

## School Location and Size as Predictors of Head Teachers' Job Satisfaction

Dr. Safdar Rehman Ghazi

*Institute of Education & Research  
University of Science & Technology, Bannu, Pakistan  
[drsrghazi@yahoo.com](mailto:drsrghazi@yahoo.com)*

Gulap Shahzada

*Institute of Education & Research  
University of Science & Technology, Bannu, Pakistan  
[Gulap\\_786@yahoo.com](mailto:Gulap_786@yahoo.com)*

Doi: 10.5901/mjss.2012.03.01.613

---

**Abstract** *The general intent of this descriptive study was to document the general job satisfaction of the head teachers working in government elementary schools in context of their school location and size as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Therefore, survey design was used to obtain needed information. The teachers of all categories who were working as head teachers in government elementary schools at district Toba Tek Singh (in any area, i.e., rural or urban) in the Punjab, Pakistan (except the sampled for pilot study), were asked to fill the questionnaire. The Urdu version of the modified Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used as a research tool in this study. It was concluded that the head teachers working in government elementary schools at district Toba Tek Singh in the Punjab, Pakistan were found generally satisfied with their positions regardless of their school location and size. The head teachers working in urban areas were found significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of rural areas, and no significant differences were found among the job satisfaction levels of the head teachers working in smaller and larger schools. On the basis of the responses to the MSQ, it appears that elementary school head teachers (Toba Tek Singh) in the Punjab, Pakistan were satisfied with their jobs. Policy makers and other concerned authorities should put forth effort to either maintain this level of satisfaction or increase it to a higher level. This may be done by increasing satisfaction for different aspects of job: Compensation, Working Conditions, Social Status, and School System Policies and Practices. There is need to improve the job satisfaction level of the government elementary school head teachers working in rural areas of district Toba Tek Singh. This can be done while providing them some special facilities, incentives, and allowances, like better working conditions and transport or travelling allowance etc. Study on satisfaction and school location should be conducted to investigate the reason why job satisfaction increases with urban schools and studies on satisfaction to investigate more predictors to job satisfaction should be conducted.*

**Keywords:** *Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction, Head Teacher, Size, Location, Elementary Education*

---

### 1. Introduction and Background of the Study

Like almost all other organizations, an educational organization also owes its existence to four universally recognized elements i.e. man, money, method and material. Out of these, the single most important element is human being (man). This element operates the other three in such a way that the organization could achieve its goals. Therefore, the concept, happy worker is a better worker, got the attention of the researchers, and the importance of job satisfaction has attracted attention than ever before.

Studies on job satisfaction began in the early 1900's in United States. During this period, psychologists in the field of industry conducted an array of studies on industry workers in an attempt to study employee's behavior at work and to determine the extent of job satisfaction. Subsequently, the findings from these studies produced data relevant to specific job factors and to the employee's perceptions of these factors. Hoppock (1935) states job satisfaction as any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that would cause a person to state, "I am satisfied with my job". Traditionally

job satisfaction has been viewed as the opposite of job dissatisfaction (Steers, and Porter 1975). "This model is best characterized by the writings of Taylor (1911), and his associates in the scientific management school" (Steers, and Porter 1975) movement dating from approximately 1910-1940. Job satisfaction is the degree to which people like their jobs (Rocca, and Kostanski, 2001). It is a general attitude toward the job. A person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive attitudes towards the job, while a person who is dissatisfied with his or her job holds negative attitudes about the job (Robbins et al. 1995). Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly (1985) state, satisfaction and morale are similar terms referring to the extent to which the organization meets the needs of employees. We use the term satisfaction to refer to this criterion. Similarly, the utilitarian perspective to job satisfaction, asserts that job satisfaction can lead to behaviours that can have either a positive or negative effect on organizational functioning. For example, in the way teachers relate to students and other colleagues could be strongly influenced by their sense of satisfaction within that school (Spector 1997).

Gruneberg (1979), states that most writers distinguish between job satisfaction and job morale. Morale refers to group wellbeing, whereas job satisfaction refers to the individual's emotional reactions to a particular job. Thus Locke (1976) defines job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state, resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences". According to Gorton (1976), employee satisfaction and morale are attitudinal variables that reflect positive or negative feelings about particular persons or situations. Frequently the two terms are used synonymously in the educational literature, and when the two concepts are analyzed, there appears to be considerable conceptual overlap, "satisfaction", when applied to the work context of teaching, seems to refer to the extent to which a person can meet individual personal and professional needs as an employee (Strauss 1974). "Morale", on the other hand, appears to have a group dimension, as suggested by Gross and Herriott's identification of six indexes of staff morale (Gross, and Herriott 1965).

There is no one agreed definition, however, Wanous and Lawler (1972) list nine different operational definitions, each based on a different theoretical orientation and each resulting in different measures. The major difference between definitions is in terms of the different ways in which aspects of job satisfaction are combined. When the relationship between job satisfaction for different aspects of the job and overall job satisfaction is analyzed, considerable differences in the extent of the correlation are found.

