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ABSTRACT

The concept of job satisfaction has been having a widespread interest but very little attention has been focused on job satisfaction amongst Parliamentary Joint Services employees in Kenya. This is because the majority of the studies conducted on job satisfaction have focused on measuring levels of job satisfaction of employees rather than determining which factors influence job satisfaction on an employee. This study intended to evaluate the determinants of employee job satisfaction of Parliamentary Joint Services Kenya. Three job satisfaction dimensions were identified and they included leadership, meritocracy, and working conditions. The study adopted the Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory and Edwin A. Locke’s Range of Affect Theory which the study was based on. This theory has been used as a framework for research concerning employee motivation in the workplace since 1959. The relevance of the above theory to this work is evidence that employees have expectations on their jobs that act as factors that influence their perception of job satisfaction on the job and enhance performance. The Researcher relied on primary data which was collected using a questionnaire. The questionnaire was in four parts, Part A collected personal data of the responses. Part B on factors affecting job satisfaction and Part C on employees perception on pay and related benefits, were presented as a five-point Likert scale and Part D consisted of an open-ended question aimed at allowing the respondents to add any other information. The total population was 160 employees, and 120 employees from the different departments in the Parliamentary Joint Services responded to the questionnaires. This was drawn by the use of proportionate sampling technique. The study adopted a descriptive research design which was to bring out the reality on the perception of job satisfaction of employees. The data collected was analyzed and presented in topical discussions, tables, and graphs as appropriate. This study has drawn attention to the importance of the relationships between leadership, meritocracy and working conditions and job satisfaction in the Parliamentary Joint Services. Results indicated that the respondents were not confident with the leadership, 76% of respondents were not satisfied with the limited number of training offered and that in terms of working conditions, 24% of respondents indicated that deadlines and targets were realistic and those who thought otherwise were 23%.
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Definition of Operational Terms

Employee Job satisfaction-It is a measure of how happy employees agree with their job and working environment. Employee job satisfaction is the terminology used to demonstrate whether employees are happy or contented and fulfilling their desires and needs at work.

Working Conditions-Refers to aspects of space, surroundings, and status in workplaces.

Employee-This is a person who works in the service of another person under an express or implied contract of service.

Career advancement-This is the process by which employees' progress through a series of stages, each characterized by a different set of developmental tasks, activities, and relationships.

Job Security-This is a feeling which involves being able to hold onto the job, being sure that all will be well with the job in the future as in the past.

Job Advancement-This is the promotion of an employee within a company position of the job task.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the study

Employee Job satisfaction has received much attention to all the research among all the work-related attitudes, (Locke & Latham, 2002). Employee job satisfaction is the level where individuals like or do not like their job. An individual who is satisfied with his/her job is more dedicated to their job, while an employee who is not satisfied with his/her job is less dedicated to their job (Marion, 2001). Employee job satisfaction is a concern for researchers all worldwide who focus on measuring employee attitude towards their work, resignation from work and missing work intentionally. Organizations aim at ensuring their employees are satisfied to maximize their productivity and efficiency (Shah & Jalees, 2004). Employee job satisfaction is therefore very important and is often gauged by organizations. Rating scales are the most used measures of job satisfaction and employees use them to record their attitudes towards work.

According to (Sokaya, 2000), many developing economies have rejuvenated interest in the degree of performance in the public sector, since they compete more in the global environment. Several studies have enumerated that employee' commitment to their work affects their performance, which leads to their attitudes of being motivated by personal characteristics and job characteristics.
1.2. Employee Job Satisfaction

Satisfied employees are happy and therefore are more productive and the prosperity of their organization depends on their satisfaction (Saari & Judge, 2004). Job satisfaction can be perceived as a level where an employee’s affective orientation affects their position in the workplace either positively or negatively (Tsigilis, 2006). The happier the employees are with their work, the more satisfied with their work the more satisfied they are said to be.

Multiple factors have been identified by researchers crucial to job satisfaction however, majority of them agree on the core factors of salary, job, and oversight, job elevation to the next position, work environment, and co-workers (Williams & Sandler, 1995); (Wiedmer & S, 1998); (Saari & Judge, 2004). Different group titles are being used to represent dimensions of the job satisfaction, for example, “personal and job characteristics, difficult tasks, equal benefits, conducive working environment, colleagues who encourage each other, good attitude and social interaction (Bajpai & Srivastava, 2002).

The effects of the core factors vary with the variables in demographic attributes of the employees. Several demographic variables exist amongst employees, which affect the levels of satisfaction from salary, job, work oversight, etc. For example, sex, age, literacy level, duties and responsibilities at work, work experience and whether the employees are single or married, have widely been found to affect Job satisfaction in one way or another (Wiedmer & S, 1998); (Marion, 2001); (Shah & Jalees, 2004); (Eker, Adem, & Lalac, 2007). The study will explore the drawbacks of employee job satisfaction among the workforce in the Parliamentary Joint Services.
Job satisfaction is said to be realized if an individual tends to appreciate some parts of the job more than the others. According to (Broom, 1966), employee satisfaction is viewed as a “positive perception of an individual on the job which the individual is holding currently”. Spector, (1997), observed that employee job satisfaction is the level where people appreciate or do not appreciate their jobs. Job satisfaction is generally the perception that individuals have about their jobs. The relationship of job satisfaction with various variables is achievement, advancement, benefits or allowances, group work, promotion, cooperation, job stress, mentoring and training needs, the development, management, and recognition of success. An assumption is made that an employee’s degree of satisfaction is determined by his/her attitude; therefore, a happy employee is very productive and vice versa.

Job satisfaction occurs as a result of an employee experiencing obligations, recognition, work, and achievement, advancement, and the possibility of growth. Addressing these influencers will lead to a majority of the employees being satisfied resulting in good results. Job satisfaction is meant to be assessed by looking at how productive the employees are, ensuring employees stay at their job and expenses related to employees leaving jobs, skipping work, quality of outputs and dedication to the institution. Assessing the degree of job satisfaction is a crucial element for the employer to undertake. Job satisfaction assessments are classified into two categories: Single question and multiple-item measures (Spector, 1997).

For Single query, it measures queries asked for example; are you content of not content with your work? (Quinn, 1974). A respondent can consequently be accorded with a scale of measure from contentment to discontentment or vice versa. Multiple item measures, ask questions that
respondents' rate the different aspects of their job on a scale running from degrees of dissatisfaction to degrees of satisfaction. According to (Lawler III, 1971), job satisfaction form is important for scientists to comprehend more about being away from work and moving from work.

Organizations should always make sure that employees are comfortable with their jobs to reduce the cases of employees avoiding to go to work and resignations from their places of work, leading to organizations performance being compromised, which is an expense. Performance is measured by how accurate an individual or individuals fulfil their job descriptions. According to (Donnelly, 1994) performance should be gauged correctly and systematically to ensure benefits are equally shared.

1.3. Job Satisfaction Variables

There are several demographic variables among the workforce, which influence the degrees of job satisfaction apart from pay, work and supervision. This study explored three variables, that is, leadership, meritocracy and working conditions of the employees which have widely been found critical in determining Job satisfaction (Marion, 2001). It also explored the problems of job satisfaction among the employees in the public sector in Kenya with special emphasis to the Parliamentary Joint Services.

1.4. Statement of the problem

One of the fundamental elements of effective leadership in an organization is job satisfaction. It has indicators that include high results, high self-esteem and commitment to work while
indicators of job dissatisfaction include low results, low self-esteem, and lack of commitment, absenteeism and reluctance to take up leadership positions.

