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ABSTRACT

One of the practices in post-primary schools of Leribe is teacher movement between schools (Teacher Mobility). This study was intended to determine factors influencing teacher mobility in Leribe post-primary schools in Lesotho.

Random sampling of heads of department, teachers (transferred and not transferred), and parent representatives was carried out from the target population of all heads of departments, all teachers in different categories, head teachers, deputy head teachers, education officers and parents representatives in the Leribe district. Samples were made up 18 head teachers and 18 deputy head teachers, 36 heads of department, 144 teachers (72 transferred and 72 not transferred), 36 parent representatives and 8 education officers. Two leaders of teachers unions were part of the sample.

The study used both quantitative and qualitative research techniques in collecting data. Questionnaires were used to collect data from head teachers, deputy head teachers, and heads of department, teachers and parent representatives. Education officers and leaders of teachers unions were personally interviewed because they were fewer in number.

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data and the following results were revealed by the study:

- The lack of facilities in schools and poor management of schools contributed to teacher mobility in the Leribe district.
- Teachers' preference of teaching near home and teaching in schools situated in urban areas.
- Unsatisfied teachers' needs and interests, lack of grants in schools and teachers' preference of teaching in better performing schools in examinations.
- Lack of co-operation among teachers themselves and between teachers and administration.
- The remaining teachers were negatively affected because of high teaching overloads.
Disorganization of schools plans
- Students' academic performance was negatively affected.
- Respondents were aware of teacher mobility, however, they could not determine the extent at which it was happening.

Suggestions by the respondents to address teacher mobility were as follows:
- Teachers must be involved in the affairs of the school and provision of equal facilities by stakeholders in all schools.
- Meeting teachers' needs and interests and creation of good working relationships in schools.
- Review of policies and rules in relation to teachers' transfers.

From the findings it was noted that several factors contributed to teacher movements between schools in Lesotho and more particularly in the Leribe district. Teacher transfers were exacerbated by the teaching service regulation on transfer which allowed teachers to transfer to other schools whenever they deemed necessary.

Recommendation for further research was that, research could be undertaken using a more qualitative approach in order to get in-depth information from the respondents. The further study could also be undertaken involving more than one district in the country to determine factors influencing teacher mobility in schools which the present might not have accomplished.
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DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purposes of this study, the terms shown below will be used as defined.

1. Post-Primary Schools
   These are junior and senior secondary schools in Lesotho. They are called Secondary and High Schools in Lesotho.

2. Teacher Mobility
   This term refers to the practice of moving or transferring from one school to another by teachers in post primary schools.

3. Transferred Teachers
   These are teachers who have transferred or moved from their schools of first posting to other schools.

4. Not Transferred Teachers
   These are teachers who have never transferred or moved from one school to another since their first school posting.

5. Teacher Turnover
   This refers to teachers who leave their jobs in schools and are replaced over a given period of time.
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CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background to the study. The study focuses on teachers who voluntarily transfer or move from one post-primary school to another in the Leribe district, Lesotho. The chapter begins with a brief historical background of education in Lesotho. There is also an overview of teacher mobility in Lesotho and the importance of teachers in education. This is followed by the description of the research problem and the theoretical framework informing the study. The rationale and significance of the study followed by the organization of the study report are the last sections to be presented in the chapter.

1.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF EDUCATION IN LESOTHO

1.2.1 Traditional Sesotho Education

In 1800 before European influences filtered through to the Basotho nation, education was already established among the Basotho. Learning was informal and practical in nature, the youth had to demonstrate what was learnt practically at home and in the fields. This was done to examine whether learning had indeed taken place. Formal learning among the Basotho took place at initiation schools where boys and girls were separately taught cultural values and philosophy. Initiation schoolteachers were local leaders, and wise elders of the community. The youth were taught about the roles they were expected by the society to play. Traditional education continues to exist even today among the Basotho, though on a limited scale compared to the past (Education Sector Survey: Report of the Task Force, 1982:18). Even though traditional education was strongly established among the Basotho, the coming of the missionaries in 1833 brought significant changes in education.
1.2.2 Mission Schools

Missionaries of the Paris Evangelical Society (PEMS) established formal schools in Lesotho in 1838. These schools were meant for bible teachings, literacy and numeracy for members of the church. Since that time, every church that came to Lesotho established schools to instruct its followers. This explains the present situation where most schools, both primary and secondary, belong to the churches. The administration of schools therefore, has always been the responsibility of the churches. Furthermore, churches established their own small denominational teacher training institutions to train teachers for the schools of their denomination. These churches are the Lesotho Evangelical church (LEC), the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) and the Anglican Church of Lesotho (ACL). Churches were responsible for the employment, transfer, promotion and dismissal of teachers (Education Sector Survey: Report of the Task Force, 1982:18).

Administration of schools under churches has always been poor because managers of schools are based in church parishes where they have other duties to perform like pastoral duties. To make things worse, in most cases these managers are neither professionals nor educators. Consequently, managers devote themselves inadequately to the problems of their schools (Education Sector Survey: Report of the Task Force, 1982:18). This necessitated the establishment of the Task Force to look at the education system of Lesotho.

1.2.3 Problems of education in Lesotho

The Task Force Report identified several problems within the education system of Lesotho. The report also indicated that these problems needed immediate attention. Some of these problems are:

- Quality. The Task Force revealed that the quality of education was declining. This was clearly shown by the poor performance of secondary and high schools.
• Relevance. It was argued that the type of education provided was irrelevant to the needs of Basotho. Emphasis was placed on the need for the provision of vocational and technical education.

• Organization. Although there is partnership between the church and government in the administration of schools, there is an uncertainty of accountability. It was not clear as to who was accountable for certain aspects of education.

• Government. There must be full government participation in the education system. The proprietors alone could not adequately support education, especially in financing it. Government intervention was necessary to support and develop what the proprietors of schools have already done.

• Costs. Costs of education in schools were not the same especially in the post-primary sector. There was a question of uniformity in charging fees in schools. The managers and school governing bodies could not account for these high costs. (Ministry of Education, The Education Sector Survey: Report of the Task Force, 1982: 12).

1.2.4 The Task Force Report Contribution to the Educational System of Lesotho

In 1978, there was a National Education Dialogue that was meant to look at the problems of education in Lesotho. This dialogue recommended the formation of the Education Sector Survey Task Force to look more deeply into the problems facing the educational system of Lesotho. The Task Force was established in 1980 and was meant to:

• identify and clarify the major problems and goals of Lesotho’s education system in the context of the country’s national development;

• review the curricula and structure of the formal and non-formal sectors of the education system in terms of national development;

• examine the organization of education with particular attention to the responsibility and roles of the government and the church missions in the management of schools;
• explore potential improvements in such areas as the construction and use of facilities, the production and use of instructional materials, and the use of radio and other mass media that would improve the efficiency and/or relevance of the education system;

• examine the distribution of education opportunities and resources in relation to demographic trends and Lesotho’s development needs;

• analyze the financing and cost of education in relation to overall economic trends; and

• propose policies, objectives and strategies for the improvement of the education system.

• The proposals are to be phased and costed and related to the country’s overall long-term development strategies.


The policies and strategies proposed by the Task Force for the development of the education system of Lesotho have proved to be invaluable. Many developments have taken place including the organization of the education system, improvements in primary school infrastructure and the provision of free primary education, to name a few. Nevertheless, there are still problems within the education system of Lesotho.

1.3 EDUCATION IN POST-PRIMARY SCHOOLS

1.3.1 OVERVIEW OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

Post-primary school education refers to education after the completion of primary education of seven years’ duration. After these seven years, students graduate to secondary education which is divided into two levels, junior and senior secondary. Junior secondary begins in Form A and progresses to Form C; senior secondary is from Form D to Form E. Students graduating in junior secondary obtain a Junior Certificate (J.C.), and students graduating in senior secondary obtain a Cambridge Overseas School Certificate (C.O.S.C.). Post-primary schools education is of five years duration in Lesotho and
prepares students for tertiary education (Report of Task force, 1982; Schorn and Blair, 1982).

1.3.2 AIMS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

In order to fulfill its responsibility of providing education to the nation, the Ministry of Education (MOE) in Lesotho intends to achieve the following objectives which include: determining education sector needs and providing adequate facilities to the secondary sector. Other objectives include funding people who intend furthering their studies; recruiting and retaining the best qualified teachers in the secondary sector; monitoring teachers' performance in schools and ensuring an adequate and balanced supply of qualified people.

1.3.3 AGE GROUP OF STUDENTS IN SECONDARY EDUCATION

Students graduate from the basic primary education after twelve years of age. Secondary education begins when they are thirteen years. After completion of junior secondary, students proceed to senior secondary education, which takes two years to complete. After graduating from senior secondary school, students may proceed to tertiary education. Secondary education is of five years duration from when students are thirteen years to seventeen years (Education Statistics, 1999).

1.3.4 STAKEHOLDERS IN SECONDARY EDUCATION

The management of education in Lesotho is in the hands of three partners: the government, the churches and the local community. This partnership lacks clear roles and lines of demarcation as to who is responsible for what. These problems have been addressed by the MOE through holding workshops for stakeholders and there are now regulations stating responsibilities for the stakeholders in secondary education (Education Sector Development Plan, 1996).
Training programmes have been established to equip the stakeholders with management skills in order to carry out roles they are to play in the management of education in Lesotho. Different stakeholders in post-primary education include School Boards, the MOE, Educational Secretaries and Supervisors of Government schools as well as teachers (Education Sector Development Plan, 1996). Post-primary schools have School Boards or School management Committees appointed by the proprietor of the school. The School Board is composed of two representatives of the proprietor, of whom one is a chairman; three members of the community served by the school, one of whom is selected as a vice-chairperson, and these are elected by parents of the pupils admitted in that school; one representative of teachers, who is elected by teachers who teach in that school; a chief of the area where the school is situated or his representative; a principal of the relevant school who shall be the secretary of the School Board (Government Gazette Extraordinary, 1995).

1.3.5 ROLES OF DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS IN POST-PRIMARY EDUCATION IN LESOTHO

1.3.5.1 The School Board

The School Board is responsible for the supervision of schools that are under its control, takes responsibility for the school management, ensures proper and efficient running of the school, and recommends to the Educational Secretary or Supervisor, the appointment, discipline, transfer, removal from office of a teacher other than a teacher whose salary is paid by the government. Further, on the advice of the District Education Officer, the School Board recommends to the Educational Secretary, the promotion or demotion of a teacher other than a teacher whose salary is paid by the Government (Government Gazette Extraordinary, 1995).

1.3.5.2 Educational Secretaries

The proprietor (church) appoints an Educational Secretary who will be approved by the MOE. This secretary is responsible for (a) organizing, co-ordinating and supervising the
educational work of the proprietor that appointed him; (b) liaising with the Ministry responsible for education on matters of management of schools; and (c) perform such other duties as may be assigned to him by the Minister (Government Gazette Extraordinary, 1995).

1.3.5.3 Supervision of Government Schools

There are church schools and government schools in Lesotho. However, the majority of schools both primary and secondary belong to the churches. The supervisor is responsible for supervising the administration of government schools and other schools which the Minister may place in his charge.

1.3.5.4 Ministry of Education (MOE)

The MOE is the umbrella body in educational matters together with its different departments. The MOE has been established with the purpose of developing and managing education at all levels so as to improve human resources responsible for the economic, social and cultural development of Lesotho (Annual Report, 1991). The MOE is responsible for the development of policies for the education sector, identifying education sector needs and ensuring the availability of educational opportunities.

School Boards, Educational Secretaries, Supervisors of Government schools and the MOE work towards improving education in schools. The intention of the education policy is such that there should be proper school administration for effective examination results and overall school efficiency. The education Sector Development Plan, (1996:101) indicates, “Weak administration and management have consistently been identified as contributing to poor school quality...”

1.4 TEACHER MOBILITY IN LESOTHO

Lesotho gained its independence from Great Britain in 1966, and after that there were several developments within the education system such as the increasing number of schools and growth in school enrolments. The provision of education by churches and the
exclusion of direct government control encouraged a spirit of competition among churches. This was an unacceptable situation because many schools were established without planning. This rapid increase in the number of schools throughout the country exacerbated teacher transfers in the sense that teachers wanted to move to better placed schools. This marked the beginning of teacher mobility in Lesotho. Consequently, administrative problems developed because there was more work to be shouldered by the churches (Education Sector Survey: Report of the Task Force, 1982:4).

Being aware of administrative problems in schools, the government formed partnerships with the churches to organize the administration of education. The Ministry of Education (MOE) in collaboration with the churches through the Teaching Service Department (TSD) formulated the Teaching Service Regulations. The regulation on teacher transfers allows teachers to transfer from one school to another if they deem it necessary to do so (Teaching Service Regulations, 1986:669). Consequently, as observed by the researcher, voluntary teacher transfers have become a common practice mostly in the post-primary schools of Lesotho. The MOE, in an attempt to check on teacher transfers, instructed the Principal Secretary for Education to register the names of teachers and their qualifications in each school. This exercise was aimed at informing the Ministry on the common practice of teachers' transfers from one school to another. The Ministry would be informed of teachers who were no longer in their former schools (The Education Bill, 1995:50).

In spite of this attempt at monitoring by the MOE, teachers in post-primary schools continue to transfer to schools of their own choice within the country. This practice has brought educational inequalities where other schools are overstaffed, mostly with experienced teachers and others less staffed especially with inexperienced teachers. It is important for schools to be adequately staffed because teachers are vital in the provision of education.
1.4.1 IMPORTANCE OF TEACHERS IN EDUCATION

The importance of teachers in the educational system of any country cannot be overemphasized. Hargreaves (1994) has pointed out that the most important person contributing towards the well being of schools, and who can bring a significant change in education, is the teacher. Anderson is of the same opinion when saying that, "teachers have been identified as the schooling factor most likely to influence the quality of education which is why in excess of 80% of national education budgets in developing countries are expended on teacher provision and employment" (Anderson, in Williams, 1998:7). This is usually the case in developing countries where sometimes teachers are the only resource available in schools. It is through teachers that a curriculum is developed, interpreted and implemented in schools. Teachers' thoughts, beliefs and their interaction with the pupils in the classroom, model and shape pupils' learning (Hargreaves, 1994).

Goodson, highlighting the importance of teachers in the curriculum asserts, "the teacher is the key factor to the intentions of students who have their own ideas about the curriculum. It is the teacher who is representative of society's interest in the education of its youth" (Goodson in Biddle, Good and Goodson, 1997: 1186). For most of the time, it has been the teachers' work to prepare the youth for the roles they are to play as citizens in their society (Anglin, Goldman and Anglin, 1982).

It is of paramount importance for schools to retain their good teachers. This is important due to the fact that the students are used to the teachers and vice versa. The teachers themselves are used to one another and can work together to help each other. The administration of the school is also familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of its teaching force. It goes without saying therefore that, if teachers come and go, problems may emanate and affect the on-going plans of the school. Halliday & Hogan, put emphasis on "retaining the investment in teaching staff, particularly in optimizing the deployment and utilization of the teaching force available" (cited in Williams, 1998: 7).
It is important for schools to consider the needs of their teachers because as Hargreaves (1994) put it many aspects affect the quality of their teaching. These aspects include their relationship with the co-workers, the working conditions, teachers' careers and the administration of schools where they work.