There is a close relationship between job satisfaction and the rewards people receive from their work. Workers experience job satisfaction "to the extent to which their jobs provide them with what they desire, and they perform effectively in them to the extent that effective performance leads to attainment of what they desire" (Vroom, 1964). Chruden and Sherman (1976) state, if a person in a particular incentive program sees a quite high probability of the program having a satisfying outcome, then this person will respond well and perform as intended. This employee perceives that by successfully exhibiting the behavior which management desires, he/she will likely reap the benefits in personal satisfaction and material reward (Nebel 1978). According to Chruden, and Sherman (1976), Incentives, Wage Secrecy, Pay Ranges, Pay Raise Policy, Ranking Method, Fringe Benefits, and Retirement are key elements in increasing and maintaining productivity and morale. Lortie (1975) believes that teaching continues to be rather limited in its available extrinsic rewards, and that if teacher satisfaction is to be increased, efforts will need to be made to improve the teaching situation itself. Miller and Swick (1976) identified a large number of incentives and reward systems that will motivate teachers to perform better. These include (1) acknowledgment of efforts by teachers for self-improvement, (2) compensation to encourage teacher self-improvement, (3) rewards for teacher accomplishments, and (4) community recognition of teacher efforts. Research by Fuller and Miskel (1972) identified fifty-two specific incentives that teachers said are important, among them, school system support, working conditions, salary and fringe benefits, and personal and professional relationships with teachers and students. McDonald (1979) found in a study that the most important satisfaction reported by teachers was gained by imparting knowledge to students. That this source of satisfaction may not be easily available has already been noted by Lortie (1975).

Bowditch, and Buono (2001), state that if an organization's goals, values, or particular work assignments are perceived as part of an individual's self-concept, as a means of growth and development, or as a way of asserting and challenging personal capabilities, task accomplishment becomes an end in itself. Then extrinsic incentives become less important. Social workers and teachers, for example, often complain about their working conditions and level of pay, yet still put in many hard hours dealing with clients or working with students because of the fulfillment and satisfaction derived from the work itself. This is not to suggest, however, that extrinsic incentives are unimportant. Good pay and benefits, sick leave, and pension plans are significant aspects of a person's total compensation package.

Recent studies have shown fairly conclusively that teachers are motivated more by intrinsic than by extrinsic rewards. Pastor and Erlandson (1982) conducted a survey which found that teachers perceive their needs and measure their job satisfaction by factors such as participation in decision-making, use of valued skills, freedom and independence, challenge, expression of creativity, and opportunity for learning. They concluded that high internal motivation, work satisfaction, and high-quality performance depend on three "critical psychological states": experienced meaningfulness, responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of results. Sergiovanni (1967) found that teachers obtain their greatest satisfaction through a sense of achievement in reaching and affecting students, experiencing recognition, and feeling responsible. Teachers are primarily motivated by intrinsic rewards such as self-respect, responsibility, and a sense of accomplishment. Thus administrators can boost morale and motivate teachers to excel by means of participatory governance, inservice education, and systematic, supportive evaluation.

Duncan (1976) found that teacher morale was significantly higher in schools with employee-oriented administrators than in schools with task-oriented administrators. He recommended, however, that a combination of the two styles be utilized by administrators in working with their staffs. Ingle and Munsterman (1977) noted that teachers in high-satisfaction schools perceived their principals to be more democratic than did teachers in low-satisfaction schools. Gorton (1976) recommended that administrators (1) attempt on a regular basis to obtain systematic feedback from staff members regarding their perceptions of problems, concerns, and issues; (2) exert a major effort toward improving the satisfaction that teachers derive from classroom teaching; (3) strive to improve the operation of the school and the overall quality of the educational program in the school; (4) try to be sensitive to, and mediate where appropriate, any problems of an interpersonal nature between and among teachers, students, and parents; (5) practice good human relations in interactions with the staff; and (6) provide meaningful participation for teachers in the decision-making processes of the school.

Symptoms of teacher dissatisfaction and low morale vary. They include questioning and criticizing of school goals and policies, lack of enthusiasm for teaching, rejection or lack of follow-up on administrative directives (Cook, 1979), absenteeism (Educational Research Service, 1980), and fragmentation, that is, a general feeling of being pulled in different directions (Klugman, Carter, and Israel, 1979). Some of these symptoms are also reported in a study by Stapleton et al. (1979). Tack, et al. (1992), express that only a few minorities are now in the academic pipeline, the minorities who complete the doctorate often choose other occupations because they do not view the faculty position as a viable career choice. (Jones and Nowotny 1990). Consequently, institutional officials in higher education must recognize the factors that lead to job dissatisfaction and eliminate them; conversely, they must recognize the factors that increase job satisfaction and enhance them.

The level of employee job satisfaction can have an impact on organizations. Potential organizational consequences of job satisfaction involve performance, absenteeism, turnover and burnout. These consequences have been discussed by many interested in job satisfaction. Carrell (1976) discussed several reasons for examining job satisfaction. He suggested that the relationships of satisfaction to training, absenteeism, and turnover were important. Cano and Miller (1992) explain; several researchers Davis, and Newstrom, (1989), Lawler (1977), Porter, and Steers (1973), Grady (1988) conducted a study which found support for a possible causal chain leading to job turnover/retention. The chain proceeded from individual

expectation through commitment propensity, along with meaningfulness of the job to increased commitment, through intention, and finally to turnover/retention.

