

**Assessment of Job Satisfaction among
Teachers and Its Relationship with
Demographic Variables**

By:

Talal S. Almutairi

(PhD in Educational Evaluation, Assessment and
Effectiveness, The State of Kuwait.)

Assessment of Job Satisfaction among Teachers and Its Relationship with Demographic Variables

Talal S. Almutairi*

Abstract:

Ministries or organisations should assess their employees' satisfaction to enhance their performance. The purposes of the current study were to assess teachers' satisfaction in Kuwait and to determine the amount of variance in teachers' satisfaction explained by the selected demographic variables. The questionnaire designed for this study was shown to be reliable and valid. The sample in this study comprised 1017 teachers from three districts. The findings indicated that supervision styles, cooperation with colleagues, the work itself, and recognition and promotion had positive moderate effects on the level of satisfaction. This study also found that different types of scholarships along with a good salary, laws to protect teachers from incidents involving students and/or parents, and clear school policies as well as their application could have positive effects on teachers' satisfactions.

Keywords:

Teacher, job satisfaction, performance, advancement, promotion, Kuwait

***Talal S. Almutairi:** (PhD in Educational Evaluation, Assessment and Effectiveness, The State of Kuwait.)

تقييم الرضا الوظيفي لدى المعلمين وعلاقته بالمتغيرات الديموغرافية

د/ طلال سعد المطيري

(دكتوراه بالقياس والتقييم التربوي - دولة الكويت)

ملخص الدراسة:

يتوجب على الوزارات أو المنظمات في وقتنا الحالي السعي في تحقيق درجة عالية من الرضا الوظيفي للعاملين لديها بغرض تحسين أداء الموظفين وبالتالي وتطوير أداء تلك المنظمة أو الوزارة. حيث إن علميات التطوير والتحسين والتنمية لا يمكن أن تنجح دون الاهتمام بالموارد البشرية وتحقيق الرضا الوظيفي يعد من أحد العناصر المهم للاهتمام والارتقاء بالموارد البشرية.

في هذه الدراسة قام الباحث بعملية تقييم للرضا الوظيفي لدى المعلمين في دولة الكويت وتحديد مقدار التباين بين مستويات الرضا بواسطة المتغيرات الديموغرافية المختارة. وأظهر الاستبيان المصمم لهذه الدراسة أنه يتمتع بدرجات مناسبة من الصدق والثبات. شملت هذه الدراسة أيضاً عينة مكونة من ١٠١٧ معلم ومعلمة من ثلاث مناطق مختلفة.

أشارت النتائج إلى أن أساليب الإشراف والتعاون مع الزملاء وطبيعة العمل نفسه والترقيات كان لها تأثير إيجابي على مستوى الرضا لدى المعلمين. ووجدت هذه الدراسة أيضاً أن أنواعاً مع توافر المنح والبعثات الدراسية للمعلمين إلى جانب الراتب الجيد وسن قوانين وتشريعات لحماية المعلم يمكن أن يكون لها تأثير إيجابي واضح على رضا المعلمين.

الكلمات الدالة: معلم، الرضا الوظيفي ، الأداء ، حماية المعلم.

Introduction:

The purpose of education is to develop and improve individuals' knowledge and provide them with the skills they need. To make this possible, we need good teachers, as the teacher is the heart of education. The characteristics of a good teacher include taking responsibility for coordinating teaching activities and strategies with students while creating a classroom and managing students' behaviour (Coe, Aloisi, Higgins, & Major, 2014; Muijs & Reynolds, 2017); such contributions to learning cannot be limited. Therefore, educational organisations should consider both teacher and teaching quality (Darling-Hammond, Cook, Jaquith, & Hamilton, 2012) by supporting teachers to be proficient and make their teaching more effective, as they have considerable influence on student learning (Almutairi, 2016). Such support will enable teachers to help students improve or develop their learning, although they might be blamed for those students who show inadequate or weak achievements. However, many factors (e.g., teacher knowledge, job satisfaction) can have positive or negative influences on teachers and their effectiveness (Narayan, 2016).

