

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19517949>

Impact Of Demographic Variables On Teachers' Working Conditions And Job Satisfaction At Secondary School Level In District Sialkot, Pakistan



Maryam Islam

Lecturer in Education, Govt. Associate College for Women Marakiwal, Sialkot, maryamislam95@gmail.com

Dr. Muhammad
Abiodullah

Associate Professor & Chairman Department of Educational Research and Evaluation, IER University of the Punjab Lahore Pakistan, abiodullah.ier@pu.edu.pk

Abstract: *This study explored Impact of Demographic Variables on Teachers' Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction at Secondary School Level in District Sialkot, Pakistan. A quantitative and descriptive research design was employed. The sample consisted of 320 teachers selected through proportionate stratified random sampling. Data were collected using standardized questionnaires on working conditions (mass tells) developed by Johnson, Kraft, & Papay in (2012) and the second survey was used to measured teachers' job satisfaction was teachers job satisfaction survey (TJSS), this scale was developed by Ngimbudzi in (2009). Inferential statistics (t-test, one-way between-groups ANOVA) was used to analyze the data.*

Keywords: Knowledge, skills, professional degrees, teacher, education, schools

Introduction

Knowledge, skills or professional degrees are crucial in recruitment of teachers but they cannot be the only way to determine the effectiveness of teachers and improve the education quality in schools. There are various external and internal factors that create teachers attitude towards their jobs. Teachers work performance in work is decreasing due to the lack of job satisfaction and poor working conditions (ye, 2016).

There is an overall image that teachers are not satisfied with their jobs which is adversely affecting the motivation level of teachers and students. Average salary of teachers is very low as well as lack of autonomy and poor condition are leading towards poor and unsatisfactory results in teaching learning process. Various efforts has been made to tackle these issues but they are not addressing the core issues (Naz, 2017).

Review of the related literature

Traditionally the concept of working conditions is based on teacher's salary, size of the class and transfer policies. There are a variety of components that constitute school environment such as the quality of school leadership, prospects for development, and quality of facilities, physical, social, political, educational and psychological features of etc. Numerous studies have elucidated that the workplace environment can empower or restrain the efforts of teachers. Teachers feel themselves more empowered and supported when they have adequate facilities and positive attitudes towards their jobs (Ladd, 2011).

According to Ingersoll (2001) working conditions has an impact on the turnover rate of teachers. He further recommended the four aspects of teacher retaining such as compensation reward and salary structure, provision of administrative support, relationship with colleagues & contribution in policy making.

There is an overall feeling that teachers are not

satisfied with their professions as a result education standards are falling. Satisfaction of teachers with their work have strong implications for students. In case of lack of support, satisfaction and motivation with their profession teachers are most likely to leave their jobs (Akhtar, Hashmi & Naqvi 2010). Because of the lack of job satisfaction the performance of teachers is declining. Which in turn leading to poor students' achievements (Bishay, 1996).

The major concern of contemporary organizations is the job satisfaction and motivation of employees. A range of material and immaterial rewards at the workplace is a unique way to increase the commitment of employees at the work place (Kinicki & Kreitner, 2007).

Liu and Ramsey (2008) as cited in (Salehi & Yunus 2015) the reason of lack of job satisfaction is stress which is the result of poor working conditions and inadequate time with the heavy load of teaching.

Education quality is influenced by the job satisfaction of teachers as there is an affirmative impact of job satisfaction of teachers on the quality of education and achievements of students (Michaelowa & Wittmann, 2009).

According to Brendle-Corum (2010) poor working conditions not only create job dissatisfaction but also have an undesirable impact on the outcomes and achievements of students. If employees are not satisfied with their job this can leads to burnout, absenteeism and turnover (Chamundeswari, 2013).

Academic performance of students is affected by various factors such as students, school and teacher factors. According to Jaiyeoba and Jibril (2008) satisfied and enthusiastic teachers are central for any education system for their success and failure. Any education system depends on fulfilled school administration and especially teachers who spend a huge amount of their time in classrooms they have considerable approach on achievements of students.

Theories of job Satisfaction

Maslow's Theory of Motivation/Satisfaction

Although Maslow's pyramid of need generally defines the human motivation in general, however it has been used in work setting to explain job satisfaction. Human needs are categorized into five level in order such as

- Physiological needs
- Safety
- Belongingness/love
- Esteem
- Self- actualization

Physiological needs can be fulfilled through compensations and other health related benefits some other aspects of job satisfaction may also include structure and policies of the company.

Security needs can be fulfilled through providing a safe work environment, establishing positive relationships at workplace and providing job security.

At the third phase of affiliation and recognition employee seek for acknowledgement and gratitude.

At the final stage of self-actualization predicts employees' accomplishment level. Organizations should pay attention to the lower level of needs in order to help the employee to progress towards advanced level of needs. (Maslow, 1954).

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory

Frederick Herzberg in his motivator-hygiene theory suggested that job gratification and dissatisfaction are not actually two conflicting ends of the same continuum, but they are two distinct and disparate concepts. Motivators includes pay, salaries, , benefits and achievements while hygiene factors consists of working environments, company's rules and job security etc. This model states that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction is a creation of different factors – motivation and hygiene separately. Hygiene factors just prevent dissatisfaction.

Motivation hygiene theory provides a useful model to study job satisfaction and can be useful in educational settings (Kim, 2004).

Hygiene factors deal with the exterior conditions of a job. Providing hygiene factors can prevent dissatisfaction but not necessarily motivate for superior performance and job satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman ,1954).

Alderfer's Existence Relatedness and Growth Needs Theory

The Theory is parallel to Maslow's hierarchy of needs but Alderfer divides human needs into broad three categories.

- **Existence Needs:** Existence needs are basic needs for survival of human beings. It includes salary, benefits, working conditions and all physiological and safe environment.
- **Relatedness Needs:** Having strong and positive relationships with colleagues, supervisors support, recognition and sense of belongingness.
- **Growth Needs:** It involves the needs for personal growth and development. Sense of Self-actualization and self-fulfillment fall under this category (Alderfer, 1969).

McGregor's X & Y Theory

Theory X and Y proposed two characteristics of human behavior at workplace such as Negative (Theory X) and Positive (Theory Y). Theory X assumes that average employee hate work and avoid responsibility that's why they are forced and coerced to work through intimidation and punishments. While theory Y assumes that externally imposed threat and control is not the only way to get the work done. People took it as a learning opportunity if they are allowed to work more a self-directed environment. Theory Y is more suitable in order to inculcate a sense of satisfaction among employees (McGregor, 1960).

McClelland's Needs - Achievement Theory

Three basic human needs are necessary in motivation of employees.

- 1) **Achievement Needs:** Achievement needs refers to the desire to excel and succeed
- 2) **Power Needs:** It refers to the desire to have an effect, to be prominent, and to control others
- 3) **Affiliation Needs:** Refers to the desire for cooperative, friendly and optimistic interpersonal (Saif, Nawaz, Jan & Khan, 2012).

