THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND INTENT TO LEAVE AMONG LECTURERS OF PRIVATELY OWNED COLLEGES IN MOMBASA CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT

MERCY WAIRIMU MUHORO

A RESEARCH PAPER SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (MBA) DEGREE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI.

NOVEMBER 2012
DECLARATION

This Research Project is my original work and has not been submitted for award of a degree in the University of Nairobi or any other University.

Signed………………………………….
Date…………………………………

Mercy Wairimu Muhoro
D61/60556/2010

This Research Project has been submitted for examination with my approval as the University Supervisor.

Signed………………………………….
Date…………………………………

Florence Muindi
School of Business
University of Nairobi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the support, advice and tireless efforts of my Supervisor Florence Muindi during the research work and in writing of this research project report. Any errors are the sole responsibility of the author.

I also appreciate the support of the lecturers of Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District who supported me in this project by completing the questionnaires administered to them. Your efforts are sincerely appreciated.

I would also like to acknowledge any assistance given to me by the staff at the School of Business, University of Nairobi. May God bless you.

Finally, there are people who contributed in one way or the other in completion of this study but their names have not been mentioned. To them I am most grateful.

DEDICATION
This study is dedicated to my parents James and Faith Muhororo who have borne the burden of educating me up to this level. May God bless you. To the Lord God Almighty I give all Thanks, Praise and Glory for bringing me this far.
ABSTRACT

Job satisfaction of employees is important in any work environment because it plays a major role on intent to leave. Previous studies have been done on Job satisfaction and Intent to leave but none has focused on lecturers of Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District. This study wanted to establish the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave among lecturers of Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central District.

This study adopted a cross section survey. The population of study comprised of all the lecturers in the 22 Registered Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District as shown in Appendix I. Primary data was used for this study. A semi structured questionnaire with both open ended and closed ended questions was used to collect data. Drop and pick later method was used to administer the questionnaires. Descriptive statistics such as mean scores and standard deviations were used in the analysis of data and Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to test the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation value of -0.46 shows a relationship between Job satisfaction and intent to leave among the lecturers where intent to leave increases as job satisfaction decreases. Pay and Promotion opportunities were found to be major dissatisfaction factors among the lecturers which in turn influence their intent to leave.
TABLE OF CONTENTS
Declaration.........................................................................................................................i
Acknowledgements...........................................................................................................ii
Dedication ..........................................................................................................................iii
Abstract ..............................................................................................................................iv
List of Tables ......................................................................................................................vii
List of Figures...................................................................................................................ix

CHAPTER ONE .................................................................................................................1
INTRODUCTION ..............................................................................................................1
1.1 Background of the study .............................................................................................1
  1.1.1 Job satisfaction .....................................................................................................2
  1.1.2 Intent to leave ......................................................................................................3
  1.1.3 Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District ......................4
1.2 Research Problem ......................................................................................................5
1.3 Research Objective ....................................................................................................7
1.4 Value of the study ......................................................................................................7

CHAPTER TWO ..............................................................................................................9
LITERATURE REVIEW ....................................................................................................9
2.1 Introduction ...............................................................................................................9
2.2 Job Satisfaction .........................................................................................................9
2.3 Models of Job Satisfaction ......................................................................................10
2.4 Measures of Job Satisfaction ..................................................................................12
2.5 Intent to leave ..........................................................................................................14
2.6 Reasons for Intent to leave .....................................................................................15
2.7 Job satisfaction and Intent to leave .........................................................................17
CHAPTER THREE .........................................................................................................................20

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ......................................................................................................20

3.1 Introduction ..........................................................................................................................20
3.2 Research design ..................................................................................................................20
3.3 Population of the Study .......................................................................................................20
3.4 Data Collection ...................................................................................................................20
3.5 Data Analysis .....................................................................................................................21

CHAPTER FOUR ..........................................................................................................................22

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....................................................................22

4.1 Introduction ..........................................................................................................................22
4.2 Response Rate ....................................................................................................................22
4.3 Demographics Statistics of Respondents ...........................................................................22
    4.3.1 Gender Profile .............................................................................................................23
    4.3.2 Age of Respondents ....................................................................................................24
    4.3.3 Period of Service of Respondents ............................................................................24
    4.3.4 Academic Qualifications of Respondents .................................................................25
4.4 Satisfaction Level of Respondents .....................................................................................26
    4.4.1 Satisfaction with Work Itself .....................................................................................27
    4.4.2 Satisfaction with Employee - Supervisor Relations ....................................................28
    4.4.3 Satisfaction with Pay ..................................................................................................30
    4.4.4 Satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities .................................................................32
    4.4.5 Satisfaction with Co-Workers ....................................................................................34
4.5 Intent to Leave ....................................................................................................................35
    4.5.1 Reasons for Intent to Leave .......................................................................................36
4.6 Pearson Product Moment Correlation ................................................................................38

CHAPTER FIVE .............................................................................................................................39
## LIST OF TABLES

| Table 4.1: | Age of Respondents | 24 |
| Table 4.2: | Period of service of the Respondents | 25 |
| Table 4.3: | Academic Qualifications of the Respondents | 26 |
| Table 4.4: | Satisfaction with Work Itself | 27 |
| Table 4.5: | Satisfaction with Employee- Supervisor Relations | 28 |
| Table 4.6: | Satisfaction with Pay | 30 |
| Table 4.7: | Satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities | 32 |
| Table 4.8: | Satisfaction with Co-workers | 34 |
| Table 4.9: | Intent to Leave | 36 |
| Table 4.10: | Reasons for Intent to Leave | 37 |
| Table 4.11: | Pearson Product Moment Correlation | 38 |
LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 4.1: Gender of Respondents.................................................................23
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Satisfaction of employees is an important factor for the success of any organization. It is important for every employer to ensure that his employees are well satisfied both with the job and with the workplace for them to be effective, efficient and productive. Ullman (2002) described desirability of movement from one job to another among nurses as being primarily determined by job satisfaction factors. He argued that job satisfaction had several components like monetary rewards, participation in job assignment, type of supervision that the employer uses on the employee, leadership style and work environment. All these components should be in the desired quantity and quality for job satisfaction to be high and intent to leave low in the organization.

