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Job satisfaction is a desired commodity globally and has an impact on labor market behavior and work productivity. The purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of principals’ governance practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county, Kenya. Specifically, the study was set to determine the extent to which principals’ recognition of teachers’ work, involvement of teachers in decision making process, facilitation of teachers’ professional development and supervision influence teachers’ job satisfaction. The study employed a descriptive survey design where a total of 29 principals and 270 teachers employed by the Teachers Service Commission were targeted. The sample size consisted of 20 principals and 145 teachers from 20 selected schools. The teachers who participated in the study were selected using simple random sampling. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics; frequencies and percentages and presented as bar graphs and pie charts and textual form. The study found that principals’ governance practices such as organizing of school trips, giving teachers prizes during prize giving days, giving recognition and thank you letters influenced teachers’ job satisfaction. Recognition of teachers by school principals was job satisfiers among teachers and it influenced their job satisfaction to a very great extent. Majority of teachers (78 percent) agreed that those being involved in decision making influence their job satisfaction. Principals’ facilitation of teachers’ professional development was found to influences teachers’ job satisfaction. Relationship between the supervisor and the supervised was not good and this influence teachers’ job satisfaction. From the research several recommendations are made; Principals should appreciate and recognize teachers’ work whether big or small. This will make the teacher feel good and satisfied with his or her job; teachers should be involved in decision making for smooth implementation of school programmes and also for teachers to feel at home; principals and the teachers service commission should come up with professional development programmes for teachers. The ministry of education should improve the quality of in-service training for teachers. Mentorship programmes in schools should also be improved; principals should minimize on classroom visitation and also give positive feedbacks on such visitations. The relationship between the supervisor and the supervised should be improved for better working relationship. Suggestions for further studies have also been given which include; Head teachers’ governance practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in public primary schools, socio-economic factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in secondary schools, perceived teachers factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in secondary schools.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Job alludes to the pleasurable or positive passionate state coming about because of the examination of one's activity or professional training. It alludes to a lot of good emotions with which representatives see their work. Occupation fulfillment/Job satisfaction alludes to workers' impression of how well the employments which they perform to give them those things which they see as critical to both themselves and the association (Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2014).

Job satisfaction is a desired commodity globally; the expectations of workers correlate worldwide (Heywood, 2008). According to Heywood, countries like US, United Kingdom, Australia, Germany and Korea take job satisfaction with high regard. Job satisfaction has been explored in the fields of psychology, sociology, economics and management sciences. Many experts believe that job satisfaction has an impact on labor market behavior and work productivity. In the US, workers are satisfied with work itself, their job satisfaction is not dependent on the management but if one is dissatisfied, he/she is free to look for greener pastures. It is the responsibility of many companies in the US to make sure that their employees are satisfied with their job (Heywood, 2008).
According to the annual educators’ survey of 2013, half of America’s public secondary school teachers said that they are dissatisfied with their jobs. Teachers’ dissatisfaction has declined 23% points since 2008, from 62% to 39%.

In Pakistan, teachers are highly dissatisfied with their jobs and this has an impact the quality of education and the general performance of students (Amin, Shah, Tatlah, 2013). Dissatisfaction among teachers leads to a high turnover (Akram, Malik, Sarwar, Anwer & Ahmad, 2015). According to a study carried out in Tanzania by (Davidson, 2007), teachers in Tanzania were dissatisfied with their wages, fringe benefits, accommodation, promotion and the number of lessons allocated. A case study by (Ombeni, 2016) on the levels of job satisfaction among teachers in public secondary schools in Tanzania established that teachers were satisfied with the available scheme of funding academic studies.

In Kenya as in other countries in the developing world, most teachers are dissatisfied with their jobs. Njeru (2009), Karuga (2010) and Wamuyu (2011) carried out research to determine factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in Mombasa, Meru and Kirinyaga district respectively and found that there was a positive relationship between teachers’ job satisfaction and learners’ academic performance. Today, a satisfied teacher improves the academic performance of learners as compared to dissatisfied teachers. Teachers are blamed for poor academic performance of students without taking into consideration their job
satisfaction (Hanushek, 2007). According to a study done by (Kusinga, 2010) on the influence of principals’ leadership styles on public secondary schools teachers’ job satisfaction in Nairobi province Kenya, 56% of teachers were satisfied with recognition, financial reward, responsibility, subject taught and job performance.

Teachers are among public servants who are not satisfied in the employment industry (Sumra, 2004). According to Sumra, teachers’ dissatisfaction is evident by massive failure of candidates each year due to low morale in teaching, absenteeism and movement of teachers from one profession to the other. Satisfaction has some important consequences. Satisfied teachers are happy, dedicated and committed. They bring their best qualities to their schools so that students, parents and society may benefit from their services. Successful education system is dependent on motivated teachers and satisfied school administration (Jaiyeoba & Jibril 2008).

Teacher satisfaction reduces attrition, enhances collegiality between and among the supervisors, teachers, students and parents, improves job performance and has an impact on student outcomes. Satisfied teachers are motivated and committed to do what is expected of them. Satisfied teachers are the main contributors to a positive academic environment and these have a high premium and maintain quality in the education system (Johnson, 2007).
According to Mwamwenda in (Badenhorst, George & Louw 2008) a lack of teachers’ satisfaction results in frequent absenteeism from school, aggressive behavior towards colleagues and teachers, early exit from profession and psychological withdrawal from work and all these leads to quality in teaching.

A satisfied teaching force leads to a higher commitment and productivity because of fewer disruptions e.g. absenteeism. Personal satisfaction along with professional responsibility is an indicator of a personal psychological wellbeing and a predictor of work performance and commitment (Hongying, 2008).

The study is therefore necessary to investigate principals’ governance practices influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in Narok West sub-county. These practices include teachers’ involvement in decision making, facilitation of teachers’ professional growth and development, recognition about good work and the influence of supervision on job satisfaction.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Teachers’ job satisfaction is the main predictor of their intent to remain in a profession. When teachers are dissatisfied with their job, they have a low morale and they are ineffective in their teaching. Some may leave the teaching profession to join other professions and this has an impact on the quality of the education (Chang, Kim and Tickle 2010).
Many studies Njeru (2009), Karuga (2010) Akinyi (2011), Wamuyu (2011) have carried out research to determine factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in areas like Mombasa, Meru and Kirinyaga district respectively. No single study has been carried in Narok West sub-county to determine factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in regard to principals’ governance practices.

Teachers in Narok West sub-county lack job satisfaction and this is evident by the high number of teachers leaving their teaching profession to other professions. According to the Teachers Service Commission human resource personnel in Narok County, 11 teachers have moved to non-teaching related jobs in both public and private sector in the year 2018 while 21 are seeking transfers to other areas. Records available at Narok Public Service Board indicate that many teachers from Narok West Sub-County have been applying for various positions in the county government since the year 2013 with an aim of leaving the teaching profession. This indicates that secondary school teachers in Narok West sub-county would quit teaching profession if an opportunity arises.

Therefore, it is on this basis that the researcher seeks to find out whether secondary school principals’ governance practices has got any influence on teachers’ job satisfaction.
1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of principals’ governance practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county, Kenya.

1.4 Objectives of the study

The study was guided by the following objectives

i. To determine the extent to which principals’ recognition of teachers’ work influences teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county Kenya.

ii. To establish the influence of principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making process on teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county Kenya.

iii. To determine the influence of principals’ facilitation of teachers’ professional development on teachers satisfaction in public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county.

iv. To determine the extent to which principals’ supervision influence teachers’ job satisfaction in Narok West sub-county.

