

## Job satisfaction of plus two male lecturers of District Budgam with respect to their marital status

Wahid Ahmad Dar, Irshad Ahmad Najar

Research Scholars, Department of Education and Behavioral Sciences University of Kashmir, Jammu and Kashmir, India

### Abstract

Job satisfaction of lecturers at any level of education has important implications in the context of human resource development. Every country is trying their best to boost their status from every possible angle in order to bring qualitative and quantitative improvements in all walks of life which is the basis of human resource development. In the present study, an attempt is made to study the job satisfaction of lecturers working at plus two level. The sample for the present study comprised 60 male lecturers, 30 married and 30 unmarried male lecturers. Meera Dixiti's job satisfaction scale was administered for collection of data. The data collected data was analyzed with the help of various statistical techniques like mean, S.D and t-test. Results reveal that there is a significant difference between married and unmarried male lecturers on composite score but on dimension wise insignificant difference was found except for dimension Salary, Promotional Avenues and Service Conditions.

**Keywords:** job satisfaction, marital status, married lecturers, unmarried lecturers

### Introduction

The concept of job satisfaction was first introduced to social sciences by Hoppock (1935) [7] he defined job satisfaction as any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say I am satisfied with my job. Job satisfaction improves the performance as well as effectiveness of an individual irrespective of the nature of work. Job satisfaction is closely linked to the individual's behavior in workplace (Davis *et al.*, 1985) it entails the overall adjustment to work situation. Specific attitude, namely, job specific factors, individual features and relationships existing in groups help in developing general attitude of teachers towards their job. The managers are the most resourceful persons to bring quality in any organisation. And, level of satisfaction in job is very important for managers to produce effective outcome and bring quality in service sector. Therefore, the success of any system depends upon the job satisfaction of its managers.

Locke (1976) created the most quoted job satisfaction definition describing it as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences. (Porter *et al.*, 1974) after a longitudinal study among psychiatrists argued that job satisfaction is critical for organizational turnover in initial years of working in an organization but at latter stages organizational commitment better determines turnover.

Shin and Reyes (1995) [14] found that teacher job satisfaction is a determinant of teacher commitment and urged that school administrators need to work on teacher job satisfaction before teachers develop a sense of commitment to the organization. In Indian context Mehta, (2012) [10] observed that government school teachers appeared to be more satisfied than the private school teachers, though gender was not able to predict job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is critical Teacher-pupil relationships (Shann, 1998) [11]. Greater job satisfaction

contributes significantly towards an increase in organizational commitment (Nagar, 2012) [15].

A plethora of research has been carried out in the field of job satisfaction-income level, Physical environment, Age, Educational attainment, Gender, Marital status, Teaching experience, Occupational efficacy, Work motivation, Job stress, Mental health, Psychological health, Emotional intelligence and so on. The findings that have been reported are of diverse kind and also are with contrasting nature. Murage & Kibera (2014) [9] found insignificant relationship between job qualification and professional grade. Adeoye *et al.*, (2014) [1] study reveal that marital status, age and educational attainment are predictors of job satisfaction. But it is seen that both marital status and educational attainment are best predictors while age is a bad predictor of job satisfaction. Kumar *et al.*, (2014) [8] found that the relationship between age & remuneration has inverse proportionality and direct proportionality between age and job satisfaction. Basu (2013) [3] study revealed that Effective Educational Administrators differ significantly from Ineffective Educational Administrators with respect to their Job Satisfaction. A significant positive correlation exists between Occupational Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of Effective Educational Administrators and low correlation exists between Occupational Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of Ineffective Educational Administrators. Tulen & Eyupoglu (2013) investigation have highlighted that job satisfaction of married academics is on the whole higher than not married academics. Results further indicate that the female academics (married and not married) are more satisfied when compare to the male academics (married or not married). Raj & Lalita (2013) [13] study revealed that there is no significant difference in the level of satisfaction of male and female teachers. Furthermore, it was again revealed that there is no significant difference in the level of satisfaction of Govt. and Private school teachers.