It is against this background that the researcher as a teacher developed an interest in the study of teacher mobility. The study was conducted in order to gain insight into the factors influencing teacher mobility in post-primary schools of one district, namely Leribe, Lesotho.

1.5 THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine factors influencing teacher mobility in post-primary schools of Leribe.

1.6 STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Improving the quality of education is one of the salient contemporary issues in developing countries (Rust and Dalin, 1990). Teachers are of paramount importance in carrying out this process. However, there is a dearth of knowledge concerning certain factors affecting the very process such as teacher mobility. This (teacher mobility) comes out to be a problem in an efficient education system. In this way, there is lack of stability within the system.

1.6.1 CRITICAL RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Specifically, the study answers the following critical research questions:

1.6.1.1 What is the extent of teacher mobility in Leribe between 1998-2000?
1.6.1.2 What are the effects of teacher mobility in post-primary schools of Leribe?

1.6.1.3 What makes teachers move from one school to another in the Leribe district (in particular) and in Lesotho (in general).

1.6.1.4 What suggestions are made to address teacher mobility in Leribe, according to the following stakeholders?

(a) Management: district education officers.

(b) School site managers:
   1. Head teachers
   2. Deputy head teachers
   3. Heads of departments
   4. Parents' representatives

(c) Teachers:
   1. Those who have transferred
   2. Those who have not transferred.

1.7 RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

The researcher developed an interest in this study after being made aware of the consequences of teacher mobility in post-primary schools of Leribe, more especially in a school where the researcher worked. According to the researcher's observation, some of the problems presented by this practice are disruption of the normal operation of schools where plans have to be revised. The practice results in a shortage of teachers and is usually affects the academic performance of students.

Any influences disrupting the normal school operations are against the plans of most countries concentrating on human resource development as the basis for development. Teacher mobility therefore, as one of the educational constraints, needs to be understood and addressed for the purpose of improving the quality of education in Lesotho. The
researcher deemed it worthwhile to conduct a study of this type in order to shed light on the educational constraints and concerns related to teacher mobility. It was thought that the findings of the study could contribute to the body of knowledge that is indispensable to educational development.

1.8 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Governments in most countries, especially developing countries, put great emphasis on human resource development. This is because there is a belief that people can bring about development and this process can only be successful if people themselves are developed (Owens, 1998). Education is the cornerstone of this development process. Teacher mobility might undermine the government's and school's goals of providing quality education to students for development purposes. The findings of this study could be useful to schools' management because there will be an awareness of the factors influencing teacher mobility in schools. Management might, therefore, devise means and ways of dealing with the problem for the well being of the schools.

There has never been research on teacher mobility in Lesotho. Therefore, little has been done concerning factors influencing teacher mobility in post-primary schools of Lesotho. What the literature shows are the rates of teacher turnover and attrition in schools (Education Sector Development Plan, 1996). The present study intends to determine the contributing factors to teacher mobility in post-primary schools of Leribe. A study of this nature is worth undertaking because having a stable teaching force contributes to the development of education which, in turn, may improve the human resource for national development. Policy-makers and the department of education could gain from this study if the outcomes are made known to them. This may enable them to make better-informed decisions in the improvement of education and future prospects. The study could help in the development of teachers' recruitment policies that need re-formulating.
decisions in the improvement of education and future prospects. The study could help in the development of teachers’ recruitment policies that need re-formulating.

Schools concentrate on providing and improving the quality of education (Hargreaves & Hopkins, 1994). It is of the utmost importance therefore, to consider the constraints on improved education, such as teacher mobility.

The study results could help teachers to shape their career paths. Full-time teachers could be easily promoted because their strengths and weaknesses are well known by management of schools. This can help teachers to grow in their profession. The outcomes of this study could benefit the students, as they are the ones adversely affected by teacher movements. Teacher mobility can cause disruption of the teaching and learning process and can cause tension that usually leads to student strikes and misunderstandings between teachers. Dealing with factors influencing teacher mobility may improve students’ pass rates.

The findings from this study could help parents to have an understanding of the bigger picture and the influences on student academic performance. They may also gain insight as to differences in schools concerning academic performance. Other interested parties like scholars in education research, academic institutions and the whole system of education could benefit from the outcomes of the study. They could all be made aware of factors affecting academia and perhaps develop an interest in further research.

1.9 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY REPORT

The report is composed of five chapters. Chapter One introduces readers to the general background to the research problem. Chapter Two is concerned with theoretical framework and review of the related literature to the study. Chapter Three discusses the methodology, that is, how the research was carried out. Chapter Four is concerned with the analyses and discussion of the findings of the study. Conclusions and recommendations in relation to the study are presented in Chapter Five of the study.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The literature sources reviewed for this study pertain to teacher mobility, teacher turnover and attrition. A review on teacher attrition and teacher turnover is made since some of the factors influencing teacher attrition and turnover may also apply to teacher mobility. In fact, teacher attrition and turnover are components of teacher mobility (Williams, 1998). The chapter begins by explaining the aims and role of education in post-primary schools in Lesotho. The composition of post-primary schools, roles of stakeholders and their impact on schools as organizations is also explained. Furthermore, a review is made on organizations, organizational effectiveness and school effectiveness research. Teacher mobility, turnover and attrition are looked at in terms of their impact on organizational effectiveness.

Research on teacher mobility has been conducted mostly in developed countries (Williams, 1998). Even though the research was undertaken in countries different in other aspects like economy and context, it nevertheless, provides the foundation for this review. Furthermore, Williams (1998) indicated that the effects of teacher attrition and teacher mobility on schools as well as on students are similar.

2.2 SCHOOLS AS ORGANIZATIONS

Rue and Byars define an organization as "a group of people working in some type of concerted or co-ordinated effort to attain objectives...an organization provides a vehicle for accomplishing objectives that could not be achieved by individuals working separately" (1995:226). Ferguson and Ferguson (2000) define organizations as "a group of people acting to achieve particular outcomes" (p.16). The importance of organizing in schools cannot be overemphasized. The better use of resources in schools to achieve organizational goals is determined by organizing as a function of management (Owens,
1998). Ferguson and Ferguson (2000), Rue and Byars (1995), and Smit and Cronje (1999) all argue that organizing establishes lines of authority, develops the efficiency and quality of work through synergism and improved communications. The school is an educational organization which is composed of a group of people that include teachers providing skills, knowledge and attitudes to students which ultimately helps students to get better examination results.

2.3 ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Literature on organizational effectiveness has shown that there is no working definition of organizational effectiveness because it means different things to different people (Robbins, 1987:27). Research has also indicated that measuring organizational effectiveness is a very complicated process (Owens, 1998). Robbins (1987) defines organizational effectiveness thus: “the degree to which an organization attains its short-term (means) and long-term (ends) goals, the selection of which reflects strategic constituencies, the self-interest of the evaluator, and the life stage of the organization” (1987:51). Organizational effectiveness is important because it is at the heart of every organization looking forward to attain its goals. Schools as organizations should also be judged in terms of their effectiveness.

2.3.1 INDICATORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS.

The following are indicators of organizational effectiveness:

- Attainment of goals.
- Organizations’ ability to acquire and utilize resources.
- Ability to satisfy the demands of the people around the organization environment.

Attainment of goals. If an organization is able to attain its specified goals, that is a sign of effectiveness. The accomplishment of goals is considered to be a suitable indicator of effectiveness. These goals may be of long-term or short-term duration (Owens, 1998; Robbins, 1987). The organization’s ability to acquire and utilize resources refers to the availability of resources that help the organization to maintain itself and as a result keep
on functioning and surviving. It is important for an organization to interact with the external environment. For example, raw materials need to be availed and vacancies filled up. Failure to acquire and replenish resources will be detrimental to the organizational continuity (Smit and Cronje, 1992). Ability to satisfy the demands of the people around the organization environment. An organization needs to satisfy the demands of the people around the organization environment. This is the case because the constituencies in their environment support the organization and enable it to exist. An organization is considered effective if it is able to satisfy the demands of its constituencies. Organizational effectiveness in an educational setting leads to school effectiveness (Owens, 1998).

2.3.2 ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN EDUCATION

Owens (1998:93) identified five basic assumptions when looking at organizational effectiveness in educational settings. First, Owens indicated that the schools' central purpose is to teach because success is measured by students' progress in knowledge, skills and attitudes. Secondly, the school is responsible for providing the overall environment in which teaching and learning occur. Thirdly, schools must be treated holistically. Partial efforts to make improvements that deal with the needs of only some of the students and break up the unity of the instructional programme are likely to fail. Fourthly, the most crucial characteristics of a school are the attitudes and behaviours of the teachers and other staff, not material things such as the size of its library or the age of the physical plant. Fifthly, the school accepts responsibility for the success or failure of the academic performance of the students. Students are capable of learning regardless of their diverse backgrounds. Student achievement is affected by school differences as Purkey and Smith (in Owens 1998:93) have observed and the school staff controls these differences.
2.3.3 CONCLUSIONS DERIVED FROM DATA ON EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

From the reported research on effective schools, Purkey and Smith, (in Owens, 1998:94) identified thirteen characteristics of effective schools, namely:

- school-site management and democratic decision-making in which individual schools are encouraged to take greater latitude for educational problem solving;
- there must be support from the district for increasing the capacity of schools to identify and solve significant educational problems; this includes reducing the inspection and management roles of central office people while increasing support and collaborative problem solving;
- strong leadership, which may be provided by administrators but also may be provided by integrated teams of administrators, teachers’ and perhaps others;
- staff stability, to facilitate the development of a strong cohesive school culture;
- a planned, co-ordinated curriculum that treats the students’ educational needs holistically and increases time spent on academic learning;
- school-wide staff development that links the school’s organizational and instructional needs with the needs that teachers themselves perceive should be addressed;
- parental involvement particularly in support of homework, attendance, and discipline;
- school-wide recognition of academic success, both in terms of improvement in academic performance and achievement of excellence;
- time emphasized on teaching and learning; for example, by reducing interruptions and disruptions, emphasizing the primacy of focused efforts to learn, and restructuring of teaching activities;
- collaborative planning and collegial relations that promote feelings of unity, encourage sharing of knowledge and ideas, and foster consensus among those in the school;
- sense of community, in which alienation of both teachers and students is reduced and a sense of mutual sharing is strengthened;
• shared clear goals and high achievable expectation, which arise from collaboration, collegiality, and a sense of community and which serve to unify those in the organization through their common purposes;
• order and discipline that bespeak the seriousness and purposefulness of the school as a community of people, students, teachers and staff, and other adults, that is cohered by mutual agreement on shared goals, collaboration and consensus (Owens, 1998:94).

The characteristics of effective schools serve as indicators of organizational effectiveness. Lack of these characteristics affect students and teachers and leads to job dissatisfaction on the side of teachers. Job dissatisfaction ultimately causes teacher instability in schools which may be in the form of teacher mobility (Becker, 1995), teacher turnover, (Ingersoll, 2001) and teacher attrition in schools (Williams, 1998). These three factors have a bearing on schools as formal organizations in terms of effectiveness or ineffectiveness. It is important that employees are satisfied in their work places because satisfaction may bring effectiveness. Job satisfaction is therefore an important parameter at work (Evans 2001; Smit and Cronje, 1999; Mwamwenda, 1995).

2.4 FACTORS INFLUENCING SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

School effectiveness has a wide range of factors influencing it, however, the focus is only on one factor namely staff stability. In this very factor the concern is on the possible effect of teacher mobility on stability. Movement of teachers in and out of the education system is three dimensional namely: teacher mobility, teacher turnover and teacher attrition. Teacher mobility is looked at from the perspective of the individual teachers and then teacher turnover is looked at from the perspective of the school and teacher attrition is looked at from the perspective of the education system.

These dimensions are discussed individually as they are central to the study. The primary concern is the impact that these three dimensions have on the school.
2.4.1 TEACHER MOBILITY

Instances of teacher transfers from one school to another have been observed by the Ministry of Education (Lesotho) (Government Gazette extraordinary, 1995). Williams (1998:30) refers to teacher mobility or migration as the tendency of “teachers moving or transferring from one school to another.” For the purposes of the present study, teacher mobility does not refer to a teacher who has quit the teaching profession in Lesotho, but a teacher who moves between schools.

Teacher mobility according to Becker (1995) may be horizontal or vertical. The difference between the two is that horizontal mobility in this case refers to teachers’ either moving between schools or within a school without actually being promoted. For example, when an assistant teacher transfers to another school and still occupies an assistant position, or moves to another department within the same school. Vertical mobility on the other hand, means that a teacher moves a step forward to a higher position. For example, if a teacher moves from a position of an assistant teacher to a position of a head of department, that is vertical mobility.

Horizontal teacher mobility according to Becker (1995) is an important move towards teachers’ career satisfaction. If a teacher teaches in a school where there is no job satisfaction, it is important for the teacher to move to a school where there may be job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is influenced among other things by collegial relations or networks (Wedekind, 2001; Evans, 2001). Evans defines collegial relations as “work-related product or output of work-place interpersonal relations” (2001:302) and these may retain teachers in schools. Wedekind highlights this fact thus:

    Colleagues provide an initial social figuration into which new teachers enter, and they can be central to decisions about remaining within specific schools or indeed remaining within the profession as a whole (2001:173).

Collegial relations are therefore important because they could determine whether a teacher stays or leaves a certain school. Research on teacher supply reveals endemic difficulties with staffing schools with qualified teachers because of instability in the
teaching profession. Research has shown that the career of teaching is characterized by very high mobility (Theobald and Michael, 2001: 3). See also Ingersoll, (1995, 2001)

Other studies on teacher transfers have demonstrated that transfers between schools are useful because teachers want comfort. If they feel uncomfortable, the solution is to go to other schools where they will feel comfortable (Cook, 1991). Cook emphasizes periodic relocation of teachers thus: “as much as you love a school and its staff, a transfer every five years or so is good for the spirit” (1991:24). Cook concluded that it could bring comfort to teachers and contribute to school effectiveness. Cook’s argument is interesting but must be weighed against the evidence from other studies that detail numerous difficulties. (Hatton, Watson, Squires and Soliman, 1991).

The study on teacher transfers by Viadero (2001) in Philadelphia schools in the United States of America on voluntary and compulsory teacher transfers indicated that teachers are fond of transferring to schools with better performance in examinations, fewer students from impoverished families, and fewer non-white students. Viadero argues that these movements create an imbalance of teachers within the district. This imbalance exacerbates educational inequities by placing more experienced teachers in higher performing schools. The low performing schools and those with a high poverty rate had fewer teachers. The imbalance is the source of schools ineffectiveness as it usually takes time for schools to rectify the imbalance by replacing transferred teachers. As a result of this delay, student performance and administrative costs such as costs of recruiting replacement teachers' increases (Bempah, Kaylen, Osburn and Birkenholz, 1994).

Patterson and Kruss (1998:150) study on student migration has shown that context specific conditions influence student migration in South Africa. According to their study, students were motivated by educational opportunities which seemed to be better in Cape Town Metropolitan Area and away from areas where these conditions were not so good. The same context specific conditions may also influence teachers who usually want to be in areas where the conditions are favourable for them. Better performing schools as indicated by Viadero (2001) also attract teachers from bad performing schools. The study
conducted by Hanushek, Kain and Rivkin (2001) on why public schools lose teachers in America has found that teacher mobility is strongly related to students’ characteristics, more especially race and achievement rather than salary. Non-black and non-Hispanic teachers preferred students who were also non-black and non-Hispanic. This resulted in teacher shortages in schools where there are large minorities (Hanushek et al., 2001).

