

Age and Qualification as Influencer of Facet-Specific Job Satisfaction

Safdar Rehman Ghazi

*Institute of Education & Research, University of Science & Technology,
Bannu Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan
E-mail: drsrghazi@yahoo.com*

Abstract *The purpose of this study was to document age and qualification influence on facet-specific levels of job satisfaction as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The Long Form MSQ 1967 was chosen to measure satisfaction levels of twenty job facets. The head teachers with younger and older age, bachelor degree holders, obtained high means than head teachers with middle age and master degree holders. Significant differences were found among different age groups for different dimensions of job. Therefore, no significant differences were observed for qualification. Younger and older age head teachers were significantly more satisfied with almost all the dimensions of the job than the middle age head teachers. No significant differences were found between the head teachers with bachelor degree and the head teachers with master degree for any dimension of the job. Results based on this study provide a sufficient ground to frame the following recommendations; salary of the teachers should be increased, a large amount in annual budget should be reserved to improve the working conditions in the schools, special attention should be given to facilitate the medium age teachers, studies on satisfaction and age should be conducted to investigate the reason why satisfaction increases in younger and older age while decreases in middle age, and studies on satisfaction to investigate more predictors to job satisfaction should be conducted.*

Keywords: *Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction, Job Dimensions, Job Facets, Teacher Satisfaction*

1. Introduction

Demographic variables have been examined in a number of studies to determine their effects on the various aspects of the job experienced by workers in various positions. One of the arguments often brought against the theories of job satisfaction is that they take little account of differences between people (Gruneberg 1979).

Gruneberg (1979) states that the general finding reported by Herzberg et al. (1957) on the relationship between job satisfaction and age, shows that job satisfaction starts high, declines, and then starts to improve again with increasing age. This relationship has basically been found in male populations but a recent study by Glenn, Taylor and Weaver (1977) indicates that female job satisfaction also increases with increased age. It should be pointed out, however, that other researchers, such as Hunt and Saul (1975), failed to find any relationship between job satisfaction and age for female workers, although they did find the hypothesized U-shaped curve for male workers. The results in this area are clearly inconsistent.

Lowther, et al., (1985) research results indicate job satisfaction increases with age, job values remain constant with age, job rewards increase with age, and the major determinants of job satisfaction are intrinsic to teaching for younger teachers and extrinsic to teaching for older teachers.

Newby, (1999) found that the youngest group obtained the highest mean, and then general satisfaction began to decline as principals reached the middle age groups. After age 55, satisfaction started to increase again, but not to the level of the youngest principals. She also found that younger and older principals were significantly more satisfied with Activity than middle aged principals. Moguerou (2002) also stated such findings that a U-shaped age profile for job satisfaction was found for males and to a lesser extent for females. A Statistical Analysis Report (1997) on United States teachers' job satisfaction showed the similar results too. These findings showed a U-shaped curvilinear association between age and satisfaction similar to those findings reported by Herzberg (1957). Contrary to the findings of other researchers (Fansher &

Buxton, 1984; Finley, 1991; and Schonwetter, 1993) who found that the oldest worker were the most satisfied.

Keung-fai, (1996) in his research when tested group differences by one-way ANOVA, significant effects were found for age, school type, and major teaching level. Teachers in the 26-30 year age group reported the lowest level of satisfaction with Promotion, Colleagues and Pay scales. Government school teachers reported the highest level of satisfaction with Pay and Promotion scales.

A review of job satisfaction studies that included education as a variable indicates that the relationship between education and job satisfaction can be negative or positive. Gruenberg (1979) mentions, as far as educational level is concerned a study by Vollmer and Kinney (1955) showed this effect. Their results indicated that more college than high school educated employees reported dissatisfaction with their jobs. Similarly more high school trained workers reported dissatisfaction than lower trained grammar school educated worker.

Similarly findings to those of Vollmer and Kinney were reported by Klein and Maher (1966), who studied the pay satisfaction of college educated and non-college educated managers. Again they found non-college educated managers to be more satisfied with pay than college educated managers.

A large number of studies have shown that there is increased job satisfaction with increasing occupational level and clearly, the higher the education, the likelier it is that one will be at a higher occupational level (Gruenberg 1979).