Lee et al (1992) argues that job satisfaction plays a major role on intent to leave and can actually be used to predict whether turnover will be high or low in any organization. When job satisfaction is high, labour turnover is said to be low but when job satisfaction is low there is likely to be a high labour turnover. Carrel (1995) states that job satisfaction is often considered a strong determinant of employee turnover intentions. He argues that a high rate of labour turnover is a sign of job dissatisfaction while a low rate of turnover is a sign of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is important in any work environment. Researchers like (Steers and Porter, 1991) have proved that job satisfaction influences the rate of turnover intentions
in an organization. For an employer to reduce turnover intentions in his organization, he has to make sure that his employees are satisfied both with the job and the workplace. It is therefore important for any employer to ensure that his employees are highly satisfied in the workplace so as to reduce turnover intentions.

1.1.1 Job Satisfaction

Graham & Bennet (1998) define job satisfaction as a collection of feelings and beliefs that managers have about their current jobs. Price (2001) defines job satisfaction as an affective orientation that an employee has towards his or her job. Every employer has a desire to have satisfied employees in his organization because it is believed that satisfied employees are more productive. Bruce & Blackburn (1992) however argues that sometimes satisfied employees perform better and sometimes they do not. Satisfied employees are also less likely to resort to industrial action and therefore less likely destabilize the operations of the organization. No organization wants to be viewed as unfair to its employees in the public eye and therefore much effort should be put in place by management of organizations to ensure that employees are satisfied.

Various components to job satisfaction have been investigated over the years that include leadership style, compensation, work environment (Basset, 1994), opportunity for advancement and organizational structure (Schneider, 1992). Lawler (1997) argues that if these components are readily available and accessible with the measure that employees require in the organization, then job satisfaction is likely to be high.
### 1.1.2 Intent to Leave

Intent to leave is defined as an employee’s plan of intention to quit the present job and look forward to find another job in the near future (Purani & Sahadev, 2007). Turnover intentions reflect the probability that an individual will change his or her job within a certain time period. This can be caused by job dissatisfaction as a result of poor pay, poor supervision behaviours and poor supervisor-subordinate relationship.

Cole (2002) defines intent to leave as an index of organizational effectiveness and as such it warrants attention and some understanding. French (2003) states that employees turnover intentions are as a result of some dissatisfaction by the employee which can be used as a reflection of how effective an organization is at handling its employees. Employee turnover intentions may also have organizational benefits if the employee actually separates from the organization. Mobley (1997) states that a blanket reduction in the level of employee turnover may only offer part of a solution in the organization as it allows organizations to restructure themselves.

Intent to leave by an employee is always voluntary. Voluntary turnover is when an employee leaves the organization willingly for example through resignation. This occurs when according to Morrel et al (2001) an employee controls the leaving process. Most often employees turnover intentions are considered to be an indication of failure in personnel management practices and policies. It is however necessary to make a thorough analysis of the reasons why employees intend to leave the organization before blaming the employer for the turnover intentions.
1.1.3 Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District

A Privately owned College is an independent educational institution or establishment providing higher education or specialized vocational or professional training that sets its own policies and goals and is privately funded. Privately owned colleges are different from universities. (Wikipedia). Privately Owned Colleges offer professional courses at certificate and diploma levels. The growth of Privately Owned Colleges in Kenya has been due to an excess in the social demand for higher education which the public universities sector could not meet (Altbach, 1999). Schuller (1991) in his study on Kenya contends that the growth of private higher education was an outcome of the great expansion of public secondary and higher education in the late 1980s. This expansion could not be accommodated by the public sector and subsequently private universities and Privately Owned Colleges were permitted to develop. This led to an influx of Privately Owned Colleges in Kenya including around Mombasa’s Central Business District where there was no University then.

The Ministry of Education Mombasa Office records shows a list of 22 Registered Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District. These colleges offer both professional and specialized training. They offer programmes in areas like Secretarial studies, Accounts, Business Management, Community Development, Communication and Language and Information Technology. They award their own Certificates and Diplomas and they also allow their students to do exams with national bodies like Kenya National Examinations Council and Kenya Accountants and Secretaries National Examinations Board or even international bodies like Association of Business Executives where they are awarded Certificates upon passing exams.
1.2 Research Problem

Job satisfaction and intent to leave are directly related to each other whereby job satisfaction has a direct effect on intent to leave among employees in an organization (Droussiotis et al, 2007). Hellman (1997) argues that increasing dissatisfaction in employees results in a higher chance of considering other employment opportunities. Carrel (1995) states that job satisfaction is often considered to be a strong determinant of employees intent to leave their employment. If they are dissatisfied, they are highly likely to consider alternative employment but when they are satisfied they are likely to stay longer in their jobs. Job satisfaction of employees should therefore be a primary concern to every employer so as to reduce their intent to leave the organization.

Attracting and retaining high quality lecturers in Privately Owned Colleges should be the primary necessity for a strong education system. For an institution to be successful, it must maintain an expertise staff among its lecturers. These lecturers need to feel satisfied with their jobs (Ajayi & Ayodele, 2002). The researcher being a lecturer in one of the Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District upon discussing with fellow lecturers has found out that turnover intentions among the lecturers is very high. The lecturers have also been complaining about their level of job satisfaction in the various institutions.

Studies have been done on Job satisfaction and intent to leave. Pierce, Hazel and Mion (1996) examined the effect of a Professional Practice Model (PPM) on nurses’ job satisfaction and intent to leave. They established that the two are significantly correlated. With increased job satisfaction the intent to leave among nurses decreases. Kiarie (2008)
when studying insurance companies established job dissatisfaction as one factors leading to turnover intentions. Abuti (2006) studied media houses and concluded that the factors that increase job satisfaction in the workplace like job security, remuneration methods and levels, chances of promotion and flexible work systems as the dominant factors that seem to influence a presenter’s decision on whether to accept or reject a job offer. Kimeu (2008) when studying job satisfaction and employee commitment to the organization in the banking sector concluded that employees who are satisfied are likely to stay in their jobs unlike the employees who are dissatisfied.

The above studies done before on Job satisfaction and Intent to leave among employees in organizations shows that there is a relationship between Job satisfaction and Intent to leave though they have been done in different sectors like the Insurance sector, Media sector, Health sector and Banking sector. No study has been done in the Educational Sector with specific regard to Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District. Whether the same relationship between Job satisfaction and Intent to leave is applicable to Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District is yet to be determined by the researcher. It is this gap that the researcher studied about. The study therefore sought to answer the following question: “Is there a relationship between Job satisfaction and Intent to leave among lecturers of Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District?”
1.3 Research Objective

The objective of the study was to establish the relationship between Job satisfaction and Intent to leave among lecturers of Privately Owned Colleges operating in Mombasa Central Business District.

1.4 Value of the Study

The findings of the study will be of significance to the following stakeholders:

The Management of Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District will be able to identify the level of job satisfaction among lecturers in their institutions and link it to their intent to leave and help them come up with strategies to increase job satisfaction among their lecturers so as to reduce their intentions to leave.