2.4.2 TEACHER TURNOVER

Studies on teacher turnover indicate that the rates on teacher turnover are high in post-primary schools of Lesotho (Education Sector Development Plan, 1996). Turnover is defined as “an individual’s voluntary termination of employment from an organization or institution” (Muchinsky and Morrow 1980:80). From the schools point of view, turnover is “the rate at which teacher’s resign from their school(s)” (Leap and Crino, 1993:56). Literature on employee turnover indicates that there are two types of turnover: voluntary and involuntary turnover (Price, 1977; Horn and Rodger, 1995 and Morrow et al. 1999). Voluntary turnover refers to an employees’ decision to leave an organization, while involuntary turnover refers to organizational decisions to dismiss an employee from work. Employees may not just decide to leave organizations, they may be influenced by certain factors, which do not satisfy them and search for higher levels of satisfaction (Herzberg, 1959 and Maslow, 1954).

There are various reasons that could make teachers leave their schools. They may decide to leave due to the poor management of schools; poor relationships among teachers themselves; poor relationships between teachers and administration (Owens, 1998); they may leave due to the lack of facilities in their schools (Certo and Fox, 2002); or being far from family or home. There are many internal and external factors that may influence them to leave. A study of Nigerian higher learning institutions investigated factors perceived as influential for faculty members leaving their jobs voluntarily (Mallam, 1994). The findings indicated that faculty members were dissatisfied with their conditions of service especially payment and promotion opportunities. The outcomes of this research support the work of Nicholson and Miljus (cited in Mallam, 1994) who also found that
salary and promotion were dominant factors contributing to faculty members' voluntary turnover in Ohio Liberal Arts College.

Mallam's (1994) study concluded that pay, promotion opportunities and lack of commitment were factors influencing faculty members to leave their jobs. It was also concluded that the job in general, supervision, co-workers, present pay, work and consideration for promotion were related to voluntary turnover (Luthans and Davis, 1992). Job dissatisfaction may lead to teacher turnover, which in turn influence organizational effectiveness (Hom & Rodger, 1995). The study was carried out because the faculty member's turnover presented abnormalities such as disruption of normal academic activities and shortage of full-time faculty members.

Research has shown that employees join organizations having certain expectations that need to be met (Menon and Christou, 2002; Steers and Porter 1973). If organizations do not meet these expectations, problems may crop up among the employees. These problems come in different forms such as strikes, absenteeism, turnover and attrition.

High teacher turnover, as many studies have indicated, negatively affect the education system (Hatton, Watson, Squires and Soliman, 1991) and prevent the schools development efforts (Berman & McLaughlin, 1977); Murnane et al. (1991). Furthermore, research has shown that "high rates of teacher turnover can obviously disrupt the stability, continuity, and cohesion of instructors and thus student performance" (Theobald and Michael, 2001:3). Other studies have demonstrated that whenever minority teachers from low social and economic status come across intolerable situations in schools, they quit the teaching profession. Schools' staffing problems, teacher shortages and poor performance of schools are the results of teacher turnover (Ingersoll, 1999, 2001).

Much as teacher turnover has negative organizational consequences, it may also have positive organizational consequences as observed by Mobley (1982: 22) Turnover enables displacement of poor performers in the sense that employees are replaced with
better performers; turnover replacement may bring new knowledge, ideas and approaches. This acquired knowledge leads to high internal mobility, which in turn creates flexibility in developing careers and cross training. In this way, turnover may lead to high morale with remaining workers. Absence of turnover can be detrimental to organizational effectiveness because innovation, flexibility and adaptability may not materialize. This tallies with Herzberg’s research that people are motivated and perform well when given an opportunity to grow or develop in their jobs and given interesting work (Herzberg 1959; Hunter 2002). Positive organizational change can thus be realized due to turnover. Mobley observed that, “in evaluating the causes and consequences of turnover, an organization may well evaluate and implement policies, practices and processes that result in better turnover management and overall organizational effectiveness” (1982: 25).

Turnover decreases other withdrawal behaviours like absenteeism and poor quality work (Porter and Steers, 1973). An organization may benefit if such workers completely leave in order to avoid these alternative withdrawals from work. Schools are characterized by greater absenteeism of teachers due to lack of motivation at work, hence, poor quality work. This might explain the differences in examination performance of schools.

Turnover may be the best solution to the resolution of the organization’s conflicts. It is rightly observed that, “to the extent that deeply ingrained conflict impairs organizational functioning, turnover as a last resort means of conflict resolution may well be positive from both organizational and individual perspectives” (Staw, 1980:26).

2.4.3 TEACHER ATTRITION

Lesotho’s education system is faced with numerous problems of which teacher attrition is one in both primary and secondary sectors (Education Sector Development Plan (1996:86). Teacher attrition research has been a subject of debate in educational circles.
There is a general feeling that it is a major problem facing educational systems of
countries (Herzberg, 1968; Williams, 1998; Sanders, 1991 and Kamara, 2002). Williams’
(1998) study looked at the rates of teacher attrition and identified the predictors of that
attrition. The findings revealed that pay and conditions of service available to teachers in
Lesotho were significant factors influencing Basotho teacher attrition.

Researchers have pointed out that not only salary has a bearing on teacher attrition but
also lack of incentives contribute to teacher attrition (Murnane, 1987; Manger &
Eikeland, 1990). The decisions to quit are influenced by other alternative jobs and one’s
working conditions. Murnane et al. (1987) argue that teacher attrition is the result of
individual teachers reacting to incentives offered in other fields outside teaching and not
the failure of schools to retain teachers. Following this statement, it can be argued that it
is also possible for schools to offer incentives to teachers in order to retain them. Schools
cannot afford to wait and not change with the demands of the changing world. The
question of whether teachers are motivated is still a debatable issue. Teachers may long
for the satisfaction of their needs, which may increase their morale at the work place.

Studies on teacher attrition and retention have been done mostly in the United States of
America. The study conducted by Certo and Fox (2002) in seven Virginia school
divisions, urban, suburban and rural localities looked at teacher attrition and retention.
The findings reveal that teachers remain in school divisions due to commitment to the
profession, quality administration and an appreciation for relationship with their
colleagues. Teachers leave the profession due to inadequate salary, lack of administrative
support, and lack of planning time. The aspect of inadequate salary is considered as a
major cause of teacher attrition (Williams, 1998; Lockheed & Verspoor, 1991; Smith,

It is important for countries to reduce teacher attrition because countries can benefit out
of that process. First, countries can get economic and social return on their investment in
training teachers. Trained teachers can also help by improving human resource. Secondly,
countries reduce the expenses of training teachers to replace those who left. Thirdly, new
teacher's in the profession means high chances of decrease in pass rates in schools due to the lack of experience. Finally, in countries of high teacher turnover, parents withdraw their children out of such schools and do not support new teachers (Lockheed and Verspoor 1991:102). Parents in post-primary schools prefer schools with high pass rates and this reduces student enrolments in schools performing poorly. It can be argued that this tendency also encourages teachers to leave low performing schools and go to schools performing well in examinations.

2.5 JOB SATISFACTION

One of the most important parameters in any organization is to see to it that employees are satisfied in their work place hence job satisfaction forms a central part of this study. Job satisfaction refers to “an individuals’ general attitude towards his or her job” (Smit et al. 1992: 361). The way people think and look at their job may determine their satisfaction in those jobs. Organizations are made up of people and the attention given to them at work and how they relate to each other may create job satisfaction and lead to organizational effectiveness and schools are not an exception in this case. However, if teachers move out of the educational system and keep changing schools, their movements have consequences for the organizations and their effectiveness.

Research has indicated that teachers enjoy teaching and are satisfied when their anticipation about their work becomes a reality in schools (Mwamwenda, 1995). Mwamwenda's study in Transkei Secondary schools further pointed out that teachers were so satisfied that if given a chance to choose a profession again, they would again choose teaching as a career. However, some teachers experienced job dissatisfaction because teaching was not congruent to their expectations.

Mwamwenda has pointed out that factors which led to job dissatisfaction were (a) inadequate teaching-learning aids; (b) crowded classes which made it difficult for many students to learn; (c) lack of official teacher accommodation; (d) teaching of subjects they have not specialized in; (e) lack of facilities (like science laboratories) and equipment; (f)
high teaching loads. Some of these factors raised by dissatisfied teachers may lead to staff turnover, absenteeism, dissatisfaction and loss of qualified and experienced teachers (Mark, Pierce, & Molloy in Mwamwenda, 1995). Teacher mobility may also be caused by the same factors raised by dissatisfied teachers of secondary schools in the Transkei.

Job satisfaction has been a subject of much controversy in organizations particularly in education. The findings of Steyn and Van Wyk (1999) on the perceptions of principals and teachers in urban black schools in South Africa indicated several factors influencing job satisfaction. These factors include the following: (a) physical working conditions; (b) support by educational authorities; (c) job security and teachers’ salaries; (d) interpersonal relations; (e) appreciation by the community; (f) school culture; (g) environmental factors; (h) nature of work and workload; (i) physical and emotional effects on teachers. It can be argued that teacher mobility among post-primary teachers’ in Leribe district might be influenced by job dissatisfaction among teachers. Watson et al., (1991) emphasize this point thus: “it may be expected that satisfied workers are less likely than dissatisfied ones to seek other employment”(p.70). Continuing dissatisfaction among teachers is likely to hamper the development of the school. Watson et al. (1991) in their study found that, relations between the administration and the teachers and among teachers themselves, pupil qualities, personal achievement and school tone contribute to teacher job satisfaction.

It is important therefore, to know how more about why people move out of organizations or between organizations. They move for a range of reasons of which job satisfaction is one of them. To understand job satisfaction, Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory and Herzberg’s two-factor theory have been found relevant in this study.

2.6 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory and Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory informs this study. These are motivation theories from the humanistic perspective. These theories posit that members join organizations, stay and work in them or leave due to many
factors. Some of these factors are internal to the employees themselves, while some are related to the organizations themselves. In this case, it is possible to assume that the movement of teachers from one post-primary school to another in Leribe can be explained using these theories.

2.6.1 MASLOW'S HIERARCHY OF NEEDS THEORY

According to Maslow (1954) people have needs which must be satisfied. These needs are hierarchically ordered according to their importance. These needs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Category</th>
<th>Description and Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-ACTUALIZATION</strong></td>
<td>To develop into what one is capable of becoming, autonomy and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self-direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTEEM</strong></td>
<td>Self-esteem and recognition by peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL AFFILIATION</strong></td>
<td>Love, belonging, acceptance by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECURITY AND SAFETY</strong></td>
<td>Physical safety, financial security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASIC PHYSIOLOGICAL NEEDS</strong></td>
<td>Food, water, shelter, sex and air</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Maslow pointed out that human needs are hierarchical and usually start with deficiency needs (survival needs). People must first satisfy the lower order needs because they are basic to life before satisfying the higher order needs. The lower order needs (below social
needs) are extrinsic because they are satisfied by external factors such as food and praise. The higher order needs (above security) are motivators, according to Maslow, because they are satisfied by internal factors such as feelings of accomplishment. This, according to Maslow, is called intrinsic motivation. According to this theory, people's behaviour is purposive and directed towards meeting a particular need. People usually strive to satisfy higher order needs, which are intrinsic in nature and lead to growth and self-development. Maslow drives this point home thus, "...people are driven from within to realize their full growth potential" (cited in Owens, 1998:142).

Using this theory, teacher movements from one school to another can be attributed to their search for higher levels of satisfaction. It is possible that teachers change schools in the hope of meeting these higher needs not met in their original schools. This study will find out whether this is the case for post-primary teachers in Leribe.

2.6.2 HERZBERG TWO-FACTOR THEORY

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory posits that motivation is affected by two factors. These are motivation and hygiene or maintenance factors (Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman 1959:114). Motivators, if present, satisfy employees in an organization and lead to job satisfaction. Motivators according to Herzberg are achievement, work itself, growth, responsibility and recognition (Owens, 1998:149). These factors, according to this theory cause satisfaction, or no satisfaction. Maintenance factors if not adequately present can affect or hinder motivation and therefore lead to job dissatisfaction. Even though maintenance factors are not motivating, they are necessary for motivation to take place and even when available do not lead to satisfaction, but make situations normal. Some of the maintenance factors are work environment (prevailing conditions in an organization), type of supervision, attitudes and policies of administration, salary and fringe benefits and job security. Huge sums of money have been spent by organizations solely to develop human resource programmes upon realizing the identified effects of a dissatisfied and poorly motivated workforce. These effects include low production, high turnover, absenteeism and other behaviours not conducive to production.
Viewing the problem using this theory, teachers' frequent voluntary transfers can be explained in terms of wanting to obtain intrinsic satisfaction. Since dissatisfiers even when removed do not motivate workers, it is possible that teachers in Leribe post-primary schools move around in order to avoid dissatisfiers in their original schools, or to seek satisfaction by moving to schools where they think conditions are conducive to motivation. This study investigated the extent to which this is a valid explanation for teachers' mobility in Leribe. It is the researcher's opinion that factors underlying teacher transfers in schools can best be looked at and interpreted by considering the motivation theories of Maslow and Herzberg. These theories look at people, why they behave as they do, and what sustains and influences their behaviour. Human behaviour is complex and influenced by a variety of conditions (Sanzotta, 1977). It is thought that the motivation theories of Herzberg and Maslow might explain and interpret the teachers' behaviour. These theories are therefore, relevant to guide this study.

2.7 CONCLUSION

The literature review has pointed out important aspects or factors influencing teachers in schools. It is worth noting that school characteristics and organizational conditions in which teachers work have a bearing on teachers' decisions to quit the school either in the form of transfer, turnover or attrition. However, for the purposes of this study, the concern is with teacher mobility. The concern for people in organizations is important because effectiveness and ineffectiveness of an organization depends on employees. It is important for employees to be motivated at the work place, and this can come about if employees' needs are met by the organization. Motivation brings job satisfaction, which in turn increases morale among employees. The end result is better performance of an organization. When employees' needs are not considered, dissatisfaction crops up at the work place and this ultimately leads to employees quitting the organization.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the research methodology employed in the collection of data for this study. It explicitly describes what the researcher did in this process of data collection. The chapter is presented in seven sections: the research site is the first to be explained, the second section describes the research design of the study, the research population is dealt with in the third section, the fourth section explains the sample and sampling procedures, the fifth looks at the research techniques and instruments, the sixth section is about procedures followed in data analysis. The last section in this chapter forms the conclusion.

3.2 RESEARCH SITES

This study was conducted in Lesotho. The research sites were post-primary schools in the Leribe district. Leribe is one of the ten districts of Lesotho situated in the northern part of the country. The post-primary schools in Lesotho are composed of secondary and high schools. Secondary schools have three forms/classes namely: Form A, Form B, and Form C. The graduates of secondary schools obtain a Junior Certificate (J.C.) after completing their course and can proceed to high school if they have passed. High schools have two forms/classes namely, Form D and Form E. The high school graduates obtain the Cambridge Overseas School Certificate (C.O.S.C.) after successfully completing their course.