Newby, (1999) found that those with educational specialist degrees obtained a higher mean than those with masters and doctoral degrees. Basically, satisfaction increased from the master level to the education specialist level where it peaked and then dropped at the doctorate level, thus forming a curvilinear association between degree status and satisfaction. These findings are contrary to findings reported in the existing small body of literature which report that the most highly educated employees were the most satisfied because they had secured desirable positions (Quinn et al. 1974). He also found that principals with educational specialist degrees were significantly more satisfied with Achievement than doctorate and masters principals.

Feinstein, (2002) found that the level of education significantly affected satisfaction with recognition and Demato (2002) showed, elementary school counselors who have a master's degree and intend to stay in their current position are more satisfied with their jobs.

1.1 Objectives

The study was designed with the following objectives.

1. To identify the facet-specific level of job satisfaction of head teachers according to the demographic variables age and qualification,
2. To determine head teachers' satisfaction level differences for each of the twenty dimensions of the job having different age and qualification,
3. To suggest some measures to improve the situation, and recommend further research studies to explore the area of job satisfaction.

1.2 Delimitations

This study was delimited to the twenty facets of job satisfaction as assessed by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

2. Research Methodology

2.1 Population and Sampling

In the present scenario of Pakistan the transfer of powers to district level is considerable. This decentralization of powers has its own importance. With the devolution of powers, school education has gone under the district governments. Considering the point, the researcher was attracted to research at district level. Therefore, the population of this study consisted of all male and female head teachers of government elementary schools situated in all areas (rural & urban) of district Toba Tek Singh in the Punjab.

The teachers of all categories who were working as head teachers in (any area, i.e., rural or urban) government elementary schools at district Toba Tek Singh in the Punjab (except the sampled for pilot study), filled the questionnaire. In short, to make the results more authentic at district level population was hundred percent sampled.

2.2 Instrumentation

There were two versions of the long-form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) 1977 version and 1967 version. The 1977 version, which was originally copyrighted in 1963, uses the following five response choices: Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, and Very Dissatisfied. The authors utilized the instrument to collect normative data for 21 MSQ scales for 25 representative occupations including bookkeepers, laborers, typists, engineers, managers, and teachers. A “ceiling effect” obtained with the rating scale used in the 1977 version tends to result in most scale score distributions being markedly negatively skewed—most responses alternate between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied.” Therefore, 1967 version was developed that adjusted for the ceiling effect by using the following five response categories: Not Satisfied, Slightly Satisfied, Satisfied, Very Satisfied, and Extremely Satisfied. The revised rating scale resulted in distributions that tend to be more symmetrically distributed around the “Satisfied” category. MSQ long form 1967 was used as a research tool in this study. This was developed by Weiss, Dawis, English, and Lofquist (1967) to measure the individual’s satisfaction with twenty different aspects of the work environment and is one of the most popular measures of job satisfaction.

Page two of the MSQ seeks answers to questions concerning standard demographic characteristics of respondents. This page was replaced with two demographic variables, i.e. age and qualification. Age was referred to the length of life for each respondent. It was measured by asking the respondents to select the appropriate given age range and qualification was referred to an academic title conferred by a college or university upon the completion of studies. Qualification was measured by asking the head teachers to encircle their highest degree from given options.

The 1967 Long-Form MSQ was slightly modified and an Urdu version of it was developed. This was used primarily because it is a well-known instrument designed to measure job satisfaction. It is a gender-neutral instrument that can be administered to either groups or to individuals. The instrument utilizes a 20-dimensions Likert-type scale format with a total of 100 items. It is self-administering with directions for the respondent appearing on the first page of the questionnaire. Instructions for the rating scale are located at the top of page. Although there is no time limit, completion of the MSQ is typically accomplished by a respondent within 15-20 minutes. Response choices for each item appear in blocks of 20, with items that comprise a dimension appearing in 20 item intervals.

Instrument in its original shape is already standardized having high validity but in different context or environment some changes were made in the questionnaire and then it was translated into Urdu by the researcher. Validation of Urdu version was checked by the committee of experts. The coefficient for each dimension was: Social Service, 0.75; Activity, 0.83; Moral Value, 0.80; Achievement, 0.65; Creativity, 0.72; Responsibility, 0.72; Variety, 0.65; Coworker, 0.70; Supervision Human Relations, 0.69; Security, 0.70; Authority, 0.70; Working Conditions, 0.65; Supervision Technical, 0.68; Status, 0.75; Policies, 0.57; Recognition, 0.65;

Advancement, 0.69; Independence, 0.85; and, Compensation, 0.65. These coefficients ranged from .85 to .65 for the dimensions, and a coefficient of .91 was obtained for the group on the MSQ.

