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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to assess the effect of performance contracting as a new tool of management in teacher training colleges in Kiambu County, with special focus on Thogoto Teachers Training College. A mixed research design involving descriptive survey and case study was used to examine the effectiveness of performance contracts in Thogoto Teachers Training College. The target population for this study included the teaching and non-teaching staffs and students. Stratified sampling was also used to sample the employees of Thogoto Teachers Training College. Students were chosen through simple random sampling whereby 100 students were selected to participate in the study. Data was collected mainly by use of questionnaires and interview guides. The research instruments were reviewed for reliability by various groups of people who include the researcher’s peers, and supervisors at the Catholic University of Eastern Africa. Data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. Frequency tables, cross tabulations, charts and graphs were used to summarize and presented the findings. The findings of the study showed that: Performance contracting as a mandatory requirement has been adopted by Thogoto Teachers Training College to a fairly moderate extent and had a positive impact on service delivery. However it also limits employee creativity and innovation as they have to operate within defined limits. Performance contracting enhances on employee job satisfaction at Thogoto Teachers Training College especially when they meet the requirements of performance contracting. The challenges the institution faced were employees resistant to change, poor communication on expected results and lack of cooperation among the staffs. Based on the findings, the researcher recommends that there should be improvement in communication, creation of employees awareness; those employees who perform excellently should be rewarded; the institution should set goals that are realistic and achievable for employees; employees should be involved in setting performance targets and lastly the institution should increase funding.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Public sector refers to economic and administrative life that deals with the delivery of goods and services to the people, whether at national, regional or local levels (Triveldi, 2000). Performance contract on other hand is the agreement about employee’s performance goals or an agreement between a manager and an employee about the employee’s responsibilities and behaviour during a review period (Cole, 1998). The use of performance contract has been acclaimed as an effective and promising means of improving the performance of public sector (Obong’o, 2000). Essentially, a performance contract is an agreement between a government and public agency which establishes general goals for the agency, set targets for measuring performance and provides incentives for achieving these targets (Bouckaert, 2009). They include a variety of incentive-based mechanisms for controlling public agencies-controlling the outcome rather than process.

The success of performance contract in such diverse countries as France, Pakistan, South Korea, Malaysia, India, and Kenya has sparked a great deal of interest in policy around the world (Miller, 2010). A large number of government and international organizations are currently implementing policies using this method to improve the performance of the public sector in their countries. Performance contract represent a state of the art tool for improving public sector performance (Larbi, 2000). They are now considered an essential tool for enhancing good governance and accountability for results in the public sector.

The use of performance contract is a process of performance management that leads to higher output, better performance, improved communication and training as well as motivates employees. Armstrong (2004) states that performance contract defines expectations of the concerned parties. They define the work to be done, the result to be attained and the
attributes (skills, knowledge and expertise) and competencies required to achieve the results. They also identify the measures used to monitor, review and assess performance. The system of performance contract entails a departure from the control of management processes to control of the outcomes of the management processes, thereby raising the quality of control, while covering the quantity of controls (Smith, 2009). Performance contracts seek to privatize the public sector style of management without necessarily transferring the ownership of the assets to private ownership. The Commonwealth secretariat describes a performance contract as a contract between the owners of an enterprise on one hand and the management of the enterprise on the other, setting out certain targets results to be achieved in a given time frame. The performance contract also enumerates the mutual obligation of the two parties in achieving the target set in the contract (Bangura, 2009).

Most of the public sector reform programmes that have taken place in developing countries during the last two decades were introduced as part of the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) of the World Bank in the 1980s and 90s (World Bank, 2009). However, most of the more recent reforms, under the influence of the New Public Management (NPM), have been driven by a combination of economic, social, political and technological factors, which have triggered the quest for efficiency and for ways to cut the cost of delivering public services. SAPs either caused influx of teachers in the training institutions or vice versa. Hence additional factors, particularly for Africa, include increasing emphasis on democracy and good governance (Balogun, 2003).

The core paradigm which can be discerned as influential in the development of public sector reforms in the 1980s and 1990s was that public sector provision was inefficient and often ineffective; that it led neither to cost containment nor to quality improvement (Therkildsen, 2001). With the problems so defined, the paradigm extended to a belief that the public and private sectors did not have to be organized and managed in fundamentally
different ways, indeed that it would be better for the public services if they could be organized and managed as much like the private sector as possible. The focus of the NPM movement therefore, was on creating institutional and organizational contexts which are to mirror what is seen as critical aspects of private sector modes of organizing and managing (Balogun, 2003). Efforts have been made to increase efficiency through accountability measures, such as performance-based contracts. These reforms are being applied, but not in a very comprehensive and consistent manner.

Public sector management reforms in Africa face a number of challenges that have limited the scope speed and quality of services rendered (Polidano & David, 2009). For example, corruption constitutes by far one of the biggest challenges in the public sector. Other challenges include multiple accountability, inadequate resource utilization and institutional capacity. African governments, therefore, need to increase their efforts to address these challenges through effective public sector reforms (Karithi, 1979). However, reformers also need to keep an open mind as to what may work and what may not, and be guided by the needs of the situation. While the new public management approach may not be a panacea for the problems of the public sector in Africa, a careful and selective adaptation of some elements to selected sectors may be beneficial. Performance contracting is a label used to describe a management culture that emphasizes the centrality of the citizen or customer, as well as accountability for results (Johnson & Johnson, 2001).

According to Hood (2005), performance contracting shifts the emphasis from traditional public administration to public management, pushing the state towards ‘managerialism’. The traditional model of organization and delivery of public services, based on the principles of bureaucratic hierarchy, planning and centralization, direct control and self-sufficiency, is apparently being replaced by a market-based public service management
or enterprise culture (Friedmann, 2002). Performance contracting has provided for a future of faster-moving service delivery organizations.

The basic foundation of performance contracting is the drive for efficiency and the use of the economic market as a model for political and administrative relationships. In addition, the institutional aspects of performance contracting derive from the “new institutional economics” movement, which has a theoretical foundation in public choice, transaction cost and principal-agent theories. These generated public sector reforms themes are based on ideas of market, competition, contracting, transparency and emphasis on incentive structures as a way of giving more “choice” and “voice” to service users and promoting efficiency in public service delivery (Sakthivel & Murugan, 2002).

Improved efficiency is now the overriding aim of public sector reforms in most African countries. State’s capability is its ability to promote and undertake collective action efficiently which sometimes is overextended. Therefore, reductions and a refocusing of the State’s activities are needed to improve macroeconomic stability, as well as the implementation of stronger incentives for performance (Forje, 2009). Furthermore, increased competition in service provision, both with the private sector and in the public sector itself, is required in order to raise efficiency (Moses, 2008). According to the World Bank (2009), governments should concentrate their efforts less on direct intervention and more on enabling others to be productive. Improved accountability in the conduct of public affairs is another reform objective. There is plenty of empirical evidence to show that even in consolidated democratic States in Africa; there are major deficits in accountability (Adedeji, 1982). Problems of accountability arise, for example, when: Governments ignore or transgress social ethics and constitutional and legal provisions in conducting public affairs. Tasks to be performed are so complex or unspecified that implementation is very difficult if not impossible; corrupt practices are widespread; political and personal loyalty are rewarded
more than merit; and public participation in running public affairs is low (Olowu, 2001; Therkildsen, 2009).

Accountability involves both the political justification of decisions and actions, and managerial answerability for implementation of agreed tasks according to agreed criteria of performance (Adamolekun, & Pinto, 1996). Accountability is about those with authority being answerable for their actions to the citizens, whether directly or indirectly, and managerial accountability is about making those with delegated authority answerable for carrying out agreed tasks according to agreed criteria of performance (Hope, 2002). The interest in accountability within public sector reform is a desire to make public sector staff more accountable for their decisions and actions. In more detail, this means that some set of recipients receive information about the outcomes of decisions made by identified individuals who are source decision-makers; those sources can be made to explain their decisions; and some sanctions can be imposed if the explanations are unsatisfactory (Day & Klein, 2007).

Performance management is expected to increase accountability because clear and explicit managerial targets, combined with managerial autonomy and incentives to perform, make it easier to establish the basis for managerial accountability and to achieve outputs (Hills & Gillespie, 2006; Lane, 2005). According to Therkildsen (2001), this in turn increases accountability by making it easier for managers to match targets with political priorities. Politicians can, in turn, hold managers accountable for their performance, and also performance targets can make service provision more transparent to customers. In this line of reasoning, increased transparency and explicit performance targets are further steps toward better control and accountability of the bureaucracy (Forje, 2009). It is a means of getting results from individuals, teams and the organizations at large, and allows for the development of indicators against which performance can be later measured. Performance management systems are currently in place in Botswana, Ghana, South Africa and Uganda. Performance
contracts or agreements specify standards of performance or quantifiable targets which a government requires public officials or the management of public agencies or ministries to meet over a stated period of time (Salemi, 2007). As part of the performance orientation in government, the common purposes of performance contracting are to clarify the objectives of service organizations and their relationship with government, and to facilitate performance evaluation based on results instead of conformity with bureaucratic rules and regulations. The setting of specific performance targets, in a format that can be monitored, is intended to provide a basis for evaluating performance and improving accountability in the public enterprise sector (Hope, 2002).

In line with the new institutionalist perspective, performance contracting between governments and public enterprises (PEs) is increasingly being applied as an instrument for restructuring PEs and for managing the Government-PE interface. Underlying performance contracting, and in line with NPM, is the belief that while granting PE management operational autonomy, there is a need to hold it accountable for performance (Osborne, David & Gaebler, 2002).

According to Balogun (2003), Performance Contracts originated from the perception that the performance of the Public Sector has been consistently falling below the expectations of the Public. Performance Contracting is part of broader Public sector reforms aimed at improving efficiency and effectiveness in the management of Public service. The problems that have inhibited the performance of government agencies are largely common and have been identified as excessive controls, multiplicity of principles, frequent political interference, poor management and outright mismanagement (RBM Guide, 2005). It is for this reason that the study seeks to establish whether performance contracting has led to efficiency and effectiveness in service delivery in teachers’ training colleges.
According to Nicholas (2004), public institutions in Kenya have been running without a clear guideline on where they are going or without a clear set objective on their strength and what they can do to improve their standards. As a government policy, all public institutions including teacher training colleges developed a strategic plan and from it signed a performance contract with the government of Kenya (Nicholas, 2004). The performance contract clearly stated the road map and the objective to be achieved within the stipulated period of time given the available resources within the institution. This has been made a government standard requirement for all public institutions. It has been pointed out as a road map towards achieving the vision 2030 (Government of Kenya, 2011). It is upon this premise that the study seeks to assess performance contracting in public teachers’ training colleges to establish what impact it has had if any. Since all Public Teachers Training Colleges Signed a performance Contract with the government of Kenya, this study will be carried to assess whether performance contracting has been successful in achieving the desired results.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In introducing performance contracts in 2003, the Government indicated that performance contracts had their origin in the general perception that the performance of the public sector in general and government agencies in particular had consistently fallen below expectations (Performance Contracts Steering Committee, Sensitization Manual (PCSCM), 2005). Despite this acknowledgement little research has been done to determine the effectiveness of performance contracting in State Corporations and their impact on performance. In public Teacher’s training colleges in Kenya, no study has been undertaken to determine the effectiveness of performance contracts.

According to a study done by Cohen (2005) on performance contracting in the public sector in Great Britain, the performance of the public sector has been poor and the sector has
been seen as a vehicle to cut deals and amass wealth. The introduction of performance contract regime was intended to contain and revise this trend. The objective was to use this devise to secure greater productivity or performance. The sensitization training manual on performance contract in the public service notes that the problems that have inhibited the performance of the public sector have been excessive control, multipliarity of principals, frequent political interference, poor management and bloated staff establishment. Lack of performance contracts strategies have led to poor performance in teacher training colleges in Kenya service delivery and management. This come about in situations whereby the teachers have the premise that they are employed by the government through public service commission and therefore come what may, they cannot lose their jobs whether through poor teaching practices or any negligence on side of the teacher (Cohen, 2005). However, with the introduction of performance contracts in these institutions, it is expected that it leads to higher output; it enhances communication, better training and motivates employees (Greenaway, 2005).

This study is intended to find out whether the introduction of performance contracting has improved service delivery and management in Public Teachers’ Training Colleges and thus the information generated from this research will go a long way in guiding the policy makers.

