

Job and Life Satisfaction of Government School Women Teachers

A.Vani,

Assistant Professor of Commerce,
Government Arts College, Coimbatore,
Tamilnadu, India.

R. Kalaiselvi,

Assistant Professor of Commerce, Nallamuthu
Gounder Mahalingam College, Pollachi,
Tamilnadu, India

ABSTRACT

A teacher, who is happy with her job, plays a pivotal role in the upliftment of society. Job satisfaction implies the overall adjustment to work situation. Life satisfaction refers to person's general happiness, freedom from tension, and interest in life. It is defined as the function of actual physical fitness perceived by an individual. It is a measure of well-being and may be assessed in terms of mood, satisfaction with relations, with others and the like. A study was carried out among 100 teachers in pollachi district to assess their level of job and life satisfaction. It was found that there exists a medium level of satisfaction among the Government School Teachers. The personal variables namely area of residence, monthly income, family income, spouse, distance to school, designation, classes handled have a highly significant differences with level of job satisfaction. The variables namely area of residence and classes handled have a highly significant differences with the level of life satisfaction.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Life Satisfaction, Women, School Teachers.

INTRODUCTION:

Job satisfaction is extent to which one feels good about their job. Job satisfaction is in regard to one's feelings or state of mind regarding to the nature of their work. The source of job satisfaction is not only the job; it also creates from working environment, supervision style, and interpersonal relationship. The concept of life satisfaction is variously called as happiness in philosophy, welfare in utility in economics, subjective wellbeing in sociology and psychology and quality of life in many disciplines. In many surveys life satisfaction has been taken to be the sum total of attitudes people have towards different regiments of life such as family, work and social relations. Women are the back bone of the every family.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Nirav deva (2015) conducted a research title on job satisfaction of the teachers of higher education institutions. The study concluded that both male and female teachers of higher education institutions are highly satisfied with their jobs.

Jessica Johnson and Marciepitt-catsaphes (2008) conducted a study on the topic "Quality of Employment and Life Satisfaction: A Relationship that matters for older workers". Socio-demographics, health, social support and finance played strong roles in the achievement of life satisfaction among older workers. Socio-demographic, individual capacities and workplace resources influenced life satisfaction.

Vicdan altnok (2011) did his research work on the topic "The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction". According to this study there was no significant difference between academic personnel considering gender and graduation.

MadhuAnand and DiptiArora (2009) jointly conducted a research on "Burnout, Life Satisfaction and Quality of Life among Executives of Multi-National Companies". The result of the study also revealed that young executives of Multi-National Companies experienced low life satisfaction with good quality of life which means that the burnout negatively affected life satisfaction but not the quality of life..

Timothy A. Judge, Shinichiro Watanabe made an attempt to find out the casual relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction and to evaluate the job satisfaction level of an employee of a company and as well as to measure life satisfaction of the same employees. By using probability sampling method, they selected 804 employees from the population for their study. Correlation between job satisfaction and life satisfaction was significant. The regression analysis revealed that after controlling for demographic variables there was a significant relationship between job and life satisfaction.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

Teachers are the central part of the school system. The efficiency of educational programs greatly depends on the quality of the teachers. Professional training is required so that women may perform optimally in education systems. In traditional societies it is also important for female teachers to give parents greater confidence in sending their daughters to school. Despite the importance of this work, the teaching profession, especially as exercised by women in the first years of education, suffers from low status and low salaries. In this context this study has been carried out.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

- i. To find out the determinants of job satisfaction.
- ii. To ascertain the life satisfaction of women teachers.

METHODOLOGY:

Sources of Data:

The data required for the study is primary and questionnaire method has been followed. The design of the questionnaire is made in such a way that it considers personal profile, employment profile, job satisfaction and life satisfaction of the women teachers.

Sampling Procedure:

A sample of 100 teachers working in government schools situated in Pollachi town has been considered for the purpose of this study. Convenient sampling procedure has been followed to collect the data.

Framework of Analysis:

Analysis of data has been carried out with the help of Chi-square test.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:

The purpose of the study is to know the variables impacting job satisfaction among the school teachers in Pollachi, because, it may have a direct effect on their life satisfaction. Most of the research on job satisfaction is related to management of industrial, banking and business organization. This study covers Government school teachers' working in schools functioning in Pollachi town. The administrations of these schools will be able to take up appropriate steps to sustain and enhance job satisfaction of teachers. Further, the findings may help device suitable policies. So that teachers, specifically women, may be able to strike a perfect balance between work and life.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

The present study is based on the data collected from sample selected from Pollachi town. In the present study only those teachers were considered who were presently working in the schools. Many respondents were reluctant to give their opinion. It may be noted that only women teachers are taken for this study.

