



JOB SATISFACTION OF SELF FINANCING TEACHERS IN ARTS AND SCIENCE COLLEGES IN KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT

Dr. A. Vijayalekshmi

Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University Constituent College, Kanyakumari.

Abstract

Teachers have a major role in the growth and development of students. But the social well-being, advancement and growth of pupils depends to a great extent on the enthusiasm, efficiency and professional skills and ultimately the job satisfaction of the teachers. Job satisfaction of teachers is of much value to administrators, who frame policies, take decisions and create conditions in which teachers try to maximize their potential and thus derive greater job satisfaction. High-quality teaching staffs are the cornerstone of a successful educational system. One step in developing high-quality teachers is, understanding the factors associated with teaching quality and retention. This study focuses on job satisfaction of self financing teachers working in arts and science colleges in kanyakumari district.

Introduction

Teacher is the most vital single factor of influence in the system of education. It is the teacher who matters most as far as the quality of education is concerned. The educational process is governed by the extent of his/her receptivity and initiative. The well equipped and satisfied teacher is supreme in education. At all times the teacher is the pivot in the system of education. In the case of teachers, the study of job satisfaction is relevant for understanding and improving higher education institutions and their core functions of teaching, research and service. Moreover, by studying teachers' job satisfaction; it is also possible to improve the knowledge of the academic profession in general and to generate with the help of such knowledge more effective programmes for recruitment, retention and improvement of its members. Job satisfaction of teachers is of much value to administrators, who frame policies, take decisions and create conditions in which teachers try to maximize their potential and thus derive greater job satisfaction. This study focuses on job satisfaction of self financing teachers working in arts and science colleges in kanyakumari district. The study attempts to analyze what indicators are contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction among the teachers.

Statement of the Problem

Job satisfaction is one of the promoting factors of teachers working in either Government colleges, Government Aided colleges or Self-Finance colleges. It is disturbing to find that many of today's teachers are dissatisfied with their jobs. Nowadays, there is, however, a general feeling that the teachers do not have satisfaction in their job. There seems to be growing discontentment towards their job as a result of which standard of education are falling. As far as self-financing institutions are concerned, they are promoted and solely controlled by private agencies. The government does not financially support these self-financing institutions. The job satisfaction of teachers working in such institutions is always questionable. The need to evaluate the level of job satisfaction of self financing teachers from arts and science colleges and their reasons for satisfaction or dissatisfaction is felt by the researcher and hence the present study has been under taken. In managements of Arts and Science Colleges, didn't give proper attention to both monetary as well as non monetary problems faced by the self financing teachers. So that teacher's morale and efficiency are to be affected.

The present study is focused on the Job Satisfaction of self financing teachers in Arts and Science Colleges in Kanyakumari District. Though they are working equally on par with aided course teachers in all aspects, they are not provided with numerous benefits equally. Given the situation, a study on teacher career satisfaction is warranted.

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the satisfaction level and the factors that varies with demographic background.
2. To examine the dominant intrinsic factors involved in job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among the teachers.
3. To find out the self-financing teachers' level of job satisfaction with the job 'motivator' and 'hygiene' factors.

Hypotheses of the Study

H₀1: There is no significant difference in the overall job satisfaction between the different demographic variables.

H₀2: There is no significant prediction between overall job satisfaction and its factors (motivator & hygiene).

Research Methodology

The study involves both primary and secondary data. The survey questionnaire was prepared through analysis of secondary data and the area of study. Stratified random sampling method was used for this study. The total sample size for this study was 400.



Statistical Techniques Used

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to test what degree of differences exists between the attitudes of the respondents' demographic characteristics towards their perception of job satisfaction. The t-test was computed to test for statistically significant difference in the variables. Regression analysis was done to examine how much each individual factors of job satisfaction influence/affect the overall job satisfaction.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

ANOVA

H₀1: There is no significant difference in the overall job satisfaction between the different demographic variables.

