Chapter-V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

5.1.1 Introduction

School principals and school heads are one of the important elements in the overall growth and development of secondary educational institutions. Their administrative and leadership role should be attractive and it influences on their job satisfaction. Job satisfaction of school heads helps in achieving the aim and objectives of educational system effectively and efficiently. The job satisfaction of the secondary school heads influenced by their leadership behaviour, attitudes, work life balance, family environment, family support, socio-economic status, salary, promotions, experience, colleague’s cooperation, fair supervision and degree of participation in global setting.

Family Environment and Socio-Economic status are important factors considered in secondary schools as they can positively or negatively influence the school performance goals. The challenge before the headmasters/head mistress is to generate the culture of excellence and creating the passion and sense of worth about teaching among the teachers, giving them independence and encouragement and of course mentoring leadership among colleagues. The school heads are required to be sensitized and should act positively time to time about important policy interventions such as RTE, RMSA and acquire necessary leadership and managerial skills to meet their job satisfaction. For these schools heads needs support from their families and their socio-economic status for more
satisfaction in their jobs. Hence the researcher has taken this study to know the job satisfaction of school heads in relation to their family environment and socio-economic status in Bangalore South Educational District.

5.1.2 Need for the Study

Education is powerful instrument of social, political and economic change. It is a process of lighting lakhs of lamps to enlighten the society. Education is the aggregate of all the processes by which a person develops his abilities, attitudes and other forms of behavior, which may help to attain social competence and optimum individual development. It is believed that the school heads play a vital role in one’s life. The job satisfaction towards teaching profession among the higher secondary school heads depends on many factors such as family and socio economic status and so on. So the investigator is interested in knowing the job satisfaction of higher secondary school heads in relation to their family environment and socio-economic status.

Nowadays, the concept of Job Satisfaction is not only limited to employee sector, but also covers all the sectors, where there is involvement of the employees and workers. Job Satisfaction is like of one’s job and its fulfillment. It is acquiring an increasingly important role in modern society, in which man spends most of his time on his job, basically undertaken for payment received in lieu of it. Job Satisfaction is important both to the employee as well as the employer. Greater Job Satisfaction is likely to lead eventually to more effective functioning of the individual and the organization as a whole.

In fact, working life is to be evaluated not simply in terms of the amount of goods. Turned out, the productive efficiency and the profit it brings but the
level of satisfaction that the participants derive from it. The satisfied worker is in
general a more flexible and better adjusted who has the capacity to overcome the
effects of an environment. He is more realistic about his own situation and goals.
The worker dissatisfied with his job, in contrast, is often rigid, inflexible,
unrealistic in his choice of goals, unable to overcome environmental obstacles
and generally unhappy and dissatisfied.

Lack of Job Satisfaction can be a significant source of daily stress. There
can be various reasons of job dissatisfaction, such as bickering coworkers,
conflict with your supervisor, not having necessary equipment or resources to
succeed, lack of opportunities for promotion, having little or no say in decisions
that affect school heads, fear of losing job, work that find boring or overly
routine and work that doesn’t tap into your education, skills or interests. A study
of Job Satisfaction classifies and categorizes the conditions and factors that lead
to Job Satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Besides, one could reinforce conditions that make work more satisfying
and fulfilling instead of dull and disappointing. The same is true for teachers and
school heads also. In the education field, there has been an increasing awareness
of the demands of school heads. Of course, the schools, colleges and universities
as humanizing and educating institutions have a major role in the growth and
development of the students they serve, but the social well being, advancement,
and growth of pupils depends to a great extent on the enthusiasm, efficiency and
professional skills of the school heads. The progress and future of education, its
quality and ideals will depend upon how and by whom young persons are
educated.
Blum and Naylor (1968) found that job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee. In a narrow sense, their attitudes are related to the job and are concerned with such specific factors as wages supervision, steadiness of employment, conditions of work, opportunities for advancement, recognition of ability, fair evaluation of work, social relations on job, prompt settlement of grievances, and fair treatment by employer and similar other items. Education Commission (1966) cautioned that dissatisfaction of individual, whatever may be the occupation in which he is engaged, results in professional stagnation and becomes harmful to the clientele. A dissatisfies school heads spells disaster to the country’s future. Dissatisfaction among the workers is undesirable and dangerous in any profession. It is suicidal if it occurs in the teaching profession. Herzberg (1957) has shown that more satisfied workers will tend to add more value to an organization. Unhappy employees, who are motivated by fear of job loss, will not give 100 percent of their effort for very long. Hoppock’s (1935), seminal study of job satisfaction revealed that dissatisfaction with wages was the most important reason advanced for voluntary separation across a broad array of occupations.