Data collection was done personally and through mail. The participants for this study were selected, listed in the Executive District Officer Education office Toba Tek Singh. Using these methods, all the sampled head teachers were asked to participate in this study.

3. Data Analysis

All the scores were entered in the software SPSS-10 data base, and data pertaining to the objectives of this study were generated accordingly. The categories for each variable were assigned codes, and the codes were entered into the software (e.g., for qualification, Bachelor was assigned the code 1 and Master was assigned 2). Twenty dimensions analyzed in this study were: Ability Utilization, Achievement, Activity, Advancement, Authority, School policies, Compensation, Coworkers, Creativity, Independence, Moral Values, Recognition, Responsibility, Security, Social service, Social Status, Supervision Human Relations, Supervision Technical, Variety, and Working Conditions. There were 5 items on the MSQ in increments of 20 to assess satisfaction for each of the 20 dimensions. For example, Variety was the average of items 5, 25, 45, 65, and 85. The scores on the five items were averaged and mean for each dimension was computed. The 5 options and the assigned weight and range for each were:

Weight Scale	Range	Option
1	1.00-1.50	Not Satisfied
2	1.51-2.50	Slightly Satisfied
3	2.51-3.50	Satisfied
4	3.51-4.50	Very Satisfied
5	4.51-5.00	Extremely Satisfied

Demographic scores for twenty dimensions using mean, ANOVA, Scheffe post hoc test and t-test followed by significance value were presented in tabular form.

Table 1. Comparisons of different Age groups for Twenty Dimensions of Job (N=180)

Sr.No	Dimension	Mean				F	P
		Younger than 36	36-45	46-55	Older than 55		
1	Ability Utilization	3.23	2.92	2.99	3.09	3.44	.01*
2	Achievement	3.18	2.85	2.91	3.40	13.90	.00*
3	Activity	4.02	3.24	3.53	3.92	25.87	.00*
4	Advancement	2.82	2.21	2.54	3.03	16.85	.00*
5	Authority	3.14	2.55	2.88	3.37	23.79	.00*
6	Colleagues	2.98	2.56	2.83	3.43	18.86	.00*
7	Compensation	2.29	1.86	1.99	2.22	7.46	.00*
8	Creativity	3.03	2.20	2.69	3.15	32.76	.00*
9	Independence	3.00	2.57	2.82	3.11	9.05	.00*
10	Moral values	3.88	3.44	3.48	3.94	9.33	.00*

11	Recognition	2.97	2.27	2.70	3.06	26.32	.00*
12	Responsibility	3.13	2.83	2.94	3.19	5.98	.00*
13	School Policies/Practices	2.59	2.16	2.60	3.12	21.94	.00*
14	Security	2.85	2.50	2.82	3.23	6.48	.00*
15	Social Service	2.86	2.21	2.61	2.89	15.01	.00*
16	Social Status	2.85	2.03	2.08	2.45	19.70	.00*
17	Supervision Human Relations	3.08	2.48	2.70	3.27	23.02	.00*
18	Supervision Technical	3.26	2.54	2.80	3.29	27.65	.00*
19	Variety	4.00	3.16	3.46	3.80	24.35	.00*
20	Working Conditions	2.60	1.86	2.17	2.59	27.22	.00*

*P ≤ .05

Table 1 shows that the respondents of each category of age were "Satisfied" with the dimensions; Ability Utilization, Achievement, Authority, Colleagues, Independence, Responsibility, Social Service and Supervision Technical with mean scores ranged from 2.51-3.50. The age groups younger than 36 years and older than 46 years were "Very Satisfied" with mean scores ranged from 3.51-4.50 for the dimension of Activity while the age group 36-45 years is "Satisfied" with mean scores ranged from 2.51-3.50 for this dimension of job. The age groups younger than 36 years and older than 45 years were "Satisfied" with mean scores ranged from 2.51-3.50 for the dimensions of Advancement, Creativity, Recognition, School Policies/Practices, Security, and Supervision Human Relations while the age group 36-45 years is "Slightly Satisfied" with mean scores ranged from 1.51-2.50 for these dimensions of job. Respondents of all categories of age groups were "Slightly Satisfied" with mean scores ranged from 1.51-2.50 for the Compensation dimension of job. The age groups younger than 36 years and older than 55 years were "Very Satisfied" with mean scores ranged from 3.51-4.50 for the dimensions of Moral Values and Variety while the age group 36-55 years is "Satisfied" with mean scores ranged from 2.51-3.50 for both dimensions of job. The age group younger than 36 years is "Satisfied" with mean scores ranged from 2.51-3.50 for the dimension Social Status while the age group older than 36 years is "Slightly Satisfied" with mean scores ranged from 1.51-2.50 for this dimension of job. The age groups younger than 36 years and older than 55 years were "Satisfied" with mean scores ranged from 3.51-4.50 for the dimension Working Conditions while the age group 36-55 years is "Slightly Satisfied" with mean scores ranged from 2.51-3.50 for this dimension of job. The P value for all the twenty dimensions is significant at 0.05 level of significance which means that all the age groups significantly differ for all the twenty dimensions of job. Therefore, ANOVA results require following by Post Hoc test.