Table 1: Difference among different age groups of job satisfaction and its factors

Factors	Age	Mean	SD		sum of square	df	mean square	F	Sin
Motivator Factors	Below 30yrs	90.03	14.563	Between Groups	1841.135	3	613.712	3.411	0.018 (S)
	31 to 40yrs	94.16	11.466	Within Groups	71254.865	396	179.937		
	41 to 50yrs	94.38	11.171	Total	73095.996	399			
	Above 50yrs	88.63	17.618						
Hygiene Factors	Below 30yrs	118.05	19.874	Between Groups	133.868	3	44.623	0.124	0.946 (NS)
	31 to 40yrs	118.07	19.152	Within Groups	142080.922	396	358.790		
	41 to 50yrs	119.54	13.172	Total	142214.79	399			
	Above 50yrs	116.75	20.486						
Overall Job Satisfaction	Below 30yrs	208.08	32.512	Between Groups	.188	3	.188	0.910	0.436 (NS)
	31 to 40yrs	212.22	28.282	Within Groups	114.672	396	.775		
	41 to 50yrs	213.92	22.850	Total	114.860	399			
	Above 50yrs	205.38	37.420						

0.05 % significant level

With reference to motivator factors, the calculated F-value is 3.411 is greater than (2.60) the table value. The derived probability value is 0.018, is less than the critical value = 0.05. This shows that there is a difference among different age groups of motivator factors of job satisfaction. With reference to hygiene factors, the calculated F-value is 0.124 is less than (2.60) the table value. And the probability value 0.946 is greater than the critical value 0.05. This shows that there is no difference among different age groups hygiene factors of job satisfaction. The calculated F-value is 0.910 is less than (2.60) the table value and the derived probability value 0.436 is greater than the critical value = 0.05. This proves that there is no significant difference among different age groups and overall job satisfaction.

Table 2: Difference among experience of job satisfaction and its factors

Factors	Experience	Mean	SD		sum of square	df	mean square	F	Sin
Motivator Factors	Below 3 years	88.97	14.721	Between Groups	2821.935	3	940.645	5.301	0.001 (S)
	4 to 6 years	93.61	11.476	Within Groups	70274.065	396	177.460		
	7 to 9 years	93.67	12.347	Total	73096	399			
	Above 9 years	96.69	14.168						
Hygiene Factors	Below 3 years	113.37	20.224	Between Groups	7988.342	3	2662.781	7.856	0.000 (S)
	4 to 6 years	122.18	16.806	Within Groups	134226.448	396	338.956		
	7 to 9 years	119.70	15.525	Total	142214.79	399			
	Above 9 years	124.94	18.486						
Overall Job Satisfaction	Below 3 years	202.34	32.255	Between Groups	20113.927	3	6704642	7.635	0.000 (S)
	4 to 6 years	215.79	26.488	Within Groups	347744.063	396	878.142		
	7 to 9 years	213.37	27.055	Total	367857.99	399			
	Above 9 years	221.63	31.280						

0.05 % significant level

With regard to the motivator factors, the calculated F-value is 5.301, which is found to be greater than (2.60), the table value. And the derived probability value 0.001 is less than 0.05, the critical value. This proves that there is a significant difference among experience and motivator factors of job satisfaction. With regard to hygiene factors, the calculated F-value



is 7.856, which is greater than (2.60), the table value. And the derived probability value 0.000 is less than 0.05, the critical value (0.05). This proves there is a significant difference among experience and hygiene factors of job satisfaction. The group which had above 9 years of experience showed a higher level of satisfaction with reference to hygiene factors, compared to the other three groups with a mean value of 124.94. This shows there is a significant difference among experience and job satisfaction.

