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Abstract
The study analyzed the relationship between employment factors contributing to teachers’ job satisfaction and academic performance among public secondary schools in Homa-Bay County. The study emanates from a background of dismal academic performance of secondary schools as alleged by Ministry of Education Report (2011) and constant complaints of working conditions by teachers. A sample of 27 principals and 129 secondary schools teachers who taught form four students in the year of the study were selected for the study. Data was collected by a Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and was analyzed by use of descriptive statistics. The analysis of variance tests was done at 0.05alpha level of significance. Employment factors that had significant relationship with teachers’ job satisfaction in high performing schools were designation, recognition by management and education staffing policy. Employment factors contributed 22.5% to job satisfaction among teachers in public secondary schools in the County. Employment factors were also predictors of job satisfaction in the schools. It was also found that academic performance is pegged on teachers’ job satisfaction. This study recommends improving teachers’ job satisfaction and academic performance in Kenya; most teachers still work in deplorable conditions. It was recommended that government improves salary and allowances for teachers and the ministry of education should encourage strong parental and community support through parent teacher association and Board of Management should ensure that secondary schools are well equipped with necessary learning facilities for quality education and improved academic performance. It is hoped that the findings of this study may be useful to the personnel involved in decision making, policy formulation and implementation, and secondary school principals towards making sure that teachers are satisfied for schools to perform highly and towards realizing the vision 2030 in education sector.
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1.0 Introduction
Job satisfaction has been defined as the attitude and feelings people have about their work. Everard, Moriris and Wilson (2004) say it is a possible cause of the current teaching crisis in Kenya resulting in low of academic achievement and national teachers’ strikes. Okumbe (1999) asserts that job dissatisfaction among teachers robs them of a sense of internal security and makes them feel unsuccessful, resulting in low school performance. He adds that job satisfaction can only be inferred and not seen. If teachers perceive that, they work harder to achieve the organizational goals than employees with similar or compatible qualifications in other sectors of
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the economy, but receive fewer rewards, they will most likely feel dissatisfied with their job. This implies that, if teachers receive their rewards equitably then they will feel satisfied with their teaching job and opt to remain in the schools so as to achieve the objectives of the organization.

Nyongesa (2007) argues that for teachers to be satisfied positive re-enforcers should be used to motivate them so as to improve productivity. Such re-enforcers include; pride, team effort, enthusiasm, praise and listening. Dissatisfaction among teachers occurs when their personal needs are not met. He identifies four major factors causing dissatisfaction which includes; terms of employment, school administration, the physical and social environment, and the attitudes of employees themselves. Terms of employment include factors such as poor remuneration, delays in payment of salaries, lack of an objective system of promotion, poor posting and forcing teachers to teach subjects they are not trained in. Autocratic heads of institutions and managers are another major cause of dissatisfaction. If teachers are not given an opportunity in the decision making process then they become dissatisfied and ineffective. A harsh geographical environment can affect a teacher’s health. Similarly a hostile community can make teachers feel insecure and ineffective in their work. Attitudes that employees bring to bear on the job can adversely affect performance. Negative attitudes to authority or to the profession affect the quality of teaching in schools Foskett and Lumby (2003).

White (2002) points out that, there is no best way, known to determine job satisfaction, or dissatisfaction. However, when teachers are dissatisfied the first step is for the administrator to determine the reasons for the dissatisfaction. She adds that there may be several causes, namely poor working conditions, lack of security, unfair pay, lack of opportunities for advancement, personal conflict among teachers and unfulfilled needs. Other causes may include unnecessary restrictions and delays in salary payments and insufficient authority to deal with employees problems. D’Souza (2009) indicates that for teachers to put out their best they have to have a feeling of personal worth and the knowledge of being appreciated.

Filack and Sheldon (2003) posit that the relevance of job satisfaction and school performance are very crucial to the long term growth of any educational system around the world. They probably rank alongside professional knowledge and skills, center competencies, educational resources and strategies as the veritable determinants of educational success and academic performance. Ubom and Joshua (2004) say that teachers are expected to render quality content to the learners. Also the ministry of education demands a very high measure of loyalty, patriotism, dedication, hard work and commitment from its teachers.