1.5 Research questions

The following are the research questions that the study sought to evaluate;
i) How does the principals’ recognition of teachers’ work influence teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county?

ii) To what extent does the teachers’ involvement in decision making process influences teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county?

iii) How does the facilitation of teachers’ professional development influence teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county?

iv) What is the influence of supervision on job satisfaction of secondary school teachers in Narok West sub-county Narok?

1.6 Significance of the study

The study may give insight to the Ministry of Education Science and Technology and the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) on the importance of teachers’ job satisfaction so as to come up with human resource development initiatives.

The research may help the educational managers to identify the management practices that enhance job satisfaction among teachers.

The study may not only provide a point of reference for future researchers but may help the Teachers Service commission to come up with policies for career development of teachers.
1.7 Limitations of the study

Limitations are aspects that are likely to affect the outcome of the study but which the researcher has no control over (Mugenda, 2009. There was lack of standardized instrument to measure teachers’ level of job satisfaction. There was lack of enough research on job satisfaction of public secondary schools in Narok West Sub-county and thus it becomes a challenge to use the related literature to adequately approve or disapprove the findings of this study. To overcome this, the researcher visited public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county so as to get first-hand information.

1.8 Delimitations

Delimitations refer to boundary limitations Orodho, (2014). The study was restricted to principals’ governance practices influencing teachers’ job satisfaction. The study was carried out in public secondary schools in Narok west sub-county therefore leaving out private schools in the sub-county, therefore the study cannot be generalized to the entire educational institutions. The study also focused on teachers employed by the TSC. The study was conducted using sample size from the targeted population; therefore it was not possible to investigate all teachers. The researcher used a large sample so as to capture many respondents and increase validity.
1.9 Basic assumption of the study

The following were the basic assumptions of the study;

i. It was assumed throughout the study that the respondents would be familiar with the concept of job satisfaction and therefore the information given on the questionnaire will be true.

ii. It was assumed that the principals have a role in influencing teachers’ job satisfaction.

iii. It was assumed that all the public secondary schools in the sub county face same problems in regard to teachers’ job satisfaction.

iv. It was assumed that the institutional set up of the environment is the same for all the public secondary schools in the sub-county.

1.10 Definition of significant terms

**Facilitation** refers to the act of assisting or making easier teachers’ professional development

**Governance** refers to the action or manner of governing an organization

**Influence** refers to activities carried out by the administrator in day to day basis to modify and bring about change in variable within the school environment.

**Involvement** refers to the act of sharing in common with others

**Job satisfaction** refers to the feeling of fulfillment or enjoyment that a person derives from their job.

**Practice** refer to the application or use of an idea as opposed to theories
**Principal** refer to a person who is in charge of secondary schools

**Professional development** alludes to the securing of learning and abilities both for individual and for professional success

**Public secondary school** refers to schools that are run by public funds under the supervision of government.

**Recognition** refers to principal’s timely, informal or formal acknowledgement of a teacher’s behavior, effort or result that truly serves the school’s goals and values

**Supervision** refers to the abilities of the principal to provide technical assistance and behavioral support to teachers

### 1.11 Organization of the study

The study was organized into five chapters. Chapter one consisted of background to the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations of the study, delimitations of the study, basic assumptions, definition of significant terms and organization of the study.

Chapter two consisted of review of related literature on teachers’ job satisfaction. The chapter was organized according to the study’s objectives with a view to determine the influence of principal’s recognition of teachers’ work on teachers’ job satisfaction, the influence of principals’ involvement of teachers’ in decision making, the influence of principals’ facilitation of teachers’ professional development on teachers’ job satisfaction and the extent to which principals’
supervision influence teachers job satisfaction. This chapter also consisted of the theoretical framework and conceptual framework.

Chapter three of the study described the research methodology which includes the rationale for the area of study, research design, target population, sample and sampling procedures, research instruments, validity and reliability of instruments, data collection and data analysis technique and ethical consideration. Chapter four contained introduction, questionnaire return rate, demographic information, influence of principals’ governance practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools and Chapter five covered the summary of the study, conclusions, recommendations based on the findings and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction
This chapter covered the literature review under the following sub-headings: the concept of principals’ governance practices, teachers’ recognition of good work and job satisfaction, teachers’ involvement in decision making process and job satisfaction, facilitation of teachers’ professional development and job satisfaction and influence of supervision on job satisfaction of secondary school teachers.

2.2 The concept of principals’ governance practices
Principals’ governance practices allude to how he/she practices his/her forces in an establishment with a point of accomplishing the targets and win the regard of the partners. The chief is in charge of planning, creating and affecting hierarchical destinations and assets in order to accomplish the foreordained authoritative objectives.

A school principal is responsible for bringing together both the teaching and non-teaching staff and also the teaching resources for the achievement of the institutional objectives. Therefore school administrators must possess sufficient ability to manage three major tasks; achieve the goals of the organization, utilize other people in fulfilling these goals and support the morale of his co-workers by providing suitable conditions to do better work. (Okumbe 2000)
The education administrator cannot manage the organization alone. He has to harness the potentials of his staff to his great advantage. He should place the necessary structures and allow his colleagues to participate in the organizational governance especially as it affects them in their expertise and welfare (Amadi, 2008).

Although school size, location, wealth, student composition and school type have a role in teachers’ job satisfaction, research indicates that principals’ governance practices determine whether teachers are satisfied with their jobs and whether they stay (Beteille 2012, Urick 2016). Highly effective principal is more capable of recruiting and retaining teachers.

A secondary school principal must enhance an aspect of teaching and learning in any given school. A school principal can do this by influencing the development of goals and policies and establishing and coordinating the planning and implementation of organizational programmes and producing and managing resources, money and material to support the organization and its programmes.

A study by (Wood 2008) found that British employees derived their satisfaction from supportive administration. An administrator who can easily be reached and consulted by employees makes employees comfortable with their jobs.
2.3 Principals’ recognition of teachers’ work and job satisfaction

Prosperity and success of any organization greatly depend on the employees. If the institution does not recognize the efforts of their employees, the organization cannot conquer the highest level of job satisfaction. Reward and recognition can have an impact on job satisfaction of teachers (Ali & Ahmed, 2009). Extrinsic and intrinsic incentives work together. Giving financial incentives without recognition may not work.

The impacts that teachers have on student achievements, quality education and educational reforms should be recognized and respected by the school principal (Karsli & Iskender 2009). In Uganda, teachers who were not recognized by the school principals were unhappy and dissatisfied with their jobs (Garett & Ssesanga 2005).

According to (Mumanyire, 2005) recognizing the efforts of teachers and praising them for work well done also boosts their morale and enhance the productivity of teachers in the school system. (Mghana, 2013) in his study on factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Voi district found that 52 percent of teachers were not satisfied with the reliability of the supervision while 48 percent were at least satisfied. (Mumanyire, 2005) found that the strategies for enhancing job satisfaction include both pecuniary and non-pecuniary factors.
Mcneese (2014) exploited job satisfaction, productivity and commitment and noted that job satisfaction was influenced by the manager. According to him the characteristic of a manager that influence job satisfaction include provision of recognition and praise, meeting employees’ personal needs, helping or guiding employees and using leadership skills to meet unit needs and supporting the team. Job dissatisfaction is due to managers’ not giving due recognition and support not being able to follow through problem and not helping but critizing in a crisis. Besides providing recognition managers who create a positive climate in the work environment help employees’ to be more productive (Mcneese, 2014).