LEVEL OF JOB SATISFACTION:

In order to find out variables associated with level of job satisfaction, the teachers have been first classified into three groups as those with low, medium and high level of job satisfaction. For that purpose, average job satisfaction index and standard deviation for such index have been calculated for government school teachers. The following procedure has been followed for classification of teachers based on the level of job satisfaction.

Low job satisfaction: Teachers with index ranging up to mean index minus standard deviation.

Medium job satisfaction: Teachers with index ranging between mean index minus standard deviation and mean index plus standard deviation.

High job satisfaction: Teachers with index ranging above mean index plus standard deviation. Accordingly the grouping of teachers is as below:

School type	Mean index	Standard deviation	Level of Job Satisfaction		
			Low	Medium	High
Government	76.19	7.81	21	67	12

Table 1: Select personal variables and job satisfaction (Chi-Square test)

variables		Level of job satisfaction			total	d.f	χ^2 value
		Low n=21	Medium n=67	High n=12			
Age	21-30	2 (13.33)	10 (66.66)	3 (20)	15	6	4.588
	31-40	9 (28.12)	20 (62.5)	3 (9.37)	32		
	41-50	8 (19.51)	27 (65.85)	6 (14.63)	41		
	51-58	2 (16.66)	10 (83.33)	0	12		
Area of Residence	Rural	11 (24.44)	25 (55.55)	9 (20)	45	2	6.425**
	Urban	10 (18.18)	42 (76.36)	3 (5.45)	55		
Educational Qualification	UG	6 (19.35)	20 (64.51)	5 (16.12)	31	2	0.738
	PG	15 (21.73)	47 (68.11)	7 (10.14)	69		
Marital Status	Married	21 (22.10)	63 (66.31)	11 (11.57)	95	2	1.519**
	Un married	0	4 (80)	1 (20)	54		
Type of Family	Nuclear	15 (20.83)	48 (66.66)	9 (12.5)	71	2	0.061
	Joint	6 (21.42)	19 (67.85)	3 (10.71)	29		
Earning Members in the family	1 - 2	18 (22.22)	53 (65.43)	10 (12.34)	81	2	0.502
	Above 2	3 (15.78)	14 (74.68)	2 (10.52)	19		

variables		Level of job satisfaction			total	d.f	χ^2 value
		Low n=21	Medium n=67	High n=12			
Non-earning Members	1 - 2	15 (19.73)	53 (69.73)	8 (10.52)	76	2	1.168
	Above 2	6 (25)	14 (58.33)	4 (16.6)	24		
Monthly Income	Low	4 (23.52)	8 (47.05)	5 (29.41)	17	4	12.641
	Medium	17 (25.75)	45 (68.18)	4 (6.06)	66		
	High	0	14 (82.35)	3 (17.64)	17		
Family Income	Low	2 (14.28)	7 (50)	5 (35.71)	14	4	11.702**
	Medium	17 (23.61)	51 (70.83)	4 (5.55)	72		
	High	2 (14.28)	9 (64.28)	3 (21.42)	14		
Spouse	Employed	15 (17.64)	59 (69.41)	11 (12.9)	85	2	9.722**
	Un employed	6 (60)	4 (40)	0	10		
Distances to School	Up to 5kms	3 (9.09)	27 (81.81)	3 (9.09)	33	6	13.270**
	6- 10 kms	4 (14.28)	20 (71.42)	4 (14.28)	28		
	11-15 kms	8 (50)	6 (37.5)	2 (12.5)	16		
	Above 15 kms	6 (26.08)	14 (60.86)	3 (13.04)	23		

