



# A Study of Job Satisfaction of High School Teachers

Guide  
DR. VINITKUMAR M. THAKUR

Researcher  
PRIYANKAKUMARI J. PATEL

## 1. Introduction

Job satisfaction is the inspiring and nourishing an effort to carry out a particular task, which is required for the students to make a good career. Job satisfaction is good for both the employees and employers. This enhances the productivity and diminishes the absentees and turnover in the organization or an educational institution. This encourages happiness, success and high proficiency in the professional life of an individual and helps them to develop an interest and happiness to work at the workplace. This also creates a wonderful environment for them to work. This also increases the gross revenue rate, intentions and tendencies and also increases absenteeism. This is the main reason to not make any employees feel dissatisfied. It is critical for anyone to identify and regulate various factors those are taking a toll on the satisfaction of the teachers. When you discourse this issue, the organization can enhance the performance of teachers and their efficiencies.

The purpose of this study was to construct a tool which can explore job satisfaction of secondary school teachers working in the secondary schools of Gujarat State.

## 2. Definitions of Job Satisfaction

According to Locke (1976),

“Job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience.”

Robbins (2005) defines job satisfaction as

“The difference between the number of rewards workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive.”

Schultz & Schultz (2006) said,

“Job satisfaction refers to the positive and negative feelings and attitudes we hold about our jobs.”

According to Newstorm (2007),

“Job Satisfaction is a set of favourable or unfavourable feelings and emotions with which employees view their work. Job satisfaction is an affective attitude - a feeling of relative like or dislike toward something.”

## 3. Variables of study

In this study the following types of variables are selected.

### 3.1 Independent variable

#### Area

- Urban
- Rural

#### School Type

- Grant-in-aided
- Self-finance

#### Stream of teacher’s education

- General
- Science

## Gender

- Male
- Female

## 4. Dependent variable

Scores of Job Satisfaction Scale

## 5. Objectives of Study

Objectives in present study are as follow.

1. To construct the Job Satisfaction Scale.
2. To standardize the Job Satisfaction Scale.
3. To establish the norms of Job Satisfaction Scale.
4. To study the job satisfaction of secondary school teachers.
5. To study the job satisfaction of secondary school teachers in context of area.
6. To study the job satisfaction of secondary school teachers in context of type of school.
7. To study the job satisfaction of secondary school teachers in context of their stream.
8. To study the job satisfaction of secondary school teachers in context of gender.

## 6. Hypotheses of Study

Hypotheses of present study are as follow.

- Ho1** There is no significant difference between mean scores obtained in Job Satisfaction Scale by teachers of secondary schools of urban and rural area.
- Ho2** There is no significant difference between mean scores obtained in Job Satisfaction Scale by teachers of grant-in-aided and self-finance schools.
- Ho3** There is no significant difference between mean scores obtained in Job Satisfaction Scale by teachers of general and science stream.
- Ho4** There is no significant difference between mean scores obtained in Job Satisfaction Scale by male and female teachers.

## 7. Research Method

The researcher selected a sample from secondary schools of different zones of Gujarat state. In present study, the researcher had to collect data from a predefined group of respondents to obtain information and insights into various factors regarding job satisfaction. When data is usually obtained through the use of standardized procedure that each respondent can answer the tool items at a level playing field to avoid biased opinions that could influence the outcome of the research, Survey method is always used. That's why in present study, the researcher used **survey research method**.

## 8. Sample of the Study

The researcher selected 3450 secondary school teachers from urban and rural area of Gujarat state.

**Table 1: Area wise sample of the study**

Area/Gender	Urban	Rural	Total
Male	1115	1445	2560
Female	476	414	890
Total	1591	1859	3450

According to above table, the researcher selected 1115 male and 476 female teachers from urban area. 1445 male teachers and 414 female teachers were selected from rural area. Total 3450 secondary school teachers were selected out of which 2560 were male teachers and 890 were female teachers.