In order to curb the negative consequences associated with job dissatisfaction a thorough understanding is required as to which factors lead to job satisfaction and which create job dissatisfaction (Davis and Newstrom 1989). Schuh (1967) states, as the overall level of job satisfaction increases, absenteeism and turnover significantly decline. The level of employee job satisfaction can have an impact on organizations. Potential organizational consequences of job satisfaction involve performance, absenteeism, and turnover. These consequences have been discussed by many researchers (i.e., Gruneberg 1979, Locke 1976, Spector, 1997) interested in job satisfaction.

According to Rocca, and Kostanski (2001), studies have been reasonably consistent in showing a strong association between job satisfaction and turnover. Edelwich, and Brodsky (1980) found that employees who are dissatisfied in their job become less committed or give up the profession altogether (Hulin, Roznowski, and Hachiya, 1985). In two investigations of the effects of unemployment, it was found that labour market factors interact with job satisfaction in prediction of quitting. Carsten and Spector (1987), and Gerhart (1990) suggested that, job dissatisfaction was more strongly related with high turnover during periods when the rate of unemployment was lower.

Porter, and Steers (1973), Baum, and Youngblood (1975), and Bartol (1979) reported that there was a low, but consistently positive correlation between job dissatisfaction and several factors, one of which was job turnover. According to Hackman, Lawler III, and Porter (1977), Ross and Zander (1957) measured the job satisfaction of 2680 female workers in a large company. Four months later, these researchers found that 169 of these employees had resigned; those who left were significantly more dissatisfied with the amount of recognition they received on their jobs, with the amount of achievement they experienced, and with the amount of autonomy they had.

Probably the major reason that turnover and satisfaction are not more strongly related is that turnover is very much influenced by the availability of other positions. Even if a person is very dissatisfied with his job, he is not likely to leave unless more attractive alternatives are available. There is research evidence to support the argument that voluntary turnover is much lower in periods of economic hardship. According to Perie, Baker, and Whitener (1997), recent research links turnover to school quality and cohesion as well as to school sector and size (Lee et al., 1991).

Hackman, Lawler III, and Porter (1977), in the 1950s, two major literature reviews showed that in most studies only a slight relationship had been found between satisfaction and performance. A later review by Vroom (1964) also showed that studies had not found a strong relationship between satisfaction and performance; in fact, most studies had found a very low positive relationship between the two. A considerable amount of recent work suggests that the slight existing relationship is probably due to better performance indirectly causing satisfaction rather than the reverse. Lawler and Porter (1967) explained this "performance causes satisfaction" viewpoint as follows:

In retrospect, it is hard to understand why the belief that high satisfaction causes high performance was so widely accepted. There is nothing in the literature on motivation that suggests this causal relationship. In fact, such a relationship is opposite to the concepts developed by both drive theory and expectancy theory. Yet, for some reason, many people believed-and some people still do believe-that the "satisfaction causes performance" view is best. Originally, much of the interest in job satisfaction stemmed from the belief that job satisfaction influenced job performance. The college teachers with high scores on job satisfaction performed better in classrooms and vice versa Hayat (1998). Specifically, psychologists thought that high job satisfaction led to high job performance (Hackman, Lawler III, and Porter 1977).

According to Rocca, and Kostanski (2001), absence (a failure to attend work) is a phenomenon that can reduce organisational effectiveness and efficiency by increasing labour costs. In a school environment it can be very detrimental to student learning. Smith (1977) hypothesised that job satisfaction plays a critical role in an employee's decision to be absent. Steers and Rhodes (1978) found a multiplicity of influences on

the employees' decision and ability to come to work. These influences included job dissatisfaction and a perceived lack of opportunities for further advancement. Empirical support for this position has proven difficult (Hackett, and Guion, 1985). The weak correlation between job satisfaction and absence may be due to a range of complex variables.

Research by Nicholson and Johns (1985), has found that organisations have 'absence cultures' that represent shared understandings about absence legitimacy and that define appropriate absence behaviour. Recent research on 'absence cultures' by Xie and Johns (2000) supports Nicholson and John's assertions. According to Hackman, Lawler III, and Porter (1977), like turnover, absenteeism has been found to be related to job satisfaction. The relationship between satisfaction and absenteeism seems to be stronger than the relationship between satisfaction and turnover. It is found that voluntary absence rates are much more closely related to satisfaction than are overall absence rates (Vroom, 1964).

Rocca, and Kostanski (2001) state, burnout has been identified as a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, feelings of depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do "people work" of some kind (Maslach, 1982). It is a response to the chronic emotional strain of dealing extensively with other individuals, particularly when they are troubled or have problems. It can be considered as one type of job stress. There are three components of burnout. "Depersonalisation" - the emotional distancing from direct care clients that results in a callous and uncaring attitude toward others. "Emotional exhaustion" - the feeling of fatigue and lack of enthusiasm for work. "Reduced personal accomplishment" - the sense that nothing of value is being done at work by the person. A pattern of emotional overload, and subsequent emotional exhaustion, is at the core of the burnout syndrome (Maslach, 1981).

According to Schwab and Iwanicki (1982), teachers exhibit signs of emotional exhaustion when they feel that they are incapable of giving 100% to students. Schwab and Iwanicki also suggest that teachers are likely to yell more at students and can also exhibit cognitive misfunctions (e.g., overlooking errors when correcting written tasks). The quality of teaching is therefore adversely affected.