2.4 Principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making process and job satisfaction

Decision making is described as the method of specifying the character of a particular problem and deciding on amongst variables options with a purpose to solve it. Making decisions is one of the top features of an education supervisor, wherein choices are made in such vital areas as the allocation of scarce teaching and learning assets, the enrolment of students, employment of teaching and non-teaching personnel, the advent of the brand new curriculum, student and personnel discipline, instructors welfare, personnel education and techniques of enhancing pedagogy and educational studies. (Ndege, 2017) in her have a look at on influence of principals’ administrative practices on students’ performance at KCSE in Butere sub-county found that fifty seven% of instructors agree that
principals did not involve them in choice making and this had an effect on their task satisfaction.

In organizations, most decisions should be made through participatory approach whereby individuals or groups are involved in decision making process. In participatory decision making, individuals who participate are usually more satisfied with the decisions they have collectively made and they will enthusiastically support it (Okumbe, 1998). Every organization is involved in policy-decision making; this is the responsibility of the school manager. However, the school principal cannot make the decisions governing the whole organization alone. He needs other people to help him in formulating workable decisions. The principal should involve teachers in decision making and share information with them (Hui, 2013)

2.5 Principals’ facilitation of teachers’ professional development and job satisfaction

The school principal has an obligation of empowering teachers’ perception about their profession and job satisfaction (Shen, 2012). It results in high productivity, improve self- esteem, morale, efficiency of work and result to a high job satisfaction.
Harris and Sass (2008) on professional development on Mathematics found that teachers receiving professional development have better performance. Teachers are important in imparting knowledge, skills and attitudes to the students. Teachers should be given an opportunity for professional development so as to meet the international standards (UNESCO 2012).

According to a study carried out by (Ongatoh, 2017) on institutional factors influencing pupils performance in Matungu sub county, Kakamega County, there is significance between professional development and academic performance of learners.

According to (Peter, 2011), the school managers should identify training needs of their teachers. This means that the principals should inform the teachers about seminars, workshops going on and encouraging them to further their education for job satisfaction. (Ndege, 2017) in his study on influence of principals administrative practices on students’ performance at KCSE in Butere sub-county found that 53 percent of teachers indicated that principals encouraged them to attend seminars/workshops for professional development. Teachers need more professional development and trainings so as to cope with changes in globalization, technological advancement, curriculum changes and modern competitiveness (TSC 2017).
The introduction of Performance Contracting (PC) and Teacher Performance Appraisal and Development (TPAD) in January 2016 remains one of the most transformative reform programmes to be implemented in the teaching service. TSC TPAD and PC focuses on delivery of quality education in public learning institutions. TSC TPAD and PC also assess the effectiveness of instructional teaching and learning has generated a lesson observation tool, the appraiser in this case the school principal applies it in assessing the effectiveness of a teacher in knowledge and delivery of skills.

TSC/TPAD provides six performance competency areas, a teacher is therefore required to identify the performance gap, identify training needs and find a solution through training and professional development courses.

2.6 Principals’ supervision of teachers work and job satisfaction

Supervision means overseeing, being watchful, in control or providing direction. Its purpose is to advance the work and effectiveness of individual employees. In school, it means primarily improving classroom instructions; supervision is concerned with the following elements; the teaching-learning situation, the improvement of teaching and the human relationship between the supervisor and the supervised.
According to a study carried out by (Mghana, 2013) on factors influencing teachers job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Voi district Kenya, 52% of teachers were not satisfied with the reliability of the supervision while 48% were at least satisfied with the reliability of the supervision.

Supervision is essential to an organizations and firms since the supervisors have extensive knowledge of job requirements and also adequate opportunity to observe their employees (Bavendan, 2012). Normally, supervisors are the managers and they gain from the employees’ high performance as well as lose from low performance. Managers are provided with the potential to be significantly more influential than might otherwise be the case, as such; they are a vital ingredient in the process of translating organisational imperatives into strategic intentions and effective action (Rose, 2013). Gupta (2004) suggested that considerate supervision tends to improve job satisfaction of workers. The opportunity accorded to participate in decision-making process may lead to higher job satisfaction. Employee satisfaction from supervisory behaviour may; however be more dependent upon the influence the supervisor exercises on his own leadership style.

According to Bavendam (2012) supervision also requires good leadership skills, ability to treat all employees’ fairly and use of positive feedback whenever possible. Other than the cultural harmony and communication between
employees’, inside social dimensions, there were other factors that are personal and it is up to the supervisor to work on them through finding out from the employees’ to improve their motivation. Work itself can’t show employees that the work they are doing is important and that their tasks are meaningful (Mohammed & Quang, 2009). “Perceptions Under normal circumstances employees’ may not find all their tasks interesting or rewarding, however managers should show the employees’ how those tasks are essential to the overall processes that make the practice succeed.

2.7 Summary of reviewed related literature

The impacts that teachers have on student achievements, quality education and educational reforms should be recognized and respected by the school principal (Karsli & Iskender 2009). Mumanyire (2005) found that recognizing the efforts of teachers and praising them for work well done boosts their morale and enhance their productivity in the school system. Ndege (2017) found that 57% of teachers agree that principals did not involve them in decision making and this had an impact on their job satisfaction. Decisions should be made through participatory approach whereby individuals or groups are involved in decision making process. Harris and Sass (2008) found that teachers receiving professional development had better performance. The reviewed literatures do not talk about principals governance practices and teachers’ job satisfaction. The study therefore sought to
investigate the influence of principals’ governance practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county, Kenya.

2.8 Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework for examining influence of principals’ governance practices on teachers’ job satisfaction is guided by Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. Abraham Maslow distinguished a theory of human needs based on a hierarchical model ranging from low order needs at the bottom to higher-order needs at the top (Maslow, 1954). Maslow suggested that human needs are arranged in series of levels. Based on this hierarchy, Maslow identified five human needs. At the lower level is; physiological needs, safety needs, security needs, love needs and the need for self-fulfillment at the higher level. Unless the needs at each level have been satisfied, it’s hard to meet the higher hierarchical needs. Once the lower hierarchical needs have been met, it’s no longer a motivator (Mullins, 2005)

a) The physiological needs

The physiological needs are the most basic in the hierarchy. They are the basic biological functions of the human organism. These needs are unlearned. Examples are hunger, thirst, sleep and sex. These basic needs or lower-order needs usually fairly satisfied in work place hence they rarely dominate (Amos et.al 2008).
b) Safety or security needs

The safety (security) needs occupy the second level. These needs include both emotional and physical needs. Physical needs include the need for freedom from pain or from threat or physical attack, the need for savings and medical aid (Mullins 2005, Amos et. Al 2008). In a work environment, safety needs are reflected by fair treatment by the principal, safe working conditions, first rate fringe benefits, fairness, quality supervision and job security (Amos et.al 2008) Workers want assurance that their security is guaranteed. Security in a work environment ensures that workers’ needs will be met.

c) Love or social needs

The third level of needs is variously referred to as love, belonging, affection, affiliation or social needs. Love or social needs include the need for affection, a sense of belonging, social activities and friendships (Mullins, 2005). Since workers spend most of their working hours in their school environment, most of the love needs should be satisfied here. In school, the love or social needs are manifested in good interpersonal relations with colleagues, students, the school manager, acceptance by others and affable supervision by the principals (Boey, 2010). When teachers are involved in decision making it creates a sense of belonging.
d) Esteem or ego needs

The fourth level of needs is the esteem needs. It refers to self-respect and the esteem of people. These are the needs for power, achievement, recognition, competence and status. At this level, individuals want to feel that they are worthy, that others also recognize this and that the individuals likewise recognize that others are worthy. To be held in high esteem by others involves having a good reputation or status, recognition and being appreciated. (Amos et.al 2008).

