Relationships of Various Social Psychological Variables with Primary Teachers' Job Satisfaction

Yener ÖZEN

Erzincan University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences / Turkey
yenerozen@erzincan.edu.tr

Abstract

The present study was conducted to determine the relationship among job satisfaction and social psychologial variables of government primary school teachers. Two questionnaires were used to determine the relationship between organizational climate and teachers' job satisfaction. There was no significant relationship among organizational climate subscales, which showed that subscales were independent of each other. There was significant relationship between job satisfaction factors that showed that job satisfaction factors were dependent of each other. Supportive principal behavior and directive principal behavior were found to be significantly correlated with job satisfaction; on the other hand restrictive principal behavior was found no significantly correlated with job satisfaction. Collegial teacher behavior and intimate teacher behavior were found to be significantly correlated with job satisfaction; on the other hand disengaged teacher behavior was found no relationship with job satisfaction.

Keywords: job satisfaction, teacher, school, social psychological variables

Job satisfaction describes how content an individual is with his /her job. The happier people are within their job, the more satisfied they are said to be. Job satisfaction is not the same as motivation or aptitude, although it is clearly linked. Job design aims to enhance job satisfaction and performance, methods include job rotation, job enlargement, job enrichment and job re-engineering. Other influences on satisfaction include the management style and culture, employee involvement, empowerment and autonomous work position.

Job satisfaction is simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs (Spector, 1997). An alternative approach is that proposed by Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza, based on the assumption that there are basic and universal human needs, and that, if an individual's needs are fulfilled in their current situation, then that individual will be happy. This framework postulates that job satisfaction depends on the balance between work-role inputs - such as education, working time, effort - and work-role outputs - wages, fringe benefits, status, working conditions, intrinsic aspects of the job. If work-role outputs ('pleasures') increase relative to work-role inputs ('pains'), then job satisfaction will increase (Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2000).

Organizations are ever-present features of modern society. We look towards organization for food, education, employment, entertainment, healthcare, transportation and protection of basic rights. Nearly every aspect of modern life is influenced in one way or another by together to achieve objectives. Organizational climate is the human environment with in which an organization's employees do their work. It may refer to the environment with in a department or in an entire organization. We cannot see climate or touch it, but it is there. In turn climate is affected by most every thing that is occurring in organization (Davis & Newstrom, 1985).

The climate of an organization is thought to represent the perception of objective characteristics by organization's members. As an example, the size of and organization is objective but a person's feelings about that size is subjective, it is the perception of these objectives that is represented by the climate of an organization (Landy & Trumbo, 1980).

Other theorists (Rose, 2001) have viewed job satisfaction as a bi-dimensional concept consisting of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction dimensions. Intrinsic sources of satisfaction depend on the individual characteristics of the person, such as the ability to use initiative,

relations with supervisors, or the work that the person actually performs; these are symbolic or qualitative facets of the job. Extrinsic sources of satisfaction are situational and depend on the environment, such as pay, promotion, or job security; these are financial and other material rewards or advantages of a job. Both extrinsic and intrinsic job facets should be represented, as equally as possible, in a composite measure of overall job satisfaction.

Davis (1985) said, both employers and employees want a more favourable climate because of its benefits. Such as, better performance and job satisfaction. Employees feel that the climate is favourable when they are doing something useful that provides a sense of personal worth. They frequently want challenging work that is intrinsically satisfying. Many employees also want responsibility and the opportunity to succeed. They want to be listened to and treated as it they have value as individuals.   They want to feel that the organization really cares about their needs and problems.

The meaning of 'job' as a post or appointment is of primary importance. Every job is an instance of the employment relationship, embodying a contract (substantive or implied) to exchange an ability to work (labour, provide service, exercise ingenuity, direct efforts of others, etc) for rewards (both material and symbolic). True, performing work tasks provides a stream of experiences, technical and social, that can energize psychosocial responses; any resulting data summarizing these reactions are indispensable. However, such data must not be weighted higher than those concerning experience of the overt (or ostensible) contractual terms - above all, those concerning pay and job security (Rose, 2001). Work climate is a perceptual interpretation of how well organizational and managerial practices fit or match employee needs, goals and expectations at a point in time.   In effect, organizational members combine perceptions of their work environments into positive or negative attitudes that is turn influence behavior. Climate produces unfavorable or negative attitude when employees feel abuses or inconsistencies between personal expectations and management practices.   Abuses can range from unfair or discriminatory treatment by a supervisor to working conditions that are unsafe, tedious or boring. Climate has positive or favorable manifestations when members are not distracted by frustrations-when organizational practices and events are supportive of personal needs, goals and expectations (Curtis, 1986).

