

Job Satisfaction Among Teachers Working at Various Levels: A Case Study of District Kangra

Dr Gulshan Kumar Dhiman

Associate Professor

Govt. College Dhaliara(Kangra)H.P.

ABSTRACT:- Teacher is the most important factor in the education system. The whole system of education revolves around the teacher. If teacher is satisfied with his job, only then he or she can give the best performance to the students. If teacher is not satisfied with his job then we have delinquent in the coming society. So the investigation in the job satisfaction of teachers is very essential. In the present paper job satisfaction of Kangra(Himachal Pradesh) District teachers has been done using questionnaire.

Key Words:- Job satisfaction, Maslow's hierarchy, Vroom interaction model, ANOVA, Post-Hoc.

The relationship between man and work has long attracted the attention of philosophers. A major part of man's life is spent in work. It is, therefore, natural to expect that man would seek to satisfy many of his needs in and through his work. However, an analysis of job satisfaction through the fulfillment of need per se is not new. For example Maslow's hierarchy of human need provided the basic foundation of many subsequent studies on job satisfaction.

In true sense, job satisfaction doesn't mean a perpetual smirk on the face of employee. It doesn't mean turning work into hobby, undertaken just for the pleasure of it. Job satisfaction essentially means economy of efforts, getting rid of avoidable tension, utilizing the energy of the employees for better performance of work instead of allowing them to be dissipated needlessly (. Bhatia, 1986).

Hoppock(1935) defined job satisfaction as, " any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say: I am satisfied with my job"

Review of Literature

Lavingla (1974) conducted a study of 1600 teachers from secondary and primary schools situated in urban and rural areas selected among 18 districts from Gujarat and found that teacher serving in rural areas were more job satisfied then the teachers working in urban area.

The proportion of research evidence indicate that there is no strong linkage between job satisfaction and productivity. Satisfied worker will not necessary be the highest producers. There are many possible moderating variable the most important of which seems to be rewards. If people receive rewards they feel are equitable, they will be satisfies and this is likely to greater performance in efforts (Luthan's 1998).

Even though the efforts are modest the fact that job satisfaction contributes to decreasing the level of employees absenteeism remains. So satisfaction is worth paying attention to, specially since it is potentially under your control- unlike some of the other causes of absenteeism (Sweney and Mcfarlin, 2005)

Research Methodology

Teachers were randomly selected from different Govt. Institutions selected from Kangra for the purpose of study different levels were defined as follows:

1. Teachers who taught from class 1-5 were defined as primary level teachers.
2. Teachers who taught from class 6-10 were considered as high school level teachers.
3. Teachers who taught class 10+1 and 10+2 were classified as Senior secondary level teachers

Three districts namely Dehra, Dharamshala and Jaisinghpur were selected from Kangra District, depending upon their demographic profile. From each tehsil 30 teachers working at each level were chosen for the study .

Job satisfaction was assessed by Satisfaction Dissatisfaction Employees inventory (S. D. E. I). This inventory has been standardized by Pestonjee(1973-1981). This inventory is based on Vroom's interaction model (Vroom 1973-1981). The Questionnaire comprised of on the job and off the job factors. This inventory has total 80 Questions. Scoring has been done with the help of standardized scoring key. The front page of profile of job satisfaction included the demographic variable of the individual.

Objective of the study

1. To find the level of job satisfaction among teachers working at various levels.
2. To study the significance of difference between the degree of job satisfaction among teachers working at various levels.

Hypothesis:-

Null Hypothesis: There would be no significant difference in the degree of job satisfaction of teachers working at various levels.

Alternate Hypothesis: There would be significant difference in the degree of job satisfaction of teachers working at various levels.

Statistical Techniques :-

1. Mean and standard deviation were calculated for job satisfaction of teachers working at various levels .
2. The mean score obtained by each level of job satisfactions were tested for the significance of difference using ANOVA test.
3. The mean scores of job satisfaction obtained were tested for significance of difference using Post –Hoc test.