Adam's Equity Theory

Individuals associate value of rewards to effort and compare it to other people. Adams (1963) defines equity as, "a fair exchange between which is not perceived only a matter of payments or rewards, it's an element of fairness or inequity. Adam's theory deals directly with the fairness of the exchange in which an individual gives something and gets something in return. Feelings of unfairness is a source of job dissatisfaction. Equity is a source of motivation to maintain the current situation. Individual

compares the inputs and outcomes of self to the inputs and outcomes of the others. Inequity can also be unfavorable for the person who is getting benefits more than his/her efforts considered himself over rewarded in comparison with others.

Job Characteristics Theory

Hackman and Oldham's (1980) formulated the theory of job characteristics. The theory of job characteristics describes the features how employees' perceive their job and role in an organization. The greater the clarity of task leads to commitment and involvement in work (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007).

Research methods

Objectives of the Study

- To examine the relationship between teachers' working conditions and job satisfaction with respect to demographical variables (age, gender, professional qualification, academic qualification and experience).

Research Questions

- To what extent teachers' working conditions and job satisfaction is related to their demographic variables (age, gender, professional qualification, academic qualification and experience).

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative and descriptive research design. The purpose was to investigate "Impact of Demographic Variables on Teachers' Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction at Secondary School Level in District Sialkot".

Population of the Study

The sample consisted of 320 teachers selected from 40 government secondary schools across four tehsils of Sialkot district.

<i>Tehsil</i>	<i>Total (N)</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
Sialkot	79	34	45
Pasrur	61	25	36
Sambrial	34	16	19
Daska	53	23	30
Total	227	98	130

Sample of the study

A total of 14 schools were selected from Sialkot, 11 from Pasrur, 6 from Sambrial, and 9 from

Daska. From each school, eight teachers were selected, resulting in a total of 320 participants. The gender distribution indicated that 136 were male teachers and 184 were female teachers.

<i>Tehsil</i>	<i>Total Schools</i>	<i>Male Schools</i>	<i>Female Schools</i>	<i>Total sample</i>
Sialkot	14	6*8=48	8*8=64	122
Pasrur	11	4*8=32	7*8=56	88
Sambrial	6	3*8=24	3*8=24	48
Daska	9	4*8=32	5*8=40	72
Total	40	136	184	320

Instruments

Data were collected using two standardized, close-ended questionnaires:

1. **Working Conditions Scale** – measured teachers' perceptions of their work environment, including workload, administrative support, physical infrastructure, and collegial relationships.
2. **Job Satisfaction Scale** – measured teachers' satisfaction with aspects such as professional recognition, work meaningfulness, benefits, and overall job experience.

Both instruments were pilot-tested for reliability and validity prior to administration. Cronbach's alpha values exceeded the acceptable threshold of 0.70, confirming internal consistency.

Data Collection Procedure

The questionnaires were distributed personally to teachers across selected schools in District Sialkot. Respondents were assured of confidentiality, and participation was voluntary. Completed questionnaires were collected and prepared for statistical analysis.

Survey response rate

Out of 320 the total survey response rate was 300

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using inferential statistics (t-test, one-way between-groups ANOVA) to summarize Impact of Demographic Variables on Teachers' Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction at Secondary School Level in District Sialkot.

Data analysis

Working Conditions

Table

Independent Samples t-test for Gender (N=300)

		Male		Female		t-test for Equality of Means		95% CI		
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Sig</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>U</i>
Total conditions	Working	3.48	.76	3.61	.58	.10	-1.63	-.12	-.28	.03
Colleagues		3.47	.93	3.71	.73	.01	-2.52	-.24	-.43	-.05
time use		3.49	.91	3.50	.86	.86	-.17	-.01	-.22	.19
Resources		3.15	.96	3.11	.88	.66	.43	.04	-.16	.26
Facilities		3.61	1.09	3.83	.93	.05	-1.92	-.22	-.46	.00
Governance		3.50	.94	3.59	.78	.38	-.86	-.08	-.28	.11
Professional expertise		3.54	.95	3.74	.79	.05	-1.96	-.19	-.31	.00
Principal		3.63	.88	3.70	.71	.42	-.79	-.07	-.25	.11
Community support		3.09	1.12	3.43	.97	.006	-2.78	-.33	-.58	-.09
School culture		3.53	.91	3.74	.82	.03	-2.06	-.21	-.41	-.01

Note: M

=mean, SD=standard deviation, MD=mean difference, CI=class intervals, L=lower, U=upper

To analyze the scores of male and female teachers regarding their working conditions independent samples t test was conducted. There was not significant difference in the scores of males and females $t(298) = -1.63$; ($p=.10$). The total working condition scores of male are low ($M=3.48$, $SD=.76$) as compared to female ($M=3.61$, $SD=.58$) with the very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.008$).

There was a noteworthy difference in the scores for relationship with colleagues of males and females $t(298) = -2.52$; ($p=.01$). The colleague scores of male are low ($M= 3.47$, $SD=.93$) as compared to females ($M= 3.71$, $SD=.73$) and the magnitude of effect size was very small ($\eta^2=.02$).

There was no significant difference in scores of time use for male and females $t(298) = -.17$; ($p=.86$). The time use scores of male ($M=3.49$, $SD=.91$) are not significantly different as compared to females ($M=3.50$, $SD=.86$). There was a large effect size of ($\eta^2=.39$).

There was no significant difference in

scores of availability of resources for male and female $t(298) = .43$; ($p=.66$). The scores of male ($M=3.15$, $SD=.96$) are not significantly different from females ($M=3.11$, $SD=.88$); There was a very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.03$).

There was a significant difference in scores of facilities for male and females $t(298) = -1.92$; ($p=.05$). The scores of facilities for male ($M=3.61$, $SD=1.09$) are low as compared to females ($M=3.83$, $SD=.93$). The magnitude of effect was very small ($\eta^2=0.01$).

There was not significant difference in scores of governance for male and females $t(298) = -.86$; ($p=.38$). The scores of governance for male ($M=3.50$, $SD=.94$) are not significantly different from females ($M=3.59$, $SD=.78$). The magnitude of effect ($\eta^2=.002$).

There was a substantial difference in scores for male and female related to professional expertise $t(298) = -1.96$; ($p=.05$). The scores of male ($M=3.54$, $SD=.95$) are low as compared to females ($M=3.74$, $SD=.79$). The magnitude of effect size was very small ($\eta^2=.006$).

There was no significant difference in

the scores of principle for male and female $t(298) = -.79$; ($p = .42$). The scores of male ($M=3.63$, $SD=.88$) are not significantly different from females ($M=3.70$, $SD=.71$).The magnitude of effect was very small ($\eta^2=.002$).

