



Available Online

Journal of Education and Social Studies

<http://www.scienceimpactpub.com/jess>

A STUDY OF JOBS SATISFACTION OF FEMALE TEACHERS IN DISTRICT HAFIZABAD

Amna Akhtar¹, Iqbal Javed^{1,*} and Haroon Javaid²

¹Department of Economics, University of Lahore, Sargodha Campus, Sargodha, Pakistan

²University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

A study about job satisfaction of female school teachers in district Hafizabad was carried out during 2020. Pre-tested questionnaires were given to 400 female school teachers in which questions related to socioeconomic, demographic, education, etc., and satisfaction level of respondents was asked. The collected data were analyzed by using SPSS. The majority of respondents, 38.8% and 21.5% were fairly to highly satisfied with their salary, respectively, while 6.0% of respondents were very fairly dissatisfied with their salary. A minimum number of respondents (2.8%) was very dissatisfied with the behaviour of the principal, while the majority of respondents (41.8%) were fairly satisfied with the behaviour of the principal. About promotion opportunities, 35.8% of respondents were fairly satisfied 10.5% were very dissatisfied with promotion opportunities. Regarding the job grade system, most respondents (48.2%) were fairly satisfied with the job grade system, while 9.2% of respondents were fairly dissatisfied with the job grade system. Regarding school working environment, 46.5% and 35.2% respondents were fairly and very satisfied, respectively, with schooled working environment while 6.8% were fairly dissatisfied with school working environment. About 41.8% of respondents showed fairly satisfaction about ICT opportunities, while 31.5% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with ICT opportunities. About the opportunity to achieve the advanced degree studies, 43.2% of respondents fairly agreed, and 25.2% of respondents were very satisfied with the statement.

Keywords: Job satisfaction; Female teachers; Teachers satisfaction; Pakistan.

This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Email: iqbaljaved_uaf@hotmail.com

© The Author(s) 2021.

INTRODUCTION

For any country, education is considered essential to the development and prosperity of society, intelligence and economy. Teachers can make a huge contribution to this prosperity by maintaining the value of the education process. Therefore, it is essential for education authorities at all levels to optimize the quality and effectiveness of teacher performance. In order to successfully implement education policies and achieve goals, schools need motivated and dedicated teachers who must feel safe at work and be able to perform their duties at a high level. Indeed, the study of job satisfaction and motivation in education, especially among teachers, has aroused the interest of many researchers. Many pieces of literature discuss the importance of teacher job satisfaction and motivation, including its impact on teacher retention, attrition, and absenteeism (Dupré and Day, 2007; Perrachione et al., 2008; Oshagbemi, 1999; Shann, 1998), As well as productivity, creativity and performance (Al-Hussami, 2008; Ellickson and Logsdon, 2002) and its health status (Aziz et al., 2012; Akhtar, 2010). Satisfied and proactive teaching is a noble but challenging profession, and teachers are the most important pillar of the education system. Naik (1998) pointed out that no profession is nobler than teaching. Mohanty (2000) believes that the role of teachers is very important in teaching school learning. The effectiveness and performance of a school usually depend on the role of the teacher. Nadeem et al. (2011) believe that “dynamic teaching cannot be achieved without a dynamic teacher. Therefore, through effective qualitative teaching, we can know an effective teacher”.

Similarly, Acker (1999) added that it is impossible to improve education without the active role of teachers. Effective teaching mainly depends on teachers' professional qualifications, experience, and attitude, and motivation level. Teachers who are satisfied with their work perform better than others. To maximize teacher performance, they need motivation. Aziz et al. (2012) believe that "motivation leads to job satisfaction and provides motivation for success. It is an important and crucial factor for teacher success and performance.

Pakistan is a developing country with poor teaching and learning effects. Aziz et al. (2012) stated: "Teachers are very competent in Pakistan, but their work performance still poses doubts about low-quality education". There are many reasons, but Warwick & Reimers (1995) pointed out that the most important reason is that the teaching profession is not a career choice for Pakistani youth due to low status and insufficient incentives. In Pakistan, job satisfaction is usually an issue. For female teachers, the level of job satisfaction is even more critical. Female teachers in Pakistan play a vital role in teaching. The proportion of female teachers in Pakistan is 45% of the total number of teachers (GoP, 2007). Sales (1999) pointed out that due to gender segregation, female teachers in Pakistan face more problems than male teachers. Unbalanced social and economic development. Female teachers in a male-dominated society have relatively few opportunities for education and work. As a result, they found it difficult to find a job. Those who succeed in finding a job do not receive the respect they deserve in society. They face a lot of criticism in their families and society as a whole. People often find that they are not satisfied with their work. This research aims to point out the problems in the job satisfaction level of female teachers, and propose ways and methods to maximize the job satisfaction level of female teachers.