1.3 Research Questions

The following research questions will guide the researcher in the course of this study:

1. To what extent has performance contracting as a mandatory requirement been adopted by Thogoto Teachers Training College?

2. What is the effect of performance contracting on service delivery at Thogoto Teachers Training College?
3. What is the effect of performance contracting on employee satisfaction at Thogoto Teachers Training College?
4. What challenges exist in the implementation of performance contracts at Thogoto Teachers Training College?

1.4 Significance of the Study

The findings of the study are likely to bring a positive impact in embracing the performance based approach in service delivery in public institutions especially the teacher training colleges in Kiambu County, form the basis of developing relevant and contextual variations in the adoption of performance contracts in various public institutions and counter the challenges of implementation of performance contracts in the country by identifying salient hindrances amongst key stakeholders including resistance to change and other structural setbacks thereby offering alternative routes to effective implementation of performance contracts. The institutions likely to highly benefit from this research in carrying out their functions and implementation of performance contracts include:

**The government of Kenya and Institution Administration:** The findings may assist the relevant Government ministries in Kenya especially efficiency monitoring unit (EMU) to come up with relevant and contextual policy guidelines on how to embrace the concept of performance contracts to enhance productivity, quality service delivery and competitiveness of the graduates from teacher training colleges both at the local and global levels.

**The management of public institutions:** The management may use the results of the study to implement management practices that shall enable them achieve the targets agreed on in the performance contract. The finding of the study shall also benefit the management of teachers’ training colleges in establishing specific strategies and policies relating to the implementation of performance contract initiative in Kenya, which is expected to help achieve high profitability and better performance. The study may go a long way in helping Principals,
Board of Governors and Tutors in identifying their weaknesses so as to adjust appropriately where necessary by developing the right strategies aimed at improving training delivery for effective preparation of graduates for job performance in the industry. The institutions may also benefit in achieving their vision and mission and realization of the national goals of education and training as espoused in the vision 2030.

**Employees:** The findings of the study would assist employees in understanding and embracing the performance contract initiative, as it will help in identifying their individual potential. This can assist them in pursuing personal development through relevant self-development initiatives.

**Researchers and scholars:** The study is going to generate literature that can be used to form basis for future research in performance contracting which is a primary concern for researchers. Scholars in educational institutions management may appreciate the findings of this study to evaluate performance contracts vis-a-vis other result based approaches in service delivery especially in teacher training colleges. The outcomes would assist future scholars in the education and training sector of the economy to appreciate the dynamic and turbulent economic environment, and the importance of provision of relevant education and skills training through standardized service delivery systems.

**1.5 Scope and Delimitations of the study**

The study will cover Thogoto Teachers Training College which is a public teacher’s training college located in Kiambu County. The researcher will select members of the college boards, principals and tutors in the teacher training colleges as they are a primary source of data related to the study. The study will focus on performance contracting as it affects service delivery in the college.
1.6 Theoretical Framework

This study will be based on McGregor’s theory X and Y which is an alternative to the classical organization theory of Max Weber. Theory X and Theory Y was an idea devised by Douglas McGregor in his 1960 book “The Human Side of Enterprise”. It encapsulated a fundamental distinction between management styles and has formed the basis for much subsequent writing on the subject (Cohen, 2005). Theory X is an authoritarian style where the emphasis is on productivity, on the concept of a fair day's work and on rewards for performance (Minogue, 2008). It reflects an underlying belief that management must counteract an inherent human tendency to avoid work (Shawcross, 2009).

Theory Y is a participative style of management which assumes that people have a desire to and should be able to contribute to the decision making process, they will organize themselves and will take responsibility if they are trusted to do so, poor performance is most probably due to boring, repetitive and tedious work or poor management and that they enjoy work, seek satisfaction from work and have many different and complex needs (Kithinji & Gelase, 2006). It is management's main task in such a system to maximize that commitment.

Theory X assumes that individuals are lazy, do not like work and are primarily motivated by money, they need to be closely supervised and controlled or they will underperform, they do not care and are not interested in the needs of the business, they lack ambition and that they have no desire or ability to assist in the decision making process or to take on any responsibility (Osborne & Gaebler, 2002). They always have a ready-made excuse for failure - the innate limitations of all human resources.

Theory Y, however, assumes that individuals go to work of their own accord. People will work without prodding; it has been their fate since Adam and Eve were banished from the Garden of Eden (Owens, 2009).
Theory Y gives management no easy excuses for failure. It challenges managers “to innovate, to discover new ways of organizing and directing human effort, even though we recognize that the perfect organization, like the perfect vacuum, is practically out of reach” (World Bank, 2009). McGregor urged companies to adopt theory Y, because he believed, could motivate human beings to the highest levels of achievement. Theory X merely satisfied their lower-level physical needs and could not hope to be as productive. “Man is a wanting animal,” wrote McGregor, “as soon as one of his needs is satisfied another appears in its place.” (Ackerman, 2009).

Theory Y in its extreme form does not work well. All individuals, however independent and mature, need some form of structure around them and some direction from others. Theory Y can also be criticized for its “inhumanity” to the weak, and to those not capable of a high level of self-motivation. According to Theory Y, people don’t hate work. It’s as natural as rest or play. They don’t have to be forced or threatened. If they commit themselves to mutual objectives, they'll drive themselves more effectively than they can be driven by management. But they'll commit themselves only to the extent they can see ways of satisfying their ego and development needs (CIDA, 2001).

In this study, the application of theory X views an organization composed of different categories of employees. All these groups of people need some form of control mechanisms as a means of achieving the desired organizational goals and objectives. Theory Y on the other hand views an organization with a leader able to apply leadership skills so as to gain willing cooperation from employees through the use of rules and regulations set by management.
1.7 Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Performance Contracting  
- Goals and objectives  
- Resources  
- Time period  
- Actions to be taken | Implementation  
Employee motivation  
Employee Satisfaction  
Improved Service Delivery |

Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework

Figure 1.1 shows aspects of the conceptual framework which includes the independent and dependent variable. The independent variable is performance contracting which includes the laid down goals and objectives, resources available, time period under review and the actions to be taken while employee motivation, employee satisfaction and improved service delivery are the dependent variables. It is expected that performance contracting would lead to improved service delivery, employee satisfaction and employee motivation within the public sector depending on implementation.

1.8 Definition of Key Terms

**Assessment** – the evaluation of performance based on set objectives in a performance contract.

**Public sector** – economic and administrative life that deals with the delivery of goods and services whether national, regional or local

**Performance contract** - it is the agreement about employees performance, goals or an agreement between the manager and the employee about the employees responsibilities.

**Moderation** – the process of ensuring that evaluation tools and instruments have been applied uniformly by the evaluator.
**Vetting** – refers to the process of scrutinizing negotiated performance contracts to establish conformity to performance contracting guidelines.

**Strategic plan** – is the cornerstone for the implementation of a performance contract. It is the blueprint of the institutions.

**Teacher training College** – An institution that trains teachers

### 1.9 Organization of the study

Chapter one lays the basis for the study. It contains a background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, significance of the study, scope and delimitations of the study, operational definition of key terms and organization of the study.

Chapter two presents reviewed literature on the topic based on the research questions and the theoretical framework. Chapter three describes the research design and methodology that the researcher intends to use in conducting the study. It also comprises description of the target population, description of the sample and sampling procedures. Chapter three will also have the description of the research instruments, reliability of the research instruments and validity of the research instruments. This chapter further describe data collection procedure and data analysis procedures that the researcher intends to use.

Chapter four deals with analysis, interpretation and presentation of data while chapter five will focus on the summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations based on the major findings of the study.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents review of relevant literature from available sources. It gives an overview of performance contracting in public sectors, precisely in colleges around the world, Africa and Kenya and offers a critical analysis of how performance was introduced and operationalized, challenges to the implementation process and how other agencies around the world have tackled this particular process. The chapter concludes with a concise summary of all literature.

2.1 Performance contracting

Performance contracting is part of the broader public reforms aimed at improving efficiency and effectiveness in the management of public services. It is a freely negotiated performance agreement between the Government, acting as the owner of a Government Agency, and the management of the agency. It clearly specifies the intentions, obligation and responsibilities of the two contracting parties (Balogun, 2003).

A performance contract constitutes a range of management instruments used to define responsibilities and expectations between parties to achieve mutually agreed results. It is a useful tool for articulating clearer definition of objectives and supporting innovative management, monitoring and control methods and at the same time imparting managerial and operational autonomy to public service managers (World Bank, 2009).

A model performance contract and a performance Contract Matrix for each category of public institutions form part of these guidelines. These may also be down loaded from the cabinet Office website. In order to ensure standardisation, the requirement and content of the model contract and matrix should not be amended or altered.
These guidelines apply to all public institutions on performance contract. In pursuit of the goal of performance improvement within the public sector, New Public Management (NPM) emphasizes on the adoption of private sector practices in public institutions (Balogun, 2003). NPM models have therefore been invariably seen through the public service reform initiatives in many developing countries as the solution to reversing falling service delivery. In quest of this same goal, Kenya introduced performance contracting not only to improve service delivery but also to refocus the mind set of public service away from a culture of inward looking towards a culture of business as focused on customer and results. The push factor for introduction of performance contracting in Kenya underlies the assumption that institution of performance measurements, clarification of corporate objectives, customer orientation and an increased focus towards incremental productivity and cost reduction can lead to improvements in service delivery (GOK, 2011).

African countries emerged from the structural adjustment programmes (SAPS) era of the 1980s both strained and scorched by the several reforms in public sector management. Governments were encouraged to deregulate public enterprises and ensure that they are run like private sector business (World Bank, 2009). The emphasis of this shift in public management was on maintaining a macro-economic stability, lowering inflation, cutting deficit spending and reducing the scope and cost of government (Therkildsen, 2001). It is these challenges that led to introduction of New Public Management (NPM) models in reform programmes of several, if not all public sector institutions in Africa. NPM concepts incorporates the application of private sector management systems and managerial techniques into public services (Farnham & Horton, 2003) together with a re-assessment of which services should be returned to private or non-government sectors (Minogue, 2008). NPM shifts the emphasis from traditional public administration to private management and entrepreneurship, pushing the state towards ‘managerialism’ (Economic Commission for Africa, 2003).
The main thrust in the NPM reform wave is that more market orientation in the public sector will lead to greater cost-efficiency for governments, without having negative side effects on other objectives and considerations. The NPM type reforms as introduced were therefore allied to the functioning and the role of the state in the economic sphere. Consequently a major common reform area that many developing countries have been pursuing in the implementation of reforms involves the adoption of a multiplicity of measures intended to improve service delivery (Government Press, 2005).

The emphasis over the period therefore had been shifting towards fixing management and performance aspects as a means of providing an immediate remedy. These measures originate from the need to show demonstrable gains from reform following the pains imposed by the structural adjustment reform period; responding to public demands for accountability and transparency; influence of NPM reform ideas as well as shift to market economies and private sector led economic development, among others (Kiragu & Mutahaba, 2005). Jones and Thomson (2007) notes, the terminology used widely to label changes now occurring in the conduct of the public sector business is performance contracting.

2.2 Overview of Public Service Reforms in Kenya

The Civil Service inherited at independence had not been designed to grapple with development needs of post-independent Kenya. The pre-occupation of the administration throughout the colonial period had been with system maintenance. As a result the only institutions that were well developed were those responsible for maintenance of law and order. The reforms being undertaken are nevertheless a continuation of activities which the government has engaged in since independence. What is important to take account of is that the launching of the on-going reform efforts was necessitated by need to address the declining performance of the Public Service inspite of the many reforms which had been carried out. The implementation of systematically planned public sector reforms in Kenya
can be broadly classified into two generations. The first generation saw the introduction of civil service reforms coming soon after the structural adjustment programmes (World Bank, Discussion Paper No. 204 of 2012).

Logically, the primary focus of these first generation reforms was to deal with the emerging economic challenges brought about by globalization and also the after shock waves of the structural adjustment programmes. The reforms were about dealing with issues that needed both immediate attention and solutions, and reshaping the state for long term development goals. As the third decade of independence draws to a close, Kenyans are facing new challenges in economic management and public policy. Quality public services remain a priority, but cost considerations have become significantly more important. Not only must Kenyans needs be met, they must be met efficiently. Pervasive reform of the Civil Service is therefore required (Kiggundu, 2008).

