

# Influence of Age group on Job Satisfaction in Academia

Milan Shrestha<sup>1</sup>

Kathmandu University School of Education

## Article History

Received 2019-04-08

Revised 2019-04-12

Accepted 2019-04-13

Published 2019-04-16

## Keywords

*Job Satisfaction,*

*Age Group,*

*Social Exchange Theory,*

*Pay,*

*Incentive and Benefits,*

*Work Itself,*

*Recognition*

## How to cite?

Shrestha, M. (2019). *Influence of Age group on Job Satisfaction in Academia.*

*SEISENSE Journal of Management,* 2(3), 30-41.

doi:<https://doi.org/10.33215/sjom.v2i3.141>

## Abstract

**Purpose** - Job Satisfaction (JS) has seen an upsurge concern in the arena of school management and it is highly associated with the age groups of school teachers. Thus, this study focused to ascertain the level of JS and examine it via age groups of school teachers.

**Design** - The scholar applied a cross-sectional survey design in post-positivist paradigm. The data were amassed from 345 school teachers of a cluster via self-administer questionnaire and analyzed with descriptive statistics and ANOVA test. In the meantime, social exchange theory was employed to scrutinize the results.

**Findings** - This study found that the school teachers expressed moderate satisfaction in the job. Likewise, the age groups significantly influence the JS among school teachers. More specifically, the senior age group teachers expressed more satisfaction in the job than other groups of the teacher. Subsequently, these job satisfied teachers contribute to more job commitment, effectiveness and work performances in the school. Furthermore, JS facilitates school to achieve elevated academic success.

**Implications** - The study endows with the concrete approach for other forthcoming scholar to explore the contribution of age groups on JS among academia.

Copyright © 2019 The Author(s)



<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author's email address: [milanshrestha313244@gmail.com](mailto:milanshrestha313244@gmail.com)

## Introduction

The Job Satisfaction (JS) of school teachers has received heightened attention for ensuring the soaring work performances in the classroom, school effectiveness, and readiness among teachers in relation to the change process of school. The high work performances, school effectiveness, and continual organizational change process promote the school to survive in the competitive market. The survival of school is only possible when the school leader transforms school to be able to compete with their rivals. However, the transformation of school, organizational change, survival of school, work effectiveness and high performance of the school is only possible when school leadership is able to satisfy their teachers in the jobs.

In circumstance of the JS, there is a profuse research associated to the age group of school teachers (e.g. Demirtas, 2010; Griffin & Bateman, 1986; Mannheim, Baruch, & Tal, 1997; Msuya, 2016; Murage & Kibera, 2014; Rao, 2015; Sundaram, Subburaj, & Sekar, 2012). However, these all researches did not examine the dimensions of JS via age groups of school teachers. Similarly, the scholar still did not find any kinds of literature mention the social exchange theory influence the JS of school teachers via their age groups. Considering it, there is the necessity of employing extensive research in the arena of JS and its dimensions in relation to age groups of school teachers. As a result, this research intends to examine the contribution of age groups in JS and its dimensions among the school teachers. In relation to this key concern, the author has stated the crucial question to tackle through this study: To what extent does the age group influence JS (Pay, Incentive and Benefits (PIB), work itself, work environment, supervision, and recognition) among school teachers?

## Literature Review

### Job Satisfaction and its Dimensions

The JS is a state of affairs within employees with some degree of favor towards the job. The gratifying or affirmative arousing state resulting from the evaluation of job or its experiences is termed as JS (Chandana, 2014; Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Mehboob & Bhutto, 2012). The JS is also explained as the overall effort which drives the employees to the state of happiness and satisfaction with their job. In this sense, JS is a complex of human thoughts and feelings which is seen when the teachers are able to achieve their desired expectation from their job. The desired expectation in the job is allied to the factors like Pay, Incentive and Benefits (PIB), work environment, work itself, supervision, and recognition. These factors altogether contributed to composite the JS (e.g. Barusman & Mihdar, 2014; Khadka, 2010) among school teachers. Likewise, it is also associated with the age groups of the school teachers (Hickson & Oshagbemi, 1999; Kemunto, Raburu, & Joseph, 2018). Furthermore, the JS is also related to the social exchange between school and teachers. For instance, the school pays the teachers as a form of salary and other benefits instead of their work performances and efforts in the classroom (Ahmed, Ismail, Amin, & Ramzan, 2012). This dialectical relationship between school and teachers is based on the social exchange theory. The reasonable social exchange between school and teachers contributes the satisfaction in job among school teachers (Birtch, Chiang, & Esch, 2015). Consequently, this social exchange between school and teacher via age groups determines the JS.

