

How to Cite This Article: Rana, M. I, Khan, W. A., Yasir, W., Taseer, N. A., & Kishwar, R. (2023). Effect of Job Satisfaction of Elementary School Teachers on School Effectiveness. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 3(1), 833–845. <https://doi.org/10.54183/jssr.v3i1.232>



Effect of Job Satisfaction of Elementary School Teachers on School Effectiveness

Muhammad Iqbal Rana	Department of Education, Thal University, Bhakkar, Punjab, Pakistan.
Waqar Akbar Khan	PhD Scholar, Shandong University of Finance & Economics, Jinan, China.
Wajiha Yasir	Lecturer, Army Burnhall College for Girls, Abbottabad, KP, Pakistan.
Naveed Ahmad Taseer	PhD Scholar at Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
Rabia Kishwer	MS Scholar, International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Vol. 3, No. 1 (Winter 2023)

Pages: 833 – 845

ISSN (Print): 2789–441X

ISSN (Online): 2789–4428

Key Words

Job Satisfaction, Elementary School, Effectiveness

Corresponding Author:

Muhammad Iqbal Rana
Email: m.iqbal@tu.edu.pk

Abstract: This study examines the impact of job satisfaction on school effectiveness among elementary school teachers using a convenient sampling technique with a sample size of 100 teachers. This research aims to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and school effectiveness and how the former can influence the latter. The study used a mixed-methods approach to collect data, including both quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative data were collected through a questionnaire survey, while the qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews. The findings of this study reveal a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and school effectiveness among elementary school teachers. The results also show that job satisfaction influences teachers' commitment, motivation, and engagement in their work, leading to improved student outcomes and school performance. The study concludes that enhancing the job satisfaction of elementary school teachers can improve school effectiveness and quality of education.

Introduction

It has always been challenging to conceive school effectiveness because of its complexity. Everyone agrees that knowing the fundamentals is crucial for a solid educational foundation. Management and leadership skills, teacher effectiveness, student motivation, school atmosphere, parental involvement, community support, and student achievement are significant in determining a school's overall effectiveness. So, it's hard to control things like school effectiveness that try to take all of these things into account (Ostroff & Schmitt, 1993). "School Effectiveness Research" (SER) is a field of study that looks at how schools

compare to each other and what factors are most important for helping students do better in school. A student's academic success is often judged by how well they do on standardized tests. Edmonds (1979) and Rutter, Maughan, et al. did the first studies that most people think of as the start of School Effectiveness Research (1979). In the early days of the field of SER, most of the work was done to directly refute the claim that "schools don't make a difference." Coleman et al. (1966) and Jencks et al. (1972) both came to the same conclusions.

Since 1979, there have been a lot more studies on how well schools work, thanks in large part to strong government support in many countries. Most of the time, the results of an experiment are related to economic and social science theory, and sophisticated methods are used to collect and analyze data (Stringfield, 1995; Scheerens, 1997). Scheerens and Bosker (1997) and Teddlie and Reynolds (1999) are the best places to start learning about SER's basics (2000). Yet, people who disagree with SER from the outside have brought up important concerns that SER authors have been ignoring for years.

"Job satisfaction" was first used by Rocca and Kostanski to describe how much people enjoy their jobs (2001). Positivity comes from being happy at work, while negativity comes from not being happy at work (Robbins et al., 1994). Experts in the field of education agree that employees are happy at work when their needs and values are met (Locke, 1976; Locke et al., 1983; Olsen, 1993; Buschet et al., 1996). (1998).

Job satisfaction comes from three things: the uniqueness of the tasks, the uniqueness of the organization in which the tasks are done, and the uniqueness of the workers themselves (Glisson & Durick, 1988).

Rarely is it possible to compare the exact effects of variables across all groups when using the same set of predictors (Herman & Hulin, 1972; Buchanan, 1974; Herman et al., 1975; Steers, 1977; Rousseau, 1978; Stevens et al., 1978; Morris & Sherman, 1981; Staw & Ross, 1985). Only two of the three factors have had much research done on them. Individual studies have either focused on finding predictors of satisfaction (Porter et al., 1974; Marsh & Mannari, 1977; O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1981; Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Williams & Hazer, 1986; Lee and Mowday, 1987) or have kept researchers from comparing the effects of each predictor on satisfaction. Because of this, there has yet to be much research done on human service organizations, which are often thought to have lower job satisfaction than other

types of businesses (Schoderbek et al., 1979; Solomon, 1986).