Table 2. Scheffe Post Hoc Test for Twenty Dimensions of Job and Age

Sr.No	Dimension	P					
		J ₁ -J ₂	J ₁ -J ₃	J ₁ -J ₄	J ₂ -J ₃	J ₂ -J ₄	J ₃ -J ₄
1	Ability Utilization	0.2*	0.18	0.72	0.88	0.47	0.86
2	Achievement	.00*	.05*	.31	.89	.00*	.00*
3	Activity	.00*	.00*	.90	.01*	.00*	.01*
4	Advancement	.00*	.26	.58	.02*	.00*	.00*

5	Authority	.00*	.15	.36	.00*	.00*	.00*
6	Colleagues	.00*	.68	.02*	.05*	.00*	.00*
7	Compensation	.00*	.99	.34	.15	.00*	.20
8	Creativity	.00*	.05*	.86	.00*	.00*	.00*
9	Independence	.00*	.61	.88	.08	.00*	.19
10	Moral values	.00*	.01*	.98	.98	.00*	.00*
11	Recognition	.00*	.15	.90	.00*	.00*	.02*
12	Responsibility	.02*	.33	.97	.62	.00*	.16
13	School Policies/Practices	.00*	1.00	.00*	.00*	.00*	.00*
14	Security	.22	.99	.34	.15	.00*	.20
15	Social Service	.00*	.31	.99	.00*	.00*	.26
16	Social Status	.00*	.00*	.05*	.97	.00*	.04*
17	Supervision Human Relations	.00*	.01*	.53	.11	.00*	.00*
18	Supervision Technical	.00*	.00*	.99	.02*	.00*	.00*
19	Variety	.00*	.00*	.53	.01*	.00*	.06
20	Working Conditions	.00*	.00*	1.00	.00*	.00*	.00*

*P ≤ .05

Key: J₁= Younger than 36 years (N =29)
J₃=46-55 (N=47)

J₂=36-45 (N=78)
J₄=Older than 55 years (N=26)

Table 2 predicts that the respondents younger than 36 years of age group significantly differ from the age group 36-45 years of age for the dimension Ability Utilization. The age group younger than 36 years significantly differs with age group 36-55 while the age group 36-55 significantly differs from the age group older than 55 years for the dimensions Achievement, Moral Values, and Supervision Human Relations. The age group younger than 36 years significantly differs with age group 36-55 while the age group 36-45 significantly differs from the age group older than 45 years and the age group 46-55 also significantly differs from age group older than 55 years for the dimensions Activity, Creativity, Supervision Technical, and Working Conditions. The age group younger than 36 years significantly differs with age group 36-45 while the age group 36-45 significantly differs from the age group older than 45 years and the age group 46-55 also significantly differs from age group older than 55 years for the dimensions Advancement, and Authority. The age group younger than 36 years significantly differs with age group 36-45 and older than 55 years while the age group 36-45 significantly differs from the age group older than 45 years and the age group 46-55 also significantly differs from age group older than 55 years for the dimensions Colleagues, and School Policies/Practices. The age group younger than 36 years significantly differs with the age group 36-45 years and the age group 36-45 years significantly differs with the age group older than 55 years for the dimension Compensation. The age group younger than 36 years significantly differs with age group 36-45 years while the age group 36-45 significantly differs from the age group older than 55 years for the dimension Independence. The age group younger than 36 years significantly differs with age group 36-45 while the age group 36-45 significantly differs from the age group older than 45 years and the age group 46-55 also significantly differs from age group older than 55 years for the dimension Recognition. The age group younger than 36 years significantly differs with age group 36-45 while the age group 36-45 significantly differs from the age group older than 55 years for the dimension Responsibility. The age group 36-45 significantly differs from the age

group older than 55 years for the dimension Security. The age group younger than 36 years significantly differs with age group 36-45 while the age group 36-45 significantly differs from the age group older than 45 years for the dimension Social Service. The age group younger than 36 years significantly differs with age group older than 36 years while the age group 36-55 significantly differs from the age group older than 55 years for the dimension Social Status. The age group younger than 36 years significantly differs with age group 36-55 while the age group 36-45 significantly differs from the age group older than 45 years for the dimension Variety.