Persons responsible for management of Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District like the Principals’ will find out what causes job dissatisfaction among their lecturers and how they can increase the level of job satisfaction so as to reduce intention to leave among lecturers in their institutions.

Human Resource Managers from other organizations and management of Privately Owned Colleges in other parts of Kenya can also replicate the findings of this study to their own organizations so as to increase job satisfaction and reduce intent to leave among their employees.

Future researchers who would wish to expand further on the studies or do similar studies in other organizations. It can provide them with literature review and recommendations for further research that might be identified in the course of doing the research. The study
will also help the researcher to partially fulfill the requirement for the award of the degree of Master of Business Administration.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will look at Job Satisfaction, Models of Job satisfaction, Intent to leave, Reasons for Intent to leave and Job Satisfaction and Intent to leave.

2.2 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a result of employees’ perception of how well the job provides those things which are viewed as important (Luthans, 1999). Job satisfaction is the most important and frequently studied attitude in the organizational behavior field. Bateman (1991) states that job satisfaction is a mixture of beliefs, feelings and behavior. Attitude scales that measure job satisfaction measure these components. Ellickson et al (2002) argues that job satisfaction of public sector employees was significantly influenced by perceptions of employee satisfaction in terms of pay, promotional opportunities, relationship with supervisors, employees’ performance management systems and fringe benefits.

Robbins (2003) states that there are different outcomes of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction which are: First, job performance where organizations with more satisfied employees tend to be more effective than organizations with less satisfied employees, Second, Organization Citizenship Behavior (OCB) where he states that satisfied employees’ are more likely to talk well of the organization and go beyond the normal expectations in their job, Third, customer satisfaction where he argues that satisfied
employees’ increase customer satisfaction and loyalty. Fourth, Absenteeism where he argues that dissatisfied employees are more likely to miss work. Fifth, Turnover intentions where he argues that if there is considerable job dissatisfaction there is likely to be high turnover intentions and Sixth Workplace deviance where he argues that job dissatisfaction predicts a lot of specific behaviours like unionization attempts, substance abuse and stealing at work.

Ivancervich (2004) argues that for employees to be productive they must feel that the job is right for their abilities and that they are all being treated equitably. Purcell (2003) argues that firms can be more successful when employees are well motivated and feel committed to the organization and when the job gives them high levels of satisfaction. It is therefore important for employees to be satisfied so that they can be productive in the organization. The level of job satisfaction is affected by intrinsic and extrinsic motivating factors, quality of supervision, social relationships with work group and the degree to which individuals succeed or fail in their work. (Armstrong, 2006). The most important thing managers can do to raise employee satisfaction is to focus on the intrinsic parts of the job such as making the work challenging and interesting (Judge, 2001).

2.3 Models of Job satisfaction

The two factor theory by Hertzberg (1959) was developed from a study of 200,000 engineers. Hertzberg found out that satisfaction was influenced by one set of factors known as satisfiers or motivators while dissatisfaction was influenced by another set of factors known as hygiene factors or maintenance factors or Dissatisfiers. According to Hertzberg, dissatisfiers must be available to reduce the levels of dissatisfaction of
workers. When these factors are absent or deficient the workers will be dissatisfied. These factors include: proper supervision of workers, job security, effective company policies and administration procedures, favourable working conditions, good salary, financial benefits and good interpersonal relationship among workers. Hertzberg explains that the satisfiers or motivators are those factors that cause the internal drive, commitment, enthusiasm and general liking of the job. When such factors are present employees tend to be motivated and committed to the work process. Such factors include: feelings of achievement, recognition, responsibility and possibility of growth and advancement in career. This theory has however been criticized because it does not consider that individuals react differently towards the satisfiers and dissatisfiers and it does not also specify how satisfiers and dissatisfiers are to be measured.

Locke’s (1976) range of Affect Theory states that satisfaction is determined by what one wants in a job and what one has in a job. The theory further argues that the aspect one values in a job like good supervisor-subordinate relationship will determine how satisfied or dissatisfied one becomes when expectations are met or not met. Hackman et al (1976) proposed the Job Characteristics model which is widely used as a framework to study how job characteristics like autonomy, skill variety, task significance and task identity impact on job outcomes including job satisfaction.

Equity theory shows how a person views fairness in regard to social relationships. Huseman et al (1987) state that equity theory not only takes into account the needs of the individual but also the opinion of the reference groups to which the individual looks for guidance. Higgin’s (1987) Discrepancy theory states that individuals learn what their obligations and responsibilities are and if they fail to fulfill those obligations they are
punished but if they fulfill them the reward can be love, praise or approval. If this is not done, employees will be dissatisfied.

2.4 Measures of Job Satisfaction

Ganzach (1998) states that job satisfaction is rarely measured in isolation but is instead measured alongside numerous other constructs like turnover intentions, absenteeism and organizational commitment. Since job satisfaction is an attitude, it cannot be directly observed and therefore must rely on the employees’ self reports (Judge, 2001). Broom (1972) argues that job satisfaction levels may be measured through employee’s feelings about pay, work itself, benefits, career advancement, co-worker performance, supervisory consideration, supervisory promotion of teamwork and participation, supervisory guidance, communication, human resource policies, concern for employee’s productivity, training and development, physical working conditions and recognition. He further explains that job satisfaction can also be measured by looking at employee productivity levels, employee retention and costs related with turnover, rates of absenteeism, quality of work and output and commitment to the organization.

Quinn (1974) identified two types of job satisfaction measures: single-question measures which ask questions such as “On the whole, would you say you are satisfied or dissatisfied with the work you do?” and multiple-item measures which asks respondents to rate various aspects of the job on a scale running from levels of dissatisfaction to levels of satisfaction. Dessler (1999) argues that job satisfaction reflects the attitudes about an employee’s job in practice. It can be measured by looking at specific aspects of job satisfaction like pay- how much pay is received and is it perceived to be equitable?,
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chances of promotion- are there available and fair opportunities to advance?, job
description- are tasks interesting?, are there opportunities for learning? Co-workers- are
workers friendly? An employee’s responses to these questions can be used to measure the
level of job satisfaction.

Job Descriptive Index (JDI) is also another measure of job satisfaction (Smith et al, 1969). It is the most widely used measure of job satisfaction today. The JDI was designed
to measure five dimensions of job satisfaction which are: Satisfaction with the work
itself, Supervision, Co-workers, Promotion opportunities and pay. Its format is simple
and it is also easy to administer. The job descriptive index is one of the most popular
measures of job satisfaction and has been found to produce highly reliable results
(Imparato, 1972).