Further, a school head has to devote more time for administering and leadership and also for preparation of classes and later delivering the teaching assignment in an effective manner. For that the school heads has to devote some of their time even at home for her academic and administrative work. In course of this he/she may not be able to take care of the family issues as effectively as women who perform exclusively the role of a home maker. In the back drop of the above it would be of high importance and relevant from the point of view of social work profession to understand the family atmosphere of female teacher.
which may be either related directly or indirectly by them in discharging their duties as an effective teacher. The socio-economic statuses of the school heads are also important for better satisfaction in their jobs.

The study of job satisfaction among high school principals is important because there are aspects of the job that are highly attractive and lead to satisfaction and aspects of the job that lead to dissatisfaction. Positive aspects include the opportunity to work with a school faculty and staff to accomplish common goals, developing school culture and the ability to work with students (Malone, Sharp, & Walter, 2001). Too often in studies of principals the study looks at negative aspects of the principalship and neglects looking at what reasons make the job of running a school attractive, leading to job satisfaction.

For the purpose of this study it is important to examine the characteristics of the principal’s profession, and personal characteristics that affect either positively or negatively the attitudes and feelings of the contemporary high school principal’s job and lead to job satisfaction. With the many difficulties most often identified with the job of high school administrators such as: (a) working hours, (b) complexity of the job, (c) unending supervision of night activities, (d) minimal pay difference between top teachers and administrators, (e) high expectations, (f) federal, state and district mandates, (g) increasingly complex society, (h) vice-principal job seen as negative, and (i) difficulty in helping teachers becoming more collaborative (Yerkes & Guaglianone, 1998). It is extremely important to identify the concepts that lead to satisfaction for high school principals. When these concepts are known then practices can be put into place that will enable superintendents and school boards to maximize job
satisfaction for high school principals, thus reducing the turnover rate and making recruitment of new people for such leadership roles easier.

Therefore, the Job Satisfaction of school heads is much value to administrators who frame policies, take decisions and create conditions in which teachers try to maximize their potential and thus derive greater Job Satisfaction. In this context, a study of Job Satisfaction can provide information to educational administrators to help them understand the school heads in a better way and explore the best possible ways to maximize the career adjustment of the secondary school heads.

5.1.3 Statement of the Problem

The problem selected for the study is stated as follows

A STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL HEADS IN RELATION TO THEIR FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

5.1.4 Objectives of the Study

The study is guided by the following objectives:

1. To determine the effect of background variables such as sex, type of school management, locality, age, marital status, subjects taught, nature of appointment and teaching experience of secondary school heads on their Job Satisfaction.

2. To study the effect of independent variables such as family environment and socio-economic status of secondary school heads on their Job Satisfaction.
3. To find out the effect of main and interaction effect of background variables such as sex, type of school management, locality, age, marital status, subjects taught, nature of appointment and teaching experience of secondary school heads on their Job Satisfaction.

4. To find out the effect of main and interaction effect of independent variables such as family environment and socio-economic status of secondary school heads on their Job Satisfaction.

5. To establish whether there is any significant relationship between Job satisfaction of secondary school heads with heir family environment and socio-economic status.