Job satisfaction has been found to be strongly related to burnout, with dissatisfied employees more likely to report high levels of burnout than those who are satisfied (e.g. Bacharach, Bamberger, and Conley 1991; Shirom, 1989). Lee and Ashford (1993) reported a negative relationship between job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion compared with depersonalisation or personal accomplishment. Cordes, and Dougherty (1993) found burnout to be strongly associated with many other variables that are connected to job satisfaction such as low levels of control, life satisfaction, levels of health, and intentions of quitting current employment (Lee, and Ashford, 1993; Shirom, 1989). In a comparative study between Australian, American and Canadian state secondary school teachers, Sarros and Sarros (1990), found that Australian teachers scored lower on emotional exhaustion compared to American and Canadian teachers, but scored higher in depersonalisation and personal accomplishment.

According to Stanton et al. (2002), job satisfaction has been measured in several ways, ranging from single-item measures (Kunin 1955, Quinn and Shepard 1974, Scarpello and Combell 1983) to general multi-item measures (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson and Paul 1989) to multifaceted, multi-item measures (Smith, Kendall and Hulin 1969, Vroom 1964, Warr and Routledge 1969, Weiss, Dawis and Lofquist 1967).

One of the arguments often brought against the theories of job satisfaction is that they take little account of differences between people (Gruneberg 1979). In this portion the question of how different characteristics of organization affect job satisfaction is discussed. School location and size, demographic variables have been examined in a number of studies in education to determine their effects on the overall level of job satisfaction as well as satisfaction with various aspects of the job experienced by workers in various positions.

Newby, (1999) in her research indicated that principals in rural, suburban, and urban schools of Virginia were satisfied with their jobs. Suburban principals, however, appeared to be more satisfied than urban and rural principals, and rural principals appeared to be the least satisfied. Finley (1991) also noted significant difference between school location and overall job satisfaction of high school principals in Tennessee. The

principals whose schools were located in urban/inner city or urban/suburban locations scored significantly higher than principals whose schools were located in rural locations.

A striking dissimilarity between the suburban and urban principal satisfaction was observed by Derlin and Schneider (1994). Specifically, the factor pay was the least heavily weighted item in the third factor of the suburban principal model and was negatively weighted (-.50). In contrast, pay was the most heavily weighted item in the first factor for urban principals (.74). This discrepancy in factor location and weighting indicated that personal compensation is perceived differently in different educational setting (Derlin and Schneider, 1994).

One of the controversies surrounding school size is that school size affects the quality of interpersonal relationships one experiences in the school setting. Specifically, Barker (1986) summarized one of the advantages of small schools is that relationships between students, teachers, administrators, and school board members tend to be closer. In as much as the factor interpersonal relations is identified by Herzberg and the authors of the MSQ as being a measure of satisfaction, school size needs to be examined for a possible influence on principal job satisfaction.

School size was one of the three variables having a greater predictor of overall satisfaction for secondary female principals in the United States as measured by the JDI. Additionally school size was one of three determinants of job satisfaction in the sub-area promotion (Fansher and Buxton, 1984). Sparkes and McIntire (1987) reported evidence to support the notion that organizational factors are an important determinant of job satisfaction. After surveying 416 principals in Newfoundland and Labrador, they stated that principals of small schools in small communities have both physical and psychological needs that are not being met. They also stated that principals in smaller schools reported lower levels of overall and facet satisfaction. Their findings suggest that there are external or organizational factors that greatly influence the principal's job satisfaction.

Newby, (1999) research results showed that satisfaction increases significantly with school size; the larger the school, the greater the satisfaction level. Therefore, a positive linear association occurred between school size and satisfaction. Similar results were found by Finley (1991), noted that Tennessee's high school principals expressed significant difference in total satisfaction scores and student enrollment. The Scheffe post-hoc procedure revealed that principals with 1,301 or more students and principals with 1,001-1,300 students had significantly higher scores than principals with 401-700 students.

Middle school principals in Indiana were studied by comparing the overall level of job satisfaction of principals from small and large schools as measured by the MSQ (Lehman, 1991). Lehman concluded that variations did exist between small and large schools among the facets identified as least satisfying. Principals in small schools cited compensation as the least satisfying factor. In large schools, principals most often categorized independence as the least satisfying factor. Although there were variations between specific factors and job satisfaction of principals from small and large schools, the author found no evidence to suggest that a significant difference existed. In contrast, Hayat (1998) in his study states that college size was found to have contribution towards job satisfaction across the climate.

The primary goal of the above literature review was to find important information about the construct of job satisfaction and then conclude a problem from this knowledge. Therefore, these interested and important studies attracted the researcher to explore the things. Presently, the area of schools has been chosen as the focus of the study. It will be desirable to conduct such studies at other levels of education to explore the concept of job satisfaction, which will be necessarily resulting in an improvement in our present education system. The other main reason to measure the job satisfaction of the head teachers especially, was that the researcher himself has been a head teacher in a government elementary school for many recent years; felt that the head teachers in his area were not satisfied with different aspects of their jobs. In this regard it was considered that the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire is the most suitable tool for the purpose. So this study is an attempt to assess various important aspects of job satisfaction among head teachers of government elementary schools at Toba Tek Singh in the Punjab, Pakistan.