Table 3: Difference among monthly salary of job satisfaction and its factors

Factors	Monthly Salary	Mean	SD		sum of square	df	mean square	F	Sin
Motivator Factors	Less than Rs. 10,000	91.11	15.412	Between Groups	306.738	3	102.246	0.556	0.644 (NS)
	Rs. 10,001 to Rs. 15,000	92.20	11.437	Within Groups	72789.262	396	183.811		
	Rs. 15,001 to Rs.20,000	91.88	13.268	Total	73096	399			
	Rs.20,001 & above	96.00	8.697						
Hygiene Factors	Less than Rs. 10,000	114.47	21.442	Between Groups	4409.675	3	1469.892	4.224	0.006 (S)
	Rs. 10,001 to Rs. 15,000	120.18	15.247	Within Groups	137805.115	396	347.993		
	Rs. 15,001 to Rs.20,000	120.26	18.174	Total	142214.79	399			
	Rs.20,001 & above	128.50	13.984						
Overall Job Satisfaction	Less than Rs. 10,000	205.58	34.072	Between Groups	6794.750	3	2264.917	2.484	0.060 (NS)
	Rs. 10,001 to Rs. 15,000	212.39	25.193	Within Groups	361063.240	396	911.776		
	Rs. 15,001 to Rs.20,000	212.14	30.022	Total	367857.99	399			
	Rs.20,001 & above	224.50	22.472						

0.05 % significant level

With reference to motivator factors of job satisfaction, the calculated F-value 0.556 is less than (2.60), the table value. And the calculated p-value, 0.644 is greater than 0.05, the critical value. This proves that there is no significance difference among monthly salary and motivators factors of job satisfaction. With regard to hygiene factors, the calculated F-value 4.224 is greater than (2.60) the table value. The calculated probability value 0.006 is less than 0.05, the critical value. This shows there is a significance difference among monthly salary and hygiene factors of job satisfaction. Those who received above Rs.20,000 salary recorded a higher level of satisfaction over motivator factors with a mean score of 96.00 and a SD score of 8.697. This proves that there is no significant difference among monthly salary and job satisfaction.

T- Test

Table 4: Difference between gender and job satisfaction and its factors

Factors	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig
Motivator Factors	Male	188	93.70	12.740	2.667	0.008 (S)
	Female	212	90.11	14.018		
Hygiene Factors	Male	188	119.34	18.080	1.143	0.254 (NS)
	Female	212	117.18	19.547		
Overall Job Satisfaction	Male	188	213.04	28.448	1.896	0.059 (NS)
	Female	212	207.29	31.789		

0.05 % significant level



With reference to calculated t value (2.667) is greater than the table value, which indicates that there is a significant difference between motivator factors of job satisfaction with respect to gender. In case of hygiene factors of job satisfaction the calculated t value (1.143) is lesser than the table value and is not significant at 0.05 level which indicates that there is no significant difference between hygiene factors of job satisfaction with respect to gender. With reference to overall job satisfaction with respect to their gender, the calculated t value (1.896) is lesser than the table value, which indicates that there is no significant difference between job satisfaction with respect to gender.

Table 5: Difference between type of family and job satisfaction and its factors

Factors	Type of family	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig
Motivator Factors	Joint	232	93.49	13.072	2.958	0.003 (S)
	Nuclear	168	89.47	13.854		
Hygiene Factors	Joint	232	121.08	19.375	3.643	0.000 (S)
	Nuclear	168	114.21	17.460		
Overall Job Satisfaction	Joint	232	214.56	30.901	3.589	0.000 (S)
	Nuclear	168	203.68	28.511		

0.05 % significant level

From the above table shows that the motivator factors of job satisfaction with respect to their type of family, the calculated t value (2.958) is greater than the table value and is significant at 0.05 level which indicates that there is a significant difference between motivator factors of job satisfaction with respect to type of family. With reference to hygiene factors the calculated t value (3.643) is greater than the table value and is significant at 0.05 level which indicates that there is a significant difference between hygiene factors of job satisfaction with respect to type of family.

Table 6: Difference between location and job satisfaction and its factors

Factors	Location	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig
Motivator Factors	Urban	232	92.38	13.432	1.201	0.274 (NS)
	Rural	168	90.85	13.694		
Hygiene Factors	Urban	232	119.54	19.029	3.379	0.000 (S)
	Rural	168	115.97	18.477		
Overall Job Satisfaction	Urban	232	211.92	30.463	2.661	0.003 (S)
	Rural	168	206.82	30.030		

0.05 % significant level

From the above table 6, it is analysed that the motivator factors of job satisfaction with respect to their location, urban and rural, the calculated t value (1.201) is lesser than the table value and is not significant at 0.05 level which indicates that there is no significant difference between motivator factors of job satisfaction with respect to location. The mean scores of hygiene factors of job satisfaction with respect to their location, urban and rural are 119.54 and 115.97 respectively and the standard deviation are 19.029 and 18.477. The calculated t value (3.379) is greater than the table value and is significant at 0.05 level which indicates that there is a significant difference between hygiene factors of job satisfaction with respect to location. Hence the hypothesis is rejected. The table also indicates that hygiene factors of job satisfaction are higher among urban teachers than rural teachers.