6. To study the predictive correlates of job satisfaction of school heads.

5.1.5 Variables of the Study

The following variables are considered for the present study:

I. Dependent Variable

Job Satisfaction

II. Independent variables

1. Family Environment

2. Socio-Economic Status

III. Background variable:

1. Sex

2. Type of Management

3. Locality
4. Age

5. Marital Status

6. Subjects Taught

7. Nature of Appointment

8. Teaching Experience

5.1.6 Statement of Hypotheses

A few hypotheses have been stated for finding the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables and also finding the significant differences in the dependent variable due to variations in the background variables.

The hypotheses were formulated, but for the purpose of testing, they were converted to null form. These null hypotheses were classified under 4 (four) major sets, for structural convenience and easy handling for testing the same.

**Set I:** This set deals with main and background variables for testing differences. This set encompasses 10 (Ten) hypotheses to test.

1. There is no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school male and female heads.

2. There is no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads working in urban and rural schools.

3. There is no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of younger and older secondary school heads.
4. There is no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of married and unmarried secondary school heads.

5. There is no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads teaching arts and science.

6. There is no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads appointed on permanent and temporary basis.

7. There is no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads having less and more teaching experience.

8. There is no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads having low and high socio-economic status.

9. There is no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads working in different types of school management.

10. There is no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads having in different levels of family environment.

**Set II:** This set deals with independent and background variables for testing main and interaction effect. This set consists of 45 (Forty five) hypotheses to test.

11. There is no significant main and interaction effect of sex and type of school management on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

12. There is no significant main and interaction effect of sex and locality on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

13. There is no significant main and interaction effect of sex and age on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.
14. There is no significant main and interaction effect of sex and marital status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

15. There is no significant main and interaction effect of sex and subjects taught on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

16. There is no significant main and interaction effect of sex and nature of appointment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

17. There is no significant main and interaction effect of sex and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

18. There is no significant main and interaction effect of sex and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

19. There is no significant main and interaction effect of sex and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

20. There is no significant main and interaction effect of type of school management and locality on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

21. There is no significant main and interaction effect of type of school management and age on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

22. There is no significant main and interaction effect of type of school management and marital status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

23. There is no significant main and interaction effect of type of school management and subjects taught on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.
24. There is no significant main and interaction effect of type of school management and nature of appointment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

25. There is no significant main and interaction effect of type of school management and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

26. There is no significant main and interaction effect of type of school management and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

27. There is no significant main and interaction effect of type of school management and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

28. There is no significant main and interaction effect of locality and age on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

29. There is no significant main and interaction effect of locality and marital status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

30. There is no significant main and interaction effect of locality and subjects taught on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

31. There is no significant main and interaction effect of locality and nature of appointment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

32. There is no significant main and interaction effect of locality and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.
33. There is no significant main and interaction effect of locality and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

34. There is no significant main and interaction effect of locality and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

35. There is no significant main and interaction effect of age and marital status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

36. There is no significant main and interaction effect of age and subjects taught on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

37. There is no significant main and interaction effect of age and nature of appointment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

38. There is no significant main and interaction effect of age and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

39. There is no significant main and interaction effect of age and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

40. There is no significant main and interaction effect of age and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

41. There is no significant main and interaction effect of marital status and subjects taught on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

42. There is no significant main and interaction effect of marital status and nature of appointment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

43. There is no significant main and interaction effect of marital status and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.
44. There is no significant main and interaction effect of marital status and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

45. There is no significant main and interaction effect of marital status and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

46. There is no significant main and interaction effect of subjects taught and nature of appointment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

47. There is no significant main and interaction effect of subjects taught and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

48. There is no significant main and interaction effect of subjects taught and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

49. There is no significant main and interaction effect of subjects taught and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

50. There is no significant main and interaction effect of nature of appointment and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

51. There is no significant main and interaction effect of nature of appointment and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

52. There is no significant main and interaction effect of nature of appointment and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

53. There is no significant main and interaction effect of teaching experience and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.
54. There is no significant main and interaction effect of teaching experience and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

55. There is no significant main and interaction effect of family environment and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

**Set III:** This set presents the relationship between dependent and independent variables. This set comprises 2 (Two) hypotheses to test.

56. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Family Environment of secondary school heads.

57. There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Socio-Economic Status of secondary school heads.

**Set IV:** This set presents the predicting correlates of Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads. This set has 2 (Two) hypotheses to test.

58. Family Environment is not found to be the significant predictor in predicting the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

59. Socio-Economic Status is not found to be the significant predictor in predicting the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

**5.1.7 Sampling Procedure**

The present study is of normative survey type, using inventories and tools administered to secondary school heads in Bangalore South District. Thus for the present study, the researcher has adopted quantitative type of research and hence the most suitable research design is adopted. Sample is a small portion of
population possessing all the characteristics of the population selected for observation and analysis. The statistical studies samples on selected instead of whole population. In the present study the researcher has used simple random sampling. The researcher used the simple random sampling method for drawing the sample. The population comprises of school heads of secondary schools from Bangalore South District. A sample of 300 heads was chosen from Government, Private aided and private unaided schools giving representation to sex.

5.1.8 Tools Used for the Research

The selection of suitable instruments or tools is of vital importance for any successful research. The tool indicates the quality and adequacy of the research. In order to obtain valid objective and reliable results, standardized tools were used and Family Environment test was constructed by the researcher. Tools help us to get successful results in the research endeavor. In the light of this, the following tools were used for the collection of data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Research Tools</th>
<th>Developed by the Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction Test</td>
<td>Dr. Haseen Taj (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Family Environment</td>
<td>Family Environment Scale</td>
<td>Constructed by the Researcher (2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.9 Collection of Data

After finalizing the sample and the tools to be used, the researcher visited each school personally and collected the data. The researcher studied the basic literature relating to the selected tests and acquainted him with the testing procedures before commencing actual testing. The researcher then obtained copies of the test booklets and the scoring sheets in the final form in adequate numbers. The direction was given and the time duration was specified for each tool. The researcher took care that the rules and procedures prescribed for each test in the manuals were strictly followed.

5.1.10 Statistical Techniques used to Analyze the Data

The following statistical techniques and purpose for which they were used as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Statistical techniques used</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>‘t’ test Analysis</td>
<td>To examine the significant differences between groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance (One-way ANOVA)</td>
<td>To examine the significant differences among groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance (Two-way)</td>
<td>To test main and interaction effect of independent and background variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pearson’s Co-efficient of Correlation</td>
<td>To find out the significant relationship between variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regression Analysis</td>
<td>To identify the significant predictors of the criterion variable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 MAJOR FINDINGS

The following are the major findings of the study

‘t’ test Results :

1. There was a significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school male and female heads (t=−5.72; P<0.01).

2. There was a significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads working in urban and rural schools (t=3.09; P<0.01).

3. There was a significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of younger and older secondary school heads (t=0.77; P>0.05).

4. There was no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of married and unmarried secondary school heads (t=0.95; P>0.05).

5. There was a significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads teaching language and core subjects (t=4.01; P<0.01).

6. There was a significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads appointed on permanent and temporary basis (t=5.28; P<0.01).

7. There was no significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads having less and more teaching experience (t=1.60; P>0.05)

8. There was a significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads having low and high socio-economic status (t=5.22; P<0.01)

One-way ANOVA Results

9. There was a significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads working in different type of school management (F=12.266; P<0.01).
10. There was a significant difference in the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads having in different levels of family environment (F=11.605; P<0.01)

**Two-Way ANOVA Results**

11. There was a significant main effect of sex (F=33.081; P>0.01) and type of school management (F=12.515; P<0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and interaction effect of sex and type of school management on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=14.696; P<0.01).