1.1 Statement of the Problem
The study was conducted among public secondary school teachers in Homa-Bay County. Secondary schools in the County have continued to register low performance in KCSE examinations. Okumbe (2008) observes that Homa-Bay district used to perform highly with KCSE examinations performance index ranging from 37.0534 to 38.0213 up to the year 2007 with teachers recording high level of job satisfaction as was signified by index 7. Nyongesa (2008) reiterates that the performance index for the district increased to 39.9021 with job satisfaction index decreasing by a small margin to 6 in the year 2008. The finding is supported by the Ministry of Education Report (2011) which indicates that Homa-Bay district, now Homa-
Bay County, used to perform well in National Examinations up to the year 2008 with teachers recording high level of job satisfaction and with better factors of employment. But this record is on a downward trend and declined seriously in the year 2010 with the performance index in KCSE examinations coming down to 33.7987 with job satisfaction index of 4, prompting DEOs and political leaders in the County to express concerns during the political caucus (Ochieng 2014). He adds that even though there are many causes of academic disparity, it is clear from the report of the Ministry of Education Science and Technology that low teachers’ employment factors are the problem causing academic decline in the County.

Based on the scenario described above, the researchers felt the need to investigate the relationship between factors of employment, teachers’ job satisfaction and academic performance among secondary schools in Homa-Bay County, Kenya.

1.2 Objectives of the Study
The study attempted to achieve the following objectives:

i. Establish the relationship between teachers’ job satisfaction and performance of students in the KCSE examinations in Homa-Bay County.

ii. Identify the employment factors that influence job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers in Homa-Bay County.

1.3 Hypothesis
(Ho1): There is no significant relationship between teachers’ job satisfaction and academic performance of students in KCSE examinations among secondary schools in Homa-Bay County.

(Ho2): There is no statistically significant relationship between employment factors and job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers in Homa-Bay County.

2.0 Research Methodology

2.1 Research Design
Descriptive research designs were used to analyze teachers’ employment factors, job satisfaction and academic performance of teachers among public secondary schools in Homa-Bay County. Descriptive research design determines and describes the manner in which conditions are. Cohen, Manion & Morrison (2000) emphasize that this type of research design is normally useful for investigating a variety of issues and problems. For example, in this study, what was looked for was what is expected as a result of academic performance when teachers are satisfied with their jobs or not satisfied. They argue that the descriptive research design has an advantage for the study of this nature due to the following reasons: It has an advantage of measuring current practices; it provides required information within a short time and the design is descriptive in its features and can help in describing the nature of what is to be correlated and can validate theoretical assumption concerning what is being investigated.

2.2 Research Location
The research was done in Homa-Bay County, Nyanza Province in western Kenya and only sampled public secondary schools were used for the study. The County comprises of the following sub-Counties; Rachuonyo South, Rachuonyo North, Homa-Bay, Suba, Ndhiwa, and
Mbita. The 2011/2012 statistical records from the office of Education Director, Homa-Bay County indicate that there are about 300 public secondary schools in the County. Lottery random sampling was applied in the selection of secondary schools. Only ten teachers and the principal were randomly selected for the study from every school that falls in the sample. The sample size was 32 secondary schools multiplied by ten teachers from each school gave a figure of 320 school teachers including principals of the schools sampled for the study.

2.3 Data Collection Instrument
Teacher questionnaire and interview schedule for the school principal were used. According to Trophim (2006), a questionnaire is a research instrument consisting of a series of questions and other prompts for the purpose of gathering information from respondents. The instrument is the tool used to collect data from the secondary school teachers in Homa-Bay County and later tested to investigate their opinion and recommendations made on the findings from the analysis of the study. There were two categories of research instruments as explained below.

2.4 Teachers Questionnaire on Job Satisfaction (TQJS)
Job satisfaction of an employee remains an important area of research in any organization around the world. This is because it aims at increasing employee performance while they are satisfied. In this research (TQJS) was a questionnaire meant to measure the level of teachers’ job satisfaction so as to determine whether it was low or high. The questionnaire was structured with closed ended items.

