An investigation into the relationship between teachers’ job performance and job satisfaction in Myanmar

Introduction
In society, demanding the development of the youth, teachers’ job performance both inside and outside the classroom is essential to fulfilling this demand. Teachers can influence the learning process to some significant extent. Teachers are expected to be role models for their students and, therefore, teachers’ job performance is crucial for students’ success. Teachers will normally be satisfied with their job if teachers have a good relationship with the principal(s) of their school, are offered the highest possible salaries, and are involved in the decision-making process at their school, they will normally be satisfied with their job. Job satisfaction is an important facet of people’s lives and their productivity in the workplace. Job satisfaction can lead to a sense of responsibility and involvement toward achieving comprehensive career goals and contributing to the productivity of an organization (Harter, James, Schmidt, Hayes, & Theodore, 2002, cited in Ismail, 2012).

Robbins states, "job satisfaction refers to the individual’s general attitude towards his or her job. He adds that "a person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive attitudes about the job, while a person who is dissatisfied with his or her job holds negative attitudes about the job" (Robbins, 2003, cited in Younes, 2012). A principal’s leadership style might affect teachers’ job satisfaction. Teachers’ job satisfaction could improve their performance in the classroom (Nadarasa & Thuraisingam, 2014). Teacher job satisfaction is a "...vital area of study since several studies have found that work satisfaction influences general life satisfaction. General life is an important influence on the daily psychological health of a teacher." This, in turn, has an impact on teachers’ job performance (Andrew and Whitney, 1974, cited in Wangai, 2012).

Teacher job satisfaction is a source of motivation that sustains effort in performing tasks required of good teachers (Watson et al., 1991, cited in Wangai, 2012). Effort results in higher performance when employees clearly understand and are comfortable with their roles (Kreitner, 1986, cited in Gathungu & Wachira, 2013). If a teacher is incompetent, dissatisfied with his jobs, and not guided by proper values, the entire edifice of the education system will be shaky (Raza, 2010). Due to better performance shown by satisfied workers, it is the top priority of all organizations to achieve the desired goals by increasing their satisfaction (Chambers, 1999, cited in Iqbal & Akhtar, 2008). In this point of view, examining the relationship between teachers’ job performance and satisfaction is crucially important for promoting a better job performance in the future.

Review of the Literature

Importance of Job Performance
Teachers play a basic and dynamic role in an educational system. Teacher performance is the most crucial input in the field of education. Teachers’ performance is very crucial in the child’s development. It is said that the good performance of students depends upon the effective teaching of their teachers. Teachers’ performance is how a teacher behaves in the process of teaching. Teachers’ performance is known to be related to teachers’ effectiveness (Medly and Shannon, 1994, cited in Raza, 2010).

"Teachers’ job performance could be described as the duties performed by teachers at a particular period in the school system in achieving organizational goals.” In light of this, Adeyemi, (2010, cited in Roul, 2012) described teachers’ job performance as the ability of the teachers to combine relevant inputs for the enhancement of the teaching and learning process. Teachers are the most valuable assets of any school. A successful high productive school can be achieved by engaging teachers in
improving teachers’ job performance. All teachers are not equal in their performance. But if they are handled effectively, their moral can be increased, and they become more productive (Roul, 2012).

**Factors Affecting the Performance of Teachers**

The factors affecting the performance of teachers are of two types, the external factors, and the internal factors. There are many external factors affecting how a teacher makes decisions in the classroom. While it is difficult to attach any order of significance to these factors, because every teacher is different, they will include to some degree, the expectations of the community, the particular school system in which the teacher is employed, the school itself, the grade policies, the parents and the students. Many of the expectations from these external factors will appear conflicting, and it is the classroom teacher who welds these into a workable framework while integrating a range of internal factors (Hasan, 2004, cited in Akram, 2010).

Ferris et al., (1988, cited in Akram, 2010) identified teachers’ job performance on seven performance dimensions. These were preparation and planning, effectiveness in presenting the subject matter, poise, relations with students, self-improvement, relations with other staff, and relations with parents and community. In this study, the factors affecting teachers’ job performance developed by Kim and Richard (1991, cited in Akram, 2010) will be discussed in detail. They are (i) Teachers’ Attitude, (ii) Subject Mastery of Teachers, (iii) Teaching Methodology, and (iv) Personal Characteristics.

**Importance of Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is an important facet of people's lives and their productivity in the workplace. Job satisfaction can lead to a sense of responsibility and involvement toward achieving comprehensive career goals and contributing to the productivity of an organization (Harter, James, Schmidt, Hayes, & Theodore, 2002, cited in Ismail, 2012). Job satisfaction is vital not only for employees but employers as it increases productivity and decreases employee turnover. According to Syptak (1999, cited in Gathungu & Wachira, 2013), Job satisfaction is an important element in a work situation and has been associated with improved performance as well as increased commitment to the organization. Employee satisfaction has been an important issue for academicians and scholars. High levels of absenteeism and staff turnover have affected various organizations as recruitment and retaining take their role. Very few organizations have made job satisfaction a top priority, because of failure to understand the significant opportunity that lies in front of them. Organizations that create work environments that attract, motivate, and retain hard-working individuals will be better positioned to succeed in a competitive environment that demands quality and cost-efficiency.