It had become evident that the Government was unable to sustain service delivery standards to the satisfaction of the citizens and pressure was mounting. Attempting to meet the high wage bill and maintain services demanded financial resources beyond those obtained through revenue and as a result the Government was forced to borrow money from the domestic market. Rising domestic debt forced up interest rates that were a major cause of slow-down in economic growth and rising levels of poverty. While the public service was being forced to produce more from fewer resources, it also had to ensure that those products were the right ones (Civil Service Reform Strategy document, 2003).

In 1993 the Government formally for the first time initiated the Civil Service Reform Programme (CSRP). The CSRP was envisaged for implementation in three phases. The first phase 1993-1998, focused on cost containment, the second phase 1998-2001 focused on performance improvement and the last phase focused on refinement, consolidation and sustenance of reform gains. The epicentre of the three phases of reform was to build a public
service that is capable of meeting the challenges of improving service delivery to Kenyans. The endeavour to improve service delivery saw a number of performance improvement initiatives being put in place. These included emphasis on the adoption of private sector business management ethos in the lines of New Public Management principles. The reform programme in Kenya as in many countries, promised a lot both to the citizens and the public servants, promises which were not being fulfilled fast enough (Akaranga, 2008). After about five years of implementing reforms, the Government through a World Bank sponsored programme and policy hired a team of private sector ‘experts’ into the public sector through short term contracts to inject the sense of urgency in improving service delivery which was thought to be lacking in career public servants (Kiragu & Mutahaba, 2005).

These experts who were invariably referred to as ‘Technocrats’ or the “Dream Team” held the following key positions: Head of the Public Service and Secretary to Cabinet, Permanent Secretary to Treasury, Permanent Secretaries in the key Ministries of Agriculture and Energy, Investment Secretary who also doubled up as the Head of the Government Privatization Programme. In addition to these top positions, around the same time a number of private sector management practitioners were hired on contracts into the public sector to head some key departments of the Ministry of Finance. The choices as to which departments the technocrats led were carefully chosen. These were seen as the key ministries whose growth would impact on the entire economy (C S R S document, 2003).

2.3 Second generation reforms: Towards performance measurement

The regime change in 2002 and the subsequent launch of the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERS) in 2004 marked a watershed for ushering in the second generation reforms. A new government, elected on a platform of change, pledged to pursue a national development strategy that rapidly sought to sustain economic growth and reduce the high incidence of poverty through wealth and employment
creation. This strategy was to be implemented by: (a) creating competitive market conditions for private sector led growth; (b) directing resources towards wealth and employment creation; (c) supporting both effective and efficient public sector performance and service delivery. The main distinguishing factor between the implementation of first and the second generation reforms lies in the shift in gears in the urgency in delivery of results. As government moved away from a concern to do towards a concern to ensure that things are done, the managerial focus has increasingly been inclined to formal process and towards speedy results. Although this striking managerial shift was strongest in developed and newly industrialized countries, it has also been slowly taking root in the rest of developing countries as seen in the Kenyan reform model (Economic Recovery Strategy, 2004).

In Kenya, reforms have attempted to improve the context for private sector development. They are aimed at changing the perception about government from being viewed as an obstacle to development which must be removed, to seeing it as a potential solution which must be appropriately targeted. Numerous measures undertaken before did not provide a framework for guiding behaviour towards attainment of results or ensured accountability in the use of public resources and efficiency in service delivery, until 2003 when the Government outlined its commitment to improve performance, corporate governance and management in the public service through the introduction of Performance Contracts (PC) in its policy framework paper “Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (2003-2007).

2.4 Introduction of results based management and performance contracts

With this global push, it was not surprising that soon after launching the ERS in 2004, in the same year the Government introduced Results Based Management (RBM) in the Public service as a deliberate policy in order to improve performance, service delivery and governance (GOK, 2004). Result Based Management (RBM) is a participatory and team
based management approach designed to achieve defined results by improving planning, programming, management efficiency, effectiveness, accountability and transparency (CIDA, 2000). The introduction and institutionalization of RBM concept in the public service was aimed at refocusing the public servants mind-set on results in service delivery to citizens. RBM was therefore to help focus attention and resources on the achievement of definite objectives and the targets prescribed in the Economic Recovery Strategy.

According to CIDA (2000) it was expected that the adoption of RBM within the public service would enable each ministry/department and public service organizations come up with clear performance objectives in line with the ERS targets, delineate the activities to help in the achievement of such objectives and determine the roles to be played by each individual staff member involved in the service delivery process. RBM strategy would refocus the operational systems in both financial and human resources arrangements with more emphasis placed on results and not mere adherence to procedures. The shift to results orientation entailed a transformation of current procedures and practices focused on processes to those focused on achieving results.

With the public service reforms laying more emphasis on performance management, the introduction of performance contracts was not a surprise, reform initiatives had shown telltale signs of eventual movement in that direction. The performance contracts were introduced as a management tool for measuring performance against negotiated performance targets (Kobia and Mohammed, 2006). They were a freely negotiated agreement between the government acting as the owner of an agency and the management of the agency (Greiling, 2005). Although signed at the corporate level, the outcome also to a large extent reflected on the performance of the individual managers, especially the chief executive officers. While addressing Cabinet Ministers and Permanent Secretaries/Accounting Officers at a sensitization workshop on Performance Contracts in the Public Service in 2005, His
Excellency the President of the republic of Kenya noted “The public service is a pivotal institution in our society. It is the facilitator of all national activities and provides leadership benchmark for the rest of the economy. Generally, when public service performs optimally, all other sectors perform well. An efficient and performing public service is a major factor in enhancing economic growth and prosperity”.

2.5 Adoption of performance contracting

All governments would like to be more efficient, more cost effective, more accountable and more responsive. The difficulty is that although failure flaunts itself and is easily spotted, success is more modest. It is easier to identify what the public service must escape from than to point out exactly where it must go. In 1990, the Government approved the introduction of Performance Contracts in the management of public agencies. In 2003, the Government made a commitment to introduce performance contracts strategy as a management tool to ensure accountability for results and transparency in the management of public resources. To that end a Performance Contracts Steering Committee (PCSC) was established in August 2003 and gazetted on 8th April, 2005 with a mandate to spearhead the introduction and implementation of performance contracts in the entire public sector. In the implementation of performance contracts, the steering committee is assisted by an Ad-hoc Negotiations and Evaluation Task Force whose members are drawn from outside the public service. The ad-hoc task forces are responsible for negotiating and evaluating performance contracts of ministries/departments, state corporations and local authorities on behalf of the Permanent Secretary, Secretary to the Cabinet and Head of the Public Service. The taskforces are independent and comprises of eminent private sector practitioners, retired public servants with a track record, business executives and members of the academia. This ensures independence in the entire process of setting performance targets and in their evaluation (Kenya gazette August 2003 and 8th April, 2005).
The steering committee developed tools and instruments for introducing and implementing performance contracts and evaluating the same. In addition to the development of tools and instruments, preparations made for the introduction of performance contracts included a series of sensitization/training workshops conducted since 2004. These workshops targeted Permanent Secretaries, Chairpersons as well as Chief Executive Officers of State Corporations and Local Authorities, and Heads of Departments. In 2005 a total of 1,054 people went through such training and in 2006 a total of 1,943 drawn from the above category were trained in a two day workshop, which ran for about three months. Performance evaluation, and by extension contracting is therefore based on the premise that ‘what gets measured gets done’ (IPMN, 2009).

The performance contracts for the central government ministries for the financial year 2005/6 were negotiated by the ad-hoc negotiating task force and subsequently signed on February 2006 at a ceremony witnessed by His Excellency the President of the Republic of Kenya. This emphasizes the importance of performance contracting to the political leadership. Consequently, the expected outcomes of the introduction of performance contracts include: improved service delivery; improved efficiency in resources utilization; institutionalization of a performance-oriented culture in the public service; measurement and evaluation of performance; reduction or elimination of reliance of public agencies on exchequer funding and enhancing overall performance. The underlying assumption driving the performance contracting concept is that ‘once performance can be measured and performance shortfalls identified (including non-performers), actions can be taken to address the shortfall (Jones & Thompson, 2007).

In different settings, different paths are therefore being followed towards a similar set of goals-a management system that emphasizes the centrality of the citizen or customer, as well as accountability for results. In New-Zealand and Britain, systemic and radical reform
measures have been adopted utilizing the new managerial inclination of the New Public Management to the full, to re-orient the public service and to decentralize its functions. In other settings such as Singapore and Malaysia, new approaches have been added to the existing administrative tool-kit available to government. New managerial tools have facilitated incremental reform, enhancing managerialism without radically destabilizing the more traditional features of the public service (Commonwealth, 2005).

2.6 Performance management and service delivery

Performance measurement is often taken to be fundamental to delivery of improved services as part of NPM. Emphasis on performance management for delivery of results is undoubtedly influenced by the basic assumption of performance management which lies in its professed ability to unite the attention of institution members on a common objective and galvanize them towards the attainment of this objective. It is this supposition of harmony of vision that underpins the New Public Management faith in leadership and its favourable inclination towards managerial empowerment, as seen in performance management principles (Balogun, 2003).

With the increased emphasis on quantitative measurement of outcomes, the term ‘performance measurement’ has become a higher priority. Measuring and reporting on organizational performance focuses the attention of public managers and oversight agents, as well as the general public, on what, where and how much value programs provide to the public (Forsythe, 2001; Hatry, 2006; Newcomer, Jennings, Broom & Lomax, 2002; Poister, 2003). The strategic use of performance management is thus intended to help drive change efforts from process to results orientation in the public service. Performance management aims at by and large to attaining operational effectiveness which in a broader sense refers to a number of practices that allow an organization to better utilize its resources.
The quest for productivity, quality and speed has spawned a remarkable number of management tools and techniques; total quality management, benchmarking, re-engineering and change management to mention just a few. All these, if pursued from strategy angle leads to emphasis being put on the wrong place. Typically, public agencies either are not clear about their goals or are aiming at the wrong goals. This lack of clarity can be attributed to the fact that most public agencies have to deal with multiple principals who have multiple (and often conflicting) interests (Triveldi, 2000).

According to Kervasdoue (2007), defining performance is enlightening in many public sector organizations. They begin to ask the right questions and realize that they need to do whatever they have defined well and deliver that efficiently. Emphasis in reforming the public sector has therefore been slowly shifting in Kenya more towards operational effectiveness, which entails doing what one is doing better. With defined outcomes and appropriate benchmarks to measure the outcomes, the rampant lack of focus is brought into the open. Managers begin to ask the right questions, redefine the problem they are trying to solve and diagnose that problem anew. In organizations where performance measurement systems are already established, and resources are already devoted to providing credible performance data in a timely fashion, performance data can be used effectively to support these change. Where performance measurement systems are not as institutionalized, efforts to develop useful performance measures can support change efforts in several ways. Performance data will be used to: Inform useful deliberations among key stakeholders about why and where change is needed—“to make the case for change”; Focus on aspects of programmatic performance likely to be affected by change; and Track the effects of changes to reinforce and reward employees for achievement of desired outcomes of change efforts.

Performance measurement, therefore, for some very good reasons has been widely been seen in many developing countries as a way of improving public service delivery.
Kervasdoue (2007) asserts that “No one would disagree that performance contract is necessary in public affairs. Governments and their bureaucrats must be accountable to their citizens about all use of taxes and public funds. Comparison of the use of these funds for the analysis of public service performance is the only way of justifying their use, other than simple arguments of authority.”

In the Kenyan context, a performance contract is a written agreement between the government and a state agency (local authority, state corporation or central government ministry) delivering services to the public, wherein quantifiable targets are explicitly specified for a period of one financial year (July to June) and performance measured against agreed targets. The performance contracting practice hence mirrors very closely the OECD definition ‘as a range of management instruments used to define responsibilities and expectations between parties to achieve mutually agreed results’. The government of Kenya guide-books on performance contracting defines it as a ‘management tool for measuring performance against negotiated performance targets’. It further states that a performance contract is a freely negotiated performance agreement between the government, acting as the owner of the agency and, the management of the agency. The Performance Contract specifies the mutual performance obligations, intentions and responsibilities between the two parties (Elmore, 2007).