The dissatisfaction in the job diminishes the teacher's performances in school. Subsequently, it influences the school's success which is evidently portrayed in the context of Nepal. For instance, the greater part (62.45 %) of school students achieved below B grade in the Secondary Education Examination (SEE) (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology [MOEST], 2017). There are abundant reasons for these stumpy academic results in the school. One of the probable causes is demonstrating the low JS (Banerjee, Stearns, Moller, &

Mickelson, 2017) in the job from the teachers. As a result, the existence of these low JS among teachers decreases the eminence of the education in the school.

The Barusman and Mihdar (2014) categorize the attributes of JS in five aspects: pay, work itself, co-staffs, promotion opportunities, and supervisions. In relation to this, the researcher categorized the factors of JS into five groups: PIB, work itself, work environment, supervision, and recognition. The first component, PIB refers to the adequate income of teachers for their adequate normal expenses. Dugguh and Dennis (2014) mention that equitable salaries, incentives, and benefits, increments, bonuses, apparent policies are associated with the payment which must visibly evade dissatisfaction. The second factor, Work itself incorporates daily tasks, autonomy, and creativity in the work (Lester, 1987). The employees (teachers in this context) want a fascinating job which contributes to their success, progress, and career advancement. Ensuring these elements in work raises their satisfaction levels towards their job. The third dimension is the sound working environment which is the desire of every teacher in the school and it results in better physical console and expediency. The absence of such a sound working environment crashes badly on teachers' physical and mental wellbeing (Parvin & Kabir, 2011). If there is a deprivation of a sound working environment, it drives them towards the job dissatisfaction. The fourth indicator of JS as supervision delineate to the supervisory behavior of boss and interpersonal relationship between employees and boss (Lester, 1987). In addition, employees enjoy work and feel themselves satisfied if they have competent, considerate, fair and honest supervisors (Unal, 2013). Finally, the fifth component recognition refers to the act of being noticed and admired due to teachers' good performances. It incorporates the appreciation, esteem, attention, and prestige to the teachers from students, supervisors, coworker, and parents (Lester, 1987). However, these five dimensions: PIB, work itself, working environment, supervision, and recognition collectively determine the JS among school teachers.

### Job Satisfaction and Age group

The JS is the attitude Prasetio, Yuniarsih, and Ahman (2017) which is associated with the age groups of school teachers (Demirtas, 2010). The age group is that demographic variable which reflects the seniority and maturity among the employees in relation to the profession. In addition, the age differentiates the enthusiasm of individuals towards the job-related activities (Msuya, 2016). So, the age groups affect the school teachers to perceive satisfaction towards their work tasks, work environment, promotion, supervision, and pays. These discrepancies via age groups create a contrast in teacher's satisfaction towards their job. As a result, the succeeding research hypothesis is sketched:

**H 1:** JS (Pay, Incentive and Benefits (PIB), work itself, work environment, supervision, and recognition) differs via the age groups of school teachers.

## Methods

### Research Design

The researcher employed cross-sectional survey as the research design in this study. In this study, the researcher identified research subject as school teachers and unit of analysis as every individual teacher of Dhading District. Meanwhile, researcher derived 345 school teachers as a sample size from 2487 school teachers (e.g. District Education Office [DEO], 2016). More specifically, the sample size was calculated at a 95 percent confidence limit by using (Yamane, 1967). Then, the researcher employed simple random sampling with a lottery approach. Considering it, the researcher developed the sampling frame and picked one by one teacher until the required number of sample was obtained.