The researcher dealt with parent representatives and education officers, therefore, parent’s homes and education offices were research sites as well. Schools were considered as research sites because teachers are found in schools. The researcher administered questionnaires to teachers in their respective schools.
3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

To carry out this research, the survey method was considered as the most appropriate for this study. The next paragraphs define survey research, justify its choice particularly for this study and lastly, considers some of the limitations of the survey approach. Fink and Kosecoff (1996) define the survey as, "a method of collecting information directly from people about their feelings, motivations, plans, beliefs and personal, educational ... background" (p.13). This definition clearly indicates that with the survey method, the researcher is able to measure attitudes, describe and explain situations or facts, as well as to identify certain behaviours (Bryman and Cramer, 1990). Lovell and Lawson further drive the point home when defining the survey as "a form of planned collection of data for the purposes of description" (1970:34). From this definition, a deduction can be made that surveys can enable the researcher to collect data so as to provide a description of the data.

Survey research was found to be the most appropriate for this study because the findings could be generalized across a large population (Burns, 2000; Creswell, 1994; Lovell, 1970; McCormack & Hill, 1997; Verma and Mallick, 1999). Surveys are used to collect data from a large population or its representative sample, which cannot be directly observed by the researcher. Large population attitudes and experiences are well measured with the survey method (Bless and Higson-Smith, 1995; Babbie in Creswell, 1994). Survey research was therefore appropriate for this study because it dealt with a large population of teachers in the post-primary schools of Leribe. From surveys, researchers can yield statistics that are quantitative in nature (Fowler and Floyd, 1993; Creswell, 1994). This can best be done by using the survey method because it provides facts on events or phenomena.

The research design combined quantitative and qualitative techniques due to the fact that both questionnaires and interview schedules were used in the data collection process from respondents. A quantitative technique was considered appropriate in this study due to the
large sample of the study. It would not have been appropriate to use other approaches like interviews over a sample population of over two hundred respondents. The researcher therefore found it fit to use structured questionnaires to collect data from the respondents. Interviews were used to gather information from the other section of the respondents namely education officers and leaders of teachers unions. Using interviews as a qualitative research technique enabled the researcher to gain more in-depth knowledge from the respondents (Jessop, in Moorosi, 2000). This approach provides an understanding of the people and their behaviour (Burns, 2000).

3.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE SURVEY METHOD

Although survey research is suitable for this study, it has limitations. One of the limitations is that surveys depend on questionnaires that are highly structured and therefore could provide limited information (de Vaus, 1996). The respondents sometimes do not return the completed questionnaires at the right time. Furthermore, respondents sometimes do not return the completed questionnaires at all. This delays the process of data collection and increases the costs of the research because the respondents have to be reminded to return the questionnaire. One of the limitations is that due to the standardized nature of questions, surveys do not provide means of exploring the topic fully (Walker, 1985). Furthermore, if the sample is defective this makes generalizing from survey findings biased. Questionnaires and interviews in the survey method are not flexible enough when it comes to sensitive issues; as a result, they lack a supportive atmosphere which must be demonstrated by the researcher (Fink and Kosecoff, 1996).

Even though the survey method has limitations, it does provide information from many people within a short period of time. This information is usually gathered by questionnaires or interviews. These research tools have relevant questions that respondents can easily follow and answer. In this study, questionnaires and interviews were used to gather information. Surveys provide a clear description of the problem under study (Lovell & Lawson, 1970). The limitations of the survey method should therefore not invalidate the findings of this study.
3.5 RESEARCH POPULATION

3.5.1 TARGET POPULATION

In order to find answers to the research questions, the researcher deemed it necessary to conduct research involving teachers. Teachers are the people actually involved in the practice of transferring/moving from one post-primary school to another in the Leribe district. There are 45 post-primary schools in the Leribe district and the target population for the study was teachers in those forty-five (45) post-primary schools in Leribe. All teachers (transferred and not transferred) formed the research population and constituted 144 in number.

In addition, chairpersons of the teacher unions, parent representatives from the school board and education officers in the district formed another target population. They were included in the study in order to identify factors influencing teacher transfers in the Leribe district. It was thought that the involvement of these participants could help the researcher to determine factors which might be influencing teacher transfers in Leribe district.

3.5.2 SAMPLING PROCEDURES

The sample was derived from the target population as indicated in paragraph 3.5.1 above. A stratified random sampling method was chosen particularly for this study because the population was divided into groups having similar characteristics (homogeneous group) (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000; Babbie, 1989). The next paragraph explains these groups.

3.5.2.1 SAMPLING OF SCHOOLS

As the country is divided into distinct geographic regions namely mountain, foothills, and lowlands, the researcher categorized and grouped the post-primary schools according to
these geographic regions. This was done to avoid a biased sample where other regions might have been excluded and as a result, produced biased results. It was therefore important to consider the geographic regions when sampling schools. Schools and teachers were selected using this method of stratified random sampling. Schools were classified into secondary and high schools in each region. Schools in each region were identified by their names and numbers were given to them corresponding with the name of the school. The numbers were placed into a hat and shuffled. After each shuffling, a number was drawn out of a hat. The number was written down and placed into the hat again. This procedure was repeated until a required number of three (3) secondary and three high schools were obtained in each region. The overall results of this process were six (6) post-primary schools in each of the three regions in the Leribe district.

The total sample size was eighteen (18) schools (40%) composed of nine (9) secondary schools (junior secondary) and nine (9) high schools (senior secondary) in different regions. Application of this procedure enabled schools to have an equal chance of being chosen in the sample of the study (Bless and Higson-Smith, 1995; Sapsford, 1999).

### 3.5.2.2 Sampling Teachers

The two categories of teachers (transferred and not transferred) formed the respondents. Other respondents included the head teachers, deputy head teachers and the heads of departments in selected schools. The two categories of teachers were identified by the head teachers and heads of departments. A stratified random sampling strategy was used to select these respondents.

Teachers were categorized as indicated above and their names written down and numbers given to them corresponding with their names. The numbers were put into a hat and shuffled in order to mix them. After each shuffling, a number was drawn out of a hat, written down and placed back into the hat. This process was repeated until a required number of four (4) teachers who transferred and (4) teachers who did not transfer were obtained from six (6) selected schools in each region. The result of this exercise yielded
eight (8) teachers in each school. Since eighteen schools constituted the sample of the study, the eight teachers in each school were multiplied by eighteen and reached a total sample of 144 respondents. This was the total sample of teachers in the study. The figure 144 is composed of 72 transferred teachers and 72 teachers not transferred.

3.5.2.3 Sampling Heads of Departments

Heads of Department (HOD) were identified by using simple random sampling if they were more than two per school. This is another type of probability sampling, which entails selecting participants from a large population list randomly in order to arrive at a sample. In this sampling strategy each element of the population has an equal chance of being selected (Babbie, 1989; Rubin and Babbie, 1997). HODs were identified through the help of the head teacher. Their names were written down and numbers assigned to each HOD. The numbers were put into a hat, mixed and a number was drawn out of a hat after each shuffling. The numbers were noted down and placed back into the hat. The procedure was repeated until two (2) required HODs were obtained in each school. This process yielded 36 participants forming the sample of HODs.

3.5.2.4 Selection of Heads and Deputy Heads

Head teachers and deputy head teachers formed another group of participants in the study. There is one head teacher and one deputy head teacher in each school, therefore, all head teachers and deputy head teachers formed another sample of participants in the study. The total sample from these participants was eighteen (18) head teachers and (18) deputy head teachers.

3.5.2.5 Sampling Parent Representatives

Parent representatives formed another group of participants. The researcher identified these representatives through the help of head teachers. A simple random sampling strategy was again employed. The researcher decided to select two representatives out of three in each school management board. Participant names were written down and
assigned numbers corresponding with their names. The numbers were put into a hat and shuffled, and numbers were drawn out. These numbers were noted down and placed back into the hat. This procedure was repeated until a required number of two (2) parents’ representatives were obtained in each school. The total number of participants was thirty-six (36).

All education officers in the Leribe district participated in the study. There were eight (8) and all of them were interviewed and notes taken by the researcher. Even though the researcher wanted to tape-record the interviews, the officers declined to be tape-recorded. While the events unfolded in the process of data collection, the researcher deemed it necessary to interview the chairpersons of the teacher unions. The researcher took this step when realizing that the 1990 and 1995 teachers’ strikes had had an impact on teacher mobility. The two chairpersons formed another group of respondents in the study.

The total respondents within the sample of eighteen (18) schools were two hundred and fifty-two (252). The number of education officers and chairpersons of teachers’ unions increased the number to two hundred and sixty-two (262) participants in the study.

3.6 DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES AND INSTRUMENTS

3.6.1 DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Questionnaires and interview schedules were used to gather data from different respondents. A researcher-designed questionnaire was used to collect data from the following respondents:

(a) Head teachers

(b) Deputy head teachers

(c) Heads of departments

(d) Teachers: (1) transferred

(2) not transferred
The use of self-administered questionnaires was advantageous to this study due to the following reasons:

- the researcher could have a high rate of return of responses as compared to interviews which are time consuming and expensive (Walker, 1985).

- the literature has indicated that the survey method uses questionnaires as the most appropriate and practical means or technique of collecting data (Bless et al., 1995).

- data collected through questionnaires can easily be analyzed because most of the questions are closed-ended as compared to interviews as another technique of data collection (Cohen and Manion, 1994).

- as indicated by Bryman and Cramer "survey designs are... able to reveal relationships between variables" (1997:13). That is, surveys enable the researcher to look at the association or connection between variables. This revelation is possible through the use of questionnaires.

- the use of questionnaires enables surveys to collect data from multiple or several variables at the same time (Bryman and Cramer, 1997).

Interviews were also used to gather data from the eight (8) education officers and two (2) chairpersons of teachers' unions. These were found appropriate due to the fact those interviews enabled the researcher to probe for more answers and that they provided in-depth responses concerning influences on teacher mobility. It was possible for the researcher to follow up interesting responses from the respondents (Melville and Goddard, 1996). The respondents were few and it would have been a futile exercise to administer questionnaires to such a small manageable number.
An advantage of combining questionnaires and interviews is that it provides for reliability in relation to results (Walker, 1985). The nature of the research questions necessitated the use of different research tools to measure certain qualities (Ary, Jacobs and Raszaviewh, 1979). The disadvantage is that this combination makes analysis difficult. It also takes time to make different data collection instruments.

3.6.2 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Research instruments must be checked for validity and reliability before they can be administered to the respondents. Validity refers to the extent to which an instrument measures what it is intended to measure (Floyd and Fowler, 1993; Kerlinger, 1979). Reliability refers to the consistency of the instrument in measuring whatever it measures.

A researcher-designed questionnaire was pilot-tested in November 2001 in two post-primary schools namely: St.Saviours High School and Ntloana-tso’ana High School. The two schools were not part of the sample. This exercise helped the researcher to make improvements such as re-designing some questions and making clarifications on the questionnaire. These improvements were made before administering the final questionnaires to the participants.

In relation to the interview schedule, two education officers were interviewed to check for validity and reliability of the instruments. Certain questions were rephrased for clarity while others had to be re-designed to suit the purposes of the research.

3.6.3 ACCESS TO THE RESEARCH SITES

As a way of negotiating access to the research sites, letters were written to the head teachers for permission to carry out the research from their schools. Fixed dates were agreed upon on which the researcher could administer the questionnaires to the selected participants. The same procedure was followed with regard to the education officers: a
letter was written to the senior education officer requesting permission to carry out interviews with education officers. The officers were informed by the senior education officer of the interviews to be conducted by the researcher. This was done in the presence of the researcher. Fixed dates were determined for interviews after examining the officers' time schedules.

3.6.4 QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN

The researcher went to the respective schools during the distribution dates. Since the participants were informed about the research, the head teacher introduced the researcher to the heads of departments and finally to the rest of the teachers. The questionnaires were distributed to the selected teachers and clarified where necessary.

Questionnaires were given to the following selected groups of teachers: (i) head teachers and deputy head teachers which groups were both given the same type of questionnaire, (ii) the heads of departments, (iii) teachers (transferred and not transferred). HODs and teachers were both given the same type of questionnaire having relevant sections for them, and (iv) the last batch of questionnaires were given to the parent representatives through the help of the head teacher who knew them.

After distributing the questionnaires, the researcher informed the respondents when to return the completed questionnaires. They were supposed to return them after three days and hand them to the head teacher. These were self-administered questionnaires in which respondents were to answer the questions during their own time. Questionnaire return was problematic due to the fact that completed questionnaires were not returned at the specified time. In some cases, teachers misplaced questionnaires and the researcher had to provide additional copies. This was a costly exercise as more photocopying of questionnaires was inevitable. It is important to note that some selected teachers up to six in some schools did not want to co-operate with the researcher. They declined to take and fill in the questionnaires. The researcher had to choose other relevant teachers who were willing to co-operate.
3.6.4.1 Questionnaire Return

The table below shows the number of questionnaires given to different participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire to</th>
<th>No. Forwarded</th>
<th>NO. Returned</th>
<th>% Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (Transferred)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (Not Transferred)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head Teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Departments</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Representatives</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above table the response rate of 79.3% was acquired and this is sufficient to validate the research findings (Ary et al. 1979).

3.6.5 INTERVIEWING

3.6.5.1 Interviewing Education Officers

Interviews were conducted with education officers and the chairpersons of the teachers' unions. The researcher went to the work place of the officers and interviews were conducted in their offices on different days and at times agreed upon. The researcher explained the purpose of interviews. The process of interviewing took more time than was anticipated due to the fact that interviewees raised some important issues the
researcher was not aware of. Also, by probing the interviewees a lot of relevant issues were raised. The researcher intended to tape record the interviews but since the officers declined to be tape-recorded, the tape recorder was not used. Notes were taken during the course of the interviews.

Tape-recording could have improved communication effectiveness as all the information could have been captured. Nevertheless, tape-recording has some limitations, in that it can make the respondents a bit reluctant and not free to reveal all the information required of them. The researcher felt that even without tape-recording the respondents would feel free and reveal the necessary information. Even though data might not all be captured, note taking is still effective as the researcher took only the necessary information. Non-verbal data cannot be recorded but notes can reveal these data. Interviewing goes hand in hand with trust, and once that mutual trust has been established as Carlgren et al. (1994) have stated, the interviewer and the interviewee feel free hence smooth flow of information is possible without taking into consideration whether it is recorded or not.

3.6.5.2 Interviewing Leaders of Teachers Unions

Appointments with leaders of teachers' unions were conducted earlier on. The researcher went to schools where they work at the date and time agreed upon. Interviews were conducted in their offices as one of them was a head teacher and another a head of department. They also provided invaluable information regarding the 1990 and 1995 teachers' strikes and how these contributed to teacher mobility in Lesotho more especially in Leribe district. Notes were taken during the course of the interview. One of the leaders was not a chairperson but the vice chairperson of the Lesotho Teachers Trade Union (L. T. T. U), while one was the chairperson of the Lesotho Association of Teachers (L. A. T). Fortunately, both leaders were in the Leribe district where the researcher resides.
3.7 DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

This section is concerned with the analysis of data collected from the respondents in the study. The chosen data analysis method is justified followed by an explanation of steps taken in analyzing the data.

