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The findings of the study were as follows:

1. Training needs are not based on any work deficiency but are all the same, according to government officials interviewed, geared towards the realization of improved performance efficiency. The employees, however, score from associating training with improved performance, perceiving it as a step towards personal gains such as promotion and other related rewards.
ABSTRACT

The study reported here had specific objectives which it intended to fulfil. These were as follows:

a) to find out how training needs are determined within the civil service,
b) to establish whether post-training deployment relates to those needs,
c) to establish whether trained personnel feel satisfied in their post-training jobs, and
d) to establish whether such satisfaction/dissatisfaction is related to a desire to quit government service.

To meet these objectives, the study adopted convenience sampling procedure through which a sample of ninety of those who had attended training of nine months or longer was chosen. A questionnaire was then administered on this sample out of which sixty-three were used in the analysis. Interviews were also used to tap data from other relevant sources.

To determine job satisfaction among the trained personnel, Herzberg's model was adopted since it is an appropriate model for the sort of the study undertaken.

The findings of the study were as follows:

a) Training needs are not based on any work deficiency but are, all the same, according to government officials interviewed, geared towards the realization of improved performance/efficiency. The employees, however, apart from associating training with improved performance, perceives the need for training as a means to personal gains such as promotion and other related rewards.
b) Post-training deployment which is considered poor by the trained personnel does not relate to these needs. This is as a result of the rank-based advancement system backed by schemes of service which incorporate arbitrary rules that hinder appropriate deployment and advancement.

c) The trained personnel did not show any definite job satisfaction. Whereas other factors used to measure job satisfaction were high enough, achievement and advancement rated low, reflecting on the rather low satisfaction level reported.

d) It was unclear whether the low job satisfaction level relates to the turnover among trained personnel within the civil service. What came out clear, however, is that job security and good relations at work as dissatisfiers account for continued service while both reward or pay and conditions of service—two other important dissatisfiers—could account for the turnover.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Deployment is an important consideration whether one is dealing with physical or human resources. Proper deployment of resources is important because any gain for an organisation is largely dependent on this. This thesis applies to the Kenya civil service where deployment of staff with an aim to achieving job satisfaction has been a major issue as is shown in this section. When trained personnel are wrongly deployed, skills are wasted, the people themselves get dissatisfied and therefore long to leave. This is why deployment, especially of trained personnel, for improved job satisfaction should be an important issue to consider.

It is important to consider trained personnel in this regard because as it is intimated in the next chapter, training is a fundamental requirement in a work situation. It is not only a fundamental requirement, it is also an expensive affair which many organisations would prefer to avoid if they could. It is therefore pertinent that once trained, the job satisfaction level of such personnel should be improved through proper deployment.

The importance of this satisfaction-oriented deployment was underscored by the workshop organized under the auspices of the Directorate of Personnel Management (DPM) which had as its theme, "Problems and Challenges of Public Service Management in Kenya." Two of its major objectives were to evaluate the environmental factors that inspire employees to achieve results that are above the average and to examine the managerial styles for working effectively and making work more meaningful and satisfying.\(^1\)

\(^1\)Republic of Kenya, Recommendations of Top Management for Public Servants, August, 1979.

\(^2\)Ibid.
One factor which came out clearly was the misallocation of scarce expertise such as deployment of professional staff including doctors and engineers in purely administrative capacities. One recommendation was that deployment of staff at various levels within the service and their transfers should, as far as possible, be related to work programmes and expected output.

This seems to be a reflection of the Ndegwa Report’s remark that there is a lack of career planning in the civil service. According to the report, even in the somewhat elite administrative and professional class where one would have expected to see effort towards career planning, there existed a haphazard career pattern.3

In the report, it is suggested that a research effort needs to be instituted primarily to assess the motivation of the Kenyan civil servant, and what form of incentives are most effective in increasing his work commitment and productivity.4 This, according to the report, is necessary in order to gain an understanding of our work force and try to establish whether the factors of motivation as have been propounded in the content theories are applicable to the Kenya civil service.


4 Ibid., p. 80.
It appears little has been done within the Kenya civil service regarding those motivation factors that account for job satisfaction. According to a study\(^5\) made by Ocheng-Ongolo in the Ministry of Works, for example, it is shown that career planning is poor as it is quite common for employees to work for five years before getting promotion as this tends to be based mainly on seniority. Consequently, many young, skilled personnel quit the Ministry to join the private sector where they see better prospects. This would hardly be so if the civil servants were properly motivated and if they had satisfaction in their jobs.

According to the study, the turnover is due to the poor scheme of service which seems to hinder career development of young employees, besides poor remuneration.\(^6\) It is noted that a scheme of service which provides for personnel development and other incentives based on merit and capability rather than seniority may help in retaining the skilled personnel.\(^7\)

The turnover among trained personnel within the civil service has not been regarded as serious since it is argued that the personnel end up serving in the same economy.

---


6\*Ibid., p. 21.

7\*Ibid., p. 21.
This view is reflected in the Ndegwa report\(^8\) and also expounded by Ochung-Ongolo in his study. It is a view which is, however, difficult to justify since it implies that although the government is unable to retain the skilled personnel, it can train for others, that is, the government is a mere training ground.

It is a view treated with a lot of concern in the report. Noting that training is an extremely expensive undertaking, both in terms of finance and of opportunity cost, it is argued that the government has the right to be assured that it is actually receiving value for the money spent on training.\(^9\) If the government spends a lot of money to train its employee and that employee decides to quit after training, the money invested in his training is basically lost. Whether he ends up within the economy, the government will still be faced with the same problem—finding another trainee and paying more money to train him in order to fill the post in question and so goes the vicious circle.\(^10\)

Such consideration induces the bonding system which is meant to ensure that those given training to enable them to do a certain job in the civil service actually do that job on completion of their training.\(^11\) The rationale for bonding is, however, highly questioned in the report. It is argued that it is not expedient to compel someone to work for the government while he prefers working elsewhere. The solution therefore appears to be only proper deployment of such staff and the institution of appropriate incentives which would make them be satisfied in their government jobs.

---

9 Ibid., p. 100.
10 Ibid., p. 95 (underlined emphasis is mine).
11 Ibid., p. 94.
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The foregoing forms the core problem of this study which arises from the consideration of the motivation provided to employees within the government to make them satisfied on their jobs and put up better work than average. Training is undertaken within the civil service to make employees perform better but it seems post-training deployment and incentive system work against this. This results in disenchantment amongst the trained personnel and consequent resignation. It is therefore worthwhile to look at the sort of deployment and incentives that would make trained personnel feel content and remain on their government jobs.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Job satisfaction is an important element in a work situation and has been associated with improved performance as well as increased commitment to the organisation. It has, at the same time, been established that training contributes to an employee’s job satisfaction as through it, the employee acquires skills necessary for his job that gives him confidence and pride. Yet as we have seen, training itself is a very expensive affair. Therefore, if the government can spend its scarce resources in training its personnel, it should be concerned with the deployment of such personnel such as to establish that the satisfaction they get from their work makes them impart their learned skills accordingly for the improvement of its performance.

In any country, the government is normally the largest single employer and Kenya is, in this case, no exception.

The Kenya government as the largest single employer feels duty bound to train its employees so that they can acquire the necessary skills to make them discharge its functions better. By mere numbers and training opportunities, the government takes a lead since due to the high cost of training personnel other employers especially in the private sector, try to avoid training their personnel and resort to “poaching” as an easy way of securing already trained personnel.

The major victim of the poaching practice is certainly the government which is seemingly a training ground for other organisations. This creates concern when one realizes that the major aim of the government in training its personnel is not just for training’s sake but to improve their post-training performance at their places of work. Why then the apparent laxity when those trained to improve performance within the government end up quitting?

With this consideration, it is hoped this study will:

1. generate more interest in this important issue within the government;
2. make the government have a renewed look at its deployment and utilization of the trained personnel with the view to retaining them within the service to improve its operations;
3. deriving from 2, deny other organisations an easy source of trained manpower and thus encourage them to train their own; and
4. consequent to their proper deployment, make the trained personnel have satisfaction in their jobs and build their careers within government service.
OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To find out how training needs are determined within the civil service.
2. To find out whether post-training deployment relates to those needs.
3. To establish whether trained personnel feel satisfied in their post-training jobs.
4. To establish whether such satisfaction/dissatisfaction is related to a desire to quit government service.

The importance attached to training in a work situation. Importance of training can be seen in various aspects— as a job requirement, as a component of the job, and as a basis of personnel utilization.

Training as a Job Requirement

Training increases the capability of an employee and when trained personnel are properly deployed, the employer obtains the greatest possible benefit from their abilities and the employees, on the other hand, obtain both material and psychological rewards from their work. This position is supported by a United Nations (UN) document on training within the public service in which it is observed:

Training, for the purpose of this paper, means in-service formal training undertaken by an employee to better his working skills.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR
TRAINING AND JOB SATISFACTION

Having given a brief introduction in chapter one, this chapter will now lay out the necessary theoretical framework. The chapter is divided into three sections which are based on the importance of training, the determinants of job satisfaction, and some findings of certain previous studies related to the subject of this study.

IMPORTANT OF TRAINING TO THE JOB

This study is based on trained personnel because of the importance attached to training in a work situation. Importance of training can be seen in various aspects— as a job requirement, as a component of the job, and as a basis of personnel utilization.

Training as a Job Requirement

Training improves the capability of an employee and when trained personnel are properly deployed, the employer obtains the greatest possible benefit from their abilities and the employees, on the other hand, obtain both material and psychological rewards from their work. This position is supported by a United Nations (UN) document on training within the public service in which it is observed:

\[\text{Training, for the purpose of this paper, means in-service formal training undertaken by an employee to better his working skills.}\]
training is necessary because no matter how well qualified a person may be at the time of recruitment (whether carried out through open competitive examination or through other means), he still has certain inadequacies and therefore much to learn before becoming a really effective civil servant. 2

This view is supported by Theodore Toedt who holds that the development of the employed man is essential if resource wastage is to be avoided. He notes that over the years, manpower development has been considered synonymous with training and training itself is no doubt a vital part of the overall development programme. 3 He further recognizes that development programmes exist as a means of continually providing the organization with competent, satisfied personnel. 4


4Toedt, Theodore A., ibid., p. 392.
This fundamental training requirement is further corroborated in an International Labour Organization (ILO) report on conditions of employment of public servants where it is stated, "a considerable effort is also needed in the field of training and retraining in order to raise the level of efficiency in public administration." The document further adds that:

- Two factors have led governments to accept more specific responsibilities in this field: in the first place, existing educational systems often do not provide the type of qualifications required for the public service, particularly at the immediate level, and secondly the training and experience of many persons already employed in the public service are inadequate or unsuitable in view of the expanding role of the service.

Thus post-employment training requirement is fundamental. What then of post-training deployment within the civil service? How should this be done such that those trained obtain both material and psychological rewards—satisfaction—from their work? This is a central theme in this paper which is elaborated on in subsequent chapters.


\[\text{ILO: General Review of Conditions of Employment of Public Servants, ibid., p. 10.}\]
Training as a Job Component

The foregoing has shown training as an important requirement in employment. Even the most qualified or the most experienced of the employee need training to fit him well in the job in the former case, and to tune up his mind in order to keep up with constant change in the latter.