2.5 Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)
Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire was developed by the School of Psychology, University of Minnesota to test whether an employee is either satisfied or dissatisfied with the working organization by answering a set of items (Hoy and Miskel 2011:65). The questionnaire was modified by using the items that suited the study. It was in three parts, Part one of the questionnaire includes demographic information as well as the respondents’ achievement profiles. Part two consisted of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) consisting of 60 items describing both job content and context; all derived from the entire 16 job factors in the Herzberg Model. Part three had open ended items comprising of questions on factors affecting teachers’ job satisfaction and how it could be enhanced.

2.6 Principals’ Interview Schedule (PIS)
The principals were interviewed on the details about the relationships between teachers’ job satisfaction, factors of employment and academic performance among public secondary schools in Homa-Bay County.

2.7 Validity of the tools
According to Patton (2002), validity refers to “the extent to which an instrument can measure what ought to be measured.” It is the extent to which an instrument asks the right questions in terms of accuracy and meaningfulness which are based on research results (Mugenda and Mugenda 2003). In designing an instrument that would yield content valid data, the researchers specified the domain of indicators which were relevant to the variables being measured, to ensure that they contained all possible items that would be used in measuring the variables. The questionnaire was randomly administered to the staff of five secondary schools in Rachuonyo North District, Homa-Bay County. Fifty respondents, ten teachers from each school including
school principals participated in answering the questionnaire. However, those who participated in piloting were left out during the final study. This process was used to establish the content validity of the instruments.

2.8 Reliability of the Tools
According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), the reliability of the instrument is the measure of degree to which a research yields consistent results after repeated trials. In order to test the reliability of the instrument to be used in the study, split half method was preferred because it has a major advantage of eliminating chance error caused due to differing test conditions. Score on the odd numbering items were correlated with the scores on the even numbered items. Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient of 0.80 confirmed the reliability of the instruments.

2.9 Data Analysis
Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequency distribution). Associations among variables were measured using Pearson’s product moment coefficient. Relationships between independent and dependent variables were analyzed using multiple regressions. To find the correlation of variable (r), Pearson’s product moment coefficient formula was used which is given as:

\[ r = \frac{N \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{[N\sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2][\sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2]}} \]

\[ t = r \sqrt{\frac{n-2}{1-r^2}} \]

The results in tables and graphs and employed content analysis in analyzing qualitative data from interviews and open ended sections of questionnaires in which the results were written down in summary form and presented according to emerging sub-themes (Kerlinger, 2003).

3.0 Results and Discussion

The information from the respondents was keyed in the SPSS system version 16.0 software and was analyzed using Pearson’s product moment coefficient, multiple regressions and presented according to research objectives. Demographic responses gathered from the teachers, are included to supplement the quantitative findings. The interview which was conducted and the open ended questions were analyzed using qualitative techniques.

3.1 Teachers Job satisfaction and demographic information among teachers in Homa-Bay County

Table 1: Distribution of respondents by gender, age group length of service and terms of employment
Of the 129 respondents, 90 (70%) were males and 39 (30%) females; 61 (47.5%) were aged between 20 and 30 years and 23 (33.4%) were aged between 31 to 40 years, 34 (14.4%) were aged between 41 to 50 years while only 11 (4.1%) were aged above 50 years of age. This shows that teaching services is dominated by young and recent graduates who have the ability to improve academic performance and whose job satisfaction level is still high Table I

### 3.2 Relationship Between Employment Factors and Teachers’ Job Satisfaction Among Secondary Schools

The null hypothesis was: there is no significant relationship between employment factors and job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers in Homa-Bay County. To test this hypothesis the study first asked teachers to rate the employment factors that impacted on their job satisfaction. The teachers’ ratings of the employment factors ranged from 1 (least satisfied) to 6 (extremely satisfied). There was no teacher who rated all the seventeen employment factors uniformly. This means that each factor influenced the level of job satisfaction differently. There was no factor that was dominant in the ratings.

