

ABSTRACT

This article examined the job satisfaction level of higher secondary school lecturers in Manipur. The study used the Dixit Job Satisfaction Scale to gather required data on the job satisfaction of 60 higher secondary lecturers. Percentage, mean, t-test, and ANOVA were used to analyse data in this study. The study found that the level of job satisfaction of higher secondary lecturers is not very high due to certain factors in which lecturers showed low satisfaction. The physical infrastructure of the school available to them was the factor of lowest satisfaction, followed by salary, promotional avenues and service conditions, while the highest factor for lecturers' satisfaction was in the factors of satisfaction with social status and family welfare.

Keywords : Job Satisfaction, Lecturers, Teachers' job satisfaction, Higher Secondary School, Manipur.

Introduction

Job satisfaction is a widely accepted psychological aspect of functioning in a profession, which describes how an individual feels about their job. "Research evidence clearly shows that employees' decisions about whether they will go to work on any given day and quit are affected by their job satisfaction" (Lawler, 1977, p. 361). The Harvard Professional Group (1998) sees job satisfaction as the key ingredient that leads to recognition, income, promotion and achievement of other goals, which leads to a general feeling of fulfilment. Attempts to improve performance in organisations might never succeed if the job satisfaction of their employees is ignored. If employees in an organisation are motivated, they will render services to the employer and customers very efficiently and effectively (Mbua, 2003). The concept of job satisfaction does not have a conventional definition despite being widely researched by many scholars (Papanastasiou, 2006, p. 230). According to Shann (2001, p. 67), "Teacher satisfaction is a predictor of teacher retention, determinant of teacher commitment, and, in turn, a contributor to school effectiveness." This literature indicates that job satisfaction is a prerequisite to an educator's long tenure, performance, and overall institutional effectiveness (Wood, 1976). According to Spector (1997, p. 2), job satisfaction is "How people feel about different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs." Mbua (2003, p. 305) defines job satisfaction as "the fulfilment acquired by experiencing various job activities and

rewards." Meanwhile, for Robbins (2005), job satisfaction refers to the employee's feelings about her or his job. Similarly, job satisfaction is "a positive feeling about one's job resulting from an evaluation of its characteristics" (Judge, 2008, p. 20).

Now, teachers' job satisfaction is defined as "the amount of importance a school places on its human resources" (Ornstein, 2004, p. 66). It is also referred to as job morale, which, according to Luthans and Kreitner (Kreitner, 1975), "has been replaced by job satisfaction". Thus, job satisfaction of teacher (s) refers to the teachers' attitudes, perceptions and feelings towards their job. Teacher job satisfaction refers to whether or not teachers are happy with their job. In other words, if teachers have positive attitudes or good feelings about their job, these qualities describe a satisfied dimension (Bateman, 1991).

Rationale of the study

Anita Devi (2009) studied teachers' job satisfaction in the eight DIET centres in Manipur. She had concentrated on finding the difference in job satisfaction among the teachers of DIET centres. She reported that no significant difference existed in job satisfaction with regard to the eight DIET teachers in Manipur. Salam Robiya Meetei (2014)

Dr. Thenkhogin Haokip

*Assistant Professor, (HOD), Department of Education,
Presidency College, Motbung, Manipur;*

P. Khailiansang Vaiphei

*Lecturer, Department of Economics, Sagang Higher
Secondary School, Churachandpur, Manipur.*

had carried out a study of teachers' attitudes towards the teaching profession in the secondary schools of Manipur, reporting that teachers had a positive attitude towards the teaching profession in the dimensions of academic and administrative only. Lack of study causes difficulty spelling out the areas of job aspects that need improvement and motivation. This study wanted to contribute to filling this small yet significant gap in knowledge.

Objectives of the study

- To find out the average level of job satisfaction of higher secondary school lecturers in Manipur.
- To compare the average level of job satisfaction of higher secondary lecturers based on their gender (sex), Age, Marital Status, Educational Qualification, Social Category to which the lecturer belong and their monthly income (per month).

Hypotheses

H_{01} : There is no significant difference in job satisfaction between male and female lecturers.

H_{02} : There is no significant difference in job satisfaction between unmarried and married lecturers.

H_{03} : There is no significant difference in job satisfaction among lecturers based on their academic degrees.

H_{04} : There is no significant difference in job satisfaction based on the different ages of the lecturers.

H_{05} : There is no significant difference in job satisfaction based on the different social categories to which lecturers belong.

H_{06} : There is no significant difference in job satisfaction between lecturers with different monthly incomes

Method

This study belongs to the category of descriptive research as it involves a survey. There are 1344 lecturers in 210 Higher Secondary Schools in Manipur; this constitutes the population or universe of the study (Ministry of Statistics, 2017). The sample consisted of 60 lecturers working in different Higher Secondary Schools in the state. Dixit Job Satisfaction Scale (DJSS), developed by Meera Dixit, Department of Education, National Degree College, Lucknow (1993), was used to collect data. The Cronbach's Alpha of these 52 statement scores is 0.910. Analysis of

Data was carried out using IBM

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 25. Statistical tools such as

mean, percentage, t-test and ANOVA were used in the study.