Mood and emotions form the affective element of job satisfaction (Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996). Moods tend to be longer lasting but often weaker states of uncertain origin, while emotions are often more intense, short-lived and have a clear object or cause. There is some evidence in the literature that moods are related to overall job satisfaction

(Roberson, 1989). Positive and negative emotions were also found to be significantly related to overall job satisfaction. Frequency of experiencing net positive emotion will be a better predictor of overall job satisfaction than will intensity of positive emotion when it is experienced (Fisher, 2000). Emotion work (or emotion management) refers to various types of efforts to manage emotional states and displays. Emotion management includes all of the conscious and unconscious efforts to increase, maintain, or decrease one or more components of an emotion. Although early studies of the consequences of emotional work emphasized its harmful effects on workers, studies of workers in a variety of occupations suggest that the consequences of emotional work are not uniformly negative (Pugliesi, 1999). It was found that suppression of unpleasant emotions decreases job satisfaction and the amplification of pleasant emotions increases job satisfaction (Cote & Morgan, 2002). The understanding of how emotion regulation relates to job satisfaction concerns two models:

Emotional dissonance. Emotional dissonance is a state of discrepancy between public displays of emotions and internal experiences of emotions (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993., Rafaeli and Sutton, 1989), that often follows the process of emotion regulation. Emotional dissonance is associated with high emotional exhaustion, low organizational commitment, and low job satisfaction (Abraham, 1999., Morris and Feldman, 1997).

Social interaction model. Taking the social interaction perspective, workers' emotion regulation might beget responses from others during interpersonal encounters that subsequently impact their own job satisfaction. For example: The accumulation of favorable responses to displays of pleasant emotions might positively affect job satisfaction (Cote and Morgan, 2002). Performance of emotional labor that produces desired outcomes could increase job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is a set of favorable or unfavorable feelings and emotions with which employees view their works (Davis & Newstorm, 1993). Job satisfaction is an effective attitude-a feeling of relative likes or dislikes (For example, a satisfied employee may comments that "I enjoy being a variety of tasks to do". Job satisfaction can be viewed as an overall attitude, or it can apply to the various parts of an individual's job. If it is viewed only as an overall attitude, however managers many miss seeing some key hidden expectations as they access an employee's overall satisfaction, for example, although Antonio Ortega's general job satisfaction may be high, it is important to discover both that he likes his promotion and that he is dissatisfied with his vacation schedule this year. Job satisfaction studies, therefore, often focus on the various parts that are believed to be very important, since

these predispose an employee to behave in certain ways. Important aspects of job satisfaction include pay, one's supervisor, the nature of task performed, and employee's coworkers and the immediate working conditions (Newstrom, 1986).

According to Kuzmits (1985), job satisfaction is a complex subject. The same kind of work (e.g. typing) may be seen as satisfying to some workers and dissatisfying to others. In addition an employee will often be satisfied with the certain aspects of the job (e.g. supervisor, coworkers) and dissatisfied with others (e.g. pay, benefits, working conditions). Finally an employee's attitude may change over time. A new professor, for example, may initially be satisfied with his or her colleagues; however, coworker relationships could conceivably erode over time to result in a dissatisfying work climate. For these reasons, it is important for managers and personal administrators to understand the dynamic nature of job satisfaction and not to be misled by the casual nature in which the term is often discussed.

Beers (1964, Breed & van Breda, 1997) defines job satisfaction as "…the attitude of workers toward the company, their jobs, their fellow workers and other psychological objects in the work environment." Isen and Baron (1991) surmise: "As an attitude, job satisfaction involves several basic components: specific beliefs about one's job, behaviour tendencies (intentions) with respect to it, and feelings about it."

Job satisfaction is an attitude, which results from balance, and summation of many specific likes and dislike experienced in connection with the job. This attitude manifests itself in evaluation of job and employing organization. These evaluations may rest largely upon one's success or failure in the achievement of personal objectives and upon the perceived contributions of the job and employing organization to these ends. Thus worker may like certain aspects of his work yet thoroughly dislike others. People find more satisfaction when there is cooperation and teamwork. They are leaving, growing and contributing, so it can be measured in terms of worker's overall satisfaction with job. The concept of organizational climate and job satisfaction has increasingly become the focus of a wide variety of research studies. The question thus remain to be answered is "does the organizational climate also effects on job satisfaction of primary school teachers.

Teachers often complain that they are not adequately consulted regarding policy changes and that their rights are violated. This leads to frustration and dissatisfaction, and in turn effects the commitment and productivity of teachers. Teacher satisfaction is attached to the freedom to try new ideas, intrinsic work elements and responsible levels. Sylvia and

Hutchinson (1985) concluded that job satisfaction is based on the gratification of higher order needs. However, Greenwood and Soars (1973) purport that teachers are motivated if they teach less and learners participate more frequently in class.

