective after promotion, while 69.8% of the females were motivated too. Promotion on merit seemed to motivate many respondents, regardless of institution. Evidence of this was in the KTC results where 67.7% of the subjects promoted on merit were motivated just like 72.4% of their colleagues in KSTC. However, there was a general dissatisfaction with the TSC promotion criteria, evident among 60 respondents (64.5%) with regard to gender, working duration and age.

Most respondents (96.8%) perceived their pay not commensurate to their work, thus performed poorly, despite their gender, age, academic qualification and working duration. Regardless of gender, age, academic qualification and working duration, 94.6% of the respondents felt that their pay was less than their contemporaries in other professions and increased pay would motivate them. Thirty two males (64%) and
twenty three females (53.5%) felt that when they related their pay to the work they did, their performance became worse across the gender, age, highest academic qualification and working duration categories.

Performance seemed to improve for 33 men (66%) that were transferred, implying that those whose transfers were both voluntary and compulsory must have also improved their performance. Almost all the 32 females (96.9%) who had been voluntarily transferred performed better after the transfers. Six males' (12%) performance was worse after compulsory transfer. The age category, over 45 years seemed to perform better (40.6%) and also worse (50%) than the other categories after transfer(s). The same trend was maintained for the respondents' highest academic qualifications and working duration categories. Voluntary transfer(s) appeared to motivate most (94.6%) DDTs to perform better as opposed to when it was compulsory and 47.6% displayed worse performance while 71.4% whose transfer(s) were both voluntary and compulsory had no difference in their performance.

Results also intimated that there wasn't much difference in the motivation of the gender (males 64% and females 63%). On the other hand most respondents (65.6%), whatever the age, academic qualifications and working duration, agreed that gender did not affect the performance of a teacher. Of the few respondents (29) who acknowledged a difference in motivation between the genders, each considered more of the opposite gender to be motivated. This applied in the subjects' age, academic qualifications and working duration categories.

It also emerged in the results that further training could only motivate DTTs if it was recognized by the employer as confirmed by 69.4% males and 75.9% females whose achievement was recognized per age category. The same applied to 77.8% males whose
studies were recognized and 82.6% females in the working duration category. This is opposed to 22.2% (8) males and 17.2% (5) females whose studies were not recognized in this category.

A spacious and well-lit office provided a conducive working environment that motivated most DTTs as was evident in the subjects’ age category, with 58% of the KSTC staff satisfied, out of whom 88% were motivated to work better. Conversely, 84% of KTC trainers were dissatisfied with their working environment resulting in poor performance by 93% of them. Respondents who were over 45 years seemed to be most affected both positively (31.2%) and negatively (62.4%) by office space and lighting than other age categories. Most of the trainers who liked their supervisors (76% in KTC and 88% in KSTC) were motivated to perform better. Twelve trainers (12.9%) who liked their supervisors still did not perform better. Nine (9.7%) of the trainers were either not affected or not sure of the effect of supervision on their performance.

5.1.1: Comparative Analysis of KTC and KSTC

Results of the two colleges brought out unique differences between the two institutions. An analysis of attendance to further training showed that more males (44%) went for further training than females (22%) in KTC while KSTC had more females (41.9%) than males (32.6%). In total, KSTC had more trainers (74.5%) undertaking further training than KTC (66%). These differences could be attributed to KTC being in a rural setting that may display conservatism in females pursuing their careers after marriage unlike KSTC'S urban environment where there is high competition necessitating further studies. Moreover, the cost of living in the rural area like KTC is lower, leading to less financial strain than that in Nairobi where the high cost of housing and transport
could motivate KSTC trainers to pursue further studies for them to increase their chances of promotion and changing career for higher pay.

About 93% of the KTC trainers were dissatisfied with their office space and lighting leading to worse performance while 88% of KSTC trainers were satisfied and performed better, regardless of gender. However, the state of the work place was not motivating enough for KSTC trainers when the working duration was considered for only 51.2% were motivated to work better. This meant that there was more to working conditions than just lighting and space.