The study of employees’ attitude towards their work and job satisfaction has contributed a substantial body of knowledge about what makes people happy or unhappy with their jobs. Literature provides evidence for a strong relationship between job satisfaction and specific individual social-economic characteristics, namely gender, education, working hours, trade union and establishment size (Lang & Johnson, 1994).

Even though union membership is positively related to wages, it has a negative effect on the job satisfaction due to the so called “exit voice” (Freeman & Medoff, 1984) that is, dissatisfied union workers tend to remain in their jobs and express their complaints through the union whereas dissatisfied non-union workers tend to leave. Miller (1990), found that, although unionized members feel more satisfied with salaries, benefits and job security, their satisfaction with all other facets of their jobs is so low that their reported job satisfaction is overall lower compared to that of the non-unionized employees.

The main concern for the research is the fact that minimal focus has been channeled on job satisfaction amongst Parliamentary Joint Services employees in Kenya despite the widespread interest in the concept of job satisfaction, majority of the research conducted on job satisfaction have concentrated on measuring the level of job satisfaction of employees rather than determining which factors affect job satisfaction on an employee.
The objective of the research was to examine the determinants of employee job satisfaction in the Parliamentary Joint Services employees in Kenya.

1.5. Objective of the study

i. To establish the extent to which leadership influences employee job satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Services.

ii. To determine the extent to which meritocracy enhances employee job satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Services.

iii. To examine the extent to which working conditions have a relationship with employee job satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Services.

1.6. Research questions

i. Does leadership influence employee job satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Services?

ii. Does meritocracy enhance employee job satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Services?

iii. Do working conditions have a relationship with employee job satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Services?

1.6. Justification and Significance

The performance of the public sector workers in Kenya has been a major concern to the Kenyan people. It has been characterized by low work performance and poor service delivery. The problem indicators include: absenteeism from work, lateness, corruption, and theft, very many complaints, low quality of work output and high turn-over of professional staff.
There is a need therefore to undertake research aimed at understanding the motivating factors in the public sector employees in Kenya.

The main objective of the study was to explore the determinants of employee job satisfaction in the Parliamentary Joint Services Kenya. It is generally accepted that the Kenyan public sector workers are highly qualified and experienced and that they have the ability to perform. This is attested to by the curriculum vitae they possess.

An efficient and motivated public sector is critical for good governance, delivery of public goods and services, formulation and implementation of economic policy and management of public resources. (Johns, 1996), affirms that motivation has become even more important in contemporary organizations as a result of the need for increased productivity and to be globally competitive.

The findings of this research project helped gain insight into ways and means of proper management of public service staff in the Parliamentary Joint Services to increase efficiency and curb wastages incurred through a non-professional workforce. The research enabled the management to evaluate the effectiveness of the incentives and retention measures put in place then use them to revise failing techniques and adopt successful ones. The study highlighted the impact of a satisfied workforce through efficient and effective service delivery to its clients.

1.7. Scope and Limitations

The research was at the Parliamentary Joint Services. Since the study was conducted on public employees of Parliamentary Joint Service, the drawback is that the generalization of this study to
other public servants may not be appropriate. This is due to the organization differences, work involved, government policy implementation, among other issues in conflict with the appropriateness and relevance to other public service operations. Administering the questionnaire may have been biased as the responses of the respondents were the results used for analysis. Their answers might have been subject to their perceptions and opinions and further may have been viewed by how someone felt about the question at hand (Nelson, 2006), (Roelen, Koopmans, Groothoff, Klink, & Bültmann, 2010).
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Employee Job Satisfaction on Global Level

There is literature on job satisfaction trying to investigate and comprehend the job satisfaction issues in the developed world. For example, (Ellickson & Logsdon, K., 2001) investigated the determinants of job satisfaction between the municipal government employees in the USA. Rocca & Kostanski, (2001), researched the connection between burnout and job satisfaction while (Nelson, 2006), researched the connection between job satisfaction and psychological contract in Australia.

People view job satisfaction of employees from different angles, that is, institutional participation and dedication, locus of the focus of control and different personalities, suppressing of stress and also the demographic opinions established on employees’ age, race, nationality, gender and education (Wiedmer & S, 1998). Employees who are not satisfied, exhibit increased likelihood for counterproductive behaviors like disengagement, fatigue and workplace aggression (Ellickson & Logsdon, K, 2001); (Eliason, 2006); (Moynihan & SK. Pandey, 2007).

Antecedent variables are in two common categories that are, Environmental factors, which are personal characteristics which focus on job satisfaction and personal qualities (Ellickson & Logsdon, K., 2001); (Rocca & Kostanski, 2001). The prowess of such professionals is what the Public sector depends on as they execute government policies successfully. Research reports indicate that the leading qualities of the Public Sector institutions that are paid, formalism and inflexibility and restricted promotion chances hinder the most eligible and executive employees
from working in the public establishments (Barrows & Wesson, T, 2001); (Linz & Susan J, 2003).

There are distinct strategies used to evaluate job satisfaction in various institutions, and the strategies directly or completely apply two types of variables as the determinant factor of job satisfaction as well as employees’ individual qualities and the environmental qualities or the institution (Moynihan & SK. Pandey, 2007); (Kuchinke, Ardichvili, Borchert, & Rozanski, 2009). Likewise, variations exist among various developed countries as well (Rocca & Kostanski, 2001); (Eliason, 2006).

Corresponding research was done of the professionals in Russia, Poland, and Germany and it showed that employees were all different in terms of work centrality, preferred or desired work outcomes, work responsibility recognition and degrees of job and career satisfaction. Respondents from the three countries had different opinions on all relevant demographic characteristics, including age, education level, and job classification, gender, and industry representation. The study revealed that the specimen was in their mid-career stage, mostly male, had professional education and training and worked as managers and technical professionals in manufacturing and service industries (Kuchinke, Ardichvili, Borchert, & Rozanski, 2009).

Personality type was revealed to be in many ways connected to the management of stress of men than women. Women employees are not highly contented with their work than their men peers (Wiedmer & S, 1998). Factors in the organization such as sufficient work tools, resources, and capacity development and an equitable workload dispensation also remarkably and certainly affect job satisfaction (Rocca & Kostanski, 2001).
Institutional perspectives of job satisfaction are affected by institutional variables connecting to the equipment for work, needed resources, well-distributed workload, proper training opportunities, etc. Job satisfaction of public sector employees is mostly reliant on the environmental qualities and not on individual qualities. Therefore, creation of the best employee environment is the strongest and conclusive factor in the job satisfaction of civil servants (Ellickson & Logsdon, K., 2001).

However, on demographic factors such as gender, age, and education more investigations should be done (Kuchinke, Ardichvili, Borchert, & Rozanski, 2009). The issue of job satisfaction has been researched broadly in various environments. The author maintains that work-related factors and demographics have outstanding effects on employees (Wiedmer & S, 1998); (DeVaney SA & Chen ZS ., 2003); (Linz & Susan J, 2003). Low regard to the institutions where the respondents worked was another discovery that intersects the three countries. This might be a confirmation of the existence of reduced years of working with the same employer, in the three Countries, the disappointment with expectations of being with the same employer for a long period, and overriding inclination on ones' career and life interests against institutional attitude.

