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ABSTRACT
The satisfaction and engagement of teachers are important factors that can enhance sustained provision of quality education. A country’s economic, socio-cultural and business competitiveness is driven by the education sector development. An environment that nurtures job satisfaction will inevitably drive up the levels of organizational engagement, especially the affective engagement which will reduce turnover rates and consequent reduction of economic costs associated with replacement and training of new hires. Enrolment of students has massively increased with the introduction of free primary education in Kenya, leading to increased student population pressure on public secondary school facilities. This has contributed to decreased job satisfaction levels and high turnover rates among secondary school teachers. The study examined the effect of four job satisfaction determinants on engagement of teachers in public secondary schools in Kenya with the employee’s age as a moderating variable. Based on the study, this paper examines two of them, namely reward and career development. The study adopted a descriptive cross-sectional design, covering a target population of 62,533 teachers drawn from 5210 public secondary schools in Kenya. Stratified sampling involving multi-stage cluster sampling technique was used by selecting 5 counties randomly from the 47 counties which was the first cluster. The number of respondents that constituted the sample size using Fischer’s calculation of sample sizes drawn from very large populations was 384 teachers. From each school, a sample of 4 respondents, comprising the head teacher or deputy head teacher and 3 teachers was randomly selected and 96 schools was the total number of schools constituting the random sample for the study. Data was collected through the use of self-administered questionnaires that were distributed to respondents at their work stations. Data analysis involved descriptive statistics and inferential statistical tools. Descriptive statistical tools were used to determine and explain the status of the variables while inferential statistics were to explain the relationships between the variables. The study findings are presented using tables and charts. The study findings revealed that Based on the findings of the study, it is clear that rewards do significantly influence teacher engagement. Indeed, most of the schools have experienced low teacher engagement due to unsatisfactory rewards in the past. Moreover, majority of teachers are not satisfied with the rewards offered in their teaching jobs. The study findings further showed that career development efforts by the employer are minimal in most schools. As a result, most of the schools have in the past experienced incidences of low teacher engagement attributed to lack of career development opportunities. Indeed, majority of teachers regard their level of satisfaction as very low with respect to current career development opportunities offered.
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INTRODUCTION
Employee engagement refers to complete dedication to both the organization and type of work. According to Morrow (1983), work engagement includes work ethic, career engagement, organizational engagement (affective and continuance) and job involvement. Morrow (1983) left out the concept of normative engagement by including work ethic principles to indicate the degree of work engagement among employees. Work ethic, also called the Protestant work ethic (PWE), has been defined “as a value or belief concerning the place of work in one’s life that either serves as a conscious guide to conduct or is simply implied in manifested attitudes and behavior” (Siegel, as cited in Awolusi, 2013). “Individuals with a strong work ethic are committed to the values of hard work and embrace the Calvinistic tradition of frugality, hard work, conservatism, and success” (Weber, as cited in Awolusi, 2013). Lodahl and Kejner (1965) define job involvement as the degree of daily absorption a worker experiences in work activity. Job involvement leads individuals to exceed the normal job expectations (Moorhead & Griffin, 1995) and is a key component in employee motivation (Lawler, 1986).

Hurter (2008) places employees in four categories, namely ambassadors, company oriented, career oriented, and uncommitted. Ambassadors are highly motivated and committed to both organization and type of work. Company oriented employees are committed to the organization, but not to the type of work and may show less than optimal productivity. Career oriented employees are uncommitted to the organization but committed to the type of work. They are highly productive but likely to move to other organizations. Uncommitted employees are uncommitted to both the organization and type of work.

Many scholars, especially in the Western capitalist countries, confine employee engagement studies to the organizational approach or view anchored around explanations of differences in competitiveness attributed to management practices unique to an organization. Differences in management practices may influence the nature of work, employee satisfaction levels and consequently employee engagement. Interest in organizational engagement has been stimulated largely by its demonstrated positive relationship to work behaviours such as job satisfaction, high productivity, and low turnover (Cohen, 2003).