As a job component and as applied to this paper, there are three considerations involved in the subject of training. There are need considerations, usage considerations, and even reward considerations.

Need for Training

This is best summarized by Bentley thus:

There is no doubt that the key resources of any organisation are the knowledge and skills of its people. This knowledge is all too often acquired from outside the organisation instead of tapping the latent talent from within. The key to finding and developing the talent is training. Old myths that seniority and experience of the past fit people for higher office will need to be swept away and replaced by an acceptance that in the modern turbulent world training is the essential ingredient for success.

---

Bentley, however, notes that it is unfortunate that in many organisations training is seen as an expensive item that can be cut when things are tight. Many organisations are reluctant to release people for training, treating it as time off. To some, training is not taken seriously and in Malm’s words, “training may be undertaken because ‘it is the thing to do’ ……… as if it were the latest fashion, without considering carefully whether the new style really fits the needs of the situation ……….”

According to Bentley, “the motivation to acquire new skills is partly survival and partly pride. The majority of people see survival as having a worthwhile job, and take pride in the fact that they are an essential part of the organisation.”

Thus training fulfils an important role for the organisation and as Bentley puts it:

it has been shown that when people are given new skills they are eager to use them. Fear of the new is eliminated when people are confident they can cope, and confidence comes from competence, which itself comes from giving people the knowledge and the skills they need.

---

8 Ibid., p. 10.
10 Bentley, Trever J., op. cit., p. 11.
11 Ibid., p. 11.
Whatever need for training may be there, it relates to both the organisation and the individual. Williams suggests that when organisations institute training, they usually have three kinds of aims — general, hidden and specific. The general aims, according to Williams, may be as vague as "increasing effectiveness" or "improving performance". Hidden aims may be a desire to boost morale, to correct deviants, to confer status or to buy off trouble makers. Specific aims, on the other hand, are commitments to a particular desired change in the nominees in terms of some additional knowledge, skill or attitude.

Whatever is the case, the need for training, both for organisation and the individual may incorporate a variety of gains, both for the organisation and the individual:

i) enhancement of productivity and quality of work;

ii) lessen spoilage and wastefulness;

iii) enhancement of greater dexterity/versality;

iv) lessen need for supervision;

v) remedy weaknesses and thus correct human oriented faults/mistakes;

vi) increase innovativeness;

vii) boost morale, confidence and give pride to the employee;

viii) development of skills, hence improvement of efficiency and job satisfaction; and

ix) provision of preparedness for future changes within the organisation such as expansion, change in working methods, installation of new equipment or techniques which require new or improved skills, among other gains.


13Ibid., p. 16.
The individual employee may, however, perceive the need for training from a completely different perspective. In a situation where he recognizes his own deficiencies his perception may, to a large extent, coincide with those of the organisation. But as Stalker observes, "individual employees largely see training in terms of its potential value to them as individuals."\(^{14}\) Such that when the value of training cannot be realized within the organisation, the temptation to quit is greater.

According to Flippo,\(^{15}\) the means (training) must be related to an end which the trainee desires (more money, a job, recognition, promotion, etc). Flippo adds that learned skills should accordingly be reinforced and lists promotions, pay increases, and praise as typical positive reinforcement.\(^{16}\)

Thus when learned skills lack such reinforcements then dissatisfaction is likely to result. As Hinrichs states, "an effective training programme must demonstrably contribute to the satisfaction of the trainee's personal goals."\(^{17}\)

\(^{14}\)Ibid., p. 16.


\(^{16}\)Ibid., p. 213.

While considering employees' stake in training, McGehee and Thayer remark that while training is a management tool, training programmes can be of relatively little value if careful consideration is not given to the individual or individuals for whom these programmes are designed. It is important, according to the two authors, that the individual employee receives some personal benefit from his training experiences and that for training to be effective, it must be geared to both immediate and long-range needs of individual employees.

It has been widely held that the basic value of training is to make the employee more efficient in his work. In situations where an employee recognizes inadequacy in his work, his training will heighten his morale as he will perceive the organisation as having interest in him. McGehee and Thayer support this view while considering the immediate benefits of training to the employee. They see training as increasing efficiency and add:


18 Ibid., p. 15.

19 Ibid., p. 16.

20 Ibid., p. 17.
adequate training gives the employee a fair chance to experience success and avoid the frustrating experience of failure in performing the duties for which he is being paid. It may be that a well-planned, well executed training programme will impress the employee with the feeling that a company has a real interest in his welfare. 20

Besides satisfactory performance, he gets the chance to acquire new skills and knowledge which, according to McGehee and Thayer, can pave the way for promotion to a job of greater responsibility, making the employee not only improve his economic status but also secure improvement in social and personal areas. 21

Training can thus be a real tool of management which can be used for the attainment of organisational goals such as higher productivity and at the same time can create a favourable climate in which employees can experience less frustration and realize maximum satisfaction. In the opinion of McGehee and Thayer, "an adequately trained employee has a better opportunity to derive the maximum satisfaction out of his daily life both inside and outside the organisation." 22 Thus the stake of an employee is not just to achieve efficiency for his organisation but also to better himself.

It is therefore possible to see an inherent conflict between the needs of the organisation and those of the individual. In one case study, it was found that whilst the objectives of the organisation tended to relate to improvements in the present job performance of the employees, the employees themselves saw the training as

20 Ibid., p. 16.
21 Ibid., pp. 16-17.
22 Ibid., p. 17.
contributing more to their long-term potential than to their present performance. It is therefore important that while undertaking the training of its employees the organisation should be aware of the way the employees themselves perceive such training.

For the organisation, the training need is therefore meant to achieve diversified aims such as improved performance, boosting of employee morale, and the development of his skills. As for the employee, his need for training may largely relate to its potential value to him as an individual. Thus without a reconciled need for training between the two parties, there may arise a conflict of training need perception.

**Training as a Basis for Deployment**

The way the need for training is perceived by the two parties would largely determine the nature of utilization of the acquired skills and knowledge, hence the nature of deployment of such skills. As Graham remarks:

> under favourable circumstances, training has the important dual function of utilization and motivation. By improving employees' ability to perform the tasks required by the company, training allows better use to be made of human resources; by giving employees a feeling of mastery over their work and of recognition by management, their job satisfaction is increased.24

---


But it should be noted that training can be used both to increase knowledge and to achieve performance in changed situations. It may, according to Wamalwa Report, involve "dis-learning" as new situations render past successful experience irrelevant or even dysfunctional and also new learning as the future may demand appropriate skills and both new methods and techniques.

As the report reveals, however, a difficulty that trained personnel encounter is that they seldom hold positions that would allow them introduce changes in operational procedures. Officers may learn a new technique like Management by Objectives (MBO) but on return to work, they will still apply old techniques because those holding decision-making positions would not allow them introduce such techniques. The officers thus end up frustrated. It is therefore desirable that senior officers receive similar training in order not to pose as a stumbling block. The report therefore appropriately observes that:

all managers, including those at the very top, need from time to time to get away from their desks, to recharge their batteries, to gain new insights, to learn about new techniques, to improve their all round knowledge. At no stage a manager ceases to have this need for personal development.  

While the report stresses the role of training in improving work efficiency, it also notes that no amount of training is likely to achieve this efficiency unless the climate of the organisation in which the work is undertaken is such as to stimulate and encourage efficiency in the organisation as a whole.

---

26 Ibid., p.8.
27 Ibid., p.8.
The fact that application of techniques acquired through training is related to the persisting environment is further underscored by Fleishman.28 In a study to assess the extent to which certain leadership attitudes and behaviour acquired during training programme were maintained by foremen after they returned to their jobs, Fleishman concluded that it is difficult to produce in an individual a behaviour change that violates the culture in which this behaviour is imbedded. He notes that when employees are trained and sent back to their jobs, one should not expect much change when the factors of their environment remain unchanged.29

Lorraine Joyce, on the other hand, observes that in evaluating management training little attention has been paid to the contextual factors yet a number of studies30 have indicated that these factors can have an important impact on the outcomes of courses. Training, according to Joyce, can have unanticipated and undesirable outcomes if the contextual factors in the organisational environment are found to work against, rather than with, the training.

In another study done by Jane Adewa31 in the City Council of Nairobi, it was found that trained personnel do not utilize the skills they acquire during training.

---


29 Ibid., p. 579.

30 Joyce, Lorraine, op. cit., p. 15.

Asked to what extent the council utilized the skills acquired in training, 25 per cent said very little while 75 per cent said none at all is utilized. Coupled with lack of advancement, recognition, and proper reward system, the result is high turnover among the trained personnel of the council as training within the council appears to give only personal satisfaction as learnt from 75 per cent of the respondents who mentioned this as the benefit they derived from training.\(^{32}\)

The problem of skill utilization was also noted by the Waruhiu Report\(^{33}\) among the personnel officer cadre in the civil service. Although the Ndegwa Commission called for more demanding qualifications and training as well as better utilization of the skills, it is noted that the role of a personnel officer has remained routine and more clerical in nature, a reflection of their inadequate utilization, deployment and the attitude of top administrators towards personnel officers.

This cadre of staff is not given the chance to perform advisory role and their work is therefore relegated to routine matters with consequent lack of motivation and job satisfaction. Besides, there is haphazard deployment of other professional and technical personnel. It is not uncommon, for example, to find a qualified doctor or engineer doing administrative work at the ministry headquarters without prior acquisition of administrative or managerial skills.

\(^{32}\)Ibid., p. 49.

It is therefore clear that for proper deployment and therefore utilization of trained personnel, the skills must be recognized by the management which must itself be disposed to the use of such skills. For them to be properly disposed, they must be in a position to appreciate such skills, a requirement that makes it necessary for them to be exposed to the same training.

Above all, the organisational environment must be conducive to the application of new techniques. This calls for Organisational Development (OD) which again can only be attained by having enlightened management which, it so happens, can only be realized through training. The idea therefore is "training for all". Malm supports this view by stating, "it is often found that effective training must begin 'at the top' so that top management and department heads themselves practise and apply what is recommended in training." 34

This is basic to appropriate deployment of trained personnel within any organisation. If applied, together with some of the factors alluded to in this section, then deploying trained personnel for improved job satisfaction within the government would be realized.

RELEVANCE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction has been studied in many ways, as both a cause and an effect, as both an independent and a dependent variable. According to Robinson and Connors, 35 for example, results of various investigations suggest presence of relationship between job satisfaction and various variables such as absenteeism, achievement, advancement, automation, job enlargement,

34Malm, F.T., op. cit., p. 299.

Consequent to human relations movement which started early this century with the Hawthorne studies, many studies have been carried out with the emergence of the movement recognition of man's ego and social needs being emphasized, and many others. This study, however, concerns itself with whether the presence or absence of some of these variables in a job diminishes or improves the workers' satisfaction level.