Result and Discussion

Scores: In Table No.1 below, the scores indicate that the average score of the lecturers lies within the interpretative score of Satisfied {Mean=188.87 (± 19.436)}. The mode of the scores lies in the score range or interval of 190-199, which is interpreted as Satisfied. Only six lecturers (10% of the respondents) lie in the highly satisfied range or interval. Another six lecturers' scores (10%) indicated no satisfaction with their job. The rest of the respondents, i.e. 48 respondents (80%), lie in the average satisfaction level based on their scores.

Table1

Frequency of Scores and Mean

Sl No	Class-Interval	f	%	Mean	SD
1	140-149	4	6.66	188.87	19.436
2	150-159	2	3.33		
3	160-169	2	3.33		
4	170-179	4	6.66		
5	180-189	16	26.66		
6	190-199	18	30		
7	200-209	8	13.33		
8	210-219	1	1.66		
9	220-229	3	5		
10	230-239	2	3.33		
	Total	60	100		

Scores based on factors of Job satisfaction

As observed from Figure 1 below, except for factors 1 & 3, lecturers' scores indicate that the job satisfaction level on all the other six factors lies within the highly satisfied level of job satisfaction. Therefore, it can be safely inferred that lecturers are well satisfied with factors such as the intrinsic aspects of the job, Institutional Plans and Policies, Satisfaction with Authorities, Satisfaction with social status and family welfare, Rapport with students and Relationship

with co-workers. However, in factors such as salary, promotional avenues and service conditions, as well as Physical facilities of institutions, the scores of the lecturers lie at a low level of job satisfaction. While interacting with lecturers, they showed great concern about these points. There is no allowance for lecturers to be posted in far-flung areas. Hence, high competition for the allotment of schools in the valley and nearby urban locations among lecturers.

Figure No. 1. Factors of Job Satisfaction



There is no consideration for local posting, even though recruitments were conducted based on the lecturer requirements of existing schools. The slow process of approving medical leave for lecturers is a significant concern for them. The board's recommendation for lecturers' medical leave was a process that took quite a while, and this process, according to them, needs a proper review and a fast-track recommendation for specific medical emergencies that need to be adopted. Another concern of lecturers is their promotional avenue. Lecturers disclosed that they needed 12 years of service before their promotion to the next higher grade in the hierarchy. Then, they must compete for one or two posts of Vice-Principal and finally Principal in these schools. Another small yet important concern of these lecturers is the low pay of their service as evaluators of examination papers, which is Rs. 15 per paper.

Hypotheses H_{01} to H_{06}

There is no significant difference in the job satisfaction of higher secondary school lecturers in Manipur with respect to gender, marital status, academic degree, age, social category and monthly income.

Table2
Result of t-test & ANOVA

Variables		N	Mean	SD	Sig.	Remark
Gender	Female	16	179.50	13.672	0.023	S
	Male	44	192.27	20.213		
Marital Status	Unmarried	8	178.25	20.513	0.097	NS
	Married	52	190.50	18.943		
Academic degree	PG	54	189.52	18.442	0.440	NS
	M.Phil./ PhD	6	183.00	28.397		
Age	20-30	2	186.00	0.000	0.610	NS
	31-40	38	186.63	16.490		
	41-50	18	194.11	26.029		
	51-60	2	187.00	0.000		
Social Category	General	2	185.00	0.000	0.770	NS
	SC	8	185.75	35.947		
	ST	46	188.78	16.651		
	OBC	4	198.00	10.392		
Monthly Income	40,000-50,000	10	184.40	6.883	0.711	NS
	50,000-60,000	40	189.40	22.281		
	Above 60,000	10	191.20	15.754		

Source: Survey. NB: NS=Not Significant

The first null hypothesis is rejected as a significant difference in job satisfaction could be observed between male and female; male lecturers with a mean score of 192.27 (± 20.213) indicated a higher level of job satisfaction than their female counterparts with a mean score of 179.50 (± 13.672). The second null hypothesis is accepted as no significant difference was observed at 5% precision in the t-test on the scores based on Table 2. The third null hypothesis is also accepted, as no significant difference was observed between the different academic degrees. The fourth null hypothesis is also accepted, as lecturers with different age groups did not show a significant difference with their slightly different mean scores as observed in Table No. 2. The fifth null hypothesis is also accepted, as no significant difference was observed in the different mean scores of lecturers based on their social category. The sixth null hypothesis is accepted as no significant difference is observed despite different mean scores of different monthly income groups of the lecturers through ANOVA.