## Measures

The researcher employed the Likert scale which incorporated a 26 number of items as the data collection tools in this study. These items included five response options (never, rarely, sometimes, often and always) and they were put on a numerical continuum for quantifying purposes. Before finalizing the scale, the researcher administered it in pilot testing and elicited more than 0.7 Cronbach's Alpha in table 1.

*Table 1 - Cronbach's Alpha of JS and its dimensions: Results of Pilot Test*

Indicators	N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
PIB	5	.723
Work itself	7	.762
Working environment	3	.729
Supervision	6	.705
Recognition	5	.746
JS	26	.892

The derived Cronbach's Alpha indicates the high internal consistency of this scale (e.g. Santos, 1999) from the overall scale and every indicator of JS. For this purpose, the researcher picked up 35 (10 %) number of sample from the total number of the final sample (Lackey & Wingate, 1998 as cited in Hertzog, 2008).

## Methods of Analyzing Data

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were employed for analysis purposes. Firstly, the researcher categorized the obtained responses on the basis of Best (1977) criteria (as cited in Shabbir, Wei, Nabi, Zaheer, & Khan, 2014) as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Higher score} - \text{Lower score}}{\text{Number of Levels}} = \frac{5-1}{3} = \frac{4}{3} = 1.33$$

Consequently, the researcher generated three levels in JS and classified as Low (1.00-2.33), Moderate (2.34-3.66) and High (3.67-5.00) based on their mean scores. For this purpose, the researcher employed percentage, mean and standard deviation to present the level of the JS among school teachers. Likewise, the one way ANOVA was adopted for examining the significant differences in JS across age groups of school teachers at the 0.05 significance level.

## Results

### Level of JS

This section includes the collected information about JS and aims to identify the level of JS (PIB, work itself, working environment, supervision and recognition) among school teachers of Dhading District. For this purpose, the collected data was analyzed and interpreted through the descriptive statistics like frequency, percentage, mean score and standard deviation respectively. The obtained result is expressed in Table 2 and 3.

Table 2 presents the data in relation to the JS collected from 345 school teachers. This section contributes to analyze and determine the level of JS through the derived mean score and standard deviation respectively. In addition, the researcher sorted out the obtained mean score in three categories: High, Moderate and Low respectively. These three levels of JS were obtained mainly based on the teachers' mean score of 1-2.33, 2.34-3.66 and 3.67-5.0 respectively.

*Table 2 - JS among School Teachers*

Dimension	Mean	SD	Level of JS
Work itself	4.06	.63	High
Recognition	3.11	.82	Moderate
PIB	3.23	.83	Moderate
Work environment	3.91	.68	High
Supervision	3.97	1.01	High
Job Satisfaction	3.66	.58	Moderate

Among this three degree of JS, the work itself (Mean = 4.06, SD = .63) seems higher than the other remaining components of JS. Besides this, the work environment and supervision also consist of the high level of JS. The satisfaction of work itself, work environment and supervision reflect that the school teachers are satisfied with their work, workplace and also with their boss in the schools. PIB (Mean = 3.23, SD = .83) and Recognition (Mean = 3.11, SD = .82), on the other hand, consist of moderate levels of satisfaction in the scale. These moderate levels indicate that the school teachers were fairly happy towards their payment and their recognition among their institutions.

Overall, Table 2 indicates that most of the components of JS appeared to be in the high category and some were in the moderate category. The overall JS among the school teachers come under moderate level (Mean = 3.66, SD = .58). This shows that the affirmative behavior of school teachers towards their job was looking moderate which means they were fairly satisfied with their job in school.

Table 3 demonstrates the frequencies and percentage of JS among school teachers. Majority of the respondents posed satisfaction in their job at school. The JS is the collective value of the mean score of all five factors (PIB, work itself, working environment, supervision and recognition) in this study.