Original Interest in Job Satisfaction

Before the findings of Elton Mayo and Fritz J. Roethlisberger in the famous Hawthorne studies, job attitudes were thought unimportant. For a long time, according to Shwenger, the overall outlook of management in the western world was based on the assumption that the worker is motivated to work mainly by the payment which he receives in return. All other motivating factors were thus overshadowed by the financial element.

This incentive system, based on the wage, leans on Adam Smith's concept of the economic man—a man who is motivated by monetary considerations. Commenting on it, Shwenger states, "Whereas this is a one-dimensional thinking about money, it should not be taken to the extreme that wages are just a 'hygiene' factor and not really a source of motivation at all." He adds that most managers and employees would not admit perhaps that this is their view yet it is proved conclusively during negotiations for labour contracts.


37 Shwenger, Pinhas, ibid., p. xiii.

38 Ibid., p. xiii.
Consequent to human relations movement which started early this century with the Hawthorne studies, many studies were carried out to determine the correlates of high and low job satisfaction, relating it to such factors like age, sex, education, occupation, and income.\(^\text{39}\) Opsahl and Dunnette\(^\text{40}\) note that with the emergence of the movement, recognition of man's ego and social needs became widespread, and job factors other than pay came to be emphasised as the major reasons why men work.

These theses are still very current although they have undergone tremendous improvement by scholars like Herzberg in his two-factor content model, and Porter and Lawler in their process model, the former applied to this study. However, agreeing with Shwinger, Opsahl notes, "Few would disagree that money has been and continues to be the primary means of rewarding and modifying behaviour in industry."\(^\text{41}\)

Why Study Job Satisfaction?

According to Lawler and Porter, the interest in job satisfaction stemmed from mere interest of scientists to learn about it but more due to its presumed relationship to job performance.\(^\text{42}\)

---


\(^\text{41}\) Ibid., p. 500.

\(^\text{42}\) See Cummings, L.L., and W.E. Scott, Jr., ibid., p. 283.
Satisfaction is not similar to motivation. He states that:

The first, and undoubtedly the most straightforward reason, however, rests on the fact that strong correlations between absenteeism and satisfaction, as well as between turnover and satisfaction, appear in the previous studies. In this regard, job satisfaction is certainly an important element for organizations which are concerned about such problems like absenteeism and turnover.

Lawler and Porter note that perhaps the best explanation of the fact that satisfaction is related to absenteeism and turnover comes from the kind of path-goal theory of motivation that has been propounded by various theorists like Georgopoulos, Mahoney and Jones. According to the theory, high satisfaction leads to low turnover and absenteeism.

A second reason for interest in job satisfaction, according to Lawler and Porter, "stems from its low but consistent association with job performance." This study is, however, concerned with the former reason rather than the latter.

Satisfaction and Motivation

It is important to distinguish job satisfaction from motivation because whereas in the Herzberg's content model satisfaction is all important, in the process models such as Porter and Lawler's, it is just a variable within the complex process of motivation. As Fred Luthans points out,
satisfaction is not similar to motivation. He states that:

satisfaction is an attitude, an internal cognitive state. Motivation is a process, and that is why the content models, especially Herzberg’s, have more to do with satisfactions than with the complex process of motivation. In the content models, job satisfaction was deemed to be the sum of various content factors such as responsibility and growth potential.46

This somewhat explains the application of Herzberg’s model in the measure of job satisfaction levels of the trained personnel within the civil service. This study, however, takes the position that the distinction between job satisfaction and motivation is a matter of degree and therefore ideas relating to motivation are widely used.

Determinants of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction as a concept is very much related to the content models of motivation, especially Herzberg’s model. In the process models such as advocated by Porter and Lawler, job satisfaction is regarded as an input. As the content models are easy to understand, and can be readily translated into practice,47 Herzberg’s model is used in this study to measure satisfaction level of trained personnel within the Kenya government. The model is particularly appropriate because as Luthans notes, “the Herzberg model is, at best, a theory of job satisfaction.”48 It is therefore pertinent to briefly look at the features of this model.

48Ibid., p. 418.
The Herzberg "Satisfaction" Model

Herzberg's model is a content development of Maslow's work. After a study he did in the 1950s among accountants and engineers, Herzberg propounded a theory which bipolarized motivation at work, dividing the factors of the workplace into two-motivators or satisfiers on the one hand and "hygiene" or maintenance factors on the other.

In his study, Herzberg used the critical incident method in obtaining data for analysis and asked his respondents to state when they had felt extremely bad and extremely good about their jobs and then tell what happened. According to the study, the former were associated with extrinsic factors of the job—the job context, while the latter were associated with intrinsic aspects—job experiences and job content.

From his analysis, Herzberg concluded that job satisfiers were related to job content and comprised elements in a job which provide satisfaction such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, promotion prospects or advancement and work itself. Job dissatisfiers, on the other hand, were associated with job context and comprised such factors whose absence or inadequacy in a job give rise to dissatisfaction, namely, pay, interpersonal relations, type of supervision, company policy, working conditions, and fringe benefits. The satisfiers were termed motivators and the dissatisfiers were branded hygiene factors, hence his famous two-factor theory. Hygiene factors were further termed maintenance factors because they tended to maintain an employee in his job as they prevent dissatisfaction, but do not lead to satisfaction.
According to Luthans, they in effect bring motivation up to a theoretical zero level and are a necessary "floor" to prevent dissatisfaction, and they serve as a take off. They thus are necessary to maintain the human resources of an organisation although they do not lead to satisfaction. But as Luthans observes, "once the belly is full" of hygiene factors, dangling any more in front of employees will not motivate them. Only a challenging job which has the opportunities for achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement and growth will motivate personnel."

An Appraisal of the Model and a Critique

Whereas the presence of the hygiene factors would not motivate, their absence might make the employee leave. Conversely, as Graham notes, "the absence of "satisfiers" would not make an employee leave but their presence would make him work harder." Herzberg himself, however, recognized that people differ in their preference for motivators or hygiene factors. Some are more concerned about the former while others are interested in the latter. At the same time, while motivator factors are intrinsic to the job, dissatisfaction - avoidance or hygiene (KITA) factors are extrinsic to the job.

49 Ibid., pp. 410 - 11.
50 Ibid., p. 411.
53 Herzberg, Frederick, ibid., p. 39.
In the various investigations he conducted, Herzberg found that motivator factors led to extreme satisfaction while KITA factors led to extreme dissatisfaction hence the terms "satisfiers" for the former and "dissatisfiers" for the latter since they form composites of factors that are involved in causing job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction respectively. On this basis Belcher notes that when the KITA factors deteriorate, job dissatisfaction results, but improving them does not provide job satisfaction as this is only realized through the intrinsic factors of the job.

Although Herzberg's theory of job satisfaction and motivation has been seen as easy to understand and apply, it has been criticised on a number of grounds: first, that it is methodically bound; second, that it is based on faulty research; and third, that it is inconsistent with past evidence concerning satisfaction and motivation.

Smith and Kendall have shown, for example, that a worker may dislike some aspects of his job, yet still think it is acceptable. Similarly, workers may dislike the job despite many desirable characteristics. They thus posit that job satisfaction is a function of the perceived characteristic of a job and depends on the individual's frame of reference. A particular job condition can be a satisfier or dissatisfier or even irrelevant only in reference to conditions in other related jobs.

---

of other people, and the standing of the individual, besides other variables relevant to the job itself. Job satisfaction is thus not exclusive as such but is relative to viable alternatives.

In his consideration of intrinsic satisfactions accruing from specific role performance, Katz postulates that the gratification is mainly dependent on the nature of the activity itself, that is, its intrinsic nature rather than extrinsic factors. The work may be appealing to the individual so much that he would not be moved to a job in which he has no interest. It may, for example, be difficult to get a committed teacher to go and be an administrator in an office despite other attractive conditions.

When further considering conditions which are conducive to the arousal of intrinsic job satisfaction, Katz states that in order for intrinsic job satisfaction or identification with the work to be realized, sufficient variety, complexity and challenge must attain in the job itself, besides such job characteristics that may sufficiently measure up to the abilities of the worker.

According to Fitzgerald, people differ considerably in their need for variety, responsibility and competence, just as they vary in their need for independence or security. As he notes, "the job Jones finds moronic and insufferable is okay with Smith, yet too much for Brown. Restructuring and/or enlarging jobs are brave attempts to fit the job to the man, but which man?"

---

59 Ibid., p. 468.
61 Ibid., p. 38.
Fitzgerald, on this basis, suggests that concepts like motives, motivators, and motivation should be discarded and people should get to see themselves simply as a society of persons. Such orientation, according to him, can be adopted by merely talking with people which in itself does a lot of good, although as it is noted, it is not favourable with many managers. Though Fitzgerald may be right in this respect, it is a widely held view that talking leads to familiarity and familiarity breeds contempt which may undermine superior's authority at a workplace. But as if he has this in mind, Fitzgerald suggests that even praise and approval would do.

It is evident from the foregoing that whereas Herzberg's theory has been popular, it has attracted many criticisms. Looking at certain findings based on it is therefore a worthwhile effort.

**SOME RELEVANT PREVIOUS FINDINGS**

Pay is a basic reward for work and has been used widely as an incentive. Yet its perceived importance has not held very well in the various inquiries that have been made. Results of the studies on motivation through money is therefore rather confusing.

When Wilkins,\(^{62}\) in a 1949-50 study, asked 18- and 19-year old males at the British Army Reception Centre to rank various job incentives on importance, "pay" was placed second only to "friendly workmates". Only 8 per cent ranked pay as most important. "Friendly workmates," "security", and "future prospects" all received more first place rankings than pay.

---

In another study by Watson\(^6\) employees ranked pay third in importance on a list of eight "morale" factors. Worthy's\(^6\) analysis of surveys conducted by Sears, Roebuck, and Company over a 12-year period also showed a very low ranking for pay which took an eighth position among factors related to high morale.

When Granuli\(^6\) asked employees in a Calcutta (India) engineering factory to rank eight items relating to working conditions in order of importance, he found that "adequate earnings" was ranked first above such factors as "job security," "opportunity for promotion," and "personal benefits." Graham and Sluckin\(^6\) also found pay the most important job factor in a survey of skilled and semi-skilled workers in England.

When it was asked in a survey in Israel whether the respondents were satisfied with the salary they receive, only 2.9 per cent felt very satisfied; another 22.3 per cent were satisfied while 74.8 per cent were dissatisfied.\(^6\)

In a study by Ocheng-Ongolo in the Kenya's Ministry of Works, it was found that dissatisfaction with remuneration is a major factor in the turnover of skilled personnel.


\(^6\) ibid., p. 512.

\(^6\) ibid., p. 512.

Opsahl and Dunnette, however, remark that the discrepancies noted in the foregoing cases can be partially explained by the different samples of employees used. One would not expect executives to have the same values and goals as blue-collar workers.

According to Opsahl and Dunnette, while pay is moderately ranked, various groups behave in a manner suggesting a desire for more money. Why is it then that money or pay is seldom ranked to tally with such behaviour? The answer, according to them, is not simple, but may include:

(a) The application of social desirability response to the self-reports. Leaning on the protestant ethic, one may not readily admit that he actually values money most without harming his conscience. This can be avoided by relegating pay to a relatively low position on the value hierarchy and giving lip service to other more acceptable factors such as "job autonomy" or "intrinsic job satisfaction."