Objectives of the Study

The broad purpose of the present study is to determine the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction of primary school teachers.

To determine the relationship between principals' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

To determine the relationship between teachers' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

To investigate different, if any among demographic information (sex, teaching subject, teaching experience and type of school) about job satisfaction.

Research Hypotheses

H1: There is no significant relationship between principals' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H2: There is no significant between supportive principals' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H3: There is no significant relationship between directive principals' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H4: There is no significant relationship between restrictive principals' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H5: There in no significant relationship between teachers' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H6: There is no significant relationship between collegial teachers' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H7: There is no significant relationship between intimate teachers' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H8: There is no significant relationship between disengaged teachers' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H9: There is no significant difference between male and female teachers' job satisfaction.

H10: There is no significant difference between urban and rural teachers' job satisfaction.

H11: There is no significant difference between science and arts teachers' job satisfaction.

H12: There is no significant difference regarding job satisfaction among teachers having different teaching experience.

Method

This study is designed to determine the relationship, between organizational climate and job satisfaction, among organizational climate factors of primary school teachers, and difference among demographic variables and job satisfaction.

Participants

The population for this study comprised of all Government Primary Schools teachers in Erzincan Province, Turkey. All the urban, rural, male and female primary school teachers were selected. There were 785 SST primary school teachers in this district and all were selected for this study, and questionnaires were administered to them and 550 (70.06%) responses were received.

Measures

Instruments used to collect data for this study were demographic information form, modified version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), (Weiss, Dawis & Lofquist, (1967) and Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire-OCDQ-RE (Hoy and Clover, 1986).

Demographic Information Form. Demographic information developed by researcher was used. Form was attached to each mailed questionnaire. Teachers were asked to indicate their demographic information by checking the right side, which has option.

Participants were asked to provide individually information about gender, teaching subject, teaching experience and type of school.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Data was analyzed through computer by using SPSS-VII programme. Analysis of the data is presented in two sections, descriptive statistics and inferential statistics.

Results

Table 1
Distribution of Male and Female Teachers

Sex	Frequency	Percentage	Total
Male	361	65.6	
Female	189	34.4	550

The above table indicates about male and female respondents. Number of male respondents was 394 (65.6 %). Number of female respondents was 207 (34.4 %). Majority of the respondents was male.

Table 2
Distribution of teaching Subjects

Teaching Subject			
Science	148	27	
Arts	402	73	550

The above table indicates about teaching subjects or science and arts teachers. 162 respondents were teaching science subjects which is 27 % out of 601 and 73 % were teaching arts subjects. Majority of the respondents were teaching arts subjects.

Table 3
Distribution of type of School Teachers

Type of School	Frequency	Percentage	Total
Urban	262	47.6	
Rural	288	52.4	550

The above table indicates about urban and rural schools teachers. 286 respondents were belong to urban schools which is 47.6 % out of total teachers and 315 respondents (52.4 %) were rural school teachers.

Table 4
Distribution of Teaching Experience

Teaching Experience (in years)	Frequency	Percentage	Total

-5	48	8.8	
6-10	69	12.6	
11-15	152	27.6	550
16-20	131	23.8	
>21	150	27.2	

The above table indicates that 8.8 % respondents had been teaching from five years. Majority of respondents had been teaching from 11 to 15 years. 12.6 % respondents had been teaching from 6 to 10 years.

Table 5
Means for Organizational Climate Subscales (N = 601)

Variables	Means	Remarks
Supportive Principal Behavior	2.7	O
Directive Principal Behavior	2.6	O
Collegial Teaching behavior	2.8	O
Intimate Teacher behavior	2.3	SO
Restrictive Principal behavior	2.3	SO
Disengage Teacher behavior	2.2	SO

Note: 0.5--1.5 = RO, 1.6--2.5 = SO, 2.6--3.5 = O, 3.6--4.5 = VFO

The means for organizational climate subscales are provided in Table 5. The results were 2.7 for supportive principal behavior, 2.6 for directive principal behavior, 2.8 for collegial teacher behavior, 2.4 for intimate teacher behavior, 2.3 for restrictive principal behavior and 2.2 for disengage teacher behavior. These results suggest that teachers describe their schools as being high on supportive principal behavior, directive principal behavior and collegial teacher behavior. Principal behavior is more supportive and directive than restrictive. Teachers were supportive of each other and enjoyed working with each other than disengages behavior.

H1: There is no Significant Relationship between Principals' Behavior and Teachers' Job Satisfaction.