12. There was a significant main effect of sex (F=38.496; P<0.01) and locality (F=13.490; P<0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of sex and locality on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=2.421; P>0.05).

13. There was a significant main effect of sex (F=31.419; P<0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads no main effect of age (F=0.096; P>0.05) and no interaction effect of sex and age on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.433; >P.005).

14. There was a significant main of sex (F=33.852; P<0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads no main effect of marital status and significant interaction effect of sex and marital status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=15.138; P>0.01).

15. There was a significant main of sex (F=27.723; P<0.01) and Subject Taught (F=12.729; P<0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of sex and subject taught on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.379; P>0.01).
16. There was a significant main effect of sex ($F=27.547; \ P<0.01$) and nature of appointment ($F=13.842; \ P<0.01$) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and significant interaction effect of sex and nature of appointment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads ($F=10.012; \ P<0.01$).

17. There was a significant main of sex ($F=32.34; \ P<0.01$) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads no main effect of teaching experience ($F=1.926; \ P>0.05$) and no interaction effect of sex and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads ($F=3.845; \ P>0.05$).

18. There was a significant main of sex ($F=27.108; \ P<0.01$) and family environment ($F=9.254; \ P<0.01$) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of sex and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads ($F=1.120; \ P>0.05$).

19. There was a significant main of sex ($F=32.080; \ P<0.01$) and socio-economic status ($F=22.022; \ P<0.01$) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of sex and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads ($F=0.152; \ P>0.05$).

20. There was a significant main of type of management ($F=12.890; \ P<0.01$) and locality ($F=8.616; \ P<0.01$) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of type of management and locality on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads ($F=2.552; \ P>0.05$).

21. There was a significant main of type of management ($F=12.059; \ P<0.01$) and no main effect of age ($F=0.01; \ P<0.01$) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of type of management and age on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads ($F=2.497; \ P>0.05$).
22. There was a significant main of type of management (F=13.570; P<0.01) and no main effect of marital status (F=2.932; P<0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and significant interaction effect of type of management and marital status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=12.341; P<0.01).

23. There was a significant main of type of management (F=13.523; P<0.01) and subject taught (F=19.003; P<0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and significant interaction effect of type of management and subject taught on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=5.493; P<0.01).

24. There was a significant main of type of management (F=7.863; P<0.01) and nature of appointment (F=9.843; P<0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of type of management and nature of appointment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.006; P>0.05).

25. There was a significant main of type of management (F=11.332; P<0.01) and no main effect of teaching experience (F=0.210; P>0.05) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of type of management and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.482; P>0.05).

26. There was a significant main of type of management (F=18.612; P<0.01) and family environment (F=17.693; P>0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and significant interaction effect of type of management and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=30.378; P<0.01).
27. There was a significant main of type of management (F=9.415; P<0.01) and socio economic status (F=16.233; P>0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of type of management and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=1.257; P>0.05).

28. There was a significant main of locality (F=7.192; P<0.01) and no main effect of age (F=0.197; P>0.05) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of locality and age on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.528; P>0.05).

29. There was a significant main of locality (F=7.319; P<0.01) and no main effect of marital status (F=1.803; P>0.05) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of locality and marital status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.846; P>0.05).

30. There was a significant main of locality (F=6.047; P<0.01) and subject taught (F=15.206; P<0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of locality and subject taught on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=1.217; P>0.05).

31. There was a significant main of locality (F=5.833; P<0.01) and nature of appointment (F=16.645; P<0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of locality and nature of appointment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.266; P>0.05).

32. There was a significant main of locality (F=6.453; P<0.01) and no main effect of teaching experience (F=0.704; P>0.05) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and significant interaction effect of locality and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (t=4.319; P<0.01).
33. There was a significant main of locality (F=9.231; P<0.01) and family environment (F=12.481; P<0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and no interaction effect of locality and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=1.297; P>0.05).