3.7.1 JUSTIFICATION OF DATA ANALYSIS TOOL

Data were analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for windows version 9-computer package at the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg. This computer package was used mainly because it could display data in a more meaningful way. This computer package can also identify differences and relationships between variables. The usefulness of SPSS is highlighted by Bryman and Cramer (1997) and Brace, Kemp, and Snelgar (2000) who assert that it can enable researchers to analyze quantitative data quickly and in many different ways. Cohen, Manion and Morrison have also indicated the relevance and suitability of SPSS for quantitative data analysis.

3.7.2 STEPS FOLLOWED IN DATA ANALYSIS

Respondents’ questionnaires were numbered to avoid repetition when entering data into the computer. Each questionnaire was given an identification number because certain specific data files had to be in one file. This computer package treats each question as a variable to be analysed. Many questions in different questionnaires were of a multiple response nature, and these were treated as variables. Variables were defined and labelled, and the labels represented variable answers as given by the respondents. Variables were (given values) coded, as SPSS can only accept numerical values. Zero (0) code represented the missing responses as some respondents failed to respond to some questions in the questionnaire. Responses from the open-ended questions were noted down and so as to be coded in order to be entered into the SPSS as variables. Interview responses were organized in terms of different responses and frequent responses were the ones to be considered in answering the research questions.
3.7.2.1 Entering and Analyzing Data

Data were entered into the SPSS programme creating different data files. Variables were placed in different columns and data belonging to the same variable were entered in the column corresponding to that variable. The rows represent respondents and their responses in different variables. Data analysis by SPSS produces frequency tables, graphs and diagrams. Also, measures of central tendency like the mean; mode, median and standard deviation were used in analyzing data.

3.8 CONSTRAINTS AND LIMITATIONS ON THE RESEARCH

Teacher mobility in post primary schools seems to be recurring throughout Lesotho. It could have been wise for the researcher to deal with all the schools in the Leribe district. Nevertheless time and money could not allow the researcher to do so.

Even though questionnaires were found to be appropriate and practical in collecting data, some questions could not be well interpreted by the respondents because they were not clearly written. This was a limiting factor on its own.

Some respondents declined to fill the questionnaires and the researcher had to look for other relevant respondents. The majority of the education officers declined to be tape-recorded hence there were chances of not capturing all the information they provided since the researcher took notes only. As a result of these limiting factors, the quality of data collected may not reveal all the necessary information for this study.

3.9 CONCLUSION

The chapter has explained the research methodology employed in the collection of data for this study. It has generally described the research sites, design, population, data collection techniques and procedures in data analysis. The study results, analysis and discussions are presented in chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter focuses on the presentation, analysis and discussion of the results of the study. A descriptive report is presented of the findings together with tables (summarizing aggregated responses to the items of the questionnaires) and a discussion of the implications. The study is divided into two sections. Section one presents the population description of the respondents and section two presents answers to the four research questions.

4.2 POPULATION DESCRIPTION
The personal profiles presented in this part emanated from the data collected from different respondents. These respondents were head teachers, deputy head teachers, heads of department, teachers (transferred and not transferred), and education officers. The respondents were mainly teachers in post-primary schools of Leribe district except the education officers. Education officers are supposed to help in the management and improvement of education in the district. Teachers on the other hand, are expected to implement the curriculum by imparting the skills to the students.

4.2.1 GENDER DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

4.2.1.1 Gender distribution of HT, DHT and HOD
Gender distribution of the respondents in table 4.1 indicates that there are more male HT and DHT than female teachers in administrative positions. However, in the category of HOD females dominated the males. This is contrary to the ratios within the population of Lesotho where females (51%) are more than males (49%). (Department of Population Manpower Planning 1999).
Table 4.1: Gender distribution of HT, DHT and HOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>HT</th>
<th></th>
<th>DHT</th>
<th></th>
<th>HOD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1.2 Gender distribution of teachers (transferred and not transferred)

Figure 1: Gender distribution of teachers (transferred and not transferred)

The figure indicates that more male teachers (65%) than female (35%) teachers transferred from one post-primary school to another. Looking at the sample of teachers who have not transferred, females outnumbered the males by 61% and 39% respectively. It is clear that male teachers transferred more than female teachers in the sample.

At the national level, the gender distribution differs because 51% of the population are females and 49% are males. Even in the education sector, 65% of the teachers are females and 35% males (Department of Population and Manpower Planning, 1999). In the light of this, one expected the study population to be composed of more females than males. It is worth noting when looking at the teachers transferred and not transferred that 65% of the male teachers transferred as compared to 35% of the female teachers. More
female teachers (61%) did not transfer and 39% of the males did not transfer according to the sample of the study population. Meaning that more males than female teachers transferred from one post-primary school to another and more female than male teachers did not transfer from one post-primary school to another. This may be in line with the traditional belief for Basotho that the teaching profession is mainly for women than men, therefore, men may transfer most because they may be looking for other more lucrative jobs or promotion within the profession as incentives differ from one school to another.

4.2.1.3 Gender of education officers

The study dealt with eight education officers (three males and five females). This indeed goes in line with the fact that there are more females than males in the population of Lesotho.

4.2.2 AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

4.2.2.1 Age distribution of HT, DHT and HOD
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Figure 2: Age distribution of HT, DHT and HOD.

Figure 2 indicates that 69% of head teachers were over 41 years of age and 40% of deputy heads and 35% of heads of department were also over 41 years of age. It is significant to note that one head of department and one deputy head teacher were between 18 and 24 years. It is important for head teachers to be experienced people who might be effective leaders in schools. This is also recommended by the Ministry of
Education upon the assumption that the older the heads, the more experience they have in teaching. This is going to be considered in the section on teaching experience.

4.2.2.2 Age distribution of teachers (transferred and not transferred)
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Figure 3: Age distribution of teachers (transferred and not transferred).

The figure indicates that most of the teachers who transferred were between the age of 30 and over 41. The majority of teachers who did not transfer were between the age of 25 and 35. It is interesting to note that teachers who transferred were older than teachers who did not transfer. It may be concluded that they transferred because they wanted to be more settled or were attracted by promotions which usually go hand in hand with experience.

4.2.3 EDUCATION QUALIFICATIONS OF RESPONDENTS

4.2.3.1 Education qualifications of HT, DHT and HOD

Table 4.2 below shows that most of the respondents, that is, head teachers (60%), deputy head teachers (58%) and heads of department (62%) had bachelor's degree in education. Only 16% of deputy head teachers had a certificate in education. It is worth noting that a
quarter of head teachers had other qualifications such as Bachelor of Commerce, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Arts and Licentiate of the College of Preceptors (L.C.P.). These qualifications lack basic school management skills that are relevant to the positions they are holding. Consequently, this lack of basic school management skills might be one of the factors contributing to the poor management of schools.

Table 4.2: Educational qualifications of HT, DHT and HOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION QUALIFICATION</th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>DHT</th>
<th>HOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERTIFICATE (EDUCATION)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIPLOMA IN EDUCATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACHELORS DEGREE IN EDUCATION</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS DEGREE IN EDUCATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER QUALIFICATIONS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ministry of Education (MOE) in Lesotho recommends that teachers be qualified and experienced in their work.

4.2.3.2 Education qualifications of teachers (transferred and not transferred) and Education officers

The figure 4 shows that most of the teachers in both categories (transferred and not transferred) had a degree in education followed by those having a certificate and a diploma in education. The following information illustrates that most of the teachers were in possession of teaching qualifications except those having other qualifications like Bachelor of Commerce and Bachelor of Arts. These qualifications as it has been said are
not relevant in the teaching profession and do not meet the requirements of the Ministry of Education.
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Figure 4: Educational qualifications of teachers (transferred and not transferred)

This provides an explanation why they keep moving between schools in Leribe district. It is also interesting to note that teachers who did not transfer had the highest qualification, masters in education. Conversely, 35% of teachers with degree in education transferred most from one school to another. It is highly recommended by the government that teachers be well qualified in order to provide quality education.

Out of eight education officers, four had a bachelor’s degree in education and another four had master’s degree in education. It is clear that most education officers were well qualified as recommended by the MOE in order to provide professional guidance to teachers.

4.2.4 TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS

4.2.4.1 Teaching experience of HT, DHT and HOD

Head teachers (59%) had between 18 and over 23 years of teaching experience while 41% had between 6 and 17 years of teaching experience. Seventy-three percent (73%) of the deputy head teachers had between 6 and 17 years of teaching experience. Looking at the heads of departments, 66% had between 0 and 11 years in the teaching profession. The fact that head teachers had more experience than deputy heads and heads of
department is in line with the recommendations of the Ministry of Education that head teachers be experienced in the teaching profession in order to be able to face challenges of the profession.

Table 4.3: Teaching experience of HT, DHT and HOD in years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>HT NO.</th>
<th>HT %</th>
<th>DHT NO.</th>
<th>DHT %</th>
<th>HOD NO.</th>
<th>HOD %</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4.2 Teaching experience of teachers (transferred and not transferred) and Education officers

As table 4.4 shows, 60% of the transferred teachers had teaching experience between 0 and 11 years, while 9% had over 23 years of teaching experience. Furthermore, the table indicates that there is a greater incidence of transfers among teachers with 0-11 years of experience. This rate of transfer decreases, as they stay longer in the profession. Among teachers who did not transfer, 77% had between 0 and 11 years of teaching experience. One can conclude that there is a higher percentage of teachers who did not transfer than those who transferred between 0 and 11 years of experience. Fewer teachers (23%) in this category had teaching experience between 18 and over 23 years. As the results indicate, teachers were not very experienced in their career.
Table 4.4: Teaching experience of teachers in years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN YEARS</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th></th>
<th>NT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In as far as education officers are concerned, four out of eight officers had teaching experience of over 15 years, and two officers were between 6 and 10 years and also two officers were between 11 and 15 years of teaching experience. The results clearly indicated that education officers were experienced in the teaching profession. This is significant for education officers, as they are supposed to guide teachers in their work.
4.2.5 YEARS IN FIRST SCHOOL POSTING OF RESPONDENTS

4.2.5.1 Years in first school posting of HT, DHT and HOD

Figure 5: Years in first school posting of respondents

Head teachers (54%), deputy head teachers (54%) and heads of department (42%) spent between 6 and 11 years in the schools they were first posted to. Heads of department (50%) had spent between 0 and 5 years in schools they were first posted to. It is interesting to note that higher percentage of HT (31%) had spent over 15 years in schools of first posting and none of the DHT were over 15 years in their first school posting. A conclusion can be made that HT were experienced than other categories of teachers. It can be concluded that teacher mobility was higher among ordinary teachers than teachers in the post levels or in the higher ranks such as head teachers, deputy head teachers and heads of department.
4.2.5.2 Years in first school posting of teachers (transferred and not transferred)

Table 4.5: Years in first school posting of teachers (transferred and not transferred)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS IN FIRST SCHOOL POSTING</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th></th>
<th>NT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the category of teachers who transferred (77%) spent between 0 and 5 years in the schools they were first posted to and in the category of teachers who did not transfer, 61% spent between 0 and 5 years. Few teachers (4%) in both categories had spent between 12 and over 17 years in the schools they were first posted to. The results generally indicated that teachers did not spend a lot of time in their schools of first posting in both categories.

4.3 ANSWERS TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS

4.3.1: WHAT IS THE EXTENT OF TEACHER MOBILITY IN LERIBE BETWEEN 1998-2000?

The first research question looked at the extent of teacher mobility in Leribe between 1998-2000 as perceived by respondents. These respondents were head teachers, deputy head teachers, head of departments, teachers (transferred and not transferred), education officers, parent representatives and chairpersons of teacher unions. It was felt important to first establish whether teacher mobility was a common practice in post-primary schools of Leribe and whether it was the source of problems in schools.
4.3.1.1: Whether teacher mobility was a common practice in post-primary schools of Lesotho.

Table 4.6 indicates that there was a common perception among teachers, head teachers, deputy head teachers and head of departments that teacher mobility was common in post-primary schools of Lesotho. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of head teachers, 96% of the head of departments, 85% of teachers (transferred and not transferred) and all the deputy head teachers (100%) agreed that teacher mobility was common in Lesotho post-primary schools. In fact, all the respondents as the table shows agreed that teacher mobility was common in Lesotho. Few respondents however, were undecided to the question. The abbreviations in table 4.5 in full, mean: A = Agree, D = Disagree, and UND = Undecided. The researcher reduced the five point-scale to three in the analysis of data. This was the case because respondents who strongly agreed and strongly disagreed obviously agreed or disagreed.

Table 4.6: Teacher mobility as a common practice in schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>UND</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.2 Extent of teacher mobility as perceived by HT, DHT, HOD, TT and NT

Respondents in table 4.7 illustrated the extent of teacher mobility in Leribe district between 1998-2000. Head teachers (12%) and deputy head teachers (25%) showed that the extent of teacher mobility in post-primary schools of Leribe was high and 6% and 17% of the same groups respectively indicated that the extent was low. Twenty four per
cent (24%) of HT and 25% of DHT indicated an average degree of teacher mobility. Teachers in all the categories were aware of teacher mobility even though the majority did not know about the degree at which teacher mobility was happening.

Table 4.7 The extent of teacher mobility in Leribe as perceived by HT, DHT, HOD, TT and NT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Increasing teacher mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were also asked whether teacher mobility was increasing in the Leribe district. Transferred teachers (73%) and those who did not transfer (76%) and heads of department (46%) indicated not knowing whether teacher mobility was increasing or not. On the other hand, 17% of NTs, 22% of TTs and 42% of HODs indicated an increasing teacher mobility. A smaller percentage of all the categories indicated that teacher mobility was not increasing. In this category, NT came out to be seven percent, TT was five percent while HOD was 13%.
4.3.1.3 Extent of teacher mobility as perceived by parent representatives

Parent representatives (52%) indicated the rate of teacher mobility as being average, (33.3%) meaning that it was neither high nor low between 1998 and 2000, while (30%) did not know the rate at which teacher mobility was taking place. A small percentage (18%) indicated an increase in teacher mobility between 1998 and 2000. It could be concluded from these findings that the extent of teacher mobility was average or that parents had not noted teacher mobility. This might not be a true reflection of the extent of teacher mobility in Leribe, since these were the perceptions of the respondents. These perceptions might be right or wrong but they show what they perceive.

4.3.1.4 Education Officers and the extent of teacher mobility

Other respondents, the chairpersons of teachers’ unions and education officers indicated an increase in teacher mobility in the Leribe post-primary schools. The respondents indicated a high rate of teacher mobility between 1998 and 2000. The chairpersons further pointed out that the high rate of transfers in schools was exacerbated by the 1990 and 1995 teachers’ strikes in Lesotho. The findings indicated that teachers were no longer happy in their former schools due to poor relations between the administration and the teachers concerned. Teachers who were on strike were not fairly treated by the administration, as one of the chairpersons said, since many of them were not supporting the strike. As a result of these events, teachers lacked the motivation and job satisfaction, which are considered important at the work place as some of the researchers have indicated (Evans, 2001; Smit and Cronje, 1999; Mwamwenda, 1995).

Teacher mobility has certain effects to the well being of the organizations. Having looked at the extent of teacher mobility in Leribe, it is also important to consider the effects of teacher mobility in post-primary schools of Leribe district.
4.3.2: WHAT ARE THE EFFECTS OF TEACHER MOBILITY IN POST-PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF LERIBE?

The findings indicated that teacher mobility had some effects both on the school and on teachers. The first part will look at how teacher mobility affects the school and the second part will consider the effects of teacher mobility on the teachers.