*Table 3 - Frequencies of JS among School Teachers*

Level		PIB	WI	WE	SUP	REC	JS
High	N	103	247	219	217	89	175
	%	29.9	71.6	63.5	62.9	25.8	50.7
Moderate	N	201	95	121	92	204	163
	%	58.3	27.5	35.1	26.7	59.1	47.2
Low	N	41	3	5	36	52	7
	%	11.9	0.9	1.4	10.4	15.1	2.0
Total	N	345	345	345	345	345	345
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100

\* PIB = Pay, incentive and benefits, WI = Work itself, WE = Work environment, SUP = Supervision, REC = Recognition, JS = Job satisfaction

More number of school teachers exist high in terms of their job in relation to work itself (N= 247, % = 71.6), work environment (N = 219, % = 63.5) and supervision (N = 217, % = 62.9) respectively. In spite of this, many teachers declared themselves to be in the moderate position in the context of PIB (N = 201, % = 58.3) and recognition (N = 204, % = 59.1) in relation to their JS. Overall, there were many teachers who were highly satisfied (N = 175, % = 50.7) towards their job. But some teachers (N = 163, % = 47.2) moderately and some other (N = 7, % = 2.0) were lowly satisfied with their job.

## Job Satisfaction and Age group

This study aims to examine that there are no significant differences in JS (PIB, work itself, working environment, supervision and recognition) across the different age groups (16-25, 26-35, 36-45, 46-60) of respondents. The purpose of this section is to calculate the F test (one way ANOVA) to derive F and  $p$ -value to test the hypothesis. Likewise, the researcher used a Post Hoc test to identify the particular groups which make significant differences in JS. The obtained statistical inferences are presented in Table 4 and Table 5

Table 4 - JS among School Teachers' across their Age group

JS		N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
PIB	16-25	87	3.13	.79	4.73	.01
	26-35	141	3.15	.87		
	36-45	70	3.26	.79		
	46-60	47	3.63	.70		
Work itself	16-25	87	4.01	.70	2.13	.09
	26-35	141	4.04	.60		
	36-45	70	4.04	.67		
	46-60	47	4.28	.48		
Work environment	16-25	87	3.96	.71	2.35	.07
	26-35	141	3.88	.65		
	36-45	70	3.76	.69		
	46-60	47	4.09	.66		
Supervision	16-25	87	4.04	.93	2.23	.08
	26-35	141	3.93	1.05		
	36-45	70	3.80	1.05		
	46-60	47	4.26	.93		
Recognition	16-25	87	3.23	.76	4.38	.01
	26-35	141	3.13	.82		
	36-45	70	2.81	.70		
	46-60	47	3.26	1.00		
Job satisfaction	16-25	87	3.67	.58	4.13	.01
	26-35	141	3.62	.59		
	36-45	70	3.53	.55		
	46-60	47	3.91	.54		

Table 4 indicates the statistical result obtained from the one way ANOVA test and it presents F and  $p$  values. Among these  $p$  values, PIB ( $F = 4.73, p = .003$ ) and recognition ( $F = 1.73, p = .005$ ) are significantly different in relation to age group of the school teachers. In addition, to get statistically significant differences across the age group of teachers a Post Hoc test was operated. The Post Hoc test confirmed that there is a significance differences ( $p = .01$ ) in PIB across the age groups, particularly between '16-25' and '46-60' age groups (MD = .50, SE = .14) among the school teachers. Among these two age groups of teachers, 46-60 years of age group consists of high level of satisfaction (Mean = 3.63, SD = .70) than the teachers of 16-25 years of age group (Mean = 3.13, SD = .79) across PIB. In addition, the Post Hoc test further shows that the differences between '16-25' and '36-45' (MD = .48, SE = .13) age groups also makes the significance differences ( $p = .01$ ) in recognition as the factors of JS. It makes sense that '36-45' age groups teachers shows high level of satisfaction (Mean = 3.23, SD = .76) than the teachers of '16-25' age groups (Mean = 2.81, SD = .70) in table 5.