5.2: CONCLUSION

From the discussion above, it is apparent that the major factors affecting motivation and performance of the DTT are promotion, pay, compulsory transfer, recognition of further training by the employer and the conditions of the work place.

5.2.1: Promotion

Promotion should be handled well so that trainers do not stay in one grade for too long and the criterion of merit would yield better results than automatic mass promotion that lacks individual recognition of a trainer’s effort.

5.2.2: Pay

Pay is a key factor affecting motivation and performance of the DTT. The trainers cannot help comparing their pay with the work they do and their contemporaries’. It can only motivate if viewed as commensurate to the work done and fairly close to that of contemporaries in other professions. A clear job analysis, description and evaluation would help the TSC come up with an acceptable and harmonized pay package to satisfy these trainers and motivate them to higher performance.
5.2.3: Transfer

Voluntary transfer(s) always elicit positive response in terms of motivation and performance. Findings also showed that compulsory transfer(s) made some trainers improve their performance while some were either indifferent or performed worse. It is therefore up to the employer to handle these transfer(s) carefully for the indifferent and worse groups to be motivated. For example, considering the effect of the transfer(s) on the families of affected trainers and the need for those over 45 years to get closer to where they wish to settle after retirement.

5.2.4: Gender

Gender does not affect motivation and performance of DTT from the results gathered. Few respondents (29) who acknowledged a difference in motivation between the genders, each considering more of the opposite gender to be motivated had no convincing evidence to support their view. It looked more of gender bias than factual.

5.2.5: Training

Training affects motivation and performance in that results showed that when training was recognized by the employer in form of perks or higher grades, subjects were motivated and performed better. With the trainers’ acknowledgement of availability of opportunities for staff development, communication of these opportunities to trainers and granting them study leave to pursue them would enhance their motivation and performance.

5.2.6: Working Conditions

Working conditions, especially lighting and office space play a significant role in the motivation and performance of the DTT as manifested with 88% satisfaction by KSTC trainers. However, this variable should be handled in combination with other factors
that contribute to a conducive working environment such as supervision given, peer relationships, staff welfare matters and teaching facilities for it to be more effective.

5.2.7: Other Motivational Factors

5.2.7.1: Teaching Experience

Teaching experience also plays some role, but is a natural factor beyond the control of the trainer and other interested parties, unlike the preceding ones that are totally within the control of other parties such as the employer or his agent who can make an effort to change the circumstances to motivate the trainer for better performance. Other factors such as age and gender play a very insignificant role in the motivation and performance of the DTT, but should not be overlooked.

5.2.7.1: Academic Qualification

Academic qualification is a unique factor in that there seems to be a gender bias on its effect with 56% of the females viewing its effect as significant while 56% of the males see no relationship between it and motivation. This calls for uniqueness in the handling of this factor by the employer and agent among the genders.

Findings from the two institutions on attendance of further training which showed that more males (44%) went for further training than females (22%) in KTC while KSTC had more females (41.9%) than males (32.6%) seem to have a pointer to the rural versus urban setting of the two institutions and the impact of this on desire for further training. It could also be attributed to cultural influence, sponsorship for training or adherence or non-adherence to affirmative action.

Most respondents in KSTC performed better after appreciating the lighting and space in their offices unlike their KTC counterparts who found their work place neither spacious
nor well-lit. This implies that the more spacious and well-lit an office is, the better the performance of its occupants.

In the study, it emerged that motivation and performance went hand in hand, in the sense that a motivated trainer mostly manifested his/her motivation in better performance and vice versa.

5.3: RECOMMENDATIONS

5.3.1: Promotion

The researcher recommends that the TSC seriously considers the promotional needs of DTT so that upward progression becomes faster than the system of tying an individual for three years in one grade before the next promotion. Those whose performance deserves promotion should get it immediately. Trainers would be more motivated if their position as middle-level trainers above basic education with a scheme of service of their own.