Herseovitch and Meyer (2002) define organizational engagement as the degree to which an employee identifies with the goals and values of the organization and is willing to exert effort to help it succeed. “Organizational engagement influences behavior independently of other motives and attitudes, and may lead to persistence to a course of action even if this
conflicts with motives” (Meyer et al., 2004; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

According to Edwards (2005), in high engagement organizations, employees deliver value in three distinct ways: (a) Persistence – longer tenure, reduced absence, improved punctuality, reduced stress; (b) Citizenship – more ethical behaviours, spontaneous ambassadorship, more proactive support for others, increased discretionary effort, and (c) Performance – greater productivity, enhanced customer service, improved quality, higher outputs. These three distinct ways are inevitably influenced to a great degree by the job satisfaction levels enjoyed by an employee. Thus many scholars have demonstrated the positive influence of job satisfaction on employee engagement, though there are exceptions in some cases. An employee may be committed to the organization due to the fear of losing existing privileges without experiencing job satisfaction.

Bateman and Strasser (1984) define organizational engagement as multi-dimensional in nature along loyalty, effort, value and goals congruency and membership. Buchanan (1974) defines engagement as being the bond between the individual (employee) and the organization (employer). Gharakhani and Eslami (2012) state that organizational engagement is viewed as an attitude of attachment to the organization by an employee, which leads to particular job-related behaviours such as work absenteeism, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, organizational citizen behaviours, work motivation and work performance. Meyer and Allen (1991) and Dunham et al. (1994) identify three forms of organizational engagement, namely affective engagement, continuance engagement and normative engagement. Affective engagement is defined as the emotional attachment, identification and involvement that an employee has with its organization and goals (Mowday et al., 1977; Meyer & Allen, 1993).

Continuance engagement is the willingness to remain in an organization because of the investment that the employee has with “nontransferable” investments. Non-transferable investments include things such as pension benefits, seniority, special competencies unique to the firm, relationships with other employees, or things that are special to the organization (Reichers, 1985). Normative engagement is the engagement or feeling of obligation and loyalty by an employee to his/her workplace (Bolon, 1993).

Employee engagement refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. In essence, measuring organizational engagement is an assessment of the congruence between an individual’s own values and beliefs and those of the organization (Swailes, 2002). Organizational engagement is characterized as employees’
willingness to contribute to organizational goals. When employees are sure that they will grow and learn with their current employers, their level of engagement to stay with that particular organization is higher (Opkara, 2004). A wide variety of definitions and measures of organizational engagement exist. Beckeri, Randal and Riegel (1995) define the term using three dimensions, namely: a strong desire to remain a member of a particular organization, a willingness to exert high levels of efforts on behalf of the organization and a belief in and acceptability of the values and goals of the organization.

Rewards

According to Luthans (as cited in Ismail, 2010), salaries not only assist people to attain their basic needs, but are also instrumental in satisfying the higher level needs of people. Previous research (Voydanoff, 1980) has shown that monetary compensation is one of the most significant variables in explaining job satisfaction. According to William et al. (as cited in Till & Karren, 2011), the actual pay level and pay satisfaction is probably a function of the discrepancy of actual pay level and the amount that employee believes his/her pay should be. Meanwhile, Lawler (as cited in Heneman III & Schwab, 1985) presents a perspective that views pay satisfaction as a discrepancy between how much pay one feels should be received and how much one feels is actually received.

The guiding benchmark that employees normally follow in defining their expected pay is more often than not a function of the amount of work load, performance outcomes, fairness and organizational justice and basic pay earned by professionals with similar qualifications in different career circles among other factors. Satisfaction pay levels may be determined proportionately to the positive or negative discrepancies between actual and expected or perceived pay. A study by Mokaya et al. (2013) on work conditions and employee job satisfaction in the hotel industry in Kenya has revealed a strong positive correlation between remuneration and job satisfaction.