Table 5 - Post Hoc Test: Job Satisfaction across Age group of School Teachers

Indicators	Age group	MD	SE	P	Indicators	Age group	MD	SE	p		
PIB	26-35	-.01	.11	.99	SUP	26-35	.10	.13	.86		
	16-25	36-45	-.13	.13		.75	16-25	36-45	.24	.16	.44
		46-60	-.50*	.14		.01		46-60	-.22	.18	.59
		16-25	.01	.11		.99		16-25	-.10	.13	.86
	26-35	36-45	-.11	.11		.76	26-35	36-45	.13	.14	.80
		46-60	-.48*	.13		.01		46-60	-.33	.17	.20
		16-25	.13	.13		.75		16-25	-.24	.16	.44
	36-45	26-35	.11	.11		.76	36-45	26-35	-.13	.14	.80
		46-60	-.36	.15		.08		46-60	-.46	.19	.06
		16-25	.50*	.14		.01		16-25	.22	.18	.59
	46-60	26-35	.48*	.13		.01	46-60	26-35	.33	.17	.20
		36-45	.36	.15		.08		36-45	.46	.19	.06
WI	26-35	-.03	.08	.98	REC	26-35	.10	.11	.78		
	16-25	36-45	-.02	.10		.99	16-25	36-45	.42*	.13	.01
		46-60	-.27	.11		.08		46-60	-.03	.14	.99
		16-25	.03	.08		.98		16-25	-.10	.11	.78
	26-35	36-45	.00	.09		1.00	26-35	36-45	.31*	.11	.04
		46-60	-.23	.10		.11		46-60	-.13	.13	.75
		16-25	.02	.10		.99		16-25	-.42*	.13	.01
	36-45	26-35	-.00	.09		1.00	36-45	26-35	-.31*	.11	.04
		46-60	-.24	.11		.17		46-60	-.45*	.15	.08
		16-25	.27	.11		.08		16-25	.03	.14	.99
	46-60	26-35	.23	.10		.11	46-60	26-35	.13	.13	.75
		36-45	.24	.11		.17		36-45	.45*	.153	.02
WE	26-35	.07	.09	.85	JS	26-35	.04	.07	.93		
	16-25	36-45	.19	.10		.29	16-25	36-45	.13	.09	.43
		46-60	-.13	.12		.71		46-60	-.23	.10	.11
		16-25	-.07	.09		.85		16-25	-.04	.07	.93
	26-35	36-45	.11	.09		.63	26-35	36-45	.09	.08	.70
		46-60	-.20	.11		.28		46-60	-.28*	.09	.02
		16-25	-.19	.10		.29		16-25	-.13	.09	.43
	36-45	26-35	-.11	.09		.63	36-45	26-35	-.09	.08	.70
		46-60	-.32	.12		.06		46-60	-.37*	.10	.01
		16-25	.13	.12		.71		16-25	.23	.10	.11
	46-60	26-35	.20	.11		.28	46-60	26-35	.28*	.09	.02
		36-45	.32	.12		.06		36-45	.37*	.10	.01

\* PIB = Pay, incentive and benefits, WI = Work itself, WE = Work environment, SUP = Supervision, REC = Recognition, JS = Job satisfaction

\* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.



Overall, Table 4 presented that the statistics ( $F = 4.13, p = .007$ ) in relation to JS was derived across all age groups of teachers. Thus, the  $p$ -value is less than the alpha value (0.05) and it, thus, rejects the null hypothesis. It means that there was a significance difference in JS across age groups of teachers. Post Hoc test (in table 5) was performed to determine the statistically significant differences in JS due to the age '26-35' and '46-60' years (MD = .28, SE = .09,  $p = .021$ ) as well as '36-45' and '46-60' years (MD = .37, SE = .10,  $p = .004$ ) respectively. These results indicate that there is significance difference in JS across age groups of teachers, particularly the age group between '26-35' years and '46-60' years, and '36-45' years and '46-60' years. In other words, the teachers of '46-60' years of age group consist of high level (Mean = 3.91, SD = .54) of JS than those of '36-45' years of age groups (Mean = 3.53, SD = .55) and these differences make changes in JS among school teachers.

These derived results show that there is a significance difference in PIB (due to the differences between age groups '16-25' and '46-60' years) and recognition (due to particularly '16-25' and '36-45' age group) among school teachers. Besides this, derived  $p$  values were higher than the alpha value (0.05) in all the dimension of JS. It shows that there are no more significant differences in the work environment, work itself and supervision respectively.