According to Olulube (2008, cited in Ngimbudzi, 2009), teachers play a very significant role in the provision of secondary education, therefore studying the factors or facets that are associated with their job satisfaction is essential. Also, it is argued that the presence of such factors in the workplace influences employees’ job performance and productivity (Witte, 2007, cited in Ngimbudzi, 2009). Teachers who are not satisfied in the workplace are more likely to leave the profession (Choy et al., 1993, cited in Ismail, 2012). If teachers can receive support from their principal and local parents if they are involved in the decision-making process, and if they work within a positive school climate and culture, they are more likely to succeed and remain in the profession (Lumsden, 1998, cited in Ismail, 2012). According to MOEC (1995, cited in Ngimbudzi, 2009), – job satisfaction and the ability of teachers to perform well professionally are key factors in the maintenance of the quality of education.

**Facets of Job Satisfaction**

The phenomenon of job satisfaction is associated with five main factors, namely: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman (1959, cited in Ngimbudzi, 2009) refer to these factors as the “basic satisfiers” or “motivators.” Job satisfaction is a multidimensional phenomenon, and it is therefore argued that different scholars identify different job satisfaction factors or facets (Bolin, 2007, cited in Ngimbudzi, 2009).

Additionally, the teachers derive their satisfaction from such factors as salaries, fringe benefits, educational policies and administration, working conditions, advancement opportunities, responsibilities within the job recognition, and so on (Denga, 1996; Nwagwu & Salmi, 1999; Ossai,
Ellis argues that teachers’ motivation and job satisfaction are associated with intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Intrinsic rewards include such issues as professional development, nature of work itself, and sense of achievement, while the extrinsic ones include pay and job security (Latham, 1998, cited in Ngimbudzi, 2009).

Intrinsic factors associated with increased levels of teacher job satisfaction included working with students, viewing the profession as rewarding, and feeling good about student progress. On the contrary, extrinsic factors leading to teacher job dissatisfaction included low wages, poor principal support, issues of student misconduct, minimal teaching resources, and a negative school atmosphere (Metlife Survey, 2001, cited in Biggerstaff, 2012). Because an employee’s level of satisfaction varies with specific aspects of the job, it is proposed that numerous facets (variables) from the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) underlie this construct. The JSS (Spector, 1997, cited in Kaltenbaugh, 2008) assesses nine facets of job satisfaction. In other words, the survey instrument has to include nine job satisfaction facets or factors, and those facets include – pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, co-workers, nature of work, and communication.

Method

Overall Design of the Study

The specific aims of this study are:

- to find out the levels of job performance as indicated by teachers,
- to examine the levels of job satisfaction as indicated by teachers,
- to investigate the relationship between teachers’ job performance and satisfaction.

In this study, the descriptive statistical design was utilized. Data were collected by using two questionnaires: a questionnaire for principals and questionnaires for teachers. To collect the general information of selected schools and demographic information of principals, questionnaires for principals developed by researchers were distributed to 6 principals from selected schools. Questionnaire for teachers was mainly used to examine the perceptions of teachers on their principal’s transformational leadership style, their job performance. So, it composed of two parts. In the first part of the questionnaire, "Performance of Teachers," developed by Kim and Richard (1991, cited in Akram, 2010), was examined to investigate the teachers’ job performance. In the second part of the questionnaire, "Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)" developed by Spector (1994, cited in Rumph, 2012) was used to find out the teachers’ job satisfaction. After collecting the related data, descriptive statistics, and the bivariate correlation of the variables were calculated using SPSS. Even though some of the questionnaires were not returned from teachers, there were six principals and 399 teachers from 6 selected Basic Education High Schools who participated in this study.

The Pilot Test

A sample of 3 Basic Education High Schools in Monywa Township was randomly selected to conduct the pilot study. The preliminary instruments were field-tested by 146 teachers (male=12, female=134) representing 3 Basic Education High Schools.

Reliability of Measuring Instruments

To measure the reliability of the instrument, the Pearson product-moment correlation method (Average Item Total Correlation) was used for internal consistency reliability. The questionnaire for teachers’ job performance had the coefficient of correlation ranging from .832 to .865, and the average was .849. The instruments were found reliable for data collection, considering a minimum value of average item-total correlation 0.3 (Nurosis, 1994). The survey instrument used for knowing teachers’ job satisfaction had the correlation coefficients ranging from .401 to .728, and the average correlation was .565. The instrument is reliable since the coefficient value was greater than 0.3.
Data Analysis

Using SPSS, descriptive statistics were calculated for teachers’ job performance and job satisfaction. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was utilized to know the relationship between teachers’ job performance and job satisfaction.