Assessing teachers' satisfaction is very important, as teachers' attitudes towards their job could affect their success (Mahmmod, Nudrat, Asdaqe, Nawaz, & Haider, 2011). Indeed, teaching is not about a "pay check" but about meeting or exceeding one's personal expectations (Zarafshani & Alibaygi, 2008). Moreover, teachers' feelings about their job affects their decision to stay or leave the field (Deneire, Vanhoof, Fadder, Gijbels, & Petegem, 2014; Giacometti, 2005).

According to Spector (1997, p. 2), job satisfaction can be defined as "a global feeling about the job or as related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the

job”; put simply, it is the extent to which employees like or dislike their job or any aspect of their job. Hoppock (1938) also defined job satisfaction as “any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person to truthfully say, I am satisfied with my job” (p. 47). Based on these definitions, it can be deduced that job satisfaction is an individual attitude, but this individual attitude can be used for several purposes; for example, job satisfaction could be used to improve performance and increase productivity (Demirdage, 2015; Rane, 2011; Singhai, Dani, Hyde, & Patel, 2016; Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2003).

Before reviewing previous studies on this topic, we need to identify the factors that affect teachers’ satisfaction. Need-based theories could be used to identify these factors. Two need-based theorists and their theories that are widely recognised include those proposed by Frederick Herzberg and Abraham Maslow. Herzberg’s and Maslow’s theories have been used to explore various sources of job satisfaction, and both explain motivation as a phenomenon within an individual. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) constructed two-dimensional factors, *motivators* (satisfaction) and *hygiene* (dissatisfaction), affecting a person’s feelings or attitudes towards his/her job. Motivators are achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement; these factors can motivate people to perform well as they have long-term positive effects on performance. Meanwhile, the absence or presence of hygiene factors can lead to dissatisfaction; they do not motivate workers or create satisfaction. Hygiene factors, including company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, and salary, have only short-term effects on people’s attitude and performance, which quickly return to initial levels. Maslow (1970) introduced his theory by linking

motivation and personality; he explained that relationships between people satisfy personal needs on the hierarchy of needs, which includes physiological (e.g., food, bills, clothing), security (e.g., fair treatment, protection against unsafe conditions), affiliation (e.g., accepted, loved), esteem (e.g., recognition, achievement, confidence), and self-actualisation (e.g., self-development, full potential). Maslow further indicated that, when a worker is satisfied with his/her needs, he/she can move to the next higher need in the hierarchy.

Literature Review

Teachers who are satisfied with their job can perform well and help both students and other teachers whereas dissatisfied teachers may have a negative effect on students' learning (Narayan, 2016). Previous studies have reported on factors that could play a significant role in teachers' satisfaction. Mahmmod et al. (2011) found that advancement, compensation, supervision, human relationships, and working conditions could affect teachers' feelings toward their job. Morris (2016) also demonstrated that leadership has both negative and positive effects on teachers' satisfaction, as teachers involved in leadership activities via a distrusted model (allowing teachers to be a leader) reported greater satisfaction. Furthermore, Moore (2012) confirmed that school administration and leadership efforts can prevent teachers from becoming dissatisfied teachers. Johnson and Birkeland (2003) demonstrated that school administration should support new teachers' development and enhance their experiences to prevent them from feeling unsatisfied and unsuccessful, which could increase their intention to leave their teaching jobs. Nevertheless, Zembylas and Papanastasiou (2003) found that teachers in Cyprus chose to pursue a teaching job because of the salary and other elements, such as holidays, which positively affected their satisfaction. Ingersoll (2001) showed

that a high salary is associated with a decreased likelihood of teachers leaving the field. Although Giacometti (2005) argued that compensation and benefits (e.g., salary and retirement package) have a moderate effect on some teachers' satisfaction and intention to leave or stay in the profession, similar to the effects of other factors, such as professional development, preparation of the teaching curriculum, classroom management, and student assessments. Giacometti indicated that emotional factors, including confidence, anxiety, commitment, joy of teaching, frustration, and burnout, have the strongest relationship between teachers' satisfaction and their choice to stay or leave the profession.