Job satisfaction is one of the most widely discussed and enthusiastic research structures in related disciplines such as industrial organizational psychology, organizational behavior, personnel and human resource management, and organizational management. This is the general emotional orientation to all aspects of work. Simply put, it is the degree to which people are satisfied with the work. Job satisfaction is the feeling or mentality about the nature of the job. The source of job satisfaction is not only work but also the work environment, supervision methods, interpersonal relationships, and organizational culture. At present, job satisfaction has become an important issue. People are interested in working in organizations and in obtaining higher satisfaction services. This is human behavior. But in fact, how much job satisfaction can be ensured in different jobs. Researchers are interested in analyzing job satisfaction from an organizational perspective. It is also interesting to look at job satisfaction from a female perspective.

A sense of satisfaction or enjoyment that a person obtains from work. When employees realize that their work helps them realize their needs and values directly or indirectly, their attitude towards work and the organization will also become positive. In short, this represents the difference between employee expectations and the experience gained at work—the greater the gap, the greater the dissatisfaction and performance. The term employee satisfaction describes a person's thinking and the way he/she perceives his/her work, including the positive and negative emotions that affect the way employees perform their work. Satisfaction is to meet the conditions or desires defined by Thorndike and Barnhart (1979), where job satisfaction is the emotional adjustment of individuals to their current job roles. Job satisfaction is a function of certain variables because a characteristic of someone's occupation may satisfy him but may not satisfy others. The variables that meet the working conditions include job content, gender, education level, working environment, location, colleagues, income, working hours, salary and benefits, promotion, rewards, relationship with supervisors, etc. Satisfaction has at least seven different ways to determine performance relationships, and these relationships show how and what factors are related to job performance.

Better human resource management (HRM) practices also centralize organizational productivity (Bloom and Van Reenen, 2007). Human resource management practices may also affect employee turnover and

productivity may increase (Sels et al., 2006). Petrescu and Simmons (2008) found that human resource management practices can improve salary satisfaction and overall job satisfaction. However, these effects are almost insignificant for union members. When implementing performance-based compensation and seniority-related reward systems, employees are more satisfied with leadership behavior and compensation. Garrido et al. (2005) researched to discover the factors that determine the job satisfaction of sales managers. The effect of human resource management practice is analyzed by using this model, which has been adopted by the empirical research institute of Spanish industrial companies. The research concluded that human resource management practices based on salary type, salary level, and autonomy of job design and resources are important determinants of job satisfaction for sales managers.

METHODOLOGY

The design of questionnaires is based on the feedback from the female school teachers from district Hafizabad, Pakistan. Pre-tested questionnaires were distributed to 560 school teachers working in district Hafizabad by post and hand. Among these, 420 questionnaires were completed, while 400 were included and found valid in the current study.

The present study has also used a survey approach to collect primary data about socioeconomic such as region, age, education, family structure, job scale, status, job experience, salary, etc.; and satisfaction level of respondents such as behaviour of principal, job opportunities, job grade system, school management, the environment of the school, chances for obtaining a higher degree, etc. there is two tehsils in district Hafizabad; one is Hafizabad and second is Pindi Bhattiyan. Non-probability sampling technique was used to collect the data. The selection of respondents was made on the basis of convenient sampling. The primary data was collected from December 2020 to March 2021. The data is collected from 400 respondents from district Hafizabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results and discussion section consist of the research work on three objectives of the study. For the first objective, socioeconomic characteristics of the sampled respondents were studied. In 2nd objective was to review the job satisfaction level of female teachers in district Hafizabad. The 3rd objective of the study was the policy Recommendations. A study about job satisfaction of female school teachers in district Hafizabad was carried out during 2020. Pre-tested questionnaires were given to 400 female school teachers in which questions related to socioeconomic, demographic, education, etc., and satisfaction level of respondents was asked. The collected data were analyzed, and results were interpreted.