This occurrence is most of the time identified as "American conditions", in Germany which means a releasing of precautionary as well as constraining labor laws, reduction of lifetime employment arrangements, higher prevalence's of industry-wide job shifts and displacements, reduction of role of labor unions, and, generally, a reduction of the psychological contract that once simplified and organized mutual responsibilities and rights between employees and employers (Kuchinke, Ardichvili, Borchert, & Rozanski, 2009). An empirical study conducted
among civil servants in a Middle Eastern country showed that, despite cultural issues, workers with higher levels of satisfaction committed themselves more in a process of change in the organizational structure (Yousef, 2001).

2.2. Employee Job Satisfaction in Africa

Hinks, (2009), analyzed the determinants of job satisfaction by looking at the effect of a racial class, the existence of an employment equity plan, and earnings on job satisfaction. He used the Mesebetsi labor data for 1999 for workers aged 18 to 65 and found that affirmative action in the organization influences black workers’ job satisfaction but notably decreases job satisfaction of colored workers. Research on ‘burnout, job satisfaction, and work situations' has been done (Aguna, Ojomo, & NA, 1997). Another research on individual associated variables of job satisfaction in public sector organizations and their influence on the theory and practice of management in least developed countries were also done in Nigeria (Tella A, 2007).

Pillay, (2008), studied the satisfaction of professional nurses in South Africa and his study revealed that there was general job discontentment among respondents. Nevertheless, respondents were content with taking care of patients and relationships among themselves. Public sector nurses were greatly discontented with the workload, and resources, while private sector nurses were moderately discontented with the workload, opportunities to grow, and pay.

According to (Abugre, 2014), job satisfaction for public administration workers in Ghana is on a extremely low level, although with a number of differences in educational background. The most current contribution of (Falco, Maloney, B., & Sarrias, 2015), utilizes the Ghana Urban
Household Panel Survey (GUHPS) to study job satisfaction across various sectors in Ghana. A mixed (stochastic parameter) ordered probit estimators is adopted to characterize the distribution of subjective wellbeing across employment sectors. According to the results, the more advantageous type of employment is self-employment. Distinctively, employees look unconcerned between formal salaried employment, self-employment without employees, and civil service/public sector employment. Aside from these studies, job satisfaction in Sub-Saharan countries has received little recognition, in part due to a lack of data.

2.3. Employee Job Satisfaction in Kenya

With the impact of population on job satisfaction in Kenya, researchers have produced various answers. Like the dispositional variables, which are control variables not supported as separate resulting to the noted variances in contentment and attachment among agricultural technicians still appeared to be more satisfied, dedicated, and showed purpose to remain than their colleagues in the public sector (Mulinge, 2000). In the industrial and organizational psychology and the sociology of work and occupations, the notions of job satisfaction and organizational attachment are some of the most studied (Mulinge, 2000).

In Kenya, the topical focus on public sector institutions is the connection linking the individual and work qualities, and dependent factors of the workplace (Sokaya, 2000). Though job satisfaction is a common issue, it is still a struggle for developed countries and Kenya to understand the topic and come up with the most effective measures to handle employee issues that is, participation, devotion, skipping work, and turnover through generating and sustaining
job satisfaction. Nevertheless, because of environmental variances, Kenya has many worries compared to the advanced world.

In a multiple regression analysis studies, there was a linkage connecting employee satisfaction and client satisfaction in Mwalimu National Savings and Credit Cooperative Society. It centered on evolution, inspirational level, employee development and their outcomes on customer satisfaction in Mwalimu National Savings and Credit Cooperative Organization. Through the Pearson correlation coefficient between employee satisfaction and client satisfaction, the research revealed there was a powerful productive connection linking employee work-life disputes and client satisfaction followed by capacity development and employee inspirational degrees. The research proposes that the satisfaction index of both employee and client should have equal levels of recognition because statistically a remarkable connection links client satisfaction and employee satisfaction.

Mwiti, (2007), observed that motivated people attain definite objectives and accomplishment of these goals which promotes job satisfaction. The research focused on management, collaboration and capacity development, careers and job progress chances, employee empowerment, employees' involvement in decision making, working conditions, and financial benefits as job satisfaction factors that forecast employee job satisfaction. The research revealed that employee satisfaction is achieved by supplying different variables that entail improved working conditions; empowered and involved staff, rewarded and recognized collaboration, training, and development. The results agreed with (Anyango, 2011), who researched the influence of reward system on employees job satisfaction. The research utilized, complaint handling, reward systems,
the predictors of employee job satisfaction and employer-employee connections. The results of the research revealed a beneficial connection linking job satisfaction and employee job satisfaction. Mehta (2012), observed association research to investigate if job satisfaction assessment and working environment are connected with job satisfaction and if these two variables have any objective on employee's resolve to leave an organization, in the IT industry. Additionally, it was revealed that job satisfaction assessment and working environment did not influence job satisfaction. In contrast, (Anitha, 2014) in her studies observe that employees are the most worth assets in any institution Consequently, enhancing employees’ job satisfaction may help an institution attain and preserve a victorious and fruitful business.

2.4. Leadership

Ojokuku, (2012), noted that one of the most important management skills is leadership which incorporates the capacity of the boss to confidently guide a team concerning a recurrent objective. Chemers (2014), observed that the rise or fall of an institution is determined by the leadership style used in an institution. The relationship between a subordinate and a leader and the employee and job satisfaction is influenced by the leadership style adopted by a leader (P. Nixon, Harrington, & Parker, 2012).

Job satisfaction does not happen in a vacuum but relies on organizational variables such as leadership (Dimitriades, 2007) which constitutes organizational climate. The presence of a leader is ordinary to all institutions, be it formal or informal, service or industrial. To achieve organizational goals, the leader works through a group or groups and to achieve these goals, the
leaders follow one leadership style or another, which will manipulate culture towards service delivery.

Whatever leadership style (such as autocratic, bureaucratic, charismatic, transactional, transformational, etc.) that is acquired will dictate the kind of collaboration and connection that will survive between the leaders and their subordinates. When management hires an employee to help in the set organizational goals, he brings to the organization his desires, preferences, biases and personal goals. Traditional management approaches majorly used mechanistic leadership styles while contemporary management has adopted humanistic styles (Schein, 2004). This former is however still largely practiced in organizations that run in a stable market environment, pay attention to internal organizational environments and give less importance to high dedicated human resource practices.

Autocratic leaders exert personal authority over all resolutions and take limited or no input from followers or subordinates. This kind of leadership has no shared vision. (Ojokuku, 2012). Bureaucratic leaders depend much on operations and strategies to reach institutional objectives. Instead of being devoted to people, these leaders are strongly committed to processes and procedures, to them strategies come before people. These leaders are most of the time faced with a lot of opposition from employees in most cases (Samaitan, 2014). Democratic leaders lead themselves making it laborious to agree to this type of leadership even in the tiniest resolution. These leaders are deficient in coming up with resolutions and delicate implementation is important here (Nwokolo, Ifeanacho, & Anazodo, 2017). Charismatic leaders have a perception and a character that influences people to accomplish that vision. Transactional leaders are always
inclined to offer something in favor of supporting them but have issues with assumptions. When there are no resources to be used for rewarding that is when a problem occurs (Srivastava, 2016). Transformational leaders work concerning transforming those that they lead to duplicate their ego-centric leadership. They have the prowess and understanding to influence people in their surroundings (Mamo, 2017).