The above measures are used to measure job satisfaction among employees to enhance
efficiency and effectiveness in organizations. Werther (1993) argues that an effective
organization meets both company objectives and employee needs. When employee needs
are met, they can also be motivated to meet company objectives. He also argues that
when employees are dissatisfied there is likely to be intent to leave, union activities and
absenteeism.
2.5 Intent to Leave

Employees intent to leave an organization is always voluntary. Heneman (1983) argues that management views intent to leave where an employee plans to separate willingly from an organization as undesirable. This is because voluntary employee turnover is expensive for employers, and particularly so in the case of talented employees whose productivity is difficult to match (Sigler, 1999). There are however occasional arguments to the contrary like Darlton et al (1993) but still there is evidence that high levels of voluntary turnover adversely affect business unit performance (McElroy et al, 2001).

Employees intent to leave usually reflects unrest in the organization. Cole (2002) argues that turnover intentions are an index of organizational effectiveness and it can be used to show how satisfied or dissatisfied employees are in the organization. It is therefore important for managers to put interest in the matter of employees turnover intentions. Bernadin (2003) however argues that some degree of resignations and turnover is beneficial as it allows the organization to renew itself and invite its practices to be critically examined from another point of view. The organization may benefit from the turnover in terms of improved labour force and bringing in new trained outsiders. The organization can therefore create an atmosphere where employees are encouraged to leave the organization so that they can get new employees and be able to restructure.

Kevin (2004) argues that employees can also have no turnover intentions. This is when there are no employees intending to leave the organization. This he says is not good because it leads to in-breeding if employees remain the same in the organization. It can therefore be concluded that intent to leave by employees can sometimes be good so that
old employees can leave and new ones come who inject new blood and ideas into the organization though it should not be high so that it does not reach the level of inflicting measurable damage to the employer (Weiss, 2002).

2.6 Reasons for Intent to Leave

There are no standard reasons for understanding why employees intend to move from their organizations but various factors have been acknowledged to establish reasons why employees intend to leave their organizations (Kevin, 2004). Researchers like (Bluedorn et al, 1982) have tried to find out reasons why employees intend to leave their organizations.

There are multiple reasons why employees intend to leave their organizations to join others. Firth et al (2007) state that some of the reasons why people intend to leave their organizations are personal individual reasons which include job related stress, lack of commitment to the organization and job dissatisfaction. Tor et al (1997) state that insufficient information on how to perform the job adequately, unclear expectations from peers and supervisors, ambiguity of performance evaluation methods and extensive job pressures may cause employees to feel less involved and less satisfied with their jobs and careers, less committed to their organizations and eventually intend to leave the organization.

Kahn et al (1990) state that lack of role clarity where roles of employees are not clearly spelled out by management can lead to intentions to leave because employees feel that their duties are not worth being recognized by the organization. Employees who work in organizations which have a high level of inefficiency also have high intentions to leave.
(Alexander et al, 1994). Organizational instability has also been shown to have a high degree on intent to leave because employees will stay in an organization which has a predictable work environment and where they can be able to predict their career advancement and vice versa (Zuber, 2001).

Organizations that have got a strong and efficient communication system enjoy lower turnover intentions of staff (Labov, 1997). This arises due to the fact that employees have a need to be informed of the occurrences in the organization and they will feel more accepted and comfortable to stay longer in organizations where they are given first hand information of daily occurrences and are involved in decision making. Where there is no sharing of information and employee empowerment, the chances of employee continuity are minimal (Magner et al, 1996).

Intent to leave can also be caused by poor personnel policies, poor recruitment procedures, poor supervisory practices, poor grievance procedures and lack of motivation in the workplace (Costly, 1987). These factors cause turnover intentions because where there is a lack of policies on personnel matters employees are not recruited procedurally, promotions are not done fairly and there are no grievance procedures in place. At the end employees will intend to quit because they are not sure of their job security in the organization. Griffeth et al (2000) argue that when high performers are insufficiently rewarded they intend to quit their organizations. He also states that employees are likely to remain with organizations that provide adequate financial incentives.
2.7 Job Satisfaction and Intent to Leave

Gupta (2004) states that the level of job satisfaction seems to have some relation with employees intent to leave. He argues that employees with high level of satisfaction are less likely to intend to quit their jobs as opposed to employees with low levels of satisfaction. Hellman (1997) argues that increasing dissatisfaction in employees’ results in a higher chance of considering other employment opportunities. In his US studies of non-working nurses, the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave was found to be very high. The more they were dissatisfied, the more they were looking for alternative employment.

When doing a research on nurses Secombe et al (1997) found out that the factors given by nurses as reasons for intending to leave were centered on issues known to affect job satisfaction such as ineffective supervisory relationships and poor opportunities for professional development rather than external labour market forces of which managers would justifiably feel unable to control.

Overall job satisfaction is consistently associated with low employee turnover intentions (Wegge et al, 2007). Job dissatisfaction forms an intention to quit (Hacket, 1979) and other withdrawal cognitions (Horn et al, 1995). In other words, people who enjoy their work, particularly its intrinsic features, are more likely to be retained by their employer and they are also not likely to intend to leave their jobs unlike those who are dissatisfied. Romen (1978) examined the relationship between job satisfaction and length of employment in a particular job and concluded that the length of service is related with job
satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. This means that if employees are satisfied they are likely to stay longer in a job unlike when they are dissatisfied.

In a study by Black et al (1994) satisfaction by both men and women in the volunteer work they did was high as they both felt highly accepted in their volunteer experience. Many volunteers reported that they intended to continue volunteering. Meyer (1999) argues that most South African employees experience a lack of job satisfaction resulting in a low level of employee commitment that in turn impacts on performance and the achievement of organizational goals. The symptoms of these problems result in low productivity, high absenteeism, labour unrest, industrial action and intent to leave. Luthans (1989) argues that employee turnover intentions, absenteeism and grievances lodged are factors that indicate whether job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction exists within organizations. Basset (1994) maintains that a high turnover intention rate is indicative of dissatisfaction among employees. French (2003) argues that employee turnover intention is often prevalent in an environment where employees are highly dissatisfied. Greenberg et al (1995) argue that employees lacking job satisfaction often tend to withdraw from situations and environments as a means of dealing with their dissatisfaction. A major form of employee withdrawal is voluntary turnover.