(b) The sort of disposition when completing a self-report questionnaire is quite different from that in the real life situation. One tends to engage in some sort of rationalization while completing such self-reports.

---

69 Ibid., p. 513.
(c) Generally, people are poor judges (and therefore poor reporters) of what they really want in a job. They do not know with certainty which job factors really attract and hold them, hence they cannot validly describe or rank the various job factors.

Thus, as Opsahl and Dunnette suggest, research on the valence of money vis-a-vis other job factors can only be validly measured through sophisticated observational techniques rather than the self reports. This is because while various groups behave as if money is all important, this surprisingly, does not come out in the self-report studies which seem to be based on oversimplified notions that tend to ignore "the complexities and multidetermined aspects of human behaviour." 70 This is an appropriate pointer to the fact that the question "how do people value money?" cannot be answered accurately simply by asking them.

Salary, however, is not the only factor which determines respondent's attitude toward his job according to Shwinger's study 71 in Israel. There is also the question of whether the worker receives satisfaction from his work. Does the job enable him to use his capabilities?

A majority of Shwinger's respondents (70 per cent) felt that the job gives them satisfaction while only 29.5 per cent complained of no satisfaction. Considering that 74.8 per cent had said they were dissatisfied with the salary they received, 72 the results supported Herzberg's theory that satisfaction on the job is not related to income.

70 Ibid., p. 513.
71 Shwinger, Pinhas, op. cit., pp. 129-130.
72 See footnote 67 on page 31.
An important factor in determining how respondents feel about their jobs is how they perceive their opportunities for occupational advancement. This came out clearly in Adewa's study where it was found that dissatisfaction and consequent turnover among skilled personnel in the Nairobi City Council results more from poor career planning. When Shwinger asked his respondents whether there were possibilities for them to advance in their careers, 56 per cent answered they did have opportunities for advancement while 45 per cent said they did not have.

From his results, Shwinger states that it is reasonable to assume that if the respondent feels he is receiving a fair salary and has a chance to advance himself he will be satisfied in his job and content to stay with his firm. On the other hand, if the respondent feels that his salary is less than he deserves, his work is not satisfying and the opportunities for advancement in the plant are minimal, then he would probably be interested in leaving the firm.

As a test of satisfaction, the respondent was asked if he was interested in leaving his job. This question, according to Shwinger, represents the workers' overall opinion of their work satisfaction. This was used as an indirect indicator of job satisfaction, conditional on opportunities in other places as they are known to the worker. A vast majority answered that they do not want to leave, implying their job is satisfactory (or that there are no prospects of better conditions elsewhere). Only 28 per cent of the respondents indicated an interest in changing jobs.

---

73Adewa, Jane A., op. cit., p. 55.
74Shwinger, Pinhas, op. cit., p. 131.
75Ibid., p. 133.
76Ibid., pp. 133-34.
On the whole, it can be noted from Shwinger's study that high income does not necessarily bring the worker job satisfaction but at the same time the worker is intelligent enough to realize that job satisfaction must be considered in relation to alternatives available. On the basis of such considerations, the worker would rather stay at his job than leave for another.

INTRODUCTION

For the identified problem, both secondary and primary sources of data were found appropriate. Certain government documents, files, and some literary materials provided the necessary data used in the study.

For the study, information was solicited from the following sources:

(a) Employees who have undergone training lasting nine months or longer and are back on their jobs. A questionnaire was given to this category of respondents for completion.

(b) Personnel in charge of training at the CPM and the organization on which the study was based.

(c) Heads of departments under whom the respondents in (a) fall.

A structured questionnaire which can be found in appendix 5 and questions for answers to (a) and (b) and interviews were conducted using the questionnaire.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

It is now appropriate at this juncture to state the methodology adopted for the study. First to be discussed are the sources of the relevant data. Following this, the research instrument employed to gather the data is considered. Finally, the sampling plan and the data analysis methods are considered.

SOURCES OF DATA

For the identified problem, both secondary and primary sources of data were found appropriate. Certain government documents, files, and some library materials provided the secondary data used in the study.

For primary data, information was solicited from the following sources:

(a) Employees who have undergone training lasting nine months or longer and are back on their jobs. A questionnaire was given to this category of respondents for completion.

(b) Officers in charge of training at the DPM and the ministries on which the study was based.

(c) Heads of departments under whom the respondents in (a) fell.

A structured questionnaire which can be found in appendix C was prepared for sources (b) and (c) and interviews were conducted using the questionnaire.
It had been intended to have interviews with all the Chief Personnel Officers of the ministries selected but because of time constraint, only a few of these were interviewed. The omission of the others did not, however, prejudice the study. One other intended source—the PSC—was also omitted, but this did not diminish the value of data obtained from other sources.

In the ministries selected for the study, namely, Finance, Economic Planning, Lands, Settlement and Physical Planning, Water Development, Office of the President (DPM), and the Office of the Attorney-General, interviews were held with four Senior Personnel Officers, two ministry-based training officers, four DPM training officers and five HoDs or their representatives. The interviews granted provided valuable data for the study.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

This consisted of the questionnaire administered on the relevant respondents. The questions were majorly of the closed type with a few open ones as can be seen in appendix B. Besides, Likert scale type of statements were included.

The questionnaire was composed of three parts. Category A questions were to gather data on need for training and attitude towards both training and the job. This was further probed through the use of a few statements in category B. Most of the statements were, however, meant to collect data on job satisfaction level of the respondents.

Category C questions probe into the type of factors the respondent feels would provide job satisfaction.
Besides, those factors which are present in the job are also sought. Both of these were meant to give a lead to an explanation about the level of job satisfaction as obtained by category B of the questionnaire. The latter part of category C questions was to bring out the characteristics of the respondents which could be of some assistance in interpreting the results.

Due to time constraint and therefore need for quick response, the questionnaire was administered personally, mostly through contacts in the departments that were visited. This was necessary not just because of time considerations but also out of a desire to obtain good response and reduce non-response rate, especially in an environment of the developing country like Kenya about which Kibera has posited the suspicion with which a researcher is treated.

**SAMPLING PLAN**

The sample comprised government employees who have undergone training lasting about a year or more in the ministries studied.

The study was based in Nairobi and the ministries selected are considered among the best trainers within the government. It was also considered the data required could be obtained from them more easily. This may be a cause of some bias which is characteristic of the convenience sampling procedure applied to this study.

The questionnaire was administered on a sample of ninety of those employees who had attended the relevant training and who were available at the departments/ministries during the period of the field work. Since sorting out the respondents available at the time from those who were away on further courses, work assignments, leave, etc., became cumbersome, no specific sample frame was used as developing one was quite arduous and, in any case, would have been necessary when the use of random sampling was intended. As Harper\(^2\) notes, sometimes the selection of a random sample is not feasible, especially:

(a) when such a sample would entail much expensive travelling for the interviewer(s);

(b) when getting the people selected would be a long and uneconomic task; and

(c) when there is no sample frame

Out of the sample of ninety respondents to which the questionnaire was administered, sixty-three completed and returned the questionnaire and the analysis was based on this number.

It is pertinent to acknowledge the fact that due to the non-random sampling procedure applied in the study, the results of the study may not be generalized but the study is, hopefully, a useful contribution to the identified problem.

METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

The methods used to analyse the data are largely opinion analysis and score rating. To get comparative differences in these the use of means and percentages are also applied. Besides, weighted means are also used in cases where they were found appropriate. An analysis of these relationships is explained separately in this chapter.

TRAINING AND DEPLOYMENT DETERMINATION

From the interviews conducted at the ministries studied and at the BPM, it was found that training within the civil service is centered around the BPM with the ministries merely giving some token towards this regarding their training requirements. Since the basic component of the training is to understand the procedures, to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the entire ministry, the ministry types (office and a Chief Official Development Officer (CIDO) must act as a representative of the BPM.

It also realized from the interviews conducted, it was revealed that requirements for training may include the improvement of performance, efficiency, comfort of status, or just a desire to learn new and efficient work. A large part of these being the focus of training within the civil service. On the other hand, the strongly held by both training officers and officials that training is not supposed to lead to promotion but may just be an advantage in upward mobility. Basically, training is meant to improve an officer's performance/efficiency in his work and this is what guides the BPM in the administration of governmental training policy.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

The way trained personnel are deployed within the civil service depends very much on the training arrangements and regulations regarding training. Post-training deployment and consequent job satisfaction are therefore dependent on these arrangements and regulations and an analysis of these relationships is therefore pertinent at this point.

TRAINING AND DEPLOYMENT DETERMINATION

From the interviews conducted at the ministries studied and at the DPM, it was found that training within the civil service is centred around the DPM with the ministries merely providing feed-forwards to it regarding their training requirements. This is done through the ministries’ training committees comprising senior officials of the ministry, Heads of Departments (HoDs), and a Chief Staff Development Officer (CSDO) who is a representative of the DPM.

Similarly from the interviews conducted, it was revealed that requirements for training may include the improvement of performance/efficiency, conferment of status, or just a desire to boost employees’ morale, the first of these being the focus of training within the civil service. On the basis of this, it is strongly held by both training officers and HoDs that training is not supposed to lead to promotion but may just be an advantage in upward mobility. Basically, training is meant to improve an officer’s performance/efficiency in his work and this is what guides the DPM in its administration of government training policy.
Although the DPM controls training matters, it thus does not confer status to individual employees on account of training. In a DPM letter entitled "deployment for maximum utilization," it was stated in part, "............. current service regulations do not provide for automatic promotion on successful completion of a course of training unless this is indicated in a scheme of service ...........". This implies that promotion based on training may only originate from individual ministries/departments either on the basis of a scheme of service or on special requirements of the departments.

There is a clear fallacy regarding DPM's role in training and subsequent deployment. While its role in training matters is clear, it seems to have no role in post-training deployment and therefore has no way of ensuring job satisfaction among the trained personnel who are actually deployed by individual ministries or the Public Service Commission (PSC) which rely mainly on the schemes of service which are the official guidelines for elevating civil servants to higher positions of responsibility. This sort of relationship between the DPM and the PSC regarding training and deployment is pursued further towards the end of this chapter. It is first necessary at this point to briefly examine the place of the schemes in training and deployment.

1A letter on post-training deployment, DPM/6/1/12/Vol. IX (106).

2The administration of the scheme of service is ministry-based and is the responsibility of the Permanent Secretary who is the executive head of the ministry. Departments are functional units of a ministry.
Schemes of service as guidelines for training and deployment

The interviews conducted at the ministries and at the DPM revealed that the schemes of service formulated for the various cadres of employees in the civil service are fundamental guidelines in recruitment, appointment, advancement, and deployment in general. It was also revealed that the schemes of service largely determine promotion-based training in the various ministries. Yet one ministry—the Ministry for Water Development—which is a relatively new ministry and whose staff still lack specific formulated schemes of service has one of the most promotion-based training programmes.

