Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies
Online ISSN 2278-8808, SJIF 2026 = 8.727
https://www.srjis.com/issues_data/304
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal, SEPT-OCT 2026, Vol- 15/97

JOB SATISFACTION AMONG TEACHER EDUCATORS IN RELATION TO SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

*__Mittapalli Mukteswar__
M.Sc. (Maths), M.Sc. (Phy.), M.A. (Soc.), M.A. (Phil.), M.Ed.
Research Scholar, Department of Education, Dravidian University, Kuppam, AP.
**__Prof. S. Vijaya Vardhini,__
M.A., M.Sc. (Psy.), M.Ed., PhD.
Professor, Department of Education & HRD, Dravidian University, Kuppam, Chittoor Dt, AP.

Paper Received On: 1 OCT 2026
Peer Reviewed On: 16 OCT 2026
Published On: 01 NOV 2026

Abstract

The present study examines the Job Satisfaction of teacher educators in relation to selected demographic variables, namely gender, subject taught at the B.Ed. level, type of institution, and social status in Telangana State. The study adopted the normative survey method. A sample of 257 teacher educators was selected from 32 colleges of education using a purposive sampling technique in Telangana State covering four geographical regions of Telangana State: North, South, East, and West. Data were collected using the Teacher's Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS), developed by Nasrin and Annes, which consists of 42 items rated on a five-point Likert-type scale. The collected data were analysed using Mean, SD, CR, and ANOVA and Tukey's post hoc test

The findings revealed no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of teacher educators with respect to gender, subject taught Pedagogy-1 and Pedagogy-2, type of institution, and social status. Although some differences were observed in the mean scores of these groups, they were not statistically significant. The findings highlight the importance of creating supportive and equitable working conditions for all teacher educators, with equal professional opportunities, fair distribution of workload, and inclusive institutional practices. Strengthening supportive leadership, professional recognition, and opportunities for professional growth, along with regular assessment of job satisfaction, may contribute to the professional well-being of teacher educators and the overall quality of teacher education.

Keywords: *Job Satisfaction, Teacher Educators, Gender, Subject Taught at B.Ed. Level, Type of Institution, Social Status, Teacher Education*

1. Introduction:

"Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world."

— Nelson Mandela

Copyright © 2026, Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies

Education plays an important role in the development of individuals, society, and the nation. Teachers are often regarded as nation builders because they contribute significantly to the intellectual, social, and personal development of future generations. The quality of education largely depends on the quality and effectiveness of teachers.

Teacher educators occupy a significant position in the education system as they are responsible for preparing future teachers. They provide prospective teachers with the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and professional competencies required to meet the changing demands of education. Therefore, the quality of teacher education largely depends on the professional competence and effectiveness of teacher educators.

The role of teacher educators is becoming increasingly challenging due to changes in educational policies, curriculum, technology, and societal expectations. They are expected to prepare future teachers to become lifelong learners and effective professionals. To perform these responsibilities successfully, teacher educators need adequate professional knowledge, skills, institutional support, and a positive working environment.

Among the various factors that influence the professional effectiveness of teacher educators, Job Satisfaction is considered an important factor. Job Satisfaction influences their motivation, commitment, performance, and overall well-being. A satisfied teacher educator is more likely to perform professional responsibilities with interest and enthusiasm. Therefore, understanding Job Satisfaction among teacher educators is essential for improving their professional effectiveness and the overall quality of teacher education.

2. Concept of Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction is an important concept in the field of psychology and organizational behaviour. It is formed from two terms: *job* and *satisfaction*. A job refers to the duties and responsibilities performed by an individual, while satisfaction refers to a feeling of contentment or fulfilment. Job satisfaction, therefore, refers to the positive or negative feelings that an individual has towards their job.