4.3.2.1 Whether teacher mobility was a serious problem in post-primary schools of Lesotho as shown by HT, DHT, HOD, TT and NT

The distribution of scores in table 4.9 shows that teacher mobility was a serious problem in schools. The majority of respondents have shown that it was indeed a problem. It is worth noting that all the deputy head teachers (100%) and 71% of head teachers agreed that teacher mobility was problematic in post-primary schools of Lesotho. Few respondents among the HOD, TT and NT indicated not knowing that it was problematic.

Table 4.9: Teacher mobility as a serious problem in post-primary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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All education officers agreed that teacher mobility was indeed a serious problem in post-primary schools of Leribe. The two leaders of teachers' unions were of the same opinion that transfers were problematic in schools.

Literature has pointed out that effectiveness in organizations could be negatively affected by instability within organizations. Instability in this context refers to recurring abnormal situations which hinder the normal operation of schools. Instability in organizations could be brought about by many factors internal and external to the organization. Teacher mobility, turnover and attrition are some of the threats to organizational effectiveness (Horn & Rodger, 1995). The school could hardly be effective if there is high teacher mobility as Norton (2002) indicated, because teacher mobility disrupts the normal academic activities of schools (Mallam, 1994; Ingersoll, 2001). The situation further affects student performance (Theobald and Michael, 2001). Research has pointed out that certain factors in schools may lead to job dissatisfaction. These factors include inadequate teaching-learning aids, crowded classes which made it difficult for students to learn, lack of official teacher accommodation, teachers teaching subjects which they are not qualified for and lack of facilities (Steyn and Van Wyk, 1999; Mwamwenda, 1995).

Job satisfaction has been considered an important parameter in organizations. It is imperative for schools as social organizations to build their human capital. Human resources in schools need to be managed in order to develop skills, attitudes, knowledge and motivations (Owens, 1998). Research has indicated that employees' morale and job satisfaction could be realised when people's needs are satisfied. It is in this context that Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory and Herzberg's Two-Factor theory have been found significant to guide this study.

The findings indicated that teacher mobility had some effects both on the school and on teachers. The first part will look at how teacher mobility affects the school and the second part will consider the effects of teacher mobility on the teachers.
4.3.2.2 Effects of teacher mobility as perceived by HT, DHT, HOD, NT and TT

One of the effects of teacher mobility was that it usually takes time for the schools to replace the transferred teachers. This is illustrated in table 4.10.

Table 4.10: Teacher transfers and time taken to replace them as perceived by HT, DHT, HOD, NT and TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>LONG TIME</th>
<th>SHORT TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results by different respondents as indicated in table 4.10 shows that it takes time for schools to replace transferred teachers. This is supported by the findings of Viadero (2001) and Mallam (1994) who also found that teacher replacement usually takes time. During the time the posts are advertised and filled, students usually stay without a teacher because other teachers have their own classes to teach. This affects the reputation of the school because there is a high possibility of the poor academic performance of the school as the student pass rate may decline (Owens, 1998 and Bempah, 1994). From the results, it can be concluded that teacher mobility affects the reputation of the school. This is supported by the most recent findings of other researchers who found that teacher mobility affected schools by bringing about teacher shortages (Hanushek et al., 2001; Ingersoll, 1999; Hatton et al., 1991; Watson et al., 1991).
4.3.2.3 Whether teacher mobility disorganizes schools’ plans

Table 4.11: Teacher mobility disorganizes schools’ plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results as indicated in table 4.11 by HOD, HT, DHT, NT and TT on the question of whether teacher mobility disorganizes schools’ plans indicated that it does affect the schools plans in the sense that it brings instability in schools (Theobald and Michael, 2001; Murnane et al. 1991). Ferguson and Ferguson (2000) stated that organizing develops the quality of work through working together. If teacher mobility disorganizes schools, problems may be realized where school plans may not be carried out effectively. Schools have to re-organize their plans in order to accommodate the loss of teachers. For example, head of departments have to draw up a temporary timetable until the new teacher arrives.

Figure 6 shows the responses of different respondents in relation to the effect of teacher mobility on student performance. The majority of respondents in different categories all agree that teacher mobility affects student performance. Students are likely to perform poorly in examinations when they do not have certain subject teachers. Furthermore, the figure shows very small percentages among TT, NT and HOD who are undecided as to whether teacher movements affect student academic performance. The results are consistent with other researchers who found that teacher mobility affects student

Figure 6: Teacher mobility and its effect on student performance.

Teacher mobility also has affects on other teachers remaining in the school. Figure 7 shows responses in relation to whether teacher mobility has any effects on the other teachers remaining in schools.

The results indicated responses in relation to the different respondents. The majority in the categories of HT, DHT and NT agreed that teacher mobility affects the remaining teachers in schools as they overload them because they get additional lessons. On the other hand, HOD, TT categories pointed out that teacher mobility does not affect the remaining teachers in schools. A conclusion can be drawn out of these results that teacher movements between schools affect the remaining teachers because they may be expected to teach extra classes whose teachers have transferred. This means more overloads to the remaining teachers, and this may bring dissatisfaction on the overloaded teachers and this situation in tum may exacerbate teacher mobility (Mwamwenda, 1995)
On the question of whether teacher mobility causes an increase in the workload of teachers in schools, respondents HT (86%), DHT (85%) and HOD (50%) indicated that it overloads other teachers remaining in schools except the NT and TT who indicated that it does not cause overloading of other teachers. However, a greater number of TT and NT disagreed with Mwamwenda’s assertion that teacher overloads brings dissatisfaction on the overloaded teachers which in turn exacerbate teacher mobility. The results are in line with the work of other researchers who found that teacher mobility overloaded other teachers (Becker, 1995; Ingersoll, 2001; Williams, 1998; Luthans and Davis, 1992, Mobley, 1982; Certo and Fox, 2002; Mwamwenda, 1995; Steyn and Van Wyk, 1999). It is interesting to note that almost half of the HOD said that teachers were overloaded while another half said that they were not overloaded. Research has indicated that the work environment may lead to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Overloading of teachers may bring dissatisfaction and lower the morale of teachers (Mobley, 1982). Teachers may lack motivation and not self-actualize in their work.
Table 4.12 Whether teacher mobility causes overloading of teachers remaining in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.4 Effects of teacher mobility as seen by education officers and leaders of teachers unions

Education officers pointed out that teacher mobility hinders progress of schools and their own progress as well, because teachers who move from one school to another impair continuity that is, there is no follow up on their work. Education officers also indicated that these movements bring instability to their work as officers (Sheila, 2001; Owens, 1998). This is the case because they provide training for teachers whose progress they could not monitor because of the aspect of changing schools. Another point mentioned by the officers was that transfers affected student academic performance. The results of the study are consistent with the work of other researchers who found that teacher mobility disrupts teachers’ work and causes instability in schools (Theobald and Michael, 2001; Smit and Cronje, 1999).

Leaders of teacher unions indicated that teacher mobility affected students’ performance negatively, disorganized the schools in relation to on-going plans, replacement took a lot of time and overloaded the remaining teachers.
4.3.3 WHAT MAKES TEACHERS MOVE FROM ONE SCHOOL TO ANOTHER IN LESOTHO IN GENERAL AND PARTICULARLY IN THE LERIBE DISTRICT?

The question of what generally made teachers move from one school to another in Lesotho generally and in Leribe particularly, was addressed by different respondents and the responses were shown in different tables. The respondents include all the stakeholders namely HT, DHT, HOD, NT and TT.

Responses in relation to the Likert scale type of questions where respondents were asked to choose among the alternatives are shown in different tables. Respondents were asked whether they agreed, disagreed, and also to mention whether they were undecided with the statements given.

4.3.3.1 Influences on teacher mobility as seen by teachers (HT, DHT, HOD, TT, NT)

Table 4.13: Influences on teacher mobility in Lesotho and Leribe district (N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS INFLUENCING TEACHER MOBILITY</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban schools preference</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better performing schools</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well managed schools</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities in schools</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied teachers needs</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of teacher involvement</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employment</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private employment</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few grants in schools</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching far from home</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows several influences on teacher mobility in Lesotho in general and particularly in the Leribe district by all teachers. Ninety-one percent (91%) of the respondents indicated teachers’ preference of urban schools and lack of facilities in schools as the most influential factors. It is worth noting that this is indicated by the same percentage of respondents. The least influential factor which constitute 75% is the teachers’ preference of better performing schools. All these factors are however significant in influencing teacher mobility in Lesotho.

On average 84% of the respondents agreed to the fact that there are factors influencing teacher mobility in post primary schools of Leribe. This has been computed by finding the mean thus: summation of scores divided by the number of scores. 1637/11=148.8, which is close to 84% of the respondents. Under the category of respondents who disagreed, on average eight percent (130/11=11.8) of them showed that there are no factors influencing teacher mobility in post-primary schools in Leribe. The conclusion drawn is that there are factors influencing teacher mobility in the Leribe district.

The factor concerning lack of facilities in schools is fully supported by Certo and Fox (2002), Ingersoll (2001), Lockheed and Verspoor (1991), Mwamwenda (1995), and Owens (1998) who all found that teachers’ decisions to stay in schools was determined by supportive work conditions. This might be the case with teachers in post-primary schools of Leribe. Provision of facilities in schools is the responsibility of the administration and the Government. If facilities are not provided there is a possibility that teachers might be negatively affected and ultimately resort to transferring to other schools where facilities are available. Lack of facilities in schools might further negatively impact on student performance in examinations. Schools having the necessary facilities usually perform well in examinations. Better performance of schools attracts teachers and therefore encourages teacher movements between schools and this is the prevailing situation in the Leribe district. This is in concert with Viadero’s (2001) findings in
Other factors influencing teacher mobility as shown by the respondents are temporary employment of teachers. This was indicated by 86% of the respondents, private employment of teachers rose by 80%, few grants in schools indicated by 93%, teaching far from home raised by 85% and poor relations among teachers indicated by 71%. The finding on poor teachers’ relations is fully supported by the work of (Hargreaves, 1994; Rust and Dalin, 1990 and Owens, 1998). If relations between teachers are poor, the end result may lead to teachers transferring to other schools in search of job satisfaction (Cook, 1991).

The next section looks at influences on teacher transfers from the structured questionnaire. Responses from different respondents are shown in tables; 4.14, 4.15, 4.16, 4.17, 4.18, 4.19 and 4.20. Respondents include the following HT, DHT, HOD, NT, TT, parent representatives and education officers.

4.3.3.2 Influences on teacher transfers as perceived by HT, DHT, HOD, NT and TT

Table 4.14: Responses of HT and DHT on teacher mobility (question 26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS INFLUENCING TEACHER MOBILITY</th>
<th>HT</th>
<th></th>
<th>DHT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied teachers needs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to be near home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty-five percent (65%) of the respondents in the category of HT indicated the need to be near home while 53% indicated lack of facilities in schools as the two main factors influencing teacher mobility in post-primary schools of Leribe district. Facilities in schools include instructional materials and housing for teachers. Deputy head teachers are also of the same view that the most influential factors are the need to be near home (85%) and lack of facilities in schools (62%). The conclusion that can be drawn from these
also of the same view that the most influential factors are the need to be near home (85%) and lack of facilities in schools (62%). The conclusion that can be drawn from these findings is that the need for teachers to be near their homes reduces the costs that can be incurred when the teacher is far from home, for example transport costs, support of two different families etc. Another conclusion that may be drawn from the findings is that provision of facilities in schools plays an important role as far as teachers are concerned. Teachers normally move away from schools with poor facilities to those with better facilities like accommodation, social amenities such as electricity and water. Hence, lack of facilities influences teacher mobility in schools. Teachers therefore move from less desirable situation to other situations where they feel comfortable (Theobald and Michael, 2001; Sheila, 2001).

Unavailable teachers' needs and interests such as instructional materials, accommodation and transport, electricity and water, sports and music were found to be influential on teacher mobility in Lesotho. This fact was indicated by 48% of TT and 54% of HOD. However, 47% of NT indicated unavailable teachers' needs and interests not being influential on teacher mobility. Teachers usually are interested in particular things that makes them comfortable and things that makes their lives easy. For example, if the teacher is interested in sports and the school is not involved in sporting activities, the teacher may feel uncomfortable and hence transfer to another school with sporting activities.

| Table 4.15: Unavailable teachers’ needs and interests and their influence on teacher mobility |
|---------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| TEACHERS | YES | % | NO | % | NO RESPONSE | % | TOTAL |
| TT | 29 | 48 | 19 | 32 | 12 | 20 | 60 |
| NT | 21 | 33 | 30 | 47 | 13 | 20 | 64 |
| HOD | 14 | 54 | 10 | 38 | 2 | 8 | 26 |
The findings on whether school reputation contributed to teacher mobility indicated that 45% of NT and 56% of TT showed that good reputation is not influential to teacher mobility in schools. Fifty percent (50%) of the heads of department also reported that good reputation was not influential to teacher mobility. Good reputation has not been considered significant by these categories of teachers.

Table 4.16: The need to be near home and its influence on teacher mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO RESPONSE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table 4.16 indicates, a greater percentage of the HOD and TT showed that the teachers’ need to be nearer to their homes influenced their movement from one school to another in the Leribe district. Smaller percentages from NT (38%) indicated that the teachers’ need to be near home did not have a bearing on teacher mobility. Generally the conclusion can be drawn that the need for teachers to be near home has an influence on teacher movements between schools.

Table 4.17: Lack of facilities in schools and their influence on teacher mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO RESPONSE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of TT (52%) and HOD (61%) indicated lack of facilities in schools as a significant factor contributing to teacher mobility in post-primary schools of Leribe. Like HT and DHT have shown previously, teachers have that tendency of moving to schools with better facilities and hence are fond of being attracted to such schools. This tendency therefore, has an influence on teacher movements between schools.
Responses to whether poor management of schools contributes to teacher movements from one school to another in Leribe district are shown in table 4.18.

Table 4.18: Poor management of schools and its influence on teacher mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO RESPONSE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses from TT (40%), NT (36%) and HOD (46%) in table 4.18 indicated that poor management influences teacher mobility. However, a smaller percentage of responses from the NT (36%) are noticed. It can be concluded that poor management did not play a significant role in influencing teacher mobility in schools.

4.3.3.3 Influences on teacher mobility as seen by parent representatives.

Table 4.19: Influences on Teacher Mobility by parent representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFLUENCES ON TEACHER TRANSFERS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unavailable teachers needs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools good reputation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools near home</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed facilities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good school results</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well managed schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents in table 4.19 indicated preference of schools with developed facilities (68%) as the main factor for teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe. The other factors; like being in schools near home (46%), good school results (46%), well managed
factors; like being in schools near home (46%), good school results (46%), well managed schools (36%), schools with good reputation (23%) and unavailable teachers’ needs and interests (32%) were found to be influencing teacher transfers but not to the same degree as developed facilities are concerned. Because parent representatives are not that close and unfamiliar with the affairs of the schools, they may not be aware of several factors that influence teacher movements between schools and hence the information they provided may not be reliable as compared to the information that teachers themselves may provide.