Johnson and Holdaway (1994) have focused on polling school principals about how happy they are with their jobs. They came up with three main reasons why the problem was happening. The first is that low satisfaction levels are linked to absenteeism and the salary of the school's head teacher, which could be a better thing. Second, there is a strong link between the happiness of each person and the quality of life in society as a whole. The third and final factor is new problems and issues, such as modernization, revolutionary technological advances, and growing liabilities. These things put stress on principals and require them to pay more attention to how happy their employees are at work.

Significance of the Study

Several studies on school effectiveness and job satisfaction have approved interventions to address the challenges. However, despite the many efforts to address these challenges, we still witness a teaching force that needs to be more active and apathetic in assisting the learners in obtaining the knowledge and competencies for future career configuration. This study will also help improve the teachers' performance regarding their duties and school effectiveness. The findings of the study would be beneficial for all the stakeholders of the education department in Pakistan. Policymakers and recruiting agencies for head teachers can get guidance and research-bound evidence for the appropriate selection and development of head teachers.

Objectives of the Study

1. Explore and examine the factors which affect school effectiveness.
2. Identify aspects of the head's role that impact school effectiveness.

The questions related to this study are as follows:

The study focuses on the investigation of the main question:

What factors affect the school's effectiveness if teachers of Elementary Schools are satisfied with their job?

This question has been answered through the following sub-questions:

1. What are the measures of school effectiveness?
2. What is the role of the head teacher in school effectiveness?
3. Is gender a source of variation in determining school effectiveness?

Review of Related Literature

Concept of School Effectiveness

Many people have different ideas about what makes a school good academically. The "input-output" view (Cheng, 1996; Lockheed & Hanushek, 1988), "schools in which students progress beyond what might be expected from thinking about its intake" (Sammons & Mortimore, 1995, p. 1), "progress in student attainment" (Willms, 1992, p. 34), and a more "holistic" view that shouldn't just focus on intellectual achievement have all been at odds with each other (1992, p. 4). Reynolds et al. (1996) say that having the right tools and people on hand is very important for success. People have to choose between different things, which makes it hard to say for sure what makes a school successful. "The HM Inspectorate of Schools in Scotland" (Drever, 1991) said in 1996 (Stoll and Fink) that outcomes should be used to measure success and that "value-added, "or the information students learn in school. More research supports the report's conclusion that non-cognitive areas should be part of the result (e.g. Rutter, 1979; Mortimore et al., 1988a;).

One could say that a school is effective if, over a few years, its policies and practices produce positive results for the vast majority of its students that can be seen (but not necessarily measured) (Reynolds, 1985; Ninan, 2006).

Because of this, the success of a school can be judged less by how many students go there and more by how well they learn overall. "Intake" is not very important to the success of a school (HMI, 1977). This goes against the idea that a school's test scores have little to do with how well it does overall (Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000, p.15).

Parental involvement in early childhood education has many benefits, but parents can run into problems that make it hard for them to be involved in their children's schooling. For example, low-income families may struggle to pay for school events, fees and a good place for their kids to learn at home due to high inflation (Jamil, 2022), other macro living factors (Jamil, Rasheed et al. 2023) institute responsibility (Jamil & Rasheed, 2023).

Mortimore says a good school is better for a child's future than other schools with similar admissions (Sammons & Mortimore, 1995). This idea of a school's "value-added" came from the need to put students' outcomes at the top of all research methods, including evaluations of how well schools do their jobs (McPherson, 1992). After that, we talked about things like reliability and durability, which are methodological issues. Hoy and Miskel (2001, p.290) did not agree that a school is good at what it does if the results of its extracurricular activities meet or beat its goals. In this situation, the idea that a good school pushes its students to do well is appropriate (Murphy, 1990). So, it should not be a surprise that a school's perceived competence is strongly linked to how much it focuses on and regularly checks the intellectual growth of its students (Al Waner, 2005). A school is academically strong if it always meets or exceeds its stated goals.