## Discussions

### Moderate Level of Job Satisfaction

The school teachers posed a moderate level of JS. This result is similar to the George, Louw, and Badenhorst (2008) and they claim that school teachers experienced a low JS due to both intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Among these, some teachers experienced satisfaction towards their job but the other teachers posed moderate and low satisfaction to their job respectively. Ghosh (2013) claims that more than half of the teachers in number experienced a moderate level of JS. These moderate levels of JS among teachers were due to their pay scale, recognition, work, supervision, and environment factors.

Among the dimension of JS, school teachers consist of a high level of work itself, work environment and supervision. But remaining components like PIB and recognition referred to a moderate level. The moderate level of JS and its dimensions revealed that the school teachers were either satisfied or not satisfied with their job. This result is similar to Imam (1990) who expressed that school teachers consist of a high level of satisfaction towards their job, people and supervision comparatively pay and promotion. In addition, Shabbir et al. (2014) write the supervision, working condition, pay factor, work itself and recognition collectively determine the satisfaction level of job among school teachers. Among these factors, working condition and recognition represent the moderate levels but the other components hold the satisfied level of JS. These literature seems similar and interpret that there is a moderate level of JS among school teachers.

The Social Exchange Theory explains the level of JS among school teachers. Ahmed et al. (2012) claim that exchange relations create the confidence and trust among both parties and it gives positive work environment maximizing the individual outputs towards the organization. Relating this theory in the research context provides with the idea that the school can maintain positive exchange relations and good learning environment by creating some obligations upon the teachers (Wang, 2008). As a part of their obligations, the school teachers made a high effort in schools and, in return, they got a good salary, benefits, facilities, recognition and favorable things from the school. They were satisfied with their job from the obligations and exchange relations. Thus, the moderate level of JS among teachers is based on the exchange relationship provided by the school.

Consequently, the Social Exchange Theory collectively made sense that the moderate and satisfied teachers were happy towards their salary, work, comfort workplace and a good boss. They also were delighted by

getting honor at their workplace. Thus, they experienced pleasurable condition resulting from their job (Pan, Shen, Liu, Yang, & Wang, 2015) and this satisfactory comfort level with pleasing experience ensured the high level of JS among the school teachers.

The JS of the teacher is associated with their better performance and also with better academic achievement in the part of their students (Iqbal, Aziz, Farooqi, & Ali, 2016). The teachers who are satisfied with their job willingly performed their teaching responsibilities. In the context of this study, the researcher derived the moderate level of JS among the school teachers. It means that the school teachers fairly performed their job affecting the overall achievements of the schools.

### **Age Group: Determinant of Job Satisfaction**

The finding of this study shows that the JS of school teachers is influenced by their age. This impression is similar to the finding of Msuya (2016) and Demirtas (2010) where they claimed that there was a positive relationship between JS and age group among school teachers. These significance differences between age groups of teachers and JS (PIB and recognition) were probably due to the presence of different aspirations, expectations, fulfillment, achievement and self-esteem among different age groups of the respondents.

The senior teachers by their age were more satisfied with their job which is similar to other studies (Msuya, 2016; Pan et al., 2015). Comparatively, the teachers from 46 to 60 years of age experienced high job satisfaction while the teachers from 36 to 45 years of age had a lower level of satisfaction towards their job. Particularly, young teachers received low salaries due to being temporary and junior teachers in school. Thus, the young teachers were less satisfied with their job (Ghazali, 1979) particularly in terms of PIB than the teachers of other age groups. Besides this, the teachers from 46 to 60 years of age enjoyed the permanent job. They got a high salary than their juniors and were satisfied with their job in relation to PIB.

By recognition, the teachers from 46 to 60 years of age experienced high job satisfaction while the teachers from 36 to 45 years of age expressed low job satisfaction. The older age group (senior) teachers were better known in society and were appreciated than other age groups teacher. Due to the appreciation from society, they retain a long time in the job (Cruickshank & MacDonald, 2018). Considering it, they were also highly satisfied with their job. Besides this, the teachers from 36 to 45 years of age got less opportunity in their carrier advancement. They were recognized lowly in society. So, they were less satisfied with jobs.