It may be argued that this is an odd case out but as it can be seen from appendix D, there are so far only thirty of these schemes, meaning, many cadres of civil servants have no such schemes and therefore no basis for training and advancement. As provided, for a cadre of personnel to warrant formulation of a scheme of service, the establishment must be quite sizeable—more than 100 employees. This in itself is bad enough because even a few employees need to know specifically about their career planning.

But even for those cadres which have the schemes, employees can only benefit if the schemes are well-administered. As it happens, most are either poorly administered or are just archaic. For example, a scheme of service for accountants lays stress on CPA rather than any advanced qualification. This means that even if an employee within

---

that cadre has a second or third degree in accountancy but has no CPA, his chances of advancement are fairly uncertain.

The poor administration of the schemes results mainly from other associated conditions for advancement incorporated into them. As it is provided, acquisition of the minimum qualifications and experience required does not automatically entitle an employee for promotion but is subject to:

1. existence of a vacancy
2. suitability of the candidate for performing duties at the higher grade, that is, merit and ability as reflected in work results.
3. a conditional minimum number of years service on the preceding grade.
4. approval of the PSC.

First, a system which sets minima should also of necessity set maxima. Such that when one is to serve for a minimum number of years on a grade before moving to the next one, he should also be told about the maximum number of years he can serve on that grade. Secondly, if merit and ability is to be used as a basis for advancement then the system requiring that must also set a proper and objective appraisal system for determining that merit and ability.

These are just some of the conditions for a proper administration of the schemes of service if they are to meet their stated aims and objectives. Therefore, though well-intended as a basis for career planning within the civil service, the schemes of service are a mere hoax in

---

4 Ibid.
the absence of a proper and effective appraisal system. Unfortunately, as Waruhiu report notes, "failure to evolve an objective and effective appraisal system which would provide a rational basis for reward has led to favouritism, nepotism and other undesirable practices."\(^5\)

These flaws are amplified by Philip Wangalwa in his review of the civil service when he observes that most top jobs in the civil service are held by people not properly fitted for them because of "backdoor" dealings.\(^6\) This sounds like a confirmation of a case found in one department where because of such "backdoor" dealings, a junior employee of a section was "lifted" to the position of deputy HoD and his head of section had to resign in protest since he had no faith in his ability even in his section. The situation arose when the HoD could not see eye to eye with his deputy who had just returned from a training course with an advanced qualification suited for the technical department. Since the deputy HoD could not be tolerated by his HoD, he had to be transferred to an administrative position in another ministry. The action is quite reverberative. First, the knowledge he had just acquired which was beneficial to his department had to be disregarded just because of personal differences—to the detriment of efficiency and productivity. Secondly, he was likely to be ineffective in his new administrative position since he was not disposed to an administrative job—again to the detriment of efficiency and productivity.

---


\(^6\) Daily Nation, Nairobi, October 12, 1983, p. 12.
Whereas this is a typical case of blatant wastage of competent personnel and a glaring misplacement of skills—at a fairly high level indeed, one would only hope that it is the exception rather than the rule within the civil service. Otherwise, the improvement of efficiency, integrity and productivity of the civil service would be elusive indeed on the one hand, and satisfaction of the trained personnel on their jobs adversely affected on the other.

The negative aspects of the schemes of service in the civil service is further underscored by Dorothy Opondo who sees them as a discouragement to the self motivation of employees to opt for training because they do not provide for immediate post-training reward. As Opondo observes, if employers had such schemes of service which provide for rewards after training their employees would not only be motivated to go for training but would actually be prepared to downgrade their social problems such as family commitments and sacrifice some of their time knowing they would be rewarded at the end of it.

This view is very pertinent here. Although the government's training policy does not recognize immediate reward on account of training, it should be clear, as Flippo and Hinrichs recognize, that learned skills should be accordingly be reinforced in order to contribute to personal goals satisfaction, hence job satisfaction.

---

It is worth noting that whatever way training is viewed by the government — whether to improve efficiency, confer status, or just boost morale, the department is crucial in the whole process as it provides important guides for training determination by the DPM. If the HoD therefore happens to be anti-training or even unable to assess the training needs for his staff then training chances for that particular department are impaired, not to mention those departments which have no schemes of service and therefore nothing on which to base training needs of personnel.

Beyond this, an analysis of the employees' perception of training and subsequent deployment is undertaken to determine job satisfaction level of the trained personnel. An examination of certain relationships, especially between the ministries, the DPM and the PSC, is also undertaken to bring out certain flaws in training and deployment determination which are fundamental to job satisfaction among the trained personnel.

EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTION OF TRAINING AND SUBSEQUENT DEPLOYMENT

From the data gathered from the trained personnel who comprised the sample that was reached through the questionnaire, the government training policy is seen as very favourable by the respondents. As the data in table 1 that follows indicate, 75 per cent of the respondents rate the training policy as good. It is, however, opined that it should be accompanied with promotion and consideration of prospects for advancement. The evaluation of the policy as good therefore relates mainly to the chances for training within the civil service as evidenced in table VII.
This is because although the respondents rate the training policy as good, their dissatisfaction with post-training deployment is quite clear as Table I shows and as it is further illustrated in category C of Table IV.

Table I: Government training policy and post-training deployment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good</th>
<th></th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training policy</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-training deployment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings, the respondents associate poor post-training deployment mainly with the DPM's lack of a defined role in the deployment of trained personnel. They are of the opinion that since DPM is central in training matters, it should equally involve itself in deployment instead of leaving it to individual ministries. This, however, may not be necessary if DPM has a proper follow-up of the utilization of trained personnel.

Those respondents who see the government training policy as "bad" give a number of reasons for their position. They argue that there is no proper follow-up to establish whether the employees benefited from training, that the training policy does not appear to have any specific
objective to achieve, that choice of nominees is not done properly, that the policy should be geared to training on the job rather than to professional or academic advancement, and that certain departments do not receive trained personnel well. These respondents also argue that the policy is slanted as it tends to spare top civil servants when nominations for training are done. They see training as necessary for all levels of government employees including senior officers as category C of table IV indicates.

Although post-training deployment is seen as poor, most of the respondents expect to do the same job as they were doing before training (table II). This is apparently an influence of the schemes of service already referred to.

Table II: Feeling about deployment, promotion and training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation to do same job after training</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of promotion after training</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether promotion got within expected time</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longingness for training</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether pushed for training</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt pre-training work deficiency</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table further indicates, although service regulations do not provide for immediate rewards as alluded to earlier, the trained personnel expect reward-oriented post-training deployment realized through promotion (table II) or some other personal gain as category c of table IV shows. This is consistent with Flippo’s and Hinrich’s thesis that training as a means must be related to such ends desired by the trainees like more money and promotion in order to contribute to the trainee’s personal goals.10

As can further be discerned from table II, though not pushed for and not undertaken because of any felt work deficiency, training is actually longed for such that when the chance to go for it comes, it is received very happily (table III a).

Table III a, b, and c: Need for and relevance of training.

(a) How selection for training was received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happily</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Ibid.
(b) Reason for accepting to go for training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merely directed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good break from work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve performance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand knowledge</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more flexible</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume greater responsibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inc. promotion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total number is much greater than the number of respondents because multiple answers were allowed.*

(c) Relevance of training to work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very relevant</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow relevant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very irrelevant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mainly taken to improve performance, expand knowledge and provide flexibility (table IIIb), the training is considered relevant to the work done (table IIIc). This being the case and since training is not desired for any work deficiency, it can only be taken that while training is taken to improve performance, such personal gains like promotion are expected to accrue from it failing which the trained personnel get disillusioned at his workplace.

Given the foregoing as the way trained personnel within the civil service view training and subsequent deployment, what is the sort of job satisfaction they derive from such training and deployment? This is examined in the following section.

TRAINING AND POST-TRAINING DEPLOYMENT AS DETERMINANTS OF JOB SATISFACTION

As stated earlier, Herzberg's "satisfaction" model was applied to determine the sort of job satisfaction attaining among the trained personnel. Once the personnel are trained and deployed at their workplaces, how do they rate each of the factors that determine satisfaction in the job according to Herzberg's model? This is presented in table IV which shows the attained levels of the measured factors.

As can be seen from table IV, the satisfiers except achievement and advancement for which moderate levels are obtained, have fairly high levels, implying that if they determine job satisfaction as propounded by the model, then the level of job satisfaction should be similarly fairly high. On the other hand, the dissatisfiers or KITA factors can be considered low except for relations at work which has a high level.
Table IV: Attained levels of measured factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Max. score required</th>
<th>Score achieved</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Inadequate) achievement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Relations at work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Unsatisfactory) reward/salary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>General dissatisfaction</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proper deployment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training as personal gain</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training for senior officers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category A groups "satisfiers" while category B groups "dissatisfiers". Category C shows the level of dissatisfaction & other factors also used in the analysis elsewhere in this chapter. Note that comment for reward/salary is low since it is unsatisfactory reward/salary that was measured and rated high at 77.5 per cent.
The low level of reward/salary as a KITA factor is quite consistent with the facts of table V which indicates the factors characterizing or attaining in the job. While job security, another KITA factor, highly attains in the job, reward/salary is relatively lacking among the dissatisfiers used.

Table V: Factors characterizing (attaining in) the job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
A = High status
B = More money
C = Better working conditions
D = Good relations at work
E = Better job security
F = More responsibility
G = A more interesting work
H = A more challenging work
I = Good prospects for advancement
J = Recognition
K = Commendation for good work done
L = All of the above
N = None of the above

The scores were calculated on a weighted basis (see appendix A). The scores are then divided by the number of respondents. The scores are then divided by the number of respondents.
Based on the attained levels of satisfiers and dissatisfiers, the dissatisfaction level of the respondents is rather low as exhibited in category c of table IV. This is consistent with Herzberg's thesis that the presence of satisfiers such as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and prospects for advancement creates satisfaction in a job while dissatisfiers help retain employees. While among the satisfiers it is achievement which has a relatively low level, the only dissatisfier whose absence is pronounced is reward or pay but as can be discerned from other studies that have been done and cited earlier, dissatisfaction with pay does not necessarily lead to lack of job satisfaction in the presence of other factors. This holds true in this study where the pronounced dissatisfaction with reward has not been reflected in the job satisfaction level of the respondents.

The relative absence of reward/salary is further revealed in table VI and appendix A which show the factors which would most be preferred at the workplace.

**Table VI: Various factors as preferred in the workplace**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The scores are calculated on weighted basis (see appendix A supplement) from the percentage scores in appendix A. Key for the factors is same as for table V.*
When the percentage scores are used in absolute terms, the desire for more money ranks first (appendix A). When the scores are averaged out on a weighted basis, this factor ranks second only to working conditions (table VI). Both are, however, dissatisfiers and the only satisfier that ranks high is advancement which can be explained by its comparatively low score among the satisfiers as indicated in category c of table IV.