Rocca and Kostanski (2001) have stated that "employment status does not impact the issues of job satisfaction and burnout too greatly. However, certain facets of job satisfaction (i.e. operating conditions, nature of work and rewards) across all employment status groups influence components and levels of burnout within secondary teaching". Male lecturers showed higher job satisfaction than female lecturers, contrary to Cano & Miller's study (Fal, 1992). On average, lecturers showed a high level of job satisfaction on factors such as the intrinsic aspects of the job, Institutional Plans and Policies, Satisfaction with Authorities, Satisfaction with social status and family welfare, Rapport with students and Relationship with co-workers. Lecturers showed low job satisfaction on factors such as salary, promotional avenues, service conditions and physical facilities of their institutions. Lecturers are most satisfied with the aspects of social status and family welfare in their jobs. Factors such as marital status, age, academic degree, social category and monthly income did not significantly affect the job satisfaction level of these lecturers.

Reference

1. Bateman, D. O. (1991). *Organisational Behaviour*. Homewood, IL: IRWIN.
2. Cano, J., & Miller, G. (Fal 1992). *A Gender Analysis of Job Satisfaction, Job Satisfier Factors, and Job Dissatisfier Factors of Agricultural Education Teachers*. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 40-46.
3. Davis, L. (2012). Davis L. C. (2012). "Exploring Relationships Among Teaching Styles, Teachers' Perceptions of Their Self-Efficacy and Students' Mathematics Achievement. Liberty University: Ph.D. dissertation. Liberty University.
4. Devi, G. A. (2009). *A study of the Job satisfaction of teachers working in eight DIET centres in Manipur*. Imphal: M.Ed. dissertation submitted to Manipur University.
5. Devi, J. (1989). *Education in Manipur*. Imphal: Rai Pravina Brothers.
6. Devi, M. S. (2001). *Development of Education in Manipur*. New Delhi: Rajesh Publications.
7. Judge, S. R. (2008). *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
8. Kreitner, F. L. (1975). *Organisational Behaviour Modification*. USA: Scott, Foresman and Company.
9. Lawler, E. E. (1977). *Job and work satisfaction*. In W. C. Schmidt, *Contemporary problems in personnel*. Chicago: St. Clair Press.
10. Mate, J. (2013). *A Study of Higher Education in Manipur*. Delhi: Maxford Books.
11. Mbua, F. N. (2003). Mbua, F. N. (2003). *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*. Limbe, South West Province, Cameroon: Design House. Limbe, South West Province, Cameroon: Design House.
12. Meetei, S. R. (2014). *Attitude of teachers towards the teaching profession in the secondary schools of Manipur*. Imphal: Ph.D. thesis in Adult Continuing Education and Extension submitted to Manipur University.
13. Ministry of Statistics, G. o. (2017). *EDUCATION - Statistical Year Book India 2017*. Retrieved from <http://mospi.nic.in/statistical-year-book-india/2017/198> No. of Educational Institutions, Schools (Statewise) Table- 29.1 (B): <http://mospi.nic.in/statistical-year-book-india/2017/198> No. of Educational Institutions, Schools (Statewise) Table- 29.1 (B)
14. Ministry of Statistics, G.O. (2017). *EDUCATION - Statistical Year Book India 2017*. Retrieved from <http://mospi.nic.in/statistical-year-book-india/2017/198> <http://mospi.nic.in/statistical-year-book-india/2017/198>
15. Ministry of Statistics, G.O. (2017). *Statistical Year Book India 2017*. Retrieved from <http://mospi.nic.in/statistical-year-book-india/2017/198> Number of Teachers in Educational Institutions (Statewise) Table- 29.4 (B): <http://mospi.nic.in/statistical-year-book-india/2017/198> Number of Teachers in Educational Institutions (Statewise) Table- 29.4 (B)
16. Nagar, R. (1975). *Development of education in Manipur from 1891 to 1970*. Gauhati: An unpublished thesis submitted to Gauhati University.
17. Ornstein, F. L. (2004). *Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices*. Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson.
18. Papanastasiou, M. Z. (2006). *Sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in Cyprus*. Zembylas, M. & British Association for International and Comparative Education. Vol. 36, No. 2, 229-247.
19. Robbins, S. P. (2005). *Organisational Behaviour*. China: Pearson Education Asia LTD.
20. Rocca, A. D. (2001). *Burnout and job satisfaction amongst Victorian Secondary school teachers: a comparative look at Contract and permanent employment*. Paper presented at the conference on Teacher education: change of heart, mind and action.
21. Scott, M. (2004). *Perceptions of Fundamental Job Characteristics and their level of Job Satisfaction*. Mississippi State University Extension Service Agents. Mississippi: Unpublished Master's Thesis, Mississippi State University.
22. Shann, M. H. (2001). *Professional Commitment and Satisfaction among Teachers in Urban Middle Schools*. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92 No. 2, 67-73.
23. Spector, P. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. California: Sage Publications.
24. Wood, O. R. (1976). *Measuring Job Satisfaction of the Community College Staff*. *Community College Review*, 3, (1), 56-64.