Table 3. Comparisons of different Qualifications for Twenty Dimensions of Job

Sr.No	Dimension	Mean		t	P
		Bachelor (N=63)	Master (N=117)		
1	Ability Utilization	2.99	3.03	0.35	.55
2	Achievement	3.06	2.96	2.04	.15
3	Activity	3.60	3.51	1.02	.31
4	Advancement	2.47	2.54	0.35	.55
5	Authority	2.83	2.87	0.18	.66
6	Colleagues	2.83	2.82	0.00	.94
7	Compensation	2.09	1.98	1.96	.16
8	Creativity	2.64	2.57	0.46	.49
9	Independence	2.84	2.75	1.10	.29
10	Moral values	3.66	3.56	1.41	.23
11	Recognition	2.62	2.60	0.04	.83
12	Responsibility	2.99	2.94	0.46	.49
13	School Policies/Practices	2.50	2.47	0.09	.75
14	Security	2.72	2.76	0.14	.70
15	Social Service	2.51	2.53	0.07	.78
16	Social Status	2.25	2.23	0.05	.82
17	Supervision Human Relations	2.75	2.75	0.00	.98
18	Supervision Technical	2.88	2.81	0.75	.38
19	Variety	3.46	3.47	0.00	.98
20	Working Conditions	2.27	2.11	3.57	.06

Table 3 shows that respondents either with Bachelor or Master degree were “Very Satisfied” with mean scores ranged from 3.51-4.50 for the dimensions Activity, and Moral Values. Respondents either Bachelor or Master degree holders were “Satisfied” with mean scores ranged from 2.51-3.50 for the dimensions Ability Utilization, Achievement, Authority, Colleagues, Creativity, Independence, Recognition, Responsibility, Security, Supervision Human Relations, Supervision Technical, and Variety. Respondents either Bachelor or Master degree holders were

“Slightly Satisfied” with mean scores ranged from 1.51-2.50 for the dimensions Compensation, School Policies/Practices, Social Status, and Working Conditions. While the Master degree holders were “Very Satisfied” with mean scores from 3.50-4.50 and Bachelor degree holder were “Satisfied” with means scores from 2.51-3.50 for the dimensions Advancement, and Social Service. While t-test shows no significant differences between the satisfaction level of the Bachelor and Master degree holders as the P value for any dimension of job is not equal to or less than 0.05 for the significance level 0.05.

4. Conclusions

1. Almost all the head teachers of different age groups were satisfied with dimensions; Ability Utilization, Achievement, Authority, Colleagues, Independence, Responsibility, Social Service, and Supervision Technical.
2. Younger than 36 years and older than 46 years were very satisfied for the dimension Activity while the head teachers 36-45 years old were satisfied with this dimension of job.
3. The head teachers younger than 36 years and older than 45 years were satisfied for Advancement, Creativity, Recognition, School Policies and Practices, Security, and Supervision Human Relations while the head teachers of age group 36-45 years were slightly satisfied with these dimensions of job.
4. All the head teachers of different age groups were slightly satisfied with the dimension Compensation.
5. The head teachers younger than 36 years and older than 55 years were very satisfied for Moral Values and Variety dimensions of job while the age group 36-55 years was satisfied with these dimensions of job.
6. The head teachers younger than 36 years were satisfied with the dimension Social Status while the age group older than 36 years was slightly satisfied with this dimension of job.
7. The age groups of head teachers younger than 36 years and older than 55 years were satisfied with the dimension Working Conditions while the age group 36-55 years was slightly satisfied with this dimension of job.
8. The head teachers younger than 36 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers 36-45 years of age for the dimension Ability Utilization.
9. The younger and older head teachers were more satisfied for almost all the dimensions of job than the medium age head teachers.
10. The head teachers younger than 36 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers 36-55 years of age and the head teachers older than 55 years were also significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of this age group 36-55 for the dimensions Achievement, Moral Values, and Supervision Human Relations.
11. The head teachers younger than 36 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers 36-55 years of age, the head teachers older than 45 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of this age group 36-45, and the head teachers older than 55 years were significantly more satisfied than head teachers of age group 46-55 years for the dimensions Activity, Creativity, Supervision Technical and Working Conditions.
12. The head teachers younger than 36 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers 36-45 years of age, the head teachers older than 45 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of this age group 36-45, and the head teachers older than 55 years were significantly more satisfied than head teachers of age group 46-55 years for the dimensions Advancement and Authority.
13. The head teachers younger than 36 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers 36-45 years of age, the head teachers older than 55 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers younger than 36 years, the head teachers older than 45 years were significantly more satisfied than head teachers of age group 36-45 years, and head