Rewards and Employee Engagement

Awolusi (2013) undertook a study in the Nigerian banking industry on effects of motivation on employees’ job engagement. He studied 6 banks out of 22 licensed banks at the time of the study. The motivational factors he considered were salary and fringe benefits, stock ownership and added responsibilities/authority. With a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.99, majority of the respondents unanimously declared that salary and benefits provided their best source of motivation followed by stock ownership and increased responsibilities/authority. Data analysis from the findings revealed that majority of the junior employees believed they were not properly motivated hence poor employee engagement. There was also sufficient evidence to conclude that successful motivational policies
had positive effects on employee job engagement among Nigeria bank employees. Awolusi (2013) recommends that although money is perceived to be the most important motivator, organizations should find other ways of motivating employees by getting to understand their needs and utilize appropriate motivational techniques with each employee.

Nawab and Bhatti (2011) have also examined the influence of employee compensation on organizational engagement and Compensation among faculty members in Pakistani universities. They examined the compensation effect on three different types of organizational engagement and findings revealed that continuous engagement highly and significantly correlated with compensation followed by affective and normative in that order. Their findings revealed continuous and normative engagement were strongly related with financial compensation and non-financial compensation had a strong influence on affective engagement.

Mokaya and Kipyegon (2011) studied determinants of employee engagement in the banking industry in Kenya a case study of Cooperative Bank of Kenya. They found that engaged employees demonstrate great loyalty, trust and engagement to an organization’s goals. Mokaya and Kipyegon (2011) examined four determinants of employee engagement, namely personal development and growth influence on employee engagement, remuneration influence on employee engagement, performance management influence on employee engagement and work recreation influence on employee engagement. Their findings revealed a strong positive correlation between the four independent variables and employee engagement. Regression analysis revealed that an increase by one unit of workplace recreation, personal development and growth, performance management, and remuneration package would increase employee engagement by 0.090, 219, 0.386 and 0.389 units respectively. All the variables covered had a positive influence on employee engagement. However, remuneration was the highest contributor of employee engagement with workplace recreation having the least influence.

Compensation is a very valuable tool for retention and turnover. It is also a motivator for an employee’s engagement to the organization which in result enhances employee attraction and retention (Zobal, 1998; Moncarz et al., 2009; Chiu et al., 2002). It also works as communicator when given to an employee against his services. It also indicates how much an employee is valuable to an organization (Zobal, 1998).

Career Development
According to Sreedhara and Monis (2011), employee growth and development activities which entail career development include education courses, tuition re-imbursement,
career development skills training, opportunities for promotion and internal career advancement, mentorship, coaching and leadership programs. According to Grawitch et al. (2006), practices that contribute to employee development have been linked to employee engagement to an organization. An employee’s opportunity for promotions is likely to exert an influence on job satisfaction (Landy, 1989; Larwood, 1984; Moorhead & Griffin, 1992; Kinicki & Vecchio, 1994). Robbins (1998) maintains that promotions provide opportunities for personal growth, increased responsibility and increased social status. Bull (2005) postulates that many people experience satisfaction when they believe that their future prospects are good. This may translate into opportunities for advancement and growth in their current workplace, or enhance the chance of finding alternative employment.

Bernard (2012) asserts that nobody desires stagnation at one job level with no promotional prospects, hence no job satisfaction can be gained from a job that does not provide opportunities for growth and advancement. According to Metcafe (2005) and Tetty (2006), training and development which is part of career development is an important and significant staff retention factor. Ogaboh, Nkoyen and Ushie (2010) argue that career development can occur at the organizational level and personal level. They further assert that the organizational dimension is a planned programme to match organizational and individual needs while at the personal level it focuses on individual development that allows work, social and family life balance.

According to MaComick and Ilgen (1985), employees’ satisfaction with promotional opportunities will depend on a number of factors, including the probability that employees will be promoted, as well as the basis and the fairness of such promotions. Interestingly, not all employees may desire to be promoted. Teachers may be satisfied by new status and higher salaries that comes with a promotion. However, some promotions come along with more challenges and responsibilities and sometimes with no significant difference in pay structure, which may result in job dissatisfaction. Organizations that enhance career development through training programs and promotion opportunities on merit induce job satisfaction and organizational engagement among their employees.