In their ranking of factors they would prefer most, the respondents rate pay and conditions of service highest among Herzberg's dissatisfiers as can be seen in the foregoing table. Notable among the satisfiers in this regard is advancement. This outcome is consistent with the view that pay is the basic component of a system of material incentives for government employees besides promotion or advancement. The high rating of advancement among factors that are preferred most in a job by trained personnel should therefore be seen in this context.

Advancement may be based on successive job ranks or on a system of post classification based on the nature of work in a particular post which may necessitate specific skills, hence the general merit and ability of an individual employee to perform the job, the level of that job within the organisation in terms of rank or pay notwithstanding. For

---

advancement based on successive ranks and therefore experience as gained on the lower ranks, trained skills tend to be downgraded in preference to the "orderly" elevation through the ranks. It is on this basis that one would understand the conditional requirement that an employee takes a certain number of years in a lower rank before he can advance to the next, a provision of the schemes of service referred to earlier.

These sort of arbitrary conditions actually work against advancement and satisfaction-oriented deployment because while an employee may possess the skills to perform duties and responsibilities of a post may be two or three ranks ahead of his, he would not be promoted to such a post because he will have not completed the minimum number of years required in the lower ranks. Inappropriate deployment as found in the study can partly be understood in this context. This sort of situation makes necessary Lippsett's thesis that avoidance of arbitrary rules is necessary to keep promotable workers who are likely to quit if their opportunities are blocked by rules such as those requiring a minimum number of years in a job before promotion can be considered.

It is therefore not surprising that job security which is a hygiene factor in Herzberg's model is the most important of the factors that have held the respondents onto their jobs according to table VII.

Table VII: Factors contributing to continued service*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospects for advancement</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of a better alternative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good relations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure income</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total number of responses is much greater than the number of respondents because multiple answers were allowed.
Though this is consistent with the model which posits that hygiene factors or dissatisfiers rather than satisfiers hold employees onto their jobs, the other factors which rank high is work itself which is not a prominent satisfier in the model, and the opportunities for training.

Since the presence of dissatisfiers, according to Herzberg's model, keep employees on their jobs but do not lead to job satisfaction, their absence drives out the employees. Of the dissatisfiers, however, it is only reward or pay that is conclusively lacking and which therefore would account for the turnover among trained personnel within the civil service. This would validate the thesis that if the trained personnel are to be retained within the civil service, considerable improvement must be made on reward system. Yet in the absence of a proper appraisal system, reward system within the civil service is closely tied to advancement through the successive job ranks.

But given the fact that even the level of job satisfaction is rather low, it becomes necessary not only to improve the dissatisfiers in order to retain the trained personnel within the civil service but also the satisfiers in order to raise the level of job satisfaction. Since within the rank-based system as found in the Kenya civil service improvement on such dissatisfiers like pay and conditions of service depends on advancement through the ranks, it is important to examine the circumstances surrounding this particular satisfier.

Attempts at improving advancement procedures may require a modification or removal of the arbitrary rules characterizing the various schemes of service which are the blue prints for advancement and to institute a proper and effective appraisal system for the civil service.
Besides, and particularly for the trained personnel, examination of the role of the PSC may also be necessary in view of the fact that the Act makes it responsible for confirming and translating appointments and acting appointments, authorizing promotions and retirements, and exercising disciplinary control over the civil service.¹⁴

As Ndegwa Report¹⁵ observes, however, it is not proper to leave such matters like recruitment, appointment, promotions and disciplinary actions to professionally unqualified commissioners. These vital management functions should be the role of the government's line managers. The arrangement is therefore a complicated one which may cause frustrations in vital personnel decisions. But this is found necessary because line managers may introduce bias in such decisions in the absence of a proper appraisal system.

Although PSC mostly goes by the recommendations of HoDs in determining promotions, it also follows closely the provisions of the schemes of service which guide it in the matter. Thus until an objective and effective appraisal system is evolved, the PSC seems best placed to determine promotion hence advancement so as to minimize such practices like favouritism and nepotism in promotions except that the schemes of service it uses for the purpose should be formulated in such a way as to allow it to handle promotions with less inflexibility, for example, in a case where an employee has acquired certain skills suitable for a higher position yet is still subjected to certain arbitrary provisions of his scheme of service.

Certain relationships impinging on advancement and deployment

It is necessary here to consider the relationship between the formulators of the schemes of service which are instrumental in advancement and those (the PSC in this case) determining promotion and therefore advancement within the civil service. The scheme of service is formulated at the DPM which has no role in promotions. It is then given to the PSC to use in determining promotions. In essence, PSC determines promotion on the basis of a document prepared elsewhere and therefore 'just ''imposed' on it.

At another level, the PSC determines promotions and yet has no role in training matters. It is the ministries and the DPM which determine and coordinate training matters and yet have no hand in promotions. This is a rather cumbersome relationship. But what it means is that PSC is unaware of who has been trained at what time until this is brought to its notice when the trained employee makes an application for a job advertised by it. This is a rather awkward way of recognizing trained skills by an institution which is responsible for overall advancement of government employees.

Even for the DPM, which controls and coordinates training within the civil service, it is apparent that it hardly goes beyond that function. For example, it does not effect a follow-up through ascertaining the way trained personnel are deployed in the various ministries. Besides, it seems it has no means to handle top civil servants who refuse to leave their desks and attend training courses. As Nyamu 16

---
notes when officers are selected for training, they individually write and say they are very busy and therefore cannot find the time and this is accepted as final apparently because DPM has no means to handle such refusals.

Advancement and proper deployment of trained personnel may also be affected by the government’s regulation that training is not for promotion but for performance improvement. It is important to realize, in this connection, that training which leads to promotion can in turn result in performance improvement which is the aim of the government’s training policy. An employee may be motivated to perform better when he is promoted after his training than when he is given no promotion despite the training. As it has been argued earlier promotion is a major incentive to greater efficiency.

The government’s position seems to be based on the thesis that training should be designed to lead to improved job performance and that it is excellence in performance which should in turn lead to advancement as propounded in the Wamalwa Report.¹⁷ Maybe this can apply well in the presence of an objective and effective appraisal system. But as noted in the same report, such position is still not accepted by a large part of the civil service, especially the lower and middle grade which holds the view that courses should lead to automatic promotion.

This probably explains why the government and the employees assess the need for training differently—the

former associating it with improved performance and
general efficiency, and the latter perceiving it largely
in terms of personal gain that can be derived from training,
that is, its potential value to the employees as individuals.

The employee's position is, however, supported by the
learning theories. Leslie and Lippitt, for example,
advocate the provision of reward after successful training.
Indeed, when there is a reward at the end of training, one
gets motivated to take the training and puts greater effort
at it. Often, for example, the youth are encouraged to
learn and they get motivated to do so because it connotes
reward, for example, a bright future in terms of securing
employment and earning money for improved welfare.
Training and post-training deployment should be conceived in
this context.

Finally, it is important to relate the foregoing
findings to the background of the respondents who comprised
the sample of the study. Though basically employees who had
had long-time training, it turned out, according to the
data, that they were mainly the middle level civil servants
in job groups F to M who have served for periods ranging
from three to twenty years. Within civil service context,

---

18 Leslie, E., and Gordon L. Lippitt, "Learning Theories
and Training," in Dorothy N. Opondo, The Problems Facing
the Training of Graduate Managers: A Kenyan Perspective
(Unpublished Independent Paper for MBA, University of
Nairobi), p. 42.
these comprise mostly the bottom of senior management or lower senior managers (groups K, L and M) and middle level managers (groups H and J) as Table VIII indicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table VIII: Status category of respondents*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower senior managers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level managers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior managers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some respondents did not give answers relating to this, hence the lower number.

It is also important to note that the respondents were overwhelmingly male who are married and relatively young in age (Table IX a, b and c).

Table IX a, b and c: Some demographic factors of the respondents

(a) Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 35 to 45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 45 to 55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(b) Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the above data (tables VIII and IX) does not directly impinge on the objectives of the study, its inclusion may be useful as a guide to any future study of a similar nature since it shows the sort of personnel who provided the data.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND
SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

SUMMARY

Turnover among trained personnel within the government is a real problem as evidenced in chapter I. The study was therefore undertaken to examine how deployment of this category of personnel can contribute to their job satisfaction in order to make such personnel remain within the government. Herzberg's model is applied to the study because it offers explanations as to what causes both satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the job and why an employee stays on or quits his job. Through the model, it was intended to measure the level of job satisfaction among trained personnel and the presence or absence of those factors that cause satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the job.

The objectives of the study as laid out in chapter I were basically to show whether post-training deployment within the government relates to identified training needs, to establish satisfaction level of the trained personnel in their post-training jobs, and to ascertain whether this contributes to a desire to quit or remain in government service.

Information regarding the subject of the study is quite abundant and this comprised the material in chapter II on relevant theories and previous findings of more or less similar undertakings elsewhere.

The approach of the study was through the questionnaire administered on the respondents on convenience sampling basis. Interviews were also sought from and granted by relevant personalities.
Through the questionnaire and the interviews, specific findings were discerned. First, the findings show that while both the government and the trained personnel perceive the need for training in terms of the improvement of performance and efficiency, the trained personnel also see the need for training in terms of such personal gains like promotion and improved rewards. Such personal gains like improved reward or pay and advancement are, however, the most lacking and according to Herzberg's model, the lack of the former as an important dissatisfier may explain why trained personnel quit government service.

The relative lack of advancement, on the other hand, and achievement—both satisfiers—may explain the rather low level of job satisfaction. Certain official regulations and procedures like the schemes of service were also found impinging on advancement as a factor of job satisfaction and therefore elaborated on.

On the basis of the findings and the backing theory detailed previously, it is appropriate that this study comes up with some succinct recommendations. These are found necessary if the deployment of trained personnel within the civil service is to result in their job satisfaction and are as follows:

1. The Kenya civil service should discard the rank-based system of promotion and adopt the duties classification system. This would allow those personnel with trained skills to occupy suitable positions within the civil service without having to “queue up” for advancement through the ranks.
2. Arbitrary rules and provisions which work against advancement of those who have acquired certain skills should be removed from the schemes of service.

3. The government should pay greater attention to advancement and proper deployment of trained personnel to make them have a feeling of achievement and a higher level of job satisfaction.

4. Herzberg's dissatisfiers like pay and terms and conditions of service should be improved in order to retain the trained personnel within government service.

5. There is a need to formulate an objective and effective appraisal system for the civil service.

6. The role of PSC in determining promotions for the trained personnel should be examined with a view to allowing the departments and the DPM which initiate and organize training courses a greater role in this. Otherwise the PSC, as the recruiting body for the government, should be more involved in training matters.

7. For its present role, the PSC should have a master roll for the trained personnel and the way they are deployed instead of waiting to know about this through applications for advertised jobs. The same should apply to the DPM which should then have a thorough follow-up to training undertakings.

8. DPM needs to be given statutory powers in order to effectively handle civil servants of all categories regarding training matters, and
9. All ministries should have qualified training officers to handle training matters for the departments instead of giving this role to the HoDs.