There was a significant difference in scores of community support for male and female); $t(298) = -2.78$; $p = (.006)$. The scores of male ($M=3.09$, $SD=1.12$) are low as compared to Table

Independent Samples t-test for Professional Qualification (N=300)

		B.Ed.		M.Ed.		t-test for Equality of Means		95% CI		
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>sig</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>U</i>
Total conditions	Working	3.58	.65	3.52	.68	.43	.78	.06	-.09	.21
Colleagues		3.59	.83	3.64	.82	.58	-.54	-.05	-.24	.13
time use		3.46	.86	3.53	.90	.45	-.74	-.07	-.27	.12
Resources		3.18	.89	3.06	.92	.25	1.13	.11	-.08	.32
Facilities		3.73	1.02	3.74	.99	.95	-.05	-.006	-.23	.22
Governance		3.62	.79	3.46	.90	.09	1.68	.165	-.02	.35
Professional expertise		3.69	.84	3.61	.88	.44	.75	.07	-.12	.27
Principal		3.70	.78	3.64	.78	.49	.68	.06	-.11	.24
Community support		3.33	1.04	3.24	1.05	.44	.76	.09	-.14	.33
School culture		3.70	.83	3.60	.89	.32	.98	.09	-.09	.29

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation, MD=mean difference, CI=class intervals, L=lower, U=upper

To analyze the scores of professional qualification of teachers regarding their working conditions independent samples t-test was conducted. There was no significant difference in total working conditions scores for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = .78$; ($p = .43$). The professional qualification scores of B.Ed. teacher ($M=3.58$, $SD=.65$) were not significant as compared to M.Ed. teachers ($M=3.52$, $SD=.68$) with the very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.002$).

There was no significant difference in colleagues score for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = -.54$; ($p = .58$). The scores of colleagues for professional qualification of B.Ed. teacher ($M=3.59$, $SD=.83$) are not significant as compared to M.Ed. teachers ($M=3.64$, $SD=.82$) with the moderate effect size of ($\eta^2=.7$).

There was no significant difference in

females ($M=3.43$, $SD=.97$ and effect size of ($\eta^2=.009$).

There was a significant difference in school culture scores for male and female $t(298) = -2.06$; ($p = .03$). The scores of male ($M=3.53$, $SD=.91$) are low as compared to females ($M=3.74$, $SD=.82$) with the very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.01$).

time use score for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = -.74$; ($p = .45$). The professional qualification scores of time use for B.Ed. teacher ($M=3.46$, $SD=.86$) are not significant as compared to M.Ed. teachers ($M=3.53$, $SD=.90$) with the very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.001$).

There was no significant difference in score of resources for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = 1.13$; ($p = .25$). The professional qualification scores of resources for B.Ed. teacher ($M=3.18$, $SD=.89$) are not significant as compared to M.Ed. teachers ($M=3.06$, $SD=.92$) with the very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.004$).

There was no significant difference in score of facilities for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = -.05$; ($p = .95$). The professional qualification scores of facilities for B.Ed. teacher

($M=3.73$, $SD=1.02$) are not significant as compared to M.Ed. teachers ($M=3.74$, $SD=.99$) with the moderate effect size of ($\eta^2=.7$).

There was no significant difference in governance scores for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = 1.68$; ($p=.09$). The professional qualification scores of governance for B.Ed. teacher ($M=3.62$, $SD=.79$) are not significant as compared to M.Ed. teachers ($M=3.46$, $SD=.90$) with the very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.009$).

There was no significant difference in score of professional expertise for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = .75$; ($p=.44$). The professional qualification scores of professional expertise for B.Ed. teacher ($M=3.69$, $SD=.84$) are not significant as compared to M.Ed. teachers ($M=3.61$, $SD=.88$) with the very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.001$).

There was no significant difference in score of principal for professional qualification of

teachers $t(298) = .68$; ($p=.49$). The professional qualification scores of professional expertise for B.Ed. teacher ($M=3.70$, $SD=.78$) are not significant as compared to M.Ed. teachers ($M=3.64$, $SD=.78$) with the very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.001$).

There was no significant difference in score of Community support for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = .76$ ($p=.44$). The professional qualification scores of Community support for B.Ed. teacher ($M=3.33$, $SD=.1.04$) are not significant as compared to M.Ed. teachers ($M=3.24$, $SD=1.05$) with the very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.00$).

There was no significant difference in score of school culture for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = .98$; ($p=.32$). The professional qualification scores of school culture for B.Ed. teacher ($M=3.70$, $SD=.83$) are not significant as compared to M.Ed. teachers ($M=3.60$, $SD=.89$) with the very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.003$).

Table

Independent Samples t-test for Marital Status (N=300)

		Unmarried		Married		t-test for Equality of Means		95% CI		
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Sig</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>U</i>
Total conditions	Working	3.59	.64	3.54	.67	.62	.52	.04	-.13	.23
Colleagues		3.65	.84	3.06	.82	.67	.41	.04	-.17	.27
Time use		3.51	.83	3.49	.90	.83	.21	.02	-.21	.26
Resources		3.03	.92	3.15	.91	.33	-.92	-.11	-.36	.13
Facilities		3.92	.87	3.6	1.03	.08	1.73	.24	-.03	.51
Governance		3.64	.88	3.52	.84	.31	1.01	.12	-.11	.35
Professional expertise		3.74	.84	3.63	.87	.37	.88	.10	-.13	.34
Principal		3.67	.73	3.67	.80	.96	.04	.005	-.21	.22
Community support		3.25	1.03	3.30	1.05	.76	-.29	-.043	-.33	.24
School culture		3.73	.86	3.63	.86	.37	.89	.10	-.12	.34

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation, MD=mean difference, CI=class intervals, L=lower, U=upper

An independent samples t- test was conducted to compare the working conditions scores for marital status of teachers. There was no significant difference in total working conditions scores of teachers $t(298) =.52$; ($p=.62$). The scores of total working conditions

for unmarried teachers ($M=3.59$, $SD=.64$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=3.54$, $SD=.67$) and moderate effect size of ($\eta^2=.06$).

There was no significant difference in

colleagues scores of teachers $t(298) = .41$; ($p=.67$). The scores Colleagues for unmarried teachers ($M=3.65$, $SD=.84$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=3.06$, $SD=.82$) and large effect size ($\eta^2=.3$).

There was no significant difference in time use scores of teachers $t(298) = .21$; ($p=.83$). The scores time use for unmarried teachers ($M=3.51$, $SD=.83$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=3.49$, $SD=.90$) with the large effect size of ($\eta^2=.3$)

There was no significant difference in scores of resources $t(298) = -.92$; ($p=.33$). The scores time use for unmarried teachers ($M=3.03$, $SD=.92$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=3.15$, $SD=.91$) with the small effect size of ($\eta^2=.002$).

There was no significant difference in scores of facilities $t(298) = 1.73$; ($p=.08$). The scores facilities for unmarried teachers ($M=3.92$, $SD=.87$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=3.6$, $SD=1.03$) with the small effect size of ($\eta^2=.009$).