In work place, esteem needs are reflected in being given responsibilities and promotions, pay increase, supervisory recognition and appreciation. (Boey, 2010) argues that when teachers are recognized for the job well done, it leads to increased self-esteem and self-confidence which in turn leads to effectiveness in their teaching.

e) Self-actualization needs

These are the needs at the top of the hierarchy. At this level, one becomes what one is capable of becoming. Self-actualization influences nearly all cadres of workers. Workers choose the occupations they like and they get certain satisfactions from accomplishing their tasks. According to (Boey 2010), an individual who is not self-actualized is restless, frustrated and discontented. At this level, individuals strive for meaningfulness and satisfaction (Amos et. Al 2008)
Maslow’s theory of needs postulates that a job can be a source of satisfaction if it can fulfill important needs of an individual. If they are not fulfilled, the individuals are more likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs and hence become demotivated.

The most important reason for teachers to work is to meet their basic needs. For teachers to be effective in their daily activities, their needs must be met, the ability to meet their needs and motivation to work are fundamental to the lives of teachers (Ololube, 2006). Most teachers struggle to meet their needs.

(Akyeampong & Bennell 2009) argue that Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory is relevant to developing countries. These countries include Kenya because of the economic downturns and financial woes. This is corroborated by STURE (CfBT,
2008) report that unless the physical needs are satisfied, employees will not be able to satisfy the order needs.

This theory also offers an account of interpersonal variations in human behavior which is important for school managers. It enables them to manage the human resources effectively and try to satisfy the particular needs of their employees.

2.9 Conceptual Framework

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) characterizes a calculated system similar to a lot of wide thoughts and standards taken from pertinent fields of request and used to structure a resulting introduction. The investigation conceptualized the independent and dependent variables as demonstrated as follows
The conceptual framework illustrates that the principals’ governance practices can impact negatively or positively on teachers’ job satisfaction. In this case, teachers’ level of satisfaction depends on factors like recognition of teachers’ work and this can be done through monetary or non-monetary incentives. Supervision is another
aspect influencing teachers’ job satisfaction and can be carried out through class
visitation or checking on teachers’ punctuality. Involvement in decision making
also has an impact on job satisfaction, teachers can make decisions in regard to
students and staff discipline, students’ welfare etc. Facilitation of teachers’
professional development is another factor which has an impact on teachers’ job
satisfaction it can be measured by looking at the available opportunities for career
progression. High retention rates, quality of academic performance and teachers’
job performance are the indicators of a highly motivated and satisfied teacher.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter contains a discussion of various components of the research methodology as applied in investigation of principals’ governance practices influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in Narok west sub county Kenya. These include research design, target population, sample size, sampling procedure, research instruments, instrument validity, instrument reliability, data collection and procedure techniques of data analysis appropriate for this study.

3.2 Research design

This refers to the plan that is utilized to conduct a study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2009). The study employed a descriptive survey design in that the study analyzed the relationship between principals’ governance practices in relation to teachers’ job satisfaction. Descriptive research design is a non-experimental process that describes the relationship between variables without manipulating them (Uma & Bongie, 2010). Descriptive survey obtains information that describes existing phenomena by asking individuals about their perceptions, attitudes, behavior or values. It provides data that is easier to analyze and also appropriate in education and research like this (Kadhor, 1995). The study collected data from a sample of targeted people so that the outcome could be generalized to the target population.
3.3 Target population

Populace is characterized as a total arrangement of people, cases or items with some regular detectable attributes (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The objective populace is that populace to which a specialist needs to sum up the consequences of an examination (Kombo and Tromp, 2006). The objective populace involve each of the 29 principals and 270 instructors in 29 open optional schools in Narok West Sub-area.

3.4 Sample size and procedure

Sampling is the procedure used to identify individual items to be studied (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The sample size of the study was derived from 70 percent of the 29 government registered schools which is equivalent to 20 schools. The 20 principals of the selected schools and 145 teachers became the study participants. The teachers who participated in the study were selected using simple random sampling to give all of them equal chance of being selected.

3.5 Research instruments

The researcher used questionnaires for teachers and principals. Questionnaires are commonly used to obtain important information about the population. Part I of the questionnaires will capture the demographic information of the respondents, part II will capture the job satisfaction factors and part III the level of satisfaction with the current job.
Questionnaires for the principals was used to capture details on principals’ demographic factors, Teachers’ satisfaction, involvement of teachers in decision making, how teachers are recognized and how supervision is carried out on teachers’ work. All the questionnaires were self-administered. The questionnaires consisted of both open ended and close ended questions with most closed ended questions adopting Likert Scales as the chosen measurement. Open ended questions aim at getting the demographic information of the respondents and give them an opportunity to express their views concerning teachers’ job satisfaction.

3.6 Instrument validity

Validity is the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences, which are based on the research results. In other words, validity is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the phenomenon under study. (Best & Kahn, 2011) asserts that validity of an instrument is improved through expert judgment. If data collection instrument cover the topics adequately then the instrument has good content validity (Cooper & Schindler, 2011). To further enhance the validity of the two questionnaires, pre-test was conducted on a 50 percent of the population. The questionnaires were scrutinized and approved by the two supervisors of the project so as to determine that the items in questionnaires and are in line with what to expect.
3.7 Instrument reliability

Reliability is defined as the measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. Reliability in research is influenced by random error. Random error is the deviation from a true measurement due to factors that have not been addressed by the researcher (Mugenda & Mugenda 1999).

The questionnaires were administered to 29 public secondary school teachers. The pilot study was conducted in 12 public secondary schools. The participants were informed about the objectives of the study so as to enable them respond sincerely. Likert scale items was ranked from one to four. Teachers marked their responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, after a pilot test, each instrument was carefully analyzed to know the reliability of the items.

The reliability of the test was computed using Cronbach alpha.

\[
\alpha = \frac{N \cdot \bar{c}}{\bar{\nu} + (N-1) \cdot \bar{c}}
\]

Where:

- \( N \) = the number of items.
- \( c \) = average covariance between item-pairs.
- \( \nu \) = average variance.
3.8 Data collection procedure

The researcher obtained the clearance letter from the department of Education Administration and planning and obtained a permit from the National Commission of Science and Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). Before the field work, the researcher sent introductory letters to the principals of the schools informing them of the researcher’s intention to visit their schools for data collection. The researcher further did some follow up calls so as to book an appointment on when to collect data.

On the day of data collection, the researcher sought permission from the sub-county Director of Education office to inform of the data collection exercise. At the school the researcher reported to the school principal for assistance in the identification of teachers to participate in the study.