Teachers' responsibilities and workload can be another reason for teachers to become dissatisfied and leave the education field, as they can manage their responsibilities and balance their personal lives better upon leaving their teaching positions (Marvel et al., 2007; Rhodes, Nevill, & Allan, 2004). Rhodes et al. (2004) further found that the recognition of teachers' efforts increased the level of teacher satisfaction. Marvel et al.'s (2007) findings also highlighted the importance of recognition in teachers' decisions to move to another school, stay in their current position, or leave the field. This study found that teachers who left the field were satisfied with recognition more than with the teaching job.

In addition, Isaiah and Nenty (2012) indicated that job security (e.g., not being laid off) makes a significant contribution to teachers' satisfaction. However, Luekens, Lyter, and Fox (2004) found that many teachers who left the educational field or changed schools were satisfied with job security; thus, the security aspect can be important for teachers' satisfaction although it might not be related only to job retention. Furthermore, relationships with colleagues and friends could affect teachers' satisfaction, as shown by Rhodes

et al. (2004). Moreover, a teacher evaluation system has been found to have a positive effect on teachers' satisfaction, as such a system should be fair, helpful, clear, and transparent (Deneire et al., 2014). Almutairi (2016) confirmed that a teacher evaluation system, which includes summative and formative purposes, explicit criteria, multiple tools, qualified evaluators, and appropriate feedback, can change teachers' feelings about their job and their performance. OCED's (2014) study conducted in TALIS countries also confirmed that, once teachers receive judgement and feedback to change their teaching practice, the level of teachers' satisfaction will increase.

Some variables have been found to predict teachers' satisfaction level, such as gender, experience, and school level. Some studies have highlighted the difference between female and male teachers (Akiri, 2014; Liu & Ramsey, 2008; Mahmmod et al., 2011; Narayan, 2016) whereas other studies found no significant relationship between gender (Giacometti, 2005; Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2003). Such a difference might be, as Narayan (2016) claimed, that female teachers might prefer working with children and benefit from long holidays, which means more time with family. Mahmmod et al. (2011) referred to market conditions when explaining the difference between males and females: male teachers may have more opportunities than female teachers to get jobs with high salaries. Furthermore, previous studies, such as those by Narayan (2016) and Zembylas and Papanastasiou (2003), found that teachers' experiences are not significantly negatively related to teachers' satisfaction, whereas Liu and Ramsey (2008) and Akiri (2014) found that teachers' experiences affect their job satisfaction. For example, according to Akiri, the length of experience was correlated with a higher level of dissatisfaction with pay due to higher financial burdens. Moreover, Zembylas and Papanastasiou

(2003) found significant differences between teachers' positions but no differences based on type of school level. Mahmmod et al. (2011) also examined the difference between teachers and found no significance between urban and rural teachers. Consequently, several variables can be used to examine differences between the level of teachers' satisfaction in different contexts.

Purpose of the Study

Kuwait is currently facing a crisis in the recruitment and retention of teachers. According to the Ministry of Education (MOE) in Kuwait (2017a; 2017b), it faces difficulties in attracting Kuwaitis to the teaching profession and replacing non-Kuwaitis with Kuwaiti teachers to achieve the new vision of the Kuwaiti government. A number of teachers have left the profession prematurely in reaction to the changed nature of their work. Indeed, the MOE's (2017c) report indicated that 2175 teachers left the profession between 2015 and 2016. Consequently, the purposes of this study were to assess the level of teachers' satisfaction and to determine the amount of variance in teachers' satisfaction as explained by selected demographic variables. To meet these aims, several questions were posed:

- 1) To what extent are teachers satisfied with the teaching profession in Kuwait?
- 2) To what extent does Kuwait teachers' satisfaction differ according to demographic variables, such as gender, years of teaching experience, degree, and school level?