The relationship in the negotiation of the contract is therefore what Elmore (2007) terms an exchange involving reciprocity: capacity for performance, and vice versa. The first approximation of this principle would look something like: For every unit of performance I demand of you, I (Government) have an equal responsibility to provide you with a unit of capacity. If I provide the capacity, you are obliged to provide the performance. If I default on capacity, you may default on performance. Reciprocity therefore operates as a political governor or control system on the relationship between the government and the agencies they
seek to influence. The success of this policy principle requires acknowledgement of the reciprocal relationship between principal and agent.

According to Farnham and Horton (2003), the process of identifying performance targets is carried out after the budget process has been completed and institutions informed about their resource allocation. This ensures that targets are realistic and achievable within the available resources. The targets emanate from the institutions and are freely negotiated and not imposed arbitrarily by the government. The process of negotiation is carried out in two phases;

The first phase is the pre-negotiation consultations. At this stage the negotiating parties carry out a SWOT analysis in order to determine the institution’s performance capacity. This helps to determine whether the targets being developed are realistic, achievable, measurable, growth oriented and benchmarked to performance of similar institutions. This stage in the process is a storming stage where parties hold lengthy meetings, often disagreeing but finally come to a consensus. The second phase in the negotiation process is where all issues agreed upon are factored into the performance contract. The draft contract is then submitted to the performance contracting secretariat for vetting. The vetting process ensures among other things that the contracts comply with the guidelines and that they are linked to the strategic objectives of the institutions, anchored on the strategic plans, growth oriented and relevant to the mandate of the institution. The performance contracts are signed at two levels. In case of government ministries, the contract is signed between the Head of the Public Service and Secretary to the Cabinet, representing the government on the one side and the permanent secretary of a ministry on the other side. To ensure that ministers, who represent the political body, are bound by the commitments of their permanent secretaries, they are required to counter sign the performance contracts.
In the case of state corporations, the first level is between the government and the board of directors. The permanent secretary representing the parent ministry of the corporation signs with the board of directors on behalf of the government, while the board chair and one independent director sign on behalf of the board. The board subsequently signs a performance contract with the chief executive to transfer the responsibility of achieving the targets to the management. This guarantees operational autonomy given that board of directors are not executive and are not therefore involved in the day-to-day management of their corporations (Balogun, 2003).

The actual achievements of the agencies are rated against the set performance targets negotiated and agreed upon at the beginning of the period. The resultant difference is resolved into weighted scores and ultimate performance denominated to a composite score-the value of a weighted average of the raw scores in a performance agreement (Triveldi, 2000). The critical requirement for each target is that they must be growth oriented and therefore must improve with time. The performance rating instrument is based on the following attributes and criteria: Excellent: Achievement of 100% above target; Very Good: Achievement of target; Good: Achievement below target but above previous year; Fair: Achievement equal to previous year; Poor: Achievement below previous year (Triveldi, 2000).

2.7 Performance Contracting in Teachers Training Colleges

For the period July 2005 to June 2006 all teacher training colleges signed a performance contract and were evaluated. To achieve this, the government developed and emphasized contractual relationships using a range of contractual instruments to improve efficiency and effectiveness in public institutions.

From the outcome performance contracting viewed against the challenge of improving service delivery and as a performance management system on the whole has
proven this far to be good and a necessary step. While recognizing that its implementation may have brought with it other challenges including high temptations to cheat in reporting of results to score highly, its execution has added value in reforming the bureaucracy from the business as usual attitude. The successful introduction is partly attributed to the political goodwill and leadership which in this case has been provided by the highest office in the land, the presidency. Performance contracting tool is emerging as a very efficient and effective planning tool which brings to the fore various aspects of an organization, some of which are often ignored (International Public Management Network, 2009).

Performance contracting has provided an avenue for comparing public Teacher Training colleges through reliable benchmarks especially during the negotiation period where members of the independent team are drawn from different leading industry players. It has also offered the opportunity to achieve a high degree of accountability and transparency in performance target setting. The ranking of these colleges is an indicator and reflection of ability of each college and its management to meet agreed performance targets and enhance healthy competition among them while improving performance and service delivery. Elaborate development of relevant measures does not necessarily ensure that they will be used, but consistent leadership is needed to institutionalize use of these performance measures. A climate supportive of performance measurement, within the network of stakeholders involved in the change effort, may be hard to cultivate but can reap benefits. Experience has shown that it is important to emphasize positive, not punitive, uses of the performance data (International Public Management Review, 2009).

2.8 Challenges to performance contracting

Whereas the general public and even some high ranking public servants may very much welcome the idea of performance contracting and measuring performance, it might not be readily accepted by everybody especially those who might feel exposed (negatively in
terms of poor performance) by the outcomes. In other cases resistance may come in the grading structure, those who feel that no grading system can even out the effects of lumping big and small ministries together. In the state corporations similar sentiments are expressed that it is unfair to grade state corporations operating in different sectors of the economy together (Government Press, 2005).

The separation of the negotiation committee and the evaluation committee may have its challenges. It may be argued that for consistency and to help put the evaluation into perspective, it may be advisable for the same team that has done the negotiation to also undertake the evaluation. Since both the negotiation and evaluation teams are independent the magnitude of these challenges may however be drastically reduced by the vetting process, which allows for review of agreed targets to ensure conformity to trends and policy. The success may also bring with it some challenges. The winners expect to be rewarded, over and above the normal pay.

However, the initial rounds of performance contracting took place before the finalization and approval of reward and sanction system. It was not just the high performers who did expect to be rewarded; the public also expected the poor performers to be punished. When this does not happen it may demoralize the high performers but also cast aspersion on the rationale and motivation for the whole exercise. On a broader note it is important to view a performance contract as part and parcel of a wider performance management system, but not as a standalone operating outside the established human resource regulations (Balogun, 2003).

2.9 Knowledge Gap

The major thrust of the reform agenda that Kenya has been pursuing involves the adoption and introduction of multiplicity of measures intended to improve service delivery. These measures originated from the need to show demonstrable gains from reform following
the pains imposed by the structural adjustment reform period; responding to public demands for accountability and transparency; influence of new public management ideas as well as a shift to market economies and private sector-led economic development among others (Balogun, 2003). Specifically a review of performance contracting in different countries shows the primary objectives for introduction of the concept are diverse. In Belgium it was introduced in the early nineties with the main aim of realizing savings. Bouckaert, Verhoest and De Corte (1999) notes that performance contracting in addition to cost saving, can allow for considerable autonomy in financial, human resources and internal organization management.

Similarly the strategy focus for performance contracting in Kenya is aimed at transforming the public service delivery system and making it a net contributor to the growth of the economy. Notwithstanding, the considerable debate and concern about the dysfunctional aspects of performance measurements in the public sector, performance contracting is firmly taking root. It has generally served to clarify roles and responsibilities and to improve performance. It is also clear that performance contracting in some areas have proven to be more successful than in others. Improving the system like introducing change in any organization is an evolutionary process. The environment within which the public sector reform is taking place is continually changing and the current practices will continually be subjected to review and assessment. Performance contracting must therefore be continually reviewed and adapted to assist organizations improve their service delivery (Odhiambo & Obong`o, 2009).
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

In this study a conscious effort was made to collect relevant information from targeted respondents who included; Principals, tutors, students. This chapter presents the research methodology which describes; research design, target population, sample and sampling procedures, data collection and analysis methods and research instruments that was adopted and used to enhance the successful completion of this study.

3.1 Research Design

A mixed research design involving qualitative and quantitative was used in this study to examine the effectiveness of performance contracts in Thogoto Teachers Training College. Gall, Borg and Gall (2003) define a survey as an attempt to collect information from members of a population in order to determine its current status with respect to one or more variables. The variables for this study include employee motivation, employee satisfaction and improved service delivery. This design was relevant to the study because facilitated adequate data collection basically by the use of questionnaires and interview guides (Kajubi, 2007).

3.2 Target Population

The target population for this study included 650 students, 392 female and 258 male. Teaching staff, the college has 57 teaching staff, 33 female and 24 male and non-teaching staffs, the non-teaching staffs are 23, comprising of 14 male and 9 female. This makes a total of 80 employees.
3.3. Sample and Sampling Procedures

Both probability and non-probability sampling procedure were used to sample the target group in the study. Stratified sampling on the other side was used to sample the non-teaching staff of Thogoto Teachers Training College.

Stratified sampling involves dividing the population into sub-populations or strata. This is because it increases the samples statistical efficiency and provides adequate data for analyzing the various sub-populations.

The employees were stratified on the basis of teaching and non-teaching staff and gender, whereby 50% of each category were selected. Therefore a total of 40 staffs comprising of 20 teaching staff and 20 non-teaching staffs were involved in the study. According to Gall, Borg and Gall (2003), 50% is representative enough to arrive at conclusions.

Lastly, since the students population was homogenous, they were chosen through simple random sampling whereby 100 students were selected to participate in the study. The number of female students sampled were $\frac{392}{650} \times 100 = 60$ while the male respondents were $\frac{258}{650} \times 100 = 40$.

3.4 Description of Data Collection Instruments

The study used the following instruments: Questionnaires for teaching and non-teaching staff; questionnaires for students and interview guides for the principal. Questionnaires were used as the main instrument of data collection. Gall, Borg and Gall (2003) observed that questionnaires give detailed answers to complex problems and therefore, are most effective. The use of questionnaires is also a popular method for data collection in deductive studies because of the relative ease and cost-effectiveness with which they are constructed and administered. Questionnaires give relatively objective data. The
questionnaires were structured based on the main research questions except the section I, which covered demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Interview guide on the other hand has its strength. It was used in the study since it generally yields the highest cooperation and lowest refusal rates, offers high response quality and takes advantage of interviewer presence and it is multi-method data collection that is it combines questioning, cross-examination, and probing techniques (Owens, 2009). This guide collected in-depth data from the principal regarding performance contracting in the institution.

The study made use of questionnaires and interview guides to elicit responses from the selected sample. The questionnaires were self-administered and had both open ended and closed ended questions. However, open ended questions were used to a greater extent. This allowed the respondents to give responses freely without feeling restricted to respond in a certain manner to their knowledge, experience and feelings. The researcher use a five point likert scale minimally.

3.5 Data Collection procedures

Data was collected mainly by use of questionnaires and interview guides. After the approval of the research proposal by the research supervisors, two approved copies were forwarded to the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology for issuance of research permit. As per the requirements, the researcher reported and gave copies of the permit to the relevant authorities of the institution under study for clearance. A copy of introduction letter was delivered to the principal of Thogoto Teachers Training College to prepare them in providing the anticipated assistance during the exercise and also familiarize them by explaining the nature and the purpose of the study. The researcher then visited the selected institution to personally administer the questionnaire to staffs and students. The interview was planned and organized by the researcher and the principal as agreed.
3.6 Reliability of Research instruments

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) defined reliability as a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. An instrument is reliable when it can measure a variable accurately and obtain the same results over a period of time. However, reliability in research is affected by random errors. The pre-test method helped the researcher identify the most likely source of errors and hence respond to them before the actual study. Test re-test method was used to pilot the questionnaires using respondents who did not form part of the sample of the study. Reliability of questionnaires was measured by Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient which was computed with the help of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The instruments were accepted as reliable if they attained a correlation coefficient greater or equal to 0.5 which is taken as reliable (George & Mallery, 2003).

3.7 Validity of Research instruments

Validity is important in ensuring the appropriateness of the research instruments. Views on the content and structure of the research instruments were incorporated in the final draft of the instruments. This was procedural in ascertaining the content validity of research instruments so as to ensure the instruments solicited the right information for the study. The term validity indicates the degree to which an instrument measures the construct under investigation. For a data collection instrument to be considered valid, the content selected and included must be relevant to the need or gap established. Face validity of the research instruments was ensured by seeking advice from the supervisors, the department of research at The Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Dr. Ogolla and the lecturers.
3.8 Data Analysis Methods

The raw data collected from the questionnaires was edited to eliminate errors. The collected data was then analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative data analysis approaches. Descriptive analysis such as frequencies and percentages were used to present quantitative data collected from lecturers and students using questionnaires.