**Career Development and Employee Engagement**

Ogaboh et al. (2010) have examined the relationship between career development and employee engagement among industrial firms in Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria. They examined career development under three components as independent variables, namely career advancement, career counselling and career opportunities. The study examined each variable’s influence on employee engagement.
The findings of the study revealed the three variables, namely career advancement, career counselling and career opportunities significantly influenced workers’ engagement.

All the three independent variables had a positive correlation with the dependent variable employee engagement. The findings indicated that employees are no longer satisfied with having just a job and fringe benefits rather they desire a career that expresses their interests, personalities, abilities and relates to their total situation. According to the study findings workers’ engagement is a function of how effective management is able to design and implement good career development programs in the organization. The study recommended high premium should be placed on the three variables by any management to increase worker productivity and engagement to organizational goals.

Saleem (2013) has studied the Impact of organizational support for career development and supervisory support on employee performance based on an empirical study from Pakistani academic sector. The study was compared the impact of supervisory support versus career development support by management to its employees. The findings indicated that supervisory support realized increasing and enhanced employee performance while career development had a moderate but positive impact on performance. Saleem (2013) recommends that organizational support for career development is essential to improve employee morale, productivity output and appreciation in employee’s mind that the organization is satisfying their part of the psychological contract and ultimately enhances employee engagement.

**Statement of the Problem**

Teacher engagement has been identified as an important factor for future success of education and schools (Hubberman, 1990; Mbwiria, 2010). Absenteeism, lateness, high turnover play an important part in influencing student achievement and attitude towards school (Firestone, 1996; Graham, 1996; Mbwiria, 2010). There is increasing concurrence among scholars on the link between teacher engagement and intimate element of passion for teaching (Day, 2004; Crosswell & Elliot, 2001; Mbwiria, 2010).

Globally, statistics reveal a worrying trend of low teacher retention rates among schools. In the West teaching has lofty attrition rates compared to law, medicine and engineering (Anderson et al., as cited in Wainaina, Kipchumba & Kombo, 2014). Recent studies indicate that about one-third of new teachers leave the profession within the first five years (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, as cited in Wainaina et al., 2014).
The old employment contract of life-time employment in exchange for loyalty is gone. Unfortunately for many institutions engagement fled with it (Laabs, as cited in Kibe, 2011). Issues surrounding lack of engagement among modern day employees have changed providing the need for more studies into employee engagement. According to Ogutu (2010), monetary rewards and leadership styles are major factors affecting teacher engagement, thus the need for school heads of public schools to undergo continuous training on relevant skills necessary for effective evaluation of teachers to improve performance and engagement to work.

In some cases, schools without funds have employed unqualified teachers; a factor that is adversely affecting the quality of education in schools. The free day secondary schools initiative introduced by the government has 1.9 million learners accessing it; numbers that are overwhelming since the number of teachers has not been increased proportionately. According to the Republic of Kenya (RoK) (2007), numerous official documents over the last decade have increasingly drawn attention to the fragility of perceived teacher job satisfaction. The Ministry of Education spends considerable funds on personnel recruitment, selection and training of new recruits leaving little funds for staff retention and development in the form of in-service trainings, scholarships for higher specialized qualifications, pay rises etc.

Current emerging issues about teacher grievances in Kenya are the bane of the impeding strike called by the union representatives in the first term of 2015 by the Kenya Union of Post-Primary Education Teachers (KUPPET) and the Kenya National Union of Teachers (KNUT). One of the grievances that is affecting teacher job satisfaction according to the Unions’ leaders is the Government of Kenya’s failure to promote 53000 teachers who hold degrees and diplomas in line with the TSC act. The teachers who had taken personal initiatives in professional and academic upgrading and had graduated with certificates, diplomas, bachelor’s degrees, master’s and PhDs expected to be elevated to the next pay grade a year ago but the Government withdrew the promotions due to budgetary constraints (The Standard, 2014, January 6). Secondly, the national government is not ready to negotiate with teachers who have refused to work in regions deemed insecure in parts of North Eastern due to insecurity following the killings of their colleagues by the Al-Shabaab militias and instead the teachers are being threatened with losing their jobs (The Standard, 2015, February 4).