To establish the relationship between employment factors and job satisfaction among secondary schools, the ratings of employment factors were correlated with teachers’ job satisfaction indices using Pearson Production Moment Correction Coefficient. The results are as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Correlation Matrix Showing relationship Between Employment Factors and Teachers’ Job Satisfaction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X_1</th>
<th>X_2</th>
<th>X_3</th>
<th>X_4</th>
<th>X_5</th>
<th>X_6</th>
<th>X_7</th>
<th>X_8</th>
<th>X_9</th>
<th>X_10</th>
<th>X_11</th>
<th>X_12</th>
<th>X_13</th>
<th>X_14</th>
<th>X_15</th>
<th>X_16</th>
<th>X_17</th>
<th>X_18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Computed value of 0.464 was greater than the set p-value.
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\[ r = \frac{\text{Pearson's correlation coefficient}}{\text{Set p-value}} \]

\[ \text{Sig.} = \begin{cases} \text{**} & \text{p-value < 0.01} \\ \text{*} & \text{0.01 < p-value < 0.05} \\ \text{.} & \text{0.05 < p-value < 0.10} \\ \text{–} & \text{p-value > 0.10} \end{cases} \]

\[ X_{12} \text{ - Challenging responsibilities} \]

\[ X_5 \text{ - School performance in KCSE} \]

\[ X_1 \text{ - Designation} \]

\[ X_3 \text{ - Job security} \]

\[ X_4 \text{ - Working Environment} \]

\[ X_2 \text{ - Teacher Experience} \]

\[ X_6 \text{ - Negative achievement} \]

\[ X_7 \text{ - Positive achievement} \]

\[ X_8 \text{ - Recognition} \]

\[ X_9 \text{ - Working Age} \]

\[ X_{10} \text{ - Education staffing policy} \]

\[ X_{11} \text{ - Terms and conditions of service} \]

\[ X_{12} \text{ - Fringe benefits} \]

\[ X_{13} \text{ - Remedial tuition} \]

\[ X_{14} \text{ - Salary} \]

\[ X_{15} \text{ - Ability to influence decision} \]

\[ X_{16} \text{ - Promotion opportunity} \]

\[ X_{17} \text{ - Further training} \]

\[ X_{18} \text{ - Job satisfaction} \]

In Table 2 can be observed that there was a positive correlation between designation and teachers’ level of job satisfaction of 0.356. The correlation was significant as the computed correlation of 0.000 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05. This means that designation positively influenced teachers’ job satisfaction. Teachers’ experience contributed negatively to their level of job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was -0.06. The correlation was not statistically significant as the computed value of 0.464 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05. Job security contributed positively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was 0.027. The relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.760 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05.

Working environment contributed negatively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was -0.07. The relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.404 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05. During the verbal interview one of the principals stated that, “When the working environment is conducive such that physical facilities are adequate, appropriate, and there is good social relation among teachers, then they are likely to be job satisfied in their institutions. This is because teachers will be comfortable at work”. This is in agreement with Mutiso (2005) who adds that a good environment for the secondary school teacher should include adequate classrooms with enough space for 40 students, adequate dormitories with enough space for each student, acceptable laboratories- number and
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size, work space for the teacher, playing ground for the students and library, machinery and automobiles.

Working condition is a major factor for any teacher in Kenya. The condition in which one works usually determines his job satisfaction and ability to deliver on the objectives of the organization. For the teachers in the County to work well the condition must be conducive without this academic performance is bound to suffer. This is in support of Johnson and Holdaway (2004) who say that working condition of an employee determines and improves his/her job satisfaction. School performance in KCSE examination contributed negatively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was -0.1. The relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.243 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05.

Challenging responsibility contributed negatively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was -0.13. The relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.133 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05. Nyongesa (2007) reiterates that responsibility and accountability are important in the teaching profession for students’ academic achievement. Positive achievement contributed negatively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was -0.11. The relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.225 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05. Johnson and Holdaway (2004) assert that the significance of recognition for achievement, advancement and responsibility are significant variables. They extended their analysis to include positive achievement and a sense of accomplishment in connection with satisfaction of teachers. Their findings showed that true job satisfaction is derived from gratification of high order needs.

Recognition by management contributed positively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was -0.207. The relationship was significant because the calculated p-value of 0.017 was less than the set p-value of 0.05. This means that, more recognition by management reduced job satisfaction of the teachers. During an interview, a principal reported that, “appreciating one’s effort motivates him/her thus enhancing job satisfaction.” When teachers effort is recognized in whatever work they do, they become motivated. This is in line with the observations of Hockman and Oldham (2014) who state that how satisfied individuals are with certain aspects of their work context may affect their willingness to respond positively to enrich work. Those who are relatively satisfied with job security, pay, co-worker relations, and supervision tend to respond more positively to job characteristics, thus having a high level of context satisfaction.