On the other hand, some people think schools are doing a good job if their students do better than average (Cuttance, 1985, p.13). In education, "effectiveness" means that a school can meet or exceed its stated goals. The goals that are set should be a true reflection of how smart the kids are. Using value-added scores is a good way to consider new students' achievement levels

(Sammons et al., 1996a in Teddlie and Reynolds, 2000, p.72). A competent institution can meet or go above and beyond its goals.

People in the UK and the US tend to judge the quality of a school only by how well its students do on tests. On the other hand, Australians think a school is good if it helps every student learn and protects their privacy (ACT, 2005).

All assessments agree that you can tell the difference between good and bad schools, but there still needs to be an agreement on what makes a good school and what makes a bad one. Different studies have different ideas about what makes a school good. Screens (2000) adds to what Reid, Hopkins, and Holly (1987) say on page 22: "School effectiveness is hard to define, and once defined, it is hard to argue."

So, there are many different ideas about what makes a school successful. As Firestone (1991, p. 2) said, "defining the performance of a given school is always a matter of choosing between values that are at odds with each other." So, he says, "the government will argue about the standards of effectiveness."

One of the most important things for how well a school works is What makes a school work well is being looked at very closely (SE). Most of the time, academics have differing views on what makes a school successful. School performance is improving because of things unique to the school setting (Scheerens, 2004). It includes everything in and around a school, such as lessons, research, administration, student motivation, and community service. Most research on how well schools work has focused on improving teaching conditions and output indicators, like how well students do.

Factors Ascertaining School Effectiveness

After looking at the relevant literature, the following have been found to affect how well a school works. In this category are things like the school's mission, curriculum, instruction, assessment and evaluation, classroom relationships, classroom management,

leadership, community involvement, a secure and well-organized environment, professionalism, school culture, home environment, high hopes, career advancement, community expertise, quality control, and coordination between the principal and faculty.

Definition of Job Satisfaction

Webster's Lexicon from 1986 says job satisfaction is "the degree to which a person gets pleasure or satisfaction from his or her job." A lot has been written about job satisfaction, and different theorists have come up with helpful operational definitions. Others have been mentioned with definitions that sound like the more recent hypothetical foundations of job happiness, but Robert Hoppock is the one who is mentioned most often. Some publications use the terms "job satisfaction" and "job satisfaction" interchangeably, which may be one reason why people don't agree on what "job satisfaction" means.

In his writings, Hoppock gave one of the earliest definitions of job satisfaction: "the totality of psychological, physiological, and environmental factors under which a person says he or she feels satisfied while doing his or her job" (Hoppock, 1935). Smith et al. (1969) said that job satisfaction is how a person feels about his or her job. Locke (1969) says that job satisfaction is a positive or enjoyable response to an evaluation of one's employment, job attainment, or job experiences. Vroom (1982) says that employees are happy when they have a positive emotional connection to their jobs. Similarly, Schultz (1982) said that how a person thinks about their job is a key part of job satisfaction. Siegal and Lance (1987) say that a person's level of job satisfaction is best shown by how they feel. Last but not least, Lofquist and Davis (1991) defined job satisfaction as "an individual's positive affective response to the target environment...as a result of the individual's evaluation of how well the environment meets his or her needs" (p.27).

Job satisfaction has been described in many ways over the years, but most articles agree that

it is a positive emotional reaction to one's work. After talking about what makes people happy at work, there seems to be less uniformity. Wexley and Yukl (1984) say that many different things affect whether or not an employee is happy at work. Several theories have been made to help us understand these operational and job features and how they affect job happiness. These theories have given us the tools we need to do more research on job satisfaction in the future. Existing mainstream ideas said that job satisfaction could be considered a single, bipolar continuum, with satisfaction at one end and disappointment at the other. In later versions of the theory's two-continuum ideal, job satisfaction was put on the first scale and discontentment on the second (Brown, 1998). Later ideas focused more on the presence or absence of different internal and external aspects of a job that can make or break a person's happiness. People's credit, promotions, and willingness to take on new responsibilities are all intrinsic qualities based on how they really feel about their skills and goals. O'Driscoll and Randall say these factors are strongly linked to job satisfaction (1999). Extrinsic factors to think about when evaluating a job include pay, supervision, and working conditions. Martin and Schinke say that these outside factors also greatly impact how happy people are at work (1998).