Since people spend a significant part of their lives at work, their satisfaction with their job is important for their overall well-being. Job Satisfaction reflects the extent to which an individual's expectations, needs, and values are fulfilled through work experiences **(Spector, 1997)**. It is also closely related to overall life satisfaction, as personal life and work experiences often influence each other **(Judge & Klinger, 2008)**. **Locke (1976)** defined Job Satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences." In simple terms, Job Satisfaction develops when individuals feel that their job meets their expectations and fulfils their important needs. In the field of education, Job Satisfaction is particularly important because teachers play a major role in the teaching–learning process. A teacher's level of Job Satisfaction can influence motivation, commitment, teaching effectiveness, and professional performance. Higher Job Satisfaction may encourage teachers to work with greater interest and enthusiasm, whereas dissatisfaction may negatively affect their performance and professional commitment (**Hoy & Miskel, 2013**).

Job Satisfaction is not influenced by a single factor. It includes several aspects of professional life, such as salary, working conditions, relationships with colleagues, opportunities for professional growth, and organizational support **(Luthans, 2011)**. It may also differ according to personal and demographic factors and institutional conditions. Thus,

Job Satisfaction can be understood as an individual's overall positive feeling and attitude towards their job. It results from the interaction of personal, professional, social, organizational, and economic factors that influence an individual's work experience.

Reddy and Rajasekharan (1991) stated that Job Satisfaction refers to the extent to which an individual's expectations match the actual conditions of the job. This highlights the importance of the relationship between what employees expect and what they experience at work. Similarly, **Opkara (2002)** explained that Job Satisfaction is influenced by several factors, such as salary, nature of work, supervision, relationships with colleagues, and opportunities for promotion. **Cranny, Smith, and Stone (1992)** described Job Satisfaction as an emotional response that results from comparing actual job outcomes with desired outcomes. Similarly, **Kreitner and Kinicki (1998)** defined Job Satisfaction as an emotional response towards different aspects of one's job. These views show that Job Satisfaction is a broad concept influenced by both personal feelings and different conditions of the work environment.

3. Determinants/ Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction among Teacher Educators

Job Satisfaction among teacher educators is influenced by several personal, professional, and institutional factors. Teacher educators perform multiple roles, including teaching, mentoring, research, assessment, and administrative work. Therefore, their Job Satisfaction depends on both intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of their profession.

a) **Working Conditions:** A positive working environment, adequate facilities, manageable workload, and availability of resources contribute to job satisfaction. Poor working conditions and excessive workload may lead to dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959).
b) **Salary and Financial Benefits:** Adequate salary, timely payment, allowances, and other benefits provide financial security and increase Job Satisfaction. Perceived inequality in rewards may result in dissatisfaction (Adams, 1965).
c) **Job Security and Appointment:** Job security is an important factor influencing satisfaction. Permanent and secure employment may provide greater confidence and stability, whereas temporary or contractual employment may create uncertainty and stress.
d) **Workload and Work–Life Balance:** Teacher educators handle various academic and administrative responsibilities. Excessive workload may cause stress and reduce job satisfaction. A balanced workload and healthy work–life balance can improve professional well-being (Luthans, 2011).
e) **Professional Growth:** Opportunities for training, research, promotion, seminars, workshops, and career advancement can enhance motivation and job satisfaction. Professional growth helps teacher educators improve their knowledge and competencies (Maslow, 1943).
f) **Administrative Support and Leadership:** Supportive administrators and effective leadership can promote trust, participation, and professional satisfaction. Recognition, constructive feedback, and involvement in decision-making positively influence employee morale (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).
g) **Recognition and Professional Status:** Recognition of teaching, research, and other professional contributions gives teacher educators a sense of achievement and motivation.

Appreciation and professional respect are important contributors to Job Satisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959).

h) **Interpersonal Relationships:** Positive relationships with colleagues, administrators, and student-teachers contribute to a healthy institutional environment. Cooperation, mutual respect, and effective communication can increase job satisfaction.

i) **Professional Autonomy:** Teacher educators may experience greater satisfaction when they have freedom in planning, teaching, research, and academic activities. Participation in institutional decision-making also promotes a sense of responsibility and belonging.

j) **Career Advancement:** Opportunities for promotion and career development influence professional motivation and satisfaction. Limited opportunities for advancement may reduce commitment and create dissatisfaction (Vroom, 1964).

k) **Personal and Demographic Factors:** Factors such as age, gender, marital status, teaching experience, educational qualification, and locality may influence job satisfaction. However, their impact may vary according to individual and institutional circumstances.