This study is significant for several reasons. First, it identifies teachers' level of satisfaction to help decision-makers in the Kuwaiti MOE obtain information about job satisfaction and enable them to help teachers overcome any conflicts. Second, this study provides an instrument for assessing teachers' satisfaction in Kuwait and elsewhere.

Finally, this study is expected to contribute to further research on related topics.

Methodology

This research is descriptive in nature because it is grounded in the need to describe and interpret teachers' job satisfaction. As Best and Kahn (2006) and Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007) indicated, descriptive research is used to describe and interpret opinions.

Sample and Procedure

The target population for this study was teachers. Eighteen schools from three districts in Kuwait (3 of 6 districts) were randomly chosen as follows: 2 elementary schools, 2 middle schools, and 2 high schools from each district, with 1 school at each level taught by female teachers and the other school at each level taught by male teachers.

The researcher obtained consent and permission to collect teachers' responses during the second semester of the 2017-2018 academic year. The instrument was distributed by visiting schools and asking the school administration to hand out the questionnaires to the teachers to complete, and the questionnaires were subsequently collected from schools. The researcher obtained responses from 1017 teachers after excluding the incomplete questionnaires.

Instrument

Herzber's theory provides a system of classifications that support the conceptual foundation of this study. Before constructing the questionnaire, the relevant literature was reviewed, including Herzberg et al. (1959); the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) by Lester (1987); the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967); and the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). However, the actual questionnaire used for this study was unique.

The questionnaire was designed with closed questions, as they are useful for calculating the frequencies and comparing groups while also being easy for participants to complete (Cohen et al., 2007; Tymms, 2012). The questionnaire first included demographic questions related to gender, experience (1–9 years, 10–19 years, more than 20 years), and school level (elementary, middle, high). Teachers were then asked how they felt about the following aspects of their current jobs: supervision, colleagues, working conditions, salary and financial support, non-teaching responsibility, the work itself, security, and recognition and promotion. Each sub-section comprised 3 items, totalling 24 items. The items were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale (very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neutral, satisfied, very satisfied).

The questionnaire was designed in English, but the official and native language of the study context was Arabic; therefore, the questionnaire was back-translated from English to Arabic and Arabic to English by two professional translators. No significant discrepancies were reported.

It was important to conduct a pilot study to obtain feedback and evaluate the questionnaire before distributing the questionnaire, as noted by Creswell (2012) and Newby (2014). Two full professors and two associate professors in the field were asked to review all items and look over the first draft. Subsequently, 9 teachers were asked to complete the questionnaire. Their experiences ranged from 2 to 24 years. The time taken to complete the questionnaire ranged between 10 and 17 minutes, and no negative feedback was reported regarding comprehension or clarity.

Statistical Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 24) was used to measure the reliability and validity of the questionnaire and to analyse the quantitative data

reflecting teachers' satisfaction. Descriptive statistics were used to present the distribution of the data. Moreover, both independent sample *t*-tests and ANOVA were applied as statistical tests to find differences between demographic variables. Tukey's HSD was used as a post hoc test.

To analyse the data, the responses were classified and reduced to three levels (low, average, high). These three levels were formulated as follows: the highest score on the scale (5) and the lowest score on the scale (1) divided by three $(5-1) / 3 = 1.33$. The three levels ranged from 1.00 to 2.33 (low), from 2.34 to 3.67 (moderate), and from 3.68 to 5.00 (high).

Validity

According to Frankel et al. (2012, p. 148), validity is “the appropriateness, correctness, meaningfulness and usefulness of the specific inferences researchers make based on the data they collect”. In educational research, different types of validity exist, such as content, construct, and criterion (Thorndike & Thorndike-Christ, 2010).

