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ABSTRACT

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the institutional factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Siaya District, Kenya. The objectives of the study included determining the influence of incentives, workload, teaching and learning resources and supervision on teachers, on their job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Siaya District, Kenya. The study provided empirical literature review evidence on job satisfaction among secondary school teachers with respect to working conditions, workload, incentives, availability of teaching and learning resources and their supervision at work and attempted to identify work dimension factors that affected the job satisfaction of teachers in secondary schools.

The research design was a descriptive survey of public secondary schools teachers in Siaya District. The study employed stratified and simple random sampling techniques to obtain a representative sample. The study used primary data that was collected using a structured questionnaire for teachers in public secondary schools with both open ended and closed ended questions to establish the motivational factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary school teachers. The target population was 82 teachers from public secondary school in Siaya District.

An analysis of the quantitative data collected is provided, which was discussed using descriptive statistics and analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) then presented in tables and graphs according to the study objectives. Though incentives impacted on job satisfaction, different kinds of incentives brought different levels of satisfaction. For instance, 74.4% were not satisfied with their jobs despite having received gifts for various reasons in their schools. Furthermore, 54 out of the 82 teachers disliked their jobs for various reasons despite having received gifts for students’ good academic performance. Therefore the most common form of incentive (gifts) did not bring the desired levels of satisfaction among teachers. The study further demonstrated that higher workloads occasioned lower levels of satisfaction among teachers. For instance the study indicated that 18 in 34 teachers were not satisfied with their jobs as a result of teaching over 30 lessons a week. Furthermore 67.1% of the 82 teachers who were involved in other responsibilities other than teaching were not satisfied with their jobs because they expressed willingness to change their current jobs. Just like incentives, different kinds of teaching and learning resources affected teachers’ job satisfaction differently. Availability of library facilities showed the greatest impact on job satisfaction with 6 in every 11 teachers whose schools had good library facilities saying that they were not satisfied with their jobs. This indicates that in every 11 teachers, 5 were satisfied with their jobs as a result of good library facilities.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Job satisfaction is viewed as the extent to which employees favourably perceive their work (Bennet, 1994). Inyoung (1994) further says that job satisfaction plays a key role in the decision as a career. It has been approximated that one out of every four students who complete a teacher training programme in Ohio-United States of America, never enter teaching, or leave teaching position within the first five years. This is attributed to lack of prospects of satisfaction within the profession (Inyoung, 1994). In the third world countries, teachers are often in short supply and therefore the study of job satisfaction among teachers in Siaya, Kenya, assumes an added importance and relevance (Simatwa, 2011).

Most countries in the world are faced with this problem of teacher shortage, but is acute in the poor countries like Kenya (Coombs, 1967). The availability of other jobs has greatly altered the position of teaching profession in Africa. With the innovations in all the spheres of economy, an increased demand for highly qualified personnel is on the demand. This has aggravated the problem because teaching has also to compete with the civil service, the industrial and the commercial sectors for the available trained personnel.
Dubey (1985) listed some functions and roles of teachers at the school level which include being a mediator for learning, being able to recognize the various qualities that reflect on a learning environment. He says, a teacher is a controller of learners behaviour since he sets rules and standards of behaviour inclined towards acceptable norms of the school. The teacher further advocates for positive change in policies and practices affecting learning in the community since he plays a role in molding future being into acceptable members of the community. A teacher is therefore seen as a public servant in the community and an agent of social change who is able to demonstrate ethical principles and standards such as integrity, honesty and equity (Dubey, 1985).

The above scenario makes teaching a very demanding job, unfortunately which is however poorly remunerated. This is one reason why there has been an exodus from the profession to other better paying jobs, depriving the teaching service of young, energetic and qualified people, plaguing most countries into teachers’ shortage. (Williams, 2004). If efficiency in any work place is to be realized, it has to be done under favourable conditions. Employee is to be provided with an enabling conducive environment to perform and produce the desired results. Locke (1976) states clearly that the success of any organization hangs on contented workers. It is in this regard that prudent organization place high premium in their workers’ welfare. Davis (1977) attributes low job satisfaction to deteriorating conditions in an organization. Williams (2004) asserts that for work to be done efficiently, it
needs to be done under favourable conditions thus an individual should be provided with an enabling environment to perform and produce the desired results. There is a lot of work given under stressful environment. This as a result gives rise to strikes, slow downs, absenteeism, disciplinary problems and employees turnover. People management is an important aspect of organizational process. This emanated from the recognition that the human resource of an organization and the organization itself are synonymous. A well managed business organization or institution normally consider the average employee as the primary source of productivity gains (Griffin, 2001). To ensure the achievement of institutional goals, the learning institution must create an atmosphere of commitment and corporation for her teaching staff through policies that facilitate employee satisfaction (Woodruff, 2000).

Satisfaction of human resource finds close link to a highly motivated employee. Motivated staff then develops loyalty or commitment to an institution resulting to greater productivity and lower turnover rates. Brudett and Smith (2003) in a study based on a sample of 57 schools in England and Wales concluded that those learning Institutions with abundant learning and teaching resource, favourable student-teacher ratio, commendable workload and good reward and incentive for teachers perform with better compared to learning institutions which do not provide the same.
Brudent and Smith (2003) in a study based on a sample of 157 schools in England and Wales concluded that those learning institutions with abundant learning and teaching resources, favourable student-teacher ratio, commendable workload and good reward and incentives for teachers perform much better compared to learning institutions which do not provide the same. The studies show that the impact of teacher’s job satisfaction is seen in terms of quality performance. Lipit (2003) and Yuki (2002) observed that all learning institutions focus on attainment of good result and the teacher is regarded as a pivotal centre upon which teaching and learning revolve. Quality results can only be realized in a school where the teaching staffs are motivated hence satisfied job wisely.

The current focus on teachers’ job satisfaction influenced by new public management for which places heavy emphasis on the management for results (Halachet, 2005). Job satisfaction is supported by wide range of factors which are none class based and class based in nature. Dewaal (2007) established that the none class factors include level of salary and benefits, relationship with immediate supervisor and incentives. The classroom based factors were established as follows: student-teacher ratio, teachers’ workload, pupil achievement level in examinations, adequate teaching and learning resources.

Since the implementation of the 8-4-4 system in 1985; 8 years in Primary, 4 years in Secondary and 4 years in University, there has been a marked change in subject load, content and coverage, the practically oriented subjects being
taught and examined as an integral part of the learner’s education. This has increased the work load on the teacher without adjusting payment. The reviews done by Kenya Institute of Education (K.I.E) and set commission, most recent – Koech Report (Republic of Kenya, 1999) to ease the work load on teachers and students alike, have not completely relieved the teacher creating more room for reviews.

Kenya is undergoing rapid social and economical changes in its occupational trends; as a result unemployment has become rampant. The economic demand of the growing population has outreached the government ability to contain it. This necessitated the government putting teachers from Colleges to public schools since 1998. This has created understaffing in most secondary schools. Kenya Union of Teachers (KNUT) puts the shortage figure at sixty thousand (Daily Nation, 10/7/2003 pp.1 & 2). The employment is now done at schools levels depending on needs of the school. The government only replaces those who die, retire or die. This does not improve the position of staffing any better.

The minimum of 27 lessons per week placed teachers (a circular released in 2002 from the office of the Provincial Director of Education (PDE) in conjunction with Teachers Service Commission (TSC). This heavy work load impacts negatively on teachers and leads to job dissatisfaction. The Waruhiu Commission Report made observation that teachers were not satisfied with their jobs in relation to those working in other fields (Republic of Kenya,
1980) since: “Teachers see no clear promotion prospects a situation that stifles initiative and innovation and leads to frustration.”(P. 47). The Ramtu Commission Report (Republic of Kenya, 1985) observed the same and recommended a review on teachers’ advancement scheme. These mentioned are clear indicators that the Kenya publics have been deprived in one way or the other in their job.

In Kenya, there is growing awareness of the need for a motivated public sector work force to provide quality services. In order to improve this quality service in education, there is need to improve teaching and learning facilities to give efficient coverage of the overstretched curriculum content. Some of our secondary schools lack basic facilities like laboratories, libraries not to mention textbooks. This hampers effective teaching and leads to dissatisfaction.

Provision of quality education in secondary schools in Kenya faces major challenges. Apart from inadequate funding, management and supervision of teaching and learning courses have raised considerable debate in public domain due to lower academic achievement in National Examination, MoE (2010) Bush (2006) and Armstrong (2005) all observed that the success of any learning institutions depend on the level of job satisfaction of the teaching staff who plays both managerial and teaching roles in an institution of learning.
The study shows that the impact of teachers’ job satisfaction is seen in terms of quality performance. Lipit (2003) and Yuki (2002) both observe that all learning institution focus on attainment of good results and the teacher is regarded as a pivotal centre upon which teaching and learning revolve. Quality result can only be realized in school where the teaching staff is motivated hence satisfied jobwisely. A healthy society is nurtured through the provision of quality education that is accessible and relevant (Digolo, 2006). The teacher forms the backbone of the implementation programme.

Kenya is one of the governments that has heeded to the call to meet MDG section of education for all (EFA) goals. The efforts to eradicate illiteracy is supported by Anderson (1994), who pointed out that learning is for all, the young regardless of their social strata. Projects like School Feeding Programmes (SFP) and the Subsidized Secondary Education (SSE). However, the resources it plans for will not stretch to cover all that is needed to meet the Kenya Education Support Programme (KESP) Ochieng, (2005). Ochieng says this stems from high levels of learner enrollment in public schools. This heavy workload stemming from over enrollment with the influx of learners, the stringent physical and infrastructural resources has been a demotivating factor (Simatwa, 2011). He further established that some teachers in public schools in Kenya are hanging on to teaching because they have failed to land in jobs of their preferences. He cited 50% who say poor pay and working conditions strangle the teaching profession and that contributes to the reason why
teachers in public schools who have alternative means are leaving the profession at a higher rate.

Simatwa (2011) discovered that when the automatic employment of graduate teachers from colleges was frozen in 1992, acute shortage of teachers was created. He suggested that the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) should revise the staffing norms, encourage the hiring of teachers through school committee to mitigate the shortage and the improvement of working conditions. This is a welcomed positive move since it will elevate the workload and reduces student-teacher ratio in classes.