Socioeconomic Characteristics of Sampled Respondents

Education of respondents: The education level of respondents is shown in Table 1, which shows that the maximum number of respondents (84.2%) had 16 years of education (Master degree) followed by 18 years of education (10.5%). A considerable number of respondents (4.0%) had completed graduation. Few respondents had matriculation (0.8%), while 0.5% of respondents had an intermediate education level.

Table 1. Distribution of respondents according to education.

Qualification	Frequency	Percent
Matric (10 years of education)	3	0.8
Intermediate (12 years of education)	2	0.5
Graduation (14 years of education)	16	4.0
Master (16 years of education)	337	84.2
M.Phil (18 years of education)	42	10.5

Area of respondents: The analyzed data in Table 2 show that the maximum respondents (60.5%) belonged to urban areas while 39.5% respondents were from rural backgrounds.

Marital status of respondents: The analyzed data regarding the marital status of respondents are shown in Table 3, which shows that the majority of respondents (55.2%) were married while 44.5% were unmarried.

Family structure: Data regarding the family structure of respondents are presented in Table 4, which indicates that maximum number of respondents (52.8%) was living in the single family whereas 47.2% of respondents were living in a joint family system.

Job status: The analyzed data pertaining to the job status of respondents are shown in Table 5. The data show that fewer respondents (24.8%) had private sector jobs while the majority of respondents (75.2%) possessed public sector jobs.

Table 2. Distribution of respondents according to region/area.

Area/region	Frequency	Percent
Rural	158	39.5
Urban	242	60.5

Table 3. Distribution of respondents according to marital status

Marital status	Frequency	Percent
Married	221	55.2
Unmarried	179	44.8

Table 4. Distribution of respondents according to family structure.

Family structure	Frequency	Percent
Single family	211	52.8
Joint family	189	47.2

Table 5. Distribution of respondents according to job status.

Job status	Frequency	Percent
Private	99	24.8
Public	301	75.2

Scale of job: The data regarding the job scale of respondents are given in Table 6. The analyzed data exhibit that most respondents (55.2%) worked in 14 scale jobs, followed by respondents (23.8%) who did not have a job scale. A considerable number of respondents (9.2%) had a job scale of 15, while 8.2% of respondents were working in 16 scale jobs. The minimum number of respondents (0.5%) had a job with 2 scales.

Table 6. Distribution of respondents according to the scale of the job.

Scale of job	Frequency	Percent
0	95	23.8
9	2	0.5
14	221	55.2
15	37	9.2
16	33	8.2
17	12	3.0

Age of respondents: The data showing the age group of respondents are presented in Table 7 that most respondents (45.5%) were under the age group of 26-30 years old, followed by 31-41 years old (27.5%). However, a considerable number of respondents (21.5%) were under the age group of 21-25 years old, while the minimum number of respondents (5.5%) was 41-55 years old.

Table 7. Distribution of respondents according to age group.

Age group	Frequency	Percent
21- 25	86	21.5
26- 30	182	45.5
31-40	110	27.5
41-55	22	5.5

Job Experience: The data regarding the job experience of respondents are depicted in Table 8. Data indicate that the maximum number of respondents (69.5%) had 1-5 years of job experience, followed by (18.8%) 6-10 years of job experience. Alike, 9.8% of respondents had 11-20 years of job experience while the minimum number of respondents (2.0%) had > 20 years of job experience.

Table 8. Distribution of respondents according to job experience.

Job experience	Frequency	Percent
1-5	278	69.5
6-10	75	18.8
11-20	39	9.8
more than 20	8	2.0

Distance from home: Data pertaining to distance from home to job placement are shown in Table 9. Data depict that 50.2% of respondents had a job within 1-5 km while 7.0% of respondents had to travel > 40 km to reach their job destination. However, 16.8% and 19.8% of respondents had their job distance of 11-20 km and 6-10 km, respectively, while 6.2% of respondents had to cover 21-40 km distance to reach the job destination.

Table 9. Distribution of respondents according to distance from home to job destination.