l) **Stress and Emotional Well-Being:** High levels of occupational stress may negatively affect job satisfaction. Stress caused by workload, administrative pressure, and job insecurity can reduce professional well-being. Emotional support and stress-management strategies can help improve satisfaction.

m) **Institutional Policies and Organisational Climate:** Fair institutional policies related to salary, promotion, workload, leave, and professional development can promote job satisfaction. A positive organisational climate based on fairness, cooperation, and open communication is also important (Spector, 1997).

n) **Nature and Meaningfulness of Work:** Teacher educators may derive satisfaction from contributing to the professional development of future teachers. Meaningful work, achievement, and a sense of contribution to society can enhance Job Satisfaction (Locke, 1976).

4. Review of the Related Literature

A. Studies on Job Satisfaction Conducted in India

Bania (2020) reported that 27% of teachers were highly satisfied with their jobs, 44% moderately satisfied, and 29% poorly satisfied. Male and female teachers did not differ significantly, but regular college teachers reported higher job satisfaction than contractual teachers. ***Singh and Saharan (2022)*** observed a significant difference in job satisfaction between male and female teacher educators, but no significant difference among age groups (high, average, and low). ***Karmakar et al. (2023)*** noted that teachers were, on average, satisfied with their jobs. The authors concluded that this contentment is likely to strengthen teachers' interest and commitment to academic work in their institutions. ***Singh (2024)*** found that teacher educators experienced lower job satisfaction in online teaching than in traditional classroom teaching, owing to increased workload, stress, and difficulty in using technology. Administrative support, technological training, and professional development opportunities improved satisfaction. The study concluded that technological competence, institutional support, pedagogical adaptation, and work-life balance influence job satisfaction in online teaching environments. ***Singha and Kar (2025)*** reported no significant difference in job satisfaction between male and female teacher educators.

B. Studies on Job Satisfaction Conducted Abroad

Yıldız and Kılıç (2021) reported that teachers' intrinsic motivation and intrinsic job satisfaction were higher than their extrinsic motivation and satisfaction. Motivation was significantly related to the dimensions of job satisfaction, with personal regulation and intrinsic motivation emerging as significant predictors. ***Baig and Khan (2022)*** observed a significant positive correlation between the work environment and teachers' job satisfaction and performance, and the work environment had a significant effect on both. ***Pérez Fuentes et al. (2023)*** noted that teachers with a Master's degree in Education reported moderate to high job satisfaction. These levels persisted after postgraduate training regardless of gender, type of employment, doctoral qualification, contract type, or type of institution, suggesting that higher qualifications and professional preparation help sustain satisfaction. ***Cabrera and Eslabon (2024)*** found that teachers had high job satisfaction across age, gender, length of service, and educational qualification. Significant differences appeared in fringe benefits, work environment, and job responsibilities by length of service and educational qualification, but not in work environment by age or in job responsibilities by gender. Job performance differed significantly by age, gender, and educational qualification, but not by length of service. ***Li et al. (2025)*** documented a positive relationship between job satisfaction and teaching performance. Educators who felt valued and supported showed greater engagement, commitment, and effectiveness. Supportive work environments, fair workload, professional development, and effective communication contributed to satisfaction, while workplace stress lowered morale and productivity. The authors concluded that improving job satisfaction and well-being can enhance teaching performance and educational outcomes.

5. Need and Significance of the Study

Job satisfaction is central to the professional life of teacher educators, shaping their motivation, commitment, performance, and well-being. Because teacher educators prepare future teachers, their job satisfaction can influence the quality of teacher education.

Their duties include teaching, mentoring student-teachers, assessment, research, and administrative work, and these responsibilities and working conditions can affect satisfaction. A satisfied teacher educator is more likely to work with interest and commitment, whereas dissatisfaction may weaken performance and professional relationships.

Personal and professional factors may also shape job satisfaction. Locality, marital status, mode of appointment, and social status can lead to different experiences and working conditions. Rural and urban teacher educators may differ in facilities and professional opportunities. Marital status may affect the balance between personal and professional responsibilities. The mode of appointment may influence job security, salary, benefits, and opportunities for growth, while social status may affect access to professional opportunities.