There was no significant difference in scores of governance for teacher $t(298) = 1.01$; ($p=.31$). The scores governance for unmarried teachers ($M=3.64$, $SD=.88$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers

($M=3.52$, $SD=.84$) with the small effect size of ($\eta^2=.003$).

There was no significant difference in scores of Professional expertise for teacher $t(298) = .88$; ($p=.37$). The scores professional expertise for unmarried teachers ($M=3.74$, $SD=.84$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=3.63$, $SD=.87$) with the small effect size of ($\eta^2=.002$).

There was no significant difference in scores of principal $t(298) = .04$; ($p=.96$). The scores principal for unmarried teachers ($M=3.67$, $SD=.73$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=3.67$, $SD=.80$) with the large eta square ($\eta^2=.3$)

There was no significant difference in scores of principal for teacher $t(298) = -.29$; ($p=.76$). The scores principal for unmarried teachers ($M=3.25$, $SD=1.03$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=3.30$, $SD=1.05$) and effect size was very large of ($\eta^2=.6$)

There was no significant difference in scores of School culture for teacher $t(298) = .89$; ($p=.37$). The scores School culture for unmarried teachers ($M=3.73$, $SD=.86$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=3.63$, $SD=.86$) and effect size was very small ($\eta^2=.002$).

Table

One -way between -groups ANOVA with post-hoc Test for Age (N=300)

		Age								ANOVA	
		20-30		31-40		41-50		51-60		F(3,296)	P
Factors		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Total	Working-conditions	3.56	.62	3.56	.71	3.46	.69	3.70	.63	1.12	.34
Colleagues		3.61	.84	3.61	.84	3.47	.84	3.89	.78	2.04	.10
Time use		3.44	.88	3.64	.86	3.42	.89	3.52	.88	1.02	.38
Resources		3.09	.86	3.11	.92	3.11	1.01	3.25	.82	.25	.85
Facilities		3.77	.918	3.75	1.07	3.62	1.12	3.82	.91	.49	.68
Governance		3.62	.83	3.55	.89	3.41	.86	3.59	.79	.96	.41
Professional expertise		3.69	.85	3.62	.94	3.57	.79	3.79	.87	.58	.62
Principal		3.66	.73	3.67	.83	3.56	.80	3.90	.80	1.48	.22
Community support		3.33	1.02	3.31	1.08	3.08	1.09	3.54	.93	1.77	.15

School culture	3.66	.82	3.61	.91	3.63	.185	3.75	.94	.22	.87
----------------	------	-----	------	-----	------	------	------	-----	-----	-----

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation

To analyze the impact of age level on working conditions one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. All the respondents were divided in four groups according to their age. (Group1= 20-30, Group2= 31-40, Group3= 41-50, Group 4=51-60). There was no statistically significant difference between groups at the level of total working conditions working ($p = .34$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$), Colleagues ($p=.10$; small effect size

$\eta^2= .02$), Time use ($p=.38$; small effect size $\eta^2= .01$), Resources ($p=.85$; small effect size $\eta^2=.002$), Facilities ($p=.68$; small effect size $\eta^2=.004$), governance ($p=.41$; small effect size $\eta^2=.009$), Professional expertise ($p=.62$; small effect size $\eta^2= .005$), Principal($p=.22$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$) Community support($p=.15$; small effect size $\eta^2= .01$)School culture($p=.87$; small effect size $\eta^2= .002$) as $p>.05$.

Table

One -way between -groups ANOVA with post-hoc Test for Academic Qualification (N=300)

	Academic qualification								ANOVA	
	B.A/B.SC		M.A/M.SC		B.S(honors)		M.Phil./M.S		F(3,296)	P
Factors	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Total Working-conditions	3.70	.61	3.54	.66	3.63	.65	3.31	.71	2.51	.05
Colleagues	3.67	.83	3.60	.82	3.67	.89	3.52	.79	.28	.83
Time use	3.52	.90	3.53	.87	3.45	1.05	3.26	.72	.92	.42
Resources	3.35	.88	3.11	.89	3.25	.84	2.62	.94	4.78	.003
Facilities	3.72	1.08	3.72	.97	4.01	.97	3.58	1.07	1.04	.37
Governance	3.72	.76	3.51	.86	3.57	.88	3.38	.86	1.30	.27
Professional expertise	3.80	.78	3.63	.85	3.87	.67	3.30	1.08	3.08	.02
Principal	3.80	.73	3.65	.79	3.70	.67	3.50	.91	1.06	.36
Community support	3.54	1.02	3.27	1.03	3.39	1.02	2.82	1.09	3.33	.02
School culture	3.93	.91	3.61	.83	3.66	.78	3.35	.93	3.35	.01

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation

To analyze the impact of academic qualification on working conditions one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. All the respondents were divided in four groups according to their academic qualification (group1= B.A/B.SC; group2= M.A/M.SC, group3= B.S (honors), group4= M.Phil./M.S). There was no statistically significant difference at the level of Colleagues ($p=.83$; small effect size $\eta^2=.002$), Time use ($p=.42$; small effect size $\eta^2=.009$), Facilities ($p=.37$; small effect size $\eta^2= .01$), governance ($p=.27$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$), Principal ($p=.36$;

small effect size $\eta^2=.01$) as $P >.05$.

But there was a statistically significant difference of academic qualification with the total working conditions as $F (3,296) = 2.51$; ($p=.05$), post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of working condition for groups1 ($M=3.7$, $SD=.61$) were significant as compared to group 4 ($M=3.31$, $SD= .71$) and there was a small effect size of ($\eta^2=.02$).

There was a significant difference of academic qualification with resources $F (3,296) = 4.78$; ($P=.003$), post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of

resources for groups1 ($M=3.35$, $SD=.88$) were statistically significant from group4 ($M=2.62$, $SD=.94$). Similarly the scores of resources for group2 ($M=3.11$, $SD=.89$) were statistically significant from group4 ($M=2.62$, $SD=.94$) likewise scores of group3 ($M=3.25$, $SD=.94$) were statistically significant from group4 ($M=2.62$, $SD=.94$) with a small effect size of ($\eta^2=.04$).

There was a significant difference of academic qualification with professional expertise of teachers $F(3,296) = 3.08$; ($p=.02$), post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of teachers' professional expertise for group1 ($M=3.80$, $SD=.78$) were high as compared to group4 ($M=3.30$, $SD=1.08$). Likewise the scores of teachers' professional expertise for group3 were low ($M=3.87$, $SD=.67$) as compared to group4 ($M=3.80$, $SD=.78$) with a

small effect size ($\eta^2=.03$).

There was a statistically significant difference of academic qualification with community support $F(3,296) = 3.33$; ($p=.02$), post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test showed that the mean scores of community support for groups1 were statistically significant ($M=3.54$, $SD=1.02$) as compared to group4 ($M=2.82$, $SD=1.09$) with the small effect size ($\eta^2=.03$).