34. There was a significant main of locality (F=5.894; P<0.01) and socio-economic status (F=20.541; P<0.01) on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads and significant interaction effect of locality and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=9.259; P<0.01).

35. There was no significant main effect of age (F=0.736; P>0.05) and marital status (F=2.235; P>0.05) and no interaction effect of age and marital status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=2.243; P>0.05).

36. There was no significant main effect of age (F=0.169; P>0.05) and significant main of subject taught (F=16.324; P<0.01) and no interaction effect of age and subject taught on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.349; P>0.05).

37. There was no significant main effect of age (F=2.637; P>0.05) and significant main of nature of appointment (F=20.743; P<0.01) and no interaction effect of age and nature of appointment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=2.092; P>0.05).

38. There was no significant main effect of age (F=0.004; P>0.05) and teaching experience (F=1.338; P<0.05) and significant interaction effect of age and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=7.882; P>0.01).
39. There was no significant main effect of age (F=0.311; P>0.05) and significant main of family environment (F=11.522; P<0.01) and no interaction effect of age and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=1.963; P>0.05).

40. There was no significant main effect of age (F=0.564; P>0.05) and significant main of socio-economic status (F=21.908; P<0.01) and no interaction effect of age and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.899; P>0.05).

41. There was no significant main effect of marital status (F=1.430; P>0.05) and significant main of subject taught (F=16.255; P<0.01) and no interaction effect of marital status and subject taught on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=3.750; P>0.05).

42. There was significant main effect of marital status (F=10.574; P<0.01) and nature of appointment (F=29.169; P<0.01) and significant interaction effect of marital status and nature of appointment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=32.018; P<0.01).

43. There was no main effect of marital status (F=3.860; P>0.05) and teaching experience (F=3.669; P>0.05) and significant interaction effect of marital status and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=8.176; P<0.01).

44. There was no main effect of marital status (F=0.989; P>0.05) and significant main effect family environment (F=11.306; P<0.01) and significant interaction effect of marital status and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=5.092; P<0.01).

45. There was no main effect of marital status (F=0.982; P>0.05) and significant main effect socio-economic status (F=20.770; P<0.01) and no
interaction effect of marital status and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.001; P>0.05).

46. There was a significant main effect of subject taught (F=15.932; P<0.01) and nature of appointment (F=17.638; P<0.01) and no interaction effect of subject taught and nature of appointment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=2.465; P>0.05).

47. There was a significant main effect of subject taught (F=15.949; P<0.01) and no main effect of teaching experience (F=1.085; P>0.05) and no interaction effect of subject taught and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.936; P>0.05).

48. There was a significant main effect of subject taught (F=15.224; P<0.01) and family environment (F=10.808; P<0.01) and no interaction effect of subject taught and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.384; P>0.05).

49. There was a significant main effect of subject taught (F=10.519; P<0.01) and socio-economic status (F=15.542; P<0.01) and no interaction effect of subject taught and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.166; P>0.05).

50. There was a significant main effect of nature of appointment (F=16.477; P<0.01) and no main effect of teaching experience (F=0.016; P>0.05) and no interaction effect of nature of appointment and teaching experience on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.189; P>0.05).

51. There was a significant main effect of nature of appointment (F=14.747; P<0.01) and family environment (F=9.715; P>0.05) and no interaction effect of nature of appointment and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.608; P>0.05).
52. There was a significant main effect of nature of appointment (F=13.903; P<0.01) and socio-economic status (F=17.310; P>0.05) and no interaction effect of nature of appointment and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=2.930; P>0.05).

53. There was a significant main effect of teaching experience (F=4.148; P<0.05) and family environment (F=12.982; P<0.01) and significant interaction effect of teaching experience and family environment on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=3.443; P<0.05).