Table 6
Correlation between Principals' Behavior and Teachers' Job satisfaction.

Variables	Mean	S.D	N.	P. Correlation	Sig.(2-tailed)
Principals' Behavior	60.62	11.32	550		
Teachers' Job Satisfaction	279.39	34.48	550	0.468	.000

Table 6 reveals that value (.468) is highly significant at .01 level of significance, so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between principals'

behavior and teachers' job satisfaction is rejected and it is concluded that there is a significant relationship between principals' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H2: There is no significant between supportive principals' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 7
Correlation between supportive principal behavior and teachers'
Job satisfaction

Variables	Mean	S.D.	N	P. Correlation	Sig.(2-tailed)
Supportive Principal Behaviour	24.60	6.31	550	0.499	.000
Teachers' Job Satisfaction	279.39	34.48	550		

Table 7 shows that correlation value (.499) is highly significant at .01 level of significance. So the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between supportive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction is rejected. It is concluded that there is a significant relationship between supportive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H3: There is no significant relationship between directive principals' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 8
Correlation between directive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction

Variables	Mean	S.D.	N	P. Correlation	Significant (2tailed)
Directive Principal Behaviour	24.62	4.61	550	0.402	.000
Teachers' job satisfaction	279.39	34.48	550		

Table No.8 shows that correlation value (.402) is highly significant at .01 level of significance, so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between directive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant relationship between directive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H4: There is no significant relationship between restrictive principals' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 9

Correlation between restrictive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction

Variables	Mean	S.D.	N	P. Correlation	Significant (2-tailed)
Restrictive Principal Behaviour	10.76	3.10	550		
Teachers' job satisfaction	279.39	34.48	550	0.091	.056

Table 9 shows that correlation values (.091) is low which is almost negligible so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between restrictive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant relationship between restrictive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H5: There in no significant relationship between teachers' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 10

Correlation between teachers' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction

Variables	Mean	S.D.	N	P. Correlation	Significant (2-tailed)
Teachers Behaviour	48.44	8.46	550		
Teachers' job satisfaction	279.39	34.48	550	0.286	.000

Table 10 shows that correlation value (.286) is highly significant at .01 level of significance, so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between behavior and teachers' job satisfaction is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant relationship between teachers' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H6: There is no significant relationship between collegial teachers' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 11

Correlation between collegial teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction

Variables	Mean	S.D.	N	P. Correlation	Significant (2-tailed)
Collegial Teacher Behaviour	23.41	5.51	550		
Teachers' job satisfaction	279.39	34.48	550	0.401	.000

Table 11 shows that correlation value (.401) is highly significant at .01 level of significance, so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between

collegial teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant relationship between collegial teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H7: There is no significant relationship between intimate teachers' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 12
Correlation between intimate teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction

Variables	Mean	S.D.	N	P. Correlation	Sig (2-tailed)
Intimate Teacher Behaviour	15.95	4.32	550	0.208	.000
Teachers' job satisfaction	279.39	34.48	550		

Table 12 shows correlation value (.208) is significant at .01 level of significance, so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between intimate teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant relationship between intimate teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H8: There is no significant relationship between disengaged teachers' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 13
Correlation between disengaged teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction

Variables	Mean	S.D.	N	P. Correlation	Significant (2-tailed)
Disengaged Teacher Behaviour	9.50	3.66	550	-0.052	.200
Teachers' job satisfaction	279.39	34.48	550		

Table 13 shows correlation value (-.052) is not significant at .05 level of significance, so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between disengaged teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant between disengaged teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

H9: There is no significant difference between male and female teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 14
Difference between male and female teachers' job satisfaction

Sex	N	Mean	t	df	Sig.
Male	361	276.48			
Female	189	283.48	2.255	548	.025

Table 14 indicates that 't' value (2.255) is significant at 0.05 level of significance, so the null hypothesis stating that here is no significant difference between male and female teachers' job satisfaction is rejected and it is concluded that there is difference between male and female teachers' job satisfaction. Female teachers have higher mean score(283.48) than the male teachers (276.48) on job satisfaction questionnaire.

H10: There is no significant difference between urban and rural teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 15
Difference between urban and rural school teachers' job satisfaction

Type of School	N	Mean	t	df	Sig
Urban	262	277.49			
Rural	288	280.17	0.893	548	2.68

Table 15 shows that 't' value is not significant at 0.05 level of significance, so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference between urban and rural school teachers' job satisfaction is accepted and it is concluded that there is no difference between urban and rural teachers' job satisfaction. There is no more difference of mean between urban and rural teachers' job satisfaction.