Although several studies have examined job satisfaction among teachers, research on teacher educators in relation to selected demographic variables remains limited. Understanding their satisfaction and the factors associated with it is essential for improving teacher education. The findings may help teacher education institutions, administrators, and policymakers improve working conditions and provide appropriate professional support.

The present study, “Job Satisfaction among Teacher Educators in Relation to Selected Demographic Variables,” therefore examines the level of job satisfaction of teacher educators

and its relationship with selected demographic variables. It aims to improve understanding of their professional satisfaction and, in turn, their well-being and effectiveness.

6. Statement of the Problem:

The title of the present study is *"Job Satisfaction among Teacher Educators in Relation to Selected Demographic Variables"*.

7. Limitations of the Present Study:

1. **Geographical Restriction:** The study was confined to Telangana state. Therefore, the findings may have limited applicability to teacher educators working in other districts and states with different educational contexts.
2. **Institutional Scope:** The investigation was conducted in 32 colleges of education selected from a total of 205 institutions in Telangana state. Hence, the findings may not fully represent all colleges of education in the state.
3. **Unequal Regional Representation:** The number of colleges of education selected from the four geographical regions was not equal. Therefore, comparisons among North, South, East, and West Telangana should be interpreted with caution.
4. **Sample Size and Composition:** The study included 257 teacher educators working in the selected 32 colleges of education. Therefore, the findings are limited to the characteristics and responses of the selected sample and may not be generalized to all teacher educators in Telangana State.
5. **Statistical Constraints:** The interpretation of the findings was based on the statistical techniques and predetermined levels of significance adopted for the study. Therefore, the conclusions are limited to the scope of the selected variables and statistical procedures.
6. In the present study, Pedagogy-1 is limited to biological science, mathematics, and social studies, whereas Pedagogy-2 is limited to English, physical science, and Telugu.

8. Objectives of the Study:

1. To find out the levels of Job Satisfaction of teacher educators.
2. To find out the significant difference if any in the Job Satisfaction of teacher educators with respect to the following variables.
   a) Gender b) Subject taught Pedagogy-1 & Pedagogy-2 c) Type of Institution
   d) Social Status

9. Hypotheses of the Study:

1. There is no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of teacher educators with respect to the following variables.
   a) Gender b) Subject taught Pedagogy-1 & Pedagogy-2 c) Type of Institution
   d) Social Status

10. Research Methodology:

A. Population: The population comprised all teacher educators working in recognised teacher education institutions in Telangana State, in both rural and urban areas and across different types of institutions.

B. Method of Study: The Normative Survey method was used to examine the existing levels of job satisfaction among teacher educators.

C. Sample: The sample was selected using purposive sampling. The colleges of education in Telangana were grouped into four geographical regions (North, South, East, and West),

and 32 of the 205 colleges in the State were selected to ensure adequate geographical representation. The final sample comprised 257 teacher educators working in these colleges.

D. Tool Used: The Teacher's Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS), developed by Nasrin and Annes, was used to assess the job satisfaction of teacher educators. The scale has 42 items covering different aspects of job satisfaction in the teaching profession. Thirty-nine items are positively worded and three (Item Nos. 2, 16, and 17) are negatively worded, which helps reduce response bias. ***Scoring****:* The JSS is a five-point Likert-type scale with the response categories Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. Positively worded items are scored 5 to 1 in that order, and negatively worded items are scored in reverse (1 to 5). A higher total score indicates higher job satisfaction. ***Validity****:* The validity of the scale was established through expert judgement. Psychologists, teacher educators, and language experts reviewed the items for clarity and relevance, and the item-total correlations were significant at the 0.01 level. ***Reliability****:* The reliability coefficient, calculated using the Spearman-Brown formula, was 0.95, which indicates high reliability. The scale was therefore considered suitable for measuring the job satisfaction of teacher educators in the present study.

E. *Statistical Techniques*: The collected data were analysed using the CR, ANOVA, and Tukey's Post Hoc Test to examine differences among the selected groups.