Distance from home to job destination	Frequency	Percent
1-5 km	201	50.2
6-10 km	79	19.8
11-20 km	67	16.8
21-40 km	25	6.2
> 40 km	28	7.0

Salary of respondents: Data regarding the salary of respondents are given in Table 10, which presents that maximum respondents (68%) received salary amount Rs. 21000-40000 while the minimum number of respondents (1.5%) received salary amount Rs. 60000. Similarly, 8.8% of respondents took the salary amount less than 10000 while 10.5% of respondents received the amount Rs.11000-20000 whereas 11.2% respondents received the salary of Rs. 41000-60000.

Table 10. Distribution of respondents according to salary.

Salary	Frequency	Percent
Less than Rs. 10,000	35	8.8
Rs. 11000- 20000	42	10.5
Rs. 21000- 40000	272	68.0
Rs. 41000-60000	45	11.2
More than Rs. 60000	6	1.5

Job Satisfaction level sampled Respondents

Salary: The satisfaction level of respondents to their salary is expressed in Table 11, which shows that majority of respondents (38.8%) were fairly satisfied with their salary while 26.8% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. However, 21.5% of respondents showed high satisfaction with their salary while 7.0% and 6.0% were fairly dissatisfied and very fairly dissatisfied, respectively.

Table 11. Satisfaction of respondents about salary.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	24	6.0
Fairly Dissatisfied	28	7.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	107	26.8
Fairly satisfied	155	38.8
Very satisfied	86	21.5

Principals' behaviour: The satisfaction views of the respondents regarding principals' behaviour are shown given in Table 12. The minimum number of respondents (2.8%) expressed that they were very dissatisfied with behaviour of the principal followed by fairly dissatisfied (3.2%). The majority of respondents (41.8%) viewed that they were fairly satisfied with behaviour of the principal, while 40.5% of respondents were very satisfied with the principal's behaviour. Alike, 11.8% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the principal's behaviour.

Table 12. Satisfaction of respondents about the principals' behaviour.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	11	2.8
Fairly Dissatisfied	13	3.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	47	11.8
Fairly satisfied	167	41.8
Very satisfied	162	40.5

Promotion opportunities: Respondents' satisfaction regarding promotion opportunities showed that a maximum number of respondents (35.8%) was fairly satisfied, followed by neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (Table 13). However, 14.2% of respondents were very satisfied with promotion opportunities, whereas 16.0% of respondents were fairly dissatisfied. A minimum number of respondents (10.5%) were very dissatisfied with promotion opportunities.

Table 13. Satisfaction of respondents about promotion opportunities.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	42	10.5
Fairly Dissatisfied	64	16.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	94	23.5
Fairly satisfied	143	35.8
Very satisfied	57	14.2

Job grade system: The analyzed data regarding the job grade system are presented in Table 14. According to analyzed data, the majority of respondents (48.2%) were fairly satisfied with the job grade system, followed by neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (19.5%). About 17.0% of respondents were very satisfied, while 6.0% were very dissatisfied with the job grade system. Alike, 9.2% of respondents were fairly dissatisfied with the job grade system.

Table 14. Satisfaction of respondents about job grade system.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	24	6.0
Fairly Dissatisfied	37	9.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	78	19.5
Fairly satisfied	193	48.2
Very satisfied	68	17.0

Behaviour of students: Data showing the satisfaction level of respondents reading student behaviour are presented in Table 15. A maximum number of respondents (48.5%) expressed that they were fairly satisfied with students' behavior while 29.0% of respondents were very satisfied with students' behaviour. However, the minimum number of respondents (0.5%) was very dissatisfied with students' behaviour followed by fairly dissatisfied (8.2%).

Table 15. Satisfaction of respondents about student behaviour.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	2	0.5
Fairly Dissatisfied	33	8.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	55	13.8
Fairly satisfied	194	48.5
Very satisfied	116	29.0

Workload: The satisfaction level of respondents regarding workload is shown in Table 16. The majority of respondents (50.8%) were fairly satisfied with the workload, whereas 16.8% of respondents were very satisfied. A considerable number of respondents (15.2%) showed neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction regarding workload, while 13.5% of respondents were fairly dissatisfied, whereas 3.8% of respondents expressed their views that they were very dissatisfied with the workload.