Zhang, et al., (2015), analyzed the effects of leadership styles on approaches utilized to keep talents on the usefulness of post-Merger and Acquisition (M&A) integration in a Chinese context. The research was determined from an exhaustive examination of an M&A case study. Leadership styles were visualized into, authoritative, task-focused, relationship-focused and coaching. The strategy used by leaders to adapt to a coaching style was the incentive structure strategy to keep talent, whereas authoritative leaders used good organizational communication strategy to keep skills. Relationship-focused leaders stressed the Guanxi network, communication and motivation structure in their game plans to keep talented employees and on the contrast, task-focused leaders used to position and job satisfaction to identify and keep talented employees. (DuBrin, 2015), observed that leaders determine the values and culture to be embraced in an institution which has a direct effect on an institution’s triumph.

Wanjiru, (2013), analyzed the effects of leadership styles on teachers’ job satisfaction in public secondary schools in Nakuru County. The research was to find out if the leadership styles embraced by the principals' affected teachers' job satisfaction concerning job satisfaction and performance of an assignment. Transactional models and transformational leadership and their influence on teachers’ motivation in terms of their capabilities, rank, self-discovery,
accomplishments and the significance they have accorded themselves, in public secondary schools were used to discuss leadership style. The findings of the research showed that the students were unable to learn well since the teachers who were not enthusiastic were unable to teach successfully. It also showed that when teachers are sidelined when decisions are being made by the head teachers, they end up despising their jobs.

According to (Bass, 1990), leaders come up with techniques for cultural development and cultural norms which emerge and change due to its leaders’ focus. The way leaders behave to settle disasters, solve problems, reward and discipline followers, are all appropriate to an institution's culture and also how clients/customers view them externally and internally by followers. Culture and leadership exchange of ideas is therefore reciprocal.

2.5. Meritocracy

Meritocracy depends on competency desire and competency selection. These competencies include abilities, skills, knowledge, and structures like values, innovation, self-control, and motivation. It is an arrangement whereby unbeaten individuals with unbeaten role effectively do their work and get salary and benefits concerning their efforts. To achieve benefits of meritocracy (personal and institutional success, improving job satisfaction, commitment to the institution, employee morale, improving production and potential of staff, effort and creating motivation), it is desirable that the organizations institute meritocracy and also considers competency selection and conditioning (Isfahani & Alinasr, 2010).
Feedback is one of the components that determine job motivation that enables a person to be aware of his/her results and it gives clear details directly from the effects of one's performance. If there are no meritocracy regulations in the workplace and the surroundings of the workplace are neglected, it will result in demotivation and dissatisfaction. (Kajbaf, Pour, & Taher, 2005).

A study conducted by (Franco, Bennett, & Kanfer, 2002), that analyzed factors affecting the motivation of health staff, indicated that integrity in management, proudness, and employee safety are the significant inspirational factors. Schroder, (1989), deduced in research that five attributes of our intelligence, values, management styles, capabilities, and motivations are factors of managers' competency. Hertz, (2001), finalized his research by observing that meritocracy is of much importance and demonstrated two major axes of ethical and social needs in a meritocracy. The ethical axis is the most suitable and complements with the combination of intellect and importance which are both genetic factors and social factors that is effective for impacts of meritocracy in generating a better society and remove hurdles hindering the progress of science and industry. Various factors go hand in hand to cause job motivation of employees.

There is some notion of a relative or ‘comparison' income by employees that get into their benefit function. This indicates that personal job satisfaction is affected by the workers own absolute level of income and their income relative to some expected level or comparison group. Hamermesh, (2001), deduces that most variances in (dis)satisfaction among employees is because of the contrast of their present job with the benchmark chances open to them.
Sloane & Williams H., (1996), find that absolute and comparative incomes have a beneficial impact on the job satisfaction of both men and women. Clark & Oswald, (1997), gives some proof that assumptions are influenced by an employees’ demographics. This is also viewed in the lenses of meritocracy and a feeling of fairness within the organization. Workers feel obliged to put their efforts when it is clear reward will be commensurate, and fair.

Another feeling of job satisfaction emanates from the different job qualities of employees. Union membership, occupation, size of the institution, union membership and hours of work have revealed to have notable effects on self-reported job satisfaction. Comparatively few researches’ have examined the effect of hours of work on employee happiness. (Hamermesh, 2001).

Further, another aspect of job satisfaction is job security. Some people get job satisfaction from the knowledge that the company they are in is not going to go under and will be stable in the distant future. Some individuals believe that this is the most important aspect of a job, and having a stable company makes them feel safe, which promotes job satisfaction.

2.6. Working Conditions

Working conditions comprises of physical environmental conditions and hazards. The Hawthorne studies by Elton Mayo (1924-1932), perhaps the most famous research towards this, sought to establish the effects of various working conditions, especially lighting, on workers’ productivity. This experiment proved that token changes in worker conditions temporarily increased productivity. It was later found that these changes emanated not from the changes in illumination but the mere knowledge by workers that they were being observed. These findings
strongly suggested that people work for purposes other than pay- the locus of the arguments of theory x and theory y by McGregor. Dimitriades, (2007), added that job satisfaction does not occur in a vacuum, it is pegged on working conditions as a variable which constitutes organizational climate.

In their empirical research on a shipbuilding company, (Bakotic & Babic, T. B., 2013), found there was no notable variance in overall job satisfaction between workers who work in normal working conditions and workers who work in unbearable working conditions. Moreover, it was realized that the satisfaction with working conditions is greater in the case of workers who work in the administration than in the case of workers who work in tough working conditions. Lastly, it was revealed that for workers who work under unbearable working conditions, the working conditions are a key component of their overall job satisfaction and it is thus needful to enhance these conditions.

Abraham, (2012), observed that workplaces with conducive conditions for working are disapproving in enhancing employee job satisfaction. He suggested that organizations require surveys regularly to single out the working conditions that encourage achievement of institutional objectives and work on those that do not boost organizational goals. (Glynn, Arnow-Richman, & Sullivan, 2015), looked at working conditions concerning hours of work, dress code, days of work, remuneration, ‘in-between breaks', leave days and off days and other benefits such as house and car allowance, health insurance, and retirement packages.
Mokaya, (2013), concluded that a workplace with conducive surroundings is an essential factor for measuring employees’ efficiency and weighing their level of contentment with their work. Sirota & Klein, (2013), observed that too much work at times leads to high levels of burnout and discontentment among workers and their job. It is then reflected in the work output and their relationship with their clients. These discoveries relate to those of (Scott & Davis, 2015), who reports that too much work negatively impacted on the well-being of employees and demoralized them. Shahid & Azhar, (2013), concluded that working conditions affect employees’ job satisfaction directly which eventually affects the organizations output as a whole. Therefore, it is fundamental for the leadership of an organization to figure out the factors that affect employees’ job satisfaction negatively at the workplace and devise ways of countering the negative effects (Nyakundi, 2012).

Iavicoli, et al., (2014), in their study noted that there was a lot of complaining from workers due to a lack of work-life balance. Workers worked for long hours and did not have time to spend with their families. This eventually causes stress, unhealthy workers and less productivity. An employer should always endeavor to shield their employees from stress as a result of burn out. Caruso, (2014), observed that workers in the healthcare industry usually operate for very long hours and do not sleep enough since they have to provide round the clock services to their patients. This results in workers suffering from various chronic diseases and causes errors when handling patients due to fatigue. Tired health care employees could also cause harm to others on their way to and from work while driving. The study came up with measures that organizations
should come up with ways of prioritizing sleep by re-structuring work done by health care workers to stop the risk factors.