11. Analysis of Data and Interpretation of Results:

Table 1 *Levels-wise Distribution of Teacher Educators on Job Satisfaction*

Sr. No.	Levels of JS	Raw Scores	N	%
1.	Low	< 167 scores	37	14
2.	Moderate	Between 168 & 188 scores	182	71
3.	High	> 189 scores	38	15
Total			**257**	**100**

Table 1 shows that 37 (14%) of the 257 teacher educators have a low level of job satisfaction, 182 (71%) have a moderate level, and 38 (15%) have a high level. The majority of teacher educators (71%) therefore fall in the moderate category, while comparatively few falls in the low (14%) or high (15%) categories. It may be concluded that most teacher educators possess a moderate level of job satisfaction.

Table 2: *Job Satisfaction – Gender – Mean - SD - CR*

Gender	N	M	SD	D	SED	CR	Remarks
Female	76	178.88	10.86	0.79	1.47	0.54 @	NS at the 0.05 level
Male	181	178.09	10.50				

Table 2 compares the job satisfaction of female (N = 76) and male (N = 181) teacher educators. The female teacher educators had a mean score of 178.88 (SD = 10.86) and the male teacher educators a mean score of 178.09 (SD = 10.50). The means and spreads of the two groups are similar.

The mean difference is 0.79 and the SED is 1.47, giving a CR of 0.54. This is below the critical value of 1.96 at the 0.05 level, so it is not significant and the null hypothesis is retained. There is no significant difference in the job satisfaction of teacher educators with respect to gender, and the small difference in means can be attributed to chance. This finding is consistent with Bania (2020), Vidyalakshmi and Praveena (2022), Halder et al. (2024),

Vyas and Pandit (2024), and Singha and Kar (2025), but differs from Sandhu (2015), Khan and Kaur (2021), and Singh and Saharan (2022).

Table 3: *Job Satisfaction – Subject Taught at B.Ed. Level – Mean - SD - CR*

Subject taught at B.Ed. Level	N	M	SD	D	SED	CR	Remarks
Pedegogy-1	128	178.85	11.11	1.05	1.32	0.80 @	NS at the 0.05 level
Pedegogy-2	129	177.80	10.07				

Table 3 compares the job satisfaction of teacher educators who teach Pedagogy-1 (N = 128) and Pedagogy-2 (N = 129) at the B.Ed. level. The Pedagogy-1 teacher educators had a mean score of 178.85 (SD = 11.11) and the Pedagogy-2 teacher educators a mean score of 177.80 (SD = 10.07). The means are close, and the spread of scores is slightly wider in the Pedagogy-1 group.

The mean difference is 1.05 and the SED is 1.32, giving a CR of 0.80. This is below the critical value of 1.96 at the 0.05 level, so it is not significant and the null hypothesis is retained. There is no significant difference in the job satisfaction of teacher educators with respect to the subject taught at the B.Ed. level.

Table 4: *Emotional Intelligence – Type of Institution- Means - SD_S - ANOVA*

ToM	N	M	SD	F-value	Remarks
Government	35	179.89	12.97		
Private-aided	9	175.44	17.62		
Private-unaided	196	177.80	9.58		
University	17	182.71	11.41		
ANOVA Summary				1.62 [	NS @ 0.05 level
Source of variation	SS	df	MS		
Between groups	541.533	3	180.511		
Within groups	28182.633	253	111.394		
Total	28724.166	256			

Table 4 presents the job satisfaction scores of teacher educators grouped by type of institution (N = 257). Teacher educators in university departments had the highest mean (M = 182.71), followed by those in government institutions (M = 179.89) and private-unaided institutions (M = 177.80). Those in private-aided institutions had the lowest mean (M = 175.44). Scores were least dispersed in the private-unaided group (SD = 9.58) and most dispersed in the private-aided group (SD = 17.62).

The between-groups mean square is 180.511 (df = 3) and the within-groups mean square is 111.394 (df = 253), giving an F-value of 1.62. This is less than the table value of 2.64 at the 0.05 level, so the F-value is not significant and the null hypothesis is retained. Type of institution does not make a significant difference in the job satisfaction of teacher educators. Although university teacher educators scored highest and private-aided teacher educators lowest, the differences among the groups are too small to be statistically significant. Since the F-value is not significant, a post hoc test is not required. This finding is consistent with Rambabu (2014), Barman and Bhattacharyya (2017), and Vidyalakshmi and Praveena (2022), but differs from Singh and Akhtar (2012), Ahmed (2015), Sandhu (2015), and Hameed et al. (2018).