54. There was no main effect of teaching experience (F=0.009; P>0.05) and significant main effect of socio-economic status (F=20.110; P<0.01) and no interaction effect of teaching experience and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=3.700; P<0.05).

55. There was a significant main effect of family environment (F=10.864; P<0.01) and socio-economic status (F=20.411; P<0.01) and no interaction effect of family environment and socio-economic status on Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads (F=0.677; P>0.05).

**Correlation Results**

56. There was significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Family Environment of secondary school heads (Moral Support & Encouragement (‘r’=0.138; P<0.01), Decision Making (‘r’=0.240; P<0.01), Family Support (‘r’=0.301; P<0.01), Work-Family Interference (‘r’=0.281; P<0.01), Well Being (‘r’=0.198; P<0.01), Work Satisfaction (‘r’=0.140; P<0.01), Family Satisfaction (‘r’=0.198; P<0.01) and overall Family Environment (‘r’=0.318)

57. There was a significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Socio-Economic Status of secondary school heads (‘r’=0.311; P<0.01).
Regression Analysis

58. Family Environment (8.00%) is found to be the significant predictor in predicting the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

59. Socio-Economic Status (7.50%) is found to be the significant predictor in predicting the Job Satisfaction of secondary school heads.

5.3 CONCLUSION

With 300 secondary school heads working in secondary schools of Bangalore South District of Karnataka participated in the present research study, comprehensive range of responses were collected to assess the effect of different independent variables such as family environment and socio economic status and also background variables such as sex, type of management, locality, age, marital status, subject taught, nature of appointment and teaching experience/administrative experience. This is also a study of relationship of Job Satisfaction with independent variables Family Environment and Socio-Economic Status. To test the hypotheses, the random sampling technique was employed for the selection of schools in Bangalore South District. For the collection of data, the school heads were selected during the year 2014-15. school heads, then collected data were analyzed with the help of appropriate statistical techniques like mean, standard deviation, coefficient of correlation, ‘t’ test, One way and Two-way ANOVA (F test) along with Scheffe’s test for post hoc analysis and multiple regression analysis (step wise).

The findings of the Study revealed that there was a positive significant relationship of Job Satisfaction of school heads with their Family Environment and Socio-Economic Status. The school heads working under better family
environment and socio-economic status had more satisfied in their job. Family environment of school heads studied was found to be very healthy.

The results of the investigation indicated that the background and independent variables sex, type of management, locality, subject taught, nature of appointment, socio-economic status and family environment exhibited varied influence on Job Satisfaction of school heads and other variables age, marital status and teaching experience did not affect the Job Satisfaction of school heads. The female school heads were found to be more satisfied than male school heads and also urban school heads showed better satisfaction in their job than rural teachers. The school heads that teach science subjects and appointed on permanent basis had better satisfaction in their job than who teach arts subjects and temporary basis appointed teachers.

Results of the step wise multiple regression analysis revealed that the two independent variables such as family environment and socio-economic status were significant predictors of Job Satisfaction of school heads with a good prediction power of about 15.50% and revealing them as significant predictors of Job Satisfaction irrespective of the background variables taken under consideration.

5.4 EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATION OF THE STUDY

Overall the findings of the Study emphasize the role of family environment and socio-economic status is that certainly make a difference in the job satisfaction of secondary school heads.

1. The school heads may be given orientation programmes or refresher courses periodically to improve their confidence and competency.
2. Periodic administrative training should be given to school heads.

3. The workload of school heads shall be reduced.

4. Organizational Health is very important to create job satisfaction among the school heads. So, the institution shall try to provide better organizational climate.

5. The institution shall fix the goals which are achievable and also acceptable so that the school heads accept the organizational policies and they try to create more involvement in the job. This will lead to job satisfaction.

6. Communication is the important one in any institution. So, the institution and the higher authorities follow open communication and also give more importance to the school heads suggestions. Also when allowed to participate in management policies and implementation they will be motivated.