Ingesroll (2002) argues that teacher shortage is caused by high turnover and 90% of new hires are replacements for recent departures. Previous studies have revealed that low organizational engagement may lead to intent to turnover. Mukuni (2005) observes that those teachers...
posted to rural areas often seek immediate transfers to urban areas or fail to turn up on consistent basis. Lewin et al. (2001) observe that there are various difficulties in attracting and retaining teachers in hard to reach remote areas. A number of reasons contributing to these difficulties include low compensation (other professions requiring similar educational qualifications offer higher compensation), poor working conditions, lack of professional development opportunities, little mobility to better positions, inadequate supervision and professional support and lack of stable incentive system to motivate teachers to remain in the teaching field.

The study was conducted to examine how the job satisfaction construct influenced teachers’ engagement to their work in schools in Kenya. Based on the study, this paper explores the influence of rewards and career development programmes on teacher engagement in Kenyan schools.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The study adopted a descriptive cross-sectional research design. Descriptive design is used when the focus on description about characteristics of variable under study occurs at a single point in time (Churchill Jr. & Iacobucci, 2005).

The population for the study was the total number of teachers in Kenyan public secondary schools who numbered 62,533 teaching in 5210 public secondary schools (Kenya School Report, 2014) at the time of the study. The study used stratified random sampling technique to come up with the sample. Stratified random sampling technique was used to ensure that all public secondary schools in all counties were well represented. Three (3) teachers were randomly selected plus the head-teacher or deputy head teacher totalling four respondents per school. This was done to achieve a variety of unbiased responses unlike one teacher per school. The study covered a total of 96 schools; each having 4 respondents totalling 384 respondents. There are 47 counties in Kenya and a random sample of 10% of the 47 counties approximating 5 counties representative of the entire country were selected at the first stage.

The study used a survey questionnaire to collect data. The questionnaire had both close-ended and open-ended questions in order to obtain accurate and in-depth answers from the respondents. The collected data was analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistical tools that were used included frequencies, percentages and mean while inferential statistical tools included Pearson Moment of Correlation and regression analysis. Pearson’s Simple Correlation (r) analysis was used to confirm the nature and strength of the relationship between some variables. Regression analysis was used to establish causal relationships between variables and the degree of causal effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Influence of Rewards on Teacher Engagement
The test of reliability of the study findings on the influence of rewards on teacher engagement indicated that the actual survey test reliability was good with a Cronbach alpha score of 0.783 > 0.7. The pilot test had a similar acceptable score of above 0.7. On validity, KMO of 0.684< 0.5 was obtained, indicating acceptable sample adequacy, and Bartlett’s test of 0.000< 0.05 was significant indicating the reward variable questionnaire items were valid with the content designed to be tested.

The respondents’ views on the influence of rewards on employee engagement were as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Influence of Rewards on Teacher Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is fairness in compensation of employees with similar qualifications.</td>
<td>31.10%</td>
<td>56.30%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the pay I receive.</td>
<td>31.60%</td>
<td>59.50%</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer offers a good performance based incentive scheme.</td>
<td>31.00%</td>
<td>68.30%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the house allowance that I receive on top of my salary.</td>
<td>34.10%</td>
<td>62.90%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am motivated by the transport allowance I receive on top of my salary.</td>
<td>29.10%</td>
<td>70.50%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NHIF scheme that covers me motivates my engagement to my job.</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>62.90%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chances for salary increases influence my teaching engagement positively.</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>12.30%</td>
<td>35.80%</td>
<td>42.70%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My School provides food and tea.</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>28.10%</td>
<td>60.60%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 indicates the mean of responses to eight question items was 2.1 on Likert scale of 1-4 ranging from 1 – strongly disagree to 4 – strongly agree with a standard deviation of 0.7. The mean of 2.1 would be rated under the scale disagree. This implied that majority of the teachers disagreed with the null hypothesis that reward does not significantly influence teacher engagement.

The study further sought to incidence of low teacher engagement due to unsatisfactory rewards. From the findings, 97.4% of the respondents had experienced low teacher engagement due to unsatisfactory rewards in the past while 2.6% of the respondents had never experienced low teacher engagement due to unsatisfactory rewards.