Data collected through face to face interview from the principal was analyzed qualitatively. The key points emerging from the interviews were reported in narrative form based on the research questions. Quantitative Data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. Frequency tables, cross tabulations, charts and graphs were used to summarize and present the findings.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

Madges (2006) argues that ethical research is considered as one that “does not harm” and gives informed consent and respects the rights of individuals being studied. Ethical issues formed an important component throughout this study. It is vital for the researcher to give a serious thought to ethical aspects in every stage of this study. Therefore in this study the researcher duly informed the respondents in the study that their participation was voluntary and that they were free to omit answers to any particular questions if they so choose. This is in line with Trochim (2006) who argued that voluntary participation requires that respondents in the study are not coerced into participating in the research. The researcher protected their confidentiality and identity through use of numbers in line with Punch (2003) who alluded that the participants should remain anonymous throughout the study. The purpose of the study was fully explained to them in advance. Informed consent was obtained from all the respondents in answering the questions. The researcher was open and honest in dealing with them. Those respondents who wanted to withdraw from the study were allowed to do so to
avoid involuntary responses. Last but not least, the researcher avoided information plagiarism and fraud through acknowledgement of all sources used in the study.
CHAPTER FOUR
PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS

4.1.0 Introduction

This chapter presents data analysis, presentation, interpretation and discussion of the findings on the assessment of performance contracting in public teachers’ training colleges in Kenya: a case study of Thogoto Teachers Training College, Kiambu County. The data was analyzed with the help of a computer program, SPSS version 20. This enabled the research data to be presented in frequencies, percentages, tables, figures and also qualitatively.

This section presents the results of the study based on the major research questions that guided the study. These include; to what extent has performance contracting as a mandatory requirement been adopted by Thogoto Teachers Training College? What is the effect of performance contracting on service delivery at Thogoto Teachers Training College? What is the effect of performance contracting on employee satisfaction at Thogoto Teachers Training College? What challenges exist in the implementation of performance contracts at Thogoto Teachers Training College?

4.1.2 Response Rate

The researcher sought to establish the distribution of respondents and their response rates.

Table 4.1: Distribution of Respondents by Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Teaching Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 100 students, 20 teaching staff, 20 non-teaching staff and one principal were selected from Thogoto Teachers Training College. During the study period, a total of 140 questionnaires were sent out to respondents, comprising of 100 for students, 20 for teaching staff and 20 for non-teaching staff. Out of the questionnaires administered, 131 were returned in addition to the interview guide with the principal. This brought the total study responses to 131, an overall response rate of 92.9%. As indicated in table 4.1 above, the respondents for the study were therefore, 90 students, 20 teaching staffs, 20 non-teaching staff and one principal. This represented 90% response rate from the students, 100% response rate from the teaching staff, non-teaching staff and the principal.

4.2 Demographic information of respondents

This section describes the general background information of three categories of respondents: Teaching staff, Non-teaching staff and students. The background characteristics of students included gender and age; for Teaching and Non-teaching were gender, age, department, academic qualifications and terms of employment.

Table 4.2: Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s indeed clear from the above table that there were more male student’s participants in this study than female. The male were 59% while the female were 41%, equally there were more male teaching staff than female whereby the male were 55% while the female were 45%. However, there was more female non-teaching staff as compared to the male. The female non-teaching staff was 60% while the male non-teaching staff was 40%. This is because the market place is dominated by male employees as opposed to female employees,
however, concerning the non-teaching staff, women were more because the roles performed at school by them are more of domestic work most of which is performed by women.

**Table 4.3: Age of the Non-Teaching and Teaching Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age bracket</th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the teaching staff’s age was lying between age brackets of 41-50 years at 55% which was twice as much as the second age group which was between 31-41 years and 25%. However, few staffs had their ages above 50 years at 15% while the least age brackets of the staffs was between 20-30 years. On the other hand, the most age brackets of non-teaching staffs lie between 20-30 years at 40% closely followed by those within age bracket 31-40 years at 35%. Further, a few of the non-teaching staffs were between age brackets 41-50 years and at 20% and the few age brackets of the non-teaching staff was that above 50 and above years which was at 5% and the fewest age of the respondents in the institution.

**Figure 4.1: Age of the Student Respondents**

Most students were of ages between 20-30 years and had the highest percentage of 55, followed by those who were below twenty years of age at 35% while the least age group of
the students’ respondents was that above 30 years of age at 10%. Thus a majority of the students were young and aware of effects of the assessment of performance contracting in the institution.

Table 4.4: Department of the Non-Teaching Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Office</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows some of the departments found in this Thogoto Teachers Training College. Some of the department found under the teaching docket is as follows; 40% human resource, 35% front office while accounts and sales and marketing at 20% and 5% respectively. This shows that most of the non-teaching staff that participated in the study came from the Human Resource department which plays a key role in performance contracting.

Table 4.5: Terms of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms of Employment</th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the groups; the teaching and non-teaching staffs had been employed on permanent basis with the highest percentage being 85% for the teaching and 75% for the non-teaching while at the same time their existed those groups of employees which was on contractual basis who included; 15% of the teaching staffs and 25% of the non-teaching staffs.
4.3 Findings According to the Research Questions

4.3.1 What is your understanding of Performance Contracting?

The researcher sought to find out the students’ understanding of performance contracting. The findings were summarized in table 4.6 below:

Table 4.6: Students’ understanding of performance contracting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is the agreement about employees performance</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets to be achieved by an employee</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a type of contracting with a clear set of objectives and indicators</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A freely negotiated performance agreement between the employer and the employee</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When students were asked their understanding of the performance contracting; most of them at 63.33% asserted that it’s the targets to be achieved by an employee from the employer in this case some of the employees’ in the institution were on contracting basis. About 47.78% of the respondents cited that their understanding of the performance contracting is the agreement about employees’ performance while 34.44% of the students when asked if they understood said that it was a type of contracting with a clear set of objectives and indicators. Finally, 27.78% which was the least group of students when asked their understanding, they asserted that it is a freely negotiated performance agreement between the employer and the employee. It can thus be concluded that the students were aware of what performance contracting was all about.

The views expressed largely agree with Balogun (2003); Kobia and Mohammed (2006) who asserted that a performance contract is a freely negotiated performance agreement between the Government, acting as the owner of a Government Agency, and the management of the agency. It clearly specifies the intentions, obligation and responsibilities of the two contracting parties (Balogun, 2003).
The students when asked if they were aware of the performance contracting at the Thogoto teachers training college, most 88% of them were aware of the exercise while only a few 12% were not aware of the existing program in the institution.

The teaching and non-teaching staff was asked whether they had signed a performance contract and the findings showed that 80% and 75% of teaching and non-teaching staffs respectively agreed to have signed while on the contrary, only few denied to have signed a performance contract whereby the teaching staffs were at 20% and non-teaching at 25% respectively.

The researcher sought to establish areas in which performance contracting appeared to be most beneficial. The findings were as illustrated in table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Areas where performance contracting has been most beneficial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting goals/targets</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the institution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping employees on toes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When all the respondents were asked which program in the institution was the performance contracting the most beneficial to the institution, greater percentage responses were gathered from the teaching, non-teaching staffs and students saying that it was on setting goals/targets between the institution and the employees respectively at 70% by the teaching staffs, 80% by the non-teaching and 78% by the students. To add on this, the teaching and non-teaching staffs were of the opinion that another area of performance contracting was the service delivery at 60% and 50% while the students were on the contrary that performance contracting was best at keeping employees on toes at 45.6%. This students’ opinion tallied with the teaching staffs who agreed at 45% on keeping the employees on the
toes. Further the non-teaching staffs were of the opinion that it was also most beneficial to the institution on self-evaluation at 40%.

There were few teaching staffs who thought that performance contracting was beneficial to the institution in the following programs; self-evaluation 15%, development of the institution at the same 15% and promotion of staffs 15% while the non-teaching staffs with the same opinion had 25% keeping employees on toes, 20% development of the institution and 5% promotion of Staff and the students had least opinion on self-evaluation 25%, service delivery 37% and development of the institution 13.3% respectively.

According to Balogun (2003), performance contracting is often taken to be fundamental to delivery of improved services. The findings of this study therefore seem to agree with the findings of Balogun (2003) as per the literature reviewed in chapter two.

**Table 4.8: Success factors in setting up the performance contract and managing the contract relationship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting achievable targets</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair remuneration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking sustainability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good communication</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the teaching and non-teaching staffs and students unanimously agreed that the key success factor in setting up performance contract and managing the contract relationship was fair remuneration at 85%, 80% and 82% respectively. However, there was mixed reactions among the responses given by all the respondents, For instance, fair remuneration, the teaching staffs had 75% setting achievable targets, 55% good communication and 50% motivation while the non-teaching staffs had 65% good communication, 55% setting achievable targets and a distant further good management at 45% and motivation at 40% and
the students were of the opinion that good communication was the best at 64.4% beside setting achievable targets at 56.7% and a distant further 37.8% good management, 18.9% checking sustainability and lastly 14.4% those who said that motivation was the best success factor.

The findings of the study tend to agree with Triveldi (2000) who found that typically, public agencies either are not clear about their goals or are aiming at the wrong goals. This lack of clarity can be attributed to the fact that most public agencies have to deal with multiple principals who have multiple (and often conflicting) interests (Triveldi, 2000).

The findings however contradict Kervasdoue (2007). According to Kervasdoue (2007), the key success factor in performance contracting lies in asking the right questions and realizing that employees need to do whatever they have defined well and deliver that efficiently. Emphasis in reforming the public sector has therefore been slowly shifting in Kenya more towards operational effectiveness, which entails doing what one is doing better. With defined outcomes and appropriate benchmarks to measure the outcomes, the rampant lack of focus is brought into the open. Managers begin to ask the right questions, redefine the problem they are trying to solve and diagnose that problem anew.

Table 4.9: Rating of performance contracting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the respondents when asked their rating of performance contracting, they unanimously rated it as good. The teaching staffs at 45%, non-teaching staffs 40% while
students 30% respectively. Further, 25% of the teaching staffs rated it as very good, 30% of
non-teaching staffs rating it fair while 23% of the students rated it fair too. Very few teaching
staffs 10% each rated it fair and excellent while 5% still it as poor. 20% of non-teaching rated
it very good while the rest 5% each rated it excellent and poor at the same percentage while
17.8% of the students rated it very good closely followed by 13.3% those who rated it excellent while 10% rated it poor and lastly, 5% rated it very poor in as far as the institution’s
performance is concerned. One of the respondents to the study was quoted as saying:

“To a greater extent, the institution has adopted the program and its effects are
being seen in terms of students, teachers and non-teaching staffs’ performance
improvement within the institution. Almost all the staffs have signed
performance contracts which have been sieved down to departmental level to
complement the overall institution’s objectives in the performance contracting
requirements.”

These views were in line with those of the teaching and non-teaching staff who were
of the opinion that performance contracting had been adopted to a greater extent at Thogoto
Teachers College. The findings further complement those of the International Public
Management Network (2009) who allude that the successful introduction is partly attributed
to the political goodwill and leadership which in this case has been provided by the highest
office in the land, the presidency.
4.3.2 What are the organisational benefits of performance contracting?

The researcher sought to establish the benefits of performance contracting to the organisational under study. The findings were as outlined in table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helps in meeting set targets</td>
<td>3 15.0</td>
<td>8 40.0</td>
<td>23 25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps in employee evaluation</td>
<td>12 60.0</td>
<td>10 50.0</td>
<td>34 37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps in employee appraisal</td>
<td>14 70.0</td>
<td>16 80.0</td>
<td>71 78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brings efficiency</td>
<td>3 15.0</td>
<td>1 5.0</td>
<td>12 13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents unanimously asserted that the organizational benefits of performance contracting are that it helps in employee appraisal. Their ratings were 70% teaching staffs, 80% non-teaching staffs and 78% students’. However, 60% of the teaching staffs further cited it helps in employees’ evaluation and very few 15% said that it helps in meeting the set targets as well as brings efficiency. The non-teaching staffs 40% on the other hand felt that it helps in meeting the set target while 50% were of the opinion that it helps in employee appraisal and only 5% said that it brings about efficiency to the organization. The students also were of the opinion that it helps in employee evaluation at 37.8%, helps in meeting the set targets 25.6% while the least percentage13.3% felt that it brings about efficiency.

The findings are in line with the International Public Management Review (2009) which states that performance contracting has led to improvement in service delivery by offering the opportunity to achieve a high degree of accountability and transparency in performance target setting. The ranking of colleges is an indicator and reflection of ability of each college and its management to meet agreed performance targets and enhance healthy competition among them while improving performance and service delivery.