Table 5: *Job Satisfaction – Social Status - Means - SD_S - ANOVA*

Social Status	N	M	SD	F-value	Remarks
BC	174	178.90	10.32		
OC	24	176.92	9.24		
SC	37	178.19	13.07		
ST	22	175.50	9.33		
ANOVA Summary				0.84	NS @ 0.05 level
Source of variation	SS	df	MS		
Between groups	281.151	3	93.717		
Within groups	28366.323	253	112.120		
Total	28647.474	256			

Table 5 presents the job satisfaction scores of teacher educators grouped by social status (N = 257). Teacher educators in the BC category had the highest mean (M = 178.90), followed by those in the SC category (M = 178.19) and the OC category (M = 176.92). Those in the ST category had the lowest mean (M = 175.50). Scores were least dispersed in the OC group (SD = 9.24) and most dispersed in the SC group (SD = 13.07).

The between-groups mean square is 93.717 (df = 3) and the within-groups mean square is 112.120 (df = 253), giving an F-value of 0.84. This is less than the table value of 2.64 at the 0.05 level, so the F-value is not significant and the null hypothesis is retained. Social status does not make a significant difference in the job satisfaction of teacher educators. Although the BC group scored slightly higher and the ST group lower, the differences among the groups are too small to be statistically significant. Since the F-value is not significant, a post hoc test is not required.

12. Major Findings:

1. Most teacher educators (71%) have a moderate level of job satisfaction, while 14% have a low level and 15% have a high level.
2. There is no significant difference in the job satisfaction of teacher educators with respect to gender, subject taught (Pedegogy-1 & Pedegogy-2) and type of institution
3. Social status does not make a significant difference in the job satisfaction of teacher educators.

13. Educational Implications:

1. Since most teacher educators (71%) have a moderate level of job satisfaction, institutions should work to move them toward higher levels through supportive leadership, reasonable workload, recognition of good work, and professional development opportunities. The 14% with low satisfaction may need closer attention and support.
2. Since gender makes no significant difference in job satisfaction, service conditions and professional support programmes can be planned for male and female teacher educators together, with equal access to resources and growth opportunities.
3. Since job satisfaction does not differ between teachers of Pedagogy-1 and Pedagogy-2, workload and academic responsibilities can be shared fairly across subjects, and neither group should receive less recognition or support.

4. Since type of institution makes no significant difference, government, private-aided, private-unaided, and university institutions can adopt common measures to sustain job satisfaction.
5. Since social status makes no significant difference, institutions should continue to promote an inclusive and equitable work environment, with equal respect, recognition, and opportunities for teacher educators of all social groups.
6. Because teacher educators prepare future teachers, sustaining their job satisfaction is important for the quality of teacher education. Improvement efforts should address the whole teaching community rather than particular groups.

14. Recommendations:

1. Teacher education institutions should adopt inclusive policies and practices that provide equal respect, opportunities, and professional support to teacher educators belonging to different social status groups.
2. Educational administrators should regularly assess the Job Satisfaction of teacher educators and identify factors such as workload, working conditions, institutional support, salary, and professional growth that may affect it.
3. Colleges of Education should organise faculty development programmes, workshops, counselling, and professional support activities to improve the professional well-being and Job Satisfaction of teacher educators.
4. Policymakers and institutional authorities should give greater attention to the professional welfare of teacher educators, as higher Job Satisfaction may contribute to greater commitment, motivation, teaching effectiveness, and improvement in the quality of teacher education.

15. Conclusion

This study examined the job satisfaction of teacher educators in Telangana State in relation to gender, subject taught at the B.Ed. level, type of institution, and social status. Most teacher educators (71%) had a moderate level of job satisfaction, while 14% had a low level and 15% a high level. No significant difference was found in job satisfaction by gender, by subject taught (Pedagogy-1 and Pedagogy-2), by type of institution (government, private-aided, private-unaided, and university), or by social status. Although the mean scores varied slightly among the groups, none of the differences was significant at the 0.05 level. These results should be interpreted within the geographical and sampling limitations of the study.