variables		Level of job satisfaction			total	d.f	χ^2 value
		Low n=21	Medium n=67	High n=12			
Designation	Secondary Grade	8 (38.09)	10 (47.61)	3 (14.28)	21	4	11.544**
	BT Assist	10 (21.27)	29 (61.70)	8 (17.02)	47		
	PG Assist	3 (9.375)	28 (87.5)	1 (3.125)	32		
Periods Engaged per week	Up to 28	6 (17.64)	25 (73.52)	3 (8.82)	34	6	8.722
	29 – 30	11 (25.58)	25 (58.13)	7 (16.27)	43		
	31 - 32	0	11 (84.61)	2 (15.38)	13		
	Above 32	4 (40)	6 (60)	0	10		
Subjects Taught	1 - 2	17 (20.73)	56 (66.29)	9 (10.97)	82	2	0.528
	3 - 4	4 (22.22)	11 (61.11)	3 (16.66)	18		
Numbers of Classes Handling	1 – 2	5 (26.31)	14 (73.68)	0	19	4	3.623
	3 – 4	14 (20.89)	43 (64.17)	10 (14.92)	67		
	Above 4	2 (14.28)	10 (71.42)	2 (14.28)	14		
Classes Handled	Up to 5	3 (27.27)	4 (36.36)	4 (36.36)	11	6	18.731**
	6 – 8	4 (40)	6 (60)	0	10		

variables		Level of job satisfaction			total	d.f	χ^2 value
		Low n=21	Medium n=67	High n=12			
	9 - 10	11 (23.40)	19 (40.42)	7 (14.8)	37		
	11 - 12	3 (9.37)	28 (87.5)	1 (3.125)	32		
Source: Primary data ** Significant at five percent level							

Table 1 reveals that among the personal variables selected there exists a highly significant difference between area of residence, monthly income, family income, spouse, distance to school, designation, classes handled. There does not exist significant difference between age, educational qualification, marital status, type of the family, earning members, non-earning members, periods engaged, subjects taught, number of classes handling.

LEVEL OF LIFE SATISFACTION:

In order to find out variables associated with level of life satisfaction, the teachers have been first classified into three groups as those with low, medium and high level of life satisfaction. For that purpose, average life satisfaction score and standard deviation for such scores have been calculated for government school teachers. The following procedure has been followed for classification of teachers based on the level of life satisfaction.

Low Life Satisfaction: Teachers with score ranging up to mean score minus standard deviation.

Medium Life Satisfaction: Teachers with scores ranging between mean score minus standard deviation and mean score plus standard deviation.

High Life Satisfaction: Teachers with scores ranging above mean score plus standard deviation.

School Type	Mean score	Standard deviation	Level of Life Satisfaction		
			Low	Medium	High
Government	78.18	15.27	16	80	4

Table 2: Select personal variables and life satisfaction (Chi-Square test):

variables		Level of job satisfaction			total	d.f	χ^2 value
		Low n=16	Medium n=80	High n=4			
Age	21-30	0	15 (100)	0	15	6	11.418
	31-40	5 (15.62)	27 (84.37)	0	32		
	41-50	9 (21.95)	30 (73.17)	2 (4.87)	41		
	51-58	2 (16.66)	8 (66.66)	2 (16.66)	12		
Area of Residence	Rural	10 (22.22)	31 (68.88)	4 (8.88)	45	2	8.131**
	Urban	6 (10.90)	49 (89.09)	0	55		

variables		Level of job satisfaction			total	d.f	χ^2 value
		Low n=16	Medium n=80	High n=4			
Educational Qualification	UG	6 (19.35)	22 (70.96)	3 (9.67)	31	2	0.988
	PG	10 (14.49)	55 (79.71)	4 (5.79)	69		
Marital Status	Married	16 (16.84)	75 (78.94)	4 (4.21)	95	2	1.316
	Un married	0	5 (100)	0	5		
Type of Family	Nuclear	12 (16.66)	58 (80.55)	2 (2.77)	72	2	1.042
	Joint	4 (14.28)	22 (78.57)	2 (7.14)	28		
Earning Members in the family	1 - 2	12 (14.81)	67 (82.71)	2 (2.46)	81	2	3.265
	Above 2	4 (21.05)	13 (68.42)	2 (10.52)	19		
Non-earning Members	1 - 2	12 (15)	62 (81.57)	2 (2.63)	76	2	1.590
	Above 2	4 (16.66)	18 (75)	2 (8.33)	24		
Monthly Income	Low	5 (29.41)	12 (70.58)	0	17	4	7.810
	Medium	11 (16.66)	51 (77.27)	4 (6.06)	66		
	High	0	17 (100)	0	17		
Family Income	Low	3 (21.42)	11 (78.57)	0	14	4	5.005
	Medium	11 (15.27)	59 (81.94)	2 (2.77)	72		
	High	2 (14.2)	10 (71.42)	2 (14.2)	14		