The mean scores of job satisfaction with respect to their location, urban and rural are 211.92 and 206.82 respectively and the standard deviation are 30.463 and 30.030. The calculated t value (2.661) is greater than the table value and is significant at 0.05 level which indicates that there is a significant difference between job satisfaction with respect to location. Hence the hypothesis is rejected. The table also indicates that job satisfaction is higher among urban teachers than rural teachers.

Table 7: Difference between type of institution and job satisfaction and its factors

Factors	Type of institution	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig
Motivator Factors	Aided	200	92.99	12.760	1.763	0.079 (NS)
	Self-financed	200	90.61	14.201		
Hygiene Factors	Aided	200	120.76	18.091	2.734	0.007 (S)
	Self-financed	200	115.64	19.344		
Overall Job Satisfaction	Aided	200	213.75	28.307	2.486	0.013 (S)
	Self-financed	200	206.25	31.921		

0.05 % significant level



From the above table 7, it is analysed that the mean scores of motivator factors of job satisfaction with respect to their type of institution, aided and self-financed are 92.99 and 90.61 respectively and the standard deviation are 12.760 and 14.201. The calculated t value (1.763) is lesser than the table value and is significant at 0.05 level which indicates that there is no significant difference between motivator factors of job satisfaction with respect to type of institution. Hence the hypothesis is accepted. The table also indicates that motivator factors of job satisfaction are higher among self-financed teachers than aided teachers.

The mean scores of hygiene factors of job satisfaction with respect to their type of institution, aided and self-financed are 120.76 and 115.64 respectively and the standard deviation are 18.091 and 19.344. The calculated t value (2.734) is greater than the table value and is significant at 0.05 level which indicates that there is a significant difference between hygiene factors of job satisfaction with respect to type of institution. Hence the hypothesis is rejected. The table also indicates that hygiene factors of job satisfaction are higher among self-financed teachers than aided teachers.

The mean scores of job satisfaction with respect to their type of institution, aided and self-financed are 213.75 and 206.25 respectively and the standard deviation are 28.307 and 31.921. The calculated t value (2.486) is greater than the table value and is significant at 0.05 level which indicates that there is a significant difference between job satisfaction with respect to type of institution. Hence the hypothesis is rejected. The table also indicates that job satisfaction is higher among self-financed teachers than aided teachers.

Table 8: Difference between department and job satisfaction and its factors

Factors	Department	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig
Motivator Factors	Arts	200	93.27	12.404	2.175	0.030 (S)
	Science	200	90.34	14.462		
Hygiene Factors	Arts	200	119.64	18.116	1.533	0.126 (NS)
	Science	200	116.75	19.551		
Overall Job Satisfaction	Arts	200	212.91	28.401	1.923	0.055 (NS)
	Science	200	207.09	32.014		

0.05 % significant level

From the above table 8, it is analysed that the mean scores of motivator factors of job satisfaction with respect to their department, arts and science are 93.27 and 90.34 respectively and the standard deviation are 12.404 and 14.462. The calculated t value (2.175) is greater than the table value and is significant at 0.05 level which indicates that there is a significant difference between motivator factors of job satisfaction with respect to department. Hence the hypothesis is rejected. The table also indicates that motivator factors of job satisfaction are higher among science teachers than arts teachers.

The mean scores of hygiene factors of job satisfaction with respect to their department, arts and science are 119.64 and 116.75 respectively and the standard deviation are 18.116 and 19.551. The calculated t value (1.533) is lesser than the table value and is significant at 0.05 level which indicates that there is no significant difference between hygiene factors of job satisfaction with respect to department. Hence the hypothesis is accepted. The table also indicates that hygiene factors of job satisfaction are higher among science teachers than arts teachers.