## 2. Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study was to measure the general job satisfaction of the head teachers working in government elementary schools. Specifically, this study sought to investigate three areas of job satisfaction. First, the study investigated the general job satisfaction levels of the government elementary school head teachers in context of their school location and size as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Second, the researcher sought to determine the influence of the variables; school location, and school size on the head teachers' general job satisfaction levels, and lastly to propose steps to improve the situation.

## 3. Research Guiding Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the general job satisfaction level of the head teachers working in government elementary schools of district Toba Tek Singh in the Punjab, Pakistan?
2. What is the general satisfaction level of the government elementary school head teachers according to the demographic variables; school location, and school size?
3. Is there a significant difference among the job satisfaction levels of the rural and urban school head teachers?
4. Is there a significant difference among the job satisfaction levels of the head teachers of smaller and bigger schools?
5. What are the proposed steps to improve the situation?

## 4. Assumptions of the Study

The assumptions listed below were necessary to establish a prudent starting point for the study:

- Respondents were well aware of the concept of job satisfaction.
- An objective and impartial response by the respondents was expected.
- Respondents were cooperative with the researcher.
- The chosen research instrument reflected an assessment of the participants' perceptions regarding job satisfaction.

## 5. Research Methodology

The general intent of this descriptive study was to document general job satisfaction of government elementary school head teachers. As surveys are the most widely used technique in education and the behavioral sciences for the collection of data, and job satisfaction research is mostly done with questionnaires, therefore, survey design was used to obtain needed information.

### 5.1 Selection of Population and Sample

The population of this study was consisted of all the male and female head teachers of government elementary schools situated in all areas (rural & urban) of district Toba Tek Singh in the Punjab, Pakistan. The teachers of all categories who were working as head teachers in government elementary schools at district Toba Tek Singh (in any area, i.e., rural or urban) in the Punjab, Pakistan (except the sampled for pilot study), were asked to fill the questionnaire. In simple words, to make the results more authentic at district level; population was hundred percent sampled.

## 5.2 Instrumentation

The Urdu version of the modified Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used as a research tool in this study. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) 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.

The MSQ is based on the following rationale:

- a) Employees have a set of expectations concerning their work environments that are derived from their histories, individual abilities, and interests;
- b) Employees have a set of work attitudes that emerge from the fulfillment of those expectations, and
- c) These attitudes make up employees' evaluation of their work environment or job satisfaction.

There were two versions of the long-form MSQ a 1977 version and a 1967 version. The 1977 version, which was originally copyrighted in 1963, uses the following five response choices: Very Satisfied, Satisfied, "N" (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, a 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.

The 1967 Long-Form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was slightly modified; an Urdu version of the MSQ was developed, and used to assess the population's job satisfaction level. The selected variable school location is referred to the geographical location of the head teacher's school. School location was measured by indicating "rural" and "urban". Rural referred to schools located in the agricultural areas outside a city or town. Urban referred to schools located in the towns and cities. School size is referred to school enrollment. This variable was measured by asking respondents to select the range of figures indicating the number of students enrolled in the school.

The MSQ 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. 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.

## 5.3 Statistical Treatment

The categories for each variable were assigned codes, and the codes were entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-10) data base (e.g., for Location, rural was assigned the code 1 and urban was assigned 2). Frequencies and summary statistics were computed and reported. These scores indicated the number of head teachers who participated in the study. To assess the frequencies of response for each of the 5 response options on the MSQ Likert Scale. The 5 options, applied scale and the assigned weight for each were:

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

The job satisfaction scores for each respondent were obtained by summing the scores for specific items on the MSQ. A measure of general satisfaction was determined by calculating a mean score for item numbers 24, 25, 28, 30, 35, 43, 51, 61, 66, 67, 69, 72, 74, 77, 82, 93, 96, 98, 99, and 100. Using the weighted scores described above, it was found that the mean satisfaction scores for the head teachers ranged from 1 to 5 ("Not Satisfied" to "Extremely Satisfied"). An analysis of the satisfaction scores was presented according to the both demographic variables selected for this study. A mean satisfaction score and the standard deviation were calculated and tabulated for job satisfaction with each demographic group by categories. These data show the degree of general satisfaction for each of the demographic groups and the comparative scores were tabulated and presented in tables and interpretation form.

## 6. Data Analysis

The calculated mean (M) was 3.08 with a standard deviation (SD) of .36. Therefore, the mean for the respondents fell within the "Satisfied" range (2.51-3.50) on the scale (< 1.5 = "Not Satisfied" to > 4.5 = "Extremely Satisfied"). The highest general satisfaction scores were observed for the head teachers of urban schools (M = 3.20, SD = .36), and the head teachers with 400 students or less (M = 3.10, SD = .37). All of the highest scores fell within the "Satisfied" range (2.51-3.50). The lowest general satisfaction mean scores were observed for the head teachers located in rural schools (M = 3.04, SD = .36), and the head teachers with greater than 400 students (M = 3.03, SD = .36). All the lowest scores fell within the "Satisfied" range (2.51-3.50).