The Government of Kenya through subsidized secondary education is supplementing the provision of teaching and learning materials through tuition fee vote head, annual recruitment of teachers though there is teachers shortage by 6,000 (KNUT Report, 2012) and development of centres of excellence in each constituency under economic stimulus project (2011 – 2012). However, it has been noted that despite the increase in enrollment, little has been done if any to bring all schools to the same level in terms of availability of adequate teaching and learning resources, favourable working condition for teachers both in rural and urban schools, favourable teacher-student ratio and teacher workload. The net effort of this condition contributes to teachers’ job dissatisfaction which is manifested in the national result they post (Ochieng, 2005). This is the reason why the researcher intends to undertake a research on the institutional factors influencing job satisfaction among secondary teachers
in public secondary schools in Siaya District Kenya. The choice of secondary school in Siaya District is borne out of consideration that its unique setting provides opportunity to study secondary schools located in both rural and urban areas.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The Kenyan government has made remarkable efforts to increase enrollment in schools so as to meet education for all (EFA) goals by the year 2015 (Simatwa, 2011). However little has been done to bring all schools to the level in terms of adequate resources and general working conditions for teachers. Worst hit are public secondary schools. Teachers seem dissatisfied with factors pertaining to their job such as, remunerations, promotion requirements and policies, teaching loads, supervision and physical working conditions (Kamina, 2002). As a result, teachers have continued to leave the profession for greener pastures in other sectors where terms and conditions are better than teaching (Okumbe, 1992). This dissatisfaction could be a major cause of the departure. This study therefore sought to establish factors influencing job satisfaction among public secondary schools in Siaya district, Kenya in relation to the above mentioned factors in Siaya District.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the institutional factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Siaya District, Kenya.
1.4 Objectives of the study

The following objectives were developed to determine the influence of institutional factors on job satisfaction in public secondary school teachers in Siaya District.

(i) To determine the influence of incentive on teachers’ job satisfaction in Siaya District.

(ii) To examine the influence of work load on the teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Siaya District.

(iii) To establish whether teaching and learning resources have influence in teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Siaya District.

(iv) To establish whether supervision by head teachers has influence on teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Siaya District.

1.5 Research questions

The following research questions were developed for the purpose of the study;

(i) What is the influence of incentives on teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Siaya District?

(ii) To what extent does the teachers’ work load influence teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Siaya District?

(iii) To what extent do the teaching and learning resources influence teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Siaya District?
(iv) To what extent does the supervision of teachers by their heads have effect on their job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Siaya District?

1.6 Significance of the study
The study helped to identify key factors which influence job satisfaction among secondary school teachers in Siaya District; Kenya. This information is important as it enabled stakeholders to present their problems to the respective authorities in more objective manner. The study would also provide empirical evidence on how the mentioned factors namely: incentives and rewards, teacher work load, teaching learning resources, supervision by superiors and working conditions are related to teachers’ levels of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Siaya district education department would be able to address these challenges faced by the teachers and strive to ensure that teachers get appropriate support commensurate to their tasks.

1.7 Limitation of the study
The use of closed ended questionnaire created sealing effect, however this was addressed by introducing more open ended questions. Respondents endeavored to give socially acceptable answers to researcher to avoid offence; such results were less reliable. Assurance of confidentiality was given to minimize this limitation.
1.8 **Delimitations of the study**

The study was restricted to only secondary schools in Siaya District. There were also a number of issues that determined the teachers’ level of job satisfaction among others were personal and non-institutional but the study emphasized on the institutional ones.

1.9 **Basic Assumptions of the study**

The assumptions of the study were that:

(i) All secondary schools have equal ability to provide resources.

(ii) All the institutional factors which affect secondary schools are uniform.

(iii) All teachers teaching in secondary schools have undergone uniform training.

(iv) Teaching was a first career choice among teachers teaching in Siaya District secondary schools.

1.10 **Definition of significant terms used**

The following are some of the significant terms used in the study:

**Absenteeism** refers to voluntary decision by teachers not to come to work as opposed to other **cases of illness or accident**.

**Incentive** refers to something that motivates an individual to perform an action well, incentives aim to provide value for money and contribute to organizational success.
Job dissatisfaction refers to any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental factors that are displeasing to the individual and thus preventing him from giving optimum service to the organization.

Job satisfaction refers to attitude that reflects extent to which teachers are gratified by their work.

Performance refers to a summary of measures of the quantity or quality of contributions made by a teacher or group for production of work unit in an organization.

Promotion policies refer to terms and conditions considered in moving a teacher from one job group to another one and from one level to another one.

Public secondary school refers to a school developed and maintained by public funds from government, parents and community.

Salary refers to all sequences of events in which compensation plays a role wage or salary increase.

Turnover refers to quitting employment by teachers.

Work load refers to number of lessons allocated to a teacher in a week alongside co-curricular activities.

Working condition refers to working situations on the ground in a school such as physical structures, availability of materials, stipulated syllabi to be covered in relation to time given.

1.11 Organization of the study

The study comprises five chapters. Chapter one contains the background information of the study, the statement of the problem, purpose of the study,
limitations and delimitations of the study, assumptions of the study, organization of the study and definition of significant terms used in the study. Chapter two contains literature review, summary of the literature reviews, theoretical framework and conceptual framework. Chapter three highlights methodology of the study. This includes research design, target population, sample size and sampling techniques, research instruments, validity and reliability of research instruments, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques. Chapter four consists of data analysis and interpretation. Chapter five comprises summary of the study, conclusions and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter explores concept of teachers’ job satisfaction in relation to working conditions, reward and incentive, work load, supervision and opportunities for advancement.

2.2 Concept and dimensions of job satisfaction

The term motivation is derived from the Latin word ‘movere’ meaning to move (Luthans, 1992). It is a process that starts with a physiological deficiency or need that activates behaviour or a drive that is aimed at a goal or incentive. On the other hand, job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job experience (Locke, 1976).

Job satisfaction can be defined as a pleasurable state resulting from the acceptance of one’s job (Okumbe, 1998). The process of motivation finally places an individual in a state where he or she can have a sense of fulfillment and a positive assurance of the accomplishment undertaken. This scenario brings job satisfaction. Work motivation and job satisfaction are therefore synomously related.
Luthans (1992) gives two dimensions of job satisfaction: The first one being an emotional response to a job situation, which can only be inferred and not seen. The second one is that it is usually determined by how well outcomes meet or exceed expectations. For example, secondary school teachers may feel that they are working much harder than other employees with similar qualification in other sectors but receiving fewer rewards and incentive, they are likely to be dissatisfied in their job. On the other hand, if secondary school teachers perceive their reward as equitable, then they will feel satisfied with their job. These attitudes are on the characteristics of the job namely; the work itself, working conditions and availability of resources to be used in teaching and learning activities, and the relationship with the immediate boss.

The success of motivating people depends on the needs that are unsatisfied and thereafter helping individuals to meet them. The educational management has a responsibility to create work environment in which teacher can satisfy their needs. Psychological conditions seen in poor working conditions like inadequate classrooms, toilets, laboratories, libraries need improvement. Teaching/learning resources should be made appropriate and available and interrelationship with immediate supervisor be made healthy. Teachers’ personal growth is also vital. If this environment is not availed, teachers will have increased frustration, low performance and job satisfaction.
2.3 Working conditions and teachers job satisfaction

Working condition is a factor that has a modest effect on job satisfaction. Luthans (1992) asserts that clean and attractive surroundings tend to make workers happy when doing their work thus increasing job satisfaction. Poor working conditions such as inadequate space, noisy and uncomfortable surrounding will make the workers dissatisfied with their work. Sogomo’s (1993) findings in the study of job satisfaction of secondary school principals in the Rift Valley Province of Kenya, found a significant relationship between job satisfaction of teachers and school environment. He proposed that work environment in the school should be such that it enhances teachers’ sense of professionalism and in turn decreases dissatisfaction. The work characteristic for teachers that are associated with job dissatisfaction should be identified in order to change the working environment for continuous job satisfaction. (Sogomo, 1993).

An employee’s overall satisfaction in his job is the result of a combination of factors. The management’s role is to enhance an employee’s job satisfaction by creating positive work environment (Allen, 2003). Okumbe (1998) says that workers are concerned with their work environment for their personal comfort as well as for facilitating efficiency at work. The environment should be clean, modern with adequate and appropriate tools for work. Providing productivity tools such as upgraded information technology helps employee accomplish task more efficiently contributing to job satisfaction. (Darling –
Hammond, 2001). The employee’s morale will be high in tasks they are assigned to do.

The teacher would desire working conditions that will result into greater physical comfort and convenience. The absence of such working conditions among other things, can impact poorly on working mental and physical well being (Born and Greenberg, 2003). Robbins (2003) advocate that working condition will influence job satisfaction as employees are concerned with a comfortable physical working environment which influence job satisfaction. According to James Brown (2007) fairness is an equal treatment; receiving the same services and benefits as competent leaders are essential to the success of the school.

2.4 Incentives and teachers’ job satisfaction

Brown (1998) states that job satisfaction levels are more focused on the presence or absence of certain intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The intrinsic factors are majorly based on personal perceptions and internal feelings. They include factors such as recognition, advancement, opportunities and responsibility. Extrinsic factors are external job-related variables such as salary, supervision, working condition and the work environment. The availability of these factors will contribute positively towards a teacher’s job satisfaction.
Several studies have established that employees want pay systems and promotion policies that they perceive as being just, unambiguous and in line with their expectations (Okumbe, 1998). Okumbe further states that job satisfaction is enhanced when workers perceive equitable pay compared to their input. Gordon (1986) indicated that the larger the reward, the more the job satisfaction of a worker.

Various motivational programs motivate teachers and motivation leads to job satisfaction. The ideal incentives are those structured for specific individuals and made flexible over time, thus needs of employees should be well understood so that appropriate stimuli be used to eventually achieve job satisfaction (Wasonga, 2004). Incentives like provision of transport for teachers, tea and lunch may go a long way in improving performance of teachers.

2.5 Workload and teachers’ job satisfaction
Dealing with a work load that is too heavy and deadlines that are impossible to reach can be very stressful. This will cause job satisfaction to erode even the most dedicated employee (Okumbe, 1998). Falling short of deadlines result in conflict between employees and supervision and raises the stress level in the work place. With the minimum number of periods of 50 per week and some having as many as 60 lessons per week, coupled with classes as big as to 70 students per class, (D.E.O office, Siaya 2012), work becomes cumbersome.
2.6 Supervision and communication in relation to teachers’ job satisfaction

As teachers go about their duties, the manner in which their supervisors coordinate their activities is very important. The supervisor has positive impact on satisfaction, (Griffin, 2001) superior-subordinate communication is an important influence on job satisfaction in work place. The way a subordinate perceives a supervisor’s behaviour can positively or negatively impact on job satisfaction. Luckens, Lyter and Fox (2004), says that a supervisor who is friendly and has open communication is more likely to receive positive feedback and high satisfaction from subordinates conversely, a supervisor who is antisocial and unfriendly receive negative feedback and create low job satisfaction in their subordinate in a work place. According to Chakrabarty, Oubre and Brown (2008), they say “perhaps the finest way in which supervisors can portray himself as a role model is to personally demonstrate proper techniques so that the employee could understand how well the job should be done”. Another study conducted by Friedlander and Margulies (1969) discovered that management and friendly staff relationship contributes to the level of job satisfaction.