A survey by (Njeri, 2012), examining components affecting job satisfaction level among deputy head teachers in public secondary schools in Kandara, observed that school head teachers workload has been growing. This is as a result of how schools are being managed which in turn leads to responsibilities being passed down to their deputies and assistants. This, therefore, led to the reduction to the focus on the quality of their teaching. The study also revealed that work-life balance influenced greatly on job satisfaction and productivity which most of the time resulted in being away from work and many employees quitting work. Quality work life (QWL) management approach has heightened the attention on the work-life discourse stressing adjustable work arrangements to aid balance work and personal life. This has had notable effects on employee job satisfaction.

2.7. A theoretical review of literature

This study will apply the Herzberg’s two-factor theory and Edwin A Locke’s Range of Affect Theory

2.7.1. Frederick Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory

This theory has been used as a structure for research concerning employee motivation in the workplace since 1959 (e.g. (Efraty & M.J. Sirgy, 1990); (Stone-Romero, 1994). Herzberg conceptualized the theory without having the educational environment in mind but several pieces
of research confirmed the theory within the 21 educational contexts (e.g. (Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, & August, 2012). The two-factor theory supports that factors influencing workers are independent of factors demotivating workers. When motivating factors are present, employee satisfaction at work will be increased, and when hygiene factors are not available employee satisfaction will be decreased.

Table 2.1: Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Factors</th>
<th>Hygiene Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Organization Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Relationships with Colleagues and Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Physical Work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Expert program management 2018

Some of the motivators of employees are an achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1968). The other aspect of Herzberg’s two-factor theory (dual-factor theory) enumerated that dissatisfaction is
brought about by hygiene factors (the dual to motivating factors) not being met. The hygiene factors suggested by Herzberg are company policies, supervision, relationship with supervisors and peers, physical work conditions, salary, status and job security. In summary, motivation factors help in increasing worker productivity and overall satisfaction, while hygiene factors help in decreasing worker dissatisfaction and turnover.

Herzberg two factor theory focusses directly on the factors that result in employees' job satisfaction which is one of the objectives of this research and has made it easy for managers to distinguish satisfiers from dissatisfiers. With this, management will not be confused about what to focus on when they want to see improvement of employees' performance.

Using the motivation hygiene theory, management must not supply hygiene factors to avoid employee dissatisfaction, but also must supply factors inherent to the work itself so that employees are satisfied with their jobs. This hampers job satisfaction solely on the shoulders of management, concluding that there is no individual responsibility for a person’s attitude on the job.

The study will fill in this gap by presenting the factors that influence employees’ satisfaction in Parliamentary Joint Services which may be motivators to the organization, whereas when examined according to Hertzberg two factor theory may be seen as hygiene factors.

2.7.2. Edwin A Locke’s Range of Affect Theory (1976)

This theory determines job satisfaction through a variance that exists linking the benefits an employee gets from the job and what the employer gets from the employee. A negligible
variance makes employees happy, and a humongous difference will mean the employee is not happy. Prioritization differs from individual employees, e.g. an individual employee may value medical cover more than anything else at work, while for another employee, a clean office can be more important in comparison to medical cover. The absence of that particular aspect leads to the employee not being content with his/her work. There is a need for finding out the most crucial aspect of the job that employees love and make sure the aspect is tackled suitably to ensure employee satisfaction.

The relevance of the above theory to this research is evidence that employees have expectations on their jobs that act as factors that influence their satisfaction on the job and enhance performance. Examples of such expectations are career advancement, promotion and fringe benefits. If these expectations are not met, employees become disgruntled, and this hurts their performances, they may become disengaged on the job.
Figure 2.8: Conceptual Framework

Determinants of employee job satisfaction

- **Leadership**
  - Equal opportunity to every employee.
  - Investment in learning, training in employees.

- **Meritocracy**
  - Equal opportunities
  - Impartial competition
  - Value system

- **Working Conditions**
  - Growth and development of individuals
  - Recognition
  - Employee involvement

Moderating Variable

- **Job Satisfaction**
  - Adaptable to repetitive work tasks
  - Adaptable to working under specific instructions
  - Motivation
  - Teamwork
  - Proactivity/self-initiative
  - Competence

Source: Author, 2019
Table 2.2: Research Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Research Gap</th>
<th>How the gap was filled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Kuchinke, Ardichvili, Borchert, &amp; Rozanski, 2009)</td>
<td>Demographic factors in particular age; gender and education should be investigated further.</td>
<td>The researcher tested or obtained the number of independent variables like age, gender and education and their relationship with factors measuring job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Franco, Bennett, &amp; Kanfer, 2002)</td>
<td>There is a lack of data on the determinants of job satisfaction in the public service in Sub-Saharan Africa. Most studies have been done in Nursing, Cooperative, and the Education sector.</td>
<td>The researcher researched the determinants of job satisfaction in the public service (Parliamentary Service Commission: Parliamentary Joint Services).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Abraham, 2012)</td>
<td>Organizations need regular surveys to identify the working conditions that boost the attainment of organizational goals and improve on those that do not boost organizational goals.</td>
<td>The researcher issued questionnaires which identified different views on the working conditions of employees at the Parliamentary Joint Services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, 2019

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

The section dealt with the method applied to execute the research. It was separated into sections namely; research design, target population, site of study, sample size and sampling procedures,
research instruments, instrument validity, instrument reliability, data collection procedures, and

data analysis techniques.

3.2. Research design

This research was descriptive. Data collection was by experiential, qualitative and quantitative

methods. The data were analyzed to identify any similarities that may be indicative of a trend.
This is because the response was subjective and what were sought were variables as they were.
The design was; therefore, intend to pick data from individuals of a particular population to
find out the characteristics of that particular population concerning many variables. The choice
of this research design is based on the fact that the Researcher was interested on the current
state of affairs in terms of the employee job satisfaction factors already existing and no variable
was manipulated or controlled.

3.3. Site of Study

The research was done among the selected staff of the Parliamentary Joint Service based in
Protection House in Nairobi.

3.4. Target population

The population is the entire cluster of people, objects or items from which samples are taken for
measurement (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). This study comprised of one hundred and sixty (160)
employees of Parliamentary Joint Services based at Parliament Buildings. The respondents were
selected based on the directorates/departments from the Parliamentary Joint Services.
Table 3.1: Number of officers in each directorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Human Resources and Administration</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Finance &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Information &amp; Research Services</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Litigation &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Parliamentary Service Commission Records, 2019

3.5. Sampling Technique

The study was undertaken through a census survey. A census survey of all the identified respondents within the Parliamentary Joint Services directorates within the Parliamentary Service Commission was adopted in the study since the number of the target population was relatively manageable in terms of administering the research instrument.

3.6. Research Instruments

The Researcher used primary data which was gathered through a questionnaire. A questionnaire comprising of both closed and open-ended questions were administered to the respondents. The choice of this instrument was informed by its simplicity to administer and convenience for collecting data within a short period. The questionnaire was in four parts,
Part A collected personal data of the responses. Part B on factors affecting job satisfaction and Part C on employees perception on pay and related benefits, were presented as a five-point Likert scale and Part D consisted of an open-ended question aimed at providing the respondents with an opportunity to add any other information.

3.7. Instrument Validity and reliability

The researcher undertook a broad literature review on the related study. This review assisted the researcher to understand the type of queries to ask to yield the desired results. The researcher also undertook to get expert advice from the supervisor and professionals from the field. The rationale behind using internal consistency method was that individual items should all be evaluating the same constructs and correlate confidently to each other (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, William, & Black, 1998). Test of reliability was calculated using the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science).

According to (Vaus, 2002), Cronbach’s alpha coefficient ranges between 0 and 1. A higher alpha coefficient value means that the scale is more reliable. Acceptable alpha should be at least 0.70 or above (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, William, & Black, 1998); (Vaus., 2002).