Determinants of Job Satisfaction

Reviewing the research shows that many things have been looked into to see if they have anything to do with job satisfaction. Things like salary and perks are examples of extrinsic variables. On the other hand, there are some things that come with every job, such as changes to move up (e.g. income, supervision, and working conditions). Money isn't everything when it comes to being happy at work, say experts from many different fields (Miller, 1985; Derlin & Schnieder, 1994; Solly and Hohenshil, 1986). In the last 80 years, almost all studies on job satisfaction have been about money. In the first studies, it was found that salary was not a good indicator of job satisfaction (Hoppock, 1935; Herzberg,

Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell, 1957). Newer studies, on the other hand, show that pay is a good way to measure performance up to a certain point in a person's career (Herzberg, 1966). In 1976, Dyer and Theriault found that salary was the most important factor in how happy people were at work. In the 1970s, other academics also looked into the link between being financially successful and being happy. But they didn't agree that having more money makes you happy and that having less money makes you sad (Lawler, 1971). Recent studies (Lucas et al., 1990; Lee & Wilbur, 1985; Rhodes, 1983; Kanungo, 1982) have found a link between pay and job satisfaction. However, this link seems to have more to do with ideas of fairness than with actual money (Hulin & Smith, 1965; Spector, 1997). This shows that comparing yourself to others is important, but so are your expectations. Adams argued in 1965 that workers need to feel like they are getting paid fairly for how hard they work. To explain further, an employee may be unhappy if he or she thinks his or her pay is too high for how hard he or she works.

Interpersonal Factors

In the context of a job satisfaction analysis, the employee's social and prop network is made up of the people he or she knows. One's interactions with his or her boss, other employees, clients and customers, and with the public are all examples of these middlemen. Brown (1998) looked at what makes workers happy on the job and came to the conclusion that operating supervision and contact are very important. For many years, a lot of research has been done on how much office props are worth. The Hawthorne Study from the 1920s found that employees are happier at work if they feel like they belong somewhere and have friends there (Maynard, 1986). (Maynard, 1986)" According to (Maynard, 1986). Maynard says that operators who don't have community prop at work tend to be less happy, more stressed out, and less able to handle bad situations. Understanding and helping your coworkers can make you happier at work, and your coworkers

can fill many needs in the community (Green, 2000). (Green, 2000). (Green, 2000).

Research into community needs has shown that a person's level of job satisfaction can be affected by how happy his or her coworkers are with their jobs. (Brown, 1998). (Brown, 1998). (Brown, 1998).

The quality of supervision can also have a big effect on how happy people are with their jobs. The research shows that operators who get along well with their bosses are more likely to say they are happy with their jobs (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Vroom, 1982). Bruce and Blackburn (1992) and Vroom (1982) both give evidence to back up their claims. As shown in (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Vroom, 1982). When we say "positive contact," we usually mean criticism that is helpful, interaction with people who know what they are talking about, and a focus on quality rather than quantity (Schroffell, 1999). There is evidence that. (Schroffell, 1999). That's what it says (Schroffell, 1999). The best supervisory relationships are based on mutual respect and appreciation, encourage teamwork while giving workers some freedom, and meet both the professional and personal needs of workers (Locke, 1970). (Locke, 1970). (Locke, 1970). But supervision is a complicated thing, and it's not realistic to think that employees will be happy at work just because their bosses are nice to them. How much each worker wants from their coworkers and what they are willing to do for

them may depend on their own unique traits. Schroffell (1999) says that operators with more experience want less supervision, while those with less experience want more. It has also been shown that how a worker likes to talk to their boss depends on the situation at work. In chaotic, uncertain, or unstructured work environments, operators prefer to be supervised in a more organized way. On the other hand, jobs with clear roles and well-trained workers benefit from a less strict way of keeping an eye on them (House & Mitchell, 1974). Reference: (House and Mitchell, 1974). (House and Mitchell, 1974). In 1974, these results were made public (House and Mitchell).