There was also a significant difference of academic qualification with school culture $F(3,296) = 3.35$; ($p=.01$), post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of school culture for group1 were statistically significant ($M=3.93$, $SD=.91$) as compared to group4 ($M=3.35$, $SD=.93$) with the small effect size of ($\eta^2=.03$).

Table

One -way between -groups ANOVA with post-hoc Test for Experience (N=300)

	Experience (In Years)						ANOVA	
	1-10 years		11-20 years		Above 20 years		F(2,297)	P
Factors	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Total Working-conditions	3.44	.65	3.52	.73	3.58	.64	.55	.57
Colleagues	3.44	.85	3.68	.80	3.60	.83	.79	.45
Time use	3.49	.77	3.43	.81	3.51	.92	.23	.79
Resources	3.10	.94	3.0	.92	3.15	.90	.46	.62
Facilities	3.55	1.00	3.78	.98	3.74	1.01	.48	.61
Governance	3.39	.93	3.51	.93	3.58	.81	.60	.54
Professional expertise	3.61	.93	3.64	.89	3.66	.84	.04	.96
Principal	3.55	.77	3.57	.83	3.72	.76	1.20	.30
Community support	3.26	1.00	3.33	1.01	3.27	1.07	.08	.92
School culture	3.45	.84	3.58	.92	3.70	.84	1.17	.31

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation

To analyze the impact of experience on working conditions one-way between groups-ANOVA was conducted. All the respondents were divided in three groups according to their experience (group1=1-10 years' experience, group2= 11-20 years' experience, group3= experience above 20 years). There was no statistically significant difference at the level of total working conditions working ($p= .57$; small

effect size $\eta^2=.03$), Colleagues ($p=.45$; small effect size $\eta^2= .005$), Time use ($p=.79$; small effect size $\eta^2= .002$), Resources ($p=.62$; small effect size $\eta^2=.003$), Facilities ($p=.61$; small effect size $\eta^2=.003$), governance ($p=.54$; small effect size $\eta^2=.004$), Professional expertise ($p=.96$; medium effect size $\eta^2= .6$), Principal ($p=.30$; small effect size $\eta^2=.008$), Community support ($p=.92$; small effect size $\eta^2= .4$), School culture ($p=.31$; small effect size $\eta^2= .007$) as $p>.05$.

Table

One -way between -groups ANOVA with post-hoc Test for Designation (N=300)

Factors	Designation						ANOVA	
	ESE/PST		SESE/EST		SSE/SST		F(2,297)	P
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Total Working-conditions	3.45	.68	3.54	.63	3.59	.67	1.03	.35
Colleagues	3.54	.88	3.68	.78	3.61	.83	.44	.64
Time use	3.47	.92	3.45	.87	3.52	.87	.18	.83
Resources	3.05	.81	2.96	.91	3.22	.93	2.35	.09
Facilities	3.53	1.06	3.83	1.00	3.76	.98	1.52	.21
Governance	3.42	.88	3.60	.86	3.56	.83	.73	.48
Professional expertise	3.51	.86	3.67	.87	3.70	.85	1.04	.35
Principal	3.55	.78	3.65	.73	3.71	.81	.94	.39
Community support	3.28	.94	3.20	1.13	3.33	1.04	.423	.65
School culture	3.54	.88	3.57	.90	3.72	.84	1.39	.24

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation

To analyze the impact of designation on working conditions one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. All the respondents were divided in three groups according to their designation. (group1=ESE/PST, group 2=SESE/EST, group3=SST/SSE). There was no statistically significant difference at the level of total working conditions working ($p=.35$; small effect size

$\eta^2=.006$), Colleagues ($p=.64$; small effect size $\eta^2=.002$), Time use ($p=.83$; small effect size $\eta^2=.001$), Resources ($p=.09$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$), Facilities ($p=.21$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$), governance ($p=.48$; small effect size $\eta^2=.004$), Professional expertise ($p=.35$; small effect size $\eta^2=.006$), Principal($p=.39$; small effect size $\eta^2=.005$) Community support ($p=.65$; small effect size $\eta^2=.002$) School culture ($p=.24$; small effect size $\eta^2=.009$) and $p>.05$.

II) Job Satisfaction

Table

Independent Samples t-test for Gender (N=300)

Factors	Male		Female		t-test for Equality of Means			95% CI	
	M	SD	M	SD	Sig	Df	MD	L	U
Total Job satisfaction	3.36	.70	3.61	.54	.001	-3.46	-.25	-.39	-.11
Job characteristics	3.22	.89	3.51	.73	.003	-3.00	-.28	-.47	-.09
Social benefits	3.66	.86	3.94	.61	.002	-3.19	-.27	-.44	-.10
Meaningfulness of job	3.40	.85	3.57	.70	.06	-1.88	-.17	-.34	.01
Supportive administration	3.48	.90	3.74	.85	.01	-2.52	-.25	-.46	-.05
Intention to remain in the job	2.64	1.09	2.75	1.21	.44	-.77	-.10	-.37	.16

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation, MD=mean difference, CI=class intervals, L=lower, U=upper

An independent samples t- test was conducted to compare the job satisfaction scores for male and female. There was a significant difference in total job satisfaction scores for male and female teachers $t(298) = -3.46$; ($p=.001$). Scores of male teachers for job satisfaction ($M=3.36$, $SD=.70$) are low as compared to females teachers ($M=3.61$, $SD=.54$) with the small effect size of ($\eta^2=.04$).

There was a significant difference in job characteristics scores for males and female teachers $t(298) = -3.00$; ($p= .003$). Scores of job characteristics of male teachers are low ($M=3.22$, $SD=.89$) as compared to females teachers ($M=3.51$, $SD= .73$). There was a very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.03$).

To analyze the scores of male and female regarding social benefits the results of independent samples t- test showed that there was a significant difference $t(298) = -3.19$; ($p= .002$) in the mean scores of males and females. The social benefit scores of male teachers are low ($M=3.66$, $SD=.86$) as compared to female

teachers ($M= 3.94$, $SD=.61$) with the effect size of ($\eta^2=.03$).

There was no significant difference in meaningfulness of job scores for males and females as $t(298) = -1.881$; ($p=.06$). The meaningfulness of job scores of male ($M=3.40$, $SD=.85$) and females ($M=3.57$, $SD=.70$) are not significantly different as there is a very small effect size ($\eta^2=.01$).

There was a significant difference in scores of supportive administration for males and females $t(298) = -2.52$; ($p=.01$). The supportive administration scores of male teachers are low ($M=3.48$, $SD=.90$) as compared to females ($M=3.74$, $SD=.85$) and there is a very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.02$).