Azim *et al.*, (2013) [2] found that Bangladeshi employees, irrespective of gender and marital status, are ‘moderately satisfied’. No statistically significant evidence is observed indicating differences in job satisfaction level between ‘male’ and ‘female’ or between ‘married’ and ‘unmarried’. Ealias & George (2012) [6] study reveals that there is a very high positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction. Bhat & Paju (2012) [5] results confirm that effective and ineffective educational administrators differ significantly on Job Satisfaction. The effective educational administrators were found to be more satisfied with their job than ineffective educational administrators in higher education. From the above findings further exploration merits attention. The present study is an attempt in this direction.

**Objectives of the study**

The following objectives were formulated for the purpose of present study: -

1. To compare married and unmarried male lecturers on composite score of Job satisfaction scale.
2. To compare married and unmarried male lecturers on job satisfaction scale dimensions wise:
  - Intrinsic aspect of the job.
  - Salary, promotional avenues and service conditions.
  - Physical facilities.
  - Institutional plans and policies.
  - Satisfaction with Authorities.
  - Satisfaction with social status and family welfare.
  - Rapport with students.
  - Relationship with co-workers.

**Hypothesis**

The following hypotheses were formulated for the present investigation: -

1. There is no significant difference between married and unmarried male lecturers on composite score of job satisfaction.
2. There is no significant difference between married and unmarried male lecturers on job satisfaction dimension wise:
  - a. Intrinsic aspect of the job.
  - b. Salary, promotional avenues and service conditions.
  - c. Physical facilities.
  - d. Institutional plans and policies.
  - e. Satisfaction with Authorities.
  - f. Satisfaction with social status and family welfare.
  - g. Rapport with students.
  - h. Relationship with co-workers.

**Methodology & Procedure**

**Sample**

The sample for the present study comprised 60 male lecturers (30 married and 30 unmarried). The sample was taken randomly from the various Govt Higher Secondary Schools of District Budgam.

**Tool/s Used**

In order to collect the data from the sample subjects, the investigators selected Job Satisfaction Scale developed by Meera Dixit as a tool for the measurement of job satisfaction.

It is a scale consisting of 52 items with 8 dimensions.

**Procedure for Data Collection**

In the present study random sampling method was used. The lecturers were approached personally in their departments. Informed consent was taken from them in order to seek their voluntary participation and only those lecturers were included who agreed to take part in this study.

**Statistical Treatment**

The data was analysed by applying various statistical techniques like Mean, S.D and t-test.

**Analysis and Discussion of results.**

**Table 1:** Significance of the mean comparison between married and unmarried male lecturers on composite score of job Satisfaction.

Group	Mean	S.D	t value	Significance
Married	125	24.1	2.17	Significant at 0.05 level
Unmarried	113	18.3		

The table 1 shows the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturers on composite score of job satisfaction. The table 1 reveals that significant difference was found between married and unmarried male lecturers on composite score at 0.05 level. However the mean favors married male lecturers which imply that married male lectures have higher job satisfaction than unmarried lecturers.

In the evidence of the above results our hypothesis No. 1 which reads as “there is no significant difference between married and unmarried male lecturers on composite score of job satisfaction” stands rejected. The above results seen to be justified on the ground that unmarried male lecturers are less satisfied due to variety of reasons like they have poor service conditions after their retirement due to new policy rules. Moreover, the institutional policies and plans do not suit them and also a cause of concern regarding the dissatisfaction of these teachers is their less experience which ultimately leads to their poor rapport building & cooperation with students as well as towards co-workers.

**Table 2:** Significance of the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturers with respect to Intrinsic Aspect of Job.

Group	Mean	S.D	t value	Significance
Married	14.70	3.23	0.680	Insignificant
Unmarried	14.16	2.81		

The perusal of table 2 shows the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturers of district Budgam. The table 4.1 highlights that there is no significant difference between married and unmarried male lecturers on intrinsic aspect of the job satisfaction scale. Since the difference was not found significant even at 0.05 level therefore, no conclusion can be drawn and our null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between married and unmarried male lecturer’s on intrinsic aspect of the job stands accepted.

**Table 3:** Significance of the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturers with respect to Salary, Promotional Avenues and Service Conditions.