2.7 Opportunities for advancement and job satisfaction

Employees are satisfied with current job if they see a path available to move up in ranks and be given more responsibilities along with higher compensation (Sogomo, 1993). Do many schools encourage teachers to acquire more advanced skills that will lead to chances of promotion?
The level of job satisfaction among teachers increases with the professional grade levels (Wasonga 2004). Studies carried out points out that employment policies laid down by the teachers service Commission(TSC) on how certain issues should be undertaken have been neglected, one being that of upward mobility for teachers. There should be further training courses, in-service training programmes that facilitates teachers’ progression toward effectiveness. This can be organized through seminars, conferences, workshops and institutions like KEMI-Kenya Education Management Institute, KIE – Kenya Institute of Education will be appropriate in keeping teacher updated.

2.8 Summary of the literature review

Different theories on work motivation and job satisfaction form the theoretical framework of the study. The explored include Vroom's expectancy valence theory and Hertzberg’s two factors theory forming the basis of reference in this study. However, scholars contend that there is no overall theory on job satisfaction and all theories emanating from various studies have a role to play in the whole process (Luthans, 1992).

Researchers such as Karugu (1980) and Ngalyuka (1985) tend to lend credence to the idea that factors such as age, professional qualifications, category of school and teaching experience influence job satisfaction levels and motivation patterns of teachers. It is clear from the review of literature that job satisfaction is directly related to work motivation. A teacher who is not
motivated will hardly experience job satisfaction which is a stage reached after appraising one’s job accomplishment and the underlying factors. The theories are therefore expected to provide points of reference and help come up with sound philosophical and conceptual principles on which to base one’s practical research work such as this study.

Critics of this theory point out a number of issues. First, they argue that it is based on a small sample of 200 factory accountants and engineers in U.S.A and it is doubtful whether this can be generalized to other occupations with different technology, environment and background. Secondly, the method used (critical incident technique) has low validity. This is because respondents were involved in self reporting on happy and unhappy experiences concerning their job conditions. This was bound to introduce bias of being able to recall the most recent conditions attributing to experience of oneself and unfavourable ones to other people. The third criticism is that it offers no explanation as to why various extrinsic and intrinsic job factors should affect performance, (Tripath, 1982).

2.9 Theoretical framework for the study

This theoretical framework explores the concepts of work motivation especially with teachers in public secondary schools. It adopts Herzberg two factor theory (Herzberg, 1968). The theory states that factors which create satisfaction originates from intrinsic contents of a job and they satisfy higher needs .This consists of work itself, advancement, responsibility and
recognition. These satisfiers are motivators since they motivate employees to greater productivity. Herzberg further says they can motivate individuals to a long term performance. On the other hand, factors that create dissatisfaction emanate from extrinsic job contents such as salary, work condition, organization policy administration and supervision. They are associated with the environment surrounding the job hygiene factors. Such factors he argues out that can produce changes in attitude and productivity but only in the short run. Herzberg however says that the hygiene factors are also necessary in maintaining human resource. Some factors fall in both intrinsic and extrinsic sides.

The major aspects of Herzberg’s theory are the two sets of factors thought to be present in a job. These are motivators and hygiene factors. The motivators are such as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement. These factors are effective in motivating employees to greater productivity and are strong determinants of job satisfaction. Herzberg argued that such satisfiers can motivate individuals to long term superior performance and effort (Herzberg, 1968). Hygiene factors such as company policy and administration’s mode of supervision, salary, relationship with co-workers and working condition arise mostly from the job environment. Herzberg further states that such factors are only involved in creating job dissatisfaction. The two factor theory further advances that the only way to motivate an employee is to find him more challenging work in which he can assume responsibility
and this can be done by making jobs more intrinsically rewarding (Herzberg, 1968).

Commitment to teaching and the work place have been found to be enhanced by acknowledgement of teaching meaningful and varied work, reasonable work load, adequate resources pay and learning opportunities provided. The extrinsic factors evolve from the working environment while the actual satisfiers are intrinsic and encouraged a greater effectiveness, designing and developing teachers higher level needs.

2.10 Conceptual framework

The study was based on a conceptual framework depicting job satisfaction as a dependent variables and institutional factors as independent variables. It is subdivided into three levels. Level one with dependable variable which is job satisfaction among secondary school teachers in public schools. Level two will examine the undependable variables of the study; incentives, workload, working condition, availability of teaching learning resources, supervision and opportunities for advancement. Level three will draw conclusions of outcomes towards job satisfaction.
Figure 1: Conceptual framework on job satisfaction for teachers in public secondary school

The study conceptualizes that for job satisfaction in public secondary schools teachers to be achieved, there is need to provide a conducive working environment, improved employment policies and promotions and availability of teaching and learning materials. If the above mentioned aspects are realized, they enhance teacher motivation and commitment by the teacher to their employer; TSC and managers who are school principals.

Incentives energizes teachers and motivates them. They feel that their inputs have been recognized and appreciated. This motivation leads to job satisfaction. When opportunities for advancement are available, hope is created in teachers as this enables them plan their career advancement since it is clear that from this level, you can move to that level, or when you do this
course or this examination and pass, you move to the next stage. This upward mobility encourages teachers to work hard and once they succeed, they feel satisfied. As far as work load is concerned, when it is manageable, with normal number of lessons, normal class size, teachers do not become stressed at work and thus enjoy their work, but when it is too heavy with deadlines impossible to reach, a stressful situation is created which leads to job dissatisfaction.

A conducive working environment will make the teachers happy and comfortable when doing their work, thus increasing their level of job satisfaction. Availability of learning resources makes the teacher well equipped and so boasts his confidence as he or she undertakes his or her duties. This increases level of job satisfaction. The interaction between teachers and their superior is very important because it either kills or boasts the teachers’ morale. When communication channels are open and the superiors positive in how they supervise the teachers, teaches get encouraged to give feedbacks to the administrators.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter represents the research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, data collection, validity of instruments, reliability of instruments and data analysis procedure.

3.2 Research design
The study used a descriptive survey method. In this method information is collected by interviewing or administering questionnaires to a sample of individuals, (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) also state that a survey is an attempt to collect data from members of a population in order to determine current status of that population in relation to one or more variables. This design was most appropriate for the study because the questionnaire used enabled collection of data which was easily drawn directly from the respondent and existing records to give the needed results. The purpose of this study was to establish institutional factors influencing teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Siaya district, Kenya.

3.3 Target population
The target population consisted of 83 secondary school teachers in Siaya District and 37 head-teachers. The district has 37 public secondary schools with a population of approximately 277 teachers on the three divisions;
Karemo division with 161 teachers, Uranga Division with 59 teachers and Boro division with 57 teachers.

3.4 Sample size and sampling procedure

Sampling is the procedure a researcher uses to gather people, places or things to study. It is a process of selecting a number of individuals or objects from a population such that the selected group contains elements representative of the characteristics found in the entire group (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). This study targeted only teachers as respondents from public secondary school found in Siaya District.

There are three divisions in Siaya district; Boro, Karemo and Uranga. The total number of public secondary schools is 37 with the total number of teachers at 277 according to records from the District Education Department as at April, 2013. Stratified random sampling was used for this study. Out of the 37 public secondary schools in the district, 35 schools were selected and grouped according to divisions then samples picked from each of three divisions. The samples were categorized into boarding girls, boarding boys and mixed day schools which provided teachers to act as respondents in the study. The remaining two schools were used in the pilot study, as the table below illustrates.
Table 1: Target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>Population of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karemo</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uranga</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boro</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>277</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source; DEO’s Siaya April 2013

The target population consisted of public secondary school teachers in Siaya district who were selected from all the 37 public secondary schools in the district. There are three divisions in the district with approximately 277 teachers.

3.5 Research instruments

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) argue that a questionnaire is a preferred method of in data collection because it is easy to administer to a good number of respondent, who respond in private setting. The questionnaire was designed to measure the teachers’ satisfaction with their job. The researcher designed questionnaires which were used to derive data. It was divided into three parts. Part A contained demographic information necessary for the study. Part B consisted of data pertaining to job satisfaction of teachers in secondary schools. It elicited information from the respondents in regard to the variables to be studied; work load, incentives, working conditions, availability of teaching and learning materials, opportunities for advancement and
supervision. Part C further consisted of open ended questions giving general information on job satisfaction.

3.6 Validity of instruments

Validity of an instrument is based on how an instrument fulfils the functions it is supposed to perform. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) emphasized that validity is a degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represent the phenomenon under study. A questionnaire is said to be valid when it actually measures the laid down items. The respondents were given same duration of time to fill questionnaires and assured of confidentiality. To establish validity of the instrument, a pilot study was conducted in two schools to ensure the questionnaire was constructed appropriately hence suitable for the study. Teachers who participated in the pilot study from the two schools did not participate in the actual study. The responses in the pilot scheme were examined in an attempt to reveal sources of ambiguity in the instructions. Variables were also modified depending on assessment from the pilot study.

3.7 Reliability of instrument

Reliability refers to the consistency of the scores obtained, how consistent they are for each individual from one administration of an instrument to another (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). A reliable one will constantly produce the expected results when used more than once to collect data from two samples randomly drawn from the same population. To test reliability the researcher used the
technique which involves splitting statements of a test into two halves, the odd and even items, (Mugenda & Mugenda 2003). They also give major advantage of this approach as elimination of chance error due to different test conditions. A reliable coefficient was calculated to indicate the relationships between the two sets of scores obtained. Pearson’s product formula was used to calculate the correlation (Kothari, 2002).

3.8 Data collection procedure
After getting permission from University of Nairobi and issued with research permission, the researcher got permit from National Council of Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) made a courtesy to Siaya district education office and inform them of the intended research in public secondary schools in the district. The researcher then wrote to head teachers asking for permission to conduct the study in their schools. Thereafter the researcher visited schools and administered the questionnaires to the teachers and head teachers. The respondents were assured of confidentiality of their identities in dealing with responses. Questionnaires were then left with respondents sampled and collected with the assistance of a research assistant after two days or on agreed time.