The mean scores of job satisfaction with respect to their department, arts and science are 212.91 and 207.09 respectively and the standard deviations are 28.401 and 32.014. The calculated t value (1.923) is lesser than the table value and is significant at 0.05 level which indicates that there is no significant difference between job satisfaction with respect to department. Hence the hypothesis is accepted. The table also indicates that job satisfaction is higher among science teachers than arts teachers.

Regression

Hypothesis

H₀₂: There is no significant prediction between overall job satisfaction and its factors (motivator & hygiene).

Table 9: Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.883 ^a	.780	.775	.238



Table 10: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	77.967	10	7.797	138.218	.000 ^a
	Residual	21.943	389	.056		
	Total	99.910	399			

Table 11: Regression Coefficients

Model		Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.321	.056		-5.680	.000
	Achievement	-.073	.032	-.072	-2.274	.024
	Recognition	.163	.034	.161	4.834	.000
	The work itself	.038	.031	.037	1.215	.225
	Responsibility	.094	.036	.092	2.619	.009
	Growth	.079	.035	.077	2.250	.025
	Organizational policy and administration	.280	.040	.278	7.063	.000
	Supervision	.209	.032	.208	6.519	.000
	Working condition	.177	.033	.176	5.285	.000
	Interpersonal relationship	.093	.030	.093	3.114	.002
	Salary	.117	.030	.117	3.930	.000

R-Square: R-square shows the percentage of the total variation of dependent variable. The derived R-square is 0.780, which means that 78 per cent variations in the dependent variables.

ANOVA: The computed $F = 138.218$ and the associated 'p' value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05, the critical alpha level. This shows the presence of significance between the dependent variables and the independent variables tested.

Coefficients: "B value shown in the 'coefficient' table denotes the corresponding level of increase in the overall job satisfaction level for every unit increase in the individual job satisfaction factors. One achievement shows a negative relationship (-0.073) and all the other satisfaction factors show a positive relationship. Except the factors, 'Achievement', 'Work itself' and 'Growth' all the other satisfaction factors show statistical significance.

Conclusion: There is statistically significant prediction between overall job satisfaction and its factors (motivation & hygiene). Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Conclusion

Job satisfaction is the prime need of employees that can be enhanced by regular review and by creating a cordial relationship between the employees and management. Every individual should be assured of job satisfaction not only at his home and also his work place too. Satisfaction with teaching as a career is an important policy issue since it is associated with teacher effectiveness which ultimately affects student achievement (Ashton and Webb, 1986). The respondents were more satisfied with the actual achievement of work-related goals, recognition of accomplishments by co-workers, work and association with college students, the authority they had to get job done, opportunities for increased responsibility in their institution, the level of understanding between them and their seniors, number of classes or groups for which they are responsible and staff welfare schemes. At the same time some of the areas like their responsibilities outside their major areas of work, opportunities to grow professionally through formal education, the procedures used to select faculty for promotion to positions, holidays and leave facilities and range of salary to other faculty members. Proper welfare measures taken in the institution would necessarily effect a positive change in the work profile and solve major problems. The findings provide information to policy makers in increasing the satisfaction levels of teachers. The researcher hopes that this study will help educational institutions in developing strategies to improve the quality of education and the performance of the students.



References

1. A variation of Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory of motivation, Human Needs in Organizational Settings, New York, The Free Press, 1972.
2. Aamodt, M.G. (1999). *Applied Industrial/Organizational Psychology* (3rd ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
3. Aisenberg, N., and M. Harrington (1988). *Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
4. Abdullah, M.M., Uli, J. and Parasuraman, B. (2009). "Job satisfaction among secondary school teachers". *Jurnal Kemanusiaan*, Vol.13, June 2009.
5. Ahsan, N., Abdullah, Z., Fie, D.Y.G. and Alam, S.S. (2009). "A study of job stress on job satisfaction among university staff in Malaysia: Empirical study". *European journal of Social Sciences*, Vol.8(1), 2009, pp.121-131.