3.8. Data collection procedure.

The researcher had a letter of introduction from Kenyatta University to be presented to the Parliamentary Joint Services. It assisted the researcher to collect information more efficiently.
The respondents involved in the study were informed through writing. The researcher delivered the questionnaire to the respondents in sampled sections.

3.9. Data analysis procedure

Data was gathered from the field through questionnaires. The questionnaires were distributed to the concerned departments/directorates and the data were entered into Microsoft excel.

The complete responses were summarized and coded into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) variable view then translated into specific categories concerning the objective of the study and guided by the questionnaire. The data entered was cleaned, explored and analyzed. Tables and charts illustrated the various outcomes of the research indicating the factors leading to job satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Service. The analysis ranked the factors in their relative importance as per the responses. The results from the analysis were presented in frequencies, pie chart, and percentages for comparisons and clarity.

3.10. Ethical Considerations

To ensure that the research was undertaken ethically, the researcher sought clearance from the universities’ graduate school as well as the National Commission for Science, Technology, and Innovation (NACOSTI). The researcher also sought oral and written consent from all respondents in the study. More importantly, the researcher ensured that the findings of the study and data are used for academic reasons and not for any other purpose or disclosed to a third party.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, AND INTERPRETATION

4.1. Introduction

This section dealt with the findings of the research. The research seeks to determine determinants of employee job satisfaction in the Parliamentary Joint Services Kenya. The objectives are; to establish the extent to which leadership influences employee job satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Services, to determine the extent to which meritocracy in employment enhances employee service delivery and employee job satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Services and to examine the extent to which working conditions affect employee service delivery and satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Services. The questionnaire was administered to one hundred and sixty (160) respondents. Of the one hundred and sixty respondents, one hundred and twenty (120) responded representing an overall rate of 75%. Data were analyzed based on this response rate and the findings were presented about each objective in the form of counts, frequency tables and pie charts. A content analysis of responses to open-ended questions has been presented as quantitative data for a better understanding of the research themes.

4.2. SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Questionnaire responses to demographic information

4.2.1. Response Rate

Out of the target of 160 respondents from Parliamentary Joint Services, only 120 responded. This represents 75%, of the total respondents issued with the questioners. In Figure 4.1, it can be seen
that in each directorate/department the response rate was more than 10%, which was good to make an inference from the data collected on Job satisfaction from each directorate/department. Fincham, (2008), indicates that a response rate of 70% and above is a very good response rate to conclude a study. Thus, this response rate is high to draw conclusions from the study.

**Figure 4.1: Response rate**

![Response rate chart]

### 4.2.2. Gender of the respondents

Figure 4.2 shows the percentage of the gender distribution of the sample. The sample is representative of a larger number of male respondents to that of female respondents. Male respondents as a percentage of the total sample were 65% (n=78) while female respondents were 35% (n=42). There are more male employees in Parliamentary Joint Services than female employee
Figure 4.2: Gender of the respondents

4.2.3. Age of Respondents

Respondents were asked to write their age. The results are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No. of employees</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean age of the respondents is 40 years. The study showed that there are low job satisfaction levels since employees seem to leave employment for greener pastures at their prime and after gaining experience.
A conclusion can be drawn to show that most of the employees that took part in this research were fairly young, varying between the ages 31-45 years old which represent 50% of the respondents.

4.2.4. Job Category of respondents

Figure 4.3 demonstrates the frequency distribution and percentage of the job category of the respondents. The middle-level category had the majority in the number of respondents having 58% (n=70). They are followed by the Top-level category at 25% (n=30) and finally Lower level category at 17% (n=20). These are the main job categories in the Joint Service and therefore they form a good representation of the population.

Figure 4.3: Job category of respondents
4.2.5. Income range of respondents

Respondents were requested to indicate their levels of income. The results are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Income range of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ksh</th>
<th>Number of employees</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-40,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000-50,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean salary of respondents is 41,667.

4.2.6. Highest level of Education of respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate their education level from O’ Level to Postgraduate.

Table 4.3: Highest level of education of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ksh</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Degree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average level of education is Bachelor's Degree level. This is a pointer to a high academic qualification. The study revealed that the respondents in this research were highly educated.
4.3. SECTION B: FACTORS AFFECTING EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION

Questionnaire responses to factors affecting employee satisfaction levels

Key

SD= Strongly Disagree; D=Disagree; N=Neutral; A=Agree; SA=Strongly Agree

4.3.1. Leadership and Planning and job satisfaction

Respondents were asked to indicate how they rated leadership and planning at the Joint Service.

The findings range from Strongly Disagree (SD) to Strongly Agree (SA).

Table 4.4: Leadership and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have confidence in the leadership of the Parliamentary Joint Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel that there is no form of favoritism at work</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The management does what it says</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As outlined in the table above, favoritism is a problem at the Parliamentary Joint Service with 77% of the respondents saying there is a form of favoritism at work. 67% of respondents are not confident with the level of confidence in the leadership. This casts a grim picture of leadership and planning at the Parliamentary Joint Service.

This is in contradiction to the study by (Joiner & Bakalis, 2006), that indicated that strong leadership support contributes to affective commitment. According to (S.H. & Honegar, 1998), a review of literature proposes that entitlement leads to increased job satisfaction. Savery, L, &
Luks, J.A, (2001), proposed that level of employee participation is directly linked to job satisfaction. Scott-Ladd et al. (2005) established that involvement in decision-making advances job satisfaction.

4.3.2. Corporate culture and job satisfaction

Respondents were asked to indicate how corporate culture affected job satisfaction. The results are indicated in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Corporate Culture and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality is a top priority at Parliamentary Joint Service</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individual initiative is encouraged</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nothing keeps me from doing my best every day</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study revealed that only 29.1% of respondents concurred strongly with 62.5% either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. The findings from the research showed that corporate culture values such as quality work, individual initiative, job enthusiasm and good reputation of the organization affect the job satisfaction of employees. This is in line with the findings of (Clark, Oswald, & Warr, 1996) who revealed that cooperate culture in the organizations processes and evaluations increase employees’ satisfaction.
4.3.3. Communication and job satisfaction

The respondents were asked to indicate if communication affected job satisfaction. The results are presented in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Corporate communications are frequent enough</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel I can trust what Management tells me</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is adequate communication between departments</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84 respondents (70%) said corporate communication was not frequent enough. Only 20% said that they can trust what management tells them and only 25% said that there was adequate inter-departmental communication respectively.

Organizations and executives who freely share information and motivate bi-directional communication have a higher rate of employee job satisfaction (Neves & Eisenberger, 2012).

4.3.4. Career Development and job satisfaction

Respondents were asked to indicate whether their career prospects affected job satisfaction. The findings are presented in Table 4.7
Table 4.7: Career Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have an established career path at the Parliamentary Joint Service</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have opportunities to learn and grow</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel there is job security despite the electoral cycle</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% of respondents were neutral that there was job security despite the electoral cycle. 76% of respondents believed that they don't have an established career path and lastly, 42% of respondents indicated that they don't have opportunities to learn and grow.

The research results are consistent with that of (Umer & akram, 2011), when organizations offer chances for growth and development like various courses and educational sponsorships then job satisfaction increases. Also they are capacity developed their perform increases and get praises for the work done which increases job satisfaction.

4.3.5. Performance appraisal and job satisfaction

Respondents were asked to indicate how their performance appraisal affected job satisfaction.