3.9 Data analysis techniques
Data analysis techniques are statistical methods used to analyze data so that it can be interpreted (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). Open ended questions were analyzed using content analysis after looking into similarities and differences,
discussed findings and implications, then drew conclusions. Descriptive statistical tools such as ratios, means, percentages and frequency distribution were used. The qualitative method was used to analyse questions in the questionnaire. Data was computed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). T-test was used for determining statistical difference between the means of distinct category of respondents like different grades or experience. The above section of research proposal was made complete with the inclusion of the analysis section, more tables, figures and appendices, besides reference. Inferential statistics was applied to establish relationship between institutional factors and job satisfaction.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

Chapter four constitutes the presentation of the data that were collected from the field and processed. Additionally, the chapter consists of an analysis of the data in order to explain the extent to which they answer the research questions which were intended to be answered by this study. The data has been presented and analyzed in line with the four research questions that were outlined for investigation in the study. Consequently, the chapter consists of four key sections with each section presenting and analyzing data relating to each research question. Therefore section one deals with rewards and incentives and they contribute to job satisfaction. Section 2 deals with the impact of work load on teachers’ job satisfaction. Section three deals with the impact of teaching and learning resources on teachers job satisfaction. Section four presents data relating to the impact of supervision on job satisfaction. Data relating to these variables has been presented in tables and graphs. For descriptive purposes, responses from the interview guides have been used. However for purposes of quantification, frequency tables, cross tabulation tables and graphs have been used in order to quantify the responses that were collected from the field.
4.1.1 Background data

This study targeted 83 teachers out of the total 277 secondary school teachers that work in Siaya District. This sample size represented 30% of the total population of teachers. After the completion of the study, it was established that of the 83 targeted respondents, one failed to return the questionnaire while the remaining 82 safely returned their filled in questionnaires. This placed the questionnaire return rate at 98.79% (approximately 98.9%). The number of respondents who returned the filled in questionnaires were considered sufficient since the opinion of the single remaining respondent could not significantly create variation in the data.

The researcher explored the demographic information of the respondents who took part in this study. 5 demographic aspects of the respondents were sought and these were age, gender, academic qualification, type of school and duration of service. Figures 2-6 below presents the demographic information of the respondents.
Figure 2: Age of teachers

Figure 2 indicates that majority of those who participated in this study were aged between 30-39. 34.1% of the 82 teachers were aged 30-39. An almost similar number was represented by teachers aged 40-49 who constituted 30.5% of the total 82 teachers. The youngest teachers (20-29) constituted the third highest number of teachers because they comprised of only 19.5% of the 82 teachers who took part in this study. The least number of teachers were the oldest (50-59) who comprised of only 15.9% of the total number of teachers who participated in this study. In relation to the problem that affect teachers’ motivation at work age did not matter, in the absence of an essential need, all behaved the same.
The number of female and male teachers who took part in this study were more or less equal. However, female teachers were slightly more than the male teachers. Figure 3 indicates that 44 females took part in this study compared to 38 males who took part. However, both responded in similar ways to the problems that affect them at work.
According to figure 4, the greatest number of teachers (65.9%) hold bachelors in education. This is because in the current system, only those with bachelors are employed by the government as high school teacher. Therefore it was expected that majority of the teachers would have bachelor degrees. However, 12 teachers had post graduated diploma in education while 9 had Masters in Education. The least number of teachers were those with diplomas.

PGDE teachers mainly consist of those who have migrated into education after failing to secure employment in their main areas of profession. Most of these had Bachelors of Science general and Bachelor of Arts. Given this scenario, they were people who did not necessary desire to be teachers but ended up in teaching because it was the only option available. Diploma teachers on the
other hand were mainly those who had graduated with diplomas in education and secured employment with high schools before the government stopped employing graduates with diploma in education.

### Table 2: Duration of service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 2, the highest number of teachers interviewed were those who had served for 1-10 years (28 teachers had served for between 1-10 years). The second largest number of teachers were those who had served for less than 1 year. This shows that majority of the teachers are those who are new in teaching. This is further proved by the fact that only 13 teachers out of the ones who participated in this study had served for over 20 years. The selection of these teachers was carefully done in order to accommodate to capture the views of different types of teachers. Therefore the data presented in table 2 give a clear indication that majority of the teachers in Siaya district are fairly young having been in service for less than 10 years.
Figure 5: Type of school

According to figure 5, majority of the teachers who were interviewed (45.1%) were working in mixed day schools. This choice was made to take care of the fact that most of the schools in Siaya District are mixed day schools. Girls’ boarding schools come second in number and this is why 32.9% of the teachers were working in Girls’ Boarding Schools. The least number of high schools were Boys’ Boarding Schools. In this study, only 22% of the teachers were working in Boys’ Boarding Schools. Having established the background information of the respondents who took part in this study, the researcher embarked on an analysis of the data that responded to the various research questions.
4.2 The influence of incentives on teachers’ job satisfaction

The first research question sought to establish the extent to which incentives impact upon teachers’ job satisfaction. However before establishing this correlation, it is of essence to establish the level of satisfaction of the teachers so as to establish the plan of action towards motivating teachers. Figure 6 below presents this data.

**Figure 6: Teachers’ level of satisfaction with the job in relation to given incentives**

![Bar chart showing levels of satisfaction](image)

Figure one above indicates that 30 teachers who took part in this study were slightly satisfied with their jobs. Out of the 82 teachers who took part in this study, 24 were not satisfied with their jobs while only 6 said that they were extremely satisfied. Therefore, in conclusion it can be generalized that only 6 in 82 teachers in Siaya district are extremely satisfied with their jobs while 24 in every 82 teachers are not satisfied with their jobs. This is an indication that majority of the teachers are either not satisfied or are just slightly satisfied with their jobs. In order to explain this level of satisfaction, it was of essence
to establish the correlation between level of satisfaction or job satisfaction generally with specific variables. The first variable which was used to explain this was incentives/rewards.

The variables which were used to measure incentives were whether one had received any gifts, reasons for receiving the gifts and the programs that a school had to improve the performance of teachers. On the other hand, job satisfaction was measured by asking the opinion of respondents regarding their willingness to change their current jobs, their level of satisfaction with their current jobs, and what they liked and disliked most about their current jobs. To establish how incentives influences job satisfaction a section of variables drawn from both the dependent and independent variables were cross tabulated to establish the degree of correlation. Table 3 below presents the statistical values that were generated from the cross tabulation of variables received any gifts by willingness to change job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received any gifts</th>
<th>Willingness to change job</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Cross tabulation of whether one has received any gifts by willingness to change job
Table 1 indicates that majority of the respondents have indeed received gifts as rewards for their good work yet also majority are willing to change job. 56.1% (46 teachers) of those who have received gifts are willing to change their jobs while only 15 teachers who had received gifts were not willing to change their jobs. On the contrary, 12 teachers had not received any gifts and were not willing to change their jobs. This shows that the gifts that teachers are given for the good work they do has not been enough in ensuring that they are satisfied with their jobs. From the interviews, one of the respondents had this to say,

“I have received alot of gifts for the good work I have been doping with my students but you know that is not part of what brought me in teaching. Despite receiving gifts, the salary is too small compared to the work that I do and so I cannot be satisfied with this job just because I received gifts which come after one year...”

According to the sentiments of this teacher, gifts are not fulfilling enough because they are never consistent. The welfare of the teacher is more important in as far as ensuring that the teachers are fulfilled in their job and not gifts which depend upon performance in various aspects so that one can be assured of getting some. One reason why gifts do not have a positive influence on job satisfaction as it would be expected is the reason for which gifts are given. As demonstrated in table 4 below, majority of the teachers are of the opinion that teachers are mostly awarded for the students’ academic performance while the other aspects of teachers’ performance such as creativity and time management are overlooked.
Table 4: Reasons for awarding teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students academic performance</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Creativity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 indicates that 54 out of 82 respondents who participated in this study felt that students’ academic performance is the major reason for which teachers are awarded while only 16 and 12 respectively said that teachers’ creativity and time management are the major reasons why teachers are awarded respectively. The reason for this response is that most schools are nowadays more preoccupied with students’ academic performance given the competition between schools. Consequently, most school administrations feel that the only way to ensure that teachers achieve their best in preparing students for exams is by rewarding them for the good academic performance of the students that one was teaching. Does the fact that teachers are mostly awarded for academic performance of students have a positive influence on job satisfaction? To answer this question, the variable students’ academic performance was cross tabulated by what the teachers disliked most about their jobs; the study having established that majority of the teachers disliked their jobs. Figures indicating the responses are presented in table 5 below.
Table 5: Cross tabulation of students' academic performance by what the teachers dislike most about their jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction expressed through what one disliked most about their job</th>
<th>Too much supervision</th>
<th>No support for further education</th>
<th>No incentive to do better</th>
<th>Too much work</th>
<th>Poor remuneration and inadequate teaching resources</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately common</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least common</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not common at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under normal circumstances, for a teacher to teach and ensure that students perform well so that he/she is awarded for good performance of the students, he/she has to teach extra hard sometimes even beyond the normal teaching hours. The involvement of teachers in extra classes has made some of them not to appreciate the system since it occupies most of their time. In deed this explanation is supported by 21 out 82 teachers who said they had received awards for students’ academic performance yet they disliked their jobs because of too much work.
Additionally, emphasis on students’ academic performance has made principals in some schools to deny some teachers the opportunity to further their education in education or fields of their choice. During data collection, the researcher came across a total of 5 teachers who had been granted admission letters by various universities to pursue higher education but the school administration had refused to sign for them the study leave forms because nobody would teach their courses if they went. Despite being good teachers who had helped their respective schools to achieve good academic results, they expressed that they had their personal lives which they had to develop and so the denial of opportunity to further their studies to them was a big disservice and a cause for even more dissatisfaction with their jobs. This view is supported by 19 out of 82 respondents as presented in table 5 who said that they had received their awards because of students’ academic performance yet they disliked their jobs because there was no support for further education.

From table 6, it can be clearly deduced that indeed more teachers had received gifts for students’ academic performance yet still more disliked their jobs mainly because they had too much work which blocked them from engaging in other personal activities. Therefore even though the school recognized their jobs by awarding them every time their students performed well, the gesture did not guarantee their satisfaction in their teaching job. Consequently the analysis of table 5 answers the first research question in the sense that awarding teachers for students’ academic performance does not have a
positive influence on job satisfaction because the journey towards these awards was characterized by too much work which robbed them off their precious time to engage in other self improving activities such as pursuing further education.

Other than presentation of gifts, it was established that schools have various programs to improve the performance of teachers. It is therefore worthy to consider the extent to which some of these programs influence job satisfaction for purposes of putting down recommendations. Table 6 below presents data that was generated from the cross tabulation of school programs to improve performance by level of satisfaction.