CONCLUSIONS

The application of Herzberg's model brought out results fairly consistent with past theory and findings. Specific dissatisfiers used are relations at work, salary or pay, and working conditions. In the study, however, job security came out as an important dissatisfier and, together with relations at work, seems to account for continued service among trained personnel due to their remarkable presence in the job. On the other hand, the other lacking dissatisfiers, notably pay and terms and conditions of service, account for the turnover of the personnel.

The satisfiers are important to the study because as elaborated in some findings in chapter II, employees can continue on their jobs if they like it, that is, if they associate it with satisfiers, despite the feeling of inadequacy of such dissatisfiers like pay.

In this case, however, job satisfaction level as recorded is only moderate due to low level of achievement and advancement—two important satisfiers. The former is apparently a result of inappropriate deployment and the latter, of the

---

1 Herzberg's models proposition is that dissatisfiers hold employees onto their jobs but do not lead to job satisfaction while their absence makes employees leave the organisation. See, for example, Graham, R.J., Human Resources Management, 2nd ed. (Estover, Plymouth, Macdonald and Evans, 1979), p. 19.

2 See, for example, p. 34.
regulation that training is not for promotion and therefore advancement thus subjecting trained personnel to the terms of the schemes of service which regulate advancement and makes it uniform regardless of the effort one makes to attain skills through training.

The government perceives the need for training its employees mainly in terms of performance improvement to the neglect of rewards that should go with such training. The employees, on the other hand, regard highly the gains they would derive from it as individuals. It is therefore necessary that the government synchronizes its perception of training need with that of the employees and then institute a proper performance appraisal system through which working skills gained by employees through training can be assessed. Otherwise it should inject specific incentives to training undertakings.

Because it is not decisively clear whether trained personnel are satisfied in their job, their turnover can only be dependent on the influence of the lacking dissatisfiers such as pay and the terms and conditions of service. But since in the rank-based system of promotion improvement on these depends on advancement, the relative lack of this satisfier also contributes to the turnover. It can therefore be argued that Herzberg's satisfiers may not only contribute to job satisfaction but may also result in job dissatisfaction depending on the way they are related to the dissatisfiers.

---

3The condition seems to attain because while other satisfiers are present in the job, two-achievement and advancement— are relatively lacking.
The way the trained personnel are deployed therefore affect their job satisfaction if the positions in which they are deployed do not provide them with the feeling of achievement and allow them the opportunity to advance.

It is pertinent to mention here that this study faced certain problems that should be brought up and which it is advisable to take note of in any future study of a similar nature.

Encountered problems

First and foremost was the problem of time and money which forced the narrowing down of the study considerably. If not for these, it might have been possible to cover the civil service more widely in the study.

Secondly, the difficulty in obtaining a clear sample frame necessitated the use of convenience sampling procedure. If a sample frame was readily available, random sampling techniques could have been adopted to make the study more applicable to the civil service as a whole.

Lastly, certain sources of data were found fairly difficult to penetrate. Many people still treat a researcher with a lot of unjustified suspicion. Some simply have a negative attitude towards the whole idea of research. It so happens, unfortunately, that some of these people are those in possession of valuable data.

In addition to it is important to examine how such one...

Such negative attitude towards research is definitely due to the lack of appreciation of the value of research not necessarily to the individual himself but to the wider society. The reversal of this sort of situation would be of great contribution to research effort. Maybe the conditions
necessary for people especially in the developing environment like Kenya to appreciate the value of research can be in itself an area worth investigating.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

The study undertaken here represents an effort towards the determination of the nature of deployment of trained personnel and the sort of job satisfaction they derive from such deployment. The major concern was the question, what would inspire the trained employees within the civil service not only to achieve results that are above the average but also to continue serving within the civil service?—a subject that has created considerable concern within civil service circles as evidenced in chapter I and parts of chapter II.

From the study, it came out clearly that though the government as an employer trains its employees well, its policy is that training is not a certificate for promotion or any immediate reward. For the employees, however, training is viewed as a personal gain and post-training rewards are therefore expected. It may, therefore, be of value to investigate whether such difference in perceiving training affects the performance of trained personnel after their training. It is necessary to determine whether the performance of those trained improves in any way without immediate incentives.

In addition, it is important to examine how such performance is evaluated in the absence of a proper performance appraisal system. Related to this, it is worthwhile looking at the necessary conditions for setting up an effective appraisal system for the civil service.
In the study, achievement and advancement as satisfiers rated relatively low. This evidently affects the job satisfaction level of trained personnel which is also just moderate. It may therefore be of importance if the factors that make trained personnel or government employees as such have a feeling of achievement are investigated. Also, it is necessary to look at the system of advancement and of material incentives in general within the civil service. Specifically, particular interest should be directed towards the effect of the schemes of service as blue prints for career planning and advancement. Since the rank-based system of promotion affects advancement as a variable of job satisfaction, it is also important to study the effect of this sort of system on the application of trained skills.

Though rather unrelated to the subject of the study, one important point came up during the interviews conducted. Having dedicated their working lives to government service, how should such government employees (both trained and untrained) be utilized after their retirement? This consideration is a factor which may actually contribute to increased job satisfaction among government employees if they know that at their retirement, they will not simply be told to take their benefits and go back to the land so that they give room to the younger employees. This consideration can be an important future dimension of job satisfaction among employees, especially those with trained skills.
## APPENDIX A

### VARIOUS FACTORS AS PERCEIVED IN THE WORKPLACE (IN ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual facing percentage score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*First row shows priority rating, second last row total score for all the factors for each priority rating, and last row full percentage corresponding to the total score. First column represents the various factors and all the other figures in the table are percentage scores for each individual factor as calculated from the total score. Horizontal reading rates a simple factor according to each priority. Vertical reading rates all the factors comparatively according to each priority such that under priority 1, for example, P is most preferred and under the last priority - 11, A loads, implying it is the least preferred among the factors. Key for the factors is same as for table 1, page 51.*
### APPENDIX A

**VARIOUS FACTORS AS PREFERRED IN THE WORKPLACE (IN ABSOLUTE TERMS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority rating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score**

| 62 | 55 | 56 | 54 | 52 | 56 | 53 | 51 | 53 | 51 | 38 |

| %  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

**Individual factor percentage score**

*First row shows priority rating, second last row total score for all the factors for each priority rating, and last row full percentage corresponding to the total score. First column represents the various factors and all the other figures in the table are percentage scores for each individual factor as calculated from the total score. Horizontal reading rates a single factor according to each priority. Vertical reading rates all the factors comparatively according to each priority such that under priority I, for example, B is most preferred and under the last priority - II, A leads, implying it is the least preferred among the factors. Key for the factors is same as for table V, page 54.*
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**SUPPLEMENT TO APPENDIX A**

WEIGHTED SCORES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Rating</th>
<th>First Three Factors</th>
<th>Weight Assigned to each factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B,H</td>
<td>D,I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>F,J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A,J</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resulting score for each factor:

A: 2 + 2 + 1 = 5
B: 11 + 10 + 6 + 2 = 29
C: 10 + 8 + 7 + 7 = 32
D: 9 + 5 + 5 + 2 = 21
E: 8 + 7 + 8 + 4 = 27
F: 5 + 3 + 3 = 11
G: 5 + 2 + 1 = 8
H: 9 + 6 + 2 = 17
I: 9 + 6 + 6 + 4 = 25
J: 5 + 3 + 2 + 2 = 12
K: 3 + 4 + 3 + 1 = 11
Weights are assigned according to priority rating determined by percentage scores in appendix A. The first of the three factors with highest percentage scores under priority I is assigned a weight of 10, while the first of the three factors with highest percentage scores under priority II—the last priority—a weight of 1. The weights drop by 1 from one level of priority rating to the other and also between the three factors weighted under each priority. Only up to three factors are weighted under each priority since going beyond this may not make any significant difference. As an example, only B, C, and D with the highest percentage scores under priority I are assigned weights of 11, 10, and 9, the same applying in all cases except with decreasing weighting. The weights for each factor are then added to obtain the total score. Key for the factors is the same as for table V, page 54.

2. What could you say about post-training deployment within the government?

3. Did you expect to do the job you were assigned after your training?
   Yes (Go to q.6)
   No

4. Did you desire a transfer to a different position after your training?

5. Were you transferred to your desired position?
   Yes
   No
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please note that the questionnaire refers to the last training undertaken lasting for a period of nine months or longer.

There are three categories of questions. Please complete the questions according to instructions that precede each category.

CATEGORY A

For the following questions, either a straight answer is appropriate or in cases where alternative answers are provided please place a tick (✓) against only one that suits you best.

1. How do you view government training policy?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

2. What would you say about post-training deployment within the government?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

3. Did you expect to do the job you were assigned after your training?

Yes (Go to Q.6)

No

4. Did you desire a transfer to a different position after your training?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

5.Were you transferred to your desired position?

Yes

No
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6. Did you expect promotion after your training?
   Yes __________________________
   No __________________________
   (Go to q.8)

7. Did you get one within the expected time?
   Yes __________________________
   No __________________________

8. Had you been longing to go for any kind of training?
   Yes __________________________
   No __________________________

9. How did you receive the decision that you had been selected for training?
   Happily _________________________
   Unhappily _________________________
   Indifferently _________________________

10. Were you a party to your selection for training?
    Yes __________________________
    No __________________________

11. Had you been aware of any deficiency in your work which made you require training?
    Yes __________________________
    No __________________________

12. Why did you accept to go for training?
    Was merely directed __________________________
    Provided a good break from work __________________________
    Improve my performance __________________________
    Expand my knowledge __________________________
    Make me more flexible __________________________
    Other (Specify) __________________________
    ____________________________________________
    ____________________________________________
13. How relevant was the training to your work?
   Very relevant ____________________________
   Relevant ____________________________
   Somehow relevant ____________________________
   Irrelevant ____________________________
   Very irrelevant ____________________________

14. How long did the training last?
   Under 1 year ____________________________
   1 to 2 years ____________________________
   Over 2 to 3 years ____________________________
   Over 3 years ____________________________

15. How long is it since you ended the training?
   Under 1 year ____________________________
   1 to 2 years ____________________________
   Over 2 to 3 years ____________________________
   Over 3 years ____________________________

16. How many training courses have you attended since you were employed?
   One ____________________________
   Two ____________________________
   Three ____________________________
   More than three ____________________________

17. List three things you like best about your job.
   1. ____________________________
   2. ____________________________
   3. ____________________________

18. List three things you like least about your job.
   1. ____________________________
   2. ____________________________
   3. ____________________________
**CATEGORY B**

For each of the following statements, please indicate by putting a tick (✓) in the appropriate column according to the following key:

- **SA** if you strongly agree with the statement,
- **A** if you merely agree with the statement,
- **I** if you are indifferent about the statement,
- **D** if you simply disagree, and
- **SD** if you strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Training provides a good break from work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Training helps one improve his/her performance at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Training helps one expand his/her knowledge considerably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is important that senior officers attend training often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Training need not be necessarily relevant to one’s work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I often apply in my work what I learnt during my training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Training contributes more to long-term potential than to present performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The training I underwent provided me with greater work dexterity than I had before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I now feel I can survive better in the constantly changing environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Therefore even if I am not rewarded at work I feel satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I would have preferred a transfer to a position where I could apply better the skills I learnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I do not do my work any better than I used to do before the training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I am not valued any better within my department than I was before the training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My superiors do not value my achievements at work any more than they did before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. My superiors do not accord me due recognition for any achievement at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. They have negative inclination to the skills I acquired during the training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I am not charged with any important responsibilities in my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I do perform my duties with least interference from my superiors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The work I do have more interesting facets than boring ones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I like more facets of my work than I dislike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. My boss takes keen interest in the sort of work I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My relations with my superiors are very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. My relations with my peers are also very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. My superiors have provided a conducive environment within which I can effectively apply my learned skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The path of advancement in my job is very clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. There are good opportunities for growth in my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. My superiors are very interested in my advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. They would assist me advance fast on my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I feel I should be rewarded better for the work I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. There should be a deliberate scheme to reward trained personnel for the effort they make</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I am not satisfied with the salary I receive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. My salary is not a proper compensation for the effort I make</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. If rewards such as promotion, salary increase, etc., are improved, I would stick to my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I am not happy with the working conditions of my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. I do not feel satisfied with my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. I do not rate the government as good employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I would therefore leave when a better opportunity arises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATEGORY C**

For the following questions, please answer as appropriately as you can.