H11: There is no significant difference between science and arts teachers' job satisfaction.

Table 16
Difference between science and arts teachers' job satisfaction

Teaching Subject	N	Mean	t	df	sig.
Science	148	274.07			
Arts	402	280.67	1.935	548	.054

Table 16 shows that 't' value (1.935) is significant at 0.05 level of significance, so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference between science and arts teachers' job satisfaction is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant difference between science and arts teachers' job satisfaction. Arts teachers have higher mean score (280.67) than science teachers (274.07) on job satisfaction questionnaire.

H12: There is no significant difference regarding job satisfaction among teachers having different teaching experience.

Table 17
Difference regarding job satisfaction among teachers having different teaching experience

Teaching Experience	N	Mean	df	F	Sig.
0-5 years	48	264.25			
6-10 years	69	255.89			
11-15 years	152	271.60	4	3.917	.006
16-20 years	131	268.80			
>21	150	273.74			

Table 17 explains that 'F' value (3.917) is significant, so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference regarding job satisfaction among teachers having different teaching experience in rejected, and it is concluded that there is significant different regarding job satisfaction among teachers having different teaching experience.

As the results are significant, it was decided to run LSD Post HOC test of multiple comparison. However only significant means difference are presented here which contribute the most in making the result significant.

Table 18
Summary of multiple comparisons regarding job satisfaction of teachers have indicated different teaching experience

Teaching Experience	Mean Difference	Sig
6-10y Vs 11-15y	15.71	.002
6-10y Vs 16-20y	12.97	.012
6-10y Vs 21>	17.84	.000

As shown in Table 18 the overall results for the Post HOC test and mean score indicates that teachers having teaching experience between 6 to 10 years have least or less job satisfaction (mean 265.89) thus makes the results of ANOVA significant.

The following results were drawn after descriptive and inferential analysis.

1. Mean scores of organizational climate subscales indicated that teaches describes their schools as being high on supportive, directive principal behavior and collegial teacher behavior.

2. Mean scores of job satisfaction factors indicated that teachers were dissatisfy with advancement, compensation and working conditions.

3. There was a significant positive correlation between principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

4. Supportive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction was found to be significantly correlated with each other.

5. The null hypothesis No.3 stating no significant relationship between directive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction was rejected establishing a significant relationship between directive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

6.The null hypothesis No.4 stating no significant relationship between restrictive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction was accepted. As no significant relationship was found between restrictive principal behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

7. The null hypothesis No. 5 stating no significant relationship between teachers' behavior and teachers' job satisfaction was rejected, thus establishing a significant relationship.

8. The null hypothesis No. 6 stating no significant relationship between collegial teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction was rejected, establishing a significant relationship between collegial teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

9. The null hypothesis No. 7 stating no significant relationship between intimate teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction was rejected, thus establishing a significant relationship.

10. The null hypothesis No. 8 stating no significant relationship between disengaged teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction was accepted, as no significant correlation was found between disengaged teacher behavior and teachers' job satisfaction.

11. The null hypothesis No. 9 stating no significant difference between male and female teachers' job satisfaction was rejected, and it was concluded that there was difference between male and female teachers' job satisfaction Female teachers had higher mean score (283.48) than male teachers (276.48) on job satisfaction questionnaire.

12. The null hypothesis No. 10 stating no significant difference between urban and rural teachers' job satisfaction was accepted, as no significant difference was found between urban and rural teachers' job satisfaction. There was no more difference of mean between urban and rural teachers' job satisfaction.

13. The null hypothesis No. 11 stating no significant difference between science and arts teachers' job satisfaction was rejected, and it was concluded that there was significant difference between science and arts teachers' job satisfaction. Arts teachers have higher mean score (280.67) than science teachers (274.07).

14. The null hypothesis No. 12 stating no significant difference regarding job satisfaction among teachers having different teaching experience was rejected, over all results for the post-hoc and mean score indicated that teachers having teaching experience 6 to 10 years have less job satisfaction.

Discussion

The basic objective of the present study was to explore the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. The finding of this study support it that organizational climate and teachers' job satisfaction are related. Pearson correlation showed organizational climate to be significantly related to teachers' job satisfaction with different aspect of the job and climate. These finding lend support for the findings by Friedlander and Margulies (1969), Lafollette and Sims (1975), Coughlan (1971) and Azhar(2005). Schneider and Synder (1975) reported significant positive correlation between organizational climate factors and job descriptive index. Downey, Hellriegel, Phelp and Slocum (1974) found a significant positive relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. Schneider and Synder (1975), observed relationship among two measure of job satisfaction, on measure of organizational climate an seven production

and turnover indexes of organizational effectiveness, it was shown that there is significant correlation between climate and satisfaction.