The above studies show that there is a link between job satisfaction and intent to leave among employees in organizations. Employees want to remain in a job where they experience a high level of satisfaction. Management of organizations should therefore ensure that their workers are satisfied so as to reduce employee turnover intentions. This can be done using a human resource audit of employee satisfaction as a means of finding how well employee needs are met (Werther, 1993).
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will look at Research Design, Population of the study, Data Collection and Data Analysis.

3.2 Research Design

This study adopted a cross section survey. Cross section survey involves observation of all of a population or a representative sample at one specific point in time. The cross section survey ensured that lecturers in all the Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District had been considered for the study.

3.3 Population of the Study

The researcher visited the Ministry of Education Mombasa Office and was given a record of 22 Registered Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District as shown in Appendix I. The population consisted of all lecturers from the 22 registered Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District.

3.4 Data Collection

Primary data was used for this study. A semi-structured questionnaire with both open ended and closed ended questions was used to collect data for this research. The questionnaire had three sections. Part A, Part B and Part C. Part A consisted of General questions about the respondent; Part B sought to answer questions on Job satisfaction and
it used the Job Descriptive Index format while Part C sought to answer questions on Intent to leave. The researcher used the drop and pick later method to administer the questionnaire.

3.5 Data Analysis

The data was first checked for completeness, coded and analyzed using descriptive statistics such as mean scores and standard deviations. This was followed by a Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis which was used to test the relationship between Job satisfaction and Intent to leave.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter highlighted the data analysis methodology and outputs or findings thereof using the primary data information collected from the questionnaires administered to the lecturers in the Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District.

4.2 Response Rate

The population consisted of all lecturers from the 22 Registered Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District. A total of 272 questionnaires’ were administered. Of those, 243 were returned and during sorting it was discovered that 208 were fully completed hence the research findings were based on the 208 respondents out of the targeted 272 respondents which makes 77% of the target population which is a good percentage for reliable findings and can be appropriately generalized. Hence a response rate of 77% was used for the study and its findings.

4.3 Demographic Statistics of Respondents

This section seeks to find out the demographic statistics of the respondents in terms of gender, age, period of service in their respective institutions and academic qualifications.
4.3.1 Gender Profile

This section seeks to find out the gender of the respondents. Out of the respondents, it can be observed that the male population consisted of 54% while the female population was 46% as shown in Figure 4.1 below. This implies that the males are more engaged in the lecturing profession as compared to their female counterparts although there is not a major significant difference. This may be caused by men taking advantage of the flexible working hours offered by the colleges to participate in other responsibilities outside the workplace.

**Fig. 4.1: Gender of Respondents**

![Pie chart showing 54% Males and 46% Females]

**Source: Own Computation**

4.3.2 Age of Respondents

This section seeks to find out the different ages of the respondents. This is because age is known to influence job satisfaction as job satisfaction is known to increase with age. (Hertzberg, 1969). Out of the data collected, most of the respondents were found to be between 30-39 years of age as shown in table 1 below.
Table 4.1: Age of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No. of Lecturers</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 years and below</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own Computation

From table 4.1, it can be observed that 20% of the lecturers were below 29 years of age, 61% were between 30-39 years of age, 16% were between 40-49 years of age and 3% were over 50 years of age. This shows that majority of the lecturers are between 30-39 years of age. This implies that most lecturers are middle age and above.

4.3.3 Period of Service of Respondents

The section seeks to find out the period the lecturers have worked in their institutions. This is because job satisfaction has been known to influence period of service as a longer period of service is associated with a positive feeling toward the employer, a high degree with employee identification and ownership with the organization (Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000). Out of the data collected, most of the respondents were found to have worked in their institutions in the period between 4-5 years as shown in the table 2 below.
Table 4.2: Period of Service of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Service</th>
<th>No. of Lecturers</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 years</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own Computation

From table 4.2, it can be observed that 22% of the lecturers had worked in their institutions for a period between 1-3 years, 64% had worked for a period between 4-5 years, 11% had worked between 6-10 years and 3% had worked for over 10 years. This shows that majority of the lecturers have served for a period between 4-5 years. This means that the period worked is long enough to understand issues relating to job satisfaction.

4.3.4 Academic Qualifications of Respondents

This section seeks to find out the academic qualifications of the lecturers. Out of the data collected, most of the respondents were found to have a degree as shown in the table 4.3.
Table 4.3: Academic Qualifications of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Qualifications</th>
<th>No. of Lecturers</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Diploma</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own Computation

From table 4.3, it can be observed that 2% of the lecturers have only a Certificate, 14% have a Diploma, 18% have a Higher Diploma, 59% have a Degree, 6% have a Masters degree and 1% have a PHD. This shows that the majority of the lecturers have a degree as their academic qualification. This is in line with the minimum qualifications needed to teach in the colleges.

4.4 Satisfaction Level of Respondents

This section seeks to find out the satisfaction levels of the lecturers in terms of the Work Itself, Employee – Supervisor relations, Pay, Promotional opportunities and Co-workers. The respondents were asked to state their levels of job satisfaction using a likert scale of 1-5 where 1 represents strongly disagree, 2 represents disagree, 3 represents neutral, 4 represents agree and 5 represents strongly agree. A value of <1.5 represents strongly disagree, 1.6 - 2.5 represents disagree, 2.6 - 3.5 represents neutral, 3.6 – 4.5 represents agree while >4.5 represents strongly agree.
4.4.1 Satisfaction with Work Itself

This section seeks to find out the satisfaction levels of the lecturers in terms of the work itself as shown in table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4: Satisfaction with Work Itself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with Work Itself</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My college has a good working environment (work and personal life balance, reasonable workload)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has got modernized working facilities (resources, tools, computers, materials and information)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has a good organizational structure</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear roles and responsibilities of staff at my college</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has an efficient program for Job stress management</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has got clear Human resources and personnel policies</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has an efficient top management leadership</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college gives room for Innovation, creativity and change management</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has got a supportive organizational culture</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have got flexible working hours in my college</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.518</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own Computation

From the above analysis in table 4.4 it shows that the lecturers are fairly satisfied with working hours with a score of 4.1 and work environment with a score of 3.7. However, they are neutral on organizational structure with a score of 3.4, job stress management...
with a score of 3.2, top management leadership with a score of 3.2, clarity of roles and responsibilities of staff with a score of 3.1, innovation, creativity and change management with a score of 2.9 and supportive organization culture with a score of 2.8.

The lecturers generally seem to be dissatisfied with working facilities with a score of 2.3 and Human Resource and personnel policies with a score of 2.3. On average, the lecturers are neutral with work itself with a mean score of 3.1

In conclusion, the lecturers seem to be satisfied with work environment and working hours but neutral on organization structure, job stress management, top management leadership, clarity of roles and opportunity for innovation, creativity and change management. The lecturers are dissatisfied with working facilities and human resource and personnel policies. Overall, the lecturers are neutral about their work.