The teaching and non-teaching staffs were asked whether their performance had improved since the introduction of performance contracting.
A whopping 80% of the teaching staffs agreed that indeed performance had improved since the introduction of the performance contracting program while only few 20% were on the contrary that it had not improved the performance. On the other hand, 85% of the non-teaching staffs agreed that the program had immensely improved the performance in the institution while very few 15% were on the contrary. The improvement in performance was evidenced in student performance before and after the introduction of performance contracting as well as a reduction in complaints. There was an improvement in student performance as well as a reduction in students’ complaints in the performance contracting era at Thogoto Teachers Training College.

Student respondents were asked whether service delivery had improved since the introduction of performance contracting at Thogoto Teachers Training College. The findings revealed that 55% of the respondents were in disagreement with the assertion that service delivery has improved since the performance contracting program was introduced in the institution while 45% were on the contrary that it had not in any way improved the service delivery. These findings contradict the findings by the International Public Management
Review (2009), who, as per the literature reviewed, found that there has been improvement in service delivery since the introduction of performance contracting in public institutions.

Respondents were asked whether there was high productivity of the employees in the organization as a result of performance contracting.

**Table 4.11: There is high productivity of the employees in the organization as a result of performance contracting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the respondents were asked whether productivity levels had improved as result of performance contracting, majority of the respondents agreed. Forty five point six percent of the students, 65% of the teaching staffs and 55% of the non-teaching staffs were of this opinion. However, 14.4% of the students strongly agreed to this assertion, 25% of the teaching staffs strongly agreed to this while 20% also strongly agreed to this statement. However, 21.1% of the students, 10% of the teaching staffs and 15% of the non-teaching staffs were uncertain to this assertion. On the other hand 15.6% of the students disagreed to this assertion while 3.3% still strongly disagreed with this statement followed by 10% of the non-teaching staffs.

The findings by large contradicted the findings regarding improvement in service delivery where majority the same respondents were of the view that service delivery had not improved with the introduction of performance contracting.
Table 4.12: There is often low productivity than what has been expected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked whether there has been low productivity since the introduction of the performance contracting, 25.6% of the students strongly disagreed, 20% disagreed and further 21.1% were uncertain to this while 23.3% agreed to this statement and only 10% strongly agreed that indeed there was low productivity that had been expected. Concerning the teaching staffs, 5% strongly agreed to this as 30% agreed to this assertion while 40% were uncertain whether low productivity had been expected but 25% disagreed to this. The non-teaching staffs on the other hand agreed to this with 40%, 20% strongly agreed to this while 15% were uncertain which was equal to those who strongly disagreed while only 10% disagreed to this assertion as well.

Table 4.13: The organization has put up measures to ensure high employee productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning the measures the organization had taken as regards employees’ productivity, a whopping 74.4% of students were uncertain, 6.7% agreed while 3.3% strongly agreed to this assertion. 5.6% however were on the contrary and disagreed in addition to 10% who strongly disagreed. The teaching staffs were of the same opinion however 5% strongly agreed as highest percentage 50% agreed to this statement. Further, 35% of them were
uncertain. On the contrary though 5% disagreed while another 5% strongly disagreed with this assertion. Some of the many non-teaching staffs who agreed were 45% in addition to 10% who strongly agreed with this, 30% were uncertain on the same while 10% disagreed as only 5% strongly disagreed with this statement.

Table 4.14: Performance contracting positively affects the productivity of the organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the respondents were asked whether performance contracting positively affected the productivity of the organization, 36.7% of the students agreed, 30% strongly agreed while 20% were uncertain whether or not it positively affected. On the contrary, 10% disagreed and only 3.3% strongly disagreed to this assertion. Further the teaching staffs held the same opinion however, 45% agreed as 40% strongly agreed to it only 10% were uncertain with this assertion. On the contrary only 5% disagreed with this. The non-teaching staffs were also in the same way in agreement with this at 25% as 50% strongly agreed to this. However, 10% were uncertain as other 10% disagreed while only 5% strongly disagreed to it.

Table 4.15: Performance contracting limits employee productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On whether performance contracting limits employees’ productivity or not, 15.6% the students agreed that it did, 14.4% strongly agreed while 10% were uncertain. On the contrary 45% disagreed that it did not as 14.1% strongly disagreed to it. 15% of the teaching staffs agreed as 5% strongly agreed to this while 35% were uncertain on the same. However, 40% disagreed to this as 5% strongly disagreed on the same. The non-teaching staffs also held the same opinion but at different ratings. 20% agreed to this, 10% strongly agreed while 5% were uncertain but 35% of them disagreed that it did not limit employees’ productivity as 30% strongly disagreed on the same.

Table 4.16: The management style encourages employees to be more productive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When they were asked whether the management style encourages employees to be more productive; 23.3% of the students agreed that it does as 10% of them strongly agreed too, 21.1% were uncertain but 20% disagreed with this as well as 25.6% who strongly disagreed. 30% of the teaching staffs agreed to this as well as 5% who strongly agreed however, 40% were uncertain whether or not it encouraged while only 25% disagreed with the assertion. The non-teaching staffs 20% strongly agreed that it did encourage employees’ productivity as well as 40% who agreed. However, 15% were uncertain concerning the same, but 10% of them disagreed as 15% strongly disagreed.

In the interview with the respondents to the study, it was obvious that performance contracting had led to improved service delivery within the institution. A respondent was quoted as saying;
“Performance contracting has been of significant in service delivery at Thogoto Teachers Training College especially in the following areas; helping in meeting set targets, helping in employee evaluation, helping in employee appraisal, bringing about efficiency. Further, it improved productivity levels, improved employees’ efficiency as well as motivating them to work extra harder and deliver on their set targets.”

4.3.3 Would you say that performance contracting motivates employees?

The researcher asked the respondents whether performance contracting motivates employees and their responses were as outlined in figure 4.3.

![Figure 4.3: Would you say that performance contracting motivates employees?](image)

When the respondents were asked whether given a chance to cite if performance contracting motivates employees; quite a number of the teaching staffs 55% did agree that it did while a few 45% were on the contrary that it did not motivate employees the non-teaching staffs had an equal percentage of 50% each of those who agreed that it does and those disagreed that it did not. A majority of the non-teaching staffs 63.3% did agree that it did motivate employees while 36.7% were on the contrary that it did not in any way.
When asked whether the employee’s motivation has increased since the signing of performance contracts; 30% of the students agreed, 3.3% strongly agreed however, 21.1% were uncertain on whether it had increased or not. On the contrary, 25.6% disagreed while 14.1% strongly disagreed on the same but 30% of the teaching staffs agreed that it did as 55 strongly agreed on the same however, 40% were uncertain while 25% disagreed. On the other hand 40% of the non-teaching staffs agreed with this statement, 20% strongly agreed while 15% were uncertain about it. However, 10% disagreed about it as 15% strongly disagreed with it.

The researcher sought to establish whether the management ensures that the performance contract is done according to one’s job description and specification. The findings were as put forth in table 4.18.

Table 4.17: Employees motivation has increased since the signing of performance contracts

| Responses   | Students | | | Teaching Staff | | | Non-Teaching Staff |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|----------|-------------------|
|             | F | %  | F | %  | F | %  |
| Strongly agree | 3 | 3.3 | 1 | 5.0 | 4 | 20.0 |
| Agree        | 27 | 30.0 | 6 | 30.0 | 8 | 40.0 |
| Uncertain    | 19 | 21.1 | 8 | 40.0 | 3 | 15.0 |
| Disagree     | 23 | 25.6 | 5 | 25.0 | 2 | 10.0 |
| Strongly disagree | 13 | 14.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 15.0 |
| **Total**    | **90** | **100.0** | **20** | **100.0** | **20** | **100.0** |

Table 4.18: The management ensures that the performance contract is done according to one’s job description and specification

| Responses   | Students | | | Teaching Staff | | | Non-Teaching Staff |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|----------|-------------------|
|             | F | %  | F | %  | F | %  |
| Strongly agree | 4 | 4.4 | 5 | 25.0 | 4 | 20.0 |
| Agree        | 26 | 28.9 | 7 | 35.0 | 9 | 45.0 |
| Uncertain    | 19 | 21.1 | 2 | 10.0 | 3 | 15.0 |
| Disagree     | 18 | 20.0 | 4 | 20.0 | 2 | 10.0 |
| Strongly disagree | 23 | 25.6 | 2 | 10.0 | 2 | 10.0 |
| **Total**    | **90** | **100.0** | **20** | **100.0** | **20** | **100.0** |
When the respondents were asked whether the management ensures that the performance contract is done according to one’s job description and specification; 28.9% of the students had their feeling on that and agreed as 4.4% strongly agreed about the same. However, 21.1% were uncertain about the same as 20% of the same disagreed with this while 25.6% strongly disagreed. The teaching staffs had a different take concerning the same; 35% of them agreed as 25% strongly agreed. However, 10% were uncertain about it, further 20% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed with this assertion. The non-teaching staffs also agreed with this statement 45% as 20% of them strongly agreed. Those who were uncertain were at 15% while those who were on the contrary were 10% those who disagreed while another 10% those who strongly disagreed.

Table 4.19: Every employee supports the method used for performance contracting

| Responses     | Teaching Staff | | | Non-Teaching Staff | | |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|
|               | F | % | F | % |
| Strongly agree| 1 | 5.0 | 2 | 10.0 |
| Agree         | 3 | 15.0 | 4 | 20.0 |
| Uncertain     | 7 | 35.0 | 1 | 5.0 |
| Disagree      | 8 | 40.0 | 7 | 35.0 |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 5.0 | 6 | 30.0 |
| Total         | 20 | 100.0 | 20 | 100.0 |

Most of both teaching and non-teaching staffs when were asked whether every employee supports the method used for performance contracting; 15% of the teaching staffs agreed as 5% strongly agreed about this, 35% were uncertain while 40% were on the contrary and disagreed as 5% strongly disagreed. The non-teaching staffs on the other hand had 20% who agreed as 10% strongly agreed about this. However, 5% were uncertain but 35% disagreed as 30% strongly disagreed with this statement.
Table 4.20: Performance contracting has enhances job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the respondents were asked whether Performance contracting has enhances job satisfaction; a greater number of students 30% disagreed while few 22.2% were uncertain as 21.1% agreed with this assertion. Only 14.1% strongly agreed with this while on the contrary 12.2% strongly disagreed. A majority of the teaching staffs 40% were uncertain when asked whether performance contracting had enhanced job satisfaction, 25% disagreed with it while 20% agreed that it enhanced as well as 5% who strongly agreed that it did have an impact on job’s satisfaction. Among the most non-teaching staffs who disagreed were 40% while on the contrary 30% agreed that it impacted on job’s satisfaction. Further 15% were uncertain as 10% strongly disagreed with this assertion.

Table 4.21: Performance contracting demotivates employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the students 48% were uncertain when they were asked whether Performance contracting demotivates employees. 34.4% agreed that it demotivates employees’ performance. 7.8% disagreed with this while at the same time 6.7% strongly disagreed. Concerning the teaching staffs, 45% agreed that the contract demotivates employees’ performance as 40% were uncertain about it, 25% disagreed while 10% strongly disagreed.
contrary to 20% who strongly agreed that it impacted on employees. A greater percentage 55% of the non-teaching agreed to this as 15% strongly agreed to this assertion. 10% were uncertain about it as 15% disagreed on one hand while 5% strongly disagreed on the same.

Table 4.22: Performance contracting puts unnecessary pressure on employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that 35.6% of the students disagreed that performance contracting puts unnecessary pressure on employees, 14.1% strongly disagreed that it did put unnecessary pressure on employees. Further, 10% were uncertain whether or not it did as 15.6% on the contrary agreed and 24.4% strongly agreed to this assertion. A significant percentage of the teaching staffs 50% agreed while 35% strongly agreed. 15% were on the contract and disagreed as 5% strongly disagreed as well. On the other hand, 40% of the non-teaching staffs strongly agreed as 45% agreed that the contract puts unnecessary pressure on employees. Only 5% were uncertain on whether it puts pressure or not as 10% disagreed on the same.