Craig (1979), Nick (1980), Krishnn (1984), Soloman (1986), Raisani (1988), Mishra (1992), Wagner (1994) and Hayat (1998) indicated that organizational climate and job satisfaction are related.

Supportive principal behavior was found in this study to be significantly but positively related to teachers' job satisfaction. This finding confirms findings of Grassie and Carss (1973) who found supportive and considerate principal leadership positively related to teachers' job satisfaction. Coughlan (1971) and Craig (1979) reported that supportive and considerate principal leadership is related to teachers' job satisfaction.

Intimate and collegial teacher behavior was found in this study to be significantly positively related to teachers' job satisfaction. Donohue (1983) and Amirtash (1983) reported that intimate dimension to be positively related to educators' job satisfaction.

Disengaged dimension of organizational climate was found in this study no relationship with teachers' job satisfaction. Donohue (1983) found the disengaged dimension to be negatively related to job satisfaction for faculties of nursing schools. The finding from this study indicate female to be more satisfied with job satisfaction than male teachers. These results provide support for the earlier studies. Sergiovanni (1967), Brimingham (1984),

Raisani (1988) Azhar (2005) and Doris (2001) showed no significant difference between urban and rural school teachers to job satisfaction. This finding supports the findings of Hughey and Murphey (1982). They found rural teachers to be satisfied but not significantly.

Finding from this study show that science teachers are less satisfy with job. Their less satisfaction is understandable because of their greater demand for their services, hence increased employability in the market; they have better chances of getting a well paid job. Bromely (1981), provides relevant data to support his explanation.

Finding from this study show that teachers having 6 to 10 years teaching experience are less satisfied. Previous researches relation teachers' teaching experience and job satisfaction suggested two viewpoints. One group of researchers showed more experienced teachers to be satisfied with their job, while another group found no relationship

between teaching experience and job satisfaction. Hayat (1998) reported that length of service (experience) of college teachers was significantly related with job satisfaction in open and autonomous climate. He further reported that age category 51 to 55 years was most satisfied with their job.

References

Abraham, R. (1999). The impact of emotional dissonance on organizational commitment and intention to turnover. *Journal of Psychology, 133,* 441–455.

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: the influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review, 18,* 88–115.

Auer, P. (2005). Protected mobility for employment and decent work: Labour market security in a globalised world. *Employment Strategy Papers, 1*, Employment Analysis and Research Unit, Employment Strategy Department, International Labour Office (ILO), retrieved from: http://www.ilo.org/public/english/employment/strat/download/esp2005-1.pdf/28 July 2011

Bauer, T.K. (2004). *High performance workplace practices and job satisfaction: Evidence from Europe*, Discussion Paper No. 1265, Institute for the Study of Labour (IZA), available at: http://ftp.iza.org/dp1265.pdf/28 July 2011

Bender, K., Donohue, S. & Heywood, J. (2005). Job satisfaction and gender segregation , *Oxford Economic Papers*, *57*(3), 479-496.

Blanchflower, D.G. & Oswald, A. J. (1999). *Well-being, insecurity and the decline of American job satisfaction, working.* Paper, retrieved from: http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/staff/faculty/oswald/blanchflower.pdf/ 28 July 2011

Bowling, N.A. (2007). Is the Job Satisfaction-Job Performance Relationship Spurious: A Meta-Analytic Examination. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 71,* 167-185.

Bradley, S., Petrescu, A. & Simmons, R. (2004). *The impacts of human resource management practices and pay inequality on workers' job satisfaction* , Working Paper 031, Department of Economics, Lancaster University Management School,

retrieved from: http://www.lums.lancs.ac.uk/publications/viewpdf/000276/28 July 2011

Brief A. P, Roberson L. (1989). Job attitude organization: an exploratory study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19*, 717-727.

Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2001). Organizational behavior: affect in the workplace (Locke, 1976 cited in). *Annual Review of Psychology, 53,* 279-307, p. 282

Casaca, S. F. (2005). *Flexibilidade de Emprego, Novas Temporalidades de Trabalho e Relações de Género* [*Flexible employment, new temporalities of work and gender relations*], Doctoral thesis, Higher Institute of Economics and Management, University of Technology, Lisbon,

Clark, A. E. (1998). *Measures of job satisfaction - What makes a good job? Evidence from OECD countries*. Labour Market and Social Policy - Occasional Paper No. 34, OECD, Paris.

Clark, A. E. (2005). Your money or your life: Changing job quality in OECD countries. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, *43*(3), 377-400.