4.4.2 Satisfaction with Employee – Supervisor Relations

This section seeks to find out the satisfaction levels of the lecturers in terms of Employee- Supervisor Relations as shown in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Satisfaction with Employee – Supervisor Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with Employee- Supervisor Relations</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel free to contact my supervisor as and when needed</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is clear to me what my supervisor expects of me regarding my job performance</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor actively listens to my suggestions</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is fair and consistent in applying the rules to all employees</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above analysis in Table 4.5 it shows that the lecturers are fairly satisfied with the ability to contact their supervisor when they need them with a score of 4.1. However, they are neutral about the ability of their supervisor to enable them perform at their best with a score of 3.1, their supervisor possessing leadership skills and being an effective leader with a score of 2.8, the expectations their supervisors have on them regarding their job performance with a score of 2.7 and their work performance evaluation on a timely basis by their supervisor with a mean score of 2.7.

The lecturers generally seem to be dissatisfied with lack of fairness and consistency of their supervisors in applying the rules to all employees with a score of 2.5, lack of their supervisors listening to their suggestions with a score of 2.1, inability of their supervisors to delegate work effectively with a score of 1.9 and failure of the supervisor to consult staff on key work related decisions and issues with a score of 1.7. On average, the lecturers are neutral with the relationship they have with their supervisor with a mean score of 2.62.
In conclusion the lecturers seem to be satisfied with the ability to contact their supervisor when they need them but neutral with their supervisor enabling them to perform at their best, their supervisor possessing leadership skills and being an effective leader, the expectations their supervisor have on them regarding their job performance and their supervisors’ work performance evaluation on a timely basis. The lecturers are dissatisfied with fairness and consistency of their supervisor in applying the rules to all employees, lack of their supervisor listening to their suggestions, inability of the supervisor to delegate work effectively and failure of the supervisor to consult staff on key work related decisions and issues. Overall, the lecturers are neutral on employee-supervisor relationship.

4.4.3 Satisfaction with Pay

This section seeks to find out the satisfaction levels of the lecturers’ in regard to their pay as shown in Table 6.

Table 4.6: Satisfaction with Pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with Pay</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My college provides me with a competitive pay and benefits package</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has clear policies related to salaries, raises and bonuses</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The benefits programs provided by my college are satisfactory and meet my expectations</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am fairly remunerated for my roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My College’s remuneration policy helps attract</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and retain high performing employees

| Performance incentives are clearly linked to objectives of the college. | 1.7 | 0.10 |
| I am aware of all the benefits I am entitled to | 3.6 | 0.33 |
| **Average** | **2.24** | **0.149** |

**Source: Own Computation**

From the analysis in Table 4.6 it shows that the lecturers are fairly satisfied with the fact that they are aware of all the benefits they are entitled to with a score of 3.6. However, they are neutral about being remunerated fairly for their roles and responsibilities with a score of 2.9. The lecturers generally seem to be dissatisfied with not being awarded a competitive pay and benefits package with a score of 2.2, inability of the benefits programs provided by their college being satisfactory and meeting their expectations with a score of 1.9, inability of their college’s remuneration policy to attract and retain high performing employees with a score of 1.9, performance incentives not being linked to the objectives of the colleges with a score of 1.7 and lack of the colleges having clear policies in relation to salaries, raises and bonuses with a score of 1.5. On average, the lecturers are dissatisfied with their pay with a mean score of 2.24.

In conclusion, the lecturers seem to be satisfied with the fact that they are aware of all the benefits they are entitled to and neutral about being remunerated fairly for their roles and responsibilities. They lecturers are dissatisfied with not being awarded a competitive pay and benefits package, inability of the benefits programs provided by their colleges to be satisfactory and meet their expectations, inability of their college’s remuneration policy to attract and retain high performing employees, performance incentives not being linked
to objectives of the college and lack of the colleges having clear policies in relation to salaries, raises and bonuses. Overall, the lecturers are dissatisfied with their pay.

4.4.4 Satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities

This section seeks to find out the satisfaction levels of the lecturers in terms of the promotion opportunities that they have in their institutions as shown in Table 4.7 below.

Table 4.7: Satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are opportunities for career growth in this college</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college gives me the opportunities to advance my career</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am growing as a professional in this College</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clearly established career path in this College</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions are done fairly based on competence and experience in this college</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of promotional opportunities and feel I have a chance for advancement, given my qualifications and experience</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My College is committed to the growth of individual lecturers</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has a clear succession policy in place</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.325</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.3275</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own Computation

From the analysis in Table 4.7 above it shows that the lecturers are neutral about the opportunities they have for career growth in their colleges with a score of 3.1, their
growth as professionals in the colleges with a score of 2.9, the opportunities given by the colleges to the lecturers to advance their career with a score of 2.7 and clearly established career paths in the colleges with a score of 2.6.

The lecturers generally seem to be dissatisfied with the fact that they feel they do not have a chance for advancement given their qualifications and experience with a score of 2.1, inability of the college being committed to the growth of individual lecturers with a mean score of 1.8, lack of promotions being done fairly based on competence and experience with a score of 1.7 and lack of the colleges clear succession policy with a score of 1.7. On average, the lecturers are dissatisfied with promotion opportunities in their colleges with a mean score of 2.325.

In conclusion the lecturers seem to be neutral about the opportunities they have for career growth in their colleges, their growth as professionals in the colleges, the opportunities given to them to advance their careers and clearly established career paths in the colleges. The lecturers are dissatisfied with the fact that they feel they do not have a chance for advancement given their qualifications and experience, inability of the college being committed to the growth of individual lecturers, lack of promotions being done fairly based on competence and experience and lack of the college’s clear succession policy. Overall, the lecturers are dissatisfied with promotion opportunities in their colleges.
4.4.5 Satisfaction with Co-workers

This section seeks to find out the satisfaction levels of the lecturers in regard to their co-workers as shown in Table 4.8.

**Table 4.8: Satisfaction with Co-Workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with Co-workers</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The people I work with cooperate to get the work done</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We resolve conflict honestly, effectively and quickly</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a spirit of teamwork at my College</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My group works well with other groups in this College to accomplish our organization’s goals</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in my team are good in celebrating success</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.16</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.868</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own Computation

From the analysis in Table 4.8 it shows that the lecturers are fairly satisfied with the spirit of teamwork in their colleges with a score of 4.5, the ability of their group working well with other groups in the college to accomplish organizational goals with a score of 4.4, the ability of lecturers to resolve conflicts honestly, effectively and quickly with a score of 4.2, the people they work with since they co-operate to get the work done with a score of 3.9 and that people in their team are good in celebrating success with a score of 3.8. On average, the lecturers are satisfied with their co-workers with a mean score of 4.16.