3.9 Data analysis techniques

Data analysis techniques involve developing summaries, looking for patterns and applying statistical techniques. Qualitative data was done by categorizing and indexing responses into common themes. Quantitative data was analyzed using Statistical Packages of Social Sciences (SPSS) which is ideal for accuracy. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics; frequencies and percentages and presented as bar graphs and pie charts and textual form.
3.10 Ethical consideration

According to Kitchin (2000), basic ethical issues to be considered in any research include privacy, confidentiality, anonymity, sensitivity to cultural differences and genders. The purpose of the study was fully explained in advance to respondents. Informed consent was obtained by asking the respondents to sign a consent letter. Respondents were briefed before responding to questionnaire and conducting interviews.

Researcher was open and honest when dealing with respondents, respect and dignity for human respondents was upheld. All the information gotten from sources other than the research was duly acknowledged to avoid plagiarism. Findings of the present study were reported with the highest possible objectivity and utmost honesty.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
The purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of principals’ governance practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county, Kenya. This chapter presents data analysis, presentation and interpretation of findings. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics where frequencies, percentages and presented as bar graphs and pie charts and textual form. The chapter is presented according to the research objectives including the questionnaire return rate and demographic information.

4.2. Response rate
Bryman (2012) defines response rate as “the percentage of a sample that does, in fact, agree to participate in a study” According to Baruch (1999) questionnaire return rate is the proportion of the questionnaires returned after they have been issued to the respondents. Table 4.1 shows the response rate for the study.
Table 4.1: Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted respondents</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Response rate Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on Table 4.1 shows an overall response rate of 90.9 percent. A response rate of above 80 percent according to Baruch (1999) is very good and adequate for this study. This implies that the response rate is very good and adequate for analysis, as it is representative of the population.

4.3 Demographic information

This section presents the demographic information of school principals and teachers that were used in the study. The study first sought to know the age distribution of the participants. Okumbe (1992) found that young employees give high expectations and aspirations which may not be met by the organization, this automatically translates to low levels of job satisfaction among the youthful employees. Age distribution is shown in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2: Distribution of respondents by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (f)</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td>Frequency (f)</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 and above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that majority of principals (52.9 percent) are 56 and above years old. This implies that they are older and experienced to know principal’s practices influencing teachers’ job satisfaction. The TSC chair madam Lydia Nzomo recently stated that “experienced teachers provide tremendous insight and encouragement to the inexperienced or struggling teachers” (Daily Nation, 18th June, 2019). Many teachers (48.9 percent) are below 35 years of age. This implies that they are still young, new and inexperienced in the teaching service. Sari (2004) found that more experienced teachers had less job satisfaction than their inexperienced colleagues. The Teachers Service Commission recently found that new teachers are leaving the profession within their first three to five years due to job dissatisfactions (Daily Nation, 18th June, 2019).
Individual characteristics such as gender have insignificant effect on job satisfaction among public sector employees (Steijn, 2004). The study sought to establish the distribution of respondents by gender and whether it had significant/insignificant effect on job satisfaction among teachers. The results are show in Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3: Distribution of respondents by age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (f)</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows that majority of principals (70.6 percent) are male. This implies that there is gender disparity among the principals. Majority of teachers (55.6 percent) are female. This implies that there are more female teachers than their male counterparts. Tasnim (2006) portrays varying levels of job satisfaction between male and female workers with female teachers less satisfied with the social environment than male teachers.

The study sought to establish the marital status of the respondents. The results are shown in Figure 4.1
Figure 4.1: Distribution of respondents by marital status

Figure 4.1 shows that majority of respondents (59 percent) are married. According to Cole (2002), married employees are more stable in their jobs than unmarried employees who keep on looking for greener pastures. This is attributed to the fact that married workers have family responsibilities like providing food, paying school fees and clothing their children unlike unmarried employees most of whom. This implies that they have families and principals’ practices might affect their job satisfaction.

The study sought to establish the highest level of education for both the principals and teachers. The results are shown in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4: Distribution of respondents by highest level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (f)</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows that majority of principals (64.7 percent) have bachelors degrees. This implies that majority of principals are qualified and have the skills to manage the schools. Northhouse (2004) found that qualified administrators place well established structures, ensure proper coordination of activities within the organization and enhance efficiency and development leading to job satisfaction among employees. Majority of teachers (62.4 percent) were bachelors’ degree holders which is a qualification for one to teach in a secondary school. This implies that the teachers are qualified to perform their duties.

Teachers were asked to indicate their teaching subjects. The results are shown in Figure 4.2
Figure 4.2: Distribution of teachers by teaching subjects

Figure 4.2 shows that many teachers, 34 (25.6 percent) teach languages. This could be as a result of English and Kiswahili subjects being compulsory.

Langat (2016) found that the teachers with no administrative positions were highly overworked and demoralized due to very strenuous workload. Teachers were further asked to indicate position the hold in the school. The results are shown in Table 4.5

Table 4.5: Distribution of teachers by position held in school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject teacher</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of department</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy principal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 4.5 shows that many teachers (36.8 percent) are subject teachers. This implies that they do not hold any position in school other than teaching.

Principals were asked to indicate the numbers of years they have served as principals. The results are shown in Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years served</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows that many principals (41.2 percent) have served as school principals for between 10 – 14 years. This implies that they are experienced administrators and they understand well the principals’ practices influencing teachers’ job satisfaction. Sari (2004) found that Turkish special school teachers showed that more experienced teachers had less job satisfaction than their less-experienced colleagues.
Principals were further asked to indicate the number of years they have served in their current stations. The results are shown in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Distribution of principals by number of years served in current station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years served</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows that majority of principals (76.5 percent) have served as school principals in their current stations for between 0 – 4 years. This means that they have been there for a short period of time. This could be as a result of the new Teachers Service Commission policy of delocalization that discourages administrators to over stay in one station for many years.

The study sought to establish whether the respondents were housed in the school. The results are shown in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8: Housing of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (f)</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td>Frequency (f)</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School house</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental house</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 shows that majority of principals (52.9 percent) and teachers (75.9 percent) live in rental houses. This could be as a result of the fact that majority of secondary teacher not working in their home counties and the delocalization policy by the teachers’ employer.

The respondents were asked to indicate their career aspiration. The results are shown in Table 4.9
Table 4.9: Career aspiration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career aspiration</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency (f)</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To change employer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To study further</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 4.9 shows that many principals (47.1 percent) and majority of teachers (63.2 percent) want to change employer. This implies that majority want new jobs different from teaching. This could be as a result of low pay in the teaching profession, poor working environment or job dissatisfaction.

4.4 Influence of principals’ recognition of teachers’ work on teachers’ job satisfaction

The study sought to establish the influence of principals’ recognition of teachers’ work on teachers’ job satisfaction. Teachers were asked indicate their feelings on principals’ recognition of their work. Okumbe (1992) Job Satisfaction Measurement Instrument (JSMI) scale with a rank of one to five points was used where 1- Extremely satisfied (ES) 2 -Moderately satisfied (MS) 3 -Extremely dissatisfied (ED) 4- Moderately dissatisfied (MD) 5- Not applicable (NA)
Table 4.10: Teachers’ responses on principals’ recognition of their work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rewards</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School trips</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes during prize giving days</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition letters</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you cards</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 133

Table 4.10 shows that many teachers (32.3 percent) felt moderately satisfied with the school trips. This implies that they liked going out for school trips for exposure and learning. Majority of teachers (53.4 percent) were extremely satisfied with prizes during prize giving days. This implies that they were happy because their efforts were being awarded. Majority of teachers (62.4 percent) were extremely satisfied for receiving recognition letters. Another 68.4 percent were extremely satisfied for receiving thank you letter. This implies that majority of teachers felt satisfied when they are recognized by the principal for their good work. Field (2008) classifies recognition among the satisfiers and thus job motivators, that is, its existence yields feelings of job satisfaction. Many teachers (49.6 percent) were moderately satisfied with their responsibilities.
Principals were asked to indicate their feelings on their recognition of teachers work. Job Satisfaction Measurement Instrument (JSMI) scale with a rank of one to five points was used where 1- Extremely satisfied (ES) 2 -Moderately satisfied (MS) 3 -Extremely dissatisfied (ED) 4 - Moderately dissatisfied (MD) 5- Not applicable (NA).