Results:

Analysis of table reveals that value of mean is maximum in case of Dehra tehsil i.e. 47.73 and minimum in case of Jai Singhpur (36.88), which shows that teachers belonging to Dehra tehsil are more job satisfied as compared to Dhramshala and Jai Singhpur tehsil as been presented in table 1.1

Table 1.1: Descriptive Statistical Analysis of Job Satisfaction on the Basis of Tehsils

| Tehsils | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | Standard error |
|--------------|-----|-------|--------------------|----------------|
| Dehra | 90 | 47.73 | 6.60954 | 0.49265 |
| Dhramshala | 90 | 43.71 | 3.67451 | 0.27388 |
| Jai Singhpur | 90 | 36.88 | 6.20082 | 0.46218 |
| Total | 270 | 42.77 | 6.87835 | 0.29600 |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

Further, the mean score for Dhramshala tehsil is 43.71 and the calculated values of standard deviation for three tehsils are as follows, Dehra (6.60954), Dhramshala (3.67451) and

Jai Singhpur (6.20082). As far as standard error of mean is concerned, the calculated values are; 0.49265, 0.27388 and 0.46218 for Dehra, Dhramshala and Jai Singhpur tehsils respectively.

Table 1.1 (a): Anova Results For Job Satisfaction On The Basis tehsils

| | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | p-value |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|---------|
| Between groups | 4190.374 | 2 | 2095.187 | 65.237 | 0.000 |
| Within groups | 8059.62 | 267 | 30.186 | | |
| Total | 12249.994 | 269 | | | |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

Table 1.1 (a) shows ANOVA results for Job Satisfaction on the basis of tehsils. The significance value of the F-test is 0.000 which depicts rejection of null hypothesis.

So, it can be said that there is a significant difference in Job Satisfaction among teachers working at various levels in Kangra District. Further, to study the pair-wise comparison Post Hoc test has been used.

Table 1.1(b): Post Hoc Results For Job Satisfaction On The Basis Of Tehsils

| Tehsil | Dhramshala | Jai Singhpur |
|------------|------------|--------------|
| Dehra | 5.833* | 9.681* |
| Dhramshala | - | 3.644* |

*Significant at the 1 percent level of significance.

The Post Hoc result for Job Satisfaction On The Basis Of Tehsils has been presented in Table 1.1 (b). The table reveals that the difference is highly significant between the respondents of tehsils Dehra & Dhramshala, Dhramshala & Jai Singhpur and Dehra & Jai Singhpur. Thus, it can be concluded from the above analysis that teachers of Dehra tehsil are highest job satisfied followed by teachers of Dhramshala and Jai Singhpur.

Table 1.2: Descriptive Statistical Analysis of Job Satisfaction on The Basis of Type of Teachers

| Type of teacher | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | Standard error |
|--------------------------|-----|-------|--------------------|----------------|
| Primary teacher | 90 | 49.73 | 6.60954 | 0.47465 |
| High school teacher | 90 | 43.77 | 3.67451 | 0.28368 |
| Senior secondary teacher | 90 | 34.81 | 6.20082 | 0.48008 |
| Total | 270 | 42.77 | 5.87835 | 0.29600 |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

Further, the mean score for primary teachers is 43.71 and the calculated values of standard deviation for three levels are as follows, primary level (6.60954), high school level(3.67451) and senior secondary level (6.20082). As far as standard error of mean is concerned, the calculated values are; 0.49265, 0.27388 and 0.46218 for primary level high school level and senior secondary level teachers respectively.

Table 1.2 (a): Anova Results For Job Satisfaction On The Basis of type of teachers

| | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | p-value |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|---------|
| Between groups | 3529.449 | 2 | 1764.72 | 34.632 | 0.000 |
| Within groups | 19470 | 267 | 72.921 | | |
| Total | 22999.449 | 269 | | | |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

Table 1.2 (a) shows ANOVA results for Job Satisfaction on the basis of type of teachers. The significance value of the F-test is 0.000 which depicts rejection of null hypothesis.

So, it can be said that there is a significant difference in Job Satisfaction among teachers working at various levels in kangra District. Further, to study the pair –wise comparison Post Hoc test has been used.

Table 1.2(b): Post Hoc Results For Job Satisfaction On The Basis Of Type of Teachers

| Tehsil | High school level | Senior secondary level |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Primary level | 6.847* | 5.632* |
| High school level | - | 4.986* |

*Significant at the 1 percent level of significance.

The Post Hoc result for Job Satisfaction On The Basis Of type of teachers has been presented in Table 1.2 (b). The table reveals that the difference is highly significant between the respondents of Primary level & High school, High school & senior secondary and Primary level & senior secondary level teacher. Thus, it can be concluded from the above analysis that teachers of Primary level are highest job satisfied followed by teachers of High school level and senior secondary level teachers..