variables		Level of job satisfaction			total	d.f	χ^2 value
		Low n=16	Medium n=80	High n=4			
Spouse	Employed	16 (18.82)	67 (78.82)	2 (2.35)	85	2	8.502
	Un employed	0	8 (80)	2 (20)	10		
Distances to School	Up to 5kms	7 (21.21)	25 (75.75)	1 (3.03)	33	6	5.040
	6- 10 kms	4 (14.28)	23 (82.14)	1 (3.57)	28		
	11-15 kms	2 (12.5)	12 (75)	2 (12.5)	14		
	Above 15 kms	3 (13.04)	20 (86.95)	0	23		
Designation	Secondary Grade	6 (28.57)	15 (71.42)	0	21	4	8.635
	BT Assist	4 (8.51)	39 (82.97)	4 (8.51)	47		
	PG Assist	6 (18.75)	26 (81.25)	0	32		
Periods Engaged per week	Up to 28	6 (17.64)	27 (79.41)	1 (2.94)	34	6	5.207
	29 – 30	8 (18.60)	32 (74.41)	3 (6.97)	43		
	31 - 32	0	13 (100)	0	13		
	Above 32	2 (20)	8 (80)	0	10		
Subjects Taught	1 - 2	11 (13.41)	67 (81.70)	4 (4.87)	82	2	2.947
	3 - 4	5 (27.77)	13 (72.22)	0	18		
s of Classes Handlin	1 – 2	3 (15.78)	15 (78.94)	1 (5.26)	19	4	2.501

variables		Level of job satisfaction			total	d.f	χ^2 value
		Low n=16	Medium n=80	High n=4			
	3 – 4	9 (13.43)	55 (82.08)	3 (4.47)	67		
	Above 4	4 (28.57)	10 (71.42)	0	14		
Classes Handled	Up to 5	5 (45.45)	6 (54.54)	0	11	6	13.245**
	6 – 8	2 (20)	8 (80)	0	10		
	9 - 10	4 (8.51)	39 (82.97)	4 (8.51)	47		
	11 - 12	5 (15.62)	27 (84.37)	0	32		
Source: Primary data ** Significant at five percent level							

Table 2 shows that the personal variables selected there exists a highly significant difference between area of residence and classes handled. There does not exist any significant difference between age, educational qualification, marital status, type of the family, earning members, non-earning members, monthly income, family income, spouse, distance to school, designation, periods engaged, subjects taught, number of classes handling.

SUGGESTION:

Job Satisfaction:

Job satisfaction is much more important to all types of employees. Government school teachers need a good relationship among colleagues. Drinking water, toilet, transport facility, library and seating facilities are to be provided in government schools.

Life Satisfaction:

Life satisfaction of teachers is based on their attitude. Government school teachers should find positive ways to increase their satisfaction level in their life.

CONCLUSION:

Job satisfaction is an attitude, which results from a balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes, in connection with the job. It is an occupational activity performed by an individual, in return for a monetary reward.

The study can be concluded that, almost majority teachers are satisfied with the job. But a small percent is dissatisfied due to good relationship among colleagues. Drinking water, toilet, transport facility, library and seating facilities are to be provided in government schools. In general, teachers working in government schools are with high level of life satisfaction.

Research scholars can make use of this study to probe potential area for further research. They may focus on comparison of women teachers with men teachers to understand the differences in life and job satisfaction. Level of job and life satisfaction of college professors in and around Pollachi taluk may be studied. Teachers' motivation and job satisfaction can be studied.

FUTURE RESEARCH:

The budding researcher can select the topic like

1. Job and Life Satisfaction of Government College Women Teachers.
2. Job and Life Satisfaction of Government Aided College Teacher.
3. Comparative study between Job and Life Satisfaction of Government School and private School Women Teacher.

REFERENCES:

- Jessica Johnson and Marciepitt-catsaphes (2008). Quality of Employment and Life Satisfaction: A Relationship that matters for older workers. *Persistent Link: <http://hdl.handle.net/2345/3537>*
- Madhu Anand and Dipti Arora (2009). Burnout, life satisfaction and quality of life among executives of Multi-National Companies, *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 35, pp: 159-164.
- Nirav deva (2015). Job satisfaction of the teachers of higher education institutions, *International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies*, volume 3, Issue 5, May2015. Pp: 447-458.
- Timothy A.Judge Shinichiro Watanabe (1993). Another look at the job satisfaction and life satisfaction relationship, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78,pp: 6939-948
- Vicdan Altnok (2011). The relationship between job satisfaction and lifetime satisfaction, *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(7),pp: 2563-2571.