Age contributed negatively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was -0.16. The relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.075 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05. Education staffing policy contributed positively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was -0.231. The relationship was statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.01 was less than the set p-value of 0.05. This means that, education policy increased job satisfaction of the teachers. Terms and conditions of service contributed negatively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was -0.03. The relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.707 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05.
Fringe benefits contributed negatively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was -0.01. The relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.91 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05. Remedial tuition contributed positively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was 0.01. The relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.9 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05. Salary contributed negatively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was -0.1. The relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.25 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05.

The study reveals that most teachers would enjoy greater job satisfaction if their pay was improved. During the interview, one principal said that, “teachers need better pay to meet basic needs and other requirements in life.” He went further to explain that this would make a teacher feel comfortable and concentrate in his/her work of teaching instead of looking for additional income sources elsewhere to satisfy his/her needs. Mutiso (2005) observes that in the U.S.A, salary and allowances are some of the most important reasons for leaving teaching profession especially for those with alternative career options. He adds that in China, both level and reliability of remuneration may be important. Sargent & Hannum (2000) also argue that most teachers quit their jobs because of heavy loads compared to their pay which is too low. UNESCO and ILO (2014) recommended that salary scales should be reviewed periodically to take into account factors like rising cost of living, increased productivity leading to higher standards of living in the country or a general upward movement in wage or salary levels.

Ability to influence decisions contributed negatively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was -0.08. The relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.381 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05. One of the principals interviewed indicated that, “involving teachers in decision-making enhances their job satisfaction.” This is because it makes teachers feel part of the institution and own whatever decision passed, hence implementing such a decision becomes very easy. Mutiso (2005) notes that administrators and policy makers should begin thinking of how to satisfy psychological needs such as feelings of responsibility and accomplishment make people work harder, and also involve teachers in decision making so as to own the decision that affect the school.

Promotion opportunity contributed positively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was 0.11. However, the relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.228 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05. Some of teachers argued that fair promotion leads to their job satisfaction. One of the teachers reported that “promotion of teachers should be made automatic for teachers who have attained the set requirements to avoid frustrating a teacher’s upward movement for too long. When a teacher over stays in one grade he/she becomes frustrated hence job dissatisfaction is likely to set in. One of the principals interviewed also indicated that, “promotion based on merit leads to teachers’ job satisfaction.” This is the view expressed by Owen (2004) who posits that lack of teachers’ professional progression and promotion as some of the drawbacks in education. Promotions and prospects for upward mobility of teachers are not very many, fair promotion of teachers to a higher grade on merit increases their job satisfaction making them feel worthy in the development of economy of the country.
Further training contributed positively to teachers’ job satisfaction as the Pearson r correlation coefficient was 0.12. Nonetheless, the relationship was not statistically significant because the calculated p-value of 0.162 was greater than the set p-value of 0.05. A respondent stated, “There should be a scheme for progressive training, structured promotion from one level to another based on ability and experience and for handsome pay, attractive housing scheme, and soft loans for cars, a well-defined leave packages and a defined professionally acceptable working hours. During the interview a principal interview replied; “When a teacher is given a chance to advance his education he performs better academically in the subjects of instruction.” The Master Plan on Education of 1997 recognizes this and recommended that the Ministry of Education should develop and implement criteria for teachers’ professional progression in order to raise their motivation (Ifinedo (2004)).

3.3 Statistical Analysis on Teachers Job Satisfaction and Academic performance

There is no significant relationship between teachers’ job satisfaction and academic performance of students in KCSE examinations among secondary schools in Homa-Bay County.