The findings point to the need to maintain a supportive and equitable working environment for all teacher educators, with fair workload distribution, professional recognition, supportive leadership, and opportunities for professional development. Regular assessment of job satisfaction may help institutions identify concerns and provide suitable support. In conclusion, because teacher educators prepare future teachers, sustaining their job satisfaction is important for the quality of teacher education.

16. References:

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 2, 267–299.

Baig, M. M. A., & Khan, T. M. (2022). Effect of Work Environment on Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Teachers in Kasur. Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology, 19 (1), 2254-2265.

Bania, S. (2020). Job Satisfaction of College Teachers in Relation to Their Gender and Nature of Appointment. International Journal for Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Field, 6 (4), 194-198.

Cabrera, J.A.S. & Eslabon, R. T. (2024). Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Performance. International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE), 1 (6), 282-297.

Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992). How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance. Lexington Books.

Garg, C. (2024). Job Satisfaction of Teachers in relation to Work Motivation, Organisational Climate and Techno-Pedagogical Competence. Unpublished Thesis, OM Sterling Global University, Hisar-125001, Haryana, India

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1959). The motivation to work (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2013). Educational administration: Theory, Research, and Practice (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Judge, T. A., & Klinger, R. (2008). Job satisfaction: Subjective well-being at work. In M. Eid & R. J. Larsen (Eds.), The science of subjective well-being (pp. 393–413). Guilford Press.

Karmakar, P., Saha, B., & Adhikari, S. (2023). To Explore the Job Satisfaction of School Teachers of Purulia District. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 5 (1), 1-6.

Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (1998). Organisational behaviour. McGraw-Hill.

Li, W., Khatibi, A., Tham, J., & Ferdous Azam, S. M. (2025). Exploring the Impact of Job Satisfaction on Educator Performance in Private Universities in Anhui, China. Communications on Applied Nonlinear Analysis, 32 (7s), 139-154.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organisational psychology (pp. 1297–1349). Rand McNally.

Luthans, F. (2011). Organisational behaviour: An evidence-based approach (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of Human Motivation. Psychological Review, 50 (4), 370–396.

Nasrin & Annes, A. (2014). Teacher's Job Satisfaction Scale. Agra: NPC.

Opkara, J. O. (2002). The impact of salary differentials on managerial job satisfaction: A study of the gender gap and its implications for management education and practice in a developing economy. The Journal of Business in Developing Nations, 8(1),

65–92.

Pérez Fuentes, C. A., Álvarez Maestre, A. J., Cardona Rivas, A. M., Aguilar Barreto, A.J., & Sanabria Alarcón, R. K. (2023). Job Satisfaction and Teacher Education: Correlational Study in Postgraduate Graduates in Education. Education Science, 13 (198), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13020198

Reddy, K. S., & Rajasekharan, T. (1991). Job satisfaction, job involvement and work involvement of permanent and temporary employees. Indian Journal of Applied Psychology, 28(1), 5–10.

Singh, H., & Saharan, S. K. (2022). A study of Job Satisfaction of Teachers working in Self-Finance Colleges of Education in the context of Gender, age, and Proactive Personality. Chetana International Journal of Education, 7 (3), 53-63.

Singh, S. (2024). Examining the Job Satisfaction of teacher educators in the context of online learning. Journal Global Values, 15 (2), 306–314.

Singha, K. S. & Kar, B. (2025). A Study on Job Satisfaction among B.Ed. Teacher-Educators of Purulia District, West Bengal, India. International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT), 13 (4), 149-153.

Spector, P. E. (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences. Sage Publications.

Srivastava, S. & Chabra, S. (2012). Job Satisfaction among Teacher Educators: Interplay of Gender and Qualifications. Researcher, 4 (8), 26-30.

http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York, NY: Wiley.

Yıldız, V. A., & Kılıç, D. (2021). Investigation of the Relationship between Class Teachers' Motivation and Job Satisfaction. International Online Journal of Education and Teaching, 8 (1), 119–131. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1286451.pdf