5.3.2: Pay

Harmonization of trainers' pay with that of colleagues in the civil service and as much as possible, close to that of contemporaries in the private sector by the TSC would go a long way in motivating and improving the performance of DTT. Moreover, this would also help retain these trainers who are currently very susceptible to career change in the hope of getting better pay.

5.3.3: Transfer

Transfers should be made voluntary as much as possible and where unique circumstances call for compulsory transfers, the TSC human resource department should prepare the concerned TTs adequately for the inevitable circumstances. The current scenario where newly employed teachers are forced to be in one station for five years before consideration for transfer kills the morale of many trainers.
5.3.4: Gender

Principals of these institutions need to observe affirmative action in allocating responsibilities, recommending trainers for promotion, providing conducive working environment and facilities so that despite this variable not playing a key role in motivation and performance, it may not be watered down to a point of becoming a motivational issue.

5.3.5: Training

Since the biographical data collected reveals that most of these TTs are middle-aged (89.2% were above 36 years), Principals of DTTCs should work together with the MOE to facilitate further training of these TTs in current training needs and methods such as E-learning, use of power point and research via internet. Provision of ICT facilities in the institutions would give hands-on experience to these TTs.

The TSC in conjunction with the MOE needs to revise the teachers' employment contract with a view to tailoring trainers' conditions of service to the rising need for promotion, improved pay, voluntary transfers and staff development. This would motivate TTs to perform better.

5.3.6: Working Conditions

The KTC administration needs to improve the office space and lighting for its trainers in order for them to be motivated and perform better.

Trade Unions like KNUT and KUPPET which represent these trainers should use findings of this study to give better representation of issues affecting motivation and performance of these cadre of trainers. It is possible to downplay the effect of these motivational factors with the assumption that trainers are more senior and may not be
affected by factors like pay and promotion like their primary and secondary school counterparts.

5.4: SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH
The researcher suggests that further research be done in the following areas:

1. The effect of these motivational and performance factors on DTTs in private colleges in Kenya. So many private DTTCs have come up and it creates curiosity on whether their needs and challenges are similar to those of public DTTIs. Moreover, some of these colleges offer both P1 and Diploma teacher training.

2. Other middle-level college trainers that may not necessarily be training teachers to compare results with those of TTs since these trainers are also teachers.

3. Difference in attitude towards the effect of academic qualifications on motivation and performance of the DTT among the genders.

4. A comparative analysis of the working conditions and gender attendance to further training in these institutions.
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APPENDIX 1

LETTER TO THE COLLEGE PRINCIPALS

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF OPEN LEARNING (NYERI)

P.O. BOX 1983,

NYERI.

27TH JULY, 2007

The ___________ Principal,

___________ Teachers College,

P.O Box ____________

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: PERMISSION TO CARRY OUT RESEARCH

I am a postgraduate student of Kenyatta University, pursuing a Master of Business Administration, Human Resource Management. I am conducting a study in Diploma Teacher Training Colleges.

I wish to seek your permission to visit your college and interview the lecturers using questionnaires in August, 2007. The questionnaires are designed for this research purpose only, therefore the responses will be absolutely confidential and anonymously given. No name will be required from any respondent or institution.

Yours faithfully,

AKALI SARAH O.
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TRAINERS

Instructions

This questionnaire is designed to gather general information that would help analyze factors affecting motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainers. Your responses will be accorded great confidentiality; hence do not write your name or that of your institution.