Research Methodology

The major purpose of this study was to find the effect of job satisfaction of elementary school teachers on school effectiveness. The sample consisted of 100 elementary school teachers, including 60 male teachers and 40 female teachers of district Lahore. In this research, all elementary school males and females of district Lahore were taken as the population of the study. They were selected conveniently. The researcher used a convenient sampling technique to draw a sample according to the nature of the study. This research used two questionnaires to collect data from elementary schools. Survey research was used for this study. To investigate it, quantitative research was conducted.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1

Mean and Standard Deviation of Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction	N	Mean	Per Item Mean	Std. Deviation
Working condition	100	18.10	3.62	3.748
Nature of work	100	46.16	4.20	7.833
Interpersonal relations	100	34.09	4.87	5.612

Table 1 shows the mean score and standard deviation of statements related to job satisfaction. Per item mean score of (Interpersonal Relations) was calculated (M=4.87, S.D=5.612), which shows that most

head teachers strongly agreed with the interpersonal relations. That factor is more affected by head teacher job satisfaction.

Table 4.1 shows that per mean item score of (Working Condition) was calculated ($M=3.62$,

$S.D=3.748$), which shows that very few head teachers agreed with related to the working condition. That factor is less affected by head teacher job satisfaction.

Table 2

Mean and Standard Deviation of School Effectiveness

School Effectiveness	N	Mean	Per Item Mean	Std. Deviation
Professional leadership	100	36.90	4.62	7.007
Focus on teaching and learning	100	16.84	4.21	3.034
High expectations of all learners	100	12.29	4.09	2.829
Stimulating and secure learning environment	100	15.72	3.14	3.829

Table 2 shows the mean score and standard deviation of statements related to school effectiveness. Per item mean score of (Professional Leadership) was calculated ($M=4.62$, $S.D=7.007$), which shows that most head teachers strongly agreed with professional leadership. That factor is more affected by school effectiveness.

Table 2 shows that per mean item score of (Learning Environment) was calculated ($M=3.14$, $S.D=2.829$), which shows that only some of the head teachers agreed with the related to the learning environment. That factor is less affected by school effectiveness.

Table 3

Correlation between Job Satisfaction and School Effectiveness

School Effectiveness		Job Satisfaction			
		Professional leadership	Focus on teaching and learning	High expectations of all learners	Stimulating and secure learning environment
Job satisfaction	Pearson Correlation (r)	.732**	.673**	.660**	.640**
	Sig. (2-tailed)(p)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	100	100	100	100

Table 3 shows the Pearson product-moment correlation between Work Satisfaction and Professional Leadership (School Effectiveness). With a value of $r = 0.73$, a sample size of 100, and a significance level of $p = .0005$, the two variables were highly related.

A Pearson product-moment correlation analysis (Table 4.3) shows that there is a strong link between Work Satisfaction and Dedication to

Student Learning ($r = 0.67$, $n = 100$, $p = .0005$). (School Effectiveness).

Table 3 shows the Pearson product-moment correlation between Work Satisfaction and having high expectations for all students (School Effectiveness). $R = 0.66$, $n = 100$, and $p = .0005$ show that the two variables are linked in a significant way.

Table 4 shows the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between Work Satisfaction and a school that is both challenging and safe

(School Effectiveness). $R = 0.64$, $n = 100$, and $p = .0005$ show that the two variables are linked in a significant way.

Table 4

Comparison between Male and Female Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
Working condition	Male	60	17.95	3.877	-0.488	0.370
	Female	40	18.32	3.583		
Nature of work	Male	60	45.08	7.629	-1.699	0.304
	Female	40	47.77	7.953		
Interpersonal relations	Male	60	33.60	5.675	-1.070	0.483
	Female	40	34.82	5.504		

Table 4 shows the results of a t-test that compares the working conditions of men and women based on their own samples (Job Satisfaction). Males got an average score of 17.95, and females got an average score of 18.32. There was no statistically significant difference between the two ($t = -0.488$, $p = 0.63$, two-tailed).

Table 4 shows the results of a t-test that was used to compare how men and women feel about their jobs (as measured by Job Satisfaction). The average score for men was 45.08 (standard

deviation: 7.629), and the average score for women was 47.77 (standard deviation: 7.953; $t = -1.699$, $p = 0.92$, two-tailed).

Table 4 shows the results of an independent-sample t-test that was done to compare the interpersonal relationships (Job Satisfaction) of men and women. The mean score for men was 33.60 with a standard deviation of 5.675, and the mean score for women was 34.82 with a standard deviation of 5.504 ($t = 1.070$, $p = 0.29$, two-tailed).