4.3.3.4 Teacher mobility as seen by Education Officers.

Respondents in this category mentioned preference of being near home, lack of facilities, poor relationship between the teachers, poor relationship between the teachers and administration and poor management as the main factors behind teacher movements between schools. This information comes from the interviews conducted with the eight education officers in the Leribe district.
4.3.4: SUGGESTIONS GIVEN TO ADDRESS TEACHER MOBILITY IN THE LERIBE DISTRICT

4.3.4.1 Suggestions given to eliminate transfers by Education Officers, Head Teachers (HT) and Deputy head teachers (DHT)

Table 4.20: Suggestions to eliminate teacher transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUGGESTIONS TO ELIMINATE TRANSFERS</th>
<th>EDUCATION OFFICERS</th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>DHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of teachers by MOE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations to transfer reviewed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers needs considered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal facilities to schools by government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of grants to schools</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved infrastructure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good working relations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20 shows suggestions given by respondents to eliminate teacher transfers in the Leribe district. Sixty-three percent (63%) of the respondents under the category of Education officers suggested effective management and 50% of them suggested allocation of teachers to schools by the Ministry of Education (MOE) and review of teacher transfer regulation. Thirty five per cent (35%) of HT and 38% of the DHT mentioned effective management of schools as one of the suggestions to eliminate teacher transfers in Leribe schools. The majority of the respondents mentioned other suggestions like provision of equal facilities to schools by the government and consideration of teachers needs. Schools in Lesotho do not have equal facilities and if the government of Lesotho can see to it that all schools are equally equipped with developed facilities, this may eliminate teacher movements between schools of the Leribe district in particular.
4.3.4.2 Suggestions given to eliminate transfers by HOD, NT and TT.

Responses in relation to the suggestions given by HOD, NT and TT to eliminate transfers are indicated in the following tables. These suggestions include teacher appraisal (table 4.21), teacher involvement in school affairs (table 4.22), provision of improved equal facilities in schools (table 4.23), increasing teachers' salaries (table 4.24), creation of good relations at work (table 4.25) and meeting teachers' needs and interests (table 4.26). The responses also include trained management of schools, provision of counseling session, policy on transfers and employment of teachers near their homes, provision of grants for teachers and co-operation between teachers and administration.

Table 4.21: Teacher appraisal as a suggestion to eliminate transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO RESPONSE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both tables few respondents suggested teacher appraisal: 4% of HOD and 3% of NT while the majority (81%) HOD, (66%) NT and (75%) TT did not suggest teacher appraisal as a factor to eliminate teacher mobility. As far as teacher appraisal is concerned, the majority of the teachers did not see it as a significant factor in the elimination of teacher movements between schools in the Leribe district.
concerned, the majority of the teachers did not see it as a significant factor in the elimination of teacher movements between schools in the Leribe district.

The findings in table 4.23 show responses in relation to the suggestion of provision of improved equal facilities in schools. Even here, respondents who raised these suggestions are few; percentages range from 27% of HODs, 27% of NT to 30% of TT. On the other hand, bigger percentages came from those who did not raise this suggestion. Percentages range from (58%) HODs, (45%) TT to (42%) NT. A conclusion made is that respondents did not consider improved equal facilities as an important suggestion that can reduce teacher transfers.

Table 4.23: Provision of improved equal facilities in schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.24: Increasing teachers salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO RESPONSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the suggestion of increasing teachers’ salaries most of the respondents (81%) of HOD, 66% of NT and 70% of TT did not support the suggestion. However, smaller percentages of the respondents as the table indicates were of the opinion that teacher’s salaries should be increased as a way of reducing transfers. A conclusion can be drawn that salaries were not considered significant to eliminate transfers in schools. Teachers as
Some researchers have shown need conducive working environments (Ingersoll, 2001; Certo and Fox, 2002). Certo and Fox go on to say that school characteristics and school organizational conditions and lack of opportunities for advancement and motivation are of significance on teacher withdrawals in schools. As Maslow indicates in his theory that people need opportunities for advancement so that they can self actualize that is, reach higher levels of their professional skills.

Table 4.25 shows responses to the suggestion that creating good relations at work can reduce transfers. However, most respondents (81%) of HOD, 73% of NT and 50% of TT did not support the suggestion that creation of good relations at work may eliminate teacher transfers. Respondents supporting this suggestion ranged from 4% to 2%. One can conclude that this suggestion was not fully supported by the majority of the respondents, hence creating good working conditions is not an answer to the reduction of teacher movements between schools.

Table 4.25: Creation of good relations at work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.26: Meeting teachers’ needs and interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The category of HOD (27%), NT (19%) and (2%) of TT believed that meeting teachers' needs and interests could reduce transfers of teachers between schools. Fifty eight per cent (58%) of the HOD, 50% of NT and 73% of the TT did not believe that these could reduce teacher transfers in schools.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a summary, conclusions and recommendations from the findings of the study. The last section of this chapter outlines some recommendations in relation to teacher mobility in the Leribe district. Suggestions and recommendations for further research are also stated.

5.2 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The study was aimed at determining the views of the respondents concerning factors influencing teacher mobility in post-primary schools in the Leribe district. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following research questions:

- What is the extent of teacher mobility in Leribe between 1998-2000?
- What are the effects of teacher mobility in post-primary schools of Leribe?
- What generally makes teachers move from one post-primary school to another in Lesotho in general and particularly in the Leribe district?
- What suggestions are given to address teacher mobility in Leribe, according to the following stakeholders: District education officers; school site managers; teachers transferred; and teachers not transferred.

Review of literature has shown that teacher mobility is the result of teachers' job dissatisfaction in schools. Teacher mobility, teacher turnover, and teacher attrition as revealed by the literature have an influence in determining the effectiveness of schools. Job satisfaction also plays an important role in organization and therefore schools cannot be an exception. Research has indicated that school characteristics and organizational
conditions such as administrative support, motivation and lack of opportunity for advancement are significant factors influencing teacher mobility and teacher turnover. The findings of this study are in concert with what other researchers have found.

The research sites were post-primary schools in the Leribe district. Eighteen schools were randomly selected from the population of 45 post-primary schools to take part in the study. From this sample, samples of eighteen head teachers, eighteen deputy head teachers, 36 heads of department, 72 transferred teachers, 72 teachers not transferred and 36 parent representatives were selected. Other samples included eight education officers and two representatives of teacher unions.

Collected data through questionnaires and interviews were used and analysed quantitatively and qualitatively. The study findings revealed the following:

The research population was composed of more males than females and their ages targeted between 25 and over 41 years. The population under study consisted of mostly teachers who had suitable qualifications in the teaching profession.

Even though respondents were aware of the existence of teacher mobility in the post-primary schools of Leribe, they did not know or could not determine the extent of this mobility between 1998 and 2000. Other respondents which included education officers and representatives of teacher unions however indicated a high rate of teacher mobility in the district. Teacher mobility according to these respondents was actually exacerbated by the 1990 and 1995 teachers’ strikes whereby many teachers were expelled in schools while others changed schools due to the fact that they were no longer comfortable in their schools of first posting.

In relation to the effects of teacher mobility in post-primary schools teachers agreed that teacher mobility affects student performance in schools and disorganizes the schools plans. Respondents’ views differed on whether transfers affected other teachers remaining in schools. The DHT, HT and NT indicated that it affected the remaining
teachers while HODs and TT were not in agreement with the statement. The HODs, HT and DHT all indicated that teacher mobility overloaded other teachers remaining in schools and probably exacerbated the situation. Respondents also indicated that it took a long time to replace transferred teachers in schools. Education officers pointed out that teacher mobility hindered progress and continuity, brought instability in their work with teachers. In relation to schools, it was found that teacher mobility affected student performance.

When referring to the question of what makes teachers move from one school to another the respondents indicated that a number of factors contributed to teacher movements in the district.

The findings of the study revealed the following factors:

- Teachers' desire to be near their homes
- Lack of facilities in schools
- Teachers' preference of urban schools
- Teachers' preference of better performing schools in examinations
- Poor relations between the teachers themselves
- Poor relations between teachers and head teachers as administrators
- Temporary employment of teachers
- Private employment
- Few grants in schools

All these reasons or factors are consistent across all respondents in the study and have been found to be contributing to teacher mobility in Leribe.
5.3 CONCLUSION

The study concluded that teacher mobility in Lesotho and Leribe in particular was influenced by several factors namely:

- Teachers’ preference to better performing schools within and beyond the district. Teachers moved to schools that consistently produced better examination results.
- Teachers’ preference to urban situated schools. Most teachers prefer schools in urban areas where it could be easy for them to get social amenities like hospitals, entertainment and further education opportunities.
- Teachers’ preferences for schools nearer to their homes. Teachers need to be closer to their families so as to take care of them.
- Lack of facilities in schools. Schools without the necessary instructional materials like science laboratories, textbooks and the entire necessary infrastructure may dissatisfy teachers.
- Poor relations between teachers. Relations between teachers are sometimes not good, and this ultimately lead to teachers moving out of such schools.
- Poor relations between teachers and the administration (head teachers). There are sometimes misunderstandings between teachers and the administration.
- Better management of schools. If schools are well managed teachers are attracted to such schools in great numbers.
- Lack of grants in schools. It may be wise for the government to provide grants to all the schools in the district.
- Temporary employment of teachers. Sometimes schools employ teachers as substitutes for those who have gone to further their studies. The situation occurs when a substitute teacher gets a government paid job in another school, the teacher leaves even before the return of the one who had gone to school.

Suggestions to reduce or eliminate teacher mobility as raised by the respondents were as follows:
- schools need to be effectively managed,
  - Teachers should be allocated to schools by the MOE,
  - teachers’ needs and interests be met,
  - provision of equal facilities in schools by the Government
  - review of regulations to transfers

The findings and the conclusions derived from this study formed the basis of the recommendations stated in the next section.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are made:

- Teaching service regulations for teacher transfers be revised. The regulations should not allow teachers to transfer at any time they feel like to any school of their choice. Conditions could be set up in order to control teacher transfers. For example, a condition may be made that a teacher could transfer after a certain period of time working in a particular school.

- It is recommended that the Ministry of Education should do the allocation of teachers. The Ministry concerned should, instead of allowing teachers to make their own choices of schools do allocation of teachers to schools. In this way schools may not run short of teachers. The present practice is such that teachers choose schools they want to work in and can transfer to certain schools if they wish to do so. This brings educational inequalities whereby other schools will have many experienced teachers while others will have inexperienced teachers. The results have indicated that teachers prefer urban situated schools. If most of the teachers go to urban areas, this will lead to teacher shortages in many schools in the rural areas of the country.

- Facilities provision by the government should be allocated to all schools. All schools need to be provided with the necessary facilities such as instructional materials and
the necessary infrastructure. This can motivate teachers because their needs will be
catered for.

• Schools should evaluate themselves in order to be aware of achievements and
discrepancies in their plans. This will help schools to look for other strategies in order
to accomplish stated objectives. For example, if the school is experiencing high
teacher mobility, self-evaluation might help stakeholders to look for loopholes in their
schools.

• School administration should be effective and efficient. Lack of administrative
support has been found to influence teachers’ mobility in schools and results in job
dissatisfaction.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The study was quantitative and qualitative in nature; however, the qualitative approach
was on a very small scale. Researcher-designed structured questionnaires were used. The
questionnaires had many closed questions. A limited number of respondents were
interviewed in this study. The next study could be conducted using a qualitative approach
in order to get information directly from the respondents. In that way, it might be possible
to collect rich data from the respondents’ views on the subject, instead of reacting to
closed questions where they were confined to certain responses only.

Another recommendation is that it could also be appropriate to collect data directly from
the transferred teachers in more than one district so as to acquire substantial information
from the respondents who have been in the process of transferring. So, further research
could be undertaken along those lines.
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APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HEADTEACHERS AND DEPUTY HEADTEACHERS IN POST-PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF LERIBE.

INSTRUCTIONS:

This questionnaire is meant to collect information in relation to possible factors that influence teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe district. Respondents are kindly requested to complete this questionnaire accurately and honestly. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions. You answer according to your knowledge or views on the subject. Information collected will only be used for research purposes and also treated with strict anonymity. You do not have to write your name anywhere on this questionnaire.

Please show your responses by inserting a right (✓) in the appropriate box and where necessary fill in the spaces provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL PROFILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **Name of school**
   - Gender

2. **Region**

3. **Age:**
   - 18-24 years
   - 24-29
   - 30-35
   - 36-41
   - Over 41

4. **Education qualification**
   - 1. certificate in education
   - 2. diploma in education
   - 3. bachelor's degree in education
   - 4. master's degree in education
   - 5. other (specify)

5. **Teaching experience**
   - 0-5 years
   - 6-11
   - 12-17
   - 18-23
   - Over 23

6. **Number of children**
   - 0-5
   - 6-11
   - Over 11

7. **Number of years in first school posting**
   - 0-5
   - 6-11
   - 11-15
   - Over 15 years

8. **Number of years in this school**
   - 0-5
   - 6-11
   - 12-17
   - 18-23
   - Over 23

---

**APPENDIX D**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HEADTEACHERS AND DEPUTY HEADTEACHERS**

**SECTION B:**

**GENERAL TEACHER TRANSFER**

9. **As a head teacher/deputy head teacher in this school, what are your responsibilities?**
- Staffing the school
- Make resources available
- Admit students
- Collection of fees
- Community (school relations)
- Assist the head teacher
- Administer the school during the head teacher's absence

Other: Head: .................................................................
.................................................................

Deputy: .................................................................
.................................................................

10. What was your first school posting after your training? .................................................................
........................................................................

11. Of all schools in Lesotho, why did you decide to teach in this particular school?

- had a vacancy for me
- well administered school
- near my home
- good reputation
- better performing school
- well developed school with facilities

Other reason(s): .................................................................
........................................................................
........................................................................
12. What could be the reason(s) for leaving the school of your first choice?

- lacked facilities
- had promotions somewhere
- offered more money in another school
- wanted change of environment
- far from home
- not well managed

Other: ..........................................................................................

13. Have you taught in other schools before coming to this one?

Yes
No

14. What is it that you like about this school?

- better performing school in exams
- disciplined school
- good reputation
- well administered
- co-operation is there in this school

Other: ..........................................................................................

................................................................................................
15. Are you aware of voluntary teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. In your experience as a head teacher / deputy head teacher, how was teacher transfers in Leribe post-primary schools between 1998-2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>- high</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- not sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other......................................................................................... .
......................................................................................... .

17. What are some of the reasons teachers give for transferring to your school?

| - good reputation |     |
| - teachers needs and interests are considered |   |
| - well administered school |   |
| - near their homes |   |
| - good facilities |   |
| - want to be grant aided |   |

Other......................................................................................... .
......................................................................................... .

18. What are some of the reasons teachers give for transferring from your school to other schools?

......................................................................................... .
......................................................................................... .
......................................................................................... .
......................................................................................... .
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19. Do you know where teachers who have moved transferred go to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- urban schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- rural school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- better performing schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- schools near their homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- where higher posts are available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other.........................................................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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20. Do you know where teachers who transfer to your schools come from?

- poor performing schools
- not well managed schools
- lacking facilities e.g. housing, water etc
- far located schools from their homes
- rural schools
- where they were not granted

Other

21. After how long do you usually find teachers to replace those who have left?

- Short time
- Long time

22. In your view, which age group do you think transfer most into your school?

- 20-25 years
- 26-31
- 32-37
- 38-43
- Over 43

23. In your view, which age group do you think transfer most out of your school?

- 20-25 years
- 26-31
- 32-37
- 38-43
- Over 43
24. Why do you think the situation is as you indicated in the above two questions?