There was a significant difference of intention to remain in the job in scores for male and female $t(298) = -.77$; ($p=.44$). The intention to remain in the job scores of male teachers are low ($M=2.64$, $SD=1.1$) as compared to female teacher ($M=2.75$, $SD=1.21$) and there was a small effect size of ($\eta^2=.001$).

Table

Independent Samples t-test for Professional Qualification (N=300)

Factors	B.Ed.		M.Ed.		t-test for Equality of Means			95% CI	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>sig</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>U</i>
Total Job satisfaction	3.53	.67	3.46	.56	.32	.98	.07	-.07	.21
Job characteristics	3.46	.82	3.32	.80	.14	1.47	.13	-.04	.32
Social benefits	3.81	.78	3.84	.69	.72	-.35	.03	-.19	.13
Meaningfulness of job	3.55	.80	3.45	.74	.29	1.04	.09	-.08	.26
Supportive administration	3.66	.90	3.61	.86	.58	.54	.05	-.14	.25
Intention to remain in the job	2.77	1.15	2.63	1.17	.31	1.01	.13	-.12	.40

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation, MD=mean difference, CI=class intervals, L=lower, U=upper

An independent samples t- test was conducted to compare the job satisfaction scores for professional qualification. There was no significant difference in total job satisfaction scores for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = .98$; ($p=.32$). The professional

qualification scores of total job satisfaction for B.Ed. teachers ($M=3.53$, $SD=.67$) were not statistically significant as compared to teachers with the qualification of M.Ed. ($M=3.46$, $SD=.56$) and very small effect size of ($\eta^2= .003$).

There was no significant difference in job

characteristic scores for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = 1.47$; ($p=.14$). The professional qualification scores of job characteristics for B.Ed. teachers ($M=3.46$, $SD=.82$) were not statistically significant as compared to teachers with the qualification of M.Ed. ($M=3.32$, $SD=.80$) and small effect size of ($\eta^2=.007$).

There was no significant difference in social benefits scores for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = -.35$; ($p=.72$). The professional qualification scores of social benefits for B.Ed. teachers ($M=3.81$, $SD=.78$) were not statistically significant as compared to teachers with the qualification of M.Ed. ($M=3.84$, $SD=.69$) and very small effect size of ($\eta^2=.02$).

There was no significant difference in meaningfulness of job scores for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = 1.04$; ($p=.29$). The professional qualification scores of meaningfulness of job for B.Ed. teachers

($M=3.55$, $SD=.80$) were not statistically significant as compared to teachers with the qualification of M.Ed. ($M=3.45$, $SD=.74$) and small effect size of ($\eta^2=.003$).

There was no significant difference in meaningfulness of job scores for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = .54$; ($p=.58$). The professional qualification scores of meaningfulness of job for B.Ed. teachers ($M=3.66$, $SD=.90$) were not statistically significant as compared to teachers with the qualification of M.Ed. ($M=3.61$, $SD=.86$) and large effect size of ($\eta^2=.7$).

There was no significant difference in Intention to remain in the job scores for professional qualification of teachers $t(298) = 1.01$; ($p=.31$). The professional qualification scores of Intention to remain in the job for B.Ed. teachers ($M=2.77$, $SD=1.15$) were not statistically significant as compared to teachers with the qualification of M.Ed. ($M=2.63$, $SD=1.17$) and small effect size of ($\eta^2=.003$).

Table

Independent Samples t-test for Marital Status (N=300)

	Unmarried		Married		t-test for Equality of Means			95% CI	
Marital status	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Sig</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>U</i>
Total Job satisfaction	3.49	.59	3.50	.63	.88	-.14	-.01	-.18	.15
Job characteristics	3.40	.76	3.39	.83	.92	.09	.01	-.21	.23
Social benefits	3.76	.71	3.84	.75	.41	-.81	-.08	-.28	.11
Meaningfulness of job	3.47	.77	3.51	.77	.73	-.34	-.03	-.25	.17
Supportive administration	3.65	.80	3.63	.90	.89	.13	.01	-.22	.25
Intention to remain in the job	2.83	1.14	2.67	1.17	.31	1.01	.16	-.15	.48

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation, MD=mean difference, CI=class intervals, L=lower, U=upper

An independent samples t- test was conducted to compare the job satisfaction scores for marital status of teachers. There was no significant difference in total job satisfaction scores of teachers $t(298) = -.14$; ($p=.88$). The scores of total job satisfaction for unmarried teachers ($M=3.49$, $SD=.59$) were not statistically significant as

compared to married teachers ($M=3.50$, $SD=.63$) and the effect size was very large ($\eta^2=.3$).

There was no significant difference in job characteristics scores of teachers $t(298) = .09$; ($p=.92$). The scores of job characteristics for unmarried teachers ($M=3.40$, $SD=.76$) were not statistically significant as compared to married

teachers ($M=3.39$, $SD=.83$) and large effect size of ($\eta^2=.6$)

There was no significant difference in social benefits scores of teachers $t(298) = -.81$; ($p=.41$). The scores of social benefits for unmarried teachers ($M=3.76$, $SD=.71$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=3.84$, $SD=.75$) and effect size was very small ($\eta^2=.01$). There was no significant difference in meaningfulness of job scores of teachers $t(298) = -.34$; ($p=.73$). The scores of meaningfulness of job for unmarried teachers ($M=3.47$, $SD=.77$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=3.51$, $SD=.77$) and large effect size of ($\eta^2=.7$).

Table

One -way between -groups ANOVA with post-hoc Test for Age (N=300)

Factors	Age								ANOVA	
	20-30		31-40		41-50		51-60		F(3,296)	P
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Total Job satisfaction	3.53	.60	3.58	.59	3.31	.67	3.61	.55	3.18	.02
Job characteristics	3.42	.76	3.41	.84	3.22	.87	3.61	.77	2.04	.10
Social benefits	3.71	.69	3.97	.68	3.70	.84	3.98	.71	2.44	.06
Meaningfulness of job	3.55	.77	3.60	.78	3.26	.74	3.65	.73	3.47	.01
Supportive administration	3.67	.84	3.78	.87	3.40	.95	3.72	.77	2.70	.04
Intention to remain in the job	3.05	1.11	2.70	1.18	2.38	1.10	2.24	1.07	7.80	.000

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation

To analyze the impact of age on job satisfaction one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. All the respondents were divided in four groups according to their age. (Group1= 20-30, Group2= 31-40, Group3= 41-50, Group4=51-60). There was no statistically significant difference between groups at the level of job characteristics ($p=.10$; small effect size $=.02$), social benefits ($p=.06$; small effect size $=.02$) as $p>.05$.

But there was a statistically significant difference of age with the total job satisfaction as $F(3,296) = 3.18$; ($P=.02$), post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of job satisfaction for group2 ($M=3.58$, $SD=.59$) were significant as compared to group3 ($M=3.31$, $SD=.67$) and there was a small effect size of ($\eta^2=.03$).