Table 4.23: Meeting the requirements of performance contracting does not necessarily lead to job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting the requirements of performance contracting does not necessarily lead to job satisfaction; 38.9% of the students’ responses agreed with this assertion, 14.4% strongly agreed to this statement, 21.1% were uncertain with it while on the contrary, 10% disagreed as 15% strongly disagreed on the same. A significant 60% of the teachers agreed, as only 10% strongly agreed while 5% were uncertain as 25% disagreed with the assertion. Further, 55% of the non-teaching staffs agreed and 20% strongly agreed as well. 15% were uncertain as 10% disagreed with the statement.

**Table 4.24: Benefits of Performance contracting to employee Job Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leads to reduced job ambiguity</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads to job enrichment</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets parameters for evaluation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces job overload</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the respondents were asked the benefits that performance contracting bring to employee job description; 45.6% of the students said it leads to reduced job ambiguity, 38.9% asserted that it leads to job enrichment while 52.2% said it helps set parameters for evaluation in addition 18.9% agreed that it reduces job overload. In addition, 65% of the teaching staffs said that it help reduce job ambiguity, 85% leads to job enrichment as 45% said that it sets parameters for evaluation and finally 30% said that it reduces job overload.

As regards to the non-teaching staffs, 70% felt that it helps reduce job ambiguity, 55% cited that it leads to job enrichment while 40% said that it sets parameters for evaluation and finally 35% it reduces job overload respectively.
Figure 4.4: To what extent does performance contracting lead to job satisfaction?

When the respondents were asked to what extent does performance contracting lead to job satisfaction; all the respondents; the teaching 65%, non-teaching 50% and the students 64.4% all agreed that to a moderate extent it led to job satisfaction. Further, 20% of the teaching staffs, 40% of the non-teaching and 21.1% said to a greater extent it led to job satisfaction while 15% of the teaching staffs, 10% of non-teaching staffs and 14.4% of the students cited that to a lesser extent did it lead to job satisfaction.

During the interview with the respondents, there was an overwhelming consensus with the teaching and non-teaching staff views that the performance contracting had moderately led improvement in employee satisfaction and motivation. These were the words of one of the respondents;

“Performance contracting has moderately led to employee satisfaction and improved their performance in terms of teaching for the teaching staffs and for the non-teaching staffs they work harder and their input has improved a great deal because there is more interaction with work, reduced work overload and ambiguity as well as increased employees’ job enrichment.”
4.3.4 Challenges in the implementation of performance contracts

![Bar chart showing percentages of challenges faced by teaching staff, non-teaching staff, and students.]

Figure 4.5: Are there any challenges encountered in the implementation of performance contracting?

Indeed from the above diagram, it can be seen that there are many challenges faced in the implementation of performance contracting. A whopping 90% of the teaching staffs, 95% of the non-teaching staffs and 86.7% of the students’ did agreed that yes there were challenges faced in quest to implementing the performance contracting. While on the contrary only 10% of the teaching staffs, 5% of the non-teaching staffs and 13.3% of the students negate these by saying no, there are no challenges faced in quest to implementation of performance contracting by the institution. This implies that performance contracting comes with challenges and as a result, there is need to identify them and come up with measures to address them.
Table 4.25: Challenges Faced in Implementation of Performance Contracting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students F</th>
<th>Students %</th>
<th>Teaching Staff F</th>
<th>Teaching Staff %</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff F</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underfunding</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of co-operation among staff</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor communication on expected results</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee resistance to change</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee ignorance about performance contracting</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative attitude by employees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor management and supervision</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.25 illustrates that the students’ understanding of the challenges the institution face are; 55% mentioned employee resistant to change, closely followed by 52% who pointed out poor communication on expected results, a distant further was 38.9% with lack of cooperation among the staffs while 35.6% alluded to employees ignorance about performance contracting. Others were; underfunding at 33.3%, poor management and supervision as well as 10% negative attitudes by employees. While the teaching staffs were of the opinion that 75% of the challenges faced is underfunding as well as the non-teaching staffs hold the same opinion at 70%. 65% was cited as lack of co-operation among staff; Poor communication on expected results as an identified challenge by the teaching staffs was 40%. Further employees resistant to change and ignorance about performance contracting was 55.6% and 33.5% respectively. In addition to that, negative attitude by employees and poor management and supervision was also a problem with 10% and 21.1% respectively.

The non-teaching staffs were also of the same opinion and had a couple of enumerated challenges that faced the institution. Some of which included; 55% mentioned lack of co-operation among staff, 45% poor communication on expected results, 55% employee resistance to change, 45% employee ignorance about performance contracting and lastly 35% negative attitude by employees and 20% poor management and supervision respectively.
The researcher further sought to establish whether performance contracting lives up to its aims.

![Bar chart showing percentage of teaching staff, non-teaching staff, and students who think performance contracting live up to its aims.](chart)

**Figure 4.6: Does performance contracting live up to its aims?**

When the respondents were asked whether the performance contracting live up to its aims; 60% of the teaching staffs were on the contrary and said no as well as 85.6% of the students were on the contrary with assertion however, 55% of the non-teaching staffs held different opinion on the same and agreed that the contracting lived up to its established aims. While 40% of the teaching staffs and 14.4% of the students felt that the contracting program had lived up to its aims however, contrary to 45% of the non-teaching staffs who felt that the performance contracting was not living up to its established aims.

This goes to show that performance contracting in public teachers training colleges has not quite lived up to its expectations and there are challenges that still need to be addressed.
Table 4.26: What do you suggest to be done to minimize these challenges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased funding</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create employee awareness</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve communication</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding excellency</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All employees should be involved in setting</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting goals that are realistic and</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievable for employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When they were asked to give suggestions concerning the best remedy to the afore
challenges; 60% of the students suggested that there should be improvement in
communication, 54.4% suggested creation of employees awareness; while 52.2% suggested
that those employees who perform excellently should be rewarded; 40% felt that the
institution should set goals that are realistic and achievable for employees; 27.8% All
employees should be involved in setting performance targets and lastly 12.2% said that the
institution should increase funding while 80% improve communication, 75% of the teaching
staffs were of the opinion that the funding should be increased; 65% create employees
awareness, 45% setting goals that are realistic and achievable for employees; 40% Rewarding
excellency and lastly 35% suggested that all employees should be involved in setting
performance targets. On the other hand, 70% of the non-teaching staffs suggested that there
should be creation of employee awareness; 65% improve communication; 55% increase
funding; 45% rewarding excellence; 35% setting goals that are realistic and achievable for
employees and lastly 25% that all the employees should be involved in setting performance
targets.

In the interview with one of the respondents, it emerged that some of the challenges
existing in the implementation of performance contracts at Thogoto Teachers Training
College were underfunding, lack of co-operation among the staffs as well as employees’
resistance to change and employee ignorance about performance contracting program. One respondent was quoted as saying;

“Sometimes it becomes a challenge to meet the targets set in the performance contract due to insufficient funds. When the revenue targets are not met, this definitely impacts on most of the organizational goals and objectives. Another major challenge is lack of commitment from some members of staff who view performance contracts as a limiting factor in their performance.”

On a broader note it is important to view a performance contract as part and parcel of a wider performance management system, but not as a standalone operating outside the established human resource regulations (Balogun, 2003).
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations based on the assessment of performance contracting in public teachers’ training colleges in Kenya: a case of Thogoto Teachers Training College, Kiambu County, Kenya.

5.1 Summary

The purpose of the study was to assess performance contracting in public teachers’ training colleges in Kenya: a case of Thogoto Teachers Training College, Kiambu County, Kenya. The study sought to find out the following: To what extent has performance contracting as a mandatory requirement been adopted by Thogoto Teachers Training College? What is the effect of performance contracting on service delivery at Thogoto Teachers Training College? What is the effect of performance contracting on employee satisfaction at Thogoto Teachers Training College? What challenges exist in the implementation of performance contracts at Thogoto Teachers Training College?

This study employed a mixed research design involving case study, qualitative and quantitative research designs since it facilitated adequate data collection basically by the use of questionnaires and interview guide. The target population for this study included both teaching and non-teaching staffs and students at Thogoto Teachers Training College. Both probability and non-probability sampling procedure were used to sample the target group in the study. To start with, purposive sampling procedure was used to select the principal and teachers of Thogoto Teachers Training College. Stratified sampling on the other side was used to sample the non-teaching staff of Thogoto Teachers Training College.
The instruments that were used for this study were questionnaires and interview guide. The collected data was coded with the help of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 for windows. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages and summarized in tables and figures. The analysis revealed a number of findings. These are summarized based on the research objectives.

5.1.1 Adoption of Performance contracting

The researcher sought to find out the students’ understanding of performance contracting. When students were asked their understanding of the performance contracting; most of them asserted that it’s the targets to be achieved by an employee from the employer in this case some of the employees’ in the institution were on contracting basis. Others cited that their understanding of the performance contracting was the agreement about employees’ performance, a type of contracting with a clear set of objectives and indicators. The researcher sought to establish whether the student respondents were aware of performance contracting at Thogoto Teachers Training College. Majority of the students were aware of the exercise while only a few were not aware of the existing program in the institution.

The teaching and non-teaching staff was asked whether they had signed a performance contract. Majority of teaching and non-teaching staffs agreed to have signed a performance contract. Performance contracting was found beneficial in setting goals/targets between the institution and the employees respectively. To add on this, the teaching and non-teaching staffs were of the opinion that another area that had benefited from performance contracting was service delivery.

There were few teaching staffs who thought that performance contracting was beneficial to the institution in the following programs; self-evaluation, development of the institution.
All the teaching and non-teaching staffs and students unanimously agreed that the key success factor in setting up performance contract and managing the contract relationship was fair remuneration. All the respondents when asked their rating of performance contracting, they unanimously rated it as good.

5.1.2 Effect of performance contracting on service delivery

The respondents unanimously asserted that the organizational benefits of performance contracting are that it helps in employee appraisal. Performance contracting helps in employees’ evaluation, in meeting the set targets as well as brings efficiency. Majority of the teaching staffs agreed that indeed their performance had increased since the introduction of performance contracting program. Majority of the non-teaching staffs agreed that the program had immensely improved the performance in the institution.

Majority of the respondents were in congruent with the assertion that service delivery has improved since the performance contracting was introduced in the institution. Respondents were asked whether there was high productivity of the employees in the organization as a result of performance contracting. The findings revealed that productivity levels had improved as result of performance contracting they all unanimously agreed. Concerning the measures the organization had taken as regards employees’ productivity, a majority of students were uncertain. The teaching staffs were of the same opinion however some strongly agreed to this statement.

When the respondents were asked whether performance contracting positively affected the productivity of the organization, majority of the students agreed. Further the teaching staffs held the same opinion. The non-teaching staffs were also in the same way in agreement with this assertion. On whether performance contracting limits employees’ productivity or not, majority of the students disagreed, majority of the teaching staffs were uncertain while the non-teaching staffs also held the same opinion but at different ratings.
When respondents were asked whether the management style encourages employees to be more productive; majority of the respondents agreed that it does

5.1.3 Performance contracting and employee satisfaction

The researcher sought to establish whether performance contracting motivates employees; majority of the teaching staffs did agree that it did motivate employees, teaching staffs were equally split. A majority of the non-teaching staffs did agree that it did motivate employees.

When asked whether the employee’s motivation has increased since the signing of performance contracts; majority of the students agreed. Majority of the teaching staffs strongly agreed that it did. On the other hand, majority of the non-teaching staffs agreed with this statement. The researcher sought to establish whether the management ensures that the performance contract is done according to one’s job description and specification, the findings showed that indeed the management ensured that the performance contract is done according to one’s job description and specification.

Most of both teaching and non-teaching staffs when were asked whether every employee supports the method used for performance contracting; the teaching staffs agreed. The non-teaching staffs on the other hand agreed with this statement. When the respondents were asked whether performance contracting had enhanced job satisfaction; a greater number of students disagreed while majority of the teaching staffs were uncertain when asked whether performance contracting had enhanced job satisfaction. Among the non-teaching staffs, majority disagreed while on the contrary some agreed that it impacted on job’s satisfaction.

Most of the students were uncertain when they were asked whether performance contracting demotivates employees. Concerning the teaching staffs, majority agreed that
performance contracts demotivates employees’ performance. A greater percentage of the non-teaching agreed to this as only a few strongly agreed to this assertion.