The findings are presented in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8: Performance Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My last performance appraisal reflected my performance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The performance appraisal system is fair</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The performance appraisal does not achieve its intention of helping staff attain their potential. This is because the study revealed that 39% of the respondents did not believe that their last appraisal reflected their overall performance. 41% of respondents indicated that the performance appraisal system was not fair.

The respondents said that the performance appraisal was subjective and sometimes it is used as a tool to punish employees and also reward others unfavorably. These results are in contrast with (Roberts, 2002), who advocates that; a successful performance appraisal process should reveal a change in both the rankings of staff performance and aspects of the work environment that impact upon work performance.

4.3.6. Employee role and job satisfaction

Respondents were asked to indicate how their job at Parliamentary Joint Service affected job satisfaction. The findings are presented in table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Employee role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel I have enough authority to make decisions</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel I am contributing to my department’s mission</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel I have the material and equipment I need to work well</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is doubtful whether the departments are pulling in the same direction because only 6% of respondents contributed to their departments' mission. 77% lacked the discretion to make decisions with 51% lacking the material and equipment needed to work effectively.
This is in contradiction with (Saksena, 1988), who recommends that employee role should contain pertinent information such as reporting relationship and equipment used in the job and also employees should be able to articulate their opinions freely for decision making.

4.3.7. Employee Recognition and Rewards and job satisfaction

Respondents were asked to state whether they were recognized and rewarded and how it affected their job satisfaction. The findings are presented in table 4.10.

Table 4.10: Employee recognition and rewards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Financial rewards are commensurate to the effort</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Career progression is commensurate to the effort</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel valued at Parliamentary Joint Service</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My salary is fair for employee responsibilities</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42% of respondents were undecided on whether they were valued by Parliamentary Joint Service. On the other hand, 23% of respondents were not valued and only 18% of the respondents were valued. 68% of respondents believed that financial rewards were not commensurate to the effort while only 5% of the respondents indicated that financial rewards were commensurate to the effort. 55% of the respondents were of the view that their salary was fair for their responsibilities while 16% of respondents were neutral.

This is in line with a study by (Nelson, 2005), which concluded that whenever employees felt unvalued for their contributions or rewarded, their commitment may be threatened hence affecting their job satisfaction.
4.3.8. Teamwork and Cooperation and job satisfaction

Respondents were asked to indicate whether their departments’ working environment was characterized by teamwork and cooperation, and how it affected job satisfaction. The results are tabulated in Table 4.11.

**Table 4.11: Teamwork and Cooperation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel part of a team working towards a shared goal</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Politics in this department is distinct from professionalism</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s imperative to note that none of the respondents were unequivocal that politics did not affect professionalism. 58% of respondents were not part of a team. More respondents (25%) were neutral that they were part of a team.

The factors that affect team success start with the organizational context by affecting the scope of accessible task-relevant resources and also how team mates liaise and collaborate with each other, team constitution is believed to have a strong impact on team performance (Bell & J, 2007).

4.3.9. Working Conditions and job satisfaction

Respondents were asked to indicate how their working conditions affected job satisfaction. The findings are presented in Table 4.12.
Table 4.12: Working conditions and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My physical working conditions are good</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deadlines and targets are realistic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Workload is reasonable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I keep a reasonable balance between work and personal life</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24% of respondents did not believe that deadlines and targets were realistic and those who thought otherwise were 23%. A vast majority (53%) were however undecided. 89% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that their working conditions were good. The mental well-being of staff here is also at risk with 85% of respondents saying that they did not keep a reasonable work-life balance.

Companies should ensure conducive work conditions for the workers as they spend much of their time in the work place (Khuong & Nguyen, 2016).

4.3.10. Training program and job satisfaction

Respondents were asked to indicate how the training program affected job satisfaction. The results are tabulated in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13: Training program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am provided with as much training as I need</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
76% of respondents believed that the training is not enough, 11% of the respondents were neutral about how much training they receive and 13% were of the view that the training was enough. This shows that a majority of the respondents are dissatisfied as training is a major component of growth and building capacity.

The research findings align with that of (Umer & akram, 2011), when employees are capacity developed, their performance increases and get appreciated for the work done leading to increased job satisfaction.

4.3.11. Supervision and Job satisfaction

Table 4.14: Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My supervisor treats me fairly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My supervisor treats me with respect</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My supervisor handles my work-related issues satisfactorily</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My supervisor asks for my input to help make decisions</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My supervisor is an effective manager</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58.3% of the respondents strongly disagreed with the fact that their supervisors ask for their input in decision making and 6.6% were neutral.

This is in contrast to the finding by (Ellison & K, 2004), which revealed that supervisors are seen as important figures in the organization who are responsible for enforcing the practices and rules of the organization.
4.3.12. Organizational Bio Data

4.3.12.1. Department/Directorate

The respondents were asked to indicate the departments/directorates where they serve. The findings are presented in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15: Department/Directorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Directorate of Human Resources and Administration</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Directorate of Finance and Accounting</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Directorate of Information and Research Services</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Directorate of Litigation and Compliance</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.12.2. Duration of Service

Figure 4.5 shows the results for the distribution of respondents by years of experience in the service. As shown, 42% of respondents had up to five years of experience, 33% had up to 10 years of experience, 21% had up to 15 years of experience and 4% had 16 years and above. This shows that most of the respondents have up to 15 years of experience in the Service making them very capable of responding adequately. The findings are presented in Figure 4.4.
Figure 4.4: Duration of Service

4.4. SECTION C: EMPLOYEE’S ATTRACTION TO PAY AND RELATED BENEFITS

Key
LE= Low Extent; ME=Moderate Extent; AE=Average Extent; GE=Great Extent; GGE=Greater Extent

The respondents were asked to indicate to what extent the benefits at the service are attractive to them. Table 4.16 shows a representation of the same.

Table 4.16: Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>GGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pension Scheme</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mortgage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Car Loan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. House Allowance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Medical Cover</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Late Duty Allowance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4.16 above, 58% of the respondents were of the opinion that the pension scheme was attractive at an average extent, 67% of the respondents indicated that the mortgage was attractive at a greater extent, 50% of the respondents were of the view that the car loan was attractive at an average extent, 59% of respondents indicated that house allowance was attractive at an average extent and 66% of respondents indicated that late duty allowance was attractive at an average extent. Overall the respondents seem to be quite satisfied with the benefits offered at the service.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction

This chapter concludes the research. On the onset, an outline of the summary on findings on the levels of satisfaction in the Parliamentary Joint Service is presented. Then the correlation between job satisfaction, turnover, and retention upon which conclusions are made. Further outlined are suggested solutions based on the conclusions and finally recommendations on the use of the research and further related research areas needed.

5.2. Summary of Findings

The research sought to achieve the following three specific objectives: The first objective was to demonstrate the extent to which leadership influences employee satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Services. The research revealed that the respondents were not confident with the leadership. Only 5.8% of respondents were neutral on the level of confidence in leadership, 67% were not confident with the level of leadership and 17% were confident with the level of confidence in leadership. This contributed to job dissatisfaction.

The second objective was to determine the extent to which meritocracy in employment, training, and reward enhances employee service delivery and satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Services. The study revealed that 76% of respondents felt that the trainings were not enough. This indicates that a majority of the respondents are dissatisfied as training is a major component for growth and building capacity. On benefits the study revealed that in all the
categories of benefits offered, there was a 50% and above level of satisfaction with the benefits. This shows that the respondents seem to be quite satisfied with the benefits offered at the service.