**Table 6: School programmes to improve performance by teachers’ level of satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of satisfaction</th>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Slightly satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff outings &amp; get together</strong></td>
<td>6 (7.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.4%)</td>
<td>6 (7.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.4%)</td>
<td>16 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incentives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in games</td>
<td>0 (.0%)</td>
<td>15 (18.3%)</td>
<td>24 (29.3%)</td>
<td>21 (25.6%)</td>
<td>60 (73.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refresher courses</td>
<td>0 (.0%)</td>
<td>4 (4.9%)</td>
<td>0 (.0%)</td>
<td>2 (2.4%)</td>
<td>6 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6 (7.3%)</td>
<td>21 (25.6%)</td>
<td>30 (36.6%)</td>
<td>25 (30.5%)</td>
<td>82 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information provided in table 4.2.5 provide a clear indication that at the moment, most schools in Siaya District widely engage teachers in games as a
way of motivating them. From the table, 73.2% of the 82 teachers who took part in this study have had their schools organize for them games as a way of creating incentives among them. Though involvement in games is widely practiced, it has not improved the level of job satisfaction among teachers. This is supported by 24 out of 82 respondents who have been involved in games yet they are only slightly fulfilled in their jobs. Furthermore, 21 out of 82 respondents had been involved in games though they are not satisfied with their jobs. Surprisingly enough, no teacher who had participated in-school staff games was extremely satisfied with his/her job.

The fact that many schools have no programs to improve performance is depicted by the fact that not many teachers draw their job satisfaction from staff outing/get together and refresher courses. From table 6, only 6 respondents had participated in staff outings and get together and were extremely satisfied with their jobs. Majority of the teachers who fall in this category of response were the principals, their deputies and some Heads of Departments who were keen on defending their role of taking care of the welfare of teachers within the school. Therefore some of their views were not actually a reflection of what happens in schools that they lead but rather a public relations affair to make the researchers happy that their schools were doing better in observing teachers’ welfare. However, it should be observed that in deed some schools had these programmes to improve teachers’ performance other than awards for academic performance and in such cases,
teachers expressed that their satisfaction with their jobs were drawn from these non academic activities for teachers.

The failure to invest in refresher courses and ‘on the job training’ for teachers is depicted by the data presented in table 6 because as per the table, only 4 respondents had taken part in refresher courses organized by the school and were satisfied with their jobs. No respondent was extremely satisfied having participated in refresher courses. If 4 respondents expressed satisfaction with their jobs after taking part in refresher courses then this can mean that more teachers could be satisfied with their jobs if schools can invest more in refresher courses. This is because a course has an academic benefit to a teacher who attends it compared to games or an outing and therefore teachers are bound to appreciate courses much more than other incentives. Unfortunately this study has revealed that not many schools have this in their programs.

4.3 The effect of work load on the teachers’ job satisfaction

The second research question sought to investigate the extent to which work load that is carried by teachers has got an influence on their levels of satisfaction with the jobs they do. To establish the teachers’ work load and to be able to declare the work load as more, less or adequate, the researcher sought to gather information regarding the number of lessons a teacher teaches per week, the number of classes taught per week, the number of students in each of the classes taught by a teacher and other responsibilities held by a
teacher within the school other than teaching. Tables 7 below presents information regarding the number of lessons per week, number of students per class taught and other responsibilities held.

Table 7: Number of Lessons taught per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mode = 2

Table 7 above shows that majority of the teachers teach either 11-20 lessons per week or 21-30 lessons per week. However those who teach 11-20 lessons emerged to be slightly more by 1 teacher. Nevertheless, there are a total of 13 teachers out of the 82 who took part in this study who teach 31-40 lessons or more than 40 lessons per week. Going by the mode of the number of lessons taught (2), the most recurring scenario is that most teachers teach 21-30 lessons per week (21-30 is number 2 in the list of number of lessons taught). This implies that the number of lessons that most teachers teach per day is in a range of 4-6. A day which starts at 8.00am and ends at 5.00pm has as a total of 9 lessons. This means that a teacher who teaches 6 lessons per day has only three hours in a day to prepare for 6 lessons during the working hours and to
teach the 6 lessons. It is for this reason that some teachers either go to class unprepared to teach or fail to attend classes all together because of excess work load. Alternatively, they choose to teach only the upper classes especially the form four students who are preparing for exams and skip some of the classes in forms one and two. The information regarding the number of lessons taught per week is an indication of the excess work load that teachers have to bear in public secondary schools in Siaya district given the shortage of teachers in some schools. The question then is, “what impact does the number of lessons taught per week as an aspect of work load have on teachers’ job satisfaction?” The cross tabulation presented in table 8 below seeks to answer this question.

Table 8: Cross tabulation of number of lessons taught per week by teachers’ level of satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Slightly satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work load (Lessons taught per week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to table 8, 18 out of 82 teachers who teach 21-30 lessons per week and were not satisfied with their jobs. Contrary to expectations, only 12 of those who taught the least number of course (11-20 according to this study) were satisfied with their jobs. This is an indication that some teachers feel that they are teaching a lot of courses than they should and for that matter they don’t gain as much satisfaction from their jobs. Consequently more word load by majority of the teachers explains the low levels of teacher satisfaction with their jobs. The level of satisfaction depicted by table 8 can be explained by the fact that majority of the teachers in public secondary school in Siaya district are teaching one subject in almost all the classes in a school. This means that in schools which are double or triple streamed, they have double or triple number of classes to teach. Since high school teachers mainly major in two subjects in their university training, it is possible to find a teacher who teaches geography in all the classes in double streamed school and Kiswahili in 2 more classes in the same school. On a day that all the classes are to be taught these subjects, such a teacher will end up teaching 10 lessons in a day. This means that the teacher will not have any extra time to prepare for lessons before going to class. Consequently, such teachers either ignore to prepare or make use of their private time to do school work. The study established that a number of teachers in Siaya district are in a similar situation and this explains why they are not satisfied with their jobs because of too much work to do.

One interesting scenario however to explain which emerges from table 8 is the opinion expressed by 2 teachers who despite teaching 31-40 lessons per week
were extremely satisfied with their job. These two are either those who have a natural interest in teaching and therefore do not have a reason to express any dissatisfactions with it or those who have just been recruited and so are afraid of expressing a negative opinion about their new job for fear of victimization. It should be noted that there are teachers who believe that teaching is a call and so irrespective of the problems that might be their, they are ready to accomplish their duties as teachers. However this study appears to indicate that such teachers are very few and hence the reason why such people are only 2 according to this study. 

Other than the number of lessons taught, the other work load related factor that could influence job satisfaction is the number of students that a teacher has to attend to in each of the classes taught. Table 9 below presents information regarding the number of students in each class that a teacher teaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From table 9 above, a total of 42 teachers of the 82 who took part in this study handle classes with more than 40 students. According to the ministry of education the maximum number of students that a teacher ought to attend to in a class is 25. As per the figures presented in table 93, only 10 teachers handled classes with 20 students and below. On the other hand, more than half of the total number of teachers interviewed handled classes with double the recommended number of 25. This means that 1 in every 2 teachers in Siaya district handle classes with more than double the required number of 25.

Other than the low recruitment of teachers by the government, the free primary education that was launched in 2008 in Kenya has also contributed to increased number of students in classes in high schools. This is because as more pupils graduate from primary schools, the pressure has been there on the existing secondary schools to absorb them hence the reason why most of the schools have classes that have more than 40 students. The excess number of students in public schools implies that most teachers are unable to pay close attention to each of the students. In spite of them trying to do so, they are rendered unable and indeed overburdened and overwhelmed by their responsibilities. This is one of the explanations to teacher’s job satisfaction because as the number of students a teacher is entitled to attend to increases, the levels of satisfaction with the job also goes down.

It is worth noting that other than teaching, teachers are also entitled to perform other responsibilities in school which also require them to dedicate their time. Other than teaching, teachers also respond to the needs of students as for
instance games teachers, class teachers, administration, house teachers, heads of department and social welfare teachers e.g. guidance and counselors. If teaching alone is burdensome to some teachers, the situation might be worrying if such teachers still have to perform other responsibilities alongside teaching. Table 10 below presents data relating to the other responsibilities carried out by teachers.

Table 10: Other responsibilities held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other responsibilities</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Games teacher</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (Principal/Deputy Principal)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of department</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 10, 38 teachers had to perform the duties of a class teacher alongside their teaching duties while 13 were games teachers. 12 teachers were administrators (i.e. Principal or deputy principal) and HODs respectively while only 7 were house teachers. The most crucial thing is to establish the kind of influence that holding these non teaching responsibilities would have on a teachers’ job satisfaction. Table 11 below presents the cross tabulation of other responsibilities held by willingness to change job. The rationale of having these two variables cross tabulated is to establish the extent to which
these other responsibilities would influence a teacher’s willingness to change job.

Table 11: Cross tabulation of other responsibilities held in the school by willingness to change job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to change job</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Games teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (principal/deputy principal)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of department</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>67.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quantitative values of table 11 indicate that other responsibilities held by a teacher influenced his/her willingness to change job. This is because the willingness to change job is greater among the administrators, Heads of Departments, games teachers and class teachers. The situation is however slightly different with house teachers who do not indicate their willingness to change job on account of their extra duties.
The group that demonstrated the greatest willingness to change their jobs were the class teachers. Out of the 38 class teachers who took part in this study, 28 were willing to change their jobs while only 10 were not willing to change their jobs. From this study therefore, it possible to generalize with a minimal degree of error that about 74% of teachers of public schools in Siaya district who have the responsibilities of a class teacher are willing to change their jobs because of the responsibilities of class teacher. This is the case because class teachers perform so many functions geared towards both academic and social welfare of the students yet they are not paid for it. Consequently such teachers perceive involvement in such extra activities as exploitation hence their willingness to quit their jobs on account of this.

The scenario is the same with games teachers. From the table, 11 out of the 13 games teachers who participated in this study were willing to change their jobs on account of this responsibility while only 3 were not willing to change their jobs despite having this responsibility. However, the situation is different with house teachers who appear to do lesser work compared to their colleagues. 6 out of the 7 house teachers who took part in this study were not willing to change their jobs while only one was willing to change. Comparing the two responses from the games teachers and the house teachers, it implies that games teachers seem to be more dissatisfied because of their responsibilities as games teachers more than house teachers. This is the case because games teachers are involved in more activities than house teachers. For instance games teachers have to organize students to participate in all the games in the
school as well as accompany them out when they go to participate in various games competitions. This could explain why the games teachers are more dissatisfied than house teachers.

On the other hand, administrators and HODs appear to be equally not satisfied with their duties. This is because 9 out of the 12 administrators and HODs respectively who took part in this study were willing to change their jobs while only 3 respectively were not willing to change.

Given that the willingness to change job was more with all the teachers who were engaged in other non teaching responsibilities, it can be concluded that job satisfaction among teachers in Siaya district is highly determined by high work load occasioned by involvement in extra non teaching responsibilities.