Comparatively, the senior teachers by their age hold high social exchanges such as getting more prestige, honor, and attention than those of junior teachers. Due to these differences in the level of social exchanges (particularly recognition and pay) varies among the teachers. Thus, the teachers of different age group hold different discrepancies that cause distinct attitudes towards their job. These differences in attitudes according to different age groups played contributory roles in determining significant differences in recognition and overall JS. Furthermore, the JS is the attitude (Prasetio et al., 2017) which is influenced by the age groups of teachers (Imam, 1990) and it enhances their performances and academic achievements (Iqbal et al., 2016) in schools.

### **Conclusions**

The JS among teachers plays an influential function to determine better performance and academic results in the school. Concerning it, the school teachers were moderately satisfied and they performed their jobs well enough. It means that the social exchange relation between school and teachers is neither satisfactory nor worst. This moderate satisfaction in the job is particularly due to stumpy recognition and pays in relation to social exchanges. Likewise, the age group also brings discrepancy in expectation, fulfillment, self-esteem, achievements, attitude, and finally satisfaction in school teachers in relation to their job. That's why; the JS of teachers vary via their age groups and social exchange relations. More specifically, the senior teachers get more

prestige, honor, attention, and pay than junior teachers. These disparities in exchange relations formed distinctive attitudes towards the job and it finally shaped the differences in JS. Furthermore, the JS among teachers enhances the job commitment, performances, and effectiveness of schools. Thus, the elevated level of JS is beneficial for the school to succeed in high academic achievements.

## Implications and Directions for Future Research

This study contributes to examine the influence of gender in JS across locale of school teachers but there are still many facets to explore in the field of JS among school teachers. Generally, the school teachers possess the similar characteristics but they also show unique features. Thus, this study can be a concrete approach for other upcoming researcher to study JS of the school teachers. In addition, this study ends with following research concerns.

- a) JS in senior and junior school teachers: What difference it makes?

## References

- Ahmed, I., Ismail, W. K. W., Amin, S. M., & Ramzan, M. (2012). A Look at Social Exchange at Work: A Literature Survey Approach. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 19(7), 951-956. doi: 10.5829/idosi.wasj.2012.19.07.2297
- Banerjee, N., Stearns, E., Moller, S., & Mickelson, R. A. (2017). Teacher job satisfaction and student achievement: The role of teachers professional community and teachers collaboration in schools. *American Journal of Education*, 123(2), 203-241.
- Barusman, D. A. R. P., & Mihdar, D. F. (2014). The effect of job satisfaction and organizational justice on organizational citizenship behavior with organization commitment as the moderator. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(9), 118-126.
- Birtch, T. A., Chiang, F. F. T., & Esch, E. V. (2015). A social exchange theory framework for understanding the job characteristics-job outcomes relationship: The mediating role of psychological contract fulfillment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(11), 1217-1236.
- Chandana, K. C. (2014). A Study of Job-Satisfaction of the Primary School Teachers. *International Journal for Research in Education*, 3(3), 18-20.
- Cruickshank, V., & MacDonald, A. (2018, January 15). Teachers who feel appreciated are less likely to leave the profession, *The Conversation*. Retrieved from <https://theconversation.com/teachers-who-feel-appreciated-are-less-likely-to-leave-the-profession-89864>
- Demirtas, Z. (2010). Teachers' job satisfaction levels. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9(2010), 1069-1073. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.287
- District Education Office. (2016). *Educational report of Dhading district- 2016*. Dhading: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.deodhading.gov.np>.
- Dugguh, S. I., & Dennis, A. (2014). Job satisfaction theories: Traceability to employee performance in organizations. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(5), 11-18.