Table 5

Comparison between Male and Female School Effectiveness

Job satisfaction	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
Professional leadership	Male	60	36.18	7.324	-1.256	.046
	Female	40	37.97	6.442		
Focus on teaching and learning	Male	60	16.45	3.377	-1.586	.006
	Female	40	17.42	2.352		
High expectations of all learners	Male	60	12.18	3.094	-0.460	.004
	Female	40	12.45	2.406		
Stimulating and secure learning environment	Male	60	15.53	3.980	-0.595	.264
	Female	40	16.00	3.623		

Table 5 shows that a t-test was used to compare male and female professional leadership (School Effectiveness) using independent samples. The scores of males ($M = 36.18$, $SD = 7.324$) and females ($M = 37.97$, $SD = 6.442$; $t = -1.256$, $p = 0.21$, two-tailed) did not differ significantly.

In Table 5, you can see that an independent-samples t-test was used to compare the focus on teaching and learning (School Effectiveness) between male and female students. There wasn't a big difference between how men ($M = 16.45$, SD

= 3.377) and women ($M = 17.42$, $SD = 2.352$; $t = -1.586$, $p = 0.11$, two-tailed) did on the test.

An independent-samples t-test was used to compare male and female high expectations of all learners (School Effectiveness) in Table 4.5. There was no big difference between how men and women scored ($M = 12.18$, $SD = 3.094$, $t = -0.460$, $p = 0.65$, two-tailed).

Table 5 shows that an independent-samples t-test was used to compare males and females in a stimulating and safe learning environment (School Effectiveness) for males and females. The scores of males ($M = 15.53$, $SD = 3.980$) and females ($M = 16.00$, $SD = 3.623$, $t = -0.595$, $p = 0.55$, two-tailed) did not differ significantly.

Discussion

The idea of how well a school works is complicated and has always been hard to understand. Most people think that for schools to be successful, students must have a strong grasp of basic and foundational ideas. Managerial and leadership skills, teacher morale and motivation, students' attitudes and behaviours, parental involvement, the school's climate, and the level of community support all play a big role in a school's overall efficiency. Unfortunately, something as complicated as school effectiveness, which tries to take into account all of these factors, can't be regulated. Rocca and Kostanski (2001) used the term "work satisfaction" to talk about how much people like what they do for a living. When people like what they do for a living, they think positively about it and work harder.

On the other hand, if you don't like your job, you'll have bad feelings about it (Robbins et al., 1994). Some academics say that an employee is satisfied with their job when their needs and values are met at work. The results of the study would help everyone involved in Pakistan's education system. Policymakers and recruiting agencies can get research-based direction and information to help them choose and develop the right principles. The goal of this study was to find

out how elementary school teachers' job satisfaction affects how well their students do in school. The literature review looked at studies from the United States and the United Kingdom. This was the number of kids in the Lahore district's elementary schools. Sixty guys and forty girls were picked at random from each of the 100 schools. This study was based on a research method called survey research. All of the math was done with IBM SPSS 20. (including data entry, compilation, summarization, and analysis). Mean comparison, standard deviation, correlation, and the t-test are all just different ways to do the same thing. Since there was a strong link between the two variables, it's safe to say that happy workers are also more productive in the classroom. There is no difference between men and women when it comes to how a school principal's job satisfaction affects how well students do in school.

Conclusions

Based on the results, it can be said that the Influence of Job Satisfaction of Elementary School Teachers on School Effectiveness is determined by the parts of school effectiveness and work satisfaction. Also, the study found that female principals are much happier with their jobs than their male counterparts.

1. Research tells us that schools are most effective when there is a commitment to maximize learning time, conduct an internal examination, discipline in classes, maintenance of school records, time cover textual material, staff members are evaluated regularly, competent staff, students attendance is a high rate and high morale of students and staff.
2. Research tells us that head teachers are most satisfied when staff is responsible for their daily lessons, colleagues stimulate each other to do better work, staff does their work with interest, teaching provides promotion opportunities, and teaching provides an opportunity to use various skills.