56. In order of preference, from 1 to last, please indicate against each of the following which you would prefer most at your workplace.

A. High status
B. More money
C. Better working conditions
D. Good relations at work
E. Better job security
F. More responsibility
G. A more interesting work
H. A more challenging work
I. Good prospects for advancement
J. Recognition
K. Commendation for good work done
57. Please circle which of the listed factors in question 56 characterize your work. (Letters correspond to the factors as in question 56):

NONE A B C D E F G H I J K ALL

58. List three factors that have made you stick to government employment.

1. ___________________________
2. ___________________________
3. ___________________________

59. (a) Year of employment __________________________
(b) Designation:
   (i) at the time of employment __________________________
   (ii) before training __________________________
   (iii) now __________________________

(c) Job group:
   (i) at the time of employment __________________________
   (ii) before training __________________________
   (iii) now __________________________

(d) Age:
   (i) under 25 __________________________
   (ii) 25 to 35 __________________________
   (iii) Over 35 to 45 __________________________
   (iv) Over 45 to 55 __________________________

(e) Marital Status:
   (i) Single __________________________
   (ii) Married __________________________
   (iii) Separated __________________________
   (iv) Divorced __________________________
   (v) Widowed __________________________
60. Finally, do you have any observations or comments to make arising from any aspect of this questionnaire or the subject matter in general? You may do so in the space below/opposite.

MBA Office,
Faculty of Commerce,
University of Nairobi

1st September, 1988

Dear Respondent,

Survey Questionnaire

I am a postgraduate student in the Faculty of Commerce, University of Nairobi, and for a study I am doing within certain sections of the government on the relation between post-training deployment and attitude towards the job, I have attached a questionnaire for your kind assistance.

Please rest assured that the information received will be treated confidentially.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
SUPPLEMENT TO APPENDIX B
LETTER TO RESPONDENTS (ATTACHED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE)

MBA Office,
Faculty of Commerce,
University of Nairobi,

1st September, 1983.

Dear Respondent,

Survey Questionnaire

I am a postgraduate student in the Faculty of Commerce, University of Nairobi, and for a study I am doing within certain sections of the government on the relation between post-training deployment and attitude towards the job, I have attached a questionnaire for your kind completion.

Please rest assured that the information received will be treated confidentially.

Yours sincerely,

E.O. MUDUDA
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW GUIDELINE WITH RELEVANT GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

(SEPTEMBER, 1983)

I wish to know something about your training policy vis a vis the deployment and utilization of your trained staff. I shall therefore be grateful if you would give answers/comments to the questions/statements below:

1. Do you have a defined training policy?
2. Do you as a ministry/department have full control over it or you depend on DPM's guidance on the matter? In either case, how do you relate to the DPM on training matters?
3. How do you determine training needs for your staff?
4. How do you go about selecting those to go for training?
5. How do you determine how and where they have to take such training?
6. What does the department/ministry intend to achieve by sending its employees for training?
7. How do you evaluate the value of training that your staff receives?
8. Do you ascertain how well your staff who have undergone training are doing in their jobs—whether there is a remarkable improvement from pre-training performance?
9. Do even senior officers of the department/ministry also go for training?
10. Do you experience resistance to training from any cadre of the department's/ministry's staff?—If so, why do you think there is such resistance?
11. Does training attract any benefits/rewards such as promotion, salary increase for an individual officer?
12. Does the department/ministry accord recognition to an officer who has successfully completed training by, for example, giving him/her higher/increased responsibility?

13. For those officers who might have had training and then left the department/ministry, what have been their reasons for leaving, if you may know?

14. Can you give suggestions that may help in the retention of such staff?

15. According to the 1972 Wamalwa report on training, a difficulty that management courses encounter is that participants do not introduce major changes in operational procedures. As the major purpose of these courses is to introduce participants to these new techniques, the result is frustration. For example, officers are taught about management by objectives (MBO), but, on return to their duties, have to continue operating on the established order of "management by crisis"; an accountant goes for training and acquires new accounting techniques, but, on return, his boss who has a predilection for old techniques would not hear about the new techniques he brings along. How would you overcome such a problem? Would the boss probably be made to go for training himself so that he gets to appreciate the new techniques?

16. Wamalwa report again suggests that all managers, including those at the very top, need from time to time to get away from their desks, to recharge their batteries, to gain new insights, to learn about new techniques, to improve their all round knowledge. If this was done, the problem in 15 probably may not arise. What do you say?
17. Though the report lays stress on the role of training in improving work efficiency, it notes that no amount of training is likely to achieve this efficiency unless the climate of the organisation in which the work is undertaken is such as to stimulate and encourage efficiency in the organisation as a whole. This calls for such steps as Organisation Development (OD) advocated in the Ndegewa report of 1971. What in your view has been done about this within the civil service?

18. The view that training courses lead to promotion is widely held. How do you handle expectations of your trained staff in this regard?

19. What would you suggest about the roles of the Central Government Postings Committee and the PSC as regards deployment and utilization of personnel?

20. There are the motivation/job satisfaction theories that are variously used by managers in their organisations. Do you apply such theories within your department/ministry? Otherwise how do you try to motivate your staff? / Make sure your staff derive satisfaction from the jobs they do.

21. Being the organisation in charge of appointments, promotions, etc., how does PSC consider skills and qualifications acquired by an individual employee through training for the purpose of appropriate deployment?

22. In career development plan, some countries do not go by job groups but by responsibilities attaining in and skills required for a job. Do you think this facilitates a better career advancement?
23. Do you think career advancement within the civil service can be improved by instituting frequent training procedures and examinations to replace mandatory periods one has to take in a certain job group as a way of determining eligibility for promotion?
### APPENDIX D

**COMPLETED SCHEMES OF SERVICE AS AT 1st JULY, 1983**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme For</th>
<th>Effective Date of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Para-Medical and Auxilliary Personnel</td>
<td>1/1/72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Laboratory Technicians/Technologists</td>
<td>1/4/72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hansard Reporters and Editors</td>
<td>1/7/72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Technical Assistants and Technical Officers (Ministry of Agriculture)</td>
<td>2/4/73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clerical Cadre</td>
<td>1/4/73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personnel Officers</td>
<td>1/4/73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fingerprint Assistants and Fingerprint Officers</td>
<td>1/7/73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Technical and Professional Forest Officers</td>
<td>1/4/74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Administrative Officers (Provincial Administration)</td>
<td>1/4/74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Planning Officers and Economists/Statisticians</td>
<td>17/10/68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td>(1/1/75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Appointment of Drivers</td>
<td>1/3/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Income Tax Officers</td>
<td>1/4/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Library Assistants and Librarians</td>
<td>1/1/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Medical Records Officers</td>
<td>1/7/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Supplies Cadres</td>
<td>1/7/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Telephone Operators and Supervisors</td>
<td>1/1/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Data Machine Operators and Supervisors</td>
<td>1/1/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Weights and Measures Officers</td>
<td>1/4/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Hospital Secretaries</td>
<td>1/4/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Labour and Employment Officers and Inspectors of Factories</td>
<td>1/7/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Social Development Officers</td>
<td>1/10/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Information Officers, Producers, Film Officers, Technical Staff and Lecturers (KIMC)</td>
<td>1/1/81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scheme for  

Effective date of Implementation

23. Customs Personnel, Customs and Excise ...... 1/4/81
24. Cooperative Officers and Cooperative Lecturers, 1/10/78
    Revised .................................................. (1/10/81)
25. Secretarial staff ......................................... 1/5/77
    Revised .................................................. (1/1/83)
26. Professional Engineers ............................... 1/1/82
27. Architects and Quantity Surveyors .............. 1/1/82
28. Medical Practitioners and Dentists ............. 1/1/82
29. Accountants ............................................. 1/4/73
    Revised .................................................. (1/1/82)
30. Immigration Officers ................................. 1/1/83

Source: DPM

This definition is consistent with the way the term is used in this study to mean in-service formal instruction given to the employee to bolster his skills and make him put to good performance in his job.


APPENDIX E

DEFINITION OF CERTAIN KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS

Deployment:

Deployment, like strategy and other concepts, is a term that has been borrowed from military science where it refers to an arrangement that spreads out the units to form a wider front of narrow depth so that the units operate more or less together and in relation to one another.

As an operational definition, however, the term is used to mean the fitting of officers of various classes and grades to the various units (departments) that form the civil service. On this basis, officers are fitted in those departments and jobs in which they can perform best.

Training

Normally, training means directing one to obtain some skill in a specific area, that is, the act or process of making a person fit to perform certain tasks. According to Staley, it is instruction or learning given with a view to improve performance of certain given tasks forming a job or occupation.

This definition is consistent with the way the term is used in this study to mean in-service formal instruction given to the employee to better his skills and make him put up good performance in his job.

Training Need

This has been defined as the balance between the demands of the job and the employee’s existing ability to do the job. If such a balance shows a deficiency then training need arises. It is therefore geared towards improving job performance and it is this definition that is adopted for this study.

Trained Personnel

This refers to employees who have undergone instructional courses in specific areas either relevant or irrelevant to their jobs. For the purpose of this paper, however, it precludes those that have taken courses of less than nine months.

Job Satisfaction

According to Victor Vroom, job satisfaction is the "positive orientation of an individual towards the work role which he is presently occupying." This definition, according to Mumford, can be paraphrased as "an individual liking more aspects of his work than he dislikes."

The concept is therefore used to refer to work conditions that fulfil the needs, expectations, wishes or desires of an employee and make him develop a liking and an attachment to his job.

---

3 See Okidi, J.K., Address to Annual Provincial Water Engineers/Officers Conference on Training. (Maji House, Nairobi, 1981).


5 Mumford, Enid, Job Satisfaction, ibid., p. 63
Protestant Ethic

This concept refers to the belief that hard work brings reward and that occupational advancement brings prestige as applied in the study.
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