4.4 The influence of the availability of teaching and learning resources on job satisfaction

The third research question sought to establish the extent to which teaching and learning resources influenced teachers’ job satisfaction. To ascertain the availability of the teaching and learning resources, questions regarding availability of staffroom, library, laboratory facilities and stationeries were asked. Most of the schools demonstrated that stationeries were the most provided. However, staffroom facilities were also ranked as highly available by most teachers. Most teachers however expressed the opinion that library and laboratory facilities were not adequately available in their schools. For purposes of establishing how these resources influenced job satisfaction, the
two highly available resources (Staffroom facilities and stationeries) plus one unavailable facility (Library facility) were picked and the figures corresponding to them cross tabulated with the variables measuring job satisfaction. This was done in order to test how a variety of teaching and learning resources influence job satisfaction. The cross tabulation of availability of staffroom facilities by other career aspirations is presented in table 12 below. In this cross tabulation, the assumption made is that teacher’s choice of other career options other than education can be used to establish whether a teacher is satisfied with their jobs or not. This is the reason why other career aspirations has been used here as a measure of job satisfaction.

Table 12: Cross tabulation of availability of staffroom facilities by other career aspirations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and learning resources (Availability of Staffroom facility)</th>
<th>To change employer</th>
<th>To study further in education</th>
<th>To study further in other disciplines</th>
<th>To start a personal business</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly available</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately available</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly available</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly unavailable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly unavailable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table 12, only 2 respondents who said their staffroom facilities were highly available wished to change employer. 4 of the 11 teachers who said their staffroom facilities were highly available said they opted to study further in education. This implies that about 36% (4/11X100%) of the teachers in Siaya District whose schools had good staffroom facilities preferred to further their studies in education. This leaves us with 7 out of 11 teachers whose schools have good staffroom facilities being ready to opt for non education career options. This implies that though availability of staffroom facilities would discourage about 36% of the teachers from running away from education, it would not have a discouraging impact on about 74% of the teachers. The reason why this plus other factors seem not to contribute adequately to job satisfaction is that majority of the teachers in Kenya (not just Siaya district alone) have persistently been complaining of low pay. Therefore it appears the real cause of lower job satisfaction among Kenyan teachers is low pay. Consequently, it is low pay that requires redress if job satisfaction is to be guaranteed. Availing other facilities would only make them comfortable in school but not comfortable back in the house. This calls for the need to complement internal factors with external factors if job satisfaction among teachers is to be guaranteed.

Table 12 has demonstrated that though majority of the teachers had highly equipped staffrooms, levels of job satisfaction were still low; an indication that availability of staffroom equipment would not be effective enough in ensuring teachers’ job satisfaction. Apart from staffroom facilities, a cross tabulation of
availability of library facilities by teachers’ level of job satisfaction was done to test the extent to which library facilities though unavailable in most schools influences teachers’ job satisfaction. The statistical values generated from the cross tabulation are presented in table 13 below.

Table 13: Cross tabulation of availability of library facilities by teacher’s level of satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Slightly satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly available</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly unavailable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly unavailable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical values of table 13 appears to confirm that a number of teachers value a well stocked library more than even the staffroom facilities. This is because 10 out of 21 teachers who said that their library facilities were moderately available also said that they were satisfied with their jobs. This optimistic opinion is however thwarted by the fact that not many schools have adequate library facilities. The study indicated that most of the schools had their libraries not very well stocked. Only 21 out of the 82 teachers said that their library facilities were moderately available. 20 teachers said that their
library facilities were highly unavailable while 11 teachers said that their library facilities were highly available. In deed the study revealed that most schools had poorly stocked libraries or either did not have a library all together. A few schools mainly high ranking provincial schools in the county had well stocked libraries. This scenario of shortage of books in the libraries prompted a number of respondents to express views that signified less satisfaction with their jobs.

However in cases where the libraries were well stocked and both teachers and students could access books, teachers appeared to be more satisfied. This is prompted by the fact that teachers feel most comfortable when the school provides them with books enough for them and their students because this ensures easier accomplishment of assignments. Furthermore, teachers expressed the opinion that availability of books made their work easier because they could easily refer students to read certain sections of key books that they felt could beef up the contents that they had taught in class. Therefore with a good library, a teacher did not have to spend much time with the students but could guide the students to read certain things by themselves. This was noted to boost teacher’s level of satisfaction with their jobs as indicated by the 10 out of 21 teachers discussed. Therefore availability of library material in schools was found to be a better motivating factor to teachers compared to the availability of other facilities.
One other factor that appeared to have an equal influence on job satisfaction was the availability of stationeries such as books, pens, full scups, printing papers and others. Table 14 below shows the extent to which availability of stationeries influenced teachers’ job satisfaction. In table 14, the it was considered that what one liked about their jobs was an adequate measure of job satisfaction because it helped in establishing what a teacher liked about teaching. Depending on what a teacher liked, a conclusion could be made on whether a teacher was satisfied with the job or not.

### Table 14: Cross tabulation of availability of stationeries by what teachers liked most about their jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction measured through what one likes most about their job</th>
<th>Available teaching resources</th>
<th>Efforts are recognized</th>
<th>Minimal supervision</th>
<th>Less work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly available</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning resources (Availability of stationeries)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately available</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly available</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly unavailable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly unavailable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 14 above, availability of stationeries determined what one liked most about their job. The teachers whose schools highly provided them with stationeries also liked the fact that their efforts were recognized. The
table indicates that 22 out of the 37 teachers whose schools highly provided them with stationeries liked their jobs because of the recognition of their efforts. Furthermore 11 out 37 teachers whose schools highly availed stationeries for them liked their jobs because they worked with minimal supervision. The study indeed revealed that the best way in which majority of the schools sought to improve the satisfaction of teachers was through rewarding them with gifts especially when their students performed well academically. For this reason, majority of the teachers derived their joy in the fact that at least they would be awarded for good work done at the end of the year. However a considerable number also liked their jobs because they worked with minimal supervision.

It should however be pointed out that this study had earlier on proved that availability of teaching and learning resources and lesser work load had a better influence on job satisfaction. Incentives derived from gifts especially due to academic performance had in fact fared very poorly in as far as influencing job satisfaction was concerned. This explains why fewer teachers liked their jobs because of teaching resources or less work because these two were not present in most schools. Consequently, the fact that many schools had adequate amount of stationeries for their teaching staff could not generate a positive influence on what teachers liked most about their jobs since the high ranking reasons why teachers liked their jobs (Gifts and minimal supervision) were not sufficient sources of job satisfaction among most teachers. On the
contrary, things which contributed to better job satisfaction among teachers were not adequately available in schools.

This view is further supported by the fact that only 2 of the 37 respondents whose schools highly availed to them stationeries liked their jobs because of availability of resources and less work respectively. To support the previous point, this scenario was bound to be the case because apart from few schools having enough teaching and learning resources, majority of the teachers were overworked. This is therefore part of the reason why availability of stationeries could not adequately influence job satisfaction as a result of less work and availability of teaching and learning resources. On the contrary, availability of stationeries better influenced teachers liking of their jobs because of gifts. If we draw the conclusions from the analysis of table 1 above, it will be possible to say that availability of stationeries in schools do not positively influence job satisfaction since it was found out that gifts do not positively contribute towards job satisfaction among public school teachers.

4.5 The effect of supervision of teachers on job satisfaction

The fourth research question was an investigation into how supervision of teachers impacts upon teachers’ job satisfaction. This study revealed a variety of ways in which teachers in public secondary schools are supervised. Table 15 below indicates the views of respondents regarding whom was considered as the most responsible for teacher supervision in their schools.
Table 15: Most responsible for teacher supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODs and principal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 15, different schools adopt different styles of teacher supervision. However, most of the teachers said that the person that was most responsible for their supervision was the school principal. These are schools that mainly adopted a one dimensional form of supervision where the principal observed, recorded, reported and acted upon all the issues relating to the conduct and welfare of teachers single handedly. On the other hand, 20 out of 82 teachers said that their schools adopted a more involving form of teacher supervision where the HODs acted as go betweens between the teachers and the principal. Most of the teachers appeared to prefer this style of supervision because; the HODs being closer to them were more reliable and reachable than the administrative figure heads like the principal or deputy principal.
Some schools however adopted a system whereby supervision is done by the class teachers. Some teachers said that in their schools, the principal had delegated the work of teacher supervision to the class teachers who would keep records regarding the performance of teachers teaching their classes and report to the principal and teachers concerned in case there is need. However, most teachers appeared to dislike this method especially the class teachers themselves since often at times it created conflicts between them and teachers who fail to perform well especially when action is to be taken against them on account of supervision. Finally, 3 teachers stated a scenario where the principal and other teachers with the duty of supervision rely upon students especially school prefects to secretly present to them information regarding teachers. This however was not a very common form of teacher supervision though it was practiced in a few instances.

It is assumed in this study that teachers’ satisfaction with their jobs would highly be determined by whoever acted as a key supervisor in the school. Table 16 below indicates the extent to which teacher supervision influences job satisfaction by presenting quantitative values that were generated from the cross tabulation of most responsible for teacher supervision by other career aspirations.
Table 16: Cross tabulation of most responsible for teacher supervision by other career aspirations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other carrier aspirations</th>
<th>To change employer</th>
<th>To study further in education</th>
<th>To study further in other disciplines</th>
<th>To start a personal business</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HODs and principal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most responsible for teacher supervision</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 demonstrates that most teachers are dissatisfied with their jobs at least in the education sector because of unpleasant modes of teacher supervision. This is because majority of the teachers would want to change their jobs away from education because of having one supervisor or the other and only 10 were willing to further their studies at least in the education sector irrespective of whoever supervised them. For instance despite supervision by HODs to the principal being regarded as one of the best modes of supervision, none of the respondents who were supervised by HODs to the principal would opt to further their studies in the education sector.

This opinion is sustained regardless of HODs being regarded as the best supervisors because of the entire negative perception that nearly all teachers have created towards supervision and supervisors. The fear of authority has made most of the teachers to be always against any form of supervision by
anybody. In the interviews, one of the respondents who sought anonymity said that he had seen so many of his colleagues being victimized by the administration because of teacher supervision and this experience has always informed his pessimism towards any kind of teacher supervision since he believes that no supervision is ever done with good intentions (Interviewed, 20th April 2013). The sentiments of this teacher which is in concurrence with a number of other more or less similar responses shows that supervision has always been perceived as a means of finding fault with teachers so that drastic actions can be taken against them. Supervision is rarely perceived as a way of monitoring the performance of teachers for purposes of improving their behavior and teaching methods.

The negative perception of supervision is demonstrated by nearly all the percentages in table 14 because nearly all the respondents had career options which they were willing to opt for irrespective of whether their form of supervision was inclusive or exclusive. Just to mention a few for further explanation, 6 of the 20 teachers whose key supervisor was the principal wished to change their employer while 4 and 5 teachers whose key supervisor was the principal wished to study further in education and to study further in other disciplines respectively.

