Job Satisfaction of In-service Teacher Trainees: A Study

Kallave Maheshwar G.,
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Marathwada University,
Department of Education Sub Campus-Osmanabad

Received: 23 August 2012
Accepted: 21 September 2012

Abstract

Job satisfaction has been the most frequently investigated variable in organizational behavior (Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction varies and researchers, for example Peretomode (1991) and Whawo (1993), have suggested that the higher the prestige of the job, the greater the job satisfaction. Many workers, however, are satisfied in even the least prestigious jobs. That is, they simply like what they do. In any case, job satisfaction is as individual as one's feelings or state of mind.

Job satisfaction can be influenced by a variety of factors, for example, the quality of one’s relationship with their supervisor, the quality of the physical environment in which they work, the degree of fulfillment in their work, etc. However, there is no strong acceptance among researchers, consultants, etc., that increased job satisfaction produces improved job performance. In fact, improved job satisfaction can sometimes decrease job performance (McNamara, [n.d]; War, 1998).
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Introduction

The quality of education depends upon the merit of teachers. Teacher is the agent of social change. A teacher who treads the path by taking along qualities such as dedication to knowledge, student and society needs to make his students more curious for coping with knowledge explosion. For this to happen, the teacher should be satisfied in his occupation.

In the field of education, newer and newer trends are being introduced. In the knowledge – oriented society, the teacher has the challenge to empower his students through knowledge structuralism. Education is at the heart of social change. Primary and secondary teachers are the important factors in the process of education. Hence, in order to mould knowledge – based students, the teacher should himself be knowledge – oriented. This can be achieved only he is fully satisfied in his occupation. Hence, in order to know the level of job satisfaction of teachers pursuing in-service M. Ed. Course at Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Marathwada University, Sub-Campus, Osmanabad, present study has been undertaken.
Objectives
1) To study job satisfaction level of teachers pursuing in – service M. Ed.
2) To undertake comparative study of job satisfaction of primary and secondary teachers,
3) To undertake comparative study of job satisfaction between male and female teachers.

Assumptions
1) Each teacher has different job satisfaction level.
2) The efficiency of each teacher is different.

Null Hypotheses
1) There is no measurable significant difference between the job satisfaction level of primary and secondary teachers.
2) There is no measurable significant difference between the job satisfaction level of male and female teachers.

Methodology
In the present research work, survey method was used. In this research activity, data was collected by using the job satisfaction standardized test of Dr. Pramod Kumar and Dr. D. N. Mutha. For analysis of collected data, statistical tools such as median, standard deviation and ‘t’ test have been used.

Inferences were drawn by calculating the class difference of data in a standardized test.

Sample
A sample of 50 teachers pursuing in – service M. Ed. was chosen using purposive sampling method. Out of these 50 teachers, 25 male and 25 female teachers were chosen by using multi-level sampling method. This sample included 13 secondary male teachers and 12 secondary female teachers whereas 12 primary teachers and 13 primary female teachers.

Job Satisfaction of Teachers pursuing In-Service M. Ed.
Observation
On classifying the job satisfaction test for teachers, it was known that there were teachers who scored minimum 11 marks, whereas maximum marks scored were up to 29. In the first 2 groups, there are about half of the participants. Their job satisfaction level is good to excellent, whereas in the lower 2 groups where are 6 respondents who are dissatisfied in their profession, whereas the job satisfaction level of 20 teachers is good, whereas 6 respondents fall in the group of excellent. If average job satisfaction of all these respondents is drawn, it comes out to be 23.76 which is good.
TABLE: 01
Job Satisfaction of Primary and Secondary Teachers pursuing In-service M. Ed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Calculated ‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Observed Table ‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>I\textsuperscript{st} Year</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>II\textsuperscript{nd} Year</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation
The mean of job satisfaction of secondary school teachers is 24.15 whereas that of primary school teachers is 23.37, which is good. As a result, we can infer that teachers at both the levels are satisfied in their profession.

On testing the null hypothesis of the research work, obtained ‘t’ value is 1.52, which is lower at validity level as compared to table values, which indicates that the difference between the job satisfaction level of primary and secondary teachers is insignificant. Hence we are accepting the hypothesis no. 1.

TABLE: 02
Job Satisfaction of Male and Female Teachers pursuing In-service M. Ed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Calculated ‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Observed Table ‘t’ Value</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation
The mean of male teachers is 24, whereas that of female teachers is 23.52, whereas standard deviation is 4.71 and 5.13 respectively. From this, it becomes clear that both of them are satisfied in their jobs.

On testing hypothesis 2 in research, obtained ‘t’ value is 1.38 which is less than validity level at both the ends. Hence, the difference between the job satisfaction levels of male and female teachers is insignificant. Hence, hypothesis No. 2 is accepted.

Inferences
1) The teachers pursuing in – service M. Ed. are satisfied in their jobs.
2) As per analysis of job satisfaction standardized class test, 18% teachers are little satisfied in their jobs.
3) Average job satisfaction of 34% teachers is above 21 which is good.
4) Twenty-four % of the teachers are fully satisfied in their jobs.
5) There is no difference between job satisfaction levels of male and female teachers.
6) The difference between job satisfaction level of secondary and primary teachers is 0.78 which is insignificant.
7) All the teachers think that the profession they have chosen is the best one.

**Recommendations**
1) Teachers should keep their knowledge updated in order to obtain full job satisfaction in their profession.
2) The teachers should be given ideal place in family.
3) In order that teachers become satisfied in their jobs, prizes at various levels should be introduced.
4) Teachers should be made permanent as early as possible in their jobs.
5) They should have freedom to work in profession.
6) The administration should be prompt in solving teachers’ problems.
7) The opportunities for promotion should be made available to them from time to time.
8) The teachers should be given encouragement at various levels.

**Conclusion**
A teacher who is satisfied in his job assumes an important role in the development of society. Only a teacher who is fully satisfied in his job can play his role in the development of students. Hence, a teacher who is fully satisfied in his job becomes successfully in creating joyous atmosphere at school and in creating knowledge – based society.
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