

Role of Job-Satisfaction among Secondary School Principals in Bahraich District

Mr. Nand Kumar Shukla, Research Scholar ,
Dr. R. M. L. University, Faizabad, U.P. India.

Dr. Somveer Singh, Head Deptt. of Education ,
Gayatri Vidyapitha P.G. College, Risia. Bahraich U.P.India.

INTRODUCTION

Every society establishes and develops many organizations in course of time to achieve a variety of goals and objectives. They serve various social, economic, cultural, political, religious and other purposes. India is facing different type of challenges, which are of great significance from the point of view of development. In this context, education is the most potent instrument of imparting knowledge to people, providing them a sense of purpose and develops qualities and values in them, which are essential for building a strong , cohesive and enlightened nation. In the history of mankind, education has always been considered a potential means and strong base for the development of human society. Through the development of attitudes, values, capabilities, knowledge and skills, education plays a vital role in realizing the hopes and aspirations of the society, but this happens only when it becomes an effective instrument for achieving the set goals .

Every educational institution has fabrics of roles played by persons working in the organization, such as-principals, teachers, students and ministerial staff, who behave in accordance with established norms for their roles to achieve the common goal of the organization. To a great extent the success of an educational institution depends upon its principal. He occupies an important position in the institution; he bears the main responsibility of leading the whole staff. In

The field of education, rapid and wide spread changes within the Profession and throughout the larger society are creating enormous pressures on the institution, particularly on the college administrators. It is they who are confronted with an extraordinarily complex array of choices relative to their functions of organization and leadership.

Attempts have been made to study the job-satisfaction and administrative effectiveness. Smith (1977), Simmons (1978), Agarwal (1983), Wesson (1994), Newby (2007), Clark et. al. (2009), Kappagoda (2011) and Nadeem (2013) studied job-satisfaction with different variables. In these studies academic educational needs health problems , gender etc. of teachers and other professionals have been studied . Job-satisfaction levels of principals have not been studied. Therefore, present investigator was interested to take such a study.

Objectives of the Study

Following are the objectives of the study:-

1. To compare the job-satisfaction and sex of principals.
2. To compare the job-satisfaction of principals with urban- rural location of institutions.

Hypotheses of the Study:-

Following are the hypotheses of the study:-

1. There is no significant difference in the job-satisfaction of male and female principals.
2. There is no significant difference in the job-satisfaction of urban and rural principals.

METHODS OF THE STUDY:-

In the present study descriptive survey method has been used for the study of job-satisfaction of **secondary school principals**. The population for the study consisted of 70 principals of secondary schools of Bahraich District out of which 50 schools are from rural area and 50 are from urban area .

TOOLS USED:-

For measuring the job-satisfaction of the secondary school Principal's, an Indian adaptation of Brayfield and Rothe's (1967) , Index of Job-satisfaction made by Rathore (1983), was used. He found split – half reliability of this scale to be 0.80 and test – retest reliability to be 0.92, which is

significantly high to consider this index as reliable .

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA:-

The collected data was tabulated and frequency distributions, prepared for male / female and

urban / rural principals. Mean , S,D. were calculated . Significance of mean difference was tested by t- test , which have been shown in the following tables

**Table - I
Difference Between Job-satisfaction of Male and Female Principals**

S.NO.	NAME OF GROUP	N	Mean Job-satisfaction Score	S.D.	't' value	Level of Significance
1.	Male Principals	56	79.08	4.37	3.97	0.01 level
2.	Female Principals	14	83.14	3.09		

Above table shows that the t- value is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Thus the hypothesis is rejected. It means that these two groups of principals are not similar on job-satisfaction.

**Table - II
Difference between Job-satisfaction of Urban and Rural Principals**

S.NO.	NAME OF GROUP	N	Mean job-satisfaction Score	S.D.	't' value	Level of Significance
1.	Urban Principals	20	83.2	3.54	4.76	0.01 LEVEL
2.	Rural Principals	50	78.54	4.05		

Above table shows that the t- value is significant at 0.01 levels of significance. Thus the hypothesis is rejected at both the levels . It may be concluded that these two group of principals are not similar on job-satisfaction level . In other words it may be said that urban principals have better satisfaction as compared to rural ones .

FINDINGS:- It was found that male and female principals are not similar on job-satisfaction on the other hand urban and rural

Principals are also do not similar on job-satisfaction .

CONCLUSIONS :- The result of the study shows that there is positive and significant difference in the job-satisfaction of male and female principals. It may be said that female principals are more satisfied with their jobs than male principals . On the other hand it is found that Urban Principals are more satisfied with their job than Rural Principals.

REFERENCES :-

1. Smith, Don R. C.(1977),“Assistant Principal : With the Title Goes to Glory” ,Thrust , 6:5, pp.10.
3. Agrawal, Vidya (1983),“ A Study of Stress Proneness , Adjustment and Job-satisfaction as predictors of Administrative Effectiveness of Principals ”, Ph.D.Thesis, Meerut University, Meerut.
- 4 Wesson Linda Hampton (1994), “ An Analysis of Women Urban Superintendents”, urban Education , 1994, Vol, 28, no.4. pp. 412-424.
5. Waskiewicz Stanley Peter(1999) , “ Variables that Contribute to Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Assistant Principals”,Dissertation .Abs. Feb. 1999, Blacksburg , Virginia.
6. Newby, JoeAnn E.(2007), “ Job Satisfaction of Middle School in Virginia”, Disst. Faculty of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University .
- 7.Taylor, John R. (2007), “ Job Satisfaction of High School Assistant Principals in Seven Florida Counties ”,Diss. College of Education , University of South Florida.
8. Clark et al. (2009),“ School Principals and School Performance”, CALDER Working Paper No. 38.
9. Kappagoda Sampath (2011), “ The Relationship between Principals Emotional Intelligence and Teachers ’ Job Satisfaction : A Case of National Schools in Sri Lanka ”, International Conference on Business & Information , <http://ssrn.com> .
10. Nadeem (2013), “Study of Personality Adjustment and Job Satisfaction of Rural and Urban Secondary School Teachers”, Standard Journal of Education and Essay Vol.1(1), pp. 25