7. Leadership is also another important factor. So, the higher authorities follow democratic leadership and also motivate the subordinates. This will also create better job satisfaction.

8. Careful managing of task design may be an effective way to cope with stress. A school heads job can be enriched by improving job content factors such a recognition, advancement and growth.

9. The organization shall also try to provide training related to technological development and try to provide basic welfare measures. This will definitely create high job satisfaction.
10. To reduce role conflict the authorities should provide clear cut guidelines so that the school heads will be aware of their roles and there will be no ambiguity in understanding of what he or she is to do.

11. School heads should be provided proper guidance and counseling in the organization so that they will be aware of their duties, and working conditions in the schools, By knowing this he can adjust with the school conditions effectively.

12. There is a need to improve family environment by self and by the family members also. Programmed interventions like, meditation, relaxation and other sensitization programs may reduce stress and add quality of life to their years resulting in healthy family environment and its affect on their job satisfaction.

13. For school heads, mental and physical health academic planner can have different schedules. The education institutes can plan various academic planners including leisure activities for reduction of stress.

14. Private institutions have to pay the salary on par with UGC scale, the long term dispute in pay disparity between government and private institutions if balanced.

15. Regularly training and orientation programmes should be conducted to update the teachers. The refresher courses, training, workshops aimed at stress management and coping strategies can help in alleviating anxiety and stress are need of the hour and they can satisfied in the jobs. Orientation programmes must be there for newly appointed teachers also.
16. For over time and extra work the concerned agency has to provide incentives. This will motivate the teacher to work harder thereby improving the quality of self and the institute.

17. The school heads of private school should be brought under the employment provident fund, which is already applicable compulsory in the private schools.

18. The salary status of the private school teachers is required to make improvement.

19. There should be a fixed maximum basic pay scale.

20. To avoid overload of school heads, there should be no stress or train.

21. For extra work for school heads and some extra allowances from the school authorities.

22. Provisions for service rule from the government and management side for the betterment of the private school teachers.

23. Organise private school welfare association for the evaluation and monitoring various academic activities of private schools at every level.

A satisfied and happy school head is very likely to exert himself and work with enthusiasm. Likewise dissatisfied head is likely to be dissatisfied in several aspects. Hence the welfare of the school head should be of supreme concern to the school authorities. Thus proper environment, good working conditions and better salary will help the heads to have job satisfaction while working in the school.
To motivate school heads into higher performance, motivation and environment factors are needed. Schools need a clear understanding of what principals personally find satisfying or dissatisfying about their jobs. This is a task for school, management and government departments. It is necessary to reduce time demands, improve salaries, and increase administrative support and support services.

The key implication of the study is to know the impact of socio-economic status on the performance of school heads. Policy makers in the field of education may manage to improve the socio-economic conditions of school heads. Teaching profession may be made attractive through positive reinforcement like incentives, awards, symbol of respect etc.

5.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The Study has the following limitations:

1. School heads working in the high schools affiliated to the State Board of School Education were selected for the present Study.

2. The Study was limited to 300 school heads only.

3. The Study was limited to two independent (Family Environment and Socio-Economic Status) and one dependent variable (Job Satisfaction) only.

4. Sample was restricted to Bangalore South District only.

5.6 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The following suggestions are given for further research

1. Similar study can be undertaken in other districts of State of Karnataka.
2. Similar study can be undertaken on primary school heads and college principals for comparison.

3. Similar study can be undertaken in order to find out other variables influencing the Job Satisfaction.

4. This Study may be extended to larger sample drawn from the Karnataka state as a whole.

5. This research measured family environment and socio-economic status of school heads. Future research can include other variables like occupational stress, job anxiety, organizational commitment, school culture etc.

6. Comparative study can be conducted to know the Job Satisfaction of school heads between urban and rural school heads in relation to Family Environment, Leadership Behaviour, socio-economic status, commitment etc.