Cote, S., Morgan, L.M. (2002). A longitudinal analysis of the association between emotion regulation, job satisfaction, and intentions to quit. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *23,* 947–962.

D'Addio, A.C., Eriksson, T. & Frijters, P. (2003). *An analysis of the determinants of job satisfaction when individuals' baseline satisfaction levels may differ*. Centre for Applied Microeconometrics (CAM), Department of Economics, University of Copenhagen, 16, retrieved from: http://www.econ.ku.dk/CAM/Files/workingpapers/2003/2003-16.pdf/28 July 2011

Diaz-Serrano, L. & Cabral Vieira, J.A. (2005). *Low pay, higher pay and job satisfaction within the European Union: Empirical evidence from fourteen countries*, IZA Discussion Papers No. 1558, Institute for the Study of Labour (IZA), retrieved from: http://ideas.repec.org/p/iza/izadps/dp1558.html/*28 July 2011*

European Commission. (2002). *Employment in Europe 2002, Recent trends and prospects*. Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, availableat:http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/employment_analysis/eie/20 02_en.pdf/*28 July 2011*

European Commission. (2003). *Employment in Europe 2003, Recent trends and prospects.* Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, availableat:http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/news/2003/oct/eie2003_en.pdf/*28 July 2011*

European Commission. (2003). *Improving quality in work: A review of recent progress.* Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, COM(2003),728, Brussels, retrieved from: http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/news/2003/dec/com2003_728_en.pdf/28 July 2011

European Commission. (2005). *Employment and social policies: A framework for investing in quality.* Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, COM(2001) 313, Brussels, retrieved from: http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/employment_analysis/com2001_0313_en.pdf/*28 July 2011*

European Commission. (2005). *Working together for growth and jobs: A new start for the Lisbon strategy.* Communication to the Spring European Council, Communication from President Barroso in agreement with Vice-President Verheugen, COM(2005) 24, Brussels, 2005, retrieved from: http://europa.eu.int/growthandjobs/pdf/COM2005_024_en.pdf/28 July 2011.

Feinstein, A.H. & Vondrasek, D. (2001). *A study of relationships between job satisfaction and organisational commitment among restaurant employees* , Department of Food and Beverage Management, William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration, Las Vegas, available at: http://hotel.unlv.edu/pdf/jobSatisfaction.pdf/28 July 2011.

Fisher, D. (2000). Mood and emotions while working: missing pieces of job satisfaction? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21,* 185-202.

Fried, Y., & Ferris, G. R. (1987). The validity of the job characteristics model: A review and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 40*(2), 287-322.

Gazioglu, S. & Tansel, A. (2002). *Job satisfaction in Britain: Individual and job-related factors.* Economic Research Centre Working Papers in Economics 03/03, Ankara, available at: http://ideas.repec.org/p/met/wpaper/0303.html/28 July 2011

Green, F. & Tsitsianis, N. (2005). An investigation of national trends in job satisfaction in Britain and Germany. *British Journal of Industrial Relations, 43*(3), September 2005, pp. 410-429.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*, 250-279.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 19*, 151–188.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(3), 376-407.

Kaiser, L.C. (2002). *Job satisfaction: A comparison of standard, non-standard, and self-employment patterns across Europe with a special note to the gender/job satisfaction paradox.* EPAG Working Paper 27, Colchester, University of Essex, available at: http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/epag/pubs/workpaps/pdf/2002-27.pdf/28 July 2011

Krishnan, S. K., & Singh, M. (2010). Outcomes of intention to quit of Indian IT professionals. *Human Resource Management, 49*(3), 419-435.

Lehto, A-M., & Sutela, H. (2005). *Threats and opportunities. Findings of Finnish Quality of Work Life Surveys 1977-2003,* Statistics Finland, 2005.

Llorente, R. M. B. & Macías, E. F. (2003). *Job satisfaction as an indicator of the quality of work,* Department of Applied Economics, University of Salamanca, retrieved from: http://web.usal.es/~efm/jse.pdf/28 July 2011

Moguérou, P. (2002). *Job satisfaction among US PhD graduates: The effects of gender and employment sector,* second draft, IREDU, CNRS-University of Burgundy, France, retrieved from: http://ideas.repec.org/p/wpa/wuwpla/0204002.html/28 July 2011

Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1997). Managing emotions in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 9*, 257–274.

Mount, M., Ilies, R., & Johnson, E. (2006). Relationship of personality traits and counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effects of job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology, 59,* 591-622.