Group	Mean	S.D	t value	Significance
Married	21.30	5.73	2.199	Significant at 0.05
Unmarried	18.46	4.10		

The perusal of table 3 shows that there is significant difference between married and unmarried male lecturers on Salary, Promotional Avenues and Service Conditions of job satisfaction. The difference was found significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, the results reveal that married male lecturers are more satisfied with Salary, Promotional Avenues and Service Conditions of job satisfaction than unmarried male lecturers.

The above results seem to be justified on the ground that unmarried lecturers are less satisfied due to variety of reasons like they have less service benefits after their retirement. In this way our null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between married and unmarried male lecturers on Salary, Promotional Avenues and Service Conditions stands rejected.

**Table 4:** Significance of the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturers with respect to Physical Facilities.

Group	Mean	S.D	t value	Significance
Married	26.23	6.30	1.214	Insignificant
Unmarried	24.30	6.03		

The table 4 shows the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturer’s on physical facilities of job satisfaction scale. As is evident from the table, the calculated t-value (1.21) is less than the table value (1.96) at 0.05 level, our null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between married and unmarried male lecturer’s on physical aspects of job satisfaction stands accepted and hence no decision can be snatched from the above finding.

**Table 5:** Significance of the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturers with respect to Institutional Plans and Policies.

Group	Mean	S.D	t value	Significance
Married	15.13	6.06	1.83	Insignificant
Unmarried	12.86	3.00		

The table 5 depicts the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturers on institutional plans and policies of job satisfaction. As is evident from the table, the calculated t-value (1.83) is less than the table value (1.96) even at 0.05 level, therefore no decisive decision can be taken out from this dimension of job satisfaction scale.

**Table 6:** Significance of the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturers with respect to Satisfaction with Authorities.

Group	Mean	S.D	t value	Significance
Married	14.30	4.46	1.39	Insignificant
Unmarried	12.83	3.65		

The table 6 shows the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturer’s on satisfaction with authorities of job. As is evident from the table, the calculated t-value (1.39) is less than the table value (1.96) at 0.05 level, our null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between married and unmarried male lecturer’s on satisfaction with authorities of job stands accepted. So it can be concluded that their views on the authorities are more or less replica of one another.

**Table 7:** Significance of the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturers with respect to Satisfaction with Social Status and Family Welfare.

Group	Mean	S.D	t value	Significance
Married	9.80	3.23	1.26	Insignificant
Unmarried	8.93	1.89		

The perusal of table 7 shows the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturer’s on satisfaction with social status and family welfare. Since the calculated t-value (1.26) is less than the table value (1.96) at 0.05 level, so our null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between married and unmarried male lecturers on satisfaction with social status and family welfare stands accepted.

**Table 8:** Significance of the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturers with respect to Rapport with Students.

Group	Mean	S.D	t value	Significance
Married	13.16	3.21	1.60	Insignificant
Unmarried	11.90	2.90		

The perusal of table 8 exhibits the mean difference between the job satisfaction of married and unmarried male lecturers on rapport with students of job satisfaction. Since the calculated t-value (1.60) is less than the table value (1.96) at 0.05 level, so again no conclusion can be drawn here and accordingly our null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between married and unmarried male lecturers on rapport with students of job satisfaction stands accepted.

**Table 9:** Significance of the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturers with respect to Relationship with Co-Workers.

Group	Mean	S.D	t value	Significance
Married	10.70	2.16	1.37	Insignificant
Unmarried	9.93	2.16		

Table 9 exhibits the mean difference between married and unmarried male lecturers on relationship with co-workers of job satisfaction scale. As is evident from the table, the calculated t-value (1.37) is less than the table value (1.96) at 0.05 level, so once again no concrete decision can be drawn out and once again our null hypothesis stands accepted.

**Conclusions**

1. There is a significant difference between married and

unmarried male lecturers on composite score of Job Satisfaction.