### 9. Research Tool

The researcher constructed Job Satisfaction for secondary school teachers. In Job Satisfaction Scale 72 items were there. Each item has five responses 1) Strongly agree, 2) Partially agree, 3) Neutral, 4) Partially disagree and 5) Disagree.

### 10. Procedure of Data Collection

The researcher constructed and standardize a Job Satisfaction Scale for secondary school teachers. The researcher selected 3450 secondary school teachers for data collection. Due to COVID19 pandemic, it was impossible to collect data by physical visit to the schools. The researcher used virtual techniques in collection of data. The researcher created a google form of Job Satisfaction Scale and its link was shared with different teachers' groups. The teachers who obtained this link further shared the google form link to other teachers. The teacher who obtained the link fill up the form and submitted it online. Thus, 3450 teachers across Gujarat state filled up the forms and all the data have been collected in an excel sheet on google cloud.

### 11. Data Analysis and Results

The researcher constructed four hypotheses as mentioned above. These hypotheses were checked using t-tests. The result of t-tests is given in tables below.

**Ho<sub>1</sub> There is no significant difference between mean scores obtained in Job Satisfaction Scale by teachers of secondary schools of urban and rural area.**

**Table 2: Result of t-test conducted between mean scores obtained in Job Satisfaction Scale by teachers of secondary schools of urban and rural area**

Area	N	M	SD	SED	t	Significance
Urban	1591	268.29	33.40	1.21	6.78	0.01
Rural	1859	260.09	37.68			

df	0.05	0.01
3448	1.96	2.58

According to above table, calculated t-value is 6.78. For df=3448, table t-values are 1.96 and 2.58 at 0.05 and 0.01 level respectively. Calculated t-value is more than table t-value at 0.01 level. Thus, hypothesis HO<sub>1</sub> is rejected and there is a significant difference between mean scores of Job Satisfaction Scale obtained by teachers of urban and rural area.

In this result, mean score of teachers of urban area is higher than mean score of teachers of rural area. Therefore, it is revealed that secondary school teachers of urban area are more satisfied than secondary school teachers of rural area.

**Ho<sub>2</sub> There is no significant difference between mean scores obtained in Job Satisfaction Scale by teachers of grant-in-aided and self-finance schools.**

**Table 3: Result of t-test conducted between mean scores obtained in Job Satisfaction Scale by teachers of grant-in-aided and self-finance schools**

Type	N	M	SD	SED	t	Significance
Grant-in-aided	1987	263.67	38.61	1.21	0.39	NS
Self-finance	1463	264.14	32.12			

df	0.05	0.01
3448	1.96	2.58

According to above table, calculated t-value is 0.39. For df=3448, table t-values are 1.96 and 2.58 at 0.05 and 0.01 level respectively. Calculated t-value is less than table t-value at both levels. Thus,

hypothesis Ho<sub>2</sub> is not rejected and there is no significant difference between mean scores of Job Satisfaction Scale obtained by teachers of grant-in-aided and self-finance schools. Therefore, it is revealed that secondary school teachers of grant-in-aided and self-finance schools are equally satisfied towards their jobs.

**Ho<sub>3</sub> There is no significant difference between mean scores obtained in Job Satisfaction Scale by teachers of general and science stream.**

**Table 4: Result of t-test conducted between mean scores obtained in Job Satisfaction Scale by teachers of general and science stream**

Stream	N	M	SD	SED	t	Significance
General	1987	263.67	38.61	1.21	0.39	NS
Science	1463	264.14	32.12			

df	0.05	0.01
3448	1.96	2.58

According to above table, calculated t-value is 0.39. For df=3448, table t-values are 1.96 and 2.58 at 0.05 and 0.01 level respectively. Calculated t-value is less than table t-value at both levels. Thus, hypothesis HO<sub>3</sub> is not rejected and there is no significant difference between mean scores of Job Satisfaction Scale obtained by teachers of general and science stream. Therefore, it is revealed that secondary school teachers of general and science stream are equally satisfied towards their jobs.