**Table 1: Difference between Rural and Urban head teachers' level of Job Satisfaction**

School Location	N	Mean	SD	df	t	P
Rural	139	3.04	.36			
Urban	41	3.20	.36	178	-2.59	.01*

\*P < .05

The Independent-Samples t-test reports statistically significant differences between means for school location (P = .01). Concluding from the output of, table 1 explains that t value (-2.59) is significant at .05 level of significance. It is concluded that there is a significant difference between rural and urban head teachers' level of job satisfaction. The head teachers working in urban (M=3.20, SD=.36) areas were more satisfied with their positions than the head teachers from rural (M=3.04, SD=.36) areas.

Table 2: Difference between smaller and bigger school head teachers' Job Satisfaction

School Size	N	Mean	SD	df	t	P
400 or Less Students	116	3.10	.37			
Greater than 400 Students	64	3.03	.36	178	1.27	.20

\*P &lt; .05

The Independent-Samples t-test reports statistically no significant differences between means for school size ( $P = .20$ ). Concluding from the output of the table 2 explains that t value (1.27) is not significant at .05 level of significance. Therefore, no significant differences between smaller ( $M=3.10$ ,  $SD=.37$ ) and bigger ( $M=3.03$ ,  $SD=.36$ ) school head teachers' level of job satisfaction were found.

## 7. Discussion

Overall, the responses indicated that the respondents in this study were satisfied with their positions. Findings in this study showed that the head teachers in urban schools were significantly more satisfied with their jobs than the head teachers working in rural schools. Finley (1991) and Newby (1999) reached the same conclusion that rural head teachers tended to be the least satisfied group. Urban head teachers are probably more satisfied because they may have more chances for good physical conditions, more opportunities to earn money (e.g. part time jobs like tuition academies), fulfilling of necessities of life, conducive environments for themselves and their children's education, etc. than head teachers located in rural schools. The socioeconomic status of the urban community is higher than the other communities living in rural areas. Consequently, the inequity that exists in the head teachers' socioeconomic status from one locality to other has may effect on the head teacher job satisfaction level. Therefore, the teachers working in urban schools were found more satisfied with their jobs as compared to head teachers working in rural schools.

Findings showed that the head teachers from smaller schools scored more on general job satisfaction as compared to the head teachers of bigger schools. But no significant differences were observed between the head teachers of smaller schools and the head teachers of bigger schools for general job satisfaction. Therefore, these results are contrary to the conclusions of Finely (1991) and Newby (1999). The reason for the low satisfaction of head teachers with larger schools was not explored in this study; however, head teachers of larger schools may feel that they are not being highly respected in the community as they expect being a head of a large institution. It can also be assumed that it is very difficult task to manage bigger schools. Moreover, they may feel that their compensation is low as their work in a bigger institution. In bigger schools, there are so many problems which head teachers have to face occasionally. On the other hand in these schools head teachers have to do a lot of work as compared to head teachers working in smaller schools. However, the compensation package is equal for both. Considering such factors, the head teachers of bigger schools may feel low satisfaction with their job as compare to the head teachers of smaller schools.

## 8. Conclusions

1. The head teachers working in government elementary schools at district Toba Tek Singh in the Punjab, Pakistan were found generally satisfied with their positions.

2. The head teachers of all categories with respect to their demographic variables school location and size were found generally satisfied with their jobs.
3. The head teachers of government elementary schools working in urban areas were found significantly more satisfied than the head teachers of rural areas.
4. No significant differences were found among the job satisfaction levels of the head teachers working in smaller and larger schools.
5. The demographic variable School Location was found to be the significant predictor of job satisfaction in this study.

## 9. Recommendations

1. On the basis of the responses to the MSQ, it appears that elementary school head teachers (Toba Tek Singh) in the Punjab, Pakistan were satisfied with their jobs. Policy makers and other concerned authorities should put great effort to either maintain this level of satisfaction or increase it to a higher level in order to promote positive perceptions for this important position. This may be done by increasing satisfaction for different aspects of job; Compensation, Working Conditions, Social Status, and School System Policies and Practices.
2. There is need to improve the job satisfaction level of the government elementary school head teachers working in rural areas of district Toba Tek Singh. This can be done while providing them some special facilities, incentives, and allowances, like better working conditions and transport or travelling allowance etc.
3. Study on satisfaction and school location should be conducted to investigate the reason why satisfaction increases with urban schools and studies to investigate more predictors to job satisfaction should be conducted.