Table 4.11: Principals’ responses on their recognition of teachers work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rewards</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School trips</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes during prize giving</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition letters</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you cards</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 133

Table 4.11 shows that majority of principals (58.8 percent) felt that teachers were extremely satisfied with the school trips. This implies that principals feel that teachers enjoy school trips. Majority of principals (88.2 percent) were felt that teachers were extremely satisfied with prizes during prize giving days, 76.5 percent for receiving recognition letters and 64.7 percent for receiving thank you
letter. This implies that majority of principals felt that teachers were extremely satisfied when they are recognized.

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which principals’ recognition of teachers’ work influences teachers’ job satisfaction. The results are shown in Table 4.12.

**Table 4.12: Extent to which principals’ recognition of teachers’ work influences teachers’ job satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of principal’s recognition</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (f)</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very great extent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 shows that majority of principals (64.7 percent) and teachers (80.5 percent) indicated that principals’ recognition of teachers’ work influences teachers’ job satisfaction to a very great extent. This implies that teachers who are recognized by their principals feel satisfied with their job.
4.5 Influence of principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making process on teachers’ job satisfaction

The study sought to establish influence of principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making process on teachers’ job satisfaction. Principals were asked to indicate whether they involved teachers in decision making. The results are shown in Figure 4.3.

![Pie chart showing principals' responses on involvement of teachers in decision making]

**Figure 4.3: Principals responses on involvement of teachers in decision making**

Figure 4.3 shows that majority of principals, 13 (76 percent) indicated that they involved teachers in decision making. This implies that teachers are part of decision makers in majority of schools.
Teachers were asked to indicate the extent to which they are satisfied with being involved in decision making on matters such as class size, students’ entry behavior, setting subject targets, putting up school infrastructure and students welfare and discipline. Job Satisfaction Measurement Instrument (JSMI) scale with a rank of one to five points was used where 1- Extremely satisfied (ES) 2 – Moderately satisfied (MS) 3 – Extremely dissatisfied (ED) 4- Moderately dissatisfied (MD) 5- Not applicable (NA)

Table 4.13: Extent to which teachers are satisfied with being involved in decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ entry behavior</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting subjects target</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting up the school infrastructure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ welfare and discipline</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 133
Table 4.13 shows that many teachers were extremely dissatisfied with class size (35.3 percent) and students’ entry behavior (47.4 percent). This implies that the class sizes were either large to handle or teachers were not involved in the coming up with such classes. The entry behavior was also not good due to the ministry of education 100 percent policy which allowed all learners to transit from primary to secondary. Majority of teachers were extremely satisfied with setting subject targets (58.6 percent). This was as a result of them being involved in setting of their subject targets which were achievable. Many teachers (51.9 percent) were extremely dissatisfied with the putting up of school infrastructure. This was because they are not involved in the whole process. This means that when teachers are involved by principals in any school decision they feel satisfied with their job but if not involved, they are dissatisfied.

Principals were asked to indicate the extent to which teachers are satisfied with being involved in decision making on matters such as class size, students’ entry behavior, setting subject targets, putting up school infrastructure and students welfare and discipline. Job Satisfaction Measurement Instrument (JSMI) scale with a rank of one to five points was used where 1- Extremely satisfied (ES) 2 – Moderately satisfied (MS) 3 –Extremely dissatisfied (ED) 4- Moderately dissatisfied (MD) 5- Not applicable (NA)
Table 4.14: Principals responses on extent to which teachers are satisfied with being involved in decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ entry behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting subjects target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting up the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ welfare and discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 shows that many principals felt that teachers were moderately satisfied with class size (41.2 percent) and students’ entry behavior (47.1 percent). Majority of the principals felt that teachers were extremely satisfied with setting subjects targets (64.7 percent) and students’ welfare and discipline (76.4 percent). This implies that principals felt that teachers are satisfied when involved in decision making.

Teachers were asked to indicate whether being involved in decision making influenced their job satisfaction. The results are shown in Figure 4.4
Figure 4.4: Influence of involvement of teachers in decision making on job satisfaction

Figure 4.4 shows that majority of teachers, 104 (78 percent) agreed that them being involved in decision making influence their job satisfaction. This implies that teacher involvement in decision making by principals influences teachers’ job satisfaction.

4.6 Influence of principals’ facilitation of teachers’ professional development on teachers job satisfaction

The study sought to establish the influence of principals’ facilitation of teachers’ professional development on teachers’ job satisfaction. Teachers were asked to indicate the extent to which they are satisfied with opportunities for professional development, quality of in-service training, mentorship programme in school and
opportunities to attend seminars/workshops. Job Satisfaction Measurement Instrument (JSMI) scale with a rank of one to five points was used where 1-Extremely satisfied (ES) 2-Moderately satisfied (MS) 3-Extremely dissatisfied (ED) 4-Moderately dissatisfied (MD) 5-Not applicable (NA)

Table 4.15: Teachers responses on principals’ facilitation of their professional development and teachers’ job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional development</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for professional development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of in-service training</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship programme in my school</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to attend seminars/workshops</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 133

Table 4.15 shows that majority of teachers (53.3 percent) were extremely dissatisfied with opportunities for professional development. This implies that there were no such opportunities for professional development leading to
dissatisfaction. Many teachers were extremely dissatisfied with quality of in-service training (44.3 percent) and mentorship programme in my school (38.3 percent). This means that the quality of in-service training was poor leading to dissatisfaction among teachers. The mentorship programme in many schools was also not good. Many teachers (42.9 percent) were extremely satisfied with opportunities to attend seminars/workshops. This implies that teachers were given opportunities by their principals to attend seminars/workshops.

Principals were asked to indicate the extent to which teachers are satisfied with opportunities for professional development, quality of in-service training, mentorship programme in school and opportunities to attend seminars/workshops. Job Satisfaction Measurement Instrument (JSMI) scale with a rank of one to five points was used where 1- Extremely satisfied (ES) 2- Moderately satisfied (MS) 3- Extremely dissatisfied (ED) 4- Moderately dissatisfied (MD) 5- Not applicable (NA).
Table 4.16: Principals responses on their facilitation of teachers’ professional development and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional development</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for professional development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of in-service training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship programme in my school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to attend seminars/workshops</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 17

The data in Table 4.16 shows that many principals (47.1 percent) felt that teachers were extremely dissatisfied with opportunities for professional development. This was as a result of lack of such opportunities. Majority of principals (52.9 percent) felt that teachers were extremely dissatisfied with quality of in-service training. Majority of principals (70.6 percent) indicated that teachers were extremely satisfied to attend seminars/workshops.
Teachers were asked to indicate whether principals’ facilitation of teachers’ professional development influences teachers’ job satisfaction. The results are shown in Figure 4.5.