SECTION A

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

For questions 1-3, indicate ( )

1. Indicate sex  (a) Male ( ) (b) Female ( )

2. Indicate your age  (a). Below 30 years ( )
   (b). 30 _ 35 years ( )
   (c). 36 _ 40 years ( )
   (d). 41 _ 45 years ( )
   (e). Above 45 years ( )

3. State your highest academic qualifications

   a. KJSE ( )
   b. KCE/EACE/KCSE ( )
   c. EACE.KACE/ ‘A’level ( )
   d. BA/BSc with PGDE ( )
   e. BED (Arts) ( )
   f. BED (Science) ( )
   g. MED/MA ( )
   h. Other (specify) ____________________________

4. How long have you taught? ____________________________ Years.

5. Which job group did you start at?  _J, K, L, M, N ____________________________

6. Which is your current job group? ____________________________
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SECTION B

PROMOTION AND PERFORMANCE

7. Have you ever been promoted? Yes/ No ________________

If yes, how many times? __________

8. What criterion was used to promote you at different times? ________________

a) Do you think the promotion was effective in motivating you? Yes/ No __________

Comment ___________________________________________________________________

b) Did your performance improve after the promotion? Yes/ No ________________

Comment ___________________________________________________________________

9. Are you satisfied with the promotion criteria used by the TSC? Yes/ No __________

a) If yes, why? __________________________________________________________________

b) If no Why? __________________________________________________________________

WORKING CONDITIONS

10. Do you have enough office space? Yes/ No ________________

a) Does this motivate you? Yes/ No ________________

b) How does this affect your performance? __________________________________________________________________

11. Do you have enough lighting? Yes/ No ________________

a) Does this motivate you? Yes/ No ________________

b) How does this affect your performance? __________________________________________________________________

12. Do you like the supervision you receive at work? Yes/ No ________________
a) Does it motivate you? Yes/No __________________

b) How does it affect your performance? ______________________________________

13. What is your weekly workload? ________________________________ Hours.

a) Does it motivate you? Yes/No __________________________

b) If no, why? ____________________________________________

c) How does it affect your performance? ________________________

14. Suggest some improvements you would like in your current working conditions.

(i) ______________________________________________________

(ii) ______________________________________________________

(iii) ______________________________________________________

(iv) ______________________________________________________

(v) ______________________________________________________

TRANSFER

15. a) How many times have you been transferred in your service? _____

b) Were these transfers voluntary? Yes/No ______________________________

c) How was your performance after the transfer(s)? Better/ worse ____________

d) State two factors the TSC should consider before transferring a teacher in order for the teacher to remain motivated.

(i) ______________________________________________________

(ii) ______________________________________________________
TRAINING

16. a) Have you gone for further studies? Yes/No ________
   b) Were the studies related to teaching? Yes/No __________
   c) Why did you go? ______________________________________
   d) Who sponsored you? ________________________________
   e) Did your employer recognize the certificate you obtained after further studies? Yes/No _____
   f) Were you motivated to work after the studies? Yes/No __________
   g) How was your performance after the studies? Better/worse __________

17. Are there opportunities for staff development (further training) in the teaching profession? Yes/No ________

18. Given a chance, would you change your career? Yes/No __________ Why? ______

GENDER

19. Does gender affect the performance of a teacher? Yes/No __________
   a) Which gender is more motivated than the other? Male/female __________
       Why? _______________________________________________________
   b) Which gender performs better? Male/female __________ Why? ______
       _______________________________________________________

20. What would you suggest should be done to reflect gender differences as far as work performance is concerned? ________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
21. Do you feel your pay is commensurate to the work you are doing? Yes/No

Does this make your performance better or worse? 

22. Do you feel your current pay is more or less than your contemporaries in other professions? More/less

23. Would a pay increment motivate you? Yes/No Why?

ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

24. In your opinion do you think a teacher with higher academic qualifications is more motivated? Yes/No

Does such a teacher perform his/her work better? Yes/No

25. Does teaching experience influence a teacher’s performance? Yes/No

26. Is a teacher with higher professional qualifications more motivated? Yes/No

27. Any other comment you want to make on motivation and performance of the Diploma Teacher Trainer

Thank you for your participation.