Table 16. Satisfaction of respondents about workload.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	15	3.8
Fairly Dissatisfied	54	13.5
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	61	15.2
Fairly satisfied	203	50.8
Very satisfied	67	16.8

Working environment: Data regarding satisfaction of respondents to school working environment are depicted in Table 17. The analyzed data show that the maximum number of respondents (46.5%) was fairly satisfied with the schooled working environment while 35.2% respondents viewed that they were very satisfied with the school working environment. The minimum number of respondents (0.5%) was very dissatisfied, while 6.8% were fairly dissatisfied with the school working environment. However, 11.0% of respondents showed that they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the school working environment.

Length of working day: The satisfaction response of respondents to the length of the working day is shown in Table 18. According to analyzed data, 28.8% and 52.8% of respondents were very satisfied and fairly satisfied, respectively, with length of the working day, while 13.2% of respondents showed neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction with the length of the working day. About 4.2% of respondents were fairly dissatisfied, while 1.0% were very dissatisfied with the length of the working day.

Table 17. Satisfaction of respondents about school working environment.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	2	0.5
Fairly Dissatisfied	27	6.8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	44	11.0
Fairly satisfied	186	46.5
Very satisfied	141	35.2
Total	400	100.0

Table 18. Satisfaction of respondents about the length of the working day.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	4	1.0
Fairly Dissatisfied	17	4.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	53	13.2
Fairly satisfied	211	52.8
Very satisfied	115	28.8
Total	400	100.0

Curriculum: The satisfaction level of respondents to the curriculum is given in Table 19, which exhibits that 48.8% of respondents showed fairly satisfied with the curriculum while 34.5% respondents were very satisfied with the curriculum. About 12.0% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the curriculum, while 4.8% of respondents were fairly dissatisfied with it.

Table 19. Satisfaction of respondents about the curriculum.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	0	0
Fairly Dissatisfied	19	4.8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	48	12.0
Fairly satisfied	195	48.8
Very satisfied	138	34.4

ICT opportunities: Respondents showed various satisfaction responses to ICT opportunities, as shown in Table 20. The analyzed data depicted that nearly 41.8% of respondents expressed fairly satisfaction with ICT opportunities, and 16.0% of respondents were very satisfied with ICT opportunities. However, 31.5% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with ICT opportunities, while 6.8% of respondents were fairly dissatisfied with ICT opportunities. A minimum number of respondents (4.0%) expressed very dissatisfaction with ICT opportunities.

Training opportunities: Respondents showed various satisfaction levels for training opportunities (Table 21). According to the views of respondents, the maximum number of respondents (36.5%) showed fairly satisfaction with training opportunities while 28.8% respondents were very satisfied whereas 1.8% respondents indicated very dissatisfaction with training opportunities. Similarly, 6.2% of respondents showed fairly satisfaction, while 26.8% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Table 20. Satisfaction of respondents about new ICT opportunities.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	16	4.0
Fairly Dissatisfied	27	6.8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	126	31.5
Fairly satisfied	167	41.8
Very satisfied	64	16.0

Table 21. Satisfaction of respondents about training opportunities.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	7	1.8
Fairly Dissatisfied	25	6.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	107	26.8
Fairly satisfied	146	36.5
Very satisfied	115	28.8

Professional development and self-growth: The analyzed data regarding professional development and self-growth showed that 47.0% of respondents were fairly satisfied with the statement, while 31.5% of respondents were very satisfied with the statement (Table 22). A considerable number of respondents showed that they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the statement, while 1.2% were very dissatisfied.

Table 22. Satisfaction of respondents about professional development and self-growth.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	5	1.2
Fairly Dissatisfied	23	5.8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	58	14.5
Fairly satisfied	188	47.0
Very satisfied	126	31.5

Access to advanced studies: The respondents' views about the opportunity to achieve the advanced degree studies are presented in Table 23. The maximum number of respondents (43.2%) fairly agreed or satisfied, and 25.2% of respondents were very satisfied with the opportunity to achieve the advanced degree studies. Similarly, 10.0% of respondents showed fairly dissatisfaction while 2.0% showed very dissatisfaction about the opportunity to achieve the advanced degree studies.