Findings

Teachers’ Job Performance in Selected Basic Education High Schools

The teachers’ job performance in selected Basic Education High Schools was assessed by “Performance of Teachers” developed by Kim and Richard (1991, cited in Akram, 2010). There are five factors affecting teachers’ job performance. They are “Teachers’ Attitude”, “Subject Mastery of Teachers”, “Teaching Methodology”, and “Personal Characteristics”. Table 4.1 shows mean scores for teachers’ job performance in selected Basic Education High Schools.

Table 1: Mean Scores for Teachers’ Job Performance in Selected Basic Education High Schools

(Teachers’ Ratings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Affecting Job Performance</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>All Schools (n=387)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A (n1=65)</td>
<td>B (n2=67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Attitude</td>
<td>4.39 (0.39)</td>
<td>4.27 (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Mastery of Teachers</td>
<td>4.17 (0.40)</td>
<td>4.29 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methodology</td>
<td>4.40 (0.41)</td>
<td>4.30 (0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>4.47 (0.40)</td>
<td>3.88 (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Job Performance</td>
<td>4.36 (0.32)</td>
<td>4.19 (0.04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-2.33= Low Performance, 2.34-3.67= Moderate Performance, 3.68-5= High Performance
Figure 1: \textit{Mean Scores for Teachers’ Job Performance in Selected Basic Education High Schools}

Figure 1 shows the mean scores for teachers’ job performance in selected schools rated by them. Concerning the performance of selected teachers from selected high schools, “Teaching Methodology” was found to be the most important performance perceived by teachers, followed in descending order, by “Personal Characteristics”, “Teachers’ Attitude”, and “Subject Mastery of Teachers” as shown in Figure 4.2. In short, the overall job performance of teachers in selected high schools falls under the high-performance level.

\textit{Job Satisfaction Perceived by Teachers in Selected Basic Education High Schools}

The job satisfaction of teachers in selected Basic Education High Schools was assessed by the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) developed by Spector (1994, cited in Rumph, 2012). In JSS, there were nine facets: “Pay”, “Promotion”, “Supervision”, “Fringe Benefits”, “Contingent Rewards”, “Operating Conditions”, “Co-workers”, “Nature of Work”, and “Communication”. In this study, the teachers’ job satisfaction is divided into three levels: Low Satisfaction Level (1 to 2.33), Moderate Satisfaction Level (2.34 to 3.67), and High Satisfaction Level (3.68 to 5). The mean scores of the data resulted from this survey are depicted in Table 2.
Table 2 *Mean Scores for Teachers’ Job Satisfaction in Selected Basic Education High Schools*  
(Teachers’ Ratings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facets of Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>School A (n=65)</th>
<th>School B (n=67)</th>
<th>School C (n=52)</th>
<th>School D (n=64)</th>
<th>School E (n=70)</th>
<th>School F (n=69)</th>
<th>All schools (n=387)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>2.91 (0.86)</td>
<td>3.51 (0.06)</td>
<td>2.92 (0.48)</td>
<td>2.80 (0.64)</td>
<td>2.53 (0.90)</td>
<td>3.02 (0.61)</td>
<td>2.95 (0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>3.23 (0.59)</td>
<td>3.73 (0.07)</td>
<td>3.20 (0.53)</td>
<td>3.43 (0.58)</td>
<td>3.22 (0.64)</td>
<td>3.41 (0.49)</td>
<td>3.38 (0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>4.23 (0.44)</td>
<td>4.96 (0.15)</td>
<td>3.83 (0.45)</td>
<td>4.16 (0.47)</td>
<td>4.19 (0.47)</td>
<td>4.09 (0.49)</td>
<td>4.26 (0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>2.80 (0.85)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.06)</td>
<td>2.70 (0.67)</td>
<td>3.09 (0.66)</td>
<td>2.62 (0.78)</td>
<td>3.10 (0.71)</td>
<td>2.85 (0.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>3.37 (0.40)</td>
<td>3.56 (0.06)</td>
<td>3.12 (0.39)</td>
<td>3.17 (0.39)</td>
<td>3.13 (0.42)</td>
<td>3.12 (0.40)</td>
<td>3.25 (0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Conditions</td>
<td>3.91 (0.63)</td>
<td>3.88 (0.07)</td>
<td>3.82 (0.43)</td>
<td>3.80 (0.48)</td>
<td>3.72 (0.56)</td>
<td>3.72 (0.41)</td>
<td>3.81 (0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>4.11 (0.41)</td>
<td>4.00 (0.03)</td>
<td>3.99 (0.45)</td>
<td>4.17 (0.50)</td>
<td>4.06 (0.41)</td>
<td>4.07 (0.40)</td>
<td>4.07 (0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>4.19 (0.45)</td>
<td>4.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>3.87 (0.53)</td>
<td>3.90 (0.53)</td>
<td>3.85 (0.61)</td>
<td>3.97 (0.42)</td>
<td>3.99 (0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4.20 (0.38)</td>
<td>4.24 (0.06)</td>
<td>3.97 (0.39)</td>
<td>4.11 (0.46)</td>
<td>4.09 (0.40)</td>
<td>4.07 (0.57)</td>
<td>4.12 (0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.66 (0.34)</td>
<td>3.85 (0.03)</td>
<td>3.49 (0.30)</td>
<td>3.62 (0.32)</td>
<td>3.49 (0.35)</td>
<td>3.63 (0.31)</td>
<td>3.63 (0.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-2.33 = Low Satisfaction, 2.34-3.67 = Moderate Satisfaction, 3.68-5 = High Satisfaction

Figure 2: *Mean Scores for Teachers’ Job Satisfaction in Selected Basic Education High Schools*

Figure 2 shows the mean scores for teachers’ job satisfaction in selected Basic Education High Schools in Mandalay. According to Figure 2, “Supervision” was the highest satisfaction by the teachers in selected high schools and followed by “Communication”, “Co-workers”, “Nature of Work”, “Operating Conditions”, “Promotion”, “Contingent Rewards”, “Pay”, and “Fringe Benefits” in descending order. In summary, the overall job satisfaction of teachers in selected schools falls under the moderate satisfaction level with the mean score of 3.63.
Relationship between Teachers’ Job Performance and Job Satisfaction in Selected Basic Education High Schools

To explore the relationship between teachers’ job performance (dependent variable), and teachers’ job satisfaction (independent variable), the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was utilized. Table 3 shows the correlation between teachers’ job performance and job satisfaction in selected Basic Education High Schools in Monywa Township.

Table 3: Correlation between Teachers’ Job Performance and Job Satisfaction in Selected Basic Education High Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers’ Job Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.404**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers’ Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.404**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 3, teachers’ job performance was significantly related to teachers’ job satisfaction ($r=0.404$, $p<0.01$). This indicated that a positive and moderate relationship existed between these two variables.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the teachers from all selected high schools have a positive attitude towards teaching, their pupils and their schools. Also, they possess knowledge and skills about their teaching subjects and related subjects to teach effectively and use many methods and techniques as possible in their teaching to understand their pupils. Moreover, they present a confident role image, speak, give precise directions, and act as role models. In doing so, their good performance can provide for their schools’ success. A successful high productive school can be achieved by engaging teachers in improving teachers’ job performance.

The results show that the teachers from selected Basic Education High Schools were highly satisfied with five facets of job satisfaction, namely, “Supervision”, “Operating Conditions”, “Co-workers”, “Nature of Work” and “Communication”, but they were moderately satisfied with four facets of job satisfaction including “Pay”, “Promotion”, “Fringe Benefits” and “Contingent Rewards”. However, the level of job satisfaction in all selected high schools falls under the moderate satisfaction level with a mean score of 3.63. In short, the teachers from all selected high schools prefer the operating school conditions such as the workplace, work instruments, the work itself, school policy and school rules. They also assumed that their colleagues are sympathetic and understanding; sometimes they give helpful information, advice, and give practical assistance. Moreover, they have an effective interpersonal relationships among them and with their principals. They also like their profession and assumed that it provides them opportunities to learn and to use their skills and abilities. On the other hand, they assumed that financial compensations are not equitable according to their performance, and there is too little chance for promotion. Moreover, they do not satisfy their fringe benefits and contingent rewards. Therefore, the principals of selected high schools should pay attention to human aspects of subordinates’ problems and behavioral aspects, such as motivating forces, processes in communication, goal setting, and control and performance characteristics. They should try to identify their teachers’ needs and try to satisfy or meet them.

It was found a high positive relationship between teachers’ job performance and satisfaction in selected high schools. If the level of job satisfaction of teachers is high, the level of job performance of teachers may be high. Satisfied teachers can contribute in improving students’ academic performance and school effectiveness.
The results of this study are also in line with those of Indhumathi (2011) in that there was a positive relationship between job satisfaction and performance. Mbua (2003) also stated that if teachers in an educational organization are motivated, they will perform more efficiently and effectively. The infrastructure facilities pay scale, class size number of classes handled per day, and the attitude of students are all significantly favorable for the teachers. Thus these can improve teachers’ satisfaction and their performance.

There are other factors that influence job performance and satisfaction, such as organizational culture, climate, and other external variables. For further research, researchers should explore the relationship between other variables and teachers’ job performance and satisfaction.
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