There was no significant difference in supportive administration scores of teachers $t(298) = .13$; ($p=.89$). The scores of supportive administration for unmarried teachers ($M=3.65$, $SD=.80$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=3.63$, $SD=.90$) and large effect size of ($\eta^2=.3$).

There was no significant difference in intention to remain in the job scores of teachers $t(298) = 1.01$; ($p=.31$). The scores of intention to remain in the job for unmarried teachers ($M=2.83$, $SD=1.14$) were not statistically significant as compared to married teachers ($M=2.67$, $SD=1.17$) and effect size was very small ($\eta^2=.003$).

There was a statistically significant difference of age with the meaningfulness of job as $F(3,296) = 3.47$; ($p=.01$), post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of meaningfulness of job for groups2 ($M=3.60$, $SD=.78$) were significant as compared to group3 ($M=3.26$, $SD=.74$) and there was a small effect size of ($\eta^2=.03$).

There was a statistically significant difference of age with the supportive administration as $F(3,296) = 2.70$; ($p=.04$), post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of meaningfulness of job for groups2 ($M=3.78$, $SD=.87$) were significant as compared to group3 ($M=3.40$, $SD=.95$) and there was a

small effect size of ($\eta^2=.02$).

There was a statistically significant difference of age with the intention to remain in the job as F (3,296) = 7.80; (P=.000), post hoc comparison 0) and group4 ($M=2.24$, $SD=1.07$) there was a

using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of intention to remain in the job for groups1 ($M=3.05$, $SD=1.11$) were significant as compared to group3 ($M=2.38$, $SD=1.1$) moderate effect size of ($\eta^2=.07$).

Table

One -way between -groups ANOVA with post-hoc for Academic Qualification (N=300)

Factors	Academic Qualification								ANOVA	
	B.A/B.SC		M.A/M.SC		B.S(honors)		M.Phil./M.S		F(3,296)	P
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Total Job satisfaction	3.68	.62	3.46	.61	3.59	.57	3.28	.64	3.31	.02
Job characteristics	3.64	.82	3.35	.78	3.56	.71	3.98	.90	5.34	.001
Social benefits	3.99	.73	3.79	.75	3.91	.66	3.65	.71	1.79	.14
Meaningfulness of job	3.64	.87	3.49	.74	3.55	.69	3.28	.80	1.56	.19
Supportive administration	3.77	.94	3.61	.88	3.61	.83	3.54	.80	.64	.58
Intention to remain in the job	2.71	1.18	2.66	1.15	2.62	1.24	3.05	1.09	1.07	.36

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation

To analyze the impact of academic qualification on job satisfaction one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. All the respondents were divided in four groups according to their academic qualification (group1= B.A/B.SC; group2= M.A/M.SC, group3= B.S (honors), group4= M.Phil./M.S). There was no statistically significant difference of academic qualification with job satisfaction at the level of social benefits ($p=.14$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$), meaningfulness of job ($p=.19$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$), supportive administration ($p=.58$; small effect size $\eta^2=.006$), intention to remain in the job ($p=.36$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$), as $p > .05$.

But there was a statistically significant difference of academic qualification with the total job

satisfaction as F (3,296) = 3.31; ($p=.02$), post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of working condition for group1 ($M=3.68$, $SD=.62$) were significant as compared to group4 ($M=3.28$, $SD=.64$) and there was a small effect size of ($\eta^2=.03$).

There was a statistically significant difference of academic qualification with the Job characteristics as F (3,296) =5.34; ($p=.001$), post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean scores of job characteristics for group1 ($M=3.64$, $SD=.82$) were significant as compared to group3 ($M=3.56$, $SD=.71$) and group4 ($M=3.98$, $SD=.90$) there was a small effect size of ($\eta^2=.05$).

Table

One -way between -groups ANOVA with post-hoc for Experience (N=300)

Factors	Experience						ANOVA	
	1-10 years		11-20 years		Above 20 years		F(2,297)	P
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Total Job satisfaction	3.48	.63	3.54	.65	3.49	.61	.17	.84
Job characteristics	3.41	.79	3.39	.85	3.39	.81	.009	.99

Social benefits	3.75	.64	3.87	.73	3.81	.75	.27	.76
Meaningfulness of job	3.34	.82	3.50	.78	3.52	.76	.58	.55
Supportive administration	3.44	1.02	3.71	.90	3.63	.85	.79	.45
Intention to remain in the job	3.05	1.24	2.88	1.13	2.60	1.15	2.70	.06

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation

To analyze the impact of experience on job satisfaction one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. All the respondents were divided in three groups according to their experience (group1=1-10 years' experience, group2= 11-20 years' experience, group3= experience above 20 years). There was no statistically significant difference at the all the

level namely total job satisfaction ($p=.84$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$), job characteristics ($p=.99$; small effect size $\eta^2=.005$), social benefits ($p=.76$; small effect size $\eta^2=.001$), meaningfulness of job ($p=.55$; small effect size $\eta^2=.003$), supportive administration ($p=.45$; small effect size $\eta^2=.005$), intention to remain in the job ($p=.06$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$) as $p>.05$.

Table

One -way between -groups ANOVA with post-hoc for Designation (N=300)

	Designation						ANOVA	
	ESE/PST		SESE/EST		SSE/SST		F(2,297)	P
Factors	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Total Job satisfaction	3.36	.57	3.55	.57	3.52	.65	1.67	.18
Job characteristics	3.22	.80	3.39	.78	3.45	.83	1.65	.19
Social benefits	3.70	.74	3.84	.67	3.86	.76	1.00	.36
Meaningfulness of job	3.43	.72	3.58	.80	3.49	.77	.62	.53
supportive administration	3.56	.85	3.68	.80	3.64	.92	.31	.73
Intention to remain in the job	2.52	1.02	2.97	1.22	2.65	1.17	2.8	.06

Note: M=mean, SD=standard deviation

To analyze the impact of designation on job satisfaction one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. All the respondents were divided in three groups according to their designation. (group1=ESE/PST, group2=SESE/EST, group3=SST/SSE). There was no statistically significant difference of designation on job satisfaction at the level of total job satisfaction ($p=.18$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$), job characteristics ($p=.19$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$), social benefits ($p=.36$; small effect size $\eta^2=.006$), meaningfulness of job ($p=.53$; small effect size $\eta^2=.004$), supportive administration ($p=.73$; small effect size $\eta^2=.002$), intention to remain in the job ($p=.06$; small effect size $\eta^2=.01$) as $p>.05$.

Conclusion

Independent samples t-test was used to analyze

the impact of gender, professional qualification and marital status on working conditions. Results showed that there was a statistically significant difference of gender in working conditions at the level of colleagues, professional expertise, and community support and school culture. There was no statistically significant difference of professional qualification on all the levels of working conditions. There was no statistically significant difference of marital status of teachers and their scores on the levels of working conditions.