## References

- Bacharach, S.B., Bamberger, P. and Conley, S., (1991) Work-home Conflict Among Nurses and Engineers, Mediating the Impact of Role Stress on Burnout and Satisfaction of Work, *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 12, P. 39-53
- Barker, B. O., (1986) The Advantages of Small Schools. (Report No. RC 015-607) Las Cruces, NM ERIC Clearing House of Rural Education and Small Schools, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265-988)
- Bartol, KM., (1979) Individual versus Organizational Predictors of Job Satisfaction and Turnover among Professionals, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, SS-76
- Baum, J.F. and Youngblood, A. A., (1975) Impact of Organizational Control Policy on Absenteeism, Performance, and Satisfaction, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, P. 688-694
- Bowditch J. L. and A. F. Buono., (2001) A Primer on Organizational Behavior, (5<sup>th</sup>Ed.), John Wiley & Sons Inc New York, P. 63-100
- Cano, J. and G. Miller., (1992) An Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Job Satisfier Factors Among Six Taxonomies of Agricultural Education Teachers, The Ohio State University, P. 9
- Carrell, M., (1976) How to Measure Job Satisfaction, *Training* 13, P. 25-27
- Chruden, H. J., and A. W. Sherman., (1976) Readings in Personnel Management, 4<sup>th</sup>Ed., South-Western Publishing Co. Cincinnati, Ohio, P. 102-122
- Cook, D. H., (1979) Teacher Morale: Symptoms, Diagnosis, and Prescription. *Clearing House*, 52, P. 355-358
- Cordes, C. L. and Dougherty, T. W., (1993) A Review and an Integration of Research on Job Burnout, *Academy of Management Review*, 18, P. 621-656
- Davis, K. and Newstrom, J. W. (1989) *Human Behavior at Work: Organizational Behavior*, (8<sup>th</sup>Ed.) New York, McGraw Hill
- Derlin, R. and Schneider, G. T., (1994) Understanding Job Satisfaction Principals and Teachers, *Urban and Suburban, Urban Education*, 29 (1), P. 63-88
- Duncan, F. M., (1976) Task- and Employee-oriented Styles of Behavior in Selected Minnesota School Administrators, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 116 279)
- Edelwich, J., and Brodsky, A., (1980) *Burnout: Stages of Disillusionment in the Helping Professions*, New York, Human Services Press
- Educational Research Service, Inc. (1980) *Employee Absenteeism: A Summary of Research Service*
- Fansher, T. A. and Buxton, T. H. (1984) A Job Satisfaction Profile of the Female Secondary School Principal in the United States, *NASSP Bulletin*

- Finley, W. H. (1991) High School Principals Job Satisfaction, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee
- Fuller, R. and Miskel, C., (1972) Work Attachments and Job Satisfaction among Public Schools Educators, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago
- Gerhart, B., (1990), Voluntary Turnover and Alternative Job Opportunities, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 5, P. 467-476
- Gibson J. L., et al., (1985) *Organizations Behavior: Structure, Processes*, (5<sup>th</sup>Ed.), Business Publications, Inc. Plano, Texas 75075, P. 35
- Gorton, R. A., (1976) *School Administration*, Duhuque, Iowa: Brown
- Grady, T. L., (1988) Identifying Determinants of Commitment and Turnover Behavior, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Vocational Research Association, St. Louis, MO
- Gross, N. and Herriott, R. E., (1965) *Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry*, New York: Wiley
- Gruneberg M. M. (1979) *Understanding Job Satisfaction*, The Macmillan Press, London
- Hackett, R.D. and Guion, R.M., (1985) *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, A Re-evaluation of the Absenteeism-Job Satisfaction Relationship, P. 340-381.
- Hackman J. R., et al., (1977) *Perspectives on Behavior in Organization*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, P. 39-49.
- Hayat Skindar, (1998) A Study of Organizational Climate, Job Satisfaction and Classroom Performance of College Teachers, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Institute of Educational Research (I.E.R) The Punjab University, Lahore
- Hoppock, R., (1935) *Job Satisfaction*, New York, Harper, P. 47
- Hullin, C.L, Roznowski, M. and Hachiya, D., (1985), Alternative Opportunities and Withdrawal Decisions: Empirical and Theoretical Discrepancies and an Integration, *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, P. 233-250
- Ingle, E. B. and Munsterman, R. E., (1977) Relationship of Values to Group Satisfaction, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York
- Ironson, G. H., et al., (1989) Construction of a Job in General Scale: A Comparison of Global, Composite and Specific Measures, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, P. 1-8, 193-200
- Jones, L. and F. Nowotny, (1990) *New Directions for Higher Education, An Agenda for the New Decade*. No. 70, San Francisco, Jossey-Boss
- Klugman, E., Carter, S. and Israel, S., (1979) Too Many Pieces: A Study of Teachers' Satisfaction in the Elementary School, (ERIC; Document Reproduction Service No. ED 178 515)
- Kunin, T., (1955) The Construction of a New Type of Attitude Measure. *Personnel Psychology*, 8, P. 65-67
- Lawler, E. E. and Porter, (1967), The Effect of Performance on Job Satisfaction, *Industrial Relations*, 7, P. 20-25
- Lawler, E. E., (1977) *Contemporary Problems in Personnel, Job and Work Satisfaction* in W. D. Hamner and F. L. Schmidt (Eds.), Chicago: St. Clair Press
- Lee, R.T. and Ashford, B.E., (1993) A Further Examination of Managerial Burnout: Toward an Integrated Model, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, P. 3-20
- Lee, V. E., Dedrick, R. F. and Smith, J. B., (1991) The Effect of the Social Organization of Schools on Teachers' Efficacy and Satisfaction, *Sociology of Education*, 64, P. 190-208.
- Lehman, L. E., (1991) School Size as a Correlate of Job Satisfaction among Middle Level Principals in Indiana, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Terre Haute, Indiana.
- Locke, E. A. (1976) The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction in Dunnette, *Handbook of the Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, M.D. (Ed.), Chicago, Rand McNally, P. 1297-1349
- Lortie, D. C., (1975) *School Teacher: A Sociological Study*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Maslach, C., (1981) The Burnout Syndrome, *Burnout: A Social Psychological Analysis* in J.W. Jones (Ed.), Park Ridge IL: London House Press
- Maslach, C., (1982) *Burnout-The Cost of Caring*, Prentice Hall Inc., USA
- McDonald, R. A., (1979) A Study of the Intrinsic Reward Structure of the Classroom for the Teacher, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1978), *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 40, 585A
- Miller, L. G. and Swick, J., (1976) Community Incentives for Teacher Excellence, *Education*, 96, P. 235-237
- Nebel, E. C., (1978) The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration, *Motivation, Leadership, and Employee Performance*, *Quarterly* 19, P. 62-69
- Newby, J. E. (1999) Job Satisfaction of Middle School Principals in Virginia, Doctoral Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, February
- Nicholson, N. and Johns, G., (1985) The Absence Culture and the Psychological Contract: Who's in Control of Absence? *Academy of Management Review*, 10, P. 397- 407
- Pastor, M. C., (1982) A Study of Higher Order Need Strength and Job Satisfaction in Secondary Public School Teachers, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 20, Summer, P. 172-183
- Perie, M. and D. P. Baker, (1997) *Job Satisfaction Among America's Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation Statistical Analysis Report*, American Institutes for Research, National Center for Education Statistics U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement NCES 97-XXX. July, P. 3-4
- Quinn, R., and Shepard, G.L., (1974) *The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey*, Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research
- Robbins, S., Water-Marsh, T., Cacioppe, R., and Millet, B., (1995) *Organizational Behaviour Concepts, Controversies and Applications*, Australia, Sydney: Prentice Hall