According to Creswell (2012), a researcher can collect evidence based on test content by having experts in the area serve as judges, as this form of validity is useful when the questions are well known and identifiable. The questionnaire was discussed with five academic staff in the School of Education at Kuwait University and two head teachers in the Kuwaiti MOE. They were asked whether the questions were well presented and clear, whether they addressed the study aims, and whether they could generate suitable answers. They agreed about the appropriateness, correctness, and meaningfulness of the questionnaire.

Reliability

Cronbach's alpha was used to shed light on the results of the internal consistency reliability of aggregated scales. Furthermore, test–retest reliability was also assessed.

A) Cronbach’s alpha

According to Cohen et al. (2007), an alpha coefficient greater than .90 indicates that the instrument is very highly reliable, while an alpha of .80–.90 indicates highly reliable, and .70–.79 indicates a reliable instrument. Table (1) shows that the reliability of the teachers’ satisfaction measure regarding salary and financial support was only .77, which indicates that the scale was reliable. Other scales measuring teachers’ satisfaction were found to be highly reliable, except for the scale measuring teachers’ satisfaction with colleagues, which was very highly reliable.

Table (1) Cronbach’s Alpha Results for the Aggregated Scales

Scale	N	Alpha
Supervision	3	.87
Colleagues	3	.94
Working-Conditions	3	.84
Salary and Financial support	3	.77
Non-teaching responsibility	3	.81
Work itself	3	.89
Security	3	.85
Recognition and Promotion	3	.86

N = number of items

B) Test–Retest

As previously mentioned, test–retest was used to measure the reliability of the questionnaire in this study. For this test–retest, the sample comprised 20 teachers from a primary school in Kuwait; the test–retest period was 12 days, as recommended by Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012), who indicated that the length of time between test and retest can affect the reliability coefficients. Therefore, the period between the first and the second application should not be too short or too long (Cooper & Schindler, 2001).

Test–retest was analysed using a *t*-test (Cohen et al., 2007). Table (2) shows the result of the paired *t*-test assessing the mean responses for the aggregated scales across two periods. The *p*-value was set at $>.05$ for all scales, indicating no statistical difference between the teachers’ responses in the scores on the test and retest. The instrument was found to be reliable.

Table (2) Paired Sample test for test-retest

Scales	Mean difference (1st & 2ND)	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Interval of the Difference		t	DF	p-value
				Lower	Upper			
Supervision	-.09950	.24421	.05461	-.21379	.01479	-1.822	19	.084
Colleague	.15000	.46485	.10394	-.06755	.36755	1.443	19	.165
Work Conditions	.09967	.30810	.06889	-.04453	.24386	1.447	19	.164
Salary & Financial	-.06683	.31786	.07107	-.21559	.08193	-.940	19	.359
Non- teaching	-.08333	.38805	.08677	-.26495	.09828	-.960	19	.349
Work itself	.11667	.29170	.06523	-.01985	.25319	1.789	19	.090
Security	.08333	.28357	.06341	-.04938	.21605	1.314	19	.204
Recognition & Promotion	.10000	.36031	.08057	-.06863	.26863	1.241	19	.230

Results

Descriptive Statistical Results

Table (3) shows teachers’ responses regarding their job satisfaction. Teachers were asked about their feelings and the extent to which they were satisfied with supervision style (Heads of Departments), cooperation with colleagues, salary and financial rewards, other non-teaching responsibilities, work conditions and the work itself, security, and finally recognition and promotion.

The responses regarding supervision indicate that teachers were moderately satisfied with the assistance from

their direct supervisors, with sharing and discussing decisions with their supervisors, and with the equitable treatment they received from their supervisors. Their responses were not strongly but only moderately positive, with the lowest mean of $m = 2.98$ and the highest mean of $m = 3.11$. Similar to their views about their supervisor, teachers' responses regarding cooperation with and assistance from colleagues as well as their perceptions of the feedback and suggestions received from colleagues had the highest mean of $m = 3.10$ and the lowest mean of $m = 2.97$, respectively, which were moderately positive. Teachers also showed a moderately positive level of satisfaction with the recognition they received and their chances for promotion in their jobs. Furthermore, teachers' satisfaction with the work itself was similar to their level of satisfaction with supervision, their cooperation with colleagues, and recognition and promotion.