To analyze the impact of age, academic qualification and designation on working condition one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. The results showed that there was no statistically significant difference of age on all the levels of working conditions. There was a statistically significant difference of academic

qualification on working conditions at the levels of total working conditions, availability of resources, professional expertise, community support and school culture. There was no statistically significant difference of designation on all the levels of working conditions.

To analyze the difference of Gender, marital status and professional qualification on job satisfaction independent samples t-test was conducted. The results showed that there was a statically significant difference of gender on job satisfaction at the levels of total job satisfaction, job characteristics, social benefits and intention to remain in the job but there was no statically significant difference of professional qualification and marital status on job satisfaction.

To analyze the impact of age, academic qualification, experience and designation on job satisfaction one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. The results showed that there was a statically significant difference of age on the level meaningfulness of job, supportive administration and intention to remain in the job. There was difference of academic qualification at the level of total job satisfaction at the level of job characteristics. There was no statistical significant difference of experience on job satisfaction. There was no statistical significant difference of designation with the job satisfaction.

Discussion

Objective: To analyze the impact of demographic variables on working conditions and job satisfaction.

Research question: Is there any significant difference in mean scores of working conditions and job satisfaction with respect to age, gender, academic and professional qualification.

Working conditions

Independent samples t-test was used to analyze the impact of gender, professional qualification and marital status on working conditions. Results showed that there was a statistically significant difference of gender in working conditions at the level of colleagues, professional expertise, and community support and school culture. There was no statistically significant difference of professional qualification on all the levels of working conditions. There was no statistically

significant difference of marital status of teachers and their scores on the levels of working conditions.

To analyze the impact of age, academic qualification and designation on working condition one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. The results showed that there was no statistically significant difference of age on all the levels of working conditions. There was a statistically significant difference of academic qualification on working conditions at the levels of total working conditions, availability of resources, professional expertise, community support and school culture. There was no statistically significant difference of designation on all the levels of working conditions.

Job satisfaction

To analyze the difference of Gender, marital status and professional qualification on job satisfaction independent samples t-test was conducted. The results showed that there was a statically significant difference of gender on job satisfaction at the levels of total job satisfaction, job characteristics, social benefits and intention to remain in the job but there was no statically significant difference of professional qualification and marital status on job satisfaction.

To analyze the impact of age, academic qualification, experience and designation on job satisfaction one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. The results showed that there was a statically significant difference of age on the level meaningfulness of job, supportive administration and intention to remain in the job. There was difference of academic qualification at the level of total job satisfaction at the level of job characteristics. There was no statistical significant difference of experience on job satisfaction. There was no statistical significant difference of designation with the job satisfaction.

Working conditions

Independent samples t-test was used to analyze the impact of gender, professional qualification and marital status on working conditions. Results showed that there was a statistically significant difference of gender in working conditions at the level of colleagues, professional expertise, and community support and school culture. There

was no statistically significant difference of professional qualification on all the levels of working conditions. There was no statistically significant difference of marital status of teachers and their scores on the levels of working conditions.

To analyze the impact of age, academic qualification and designation on working condition one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. The results showed that there was no statistically significant difference of age on all the levels of working conditions. There was a statistically significant difference of academic qualification on working conditions at the levels of total working conditions, availability of resources, professional expertise, community support and school culture. There was no statistically significant difference of designation on all the levels of working conditions.

Job satisfaction

To analyze the difference of Gender, marital status and professional qualification on job satisfaction independent samples t-test was conducted. The results showed that there was a statically significant difference of gender on job satisfaction at the levels of total job satisfaction, job characteristics, social benefits and intention to remain in the job but there was no statically significant difference of professional qualification and marital status on job satisfaction.

To analyze the impact of age, academic qualification, experience and designation on job satisfaction one-way between-group ANOVA was conducted. The results showed that there was a statically significant difference of age on the level meaningfulness of job, supportive administration and intention to remain in the job. There was difference of academic qualification at the level of total job satisfaction at the level of job characteristics. There was no statistical significant difference of experience on job satisfaction. There was no statistical significant difference of designation with the job satisfaction.

Recommendations

- There should be age- specific policies to ensure career growth opportunities among teachers.
- Teachers should assigned salary and

increments based on their educational qualifications

- Schools should develop strong partnerships with the community through regular meetings, events, and communication strategies to enhance mutual trust and support.
- It is recommended that there should be an equitable access to resources, incentives and institutional support for all teachers irrespective of their gender

References

- Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 4(2), 142–175.
- Adams, J. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 67(5), 422–436.
- 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.
- Bishay, A. (1996). Teacher motivation and job satisfaction: A study employing the experience sampling method. *Journal of Undergraduate Sciences*, 3(3), 147–155.
- Brendle-Corum, A. (2010). Exploring characteristics of public school facilities and resources and the relationship with teacher retention (Doctoral dissertation, Appalachian State University, United States).
- Chamundeswari, S. (2013). Job satisfaction and performance of school teachers. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(5), 420.
- Hackman, R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(7), 250–279.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover, teacher shortages, and the organization of

- schools: An organizational analysis. *Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy*, 38(3), 499–534.
- Jaiyeoba, A. O., & Jibril, A. (2008). A study of job satisfaction of secondary school administrators in Kano state, Nigeria. *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal*, 2(2), 94–110.
- Johnson, S. M., Kraft, M. A., & Papay, J. P. (2012). How context matters in high-need schools: The effects of teachers' working conditions on their professional satisfaction and their students' achievement. *Teachers College Record*, 114(10), 1–39.
- Kim, J. C. (2004). The effects of work experiences and institutional support on job satisfaction among NCCA coaches (Master's Thesis, Texas A&M University, United States).
- Kinicki, A., & Kreitner, R. (2007). *Organizational behavior*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Ladd, H. F. (2011). Teachers' perceptions of their working conditions: How predictive of planned and actual teacher movement? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 33(2), 235–261.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). The instinctoid nature of basic needs. *Journal of Personality*, 22(3), 326–347.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Michaelowa, K., & Wittmann, E. (2009). Teacher job satisfaction, student achievement and the cost of primary education. *Discussion Paper Series*, 26273.
- Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). Finding workable levers over work motivation: Comparing job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Administration & Society*, 39(7), 1–47.
- Ngimbudzi, F. W. (2009). Job satisfaction among secondary school teachers in Tanzania: The case of Njombe District (Master's Thesis, University of Jyväskylä, Finland).
- Naz, S. (2017). Factors affecting teachers' job satisfaction. *Market Forces Journal of Management Business and Economics*, 12(2).
- Salehi, H., & Yunus, M. M. (2015). Relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and their attitudes towards students' beliefs and motivation. *English Language Teaching*, 8(7).
- Saif, S. K., Nawaz, A., Jan, F. A., & Khan, M. I. (2012). Synthesizing the theories of job satisfaction across the cultural/attitudinal dimensions. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(9), 1382–1396.
- Ye, Y. (2016). The effect of working conditions on teacher effectiveness: Value-added scores and student perception of teaching (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia).