

JOB SATISFACTION OF PARA TEACHERS IN RELATION TO THEIR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS IN THE DISTRICT OF BURDWAN

***Pranab Barman, #Dr. Dibyendu Bhattacharyya**

** Research Scholar; Dept.of Education; University of Kalyani.*

#Associate Professor and HOD; Dept.of Education; K.U.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to determine the job satisfaction of Para Teachers working at Upper Primary level in relation to their Socio-Economic status. A sample of 120 Para Teachers working in various schools in the district of Burdwan of West Bengal State was selected by purposive sampling method for the study. A standardised 'Teachers Job Satisfaction Scale' developed by the researcher and A 'Socio-Economic Status Measuring Scale' developed by the researcher were used for collection of primary data. The result revealed that the level of Job Satisfaction and Socio-Economic Status of Para Teachers is not high. The result also revealed that there is significant difference of job satisfaction between urban and rural Para Teachers and there is significant difference of Socio- Economic status between urban and rural Para Teachers and there is significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Socio-Economic Status of Para Teachers.

Keywords: *Job Satisfaction; Socio-Economic Status (SES) and Para Teacher.*

INTRODUCTION

Job Satisfaction is a very important motivation factor which can play a vital role not only in motivating the teachers in classroom performance but also in entire development of an educational institution or organisation. Generally, it is found that those teachers are happier with their profession, can perform better than others who are not satisfied with their profession. Socio-Economic condition is one of the most important predictor of job satisfaction of a teacher.

SCHEME OF PARA TEACHER IN INDIA:

Para Teacher is a scheme of central government to meet the challenge of universalisation of elementary education. The use of Para Teachers in primary education started on a large scale in the late seventies with the start of the centrally sponsored NFE scheme. But the use of Para Teachers in regular primary schools has started only in the eighties, the first initiative being the 'Volunteer Teachers Scheme' of Government of Himachal Pradesh, in 1984. Subsequently the Para Teachers have been employed in most of the states. The use of Para Teachers increased rapidly in India since the mid-1990s. There were near about 514,000 Para Teachers working in India in 2006-2007 (Mehta, 2007, p212).

Para Teachers were first employed in India with the part time education programme in the late seventies. Then the rationale for employing Para Teachers was different. It was argued that since the children because of 'their problems' cannot join full time schools, setting up part time school during the hours convenient for them was considered necessary. Since children were available for part time only, so the teacher also needed to work part time.

During the last few years, especially after the start of DPEP there has been phenomenal rise in the number of Para teacher Schemes. Almost all the educationally backward states have come up with the scheme of Para Teachers. Though, the schemes of Para Teachers are very significant in their origin and approach but the common factor in all of them are that the teachers are low paid and are appointed on contractual basis.

ORIGIN OF THE SCHEME OF PARA TEACHER IN INDIA:

The recent schemes of Para teachers have come up in response to the challenge of providing universal access to primary education under different situation. It has three important aspects:

First, there are a sizeable number of small size habitations in remote and tribal areas, in different states, which do not qualify for formal primary schools within the state government norms. These habitations are dispersed and the children of these habitations do not have access to primary schools within a radius of one kilometre. Providing formal primary schools in these habitations is financially not viable. Therefore, local teachers from the communities are appointed, on a comparatively lower salary to these schools in remote habitations.

Secondly, Para Teachers are appointed in regular schools to ensure a minimum of two teachers in every school. There are a sizeable number of single teacher schools in most of these states.

Thirdly, to address the adverse Pupil Teacher Ratio (PTR), or in other words to meet the teacher requirement. Large vacancies of teachers exist in the regular schools. These vacancies have arisen partly because of the retirement of teachers and partly due to the increase in enrolment. State governments are finding it difficult to fill up these vacancies with teachers in regular pay scales. Para teachers are being appointed to meet the requirement of teachers, because it does not require any significant increase in financial allocation, especially when the state governments are faced with the paucity of funds.

JOB SATISFACTION AND PARA TEACHERS:

Job Satisfaction is one of most important factor which can motivate a teacher to perform better inside and outside of the classroom. But what is the level of satisfaction of Para teachers with their job. They are satisfied with their job? That is very important question.

Hence the researcher found out some important dimensions to measure the level of Job Satisfaction of Para Teachers.

The following Dimensions have been considered to measure the level of Job Satisfaction of Para Teachers: *Job Security; Working Condition; Authority and Independence; Pay Satisfaction; Work Load; Availability of Power and Status; Promotion Opportunities.*

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND PARA TEACHERS:

Socio-Economic Status (SES) is an economic and sociological combined total measure of a person's work experience and of an individual's or family's economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education and occupation. But the researcher in his study has considered the term „Socio-Economic Status“ in the sense of level of income, level of personal status in the school, social position in the society. The Para Teachers at primary schools get a salary of about Rs 5,500 after a recent hike of 35 per cent while Para Teachers at the upper primary stage get a salary of Rs 7,500 which is comparatively very low than other teachers. Not only this, but also Para Teachers is facing some problems like personal identity crisis in the school environment, lack of teacher honour, lack of social position in the society.

Hence the researcher has considered the following Dimensions to measure the level of Socio-Economic Status of Para Teachers: *Level of Income; Personal Status; Social Position; Teacher's Honour; Participation in School Activities.*

Both the questionnaire has been applied to the 120 sample on upper primary level Para Teachers for collecting data. In case of Job satisfaction dimension wise calculation is to be made and for SES firstly total score has been computed and then it is divided into three groups namely: High SES, Middle SES and Low SES, out of which to have the correlation between Job Satisfaction and SES only high and low group has been considered and middle group is to be discarded for conducting inferential statistics through „t“ test.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

The problem selected for the purpose of the present investigation is read as follows: “*Job Satisfaction of Para Teachers in Relation to their Socio-Economic Status in the District of Burdwan*”.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

The researcher has conducted his study on the basis of the following objectives:

1. To study the different dimensions of job satisfaction of Para Teachers working at Upper Primary Level.

2. To study the different dimensions of Socio-Economic Status of Para Teachers working at Upper Primary Level.
3. To find out the significant difference between urban and rural Para Teachers in respect to their job satisfaction.
4. To find out the significant difference between urban and rural Para Teachers in respect to their Socio-Economic Status.
5. To find out the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Socio-Economic Status of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY:

The following hypotheses have been constructed to achieve the objectives of the study:

H_{o.1}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio economic status in relation to Job Security of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

H_{o.2}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio economic status in relation to Working Condition of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

H_{o.3}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio economic status in relation to Authority and Independence of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

H_{o.4}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio economic status in relation to Pay Satisfaction of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

H_{o.5}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio economic status in relation to Work Load of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

H_{o.6}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio economic status in relation to Availability of Power and Status of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

H_{o.7}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio economic status in relation to Promotion Opportunities of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

H_{o.8}. There is no significant difference between urban and rural Para Teachers in respect to their Job Satisfaction.

H_{o.9}. There is no significant difference between urban and rural Para Teachers in respect to their Socio-Economic Status.

H_{o.10}. There is no significant relationship between Job satisfaction and Socio-Economic Status of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Method:

In the present study Descriptive Survey Method was employed to find out the level of Job Satisfaction and Socio-Economic Status of Para Teachers. By applying the questionnaire (SES) total score of the SES has been calculated and three groups are formed high, low and middle SES group on the basis of marks obtained out of which high and low groups are taken for conducting the study and decisions are taken from inferential statistics through „t“-test.

Sample:

One hundred twenty Para Teachers of thirty schools situated in the district of Burdwan have been selected as the sample for the present study. Among these one hundred twenty Para Teachers, sixty Para Teachers from urban schools and sixty Para Teachers from rural schools have been taken for the sample.

Tools Used:

The following tools were used for the present study:

1. „Teachers Job Satisfaction Scale“ developed by the researcher.
2. „Socio-Economic Status Measuring Scale“ developed by the researcher.

Statistical Techniques:

The following statistical techniques were used in the present study:

Mean; Standard Deviation and t-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

H_{0.1}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio economic status in relation to Job Security of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

Table - 1: Shown the Job Security of Para Teachers between high & low socio-economic group.

Groups	No. of Para Teacher	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Level of Significance
High SES	35	21.50	5.55	1.45	Not significant at 0.05 level
Low SES	35	19.78	4.32		

From the above table it is clear that the „t“ value of Job Security between high and low socio-economic group is not significant. From this it may be inferred that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do not differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Job Security.

H_{0.2}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio-economic status in relation to Working Condition of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

Table - 2: Shown the Working Condition of Para Teachers between high & low socio-economic group.

Groups	No. of Para Teacher	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Level of Significance
High SES	35	22.31	4.35	2.78	significant at 0.05 level
Low SES	35	19.11	5.21		

From the above table it is clear that „t“ value of Working Condition between high and low socio-economic group is significant. From this it may be inferred that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Working Condition.

H_{0.3}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio-economic status in relation to Authority and Independence of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

Table - 3: Shown the Authority and Independence of Para Teachers between high & low socio-economic group.

Groups	No. of Para Teacher	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Level of Significance
High SES	35	23.79	4.07	3.68	significant at 0.05 level
Low SES	35	20.58	3.17		

From the above table it is clear that „t“ value of Authority and Independence between high and low socio-economic group is significant. From this it may be inferred that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Authority and Independence.

H_{0.4}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio-economic status in relation to Pay Satisfaction of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

Table - 4: Shown the Pay Satisfaction of Para Teachers between high & low socio-economic group.

Groups	No. of Para Teacher	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Level of Significance
High SES	35	22.83	3.75	2.47	significant at 0.05 level
Low SES	35	20.73	3.43		

From the above table it is clear that, "t" value of Pay Satisfaction between high and low socio-economic group is significant. From this it may be inferred that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Pay Satisfaction.

H_{0.5}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio economic status in relation to Work Load of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

Table - 5: Shown the Work Load of Para Teachers between high & low socio-economic group.

Groups	No. of Para Teacher	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Level of Significance
High SES	35	22.11	4.25	2.88	significant at 0.05 level
Low SES	35	19.51	3.33		

From the above table it is clear that, "t" value of Work Load between high and low socio-economic group is significant. From this it may be inferred that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Work Load.

H_{0.6}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio economic status in relation to Availability of Power and Status of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

Table - 6: Shown the Availability of Power and Status of Para Teachers between high & low socio-economic group.

Groups	No. of Para Teacher	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Level of Significance
High SES	35	20.55	4.13	1.48	Not significant at 0.05 level
Low SES	35	19.24	3.25		

From the above table it is clear that, "t" value of Availability of Power and Status between high and low socio-economic group is not significant. From this it may be inferred that the high

and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do not differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Availability of Power and Status.

H_{0.7}. There is no significant mean difference of job satisfaction between high and low socio economic status in relation to Promotion Opportunities of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

Table - 7: Shown the Promotion Opportunities of Para Teachers between high & low socio-economic group.

Groups	No. of Para Teacher	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Level of Significance
High SES	35	20.12	4.48	0.82	Not significant at 0.05 level
Low SES	35	19.31	3.74		

From the above table it is clear that, "t" value of Promotion Opportunities between high and low socio-economic group is not significant. From this it may be inferred that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do not differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Promotion Opportunities.

H_{0.8}. There is no significant mean difference between urban and rural Para Teachers in respect to their Job Satisfaction.

Table - 8: Shown the Difference in Job Satisfaction between urban and rural Para Teachers.

Groups	No. of Para Teacher	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Level of Significance
Urban	60	144.5	11.52	4.54	significant at 0.05 level
Rural	60	135.5	10.23		

From the above table it is clear that, "t" value of Job Satisfaction between urban and rural Para Teachers is significant. From this it may be inferred that the urban and rural Para Teachers do differ in their Job Satisfaction.

H_{0.9}. There is no significant difference between urban and rural Para Teachers in respect to their Socio-Economic Status.

Table - 9: Shown the Difference in Socio-Economic Status between urban and rural Para Teachers.

Groups	No. of Para Teacher	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Level of Significance
Urban	60	119.5	13.57	3.91	significant at 0.05 level
Rural	60	110.5	11.64		

From the above table it is clear that, t^* value of Socio-Economic Status between urban and rural Para Teachers is significant. From this it may be inferred that the urban and rural Para Teachers do differ in their Socio-Economic Status.

$H_{o.10}$. There is no significant relationship between Job satisfaction and Socio-Economic Status of Para Teachers at Upper Primary Level.

Table - 10: Shown the relationship between Job satisfaction and Socio-Economic Status of Para Teachers.

Groups	No. of Teacher	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Level of Significance
High SES	35	153.52	14.05	5.01	Significant at 0.05 level
Low SES	35	137.26	13.12		

As the t-value is significant it shows that both the variables are correlated and null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, it may be inferred that there exist significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Socio-Economic Status of Para Teachers.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY:

1. The, t^* value of hypothesis no.-1 reveals that Job Security between high and low socio-economic group is not significant. Therefore, we can say that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do not differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Job Security.
2. The, t^* value of hypothesis no.-2 reveals that Working Condition between high and low socio-economic group is significant. Therefore, we can say that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Working Condition.
3. The, t^* value of hypothesis no.-3 reveals that Authority and Independence between high and low socio-economic group is significant. Therefore, we can say that the high and low

socio-economic group of Para Teachers do differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Authority and Independence.

4. The „t“ value of hypothesis no.-4 reveals that Pay Satisfaction between high and low socio-economic group is significant. Therefore, we can say that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Pay Satisfaction.

5. The „t“ value of hypothesis no.-5 reveals that Work Load between high and low socio-economic group is significant. Therefore, we can say that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Work Load.

6. The „t“ value of hypothesis no.-6 reveals that Availability of Power and Status between high and low socio-economic group is not significant. Therefore, we can say that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do not differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Availability of Power and Status.

7. The „t“ value of hypothesis no.-7 reveals that Promotion Opportunities between high and low socio-economic group is not significant. Therefore, we can say that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do not differ in their Job Satisfaction in relation to Promotion Opportunities.

8. The „t“ value of hypothesis no.-8 reveals that Job Satisfaction between urban and rural Para Teachers is significant. Therefore, we can say that the high and low socio-economic group of Para Teachers do differ in their Job Satisfaction.

9. The „t“ value of hypothesis no.-9 reveals that Socio-Economic Status between urban and rural Para Teachers is significant. Therefore, we can say that the urban and rural Para Teachers do differ in their Socio-Economic Status.

10. The „t“ value of hypothesis no.-10 reveals that Job Satisfaction between high and low socio-economic group is significant. Therefore, we can say that there exist significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Socio-Economic Status of Para Teachers.

CONCLUSIONS

It is interestingly found that most of the variables related to Job Satisfaction are highly correlated to Socio-economic status. It is observed that Para teachers are not satisfied with their working conditions at all in which they served. Most of them think that they are negligible part of the school system. Attitude of other colleagues and teachers towards them is not up to the mark. They are facing so many problems like that lack of authority and independency in doing work; inadequate salary which is comparatively very less than other teachers and even sometimes they are facing the problem of more work load in the Institutional environment. Therefore, it is clear that Para teachers working at upper primary level are not fully satisfied with their job due to their low Socio-Economic Status. An emphasis should be given by the government over this matter of Para teachers. Some

effective measures should be taken by the government immediately by raising the salary level, improving the working conditions and reducing the work load over the Para teachers for quality education.

REFERENCES

- M.G. Borg and R.J. Riding, Occupational stress and satisfaction in teaching. *British Educational Research Journal*, 17 (1991) 263-281.
- A.B. Boshoff and C.Hoole, Portability of the job involvement and job satisfaction constructs between the United States of America and South Africa. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 1 (1998)73-84.
- A.Crossman and P. Harris, Job Satisfaction of Secondary School Teachers. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 34 (2006)29-46.
- S. R. Choudhury (Das), Professional awareness vis-à-vis job satisfaction of college and university teachers in Assam. *Edutracks*, 6 (7) (2007)32-35.
- R. Govinda and Y. Josephine, Para teachers in India: A Review. Mimeo, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, Delhi, (2004).
- U. Gupta, „Job Involvement and need patterns of Primary School Teachers in relation to Teaching Effectiveness“, Ph.D., Edu. All.Univ, (1981).
- Kingdon and R, Sipahimalani, Para teachers in India: Status and Impact. Mimeo, Institute of Education, University of London, (2009).
- K. Kumar and S. Saxena, The Trouble with Para Teachers. *Frontline*, (2001) 18-22.
- Y.Neumann, A. Reichel and I.A. Saad, Organizational climate and work satisfaction: the case of Beduin elementary schools in Israel. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 26 (1988) 82-96.
- National Council for Teacher Education, *Competency Based and Commitment Oriented Teacher Education for Quality School Education -Initiation Document*. Author, New Delhi. (1998).
- P. Bharti, “A comparative study of job satisfaction of government and private school teachers at secondary level.”*Indian Educational Review* XVI, No. 4, NCERT, (2005) 55.
- G. S. Prakasha, and H.R. Jayamma and O. Thirumalaesha, *A Study on Teacher Effectiveness in relation to job satisfaction of teacher educators*. *Journal of innovation in education and psychology*, 1 (4) (2011) ISSN 2249-1481.
- S. Shukla, *Teaching Competency, Professional Commitment and Job Satisfaction*. Retrieved from <http://www.Illusion.instablogs.com> (2009).
- J. M. Sylvester, Attitude towards teaching profession and job satisfaction of teacher educators. *Edutracks* 9(8) (2010) 36-38.
- P. Usha, and P. Sasikumar, Teachers“ commitment and teachers“ self-concept as predictors of job satisfaction. *Edutracks* 6 (1) (2007) 26-29.