- Rocca, A. D. and M. Kostanski, (2001) Burnout and Job Satisfaction amongst Victorian Secondary School Teachers: A Comparative Look at Contract and Permanent Employment, Discussion Paper ATEA Conference. Teacher Education: Change of Heart, Mind and Action. Melbourne. September, P. 1-7
- Ross, E. and Zander, A. F., (1957), Need Satisfaction and Employee Turnover, *Personnel Psychology*, 10, P. 327-338
- Sarros, J.C., and Sarros, A.M., (1990) How Burned Out are Teachers? A Cross-Cultural Study, *Australian Journal of Education*, 34, P. 145-152
- Scarpello, V. and Campbell, J. P., (1983) Job Satisfaction: Are all the parts there? *Personnel Psychology*, P. 36:577-600
- Schuh, A., (1967) The Predictability of Employee Tenure: A Review of the Literature, *Personnel Psychology*, 20, P. 133-152
- Schwab, R. L., and Iwanicki, E. F., (1982) Perceived Role Conflict, Role ambiguity, and Teacher Burnout, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18, P. 60-74
- Sergiovanni, T. J., (1967) Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 5, P. 66-82
- Shirom, A., (1989) International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Burnout in Work Organizations in C.L Cooper and I. Robertson. Chichester UK: Wiley. P. 25-48
- Smith, F.J., (1977) Work Attitudes as Predictors of Attendance on a Specific Day. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Feb, P. 16-19.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M. and Hulin, C. L., (1969) *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*, Chicago: Rand McNally
- Sparkes, R. L. and McIntire, W. G., (1987) Community and School Size as Factors in the Job Satisfaction of Principals in Newfoundland and Labradore, *Journal of Rural and Small Schools*, 23, P. 11-15
- Spector, P. E., (1997) *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences*, London: Sage
- Stanton, J. M., et al., (2002) Revising the JDI Work Satisfaction Subscale: Insights into Stress and Control, Department of Psychology, Bowling Green State University Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 62, Sage Publications, P. 878-879
- Stapleton, J. C., et al., (1979) The Relationship Between Teacher Brinkmanship and Teacher Job Satisfaction, *Planning and Changing*, 10, P. 157-168
- Steers, R. and Porter, L., (1975) *Motivation and Work Behavior*, New York: McGraw-Hill, P. 15
- Steers, R. M. and Rhodes, S., (1978) Major Influences on Employee Attendance: A Process Model, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, P. 391-407
- Strauss, G., (1974) *Organizational Behavior: Research and Issues, Job Satisfaction, Motivation, and Job Redesign* in G. Strauss, R. E. Miles, and Tannenbaum (Eds), Madison, Wis.: Industrial Relations Research Association, P. 19-49
- Tack, M. W. and Patitu, C. L., (1992) Faculty Job Satisfaction: Women and Minorities in Peril, ERIC Digest, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education Washington DC. BBB27915 \_ George Washington Univ. Washington DC. School of Education and Human Development, ERIC Identifier ED355859, ED 353 885, P.12-14
- Vroom, V. H., (1964) *Work and Motivation*, New York: John Wiley
- Wanous, J. P. and Lawler, E. E., (1972) Measurement and Meaning of Job Satisfaction, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56, 95-105
- Warr, B. and Routledge, T., (1969) An Opinion Scale for the Study of Managers' Job Satisfaction, *Occupational Psychology*, 43, P. 95-109
- 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*
- Xie, J. L. and Johns, G., (2000) Interactive Effects of Absence Culture Saliency and Group Cohesiveness: A Multi-level and Cross Level Analysis of Work Absenteeism in the Chinese Context, *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 73, P. 31-52