The majority of the students disagreed that performance contracting puts unnecessary pressure on employees, while a significant percentage of the teaching staffs agreed. On the other hand, majority of the non-teaching staffs agreed that the contract puts unnecessary pressure on employees. Meeting the requirements of performance contracting does not necessarily lead to job satisfaction; majority of the respondents agreed with this assertion. When the respondents were asked the benefits that performance contracting bring to employee job description; majority of the respondents said it leads to reduced job ambiguity, leads to job enrichment and helps to set parameters for evaluation as well as that it reduces job overload. When the respondents were asked to what extent does performance contracting lead to job satisfaction; majority of the respondents agreed that to a moderate extent it led to job satisfaction.

5.1.4 Challenges in the implementation of performance contracts

The findings of the study showed that there are many challenges faced in the implementation of performance contracting. Majority of the teaching staffs, non-teaching staffs and the students’ did agree that there were challenges faced in the quest to implementing performance contracting. When the respondents were asked whether the performance contracting live up to its aims; majority of the respondents were of the opinion that it did not live upto its expectations.

The challenges the institution faced were employees resistant to change, poor communication on expected results, lack of cooperation among the staffs and employees ignorance about performance contracting. Others were underfunding, poor management and supervision as well as negative attitudes by employees.
5.2 Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the key findings of the study and in line with the major research questions: Performance contracting as a mandatory requirement has been adapted by Thogoto Teachers Training College to a fairly moderate extent. Performance contracting has had a positive impact on service delivery at Thogoto Teachers Training College. Performance contracting motivates employees at Thogoto Teachers Training College; however it also limits employee creativity and innovation as they have to operate within defined limits. Performance contracting enhances on employee job satisfaction at Thogoto Teachers Training College especially when they meet the requirements of performance contracting.

The challenges the institution faced were employees resistant to change, poor communication on expected results, lack of cooperation among the staffs and employees ignorance about performance contracting. Others were underfunding, poor management and supervision as well as negative attitudes by employees.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the main findings, the study makes a number of recommendations. These are directed towards various stakeholders in education, namely school Management, government and policy makers. There should be improvement in communication, creation of employees’ awareness; those employees who perform excellently should be rewarded; the institution should set goals that are realistic and achievable for employees; employees should be involved in setting performance targets and lastly the institution should increase funding.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

The findings of this study are indicative rather than conclusive; hence the following research action has been suggested:
a) The effectiveness of performance contracting in enhancing efficiency in the management of Teachers Training Colleges.

b) Further studies on the challenges facing managers of Teachers Training Colleges in the implementation of performance contracting should be carried out in all institutions of learning in order to have more comprehensive/universal findings.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Letter to Respondents

The Catholic University of Eastern Africa
Faculty of Education
Department of Post-Graduate Studies
P.O. Box 62157-00200
Nairobi.

Dear respondents,

I am a Masters of Education student at The Catholic University of Eastern Africa. I am conducting a research to assess performance contracting in public teachers’ training colleges in Kenya: a case study of Thogoto teachers training college, Kiambu County. You have been selected to take part in this study. I would be grateful if you would assist me by responding to all questions in the attached questionnaire.

Your name does not need to appear anywhere in the questionnaire. The information will be kept confidential and will be used for academic research purpose only. Your co-operation will be greatly appreciated.

Thanks in advance.

Yours sincerely,
Njoroge Ceasar.
Mobile Number: 0722 863 505
Appendix II: Questionnaire for Teaching Staff

SECTION A: General Information

1. Gender
   Male ( )  Female ( )

2. Age
   20-30 years ( )
   31-40 years ( )
   41-50 years ( )
   Above 50 years ( )

3. Academic qualifications
   Primary ( )
   Secondary ( )
   Diploma ( )
   University Degree ( )

4. Terms of employment
   Temporary ( )
   Permanent ( )

Section B: Adoption of performance contracting

5. Have you signed a performance contract?
   Yes ( )  No ( )

6. In what areas does performance contracting appear to be most beneficial?
   .................................................................................................................................
   .................................................................................................................................

7. What are the key success factors in setting up the performance contract and managing the contract relationship?
   .................................................................................................................................
   .................................................................................................................................

8. How would you rate the adoption of performance contracts at Thogoto Teachers Training College?
   Excellent ( ) Very good ( ) Good ( ) Fair ( ) Poor ( ) Very Poor ( )
Section C: Effect of performance contracting on service delivery

9. What are the organisational benefits of performance contracting?

..............................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................

10. Would you say that your performance has improved since the introduction of performance contracting

Yes ( ) No ( )

Please explain

..............................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................

11. Using the key given, choose or tick the right alternative that fits your opinion

Strongly Agree=SA, Agree = A, Undecided = U, Disagree =D, Strongly disagree =SD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is high productivity of the employees in the organization as result of performance contracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is often low productivity than what has been expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has put up measures to ensure high employee productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting positively affects the productivity of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting limits employee productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management style encourages employees to be more productive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Performance contracting and employee motivation

12. Would you say that performance contracting motivates employees?

Yes ( ) No ( )

Please explain

..............................................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................................

79
13. Using the key given, choose or tick the right alternative that fits your opinion

Strongly Agree=SA, Agree = A, Undecided = U, Disagree =D, Strongly disagree =SD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee’s motivation has increased since the signing of performance contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management ensures that the performance contract is done according to ones job description and specification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every employee supports the method used for performance contracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting has enhanced job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting demotivates employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting puts unnecessary pressure on employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the requirements of performance contracting does not necessarily lead to job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section E: Performance contracting and employee satisfaction

14. What benefit does performance contracting bring to your job description?

- Leads to reduced job ambiguity [ ]
- Leads to job enrichment [ ]
- Clearly sets the parameters under which to be evaluated [ ]
- Others ...........................................................................................................................................

15. To what extent does performance contracting lead to job satisfaction?

- To a greater extent [ ]
- To a moderate extent [ ]
- To a less extent [ ]

Section F: Challenges in the implementation of performance contracts

16. Are there any challenges encountered in the implementation of performance contracting?

- Yes ( ) No ( )

Please state them
17. Does the performance contracting live up to its aims?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

18. What do you suggest to be done to minimize these challenges?
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................

   Thank you for your time and cooperation
Appendix III: Questionnaire for Non-Teaching Staff

SECTION A: General Information

1. Gender
   Male ( )   Female ( )
2. Age
   20-30 years ( )
   31-40 years ( )
   41-50 years ( )
   Above 50 years ( )
3. Department
   Human Resource ( )
   Front office ( )
   Accounts ( )
   Sales and Marketing ( )
4. Academic qualifications
   Primary ( )
   Secondary ( )
   Diploma ( )
   University Degree ( )
5. Terms of employment
   Temporary ( )
   Permanent ( )

Section B: Adoption of performance contracting

6. Have you signed a performance contract?
   Yes ( )   No ( )
7. In what areas does performance contracting appear to be most beneficial?
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
8. What are the key success factors in setting up the performance contract and managing the contract relationship?
   ............................................................................................................................
   ............................................................................................................................
9. How would you rate the adoption of performance contracts at Thogoto Teachers Training College?
   Excellent ( ) Very good ( ) Good ( ) Fair ( ) Poor ( ) Very Poor ( )

Section C: Effect of performance contracting on service delivery

10. What are the organisational benefits of performance contracting?
    ............................................................................................................................
    ............................................................................................................................
11. Would you say that your performance has improved since the introduction of performance contracting
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   Please explain
   .................................................................................................................................

12. Using the key given, choose or tick the right alternative that fits your opinion
   Strongly Agree=SA, Agree = A, Undecided = U, Disagree =D, Strongly disagree =SD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is high productivity of the employees in the organization as result of performance contracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is often low productivity than what has been expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has put up measures to ensure high employee productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting positively affects the productivity of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting limits employee productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management style encourages employees to be more productive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Performance contracting and employee motivation

13. Would you say that performance contracting motivates employees?
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   Please explain
   .................................................................................................................................

14. Using the key given, choose or tick the right alternative that fits your opinion
   Strongly Agree=SA, Agree = A, Undecided = U, Disagree =D, Strongly disagree =SD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee’s motivation has increased since the signing of performance contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management ensures that the performance contract is done according to ones job description and specification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every employee supports the method used for performance contracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting has enhanced job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting demotivates employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting puts unnecessary pressure on employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the requirements of performance contracting does not necessarily lead to job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section E: Performance contracting and employee satisfaction

15. What benefit does performance contracting bring to your job description?
   
   Leads to reduced job ambiguity [ ]
   
   Leads to job enrichment [ ]
   
   Clearly sets the parameters under which to be evaluated [ ]
   
   Others .................................................................................................................................

16. To what extent does performance contracting lead to job satisfaction?
   
   To a greater extent [ ]
   
   To a moderate extent [ ]
   
   To a less extent [ ]

Section F: Challenges in the implementation of performance contracts

17. Are there any challenges encountered in the implementation of performance contracting?
   
   Yes ( ) No ( )
   
   Please state them
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

18. Does the performance contracting live up to its aims?
   
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

19. What do you suggest to be done to minimize these challenges?
   
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

Thank you for your time and cooperation
Appendix IV: Questionnaire for Students

SECTION A: General Information

1. Gender Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Age Below 20 years ( )
   20-30 years ( )
   Above 30 years ( )

Section B: Adoption of performance contracting

3. What is your understanding of performance contracting?

   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

4. Are you aware of performance contracting at Thogoto Teachers Training College?
   Yes ( ) No ( )

5. In what areas does performance contracting appear to be most beneficial?

   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

6. What are the key success factors in setting up the performance contract and managing the contract relationship?

   ........................................................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................................................

7. How would you rate the adoption of performance contracts at Thogoto Teachers Training College?
   Excellent ( ) Very good ( ) Good ( ) Fair ( ) Poor ( ) Very Poor ( )

Section C: Effect of performance contracting on service delivery

8. What are the organisational benefits of performance contracting?
9. Would you say that service delivery has improved since the introduction of performance contracting at Thogoto Teachers Training College?

Yes ( ) No ( )

Please explain

10. Using the key given, choose or tick the right alternative that fits your opinion

Strongly Agree=SA, Agree = A, Undecided = U, Disagree =D, Strongly disagree =SD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is high productivity of the employees in the organization as result of performance contracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is often low productivity than what has been expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has put up measures to ensure high employee productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting positively affects the productivity of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting limits employee productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management style encourages employees to be more productive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Performance contracting and employee motivation

11. Would you say that performance contracting motivates employees?

Yes ( ) No ( )

Please explain
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12. Using the key given, choose or tick the right alternative that fits your opinion

Strongly Agree=SA, Agree = A, Undecided = U, Disagree =D, Strongly disagree =SD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee’s motivation has increased since the signing of performance contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The management ensures that the performance contract is done according to ones job description and specification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting has enhances job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting demotivates employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance contracting puts unnecessary pressure on employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the requirements of performance contracting does not necessarily lead to job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section E: Performance contracting and employee satisfaction

13. What benefit does performance contracting bring to employee job description?
   - Leads to reduced job ambiguity [ ]
   - Leads to job enrichment [ ]
   - Clearly sets the parameters under which to be evaluated [ ]
   - Others ...............................................................................................................

14. To what extent does performance contracting lead to job satisfaction?
   - To a greater extent [ ]
   - To a moderate extent [ ]
   - To a less extent [ ]

Section F: Challenges in the implementation of performance contracts

15. Does performance contracting live up to its aims?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]

16. Are there any challenges encountered in the implementation of performance contracting?
   - Yes ( ) No ( )
   - Please state them .................................................................................................................................
   - ...........................................................................................................................................................

17. What do you suggest to be done to minimize these challenges?
   - ...........................................................................................................................................................
   - ...........................................................................................................................................................
   - ...........................................................................................................................................................

Thank you for your time and cooperation
Appendix V: Interview guide for the principal

1. To what extent has performance contracting as a mandatory requirement been adopted by Thogoto Teachers Training College?

2. What is the effect of performance contracting on service delivery at Thogoto Teachers Training College?

3. What is the effect of performance contracting on employee satisfaction at Thogoto Teachers Training College?

4. What challenges exist in the implementation of performance contracts at Thogoto Teachers Training College?
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