Contrary to an earlier opinion that HODs are most preferred supervisors, the cross tabulation presented in table 17 depicts otherwise. According to table 17 fewer teachers whose key supervisors were class teachers wished to change their employment. Only 3 teachers whose key supervisors were class teachers
wished to change employer while none of the teachers whose key supervisors were class teachers wished to opt for any of the other career choices.

It should be noted that a total of 14 teachers said that their main supervisor was the class teacher yet here only 3 could change their employer on account of class teacher being their supervisor. This phenomenon is possible to explain by the fact that class teachers seem not to do much in as far as teacher supervision is concerned due to the fear of being ostracized by fellow teachers especially due to the fact that in most schools, class teachers and other teachers share the same staffroom. Therefore if a class teacher negatively recommends a colleague, there might be a possibility that other teachers will gang up against him or her. Consequently, in cases where main supervisors are the class teachers, rules of supervision are seemingly made loose to ensure that some teachers get away with whatever negative conduct that they display. This being the case it means that class teachers would not be the best supervisors because what they will do might not meet the required threshold of teacher supervision. Consequently those who are bound to benefit from supervision might as well loose out.

If this is the case with regard to teacher supervision in most schools, one question that can be posed is, “Which is the most preferred mode of teacher supervision among public school teachers in Siaya district and how does this preference influence job satisfaction in any way?” table 4.5.3 below presents the most preferred modes of teacher supervision.
Table 17: Most preferred mode of teacher supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal in collaboration with all teachers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal to the rest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action based on Student evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal in collaboration with HODs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 indicates that 40 teachers prefer a mode of supervision whereby the principal collaborates with HODs while 29 prefers a mode of supervision whereby the principal collaborates with all the teachers without having to pass through the HODs.

In line with an earlier discussion, 40 respondents expressed this opinion because HODs are fellow teachers and therefore teachers see a lesser form of authority in them. However, since not all of them are trustworthy according to the teachers, some would rather prefer working directly with the principal hence the reason for endorsing the second form of supervision. However, a smaller number of 11 teachers prefer the mode of supervision where orders emanate from the principal to the rest of the teaching staff. In this case there is no consultation with anybody unlike in the previous modes. It is possible that
those who expressed this opinion were a section of the principles and their deputies since in this study, 12 principles and their deputies took part. Therefore it is assumed that they would have a problem with a mode of supervision where they were directly in charge since it would help them to stamp their authority.

Having explained this, the other issue of concern is the extent to which these preferred modes of supervision influence teachers’ job satisfaction. Table 18 below seeks to elaborate on this concern by presenting the quantitative values of the cross tabulation between most preferred mode of teacher supervision by teachers’ level of satisfaction.

**Table 18: Cross tabulation of most preferred mode of teacher supervision by teachers’ level of satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most preferred mode of teacher supervision</th>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Slightly satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal in collaboration with all teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal to the rest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action based on Student evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal in collaboration with HODs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 6 21 30 25 82

7.3% 25.6% 36.6% 30.5% 100.0%
Table 18 indicates that irrespective of whomever a teacher preferred as his/her supervisor, the level of job satisfaction is still low. This opinion is demonstrated by a total of 28 out of 40 respondents who preferred a mode of supervision whereby the principal collaborates with the HODs yet they were either slightly satisfied or nor satisfied at all with their jobs. Despite this mode of supervision being the most preferred as per the statistics of table 15, it fails to boost levels of job satisfaction since it is not the mode that is commonly used for supervising teachers. However if schools were to adopt the mode of supervision whereby the principal worked in collaboration with the HODs then teachers would be more satisfied with supervision and consequently their jobs.

However with regard to those who preferred a mode of supervision whereby the principle collaborated with all teachers, opinion appears to be divided in the middle with 11 out of 29 of them saying that they were satisfied with their jobs while 13 out of 29 of them saying that they were not satisfied with their jobs. It should be noted that there were found schools where this system of supervision is practiced and teachers in such schools appeared to have no much problem with it. However, the 13 who were not satisfied were expressing wishful thinking that they would be more satisfied with their jobs if the principals worked hand in hand with all the teachers in ensuring a successful mode of supervision. Therefore it appears that they were blaming their dissatisfaction on the fact that their schools did not encourage teacher involvement in the process of supervision.
The ineffectiveness of principal-led kind of supervision is demonstrated by the fact that though 11 teachers preferred this mode of supervision, none of the 11 said he/she was satisfied with their job. It should be noted that this is a method that is practiced by a number of schools and the fact that no respondent expressed satisfaction due to this kind of supervision; it means that the method is ineffective in as far as ensuring job satisfaction is concerned. The ineffectiveness of this method of supervision is attributed to the fact that most teachers have felt victimized due to such one sided kind of supervision. In a case where the principal is not in good terms with one teacher due to one reason or another, the teacher might suffer the consequences even in instances when the allegations leveled against him or her are false.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

Chapter five consists of five sections. The first section summarizes the study in order to put the findings in view of what the study initially set out to investigate. In section two, the key findings of this study have been discussed while section three presents the conclusions which have been deduced from the findings of the study. The fourth section presents the recommendations that were possible to draw from the stated findings. Finally, the study is concluded by a suggestion for further research which has been drawn from what this study failed to establish but which emerged as the continuing missing link between institutions and their quest to improve teachers’ job satisfaction.

5.2 Summary of the study

Teachers’ performance has been influenced by a variety of factors. As earlier on proposed in this study, teachers seem dissatisfied with factors pertaining to their job such as, remunerations, promotion requirements and policies, teaching loads, supervision and physical working conditions (Kamina, 2002). This has always prompted some teachers to leave the teaching profession as they seek employment in areas that can be more fulfilling in terms of the general working environment.
The reality of job dissatisfaction in the teaching profession prompted the researcher to investigate the factors that lead to this for purposes of informing schools on what they ought to consider at an internal level to motivate teachers to keep holding on to the teaching profession. As a result, the study set out to investigate the impact that factors such as incentives, work load, teaching/learning resources and supervision have on job satisfaction among teachers in public secondary schools in Siaya district.

Using quantitative techniques of data analysis, the study managed to demonstrate that factors such as incentives, work load, teaching/learning resources and supervision had an impact on job satisfaction. However, the availability of incentives and resources as research questions one and three investigated did not yield the desired impacts on job satisfaction as it would have been expected. This is because even those teachers who had received various incentives and whose schools were quite well of in terms of teaching and learning resources expressed willingness to change their professions. This prompted us to conclude that the availability of these two factors do not necessarily improve teachers’ job satisfaction.

On the other hand, the study demonstrated that some teachers who had excess work load were more dissatisfied than those who had lesser work load. Consequently the study established an inversely proportional relationship between work load and job satisfaction. The more the work load the lesser satisfied a teacher was and the lesser the work load, the more satisfied a teacher was. The situation was more or less the same with respect to teacher
supervision. Though the study established that teachers seem not to portray a positive attitude towards supervision, majority of the teachers liked a more inclusive mode of supervision whereby the principal collaborates with the rest of the teachers in carrying out his/her supervisory roles.

5.3 Discussion of the findings

This study first managed to successfully establish that majority of the teachers in public secondary schools in Siaya District were not satisfied with their jobs. The reasons for this lower job satisfaction ranged from both internal factors that the teachers could be in control of and the external factors which teachers and the administration are not in control of. The key internal factors that determined teachers’ level of satisfaction were incentives, availability of teaching and learning resources, work load and modes of supervision that various schools adopted. On the other hand, teachers appeared to be less satisfied with their jobs because of poor remuneration. This finding is line with the assumptions of Okumbe, (1998) who states that job satisfaction is enhanced when workers perceive equitable pay compared to their input. This explains why the levels of job satisfaction appeared low despite the efforts that schools put internally to improve teacher’s job satisfaction. However, the little satisfaction that teachers enjoyed was largely drawn from the rewards they got from their respective schools when one’s students performed well.

It should be noted that despite the availability of resources and various incentives, teachers still depicted high levels of job satisfaction. For instance,
incentives, influenced job satisfaction though to a very minimal extent. This is because in most of the cases, teachers who had been awarded by their schools specifically for students’ performance still expressed willingness to change their career options; an indication that they were not satisfied with their current employments. Furthermore, majority of those who had received gifts for students’ academic performance still disliked their jobs because of various reasons.

The general opinion that appeared to emerge from the respondents who took part in this study with reference to whether incentives influenced job satisfaction was that incentives influenced job satisfaction to a very minimal extent. This was occasioned by the fact that gifts given to teachers are short lived and also one has to work extra hard in order to be sure to receive a gift at the end of the year. Therefore the journey towards securing such gifts is characterized by a lot of work and uncertainty such that when it comes, teachers still do not feel satisfied that all is well. Furthermore, the kind of incentives that a school gives to teachers determines their level of satisfaction. Most schools only rewarded their teachers for academic performance while pushing aside such incentives as transport for teachers and meals. According to Wasonga (2004), incentives like provision of transport for teachers and meals may well be great contributors to job satisfaction since they can help in improving the performance of teachers. Therefore over-emphasis on academic performance in rewarding teachers sidelines other factors which can as well boost the morale of the teachers in fulfilling their mandate.
Concerning the question that sought to establish the extent to which work load influenced job satisfaction, this study found out that excess work load lowered the motivation of some teachers to do their best even though there were a few teachers who despite teaching excess courses were still satisfied. The average opinion was that the higher the work load, the less satisfied teachers were and the lesser the work load, the more satisfied teachers were. This was demonstrated for instance by the fact that very few of the respondents who taught more than 30 lessons per week were satisfied with their jobs. However, a considerable number of those who taught fewer lessons were either satisfied or extremely satisfied. According to a study conducted by the DEO’s office Siaya District in 2012, the teachers faced difficulties of meeting their work demands when the minimum number of lessons that some of them teach per week range from 50 – 60 with classes as big as 70 students per class. Other than the number of lessons, the study established further that more of the teachers who held other responsibilities in the school were willing to change their jobs. These two scenarios present an indication that the more the responsibilities a teacher held, the less satisfied a teacher was. As Okumbe (1998) argues, heavy workloads coupled with the requirement to meet strict deadlines risks to erode the morale of even the most dedicated teachers.

Teaching and learning resources however demonstrated a different trend with teachers indicating that availability of library facilities influenced their satisfaction more than either staffroom facilities or provision of stationeries. For instance, the analysis showed that even though most of the teachers said
that their schools did not have adequate library facilities, a significant number of respondents were satisfied with the jobs because of the availability of the library facilities. This shows that if schools can improve on the endeavors to stoke their libraries, the work of teachers can be made easier and therefore job satisfaction would also improve.