Table 23. Satisfaction of respondents about opportunity to pursue advanced degree studies.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	8	2.0
Fairly Dissatisfied	40	10.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	78	19.5
Fairly satisfied	173	43.2
Very satisfied	101	25.2

Support to improve your teaching: The perusal of the Table 24 shows that respondents' satisfaction regarding support to improve the teaching was maximum, and the majority of respondents, 48.0 and 33.8% were fairly satisfied and very satisfied, respectively. The minimum number of respondents (3.5%) was very dissatisfied, while 11.2% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Table 24. Satisfaction of respondents about support to improve your teaching.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	14	3.5
Fairly Dissatisfied	14	3.5
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	45	11.2
Fairly satisfied	192	48.0
Very satisfied	135	33.8

Classroom facility: The respondents' views about classroom facilities are tabulated in Table 25. The majority of respondents (44.5%) were fairly satisfied with classroom facilities, while 28% of respondents were highly satisfied with classroom facilities. Alike, 16.0% of respondents showed neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction with classroom facilities while the minimum number of respondents (3.2%) was very dissatisfied with classroom facilities.

Table 25. Satisfaction of respondents about classroom facilities and resources.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	13	3.2
Fairly Dissatisfied	33	8.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	64	16.0
Fairly satisfied	178	44.5
Very satisfied	112	28.0

ICT facilities: The data regarding the satisfaction response of respondents about ICT facilities are shown in Table 26, which indicates that 36.9% of respondents were fairly satisfied while 16.5% were highly satisfied with ICT facilities. However, a considerable number of respondents (31.8%) showed neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction regarding ICT facilities. The fewer respondents (6.8%) showed very dissatisfaction, and 9.0% of respondents were fairly dissatisfied with ICT facilities.

Table 26. Satisfaction of respondents about ICT facilities.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	27	6.8
Fairly Dissatisfied	36	9.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	127	31.8
Fairly satisfied	144	36.0
Very satisfied	66	16.5

School management: The satisfaction level of respondents about school management is given in Table 27, indicates that 45.8% of respondents were fairly satisfied with school management, whereas 30.0% of respondents were strongly satisfied with school management. Likewise, 16.2% of respondents expressed their response as neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, while 1.8% of respondents were strongly dissatisfied and 6.2% fairly dissatisfied.

Table 27. Satisfaction of respondents about school management.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	7	1.8
Fairly Dissatisfied	25	6.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	65	16.2
Fairly satisfied	183	45.8
Very satisfied	120	30.0

School policy and administration: The respondents' satisfaction level with school policy and administration is given in Table 28, which indicates that a minimum number of respondents (6.5% and 2.0%) was fairly and very dissatisfied, respectively, with school policy and administration. At the same time, 21.5% of respondents showed neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction with school policy and administration. The majority of respondents (47.5%) showed that they are fairly satisfied with school policy and administration, while 22.5% of respondents were very satisfied.

Table 28. Satisfaction of respondents about school policy and administration.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	8	2.0
Fairly Dissatisfied	26	6.5
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	86	21.5
Fairly satisfied	190	47.5
Very satisfied	90	22.5

Administrative paperwork: The response of respondents to the statement “administrative paperwork you have to do” is summarized in Table 29. A maximum number of respondents (49.0%) were fairly satisfied with the statement, while 31.0% of respondents were very satisfied, whereas 15.5% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. The lowest number of respondents (0.8%) was very dissatisfied, while 3.8% showed fairly dissatisfaction with the statement.

Table 29. Satisfaction of respondents about administrative paperwork you have to do.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	3	0.8
Fairly Dissatisfied	15	3.8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	62	15.5
Fairly satisfied	196	49.0
Very satisfied	124	31.0

Regulations and educational systems: The satisfaction level of respondents about regulations and educational systems is shown in Table 30. The majority of respondents (49.5%) showed fairly satisfaction with regulations and the educational system, while 24.0% of respondents were very satisfied with the statement. The minimum number of respondents (3.2%) showed very dissatisfaction while 6.8% respondents were fairly dissatisfied with the stamen regarding regulations and educational systems.

Table 30. Satisfaction of respondents about regulations and educational systems.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	13	3.2
Fairly Dissatisfied	27	6.8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	66	16.5
Fairly satisfied	198	49.5
Very satisfied	96	24.0

level of stress: The views of the respondents to level of stress are shown in Table 31, which shows that 35.2% of respondents were fairly satisfied while 15.5% of respondents showed very satisfaction regarding stress level. Nearly 29.5% of respondents showed neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction with the statement whereas 2.8% of respondents were very dissatisfied. Alike, 17.0% of respondents showed fairly dissatisfaction with the statement.