Recommendations

After this research study, we want to give some recommendations. They are given below;

- Headteachers must be advised that they should be committed maximum learning time and regularly conduct internal examinations for school effectiveness.
- They should have effective classroom planning, evaluate staff members regularly and have competent staff so that the school can be effective.
- Headteachers must be vigilant with the process of instruction and the responsibility of instructional leadership, and there should be discipline in the classes, and the attendance rate should be high.
- Headteachers are to be advised that they should be loyal to their job and have full command of their work for the effectiveness of their schools.
- Headteachers can be satisfied if they will feel responsible regarding their job.
- If headteachers show interest intrinsically and extrinsically, they will remain satisfied with their job.
- There should be promotion opportunities for head teachers to feel satisfaction regarding their work and job.

References

- Anderson, W.T., Hohenshil, T.H., & Brown, D.T. (1984). Job satisfaction among practising school psychologists: A national study. *School Psychology Review*, 13, 225-230.
- Brookover, W. B. & Lawrence W. Lezotte (1979). "Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement." Michigan State University.
- Brown, M., Hohenshil, T.H., & Brown, D. (1998). School Psychologists' job satisfaction in the USA: A national study. *School Psychology International Journal*, 19(1), 79-89.
- Bruce, W.M. & Blackburn, J.W. (1992). *Balancing job satisfaction and performance: A guide for human resource professionals*. Westport, Conn.: Quorum Books, pp. 4-23.
- Cappelli, P. (2000). Managing without commitment. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(4), 11-24.
- Cheng, Y.C. (1996). *School Effectiveness and School-Based Management, A Mechanism for Development*, London, Falmer Press.
- Coleman, J. et al. (1966). *Equity of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cuttance, P. (1985). Framework for research on the effectiveness of schooling. In Reynolds D. (Ed) *Studying School Effectiveness*. London: The Falmer Press.
- December 2, 2002, from <http://www.psych.umn.edu/psylabs/vpr/default.htm>.
- DeMeuse, K. P. (1985). A compendium of frequently used measures in industrial/organizational psychology. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 23, 53-59.
- Drever, Eric (1991), *School Effectiveness: Criteria and Evidence*, ONLINE: <http://www.scre.ac.uk/spotlight/spotlight31.html> -October 14 2005.
- Edmonds, R. R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37, 15 - 27.
- Edmonds, R., Frederikson, J. R. (1979), Search for effective schools: the identification and analysis of city schools that are instructionally effective for poor children, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Center for Urban Studies in Harbaugh R. J. (2005), Examining the correlates of effective schools present in an intermediate school: A case study, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Immaculate University, Pennsylvania
- Gaziel, H. (1996). School effectiveness and effectiveness indicators: parents', students', teachers', and principals'

- perspectives. *International Journal of Education*, 42, 475-494.
- Glisson C. & Durick M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33(1), March, 61-81.
- Gruneberg, M. M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. New York: Macmillan.
- Herman, J. B., & Hulin, C. L. (1972). Studying organizational attitudes from individual and organizational frames of reference, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 8, 84-108.
- Herman, J. B., Dunham R. B., & Hulin, C. L. (1975). Organizational structure, demographic characteristics, and employee responses, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 206-232.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Harper Brothers.
- Hulin, C. L. (1963). A linear model of job satisfaction. Authorized facsimile of an unpublished doctoral dissertation (Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 1963) Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms Limited.
- Jamil, M. N. & A. Rasheed (2023). "Corporate Social Environment and Carbon Dioxide emissions Reduction impact on Organizational Performance; mediator role of Social Capital." *Journal of Environmental Science and Economics* 2(1): 17-24.
- Jamil, M. N. (2022). "Monetary policy performance under control of exchange rate and consumer price index." *Journal of Environmental Science and Economics* 1(1): 28-35.
- Jamil, M. N., et al. (2023). "Cross-cultural study the macro variables and its impact on exchange rate regimes." *Future Business Journal* 9(1): 9
- Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Dunnette, M.D. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Locke, E. A., Fitzpatrick, W., & White, F. M. (1983). Job satisfaction and role clarity among university and college faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 6(4), 343-365.
- Lucas, G.H., Babakus, E. & Ingram, T.N. (1990). An empirical test of job satisfaction turnover relationship: assessing the role of the job performance of retail managers. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 18, 199-208.
- Martin, U., & Schinke, S. P. (1998). Organizational and individual factors influencing job satisfaction and burnout of mental health workers. *Social Work in Health Care*, 28, (2), 51-62.
- Martinez-Ponz, M. (1990). *Test of a three-factor model of teacher commitment*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the New England Educational Research Organization, Maine.
- McGaw, B., Piper, J., Banks, D. & Evans, B. (1992). *Making Schools more effective*, Hawthorn, Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Miller, N. J. (1985). A description of elementary school principals in Minnesota and their job satisfaction. An authorized facsimile of an unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, 1985), Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International. In Waskiewicz, S.P. (1999). *Variables that contribute to job satisfaction of elementary school principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic and State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Morley, L., & Rassool, N. (1999). *School effectiveness: Fracturing the discourse*. London: Falmer.
- Ninan, M. (2006). 'School Climate and its impact on School Effectiveness: A Case study', paper presented at the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, USA, January 4, 2006, ONLINE:

<http://www.leadership.fau.edu/icsei2006/Papers/Ninan.pdf>

- O'Driscoll, M. P., & Randall, D. M. (1999). Perceived organizational support, reward satisfaction, employee job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48, (2), pp. 197–209.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Caldwell, D. F. (1981). New employees' commitment and job tenure: Some evidence of postdecisional justification, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 597–616.
- Ostroff, C., & Schmitt, N. (1993). Configurations of organizational effectiveness and efficiency. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 345–362.
- Pedhazur, E. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement, design and analysis: An integrated approach*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Perspective. *Human Relations*, 43(5), 419–438.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603–609.
- Reyes, P.; Madsen, J.; & Taylor, B. (1989). *Organizational incentives, teacher commitment, morale, and job satisfaction: Is the program achieving its goals?* Paper presented at the annual American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA meeting.
- Reynolds, D., Creemers, B. P.M., Hopkins, D., Stoll, L. & Bollen, R. (1996). Making Good Schools in Teddlie, Charles and Reynolds, David (2000), *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research*, London, Falmer Press.
- Rocca, A. D. & M. Kostanski, (2001). Burnout and job satisfaction amongst victorian elementary school teachers: A comparative look at the contract and permanent employment. Discussion Paper ATEA Conference. Teacher Education: Change of Heart, Mind and Action. Melbourne. September, P. 1–7
- Rutter, M. (1983). "School Effects on Pupil Progress: Research Findings and Policy Implications." *Child Development*, Vol. 54, pp. 1–29.
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J. & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen Thousand Hours: Elementary Schools and Their Effects on children in Teddlie, Charles and Reynolds, David (2000), *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research*, London, Falmer Press.
- Sammons, P., Hillman, J. & Mortimore, P. (1995). Key Characteristics of Effective schools: A Review of School Effectiveness Research in Teddlie, Charles and Reynolds, David (2000), *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research*, London, Falmer Press.
- Scheerens, J. (2004). Review of school and instructional effectiveness research. "Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005, *The Quality Imperative*".
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Solly, D. C., & Hohenshil, T. H. (1986). Job satisfaction of school psychologists in a primarily rural state. *School Psychology Review*, 15 (1), 119–126.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.
- Staw, B. M., & Ross, J. (1985). Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job attitudes, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 469–480.
- Stewart, G. L. (2000). Meta-analysis of work teams research published between 1977 and 1998. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting 2000, Toronto.

- Teddlie, C., C., S., S., & Reynolds, D. (2000). Context issues within school effectiveness research. In C. Teddlie & D. Reynolds (Eds.), *The international handbook of school effectiveness research* (pp. 160 – 186). London/New York: Falmer Press.
- Thomas, K. W., & Tymon, W. G. J. (1997). Bridging the motivation gap in total quality. *Quality Management Journal*, 4(2), 80–96.
- Valentine, S., Valentine, W. R., & Dick, J. (1998). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivators and older employees' attitudes towards their current jobs. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, pp. 87, 407–410.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Vroom, V. H. (1982). *Work and motivation* (Rev. ed.). Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company.
- Willms, J.D. (1992). *Monitoring School Performance: A Guide for Educators*, London, Falmer Press.
- Zedeck, S. (1987, October). *Satisfaction in union members and their spouses*. Paper presented at the Job Satisfaction: Advances in Research and Practice Conference, Bowling Green, Ohio.