Table3: Pearson correlation of job satisfaction and students’ academic performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>r = -0.01, p&lt; 0.0001</th>
<th>Variables, N=320</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Performance schools</strong></td>
<td>r. KCSE2009 (P) KCSE2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students perform well in all subjects</td>
<td>0.0720 0.2775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students enrollment is high</td>
<td>0.0932 0.8072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education policy</td>
<td>0.1197 0.2238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with colleagues</td>
<td>0.1425 0.4436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students undertake exchange program</td>
<td>0.1626 0.1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated by performance</td>
<td>0.1836 0.2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation and recognition</td>
<td>0.2896 0.6137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive achievement</td>
<td>0.3350 0.9994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top priority in academic performance</td>
<td>0.3539 0.8348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for creativity</td>
<td>0.3741 0.9965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good pay incentives</td>
<td>0.4039 0.6170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students undertake exchange program</td>
<td>0.4171 0.9938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Performance schools</strong></td>
<td>r. KCSE 2009 (P) KCSE2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good class attendants</td>
<td>0.0482 0.0414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical supervision</td>
<td>0.0897 0.1410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with teaching occupation</td>
<td>0.1216 0.2874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much class load</td>
<td>0.0715 0.6405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach too many classes</td>
<td>0.1218 0.3555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much bickering &amp; fighting</td>
<td>0.1607 0.9954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabi coverage</td>
<td>0.1997 0.6388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University intake is high</td>
<td>0.2770 0.8538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second area of investigation was the relationship between teachers’ job satisfaction and students’ academic performance in KCSE examination in Homa-Bay County. Table 3 shows the results of the Pearson correlation Coefficient test indicating that there is significant relationship between job satisfaction and academic performance ($r=0.01$, $p<0.0001$). The correlation is strong and statistically significant. It implies that there is relationship between teacher’s job satisfaction and students’ academic performance, a teacher who is satisfied is likely to deliver than a teacher who is dissatisfied. The KCSE in 2009 results for low school performance with the variables shown in the table indicating how the schools in Homa-Bay County performed, students perform well in all subjects had the least value of ($r=0.0720$, $p<0.2775$), high students enrollment ($r=0.0932$, $p<0.8072$). In 2011 KCSE results for the low performing schools recorded good improvement. For the high performing schools technical supervision ($r=0.0897$, $p<0.1410$) and class attendants recording the least value of ($r=0.0482$, $p<0.0414$).

The study found out that of the 129 respondents, 90 (70%) were males and 39 (30%) females; 61 (47.5%) were aged between 20 and 30 years and 23 (33.4%) were aged between 31 to 40 years, 34 (14.4%) were aged between 41 to 50 years while only 11 (4.1%) were aged above 50 years of age. This shows that teaching services is dominated by young and recent graduates who have the ability to deliver so as to improve academic performance and whose job satisfaction level is still high.

The first objective was to identify the employment factors that influence job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers in Homa-Bay County. The null hypothesis was; there is no statistically significant relationship between employment factors and job satisfaction among public secondary school teachers in Homa-Bay County. To establish the relationship between employment factors and job satisfaction among secondary schools, the ratings of employment factors were correlated with teachers’ job satisfaction indices using Pearson Production Moment Correction Coefficient and it was observed that there was a positive correlation between job satisfaction and the following: Job security, nature of work, positive achievement in the school and recognition, job excellence, technical supervision, further training opportunity, assessment for performance, salary and allowances, feedback on positive academic performance, ability to influence school performance and relationship with the society.

The second objective of the study was to establish the relationship between teachers’ job satisfaction and performance of students in the KCSE examinations in Homa-Bay County. For this objective the hypothesis was; there is no significant relationship between teachers’ job satisfaction and performance of students in KCSE examinations among secondary schools in Homa-Bay County. The results of the Pearson correlation Coefficient test indicate that there is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and academic performance ($r=0.01$, $p<0.0001$). The correlation is strong and statistically significant. It therefore implies that there is relationship between teacher’s job satisfaction and students’ academic performance, a teacher who is satisfied with his/her work usually delivers as opposed to a teacher who is dissatisfied.

4.0 Conclusion
There was a significant relationship between gender and job satisfaction with pay and supervision; female employees were found to be more satisfied with pay than their male counterparts, whereas, males were more satisfied with supervision. Employment factors that had significant relationship with teachers’ job satisfaction in schools were designation,
recognition by management and education staffing policy. Employment factors contributed 22.5% to job satisfaction among teachers in public secondary schools in the County. Employment factors were also predictors of job satisfaction among teachers in public secondary schools. Employment factors that emerged to be very important to teachers of the county were; salary, working condition, promotion, and job security. Working conditions and working environment greatly determined job satisfaction level of teachers. As for the relationship between job satisfaction and academic performance; the results shows significant relationship, teachers who are satisfied with their teaching job work hard to achieve the school objectives.
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