- do not have commitments
- experience different environments
- want more challenge
- want to go where their colleagues are
- want schools with facilities

Other

25. How often does teacher transfers happen in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: CAUSES OF TEACHER TRANSFERS.

26. If it happens, what are some of the reasons connected with that situation?

- needs and interests not met
- want change of environment
- teachers prefer schools near their homes
- want schools with facilities

Other: ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

27. As a head teacher / deputy head teacher, why do you think there is so much transfers from one school to another among post-primary school teachers of Leribe district?

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

SECTION D: EFFECTS OF TEACHER TRANSFERS

28. Do you consider teacher transfers as a serious problem for you?

Yes
No

29. If yes, why do you think it is problematic?

- affects student performance
- disorganizes me in planning
- affects the other teachers remaining
- causes overloading of other teachers

Other: ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

30. If no, why do you think it is not problematic?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
SECTION E: ADDRESSING TEACHER TRANSFERS

31. What suggestion do you have to eliminate teacher transfers in post-primary of Leribe?
(a) ........................................................................................................................................
(b) ........................................................................................................................................
(c) ........................................................................................................................................

32. The researcher is interested in your feelings concerning voluntary teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe district. Please read each statement and answer it according to how you feel about it.

**INSTRUCTIONS:**
- If you strongly agree, circle 1 (SA)
- If you agree, circle 2 (A)
- If you are undecided or uncertain, circle 3 (U)
- If you strongly disagree, circle 4 (SD)
- If you disagree, circle 5 (D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher transfers takes place in post-primary schools of Lesotho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher transfers is a common practice in post-primary schools of Leribe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There was a high teacher transfer between 1998-2000 in post-primary schools of Leribe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher transfers is on the increase in Leribe post-primary schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Young teachers are the ones who usually transfer from one school to another.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teachers usually move to post-primary schools located in urban areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teachers usually move to better performing schools in examinations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers transfer to schools which are well managed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of facilities like teaching aids, labs, housing for teachers are some of the causes of teacher transfers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Unsatisfied needs, unrecognised work done by teachers are some of the causes of teacher transfers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lack of teacher involvement by the administration on matters affecting them as teachers is another cause of teacher transfers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Temporary employment among the teachers is another cause of teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Private employment of teachers is one of the causes of teacher transfers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lack of grants in post-primary schools is another cause of teacher transfers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teaching far from home is another cause of teacher transfers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lack of co-operation among the teachers is another cause of teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers move to schools where their friends work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It takes time for the school to replace the transferred teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teacher transfers away from the school have an impact on the academic performance of the students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher transfers disorganizes the school activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. One way of eliminating teacher transfers is that teachers must be open to school management regarding their problems, needs and interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS (transferred and not transferred) AND HEAD OF DEPARTMENTS IN POST PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF LERIBE

INSTRUCTIONS:

This questionnaire is meant to collect information in relation to possible factors that influence teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe district. Respondents are kindly requested to complete this questionnaire accurately and honestly. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions. You answer according to your knowledge or views on the subject. Information collected will only be used for research purposes and also treated with strict anonymity. You do not have to write your name anywhere on this questionnaire.

Please show your responses by inserting a right (✓) in the appropriate box and where necessary fill in the spaces provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>PERSONAL PROFILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Name of school
   Gender

2. Region

3. Age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24 years</td>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-41</td>
<td>18-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 41</td>
<td>Over 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Education qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. certificate in education</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. diploma in education</td>
<td>6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. bachelor’s degree in education</td>
<td>Over 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. master’s degree in education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years in first school posting</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-11</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>Over 15 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Number of children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years in this school</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-11</th>
<th>12-17</th>
<th>18-23</th>
<th>Over 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Number of years in first school posting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years in this school</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-11</th>
<th>12-17</th>
<th>18-23</th>
<th>Over 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS (Transferred and not transferred) AND HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS IN POST-PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF LERIBE

SECTION A - PART TWO

GENERAL TEACHER MOBILITY

9. What influenced your decision to choose teaching as a career?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>love teaching profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like talking to people and helping them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influenced by job opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influenced by parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influenced by friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other: ..................................................................................................................

10. In which school did you teach after teacher Training?

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

11. Are you still teaching in that school even at the present moment?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. If yes, what is it that you like about this school that has made you continue teaching in it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>well managed school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situated near my home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location is good in an urban area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-operation is good among teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good relationships between admin. and teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers needs and interests are considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmony and peach in this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. If no, what could be the reason(s) for leaving the school of your first choice?

- school not well managed
- situated far from home
- co-operation is lacking among teachers
- located in rural areas far from services
- relationships not good between teachers and admin.

Other: ......................................................................................... .
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................

14. Do you intent transferring to another school in the near future?

Yes
No

Please explain your answer.................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................

15. As a teacher, are you aware of teacher transfers among post-primary school teachers in Lesotho?

Yes
No

16. Are you aware of other teachers who have transferred from one post-primary school to another in Leribe district?

Yes
No

17. How was teacher transfers in Leribe post-primary schools between the year 1998 –2000?

High
Low
Average
Not sure
Don’t know
18. Generally, are there some preferred schools where teachers transfer to?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What do these schools have which so much attract teachers to them?

- have good examination results
- have good reputation
- well developed schools with facilities
- well managed schools
- co-operation among teachers
- teachers needs and interests catered for

Other: .........................................................................................

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

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

20. For you in particular, what is your ideal school? (The kind of school you would want to move to / find yourself in).

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

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

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

21. In your opinion, how can such a school be created /established /made possible?

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

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

...................................................................................................
SECTION B: EFFECTS OF TEACHER TRANSFERS

22. Do you consider voluntary teacher transfers as a serious problem?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. If yes, why do you think it is problematic?

- affects student performance
- disorganizes smooth running of the school
- affects the other teachers remaining
- causes overloading of other teachers

Other problems: ..................................................
.............................................................
.............................................................

SECTION C: CAUSES OF TEACHER TRANSFERS

24. Specifically for you as a head of department, what implications does this practice have on your plans?

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

25. Talking to you as a head of department teacher (who has transferred / not transferred), what makes post-primary school teachers transfer from one school to another in Leribe district?

(a) .................................................................
..............................................................................
..............................................................................
..............................................................................

(b) .................................................................
..............................................................................
..............................................................................
..............................................................................

(c) .................................................................
..............................................................................
..............................................................................
..............................................................................
26. In your opinion, do you think there is an increase in teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. After how long do schools usually find teachers to replace those who have left?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. In your opinion, why do post-primary school teachers transfer from one school to another?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Their need and interests are not met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer schools with good reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want schools near their homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want schools with facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want well managed schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want schools with good performance in exams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>........................................................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: ADDRESSING TEACHER MOBILITY

29. What do schools usually do to deal with teacher transfers in post-primary schools?

30. Does management ask for advise from teachers on how to deal with serious issues like teacher transfers?

[Yes] [No]

31. In which age group among teachers do you usually find most transfers?

- 20-25 years
- 26-31
- 32-37
- 38-43

32. As teachers, are you open to school management regarding the problems you encounter in your work which management might not be aware of?

[Yes] [No]

33. If you are open, what response do you normally get?

34. What do you suggest can be done to eliminate teacher transfers from one school to another in post-primary schools of Leribe?
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35. The researcher is interested in your feelings concerning voluntary teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe district. Please read each statement and answer it according to how you feel about it.

**INSTRUCTIONS:**
- If you strongly agree, circle 1 (SA)
- If you agree, circle 2 (A)
- If you are undecided or uncertain, circle 3 (U)
- If you strongly disagree, circle 4 (SD)
- If you disagree, circle 5 (D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>S A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher transfers takes place in post-primary schools of Lesotho</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher transfers is a common practice in post-primary schools of Leribe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There was a high teacher transfer between 1998-2000 in post-primary schools of Leribe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher transfers is on the increase in Leribe post-primary schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Young teachers are the ones who usually transfer from one school to another.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teachers usually move to post-primary schools located in urban areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teachers usually move to better performing schools in examinations</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers transfer to schools which are well managed</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of facilities like teaching aids, labs, housing for teachers are some of the causes of teacher transfers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Unsatisfied needs, unrecognized work done by teachers are some of the causes of teacher transfers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lack of teacher involvement by the administration on matters affecting them as teachers is another cause of teacher transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Temporary employment among the teachers is another cause of teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Private employment of teachers is one of the causes of teacher transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lack of grants in post-primary schools is another cause of teacher transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teaching far from home is another cause of teacher transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lack of co-operation among the teachers is another cause of teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers move to schools where their friends work</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It takes time for the school to replace the transferred teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teacher transfers away from the school have an impact on the academic performance of the students</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teacher transfers disorganizes the school organization</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. One way of eliminating teacher transfers is that teachers must be open to school management regarding their problems, needs and interests.
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APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS REPRESENTATIVES

SECTION A: GENERAL TEACHER TRANSFERS

1. What is the name of your school?

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

2. What is the relationship between you and the school?
   a. parents representative in the school Board

3. How did you become a member?
   - elected by parents
   - nominated by parents

4. How long have you been a member?
   1 year  2 years  3 years  other

5. As a representative of parents in the school Board, what are your responsibilities?
   - help in the management of school
   - report to the parents on matters they need to know
   - to put forward parents views to the school Board

6. Are you aware of teacher transfers in post-primary schools?
   Yes  No

7. How often does it happen in a year?
   - happens many times
   - it seldom happens
   - don’t know
8. Where do teachers who transfer usually go to?

- urban situated schools
- rural situated schools
- better performing schools in exams
- schools near their homes
- don’t know

Other: ........................................................................
........................................................................
........................................................................

9. According to your observation, how is teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increasing</th>
<th>Decreasing</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- not sure
### SECTION B: CAUSES OF TEACHER TRANSFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Why do you think post-primary schools teachers transfer from one school to another?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- their needs and interests may not be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- prefer schools with good reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- want schools near their homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- want schools with facilities e.g. water, housing electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- want schools with good performance in exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- want well managed schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons ........................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What do you think are the reasons behind teacher transfers from one school to another in post-primary schools of Leribe?

(a) ........................................................................................................................................
(b) ........................................................................................................................................
(c) ........................................................................................................................................
(d) ........................................................................................................................................
(e) ........................................................................................................................................
12. How do you deal with the problem of teacher transfers in your school?

13. Who has primary responsibility to deal with this problem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- head teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- school management Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- deputy headteacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ministry of education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: ADDRESSING TEACHER TRANSFERS

14. What do you suggest as a solution to this problem of teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe?

(a) ..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
(b) ..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
© ..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
(d) ..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
(e) ..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
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APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR EDUCATION OFFICERS IN LERIBE DISTRICT.

BACKGROUND

I am a student-researcher currently studying with the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg. My research topic is: The study of factors influencing teacher mobility in post-primary schools of Leribe, Lesotho. My interest is on the possible factors influencing teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe district.

PURPOSES OF THE INTERVIEW

In this interview, I hope I will gain an insight to:

- What influences teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe, Lesotho.
- The possible effects of teacher transfers to the well-being of the schools.

ETHICS

Data collected from this interview will be treated confidential by the researcher. With your permission, I would like to tape record the interview. Collected data will be used for research purposes only and your names will not appear in any part of this research.

FORMAT

The interview will take about 40 minutes. The questions are divided into three sections: Section A: Part I - Personal Profile. Part II- General teacher transfers and Section B: Influences on teacher transfers and Section C: Addressing teacher transfers.
# INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR EDUCATION OFFICERS IN LERIBE

## SECTION A: PART I

### PERSONAL PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

- Diploma in education
- Bachelor's degree in education
- Master's degree in education
- Doctoral degree

### 4. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 NUMBER OF YEARS AS EDUCATION OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR EDUCATION OFFICERS.

SECTION A: PART 11: GENERAL TEACHER TRANSFERS

6. As an education Officer, what are your major responsibilities in relation to teachers?
   - help teachers in administration
   - supervision of schools
   - help subject teachers
   - develop teacher training

7. Are you aware of teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Lesotho?
   Yes..................
   No..................

8. Are teacher transfers a common practice in post-primary schools of Leribe District?

9. Do you have an idea as to where teachers who have transferred go to?
   a. urban schools
   b. rural schools
   c. better performing schools
   d. schools near their homes

10. In your opinion, do you think there is an increase in teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe?

11. Do you consider teacher transfers from one school to another problematic in relation to your work as an education officer?

12. How is it a problem to your work and the schools in general?
SECTION B: INFLUENCES ON TEACHER TRANSFERS

13. From your experience, why do teachers transfer from one school to another especially in post-primary schools of Lesotho?

14. According to your observation, why do post-primary school teachers transfer from one school to another in Leribe district?

SECTION C: ADDRESSING TEACHER TRANSFERS

15. What suggestions do you have that can address teacher transfers as a person concerned with educational issues?
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# APPENDIX H

## INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF TEACHER UNIONS IN LESOTHO

### PERSONAL PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. GENDER</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Diploma in education
- Bachelor’s degree in education
- Master’s degree in education
- Doctoral degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. TEACHING EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>5. NUMBER OF YEARS AS UNION REPRESENTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 15 years</td>
<td>OVER 15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. In which school did you teach after your teacher training?
7. Are you still teaching in this school at the present moment?
8. If yes, what makes you continue teaching in this particular school?
9. If no, what could be the reason(s) for leaving the school of your first choice?
10. What are your responsibilities within the structure of your union?
11. As a chairperson of the union, are you aware of voluntary teacher transfers among post-primary schools teachers in Lesotho?
12. Are teacher transfers also common in the Leribe District?
13. In your opinion, do you think there is an increase in teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe?
14. How was teachers' transfer in Leribe post-primary schools between the year 1998-2000?

EFFECTS OF 1990 AND 1995 TEACHERS STRIKES

15. Did the 1990 and 1995 teachers strike had any effect on teachers?
16. How were teachers affected

EFFECTS OF TEACHER TRANSFERS

17. Do you consider teacher transfers as a serious problem?
18. How is it problematic?

CAUSES OF TEACHER TRANSFERS

19. Even though the 1990 and 1995 teachers' strikes are over, post-primary schools teachers continue to transfer from one school to another. In your opinion, why do teachers transfer from one school to another?
ADDRESSING TEACHER TRANSFER

20. What suggestion(s) do you have that can help to address this problem of teacher transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe?
APPENDIX I

THESE ARE RESPONSES OF ONE RESPONDENT AMONG EDUCATION OFFICERS.

- Provision of advisory services to principals
- Yes I am aware of transfers in post-primary schools of Leribe
- Teacher transfers are common in post-primary schools
- Teachers go to better performing schools in examinations
- Go to urban situated schools
- Go to schools near their homes
- Get out of the profession
- Go to schools having better facilities
- It is not increasing
- It is problematic
- Lose track of events
- Progress hindered
- Schools lose good teachers
- Affect academic progress of students
- Go to schools that cater for their needs
- Teacher prefer schools near their homes
- 1995 teacher’s strike exacerbated the situation
- Promotional reasons
- Teachers well oriented in their work
- Teachers air their views
- Creation of good working relations
- MOE allocate teachers to schools
- Appraisal of teachers