- teachers older than 55 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of age group 46-55 years for the dimensions Colleagues and School Policies and Practices.
14. The head teachers younger than 36 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers 36-45 years of age and the head teachers older than 55 years were also significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of this age group 36-45 for the dimensions Compensation and Independence.
 15. The head teachers younger than 36 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers 36-45 years of age, the head teachers older than 45 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers 36-45 years of age, and head teachers older than 55 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of age group 46-55 years for the dimension Recognition.
 16. The head teachers younger than 36 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers 36-45 years of age, and head teachers older than 55 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of age group 36-45 years for the dimension Responsibility.
 17. The head teachers older than 55 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of age group 36-45 years for the dimension Security.
 18. The head teachers younger than 36 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers 36-45 years of age, and head teachers older than 45 years were also significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of age group 36-45 years for the dimension Social Service.
 19. The head teachers younger than 36 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers older than 36 years, and head teachers older than 55 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of age group 36-55 years for the dimension Social Status.
 20. The head teachers younger than 36 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers 36-55 years of age, and head teachers older than 45 years were significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of age group 36-45 years for the dimension Variety.
 21. The head teachers with different qualifications were very satisfied with dimensions Activity and Moral Values.
 22. The head teachers with different qualifications were satisfied with dimensions Ability Utilization, Achievement, Authority, Colleagues, Creativity, Independence, Recognition, Responsibility, Security, Supervision Human Relations, Supervision Technical, and Variety.
 23. The head teachers with different qualifications were slightly satisfied with dimensions Compensation, School Policies and Practices, Social Status, and Working Conditions.
 24. Master degree holder head teachers were found very satisfied while the Bachelor degree holders head teachers were satisfied with the dimensions Advancement and Social Service of their job.
 25. No significant satisfaction differences were found for any dimension of the job for degree status.

5. Discussion

Overall, the responses indicated that the respondents in this study were satisfied with their positions. They also indicated that being able to do things in their positions that do not go against their conscience and to keep busy all the time were the highest contributors to their satisfaction. One can speculate that the reason for such high Moral Values and satisfaction was mainly because the school is to be considered a social system made up of students, teachers, support staff, paraprofessionals, specialists, volunteers, and administrators. The head teachers, who are the leaders of this system, are constantly interacting with groups and individuals advising, recommending, praising, and encouraging others towards the attainment of school goals. During all these processes the head teachers do not feel or do jobs against his conscience at any stage.

The head teachers have to do all the clerical jobs by themselves because there is no post of clerk for clerical jobs in elementary schools of district Toba Tek Singh in the Punjab. So the head teachers are always much busy with their work. In this way, the head teachers have to do a variety of things daily. That's why Variety seems to be third highest contributor to head teachers' satisfaction. Obviously, head teachers in this study showed that they are quite satisfied with, the things which do not go against their consciences, and to keep busy all the time with variety of works. In short, head teachers derive high satisfaction with these three aspects of their job.

Findings pertaining to age of head teachers indicated that head teachers of younger age and older age were more satisfied with almost all the aspects of their job than head teachers of middle age. These findings show a U-shaped curvilinear association between age and satisfaction as reported by Herzberg (1957). Perhaps there is a high unemployment rate in the country and when someone finds job in his younger age he feels himself very satisfied at that time. After sometimes when he finds his salary not enough to meet all the necessities of life then his satisfaction decreases. Another conclusion may be that there is not a satisfactory increase in the salaries as compared to age of head teachers. So the reasons for such low satisfaction may be the slow rate for the increase of head teachers' salaries. And in older age head teachers feel that their salary is sufficient after the increments for many years and they feel it enough for their status quo and necessities of life. However, it was not surprising that head teachers in younger age and older age were more satisfied than head teachers of middle age because many studies already have the same results.