The third objective was to examine the extent to which working conditions affect employee service delivery and satisfaction at the Parliamentary Joint Services. The study revealed that 24% of respondents did not think deadlines and targets were realistic and those who thought otherwise were 23%. A vast majority (53%) were however undecided. 89% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that their working conditions were good. The mental well-being of staff here is also at risk with 85% of respondents saying that they did not keep a reasonable work-life balance.

An empirical review on performance appraisal and job satisfaction was accomplished and finally a theoretical review on job satisfaction was carried out. The study was a survey on the Parliamentary Joint Services. The population of the study was the employees of the Parliamentary Joint Services. The researcher focused on 160 employees of the Parliamentary Joint Services in different departments. Fifty were from the Directorate of Human Resources and Administration, forty-six from the Directorate of Finance & Accounting, thirty from the Directorate of Information & Research Services and thirty-four from the Directorate of Litigation & Compliance. The primary data collected through use of interview guide was edited, coded, classified, tabulated and analyzed using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). Other packages used were Microsoft Excel and Microsoft Word. Analysis was done by use of descriptive statistics.
The study revealed that employees at the Parliamentary Joint Services are not very keen on quality when it comes to their work. This is because study revealed that only 29.1% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that quality was a top priority at the parliamentary joint services, with 62.5% either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. 77% of the respondents indicated that there is a form of favoritism at work and 67% of respondents are not confident with the level of confidence in the leadership.

The study also revealed that employees at the Parliamentary Joint Services do not trust what management tells them because 70% said corporate communication was not frequent enough. Only 20% said that they can trust what management tells them and only 25% said that there was adequate inter-departmental communication respectively. 50% of respondents were neutral that there was job security despite the electoral cycle. 76% of respondents believed that they don't have an established career path and lastly, 42% of respondents indicated that they don't have opportunities to learn and grow.

The individuals’ feedbacks stated that less than half of the interviewed employees proclaimed to be a little bit satisfied with their jobs and only a comparatively low proportion proclaimed to be very satisfied. For financial motivations, the level of satisfaction is even lower. Examining the employees’ feedback, the factors with the highest level of dissatisfaction mentioned by the majority of individuals are leadership, working conditions, communication, teamwork, training and performance appraisal which can either have positive or negative impacts on job satisfaction. At the opposite side, the element that creates the highest degree of satisfaction among
Parliamentary Joint Services employees is benefits in terms of house allowance, medical, mortgage and car loan.

5.3. Conclusions

The main motivation of this research was to analyze the determinants of job satisfaction among employees at the Parliamentary Joint Services, using a total of 160 employees based at protection House Nairobi out of which 120 responded.

The research concluded that leadership was lacking at the Parliamentary Joint Services. Ojokuku, (2012), noted that one of the most important management skills is leadership which incorporates the capacity of the boss to confidently guide a team concerning a recurrent objective.

The research concluded that lack of training and development opportunities is a major factor. Employees will be inadequately equipped to effectively and efficiently provide services to the citizens. An employee who is not well-trained lacks the skill set and confidence to execute their mandate.

Furthermore, a lack of communication between management and staff and between departments causes job disaffection. Operations turn to be haphazard with staff relying on rumors and falsehoods as official communication. The result is that of mistrust and backstabbing. Lack of teamwork and cooperation within the Parliamentary Joint Service also contributes to this malaise.
Lack of clear career development prospects demotivates staff, and disincentives them from going beyond the bare minimum in performance of their duties. The result is the established number of indifferent respondents in this research and the risk of turnover should better prospects arise.

5.4. Recommendations

The study came up with the following recommendations;

a. There is a need for continuous employee training and development to ensure that employees are adequately skilled to take up tasks within the Joint Service. The Parliamentary Joint Service should plan for regular trainings and team-building activities during departmental retreats that will build cohesion between the departments.

b. There is a need for improving and creating conducive working conditions for employees by ensuring harmonious relationships are created amongst employees and between them and their bosses.

c. Leaders/supervisors should be trained on interpersonal and communication skills to better manage their team and this should be an ongoing exercise.

5.5. Suggestions for further study

Further research can be done on the impact of the performance appraisal system on the performance of Parliamentary Joint Service and Parliamentary Service Commission as a whole.
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Appendix I: Questionnaire

PART A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION- Please tick (√) where appropriate

1. **GENDER:** Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. **AGE:** 18-30 years [ ]; 31 to 45 years [ ]; Above 45 years [ ]

3. **JOB CATEGORY:** Top Level [ ]; Middle Level [ ]; Lower Level [ ]

4. **INCOME RANGE IN KES:** Below 30,000 [ ]; 30,000 to 40,000 [ ]; 40,000 to 50,000 [ ]; Above 50,000 [ ]

5. **HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION YOU HAVE ATTAINED**
   - High School [ ]; College Diploma [ ]; Bachelor Degree [ ]; Post Graduate Degree [ ]

PART B: FACTORS AFFECTING JOB SATISFACTION

In this section, in the boxes provided, for each and every question indicate your response from the below key;

**Key**

1= Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS AFFECTING JOB SATISFACTION</th>
<th>{1}</th>
<th>{2}</th>
<th>{3}</th>
<th>{4}</th>
<th>{5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership and planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I have confidence in the leadership of the Parliamentary Joint Service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel that there is no form of favoritism at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The management does what it says</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality is a top priority at Parliamentary Joint Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individual initiative is encouraged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nothing keeps me from doing my best everyday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Corporate communications are frequent enough
2. I feel I can trust what Management tells me
3. There is adequate communication between departments

**Career development**
1. I have a clearly established career path at the Parliamentary Joint Service
2. I have opportunities to learn and grow
3. I feel there is job security despite electoral cycle

**Performance appraisal**
1. My last performance appraisal reflected my performance
2. The performance appraisal system is fair

**Your role**
1. I am given enough authority to make decisions
2. I feel I am contributing to my departments mission
3. I have the material and equipment I need to work well

**Recognition and rewards**
1. Financial rewards are commensurate to effort
2. Career progression is commensurate to effort
3. I feel valued at Parliamentary Joint Service
4. My salary is fair for my responsibilities

**Team work and cooperation**
1. I feel part of a team working towards a shared goal
2. Politics in this department is distinct from professionalism

**Work conditions**
1. My physical working conditions are good
2. Deadlines and targets are realistic
3. Workload is reasonable
4. I keep a reasonable balance between work and personal life

**Training program**
1. I am provided with as much training as I need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My supervisor treats me fairly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My supervisor treats me with respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My supervisor handles my work related issues satisfactorily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My supervisor asks for my input to help make decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My supervisor is an effective manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANIZATIONAL BIO DATA**

**PLEASE INDICATE THE DEPARTMENT WHERE YOU SERVE:**

Parliamentary research service [ ]; Finance and Accounting [ ]; Security [ ]; Human Recourse [ ]; Media Relations [ ]; Litigation [ ]; Commission Secretariat [ ]

**DURATION OF SERVICE IN THE ORGANIZATION**

0 to 5 years [ ]; 6 to 10 years [ ]; 11 to 15 years [ ]; 16 years & above [ ]

**PART C: EMPLOYEE’S ATTRACTION TO PAY AND RELATED BENEFITS**

1. Indicate with a tick the extent to which the following benefits are attractive to you;

   where:

   1= Low Extent; 2= Moderate Extent; 3= Average Extent; 4 =Great Extent and 5= Greater Extent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pension Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Duty Allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART D: ANY OTHER INFORMATION**
Please express any further information that you may want to below;

Thank you for your response