In conclusion the lecturers seem to be satisfied with the spirit of teamwork in their colleges, the ability of their group working well with other groups in the college to
accomplish organizational goals, the ability of the lecturers to resolve conflicts honestly, effectively and quickly, the people they work with since they co-operate to get the work done and that people in their team are good at celebrating success. Overall, the lecturers are satisfied with their co-workers.

From the above analysis, it can be concluded that the lecturers are satisfied with their co-workers but neutral with the work itself and employee-supervisor relations but dissatisfied with promotion opportunities they have in their colleges and their pay in that descending order. This means that the lecturers have no problem with working with each other. Job dissatisfaction is caused by the other four factors.

4.5 Intent to Leave

This section seeks to find out the lecturers desire to leave their jobs. The respondents were asked to state their intent to leave their jobs using a likert scale of 1-5 where 1 represents not at all, 2 represents low extent, 3 represents moderate extent, 4 represents great extent and 5 represents very great extent. A mean score of <1.5 represents a Not at all desire by the lecturers to leave their jobs. A mean score between 1.6 – 2.5 represents a low extent desire by the lecturers to leave their jobs. A mean score between 2.6 – 3.5 represents a moderate extent by the lecturers to leave their jobs. A mean score between 3.6 – 4.5 represents a great extent desire by the lecturers to leave their jobs and a mean score of > 4.5 represents a very great extent desire by the lecturers to leave their jobs.
The above analysis gives a mean score of 3.775. This shows that majority of the lecturers have an intent of great extent to leave their current lecturing jobs in their various colleges. This can be attributed to the fact that out of the five satisfaction factors, the lecturers are only satisfied with one factor.

### 4.5.1 Reasons for Intent to Leave

This section seeks to support the lecturers’ intent to leave their jobs. The respondents were asked to state their responses using a likert scale of 1-5 where 1 represents not at all, 2 represents low extent, 3 represents moderate extent, 4 represents great extent and 5 represents very great extent. A mean score of <1.5 represents a Not at all response of the factor causing intent to leave. A mean score between 1.6 – 2.5 represents a low extent, a mean score between 2.6 – 3.5 represents a moderate extent, a mean score between 3.6 – 4.5 represents a response of great extent and a mean score of > 4.5 represents a response of very great extent.
Table 4.10: Reasons for Intent to leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Intent to Leave Your Job</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor Staff - Supervisor relations</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor compensation and benefits</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of proper career development procedures</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Teamwork</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-Related stress</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of commitment to the organization</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Role clarity</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear expectations from peers and supervisors</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity of performance evaluation methods</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy workload</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of inefficiency</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational instability</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient communication systems</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor personnel policies</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor grievance procedures</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor recruitment procedures</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.688</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.586</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Own Computation*

The above analysis gives a mean score of 3.688. This shows that the above listed job satisfaction factors to a great extent have an influence on the intent to leave decision by the lecturers’. The most influential job satisfaction factor causing intent to leave is poor
compensation and benefits. This is in line with the lecturers’ dissatisfaction with their pay as shown in the previous analysis of satisfaction with pay.

### 4.6 Pearson Product Moment Correlation

The Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation was worked from the mean job satisfaction among the lecturers and their intent to leave.

**Table 4.11: Pearson Product Moment Correlation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean score for Job satisfaction factors</th>
<th>Intent to leave (from very great to not at all)</th>
<th>Pearson Product Moment Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.325</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Own Computation*

A negative correlation given above of –0.46 shows a relationship where intent to leave increases with decrease in job satisfaction. This shows that as job satisfaction decreases, intent to leave among the lecturers’ increases. Out of this analysis, it can be concluded that there is a relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave among lecturers of Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District where intent to leave among the lecturers increases as job satisfaction decreases.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the findings of the study as well as conclusion gathered from analysis of the data. Findings have been summarized alongside the objective of the study. Conclusions have been drawn and recommendations given.

5.2 Summary of findings

The objective of the study was to establish the relationship between Job satisfaction and Intent to leave among lecturers of Privately Owned Colleges operating in Mombasa Central Business District. The population consisted of all lecturers from the 22 Registered Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District. A total of 272 questionnaires’ were administered and 208 were fully completed hence the research was based on a response rate of 77% of the target population.

From the study findings it was observed that from the gender of the respondents there are more males than females who work as lecturers in the Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District though the difference is not major. The study also shows that majority of the lecturers are between 30-39 years of age which shows that majority of the lecturers are of middle age. The study also shows that majority of the lecturers have worked for a period of 4-5 years in the colleges. This shows that the period that the lecturers work for the colleges is not long. The study also shows that majority of
the lecturers have got the highest level of education as a degree. This is in line with the minimum qualifications needed to teach in the colleges.

From the study findings it was observed that the lecturers are satisfied with their co-workers. They have no problems with their workmates and working in groups to achieve organizational goals. The study also shows that the lecturers are neutral about satisfaction with the work itself and satisfaction with their supervisors. This means they are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their work and with their supervisors. The study also shows that the lecturers are dissatisfied with their pay and promotion opportunities they have in the colleges. These are the only two factors causing job dissatisfaction among the lecturers.

The study shows that the lecturers have a desire of great extent to leave their jobs. This can be attributed to the fact that out of the five job satisfaction components, the lecturers are only satisfied with one component which is satisfaction with co-workers. The lecturers are dissatisfied with their pay and promotion opportunities they have in the colleges which is in line with the reasons they gave for their intent to leave where poor compensation and benefits and lack of proper career development procedures contributed the most to the lecturers’ intent to leave their jobs.

From the study findings, it was found that there is a relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave among the lecturers of Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District. The Pearson Product Moment correlation shows a correlation value of -0.46. This negative correlation shows a relationship where intent to leave increases with decrease in job satisfaction.
5.3 Conclusion

From the findings it is evident that pay and promotion opportunities are major dissatisfaction factors among the lecturers which in turn influences their intent to leave. This implies that if lecturers of Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District are remunerated well for their services and if they are given opportunities for career development, then their job satisfaction is likely to increase and intent to leave their jobs will thus decline.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

The management of the Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District should improve on the pay and benefits they give to their lecturers so as to increase their level of job satisfaction.