References:-

1. Aggarwala, U.N.(1978) : Measuring Job Involvement in India Indian Journal of Industrial Relations Volume 4(2); Pages: 219-231.
2. Aleem, Sarah and Khandelwala, Preetam (1988): Job- Involvement: Perceived Outcome Importance –A Study of Dual Carrer Couples. Indian Journal of Applied Psychology, Volume25(2), Pages 27-34.
3. Arya, P.P (1984): Work Satisfaction and its correlates. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations Pages 89-100

4. Bajab, Neelam (1977): Job-Involvement in High and Low Anxious Working Women. Journal of Applied Psychology. Pages 33-36.
5. Pajaji,C.(1985) : Organisational commitment and Satisfaction of Professionals and Non Professionals in co-operative. Vikalps, Vol.10(1). Pages 35-41.
6. Bhatia, S.K. (1986): Principles and Techniques of Personnel Management. Deep and Deep Publications.
7. Kllood N.K and Sullin, C.L. (1967) : Alienation, Environmental Characterstics and Worker Responses. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol.51. Pages 284-290.
8. Krayfield, A.H. and Rothe, H.F. (1951): An Index of Job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol..35. Pages 307-311.
9. Daily, P.C. and Korgan, C.N. (1978): Personnel Characteristics and Job Involvement as job antecedents of boundary spanning behavior: A path Analysis. Journal of Management Studies, Vol.15, Pages: 330-339.
- 10.Gorn, G.J. and Kanungo R.N.(1980): Job- Involvement and Motivation: An Intrinsically Motivated Managers More Job Involved Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance. Vol. 26, Pages, 265-277.
- 11.Goyal, J.C. (1981): A study of the relationship among Attitude. Job-satisfaction. Adjustment and Professional Interests of Teachers Educators in India. Indian Educational Review, Vol. 16(4), Pages 55-60.
- 12.Hinger, Asha (1986) : Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction. Printwell Publishers, Pages 21-22.
- 13.Hoppock, R. (1935) : Job –satisfaction. Harper and Brothers. New York.

14. Kanungo, R.N. (1980) : Biculturism and Management. Toronto, Hutterworths.
15. Kanungo, R.N. (1981) : Work Alienation and Involvement. Problems and Prospects. International Review of Applied Psychology, Vol. 30. Pages. 1-15.
16. Kanungo, R.N. (1982) : Work Alienation. N.Y., Prager Publications.
17. Lavingia, K.V. (1974): A Study of Job- Satisfaction Among School Teachers. Doctoral Dissertation, Indian Dissertation Abstract, 5,182,44.
18. Maslow, A.H.(1954) : Motivation and Personality . N.Y. Harper and Row.
19. Lodahl, T.M. and Kejner, M(1965): The definition and Measurement of Job- Involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology Vol. 49, Pages 149.
20. Mebley and Locke (1979) : The Relationship of Value Importance Satisfaction, Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance Vol. 5. Pages 463-483.
21. Mehta, P (1977) : Employee Motivation and Work Satisfaction in Public Enterprises. Vikalpa, Vol. 2(3), Page 223-236.
22. Netraj, C.L. and Hafeez, A. (1965): A study of Job- Satisfaction among Workers. Indian Journal of social work, Vol. 26(1), Pages 82-85.
23. Patchen, M.(1970) Participation, Achievement and Involvement on the job. Englewood cliffs, N.J. Prentice Hall.
24. Pathak, R.D. (1982) : Job-Involvements relationship to certain variables among bank officers in India. Prajan. Vol.XI(4), Pages 71-77.
25. Rabinowitz, S. (1975): Ego, Involvement. Job –Satisfaction and Job- Performance. Personnel Psychology, Vol. 15, Pages 159-177.

26. Robinowitz, S. and Hall, D.T. (1977) :Research on Job- Satisfaction. Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 84 Page 265-288.
27. Ruh, R.A. & White, J.K. (1974): Job- Involvement : A Construct Validity Study Paper Presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans.
28. Ruh, R.A. & White, J.K. (1975): Job- Involvement, Values, Personal- Background Participation in Decision Making and Job- Attitude. Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 18 Pages 300-312.
29. Ruh, R.A. & White, J.K. & Wood, R.R. : Job- Involvement , Values, Personal Background Participation in Decision Making and Job- Attitude. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 57. Pages 288-294.
30. Saleh, S.D. & Rosek, J (1976): Job- Involvement: Concept and Measurement. Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 19 Pages 213-214.