Nguyen, A. N., Taylor, J., & Bradley, S. (2003a). *Relative pay and job satisfaction: Some new evidence,* Working Paper 045, Department of Economics, Lancaster University Management School, retrieved from: http://www.lums.lancs.ac.uk/publications/viewpdf/000187/*28 July 2011*

Nguyen, A. N., Taylor, J., & Bradley, S. (2003b). *Job autonomy and job satisfaction: New evidence* , Working Paper 050, Department of Economics, Lancaster University Management School, retrieved from: http://www.lums.lancs.ac.uk/publications/viewpdf/000192/*28 July 2011*

O'Connell, P.J. et al. (2004). *The changing workplace: A survey of employees' views and experiences*, National Centre for Partnership and Performance, Dublin, retrieved from: http://www.esri.ie/advsearch.cfm?t=Find%20Publications&mId=2&detail=1&id=2031 /*28 July 2011*

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. Personnel Psychology, *48*, 775-802.

Pugliesi K. (1999). The Consequences of Emotional Labor: Effects on Work Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Weil-Being Motivation and Emotion, Vol. 23(2)

R. Hackman, G. R. Oldham (1976). Motivation through design of work. *Organizational behaviour and human performance 16*(2), 250–279. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1989). The expression of emotion in organizational life. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 11,* 1–42.

Rain, J.S., Lane, I.M. & Steiner, D.D. (1991). A current look at the job satisfaction/life satisfaction relationship: Review and future considerations. *Human Relations, 44,* 287–307.

Rode, J. C. (2004). Job satisfaction and life satisfaction revisited: A longitudinal test of an integrated model. *Human Relations, 57*(9), 1205-1230.

Rose, M. (2001). *Disparate measures in the workplace...Quantifying overall job satisfaction.* Paper presented at the BHPS Research Conference, Colchester, retrieved from: http://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/bhps/2001/docs/pdf/papers/rose.pdf/28 July 2011

Rose, M. (2003). Good deal, bad deal? Job satisfaction in occupations, *Work Employment and Society*, *17*(3), 503-530.

Rose, M. (2005). Job satisfaction in Britain: Coping with complexity, *British Journal of Industrial Relations , 43*(3), 455-467.

Saane, N. van, Sluiter, J.K., Verbeek, J.H.A.M. & Frings-Dresen, M.H.W. (2003). Reliability and validity of instruments measuring job satisfaction-a systematic review, *Occupational Medicine, 53*(3), 191-200.

Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management, 43,* 395-407.

Schmidt, S.W. (2004). *The relationship between satisfaction with on-the-job training and overall job satisfaction, Paper* presented at the Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education, Indiana University, Indianapolis, retrieved from: http://www.iupui.edu/~adulted/mwr2p/program/Proceedings/Schmidt.pdf/28 July 2011.

Sousa-Poza, A. & Sousa-Poza, A. A. (2000). Well-being at work: a cross-national analysis of the levels and determinants of job satisfaction. *Journal of Socio-Economics, 29*(6), 517-538.

Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences.* Sage: London.

Syptak, J.M., Marsland, D.W. & Ulmer, D. (1999). *Job satisfaction: Putting theory into practice.* American Academy of Family Physicians, retrieved from: http://www.aafp.org/fpm/991000fm/26.html/28 July 2011

The Conference Board. *US job satisfaction keeps falling, the Conference Board reports today'* Press release. 28 February 2005, retrieved from: http://www.conference-board.org/utilities/pressPrinterFriendly.cfm?press_ID=2582/28 July 2011

University of Bath, '*British women's job satisfaction takes a tumble*', Press release, 27 June, 2005, retrieved from:
http://www.bath.ac.uk/news/articles/archive/spawomenjob270605.html/28 July 2011

Valentini, E. (2005). *Psychological factors in job satisfaction* , Quaderni di ricerca No. 225, Department of Economics, Marche Polytechnic University, retrieved from: http://dea.univpm.it/quaderni/pdf/225.pdf (in English)./ 28 July 2011

Wegge, J., Schmidt, K., Parkes, C., & van Dick, K. (2007). 'Taking a sickie': Job satisfaction and job involvement as interactive predictors of absenteeism in a public organization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80,* 77-89.

Weiss H. M. & Cropanzano R. (1996). Affective events theory: a theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 8,* 1-74.

Weiss H.M., Nicholas J.P., Daus C.S. (1999). An examination of the joint effects of affective experiences and job beliefs on job satisfaction and variations in affective experiences over time. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 78,*1-24.

Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human Resource Management Review, 12,* 173-194.

Wikman, A. (2005). *Om arbetsengagemang och andra motiv för arbetet än ekonomiska ,* National Institute for Working Life, Stockholm, 2005.

Williams, J. R. (2004). *Job satisfaction and organisational commitment ,* a Sloan Work and Family Encyclopaedia entry, retrieved from: http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia_entry.php?id=244/28 July 2011