Table 2 below shows the findings on the level of satisfaction in relation to teaching jobs of teachers.
Table 2: Level of Satisfaction with Rewards in Relation to Teaching Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>302</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in Table 2 above indicate that 46.7% of the respondents experienced very low level of satisfaction and 45.4% low satisfaction levels with regard to rewards offered in their teaching jobs. Only 4% registered both high and very high levels of satisfaction.

The study thus sought to establish the role of rewards in teacher engagement. The results obtained indicated that 97.4% of the respondents felt that rewards played a role in their engagement while 2.6% felt that rewards played no role in their engagement.

The respondents were further asked to indicate the extent to which they thought rewards influenced teacher engagement. From the results obtained, 47.7% of the respondents agreed that rewards affected teachers’ engagement to a great extent and 50.7% indicated that ‘to a very great extent’ rewards played an instrumental role in their present engagement levels.

The respondents were also asked to indicate if they had witnessed positive teacher engagement due to better current rewards. From the findings, 79.1% of the teachers felt that there was positive engagement as a result of their present current rewards while 20.9% felt that there was no positive engagement arising from current rewards.

**Influence of Career Development on Teacher Engagement**

The study results on the reliability of findings regarding the influence of career development on teacher engagement indicate that the items of the measuring instrument had good reliability using the Cronbach test where $\alpha = 0.721 > 0.7$. With regards to validity, the KMO score of 0.531 indicated good sampling adequacy since it was greater than 0.5, while Bartlett’s test indicated $p=0.010<0.05$ revealing the items under career development in the questionnaire were valid to the content of the study.

The respondents’ views on the role of career development in teacher engagement were as shown in Table 3 below.
Table 3: Influence of Career Development in Teacher Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My employer has a clear career development policy for teachers.</td>
<td>36.80%</td>
<td>63.20%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development is supported in my school.</td>
<td>25.20%</td>
<td>73.20%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school has a clear promotion system.</td>
<td>32.80%</td>
<td>66.60%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are personal growth and development opportunities in our school.</td>
<td>28.80%</td>
<td>70.50%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always supported by my employer in my efforts to advance my education.</td>
<td>50.70%</td>
<td>47.40%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My employer provides scholarships for further learning.</td>
<td>41.70%</td>
<td>56.60%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good career development training programs in our school influences my engagement to teaching.</td>
<td>46.00%</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a competitive promotion system which recognizes teachers with additional/higher qualifications.</td>
<td>29.80%</td>
<td>43.70%</td>
<td>15.90%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have an allowance for study leave.</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>47.40%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results in Table 3 above, the responses to the nine items in the Likert scale had a mean of 1.7 which indicates majority of the teachers’ responses ranged between strongly disagreed and disagreed. The responses indicated that career development efforts by the employer were minimal in most schools.

The respondents were further asked to state whether or not there had been incidences of low teacher engagement due to lack of career development in their schools. From the research results, 96% of the respondents had in the past experienced an incidence of low teacher engagement attributed to lack of career development opportunities while 4% of the respondents had never experienced low engagement arising from lack of career development opportunities.

Moreover, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with career development in relation to their teaching jobs. The findings were as shown in Table 4 below.
The findings presented in Table 4 above show that 46.7% of the respondents regarded their level of satisfaction as very low with respect to current career development opportunities offered while 44.4% regarded their satisfaction as low and only 4.6% regarded it as high and 4.3% as very high. These results imply there could be no career development opportunities/programmes offered, or if offered they fell below the expectations of teachers with regard to satisfaction.

The respondents were further asked to indicate their views on the role of career development in teacher engagement. From the results obtained, 96.4% of respondents agreed with the statement that “Career development plays a role in teacher engagement” while 3.6% disagreed. This implies that majority regarded career development as critical in enhancing teacher engagement.

The respondents were further probed to indicate their views on the extent to which career development influenced teacher engagement. The findings were as indicated in Table 5 below.