Finally, the mode of teacher supervision that a school adopted influenced to a certain extent the level of satisfaction. Majority of teachers appeared to like a more inclusive mode of teacher supervision since it is friendlier to the teachers. This finding agrees with the assumptions of Luckens, Lyter and Fox (2004), who argue that a supervisor who is friendly and communicates openly is more likely to receive positive feedback and high satisfaction from subordinates unlike a supervisor who is unfriendly and whose orders are one dimensional. The assumptions of Luckens, Lyter and Fox (2004) are indeed confirmed by this study since teachers whose principals adopted an exclusive mode of teacher supervision depicted very low levels of satisfaction with their jobs. The most common mode of teacher supervision that most schools adopted was an exclusive one and this is why supervision seemed not to influence teachers’ satisfaction positively.

In summary therefore it can be said that institutional factors influence satisfaction of teachers though negatively. This means that these factors would not boost teachers’ satisfaction in themselves. It appears that most teachers feel that gifts and all other forms of resources and services that teachers require would only significantly improve teachers’ supervision if the
remuneration of teachers is looked into. This is because one of the reasons why teachers disliked their jobs was poor remuneration.

5.4 Conclusions

The responses to the four research question that were outlined for investigation in this study have been adequately answered. With regard to the first research question, it was found out that incentives did not a positive influence on job satisfaction.

The manner of rewarding teachers vis a vis the existing disconnect with the long term benefits for teachers have made incentives not to yield the desired impacts in terms of boosting teachers’ satisfaction with their jobs. This is because the price they have to pay in order to get these rewards compromises the other longer lasting self rewarding activities such as education. In conclusion therefore the answer to the first research question as per the analysis is that incentives would only influence job satisfaction positively if it was complemented by long term benefits to teachers such as better remuneration.

Concerning work load as the second research question sought to investigate, it is arguable that work load influences job satisfaction. This is because the analysis of data relating to the second research question has demonstrated that the higher the work load, the lesser the level of satisfaction among teachers. The analysis demonstrated that those teachers who were teaching high number
of lessons and higher number of students, were lesser satisfied with their jobs than those who taught lesser number of students and lessons.

This study went further to demonstrate that though most schools do not have adequate supply of teaching and learning resources, these resources are key determinants of job satisfaction among teachers and the lack of them makes some teachers to be unhappy with teaching. Teaching and learning resources seem not influence teacher’s job satisfaction adequately because not many schools have sufficient supply of these resources. However, if schools would improve the availability of library and laboratory facilities then more teachers would be more satisfied as a result of their teaching work made easier.

Finally supervision influences job satisfaction even though it has always portrayed a negative influence because of the negative perceptions that most teachers have had regarding supervision. Therefore in order to guarantee a positive impact on job satisfaction, schools ought to adopt modes of supervision which involves all teachers either directly or through their respective heads of departments.

Alongside the conclusions made regarding incentives, work load, teaching/learning resources and teacher supervision, it ought to be noted however that both external and internal factors were responsible for teachers’ job satisfaction. This is because external factors like remuneration contributed a great deal to the levels of job satisfaction that were recorded. This indicates that however much a school would improve in making available the
institutional factors, a significant number of public secondary school teachers would still not be satisfied if the issue of better remuneration for teachers is not looked into. Therefore stakeholders in education ought to strike a balance between external and internal factors if they intend to guarantee better job satisfaction, since incentives, work load, teaching and learning resources, supervision by principals all have positive influence when got in the right proportion.

5.5 Recommendations

Given the foregoing analysis, some of the recommendations which can be suggested are as follows:

Though this study appeared to indicate that teachers have lost hope in asking for more pay, incentives appear not to guarantee job satisfaction compared to good remuneration. Consequently teachers ought not to lose hope if job satisfaction is to be guaranteed. Teachers should keep on engaging their employer through their union in order to keep the fight for negotiating for better pay. Furthermore, this negotiation should help in ensuring that more teachers are employed because one of the factors that caused low levels of teacher satisfaction was excess work load. Otherwise giving up on salaries and availability of the required number of teachers will not be healthy for teachers since these two are key determinants of meaningful satisfaction for teachers.

The analysis appeared to indicate that most teachers recognize their teaching role and therefore they feel more satisfied when materials that make their
teaching work easier are highly made available. Consequently, schools ought to lay more emphasis on ensuring that facilities such books and laboratory materials are made available for both teachers and the students.

The analysis indicated that most teachers dislike teacher supervision and therefore they were not drawing any satisfaction from it because of the perception that supervision has been used as a tool to victimize teachers. Consequently, schools should adopt a more inclusive form of teacher supervision whereby the teachers themselves participate in the process of supervision. Involvement will help to demystify the myth that supervision has been used to victimize teachers. Furthermore through the practice of including teachers either directly or through their representatives will help to improve the teachers’ trust of the outcomes of supervision and fewer teachers will be bound to complain when actions are taken against them.

5.6 Suggestion for further research

It should be noted that this study concentrated on establishing the institutional factors that influence job satisfaction. However having established the inadequacies of internal institutional factors in guaranteeing job satisfaction, there is need for further research on the external factors that influence job satisfaction and whether these external factors would be adequately complement the institutional factors established by this study in improving teachers’ job satisfaction.
REFERENCES


Digolo, O.O. (2006). *Challenges of Education in 21st century; In the journal of the school education; The Educator (Vol. 1. No. 1) Eldoret, Moi University Press*


Griffin, M.A (2001) *Job satisfaction and team work, the role of supervisor support*, Organizational Behaviour, 22: 537-50


University of Nairobi  
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External Studies  
P.O. Box 92,  
Kikuyu  
Date ______________

Dear Sir/Madam,

**RE: RESEARCH ON INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS INFLUENCING TEACHERS’ JOB SATISFACTION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN SIAYA DISTRICT, KENYA**

I am a student at University of Nairobi currently pursuing M.Ed. Degree in Educational Administration.  
I would like to carry out a research on the above topic. A questionnaire is attached herein for the purposes of data collection. You are advised not to include your name.  
Kindly respond to all questions.

Yours faithfully,

Caren Odida
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE TEACHERS

This questionnaire is designed to gather information on levels of job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers in Siaya District. You may not include your name to ensure confidentiality. Mark by placing a tick inside the appropriate bracket ( ).

Part A: Background Information

1) What is your gender?
   a) Male ( )
   b) Female ( )

2) In which age category do you belong?
   20-29 years ( ) 40-49 years ( ) 30-39 years ( )
   50-59 years ( )

3) How long have you served as a secondary school teacher?
   a) Less than 5 years ( )
   b) 1 – 10 years ( )
   c) 11 – 20 years ( )
   d) Above 20 years ( )

4) What is your level of academic qualification?
   a) Master of Education ( )
   b) Bachelor of Education ( )
   c) P.G.D.E. ( )
   d) Diploma ( )
   e) Any other, please specify……………………………………………………..
5) What is the type of your school?
Boarding boys ( ) Boarding girls ( ) Mixed day ( )

6) What is your current job group? Please circle around the appropriate one.
H J K L M N O P Q R

Please indicate your answer in the spaces provided by putting a tick (P)

7. a) Given an opportunity, would you be willing to change your job?
   a) Yes ( ) b) No ( )

   b) If yes, what would be your other career aspirations?
   i) To change employer ( )
   ii) To study further in education ( )
   iii) To study further in other disciplines ( )
   iv) To start a personal business ( )
   v) Any other, specify………………………………………………

8. a) What do you like MOST about your job? (State only 1)
   i) ………………………………………………………………………

   b) Kindly explain why you like this particular aspect?
      ………………………………………………………………………
      ………………………………………………………………………
      ………………………………………………………………………
      ………………………………………………………………………
9. a) What do you dislike **MOST** about your job? *(State only 1)*
   
   i) ..............................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................
   
   b) Kindly explain why you dislike it?
   ..............................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................

10. Please tick the most appropriate condition that explains your level of satisfaction with your job.
   
   a) Extremely satisfied ( )
   b) Satisfied ( )
   c) Slightly satisfied ( )
   d) Not satisfied ( )

11. Kindly suggest three ways of improving the teaching profession in order to attract and retain as many teachers as possible
   ..............................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................

**Reward and Incentives**

12. Have you ever received any gifts in recognition of some of your duties as a teacher?
   
   a) Yes [ ]
   b) No [ ]
13. For which reasons are teachers MOSTLY awarded in your school?
   (Arrange in order of commonality as follows: 1 = Most common, 2 = Moderately Common, 3 = Least common, 4 = Not common at all)
   a) Students’ academic performance [   ]
   b) Teacher’s creativity [   ]
   c) Time management [   ]

14. Which programs does your school have to help improve the teacher’s performance? (Tick one MOST common)
   a) Staff outings and get together [   ]
   b) Refresher courses [   ]
   c) Involvement in games [   ]
   Any other, specify…………………………………………………………………………

Work load

15. How many hours do you teach per week?
   a) Less than 10
   b) 11-20
   c) 21-30
   d) 31-40
   e) Above 40

16. How many classes do you teach as per the school timetable?
   a) 2 and below       b) 3       c) 4       d) 5       e) More than 6

17. What is the average number of students in the class (es) you teach?
   a) Less than 10       b) 11-20     c) 21-30     d) 31-40
   e) Above 40
18. Other than teaching, what other responsibilities do you hold in the school?
   
a) Class teacher   
b) Administration (Principal, Deputy Principal)   
c) Head of Department   
d) Games teacher   
e) House teacher   
Any other, specify………………………………………………………………

Teaching and learning resources

19. Indicate the extent of availability of the following provisions in your school putting a tick in the appropriate space using the following scale.

(Highly Available = HA, Moderately Available = MA, Slightly Available = SA, Slightly Unavailable = SU, Highly Unavailable = HU.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>HU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Staffroom facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Laboratory facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Library facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Provision of stationeries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION.
## APPENDIX III: LIST OF TARGET SECONDARY SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Teachers population</th>
<th>Students population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ngiya Girls High School</td>
<td>Girls boarding</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bar Olengo Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Matera Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boro Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Agoro Yombe Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dibuoro Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hawinga Girls Secondary School</td>
<td>Girls boarding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kalkada Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Segere Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mwer Secondary School</td>
<td>Boys boarding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nyalula Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nyajuok Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Uwasi Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hono Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Siaya Township Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Holy Cross Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nyambure Secondary School</td>
<td>Girls boarding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Uradi Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Obambo Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kabura Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senator Obama Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ambrose Adega Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Uyoma Kobare Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Barding Secondary School</td>
<td>Boys boarding</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ulafu Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bishop Okoth High School</td>
<td>Girls boarding</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dirk Allison Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mulaha Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rambo Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ngiya Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Malomba Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mahero Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mbaga Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sirinde Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Sidok Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Unyolo Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Nduru Secondary School</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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