Figure 4.5: Influence of principals’ facilitation of teachers’ professional development on teachers’ job satisfaction

Figure 4.5 shows that majority of teachers, 119 (89 percent) indicated that principals’ facilitation of teachers’ professional development influences teachers’ job satisfaction.

4.7 Influence of principals’ supervision on teachers’ job satisfaction

The study sought to establish the influence of principals’ supervision on teachers’ job satisfaction. Teachers were asked to indicate the extent to which they are satisfied with principal’s classroom visitation, checking of teachers’ professional
records by principal, feedback from principal’s classroom visitation, human relationship between the supervisor and the supervised and competence of the supervisor. Job Satisfaction Measurement Instrument (JSMI) scale with a rank of one to five points was used where 1- Extremely satisfied (ES) 2 -Moderately satisfied (MS) 3 -Extremely dissatisfied (ED) 4- Moderately dissatisfied (MD) 5- Not applicable (NA).

**Table 4.17: Teachers responses on principals’ supervision and teachers’ job satisfaction.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>1 F</th>
<th>1 %</th>
<th>2 F</th>
<th>2 %</th>
<th>3 F</th>
<th>3 %</th>
<th>4 F</th>
<th>4 %</th>
<th>5 F</th>
<th>5 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal’s classroom visitation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers’ professional records</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from principal’s classroom visitation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relationship between the supervisor and the supervised</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence of the supervisor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 133
The results in Table 4.17 shows that majority of teachers were extremely dissatisfied with principal’s classroom visitation (57.9 percent) and feedback from such visitation (62.4 percent). This implies that teachers don’t like principals to visit them in classes when they are teaching. They also didn’t like the feedback from such visitation. Majority of teachers (60.9 percent) were extremely satisfied with principals checking their professional records. This means that they are happy when principals check their records of work. Many teachers were extremely dissatisfied with human relationship between the supervisor and the supervised (38.8 percent) and competence of the supervisor (27.8 percent).

Principals were asked to indicate the extent to which teachers are satisfied with their classroom visitation, checking of teachers’ professional records, feedback from their classroom visitation, human relationship between the supervisor and the supervised and competence of the supervisor. Job Satisfaction Measurement Instrument (JSMI) scale with a rank of one to five points was used where 1- Extremely satisfied (ES) 2 -Moderately satisfied (MS) 3 -Extremely dissatisfied (ED) 4- Moderately dissatisfied (MD) 5- Not applicable (NA)
Table 4.18: Principals responses on principals’ supervision and teachers’ job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal’s classroom visitation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers’ professional records</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from principal’s classroom visitation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relationship between the supervisor and the supervised</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence of the supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 17

Table 4.18 shows that majority of principals (52.9 percent) felt that teachers were moderately satisfied with principal’s classroom visitation and 41.2 percent felt that teachers were extremely dissatisfied with feedback from such visitation. Majority of principals felt that teachers were extremely satisfied with them checking their professional records. Many principals (47.1 percent) felt that teachers were moderately satisfied with human relationship between the supervisor and the supervised.
5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the study, conclusions, recommendations as well as suggestions for further studies.

5.2. Summary of the study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of principals’ governance practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county, Kenya. Specifically, the study was set to determine the extent to which principals’ recognition of teachers’ work, involvement of teachers in decision making process, facilitation of teachers’ professional development and supervision influence teachers’ job satisfaction. The study employed a descriptive survey design where a total of 29 principals and 270 teachers employed by the Teachers Service Commission were targeted. The 20 principals and 145 teachers from 20 schools were selected. The teachers who participated in the study were chosen using simple random sampling. The study used questionnaires for teachers and principals to collect data.

The study discovered that many teachers (32.3 percent) felt moderately satisfied with the school trips but majority of principals (58.8 percent) felt that teachers
were extremely satisfied. Majority of teachers were extremely satisfied with prizes during prize giving days (53.4 percent) and receiving recognition letters (62.4 percent). Another 68.4 percent were extremely satisfied for receiving thank you letter. Recognition of teachers by school principals was job satisfiers among teachers. Many teachers (49.6 percent) were moderately satisfied with their responsibilities. Majority of principals (64.7 percent) and teachers (80.5 percent) indicated that principals’ recognition of teachers’ work influences teachers’ job satisfaction to a very great extent.

Many teachers were extremely dissatisfied with class size (35.3 percent) and students’ entry behavior (47.4 percent). Many principals felt that teachers were moderately satisfied with class size (41.2 percent) and students’ entry behavior (47.1 percent). This was due to the ministry of education 100 percent policy which allowed all learners to transit from primary to secondary. Majority of teachers were extremely satisfied with setting subject targets (58.6 percent). Many teachers (51.9 percent) were extremely dissatisfied with the putting up of school infrastructure. This was because they are not involved in the whole process. Majority of teachers, 104 (78 percent) agreed that them being involved in decision making influence their job satisfaction.

Majority of teachers (53.3 percent) were extremely dissatisfied with opportunities for professional development, quality of in-service training (44.3 percent) and
mentorship programme in my school (38.3 percent). At the same time many principals (47.1 percent) felt that teachers were extremely dissatisfied with opportunities for professional development and many principals (47.1 percent) felt that teachers were extremely dissatisfied with opportunities for professional development (52.9 percent). The quality of in-service training was poor leading to dissatisfaction among teachers. The mentorship programme in many schools was not good. Many teachers (42.9 percent) were extremely satisfied with opportunities to attend seminars/workshops. The study found that majority of teachers, 119 (89 percent) indicated that principals’ facilitation of teachers’ professional development influences teachers’ job satisfaction.

The study found that majority of teachers were extremely dissatisfied with principal’s classroom visitation (57.9 percent) and feedback from such visitation (62.4 percent). Teachers didn’t like principals to visit them in classes when they were teaching. They also didn’t like the feedback from such visitation. Majority of teachers (60.9 percent) were extremely satisfied with principals checking their professional records. Many teachers were extremely dissatisfied with human relationship between the supervisor and the supervised (38.8 percent) and competence of the supervisor (27.8 percent).
5.3 Conclusions

Based on the foregoing findings, several conclusions were arrived at;

Principals’ governance practices such as organizing of school trips, giving teachers prizes during prize giving days, giving recognition and thank you letters influenced teachers’ job satisfaction. Recognition of teachers by school principals was job satisfiers among teachers. Majority of principals (64.7 percent) and teachers (80.5 percent) indicated that principals’ recognition of teachers’ work influences teachers’ job satisfaction to a very great extent.

Teachers were extremely dissatisfied with class size and students’ entry behavior. Teachers were dissatisfied with the ministry of education 100 percent policy which allowed all learners to transit from primary to secondary. This resulted into large class sizes which teachers were unable to control. Majority of teachers were extremely satisfied with setting subject targets. Many teachers were extremely dissatisfied with the putting up of school infrastructure because they are not involved in the whole process. Majority of teachers, 104 (78 percent) agreed that them being involved in decision making influence their job satisfaction. The study concluded that involving teachers in decision making make them feel satisfied in their jobs.

Opportunities for professional development were not there and this led to many teachers being extremely dissatisfied. The quality of in-service training was poor
leading to dissatisfaction among teachers. The mentorship programme in many schools was not good. Teachers were extremely satisfied with opportunities to attend seminars/workshops. Principals’ facilitation of teachers’ professional development was found to influences teachers’ job satisfaction.