The research results in Table 5 above indicate that 49% of the respondents agreed that career development influenced teacher engagement to a very great extent while 48.7 indicated that career development affected their engagement to a great extent. Only 1% stated that their engagement was influenced to a very low extent by career development.

The respondents were asked to state whether or not there had been positive teacher engagement due to existence of career development.
programmes in their schools. From the research results obtained, 92.4% of the respondents had experienced positive career engagement due to existence of career development programmes while 7.6% felt otherwise with existing career development programmes in their schools.

**Probit Analysis Results on Rewards and Career Development on Teacher Engagement**

**Rewards**

The results on employee engagement in the absence of rewards indicated that the coefficient of rewards in the probit regression was $-0.373746$ which meant that any value of increase of rewards multiplied by the coefficient would be negative unless zero. Negative value of rewards was the same as saying rewards were unsatisfactory. Any unit increase of unsatisfactory rewards in the probit regression equation would increase the probability of employee engagement towards negative territory implying poor engagement. When increase of unsatisfactory rewards was held at zero employee engagement would be $+3.038379$ meaning positive employee engagement. This implied there was poor employee engagement when rewards were unsatisfactory. The results further indicated the predictor variable rewards when unsatisfactory did not significantly influence the predicted probability of teacher engagement positively since $|p|=0.331>0.05$, alpha = 0.05.

The findings on employee engagement in the presence of rewards indicated that the coefficient of rewards was positive $+3.38452$ and any unit increase of predictor variable reward increased the probability employee engagement positively. The null hypothesis stated that regression coefficient of rewards was zero since it did not influence engagement. Since the coefficient was not zero and $|p|=0.000<0.05$ it was concluded that rewards significantly influenced teacher engagement. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. Employee engagement increased after rewards became better and when unit increase of rewards was held at zero employee engagement became negative, meaning it resulted in poor engagement.

The probit regression was also used to analyse predictor variable normal rewards’ influence on employee engagement of teachers at current reward levels, and not during incidences of when the rewards were low or after rewards became better. The coefficient of rewards was $+1.065487$ implying a unit increase of rewards would yield a positive increase in employee engagement in the probit regression equation. The null hypothesis stated that reward coefficient was zero but the results showed the coefficient had a positive value and significantly influenced employee engagement $|p|=0.002<0.05$. The null hypothesis was, therefore, rejected.
Career Development
The probit analysis was done to ascertain employee engagement when there was no career development. The obtained \(|p| = 0.802 > 0.05\) indicated employee engagement levels were not significant when there were no career development opportunities. However, the results indicated that employee engagement after the presence of career development opportunities was significant at \(|p| = 0.000 < 0.05\). Nevertheless, the findings indicated that teacher engagement is normally or currently not significant with present career development opportunities since \(|p| = 0.215 < 0.05\).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Based on the findings of the study, it is clear that rewards do significantly influence teacher engagement. Indeed, most of the schools have experienced low teacher engagement due to unsatisfactory rewards in the past. Moreover, majority of teachers are not satisfied with the rewards offered in their teaching jobs. Nevertheless, most of them are convinced that rewards indeed play a role in their engagement. In addition, teachers feel that there is some positive engagement as a result of present current rewards in their work.

The study findings further show that career development efforts by the employer are minimal in most schools. As a result, most of the schools have in the past experienced incidences of low teacher engagement attributed to lack of career development opportunities. Indeed, majority of teachers regard their level of satisfaction as very low with respect to current career development opportunities offered. This means that there could be no career development opportunities/programmes being offered in most Kenyan schools. Alternatively, those programmes that are being offered fall below the expectations of teachers with regard to satisfaction. Overall, teachers unanimously agree that career development does play a crucial role in teacher engagement.

Based on the findings of the study and the conclusions drawn, it is recommended that schools, in collaboration with the Ministry of Education and the Teachers Service Commission should look into the challenges that teachers face. Rewards should be streamlined with teachers’ workload, working environments and level of training of teachers. More in-service programmes should be adopted by schools and teachers should be enabled to develop their careers in line with the demands of time and enrolment levels. Those teachers who advance their careers should be properly motivated through corresponding remuneration and promotions in line with TSC regulations.
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