The management should ensure that their lecturers have promotion opportunities for career development in their colleges. This will increase their satisfaction levels because they will feel they have a chance for career growth in the colleges.

The Management should also improve on the employee-supervisor relations by consulting the lecturers on key work related issues, delegating work effectively and by applying all the rules fairly to all the employees so as to increase the lecturers’ satisfaction.
Finally, the management should improve on various elements of the work such as improved working facilities and by having human resources and personnel policies that can guide the lecturers so as to increase their satisfaction with the work.

5.5 Suggestions for Future Research

Future research is needed to investigate the relationship between lecturers’ job satisfaction and the growth of Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District.

There may also be need to replicate this study to other Privately Owned Colleges in other parts of Kenya to establish whether the same relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave also exists.

5.6 Limitations of the Study

This study was carried out within Mombasa Central Business District and covered only the Privately Owned Colleges within the locality. It has thus not covered the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave among lecturers’ of Public Colleges and lecturers’ of Privately Owned Colleges in other parts of Kenya.

Since the questionnaires were administered to the lecturers using the drop and pick later method, the researcher had no control over who fills the questionnaire.
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APPENDIX I: LIST OF PRIVATELY OWNED COLLEGES IN MOMBASA CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT.

1. Designer Datamart Solutions
2. Paragon College
3. Data Networks Institute Limited
4. Coast Facilitation & Psychological Institute
5. Coast College of Commerce
6. Mombasa College of Tourism and Business Studies
7. Rifkins Business College
8. East African Centre for Maritime Affairs Limited
9. Petite School of Fashion
10. Digital Advisory & Learning Centre
11. Maritime & Management Institute of East Africa
12. Regional Institute of Professionals & Technologists
13. Yaris Data Systems
14. Today Computer Training Centre
15. Times Training Centre
16. African Institute of Research & Development Studies
17. Airways Travel Institute
18. Vision Institute
19. Kenya Institute of Professional Counselling
20. La Nova College of Hair Dressing & Beauty Limited
21. Mombasa Aviation Training Institute
22. Mombasa College of Professional Studies

Source: Ministry of Education Mombasa Office
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

PART A: GENERAL BACKGROUND (Tick where appropriate).

1. Name of Institution (optional): .................................................................

2. Gender: Male ☐ Female ☐

3. Age: 29 years and below ☐ 30-39 years ☐ 40-49 years ☐ over 50 years ☐

4. How long have you served as a lecturer in this institution?

   1-3 years ☐ 4-5 years ☐ 6-10 years ☐ over 10 years ☐

5. Which of the following qualifications do you have?

   A. Certificate ☐ B. Diploma ☐ C. Higher Diploma ☐ D. Degree ☐

   E. Masters ☐ F. PHD ☐
PART B: JOB SATISFACTION

1. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following factors: To what extent do you agree with the following statements. (Please tick appropriately).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Satisfaction with Work Itself</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My college has a good working environment (work and personal life balance, reasonable workload)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has got modernized working facilities (resources, tools, computers, materials and information)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has a good organizational structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear roles and responsibilities of staff at my college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has an efficient program for Job stress management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has got clear Human resources and personnel policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has an efficient top management leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college gives room for Innovation, creativity and change management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has got a supportive organizational culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have got flexible working hours in my college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfaction with Employee-Supervisor Relations</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel free to contact my Supervisor as &amp; when needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is clear to me what my Supervisor expects of me regarding my job performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor actively listens to my suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Supervisor is fair and consistent in applying the rules to all employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Supervisor constantly consults staff on key work related decisions and issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Supervisor possesses leadership skills and is an effective leader (i.e. shows behavior that is consistent, positive &amp; motivating?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Supervisor enables me to perform at my best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Supervisor delegates work effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Supervisor fairly evaluates my work performance on a timely basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Satisfaction with Pay</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My College provides me with a competitive pay and benefits package</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has clear policies related to salaries, raises and bonuses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The benefits programs provided by my college are satisfactory and meet my expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am fairly remunerated for my roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My College’s remuneration policy helps attract and retain high performing employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance incentives are clearly linked to objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of all the benefits I am entitled to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Satisfaction with Promotion opportunities</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are opportunities for career growth in this college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college gives me the opportunities to advance my career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am growing as a professional in this College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clearly established career path in this College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions are done fairly based on competence and experience in this college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of promotional opportunities and feel I have a chance for advancement, given my qualifications and experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My College is committed to the growth of individual lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My college has a clear succession policy in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. Satisfaction with Co-workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The people I work with cooperate to get the work done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We resolve conflict honestly, effectively and quickly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a spirit of teamwork at my College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My group works well with other groups in this College to accomplish our organization’s goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in my team are good in celebrating success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. What do you think should be done to improve your job satisfaction level as a lecturer? Why?

**PART C: INTENT TO LEAVE**

1. Do you intend to leave your institution in the near future?
   - Yes | No

2. If yes, to what extent would you desire to leave your institution?
   - Very great extent | Great extent | Moderate extent | Low extent | Not at all
3. To what extent is your response to question 2 above related to the following job satisfaction factors? (Please tick appropriately and add any comments at the space provided at the end).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Intent to Leave Your Job</th>
<th>Very Great Extent</th>
<th>Great Extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Low extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor Staff - Supervisor relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor compensation and benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of proper career development procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-Related stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of commitment to the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Role clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear expectations from peers and supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity of performance evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of inefficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational instability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient communication systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor personnel policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor grievance procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor recruitment procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Which factor/factors is the most determining on whether you will leave your job or not? Why?

5. If the factor/factors in question 5 above were improved, would you still consider leaving your job? If yes, why? If no, why not?

6. What do you think should be done to reduce intent to leave among lecturers in your college? Why?
APPENDIX III: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

University of Nairobi,
School of Business,
P.O. Box 30197,
Nairobi.

Dear Respondent,

RE: COLLECTION OF RESEARCH DATA

I am a postgraduate student in the School of Business, University of Nairobi. I am undertaking a Management Research Project on “The Relationship between Job satisfaction and Intent to leave among lecturers of Privately Owned Colleges in Mombasa Central Business District”.

In order to undertake this research, you have been selected to form part of the study. This letter is therefore to request your assistance in filling the attached questionnaire. The information you give will be treated with strict confidentiality and is needed purely for academic purposes. Where a name has been provided it will not under any circumstance appear in the final report. You will also be provided with a copy of the final report upon your request.

Your assistance and co-operation will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

Mercy Wairimu Muhorő