Table 31. Satisfaction of respondents about level of stress.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	11	2.8
Fairly Dissatisfied	68	17.0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	118	29.5
Fairly satisfied	141	35.2
Very satisfied	62	15.5

Satisfaction to the job: The response level of respondents to the statement “ I am satisfied with my job” is shown in Table 32. Maximum respondents (50.0%) were fairly satisfied, while 33.0% of respondents were very satisfied with the statement. Alike, 13.2% of respondents expressed as neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the statement, while 0.2% of respondents were very dissatisfied.

Table 32. Satisfaction of respondents about in general, I am satisfied with my job.

Respondents response	Frequency	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	1	0.2
Fairly Dissatisfied	14	3.5
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	53	13.2
Fairly satisfied	200	50.0
Very satisfied	132	33.0

CONCLUSIONS

The majority of respondents (60.5%) belonged to the urban area, while 39.5% were from rural backgrounds. Nearly 55.2% of respondents were married, while 44.5% were unmarried. Maximum respondents (45.5%) were under the age group of 26-30 years old, while a minimum of 5.5% of respondents was 41-55 years old. About 52.8% of respondents lived in a single family whereas 47.2% of respondents lived in a joint family system. About 84.2% of respondents had taken 16 years of education (Master degree) while 0.8 and 0.5 respondents were matric and intermediate, respectively. The majority of respondents (75.2%) possessed public sector jobs, while 24.8% had a private-sector jobs. Maximum respondents (55.2%) worked in 14 scales while 8.2% were in 16 scale jobs whereas 0.5% worked in 2 scales. Approximately 69.5% of respondents had 1-5 years of job experience, while a minimum number of respondents (2.0%) had > 20 years of job experience. About 50.2% of respondents had jobs within 1-5 km while 6.2% had to cover 21-40 km distance to reach the job destination. The majority of respondents (68%) were receiving the salary amount of Rs. 21000-40000 while 1.5% respondents were taking salary amount of Rs. 60000.

The majority of respondents (38.8% and 21.5%) were fairly to highly satisfied with their salary, respectively, while 6.0% of respondents were very fairly dissatisfied with their salary. The minimum number of respondents (2.8%) was very dissatisfied with behaviour of the principal, while the majority of respondents (41.8%) were fairly satisfied with behaviour of principal. About promotion opportunities, 35.8% of respondents were fairly satisfied 10.5% were very dissatisfied with promotion opportunities. Regarding the job grade system, most respondents (48.2%) were fairly satisfied with the job grade system, while 9.2% of respondents were fairly dissatisfied with the job grade system. About 48.5% and 29.0% of respondents were fairly and highly satisfied with students’ behaviour, respectively, while 0.5% were very dissatisfied with students’ behaviour. About workload, maximum respondents (50.8%) were fairly satisfied with the workload, whereas 3.8% of respondents were very dissatisfied with the workload. Regarding school working environment, 46.5% and 35.2% respondents were fairly and very satisfied, respectively, with schooled working environment while 6.8% were fairly dissatisfied with school working environment. About the length of the working day, 28.8% and 52.8% and respondents were very and fairly

satisfied, respectively, with a length of the working day, while 1.0% were very dissatisfied with the length of the working day. Regarding curriculum, 48.8% of respondents were fairly satisfied with it, while 4.8% were fairly dissatisfied with it.

About 41.8% of respondents showed fairly satisfaction about ICT opportunities, while 31.5% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with ICT opportunities. Regarding training opportunities, the majority of respondents (36.5% and 28.8%) depicted fairly and very satisfaction with training opportunities, while 26.8% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Regarding professional development and self-growth, 47.0% and 31.5% of respondents were fairly and very satisfied with the statement, while 1.2% of respondents were very dissatisfied. About the opportunity to achieve the advanced degree studies, 43.2% of respondents fairly agreed, and 25.2% of respondents were very satisfied with the statement. Regarding the statement "support to improve the teaching", 48.0 and 33.8% were fairly and very satisfied, respectively, while the minimum number of respondents (3.5%) was very dissatisfied. About classroom facilities, approximately 44.5% of respondents were fairly satisfied with the statement, while 3.2% of respondents were very dissatisfied with classroom facilities.