**Ho<sub>4</sub> There is no significant difference between mean scores obtained in Job Satisfaction Scale by male and female teachers.**

**Table 5: Result of t-test conducted between mean scores obtained in Job Satisfaction Scale by male and female teachers**

Gender	N	M	SD	SED	t	Significance
Male	2560	261.59	35.38	1.42	6.22	0.01
Female	890	270.44	36.96			

df	0.05	0.01
3448	1.96	2.58

According to above table, calculated t-value is 6.22. For df=3448, table t-values are 1.96 and 2.58 at 0.05 and 0.01 level respectively. Calculated t-value is more than table t-value at 0.01 level. Thus, hypothesis HO<sub>4</sub> is rejected and there is a significant difference between mean scores of Job Satisfaction Scale obtained by male and female teachers.

## 12. Major Findings of the Study

Major findings of present study are as follow.

- 1.The secondary school teachers of urban area are more satisfied than secondary school teachers of rural area.
- 2.The secondary school teachers of grant-in-aided and self-finance schools are equally satisfied towards their jobs.
- 3.The secondary school teachers of general and science stream are equally satisfied towards their jobs.
- 4.The secondary school female teachers are more satisfied than secondary school male teachers.

## 13. Conclusion

The researcher studied job satisfaction of secondary school teachers of Gujarat state. The researcher selected 3450 secondary school teachers from different schools of Gujarat state. The researcher constructed and standardized a Job Satisfaction Scale for secondary school teachers. It was revealed

that the teachers of grant-in-aided schools have higher job satisfaction than teachers of self-finance schools.

## References

- 1.Sargent, T. & Hannum, E. (2005). Keeping Teachers Happy: Job Satisfaction among Primary School Teachers in Rural Northwest China. *Comparative Education Review*, 49, 2, pp. 173-204.
- 2.Ingersoll, R. (2001). Teacher Turnover and Teacher Shortages: An Organizational Analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38 (3), pp. 499-534.
- 3.Retrieved from: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/construction>
- 4.Terry, P.G. & Thomas, J. (1977). *The International Dictionary of Education*, London: Oxford University Press, p.84.
- 5.Menzel, E. W. (1952). *Suggestions for use of type test in India*, London: Oxford University Press, p.27.
- 6.Cronbach, L.J. (1984). *Essentials of Psychological Testing*, New York: University of Illinois Harper and Brothers, p.22.
- 7.Anastasi, A. & Urbina, S. (2002), *Psychological Testing (7<sup>th</sup> Ed.)*, New Delhi: Pearson Education (Singapore) Pvt. Ltd., p.6.
- 8.Kumar, S. (2011). A comparative study of effectiveness of teacher educators in different types of teacher education institutions in relation to their anxiety, stress and job-satisfaction (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak.
- 9.Locke, E. A. (1976). *The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction*, *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (1<sup>st</sup> Ed.)*, Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, p.52.
10. Michaelowa, K. (2003). *Teacher job satisfaction, student achievement and the cost of primary education (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*, University of Zurich, Zurich.
11. Newstrom, J. W. (2007). *Organizational behavior (12th ed.)*, New York: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc., p.101.
12. Paramji, S. (1977). *The relationship between general higher education and Job aspirations, job satisfaction and job efficiency and non-professional job holders (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*, The M. S. University of Baroda, Baroda.
13. Robbins, S. P. (2005). *Organizational Behaviour, 7th Ed.* Pearson Prentice Hall: New Jersey, p.102.
14. Schultz, D. & Schultz, S. E. (2006). *Psychology & work today (9<sup>th</sup> ed.)*, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc., p.89.
15. Seema (2012). *A study of occupational self-efficacy, job satisfaction and attitude towards teaching profession among teachers working in teacher training institutions (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak.
16. Yu, X. (2009). *Job Satisfaction of University Academics in China (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*, University of Newcastle, Newcastle.