Teachers were extremely dissatisfied with principal’s classroom visitation and feedback from such visitation. Teachers hate classroom visitation by principals because such visitations sometimes brought conflicts between teachers and principals. Majority of teachers were extremely satisfied with principals checking their professional records. Many teachers were extremely dissatisfied with human relationship between the supervisor and the supervised and competence of the supervisor.

5.4. Recommendations

The following recommendations were made by the study:

- Principals should appreciate and recognize teachers’ work whether big or small. This will make the teacher feel good and satisfied with his or her job.
- Board of Management should involve teachers in key decision making for smooth implementation of school programmes and also for teachers to feel at home.
- Principals and the Teachers Service Commission should create a conducive environment for professional development programmes for teachers. Kenya
Education Management Institute (KEMI) should improve the quality of in-service training for teachers. Mentorship programmes in schools should also be improved.

- Frequent classroom visitations demoralizes teachers. Principals should minimize on classroom visitation and also give positive feedbacks on such visitations. The relationship between the supervisor and the supervised should be improved for better working relationship.

5.5. Suggestions for further study

Other issues emanated from the study that requires further investigation. The following are the areas that need further research;

i. Head teachers’ governance practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in public primary schools.

ii. Socio-economic factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in secondary schools.

iii. Perceived teachers factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in secondary schools.
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APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

University of Nairobi

Department of Education administration and Planning,

P.O BOX 30197,

Nairobi

The principal/Teacher

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

I am a postgraduate student pursuing a master of education degree in Corporate Governance at the University of Nairobi. I am conducting a research on the influence of principals’ governance practices on teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Narok West sub-county Kenya. I am kindly requesting for your participation in the study by completing the following questionnaire. The information obtained will be used for the purpose of this research and your identity will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Chepngeno Rose
APPENDIX II: TEACHERS’ QUESTIONNAIRES

You are kindly requested to fill this questionnaire that seeks to find out the principal’s governance practices influencing teachers’ job satisfaction among secondary school teachers. The information obtained is strictly for research purpose and will be treated with confidentiality. For each of the item, put a tick ( ) in the appropriate box.

**Part I (Demographic information)**

Please answer all the questions appropriately

1. What is your age (in years)? Below 35 years ( ) 36-45 years ( ) 46-55 years ( ) 56 years and above ( )

2. What is your gender? Male ( ) Female ( )

3. What is your marital status? Single ( ) married ( ) any other, please specify…………

4. What is your highest level of education? Diploma ( ) B.Ed. ( ) Masters ( ) Doctorate ( )

5. What are your teaching subjects? Sciences ( ) Mathematics ( ) Languages ( ) Humanities ( ) Applied sciences ( )

6. Which position do you hold in the school? Subject teacher ( ) class-teacher ( ) Head of Department ( ) Deputy principal ( )
7. How many years have you served as a teacher in Narok West Sub-county under TSC? ..........Years

8. Where are you housed? School house (  ) Own house (  ) Rental house (  )

9. Indicate your career progression
   a) To change employer (  )
   b) To study further (  )
   c) Others please specify.................

**PART II**

The following factors are related to your job satisfaction. Each factor is divided into sub-items. You are kindly requested to tick the most appropriate number that represents your feelings with your job. The numbers have the following meaning:

1- Extremely satisfied (ES)

2- Moderately satisfied (MS)

3- Extremely dissatisfied (ED)

4- Moderately dissatisfied (MD)

5- Not applicable (NA)
### Principals’ recognition of teacher’s work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes during prize giving days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the extent to which you are satisfied with the following:

11. To what extent does principals' recognition of teachers’ work influences teachers’ job satisfaction?

   a. Very great extent ( )
   b. Great extent ( )
   c. Moderate extent ( )
   d. No extent ( )
### Principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ entry behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting subjects target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting up the school infrastructure e.g. toilets, classroom, libraries, offices etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ welfare and discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Does involvement of teachers in decision making influence their job satisfaction

Yes (  )  No (  )

### Principal’s facilitation of teachers’ professional development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>opportunities for professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of in-service training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship programme in my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to attend seminars/workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Does principals’ facilitation of teachers’ professional development influence teachers job satisfaction?

Yes ( )    No ( )

**Principal’s supervision of teachers’ work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate the extent to which you are satisfied with:</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal’s classroom visitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers’ professional records e.g. schemes of work, lesson plan and lesson notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from principal’s classroom visitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relationship between the supervisor and the supervised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence of the supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part III**

17. List in order job factors of recognition, decision making, professional development and supervision that contribute mostly to your overall level of job satisfaction in your job

a) 

b) 

c) 

d)

a) 

b) 

c)
APPENDIX III: PRINCIPALS’ QUESTIONNAIRES

You are kindly requested to fill this questionnaire that seeks to find out the principal’s governance practices influencing teachers’ job satisfaction among secondary school teachers. The information obtained is strictly for research purpose and will be treated with confidentiality. For each of the item, put a tick ( ) in the appropriate box.

Part I (Demographic information)

Please answer all the questions appropriately

1. What is your age (in years)?
   Below 35 years ( ) 36-45 years ( ) 46-55 years ( ) 56 years and above ( )

2. What is your gender?
   Male ( )  Female ( )

3. What is your marital status?
   Single ( ) married ( ) any other, please specify………………

4. What is your highest level of education?
   Diploma ( ) B.Ed. ( ) Masters ( ) Doctorate ( )

5. How many years have you worked as the school principal?
   0 – 4 years ( ) 5 – 9 years ( ) 10 – 14 years ( ) 15 – 19 years ( ) 20 and above years ( )

6. How long have you been in this school as the school principal?
0 – 4 years ( ) 5 – 9 years ( ) 10 – 14 years ( ) 15 – 19 years ( ) 20 and above years ( )

7. Where are you housed?

   School house ( )       Own house ( )       Rental house ( )

8. Indicate your career progression

   a) To change employer ( )
   b) To study further ( )
   c) Others please specify………………

PART II

The following factors are related to your job satisfaction. Each factor is divided into sub-items. You are kindly requested to tick the most appropriate number that represents your feelings with your job. The numbers have the following meaning:

1- Extremely satisfied (ES)
2- Moderately satisfied (MS)
3- Extremely dissatisfied (ED)
4- Moderately dissatisfied (MD)
5- Not applicable (NA)
Principals’ recognition of teacher’s work

How do you recognize teachers’ efforts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate the extent to which teachers are satisfied with the following:</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes during prize giving days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. To what extent does principals’ recognition of teachers’ work influences teachers’ job satisfaction?

   a. Very great extent (  )
   b. Great extent (  )
   c. Moderate extent (  )
   d. No extent (  )
Principals’ involvement of teachers in decision making

11. Do you involve teachers in decision making process?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If yes, how?

Please indicate the extent to which teachers are satisfied with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ entry behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting subjects target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting up the school infrastructure e.g. toilets, classroom, libraries, offices etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ welfare and discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal’s facilitation of teachers’ professional development

Please indicate the extent to which teachers are satisfied with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>opportunities for professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of in-service training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship programme in my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to attend seminars/workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Principal’s supervision of teachers’ work**

14. How do you carry out the supervision of teachers’ work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate the extent to which teachers are satisfied with:</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal’s classroom visitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking teachers’ professional records e.g. schemes of work, lesson plan and lesson notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from principal’s classroom visitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relationship between the supervisor and the supervised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence of the supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What strategies have you put in place as the school principal to enhance teachers’ job satisfaction?
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