2. There is insignificant difference between the job satisfaction of married and unmarried male lecturers on intrinsic aspect of the job.
3. There is significant difference between the job satisfaction of married and unmarried male lecturers on Salary, Promotional Avenues and Service Conditions of job. The mean difference favour married male lecturers.
4. There is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of married and unmarried male lecturers on physical facilities of job satisfaction.
5. There is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of married and unmarried male lecturers on Institutional Plans and Policies of the job satisfaction.
6. There is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of married and unmarried male lecturers on satisfaction with authorities of job satisfaction.
7. There is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of married and unmarried male lecturers on Satisfaction with Social Status and Family Welfare of job satisfaction.
8. There is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of married and unmarried male lecturers on rapport with students of job satisfaction.
9. There is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of married and unmarried male lecturers on relationship with co-workers of the job satisfaction.

### **Inferential Suggestions**

The findings of the present study reveal that there are certain factors which must be adopted so as to improve the job satisfaction of these teachers like:

1. Special drive or programmes for promotion of unmarried staff should be launched.
2. Service conditions should be improved so as to suit the deprived ones.
3. Infrastructure should be updated so as to bridge the gap between what is prevailing and what is expecting.
4. Modern tools & techniques should be given a due space in these institutions.
5. Institutional policies and plans should be framed in such a way so as to satisfy the whole staff not on the cost of each other.
6. Heads of departments should be sympathetic to the problems & grievances of the staff & should behave impartially.
7. Government should adopt a policy through which extra incentives should be provided to compensate inadequacy.
8. Training Programmes must be devised to make teachers objective in their teaching jobs.

### **Suggestions for Further Research**

The investigator feels that the following suggestions should be taken into consideration while conducting a study similar to the present study:

1. It will be worthwhile to replicate this study on large sample consisting of College & University teachers.
2. A comparative study may be conducted between married male and married female lecturers working in different

educational institutions.

3. In order to validate the results, this study may be replicated by assessing the job satisfaction of faculty members with the help of other standardized tools.
4. A follow up studies should be conducted on the same variable to confirm the results of present study.

### **References**

1. Adeoye, Akoma, Binuyo. Age, Marital Status & Educational Background as Determents of Job Satisfaction. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Management Sciences*, 2014; 2(2):1-7.
2. Azim MT, Haque MM, Choudhury RA. Gender, Marital Status and Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 2013; 2(2):488-498.
3. Basu Mudasir. Occupational efficacy and job satisfaction of educational administrator's - A question of outcome Merit Research Journal of Education and Review. 2013; 1(2):23-29.
4. Davis K, Newstrom JW. Human behavior at work: Organizational behavior. McGraw-Hill, 1989.
5. Bhat Shabir, Puju Javeed. Occupational Efficacy and Job Satisfaction of Educational Administrators in Higher Education. *Researcher*. 2012; 4(2):36-41.
6. Ealias A, George J. Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction: A Correlational study. *Research Journal of Commerce & Behavioural Science*, 2012; 01(04)37-42.
7. Hoppock R. Job satisfaction. Oxford, England: Harper, 1935.
8. Kumar PN, Mohan AC, Chand KK. A study of age factor on job satisfaction and remuneration leading to turnover trends, with reference to working professionals. *Abhinav International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management & Technology*, 2014; 3(4):7-13.
9. Murage WS, Kibera WL. Teachers Related Factors that Influence Secondary School Teachers Job Satisfaction Levels in Public Secondary Schools. *Journal of Education Research and Behavioral Sciences*, 2014; 3(6):148-153.
10. Mehta S. Job satisfaction among teachers. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2012; 11(2):54.
11. Shann MH. Professional commitment and satisfaction among teachers in urban middle schools. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 1998; 92(2):67-73.
12. NPE. National Policy of Education. Ministry of Human Resources Development, Department of education, New Delhi, 1986.
13. Raj, Lalita. Job Satisfaction among Teachers of Private and Government School: A Comparative Analysis. *International Journal of Social Science & Interdisciplinary Research*, 2013; 2(9):151-158.
14. Shin HS, Reyes P. Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: A causal analysis. *Journal of School Leadership*. 1995; 5(1):22-39.
15. Nagar K. Organizational commitment and job satisfaction among teachers during times of burnout. *Vikalpa*, 2012; 37(2):43-60.