- George, E., Louw, D., & Badenhorst, G. (2008). Job satisfaction among urban secondary-school teachers in Namibia. *South Africa Journal of Education*, 28, 135-154.
- Ghazali, O. (1979). *An investigation of the sources of job satisfaction of Malaysian school teachers*. (Doctor of Philosophy dissertation), University of California, California. Retrieved from <http://malcat.uum.edu.my/kip/Record/usm.454869>
- Ghosh, M. (2013). Job satisfaction of teachers working at the primary school. *Job satisfaction of teachers working at the primary school*, 2(7), 01-05.
- Griffin, L., & Bateman, T. S. (1986). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In L. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 157-188). New York: Wiley.
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159-170.
- Hertzog, M. A. (2008). Considerations in determining sample size for pilot studies. *Research in Nursing and Health*, 31, 180-191. doi: 10.1002/nur.20247
- Hickson, C., & Oshagbemi, T. (1999). The effect of age on the satisfaction of academics with teaching and research. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 26(4), 537-544.
- Imam, S. S. (1990). Job satisfaction among secondary school teachers. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 5(1-2), 17-31.
- Iqbal, A., Aziz, F., Farooqi, T. K., & Ali, S. (2016). Relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and students' academic performance. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 64, 341-350.
- Kemunto, M. E., Raburu, P. A., & Joseph, B. (2018). Does age matter? Job satisfaction of public secondary school teachers. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 7(9), 1-6.
- Khadka, J. (2010). *Job satisfaction of institutional school teachers of Kathmandu district of Nepal*. (Master of Philosophy dissertation), Kathmandu University, Kavre.
- Lester, P. A. (1987). Development and factor analysis of the teacher job satisfaction questionnaire (TJSQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47, 223-233. doi: 10.1177/0013164487471031
- Mannheim, B., Baruch, Y., & Tal, J. (1997). Alternative models for antecedents and of work centrality and job satisfaction of high-tech personnel. *Human Relations*, 50(12), 1537-1562.
- Mehboob, F., & Bhutto, N. A. (2012). Job satisfaction as a predictor of organizational citizenship behavior: A study of faculty members at business institutes. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research Business*, 3(9), 1447-1455.
- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. (2017). *Educational brochure 2017*. Kathmandu: Author.

- Msuya, O. W. (2016). Exploring levels of job satisfaction among teachers in public secondary schools in Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 8(2), 9-16. doi: 10.5897/IJEAPS2015.0435
- Murage, W. S., & Kibera, W. L. (2014). Teachers related factors that influence secondary school teachers job satisfaction levels in public secondary schools in Mombasa district, Kenya. *Journal of Education Research and Behavioral Sciences*, 3(6), 148-153.
- Pan, B., Shen, X., Liu, L., Yang, Y., & Wang, L. (2015). Factors associated with job satisfaction among university teachers in Northeastern region of China: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 12, 12761-12775. doi: 10.3390/ijerph 121012761
- Parvin, M. M., & Kabir, M. N. (2011). Factors affecting employee job satisfaction of pharmaceutical sector. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 113-123.
- Prasetio, A. P., Yuniarsih, T., & Ahman, E. (2017). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviour in state-owned banking. *Universal Journal of Management*, 5(1), 32-38. doi: 10.13189/ujm.2017.050104
- Rao, J. V. R. C. (2015). Job satisfaction among secondary school teachers. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 2(5), 92-96.
- Santos, J. R. A. (1999). Cronbach's alpha: A tool of assessing the reliability scales. *Journal of Extension*, 37(2), 1-5.
- Shabbir, M., Wei, S., Nabi, G., Zaheer, A. N., & Khan, H. (2014). Job satisfaction status of public primary school teachers: A case of Pakistan administrative Kashmir. *European Journal of Education Sciences*, 1(4), 56-71.
- Sundaram, M. S., Subburaj, A., & Sekar, M. (2012). Impact of job satisfaction and personal characteristics on employee absenteeism. *Indian Streams Research Journal*, 2(10), 1-5. doi: 10.9780/22307850
- Unal, O. F. (2013). Relationship between the facets of job satisfaction and the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior: Mediating role of organizational commitment. *The Journal of Faculties of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 18(1), 243-269.
- Wang, Y. (2008). Emotional bonds with supervisor and co-workers: Relationship to organizational commitment in China's foreign-invested companies. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19, 916-931. doi: 10.1080/09585190801993901
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Elementary sampling theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.