It was noted that degree status has no effects on job satisfaction because no significant differences were found for any dimension due to bachelor or master degree. All the head teachers were at least with bachelor degree because it is the minimum educational requirement for this post. Although there was not a single case with M. Phil or Ph.D. qualification in sampled schools but most of the head teachers were with master degree. Perhaps no major gap in qualification was considered for these two consecutive degrees by the head teachers. For almost all the dimensions, head teachers with bachelor degree scored higher but not significantly higher than head teachers with master degree. These findings supports that most highly educated employees were the most dissatisfied (Vollmer and Kinney 1955). The reason may be that head teachers with high qualification were expecting for higher post and the head teacher with low qualification were at the peak according to their qualification.

6. Recommendations

1. Inflation rate is very high in Pakistan and salary of the teachers is not increased with the same ratio. Therefore, there should be a big rise in the salaries and fringe benefits of the head teachers and a big amount in the annual budget should be reserved for the purpose as a preference.
2. A large amount in annual budget should be reserved especially to improve the working conditions in the schools especially for the provision of facilities and necessities like boundary wall, sanitation system, fresh water, building, furniture, electricity, gas, fans, heaters, science laboratories, libraries, play grounds etc.
3. Special attention should be given to facilitate the medium age teachers.
4. Studies on satisfaction and age should be conducted to investigate the reason why satisfaction increases in younger and older age while decreases in middle age.
5. Studies on satisfaction to investigate more predictors to job satisfaction should be conducted.

References

- DeMato, D. S., (2001) Job Satisfaction among Elementary School Counselors in Virginia: Thirteen Years Later. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg Virginia.
- Fansher, T. A. and Buxton, T. H., (1984) A Job Satisfaction Profile of the Female Secondary School Principal in the United States. NASSP Bulletin.
- Feinstein A. H., (2002) A Study of Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among Restaurant Employees. Department of Food and Beverage Management, William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration University of Nevada, Las Vegas, P. 2.
- Finley, W. H., (1991) High School Principals Job Satisfaction. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee.
- Glenn, W. D., Taylor, P. A. and Weaver, C. N., (1977) Age and Job Satisfaction among Males and Females: A Multivariate, Multisurvey Study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, P. 189-193.
- Gruneberg Michael M., (1979) Understanding Job Satisfaction. The Macmillan Press.
- Herzberg, F., et al., (1957) Job Attitude: Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh Psychological Services of Pittsburgh.
- Hunt, J. W. and Saul, P. N., (1975) The Relationship of Age, Tenure and Job Satisfaction in Males and Females. *Academy of Management Journal*, P. 690-702
- Keung-fai, J. W., (1996) Job Satisfaction of Hong Kong Secondary School Teachers. *Education Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 2, Winter, P. 29-44.
- Klein, S. M. and Maher, J. R., (1966) Educational Level and Satisfaction with Pay. *Personnel Psychology*, 19, P. 195-208.
- Lowther, M. A., et al., (1985) Age and the Determinants of Teacher Job Satisfaction. *Gerontologist*; Vol. 25, No.5, P. 520-25 Oct 1985. ERIC NO: EJ329170.
- Moguerou Philippe, (2002) Job satisfaction among US Ph.D. graduates: the effect of gender and employment sector Second draft IREDU, CNRS-Université de Bourgogne, Dijon France.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1997) Job Satisfaction among America Teachers: Effects of Work Place Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation Statistical Analysis Report (August) Washington, D.C
- Newby, J. E., (1999) Job Satisfaction of Middle School Principals in Virginia. Doctoral Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. February.
- Quinn, R. P., Graham, L. S. and M. R. McCullough, (1974) Job Satisfaction: Is there a trend? Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor.
- Schonwetter, D. J., (1993) Women Academic and Career Administrators' Role Perceptions and Occupational Satisfaction: Implications for Appointment and Professional Development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Atlanta, GA, April 16.
- Vollmer, H. M. and Kinney, J. A., (1955) Age, Education and Job Satisfaction. *Personnel*, 32, P. 38-43
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. W. and Lofquist, L. H., (1967) Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: XII. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center, Work Adjustment Project.