About ICT facilities, 36.9% of respondents were fairly satisfied, whereas 9.0% of respondents were fairly dissatisfied with ICT facilities. Nearly 45.8% of respondents were fairly satisfied regarding school management, while 1.8% of respondents were strongly dissatisfied with the statement. About school policy and administration, the minimum number of respondents (6.5% and 2.0%) was fairly- and very dissatisfied, respectively, while 47.5% of respondents were fairly satisfied with school policy and administration. Regarding the administrative paperwork, 49.0% of respondents showed fairly satisfaction with the statement while the lowest number of respondents (0.8%) was very dissatisfied with the statement. Most respondents (49.5%) were fairly satisfied about the regulations and educational systems, while 3.2% of respondents were very dissatisfied. About the statement "stress level", 35.2% of respondents were fairly satisfied whereas 2.8% of respondents were very dissatisfied. Regarding the statement "I am satisfied with my job", 50.0% were fairly satisfied, while 33.0% of respondents were very satisfied with the statement.

REFERENCES

- Acker, S. (1999). The realities of teachers' work: never a dull moment. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(4).
- Akhtar, S. N., Hashmi, M. A., & Naqvi, S. I. H. (2010). A comparative study of job satisfaction in public and private school teachers at secondary level. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 4222-4228.
- AL-Hussami M, (2008). A study of nurses' job satisfaction: the relationship to organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, and level of education. *Euro. J. Sci. Res.*, 22 (2), 286-295.
- Bloom, N., & Van Reenen, J. (2007). Measuring and explaining management practices across firms and countries. *The quarterly journal of Economics*, 122(4), 1351-1408.
- Aziz, F., Akhtar, M. S., & Rauf, M. (2012). The motivation level of trained male and female teachers at higher education level in Pakistan: A comparative study. *The Dialogue*, 7(2), 37-50.
- Dupré, K. E., & Day, A. L. (2007). The effects of supportive management and job quality on the turnover intentions and health of military personnel. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in Alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, 46(2), 185-201.
- Ellickson, M. C., & Logsdon, K. (2002). Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 31(3), 343-358.

- Garrido, M. J., Pérez, P., & Antón, C. (2005). Determinants of sales manager job satisfaction. An analysis of Spanish industrial firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(10), 1934-1954.
- GoP. (2007). National Curriculum for early childhood education (Revised). Ministry of Education. Government of Pakistan.
- Mohanty, J. (2000). Current trends in higher education. Deep and Deep Publications.
- Nadeem, M., Rana, M. S., Lone, A. H., Maqbool, S., Naz, K., & Akhtar, A. (2011). Teacher's competencies and factors affecting the performance of female teachers in Bahawalpur (Southern Punjab) Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(19).
- Naik, S. P. (1998). Education for the twenty first century. New Delhi: Published by JL Kumar for Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd.
- Oshagbemi, T. (1999). Overall job satisfaction: how good are single versus multiple-item measures? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14(5), 388-403.
- Perrachione, B. A., Rosser, V. J., & Petersen, G. J. (2008). Why do they stay? elementary teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and retention. *Professional Educator*, 32(2), n2.
- Petrescu, A., & Simmons, R. (2008). Human resource management practices and workers' job satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower*, 29(7), 651-667.
- Sales, V. (1999). Women teachers and professional development: gender issues in the training programmes of the Aga Khan Education Service, Northern Areas, Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 19(6), 409-422.
- Sels, L., De Winne, S., Maes, J., Delmotte, J., Faems, D., & Forrier, A. (2006). Unravelling the HRM-performance link: Value-creating and cost-increasing effects of small business HRM. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(2), 319-342.
- Shann, M. H. (1998). Professional commitment and satisfaction among teachers in urban middle schools. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92(2), 67-73.
- Thorndike, E. L., & Barnhart, C. L. (1979). *Advanced dictionary*. Scott, Foresmen and Company, Glenview.
- Warwick, D. P., & Reimers, F. (1995). *Hope or despair?: Learning in Pakistan's primary schools*. Greenwood Publishing Group.