However, they were not satisfied with work conditions, as they reported low levels of satisfaction with the clarification and definition of the school's policies by the administration ($m = 2.23$) and the way of applying these policies ($m = 2.23$), which they perceived to be practised at a sub-optimal level. Teachers' responses also indicated that the level of their satisfaction with physical environment was neither strongly nor moderately positive ($m = 2.26$).

Furthermore, the data showed that teachers were not very satisfied with the involvement of professional development; their responses reflected a low level of satisfaction with the opportunities for professional development in their jobs ($m = 2.30$). Teachers were also not satisfied with being responsible for organising school activities and other non-teaching duties in their schools ($m = 2.32$). Their responses showed an average level of satisfaction with the way they are dealing and interacting with parents ($m = 2.60$).

The data in Table (3) show that teachers’ views towards their salary were moderately positive, as the highest mean in the salary and financial support scale was $m = 3.33$. However, teachers were not satisfied with the type of scholarship they could have in their job ($m = 2.30$), as indicated by their low satisfaction. Their level of satisfaction towards their annual bonus was average.

Regarding the security of the teaching job, teachers were very satisfied with the degree of security in the teaching profession, as they believed that they would not be laid off ($m = 3.60$). However, the level of teachers’ satisfaction with the safety and protection from incidents was low ($m = 2.24$) whereas their level of satisfaction with their freedom of rights as well as freedom of thoughts, beliefs, and attitudes was average ($m = 2.53$).

Table (3) Descriptive statistical of teachers’ satisfaction

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
Supervision: (Head of Department)		
1- Supervisor’s assistance in improving or developing my performance.	3.09	1.36
	2.98	1.12
2- The opportunities the supervisor gives me to share and discuss decisions.	3.11	1.34
3- Supervisor treats teachers ‘equitably’.		
Colleagues:		
4- Cooperation and assistance from colleagues to do better work.	3.10	1.22
	2.97	1.18
5- Feedback and suggestions from colleagues about my teaching.	3.05	1.16
6- Sharing with each other what we have learnt about teaching.		
Work Conditions:		
7- The clarity and definition of the school’s policies by administration.	2.23	1.03
	2.23	1.04
8- The way school’s policies are put into practice.	2.26	1.13
9- Physical environment in my school. (<i>positive school climate in which students can learn</i>)		

54 **Assessment of Job Satisfaction among Teachers and Its Relationship with Demographic Variables**

Salary and Financial Supports:		
10- Teachers' salary and salary increases.	3.33	1.29
11- Teachers' annual bonus.	2.76	1.32
12- Types of teachers' scholarship.	2.30	1.22
Non-teaching Responsibilities:		
13- The way of interacting and dealing with parents.	2.60	1.14
14- Opportunities for professional development.	2.30	1.17
15- Responsibility for organising school activities and doing non-teaching duty.	2.32	1.17
Work Itself:		
16- The degree of freedom for making one's own decision about instruction.	3.01	1.29
	3.02	1.27
17- The chance and support of being creative.	2.85	1.22
18- Teaching workload and responsibilities. (<i>follow-up with student, planning, classes, etc.</i>)		
Security:		
19- The degree of security in my teaching job. (<i>not being laid off</i>)	3.60	1.09
	2.24	1.04
20- Safe and protected from incidents involving students and parents (<i>e.g., yelling at, using inappropriate comments or behaviour</i>).	2.53	1.17
21- Your rights to freedom of thoughts, beliefs, and attitudes. (<i>e.g., your right to wear what you want, talk about your beliefs... restrictions to your rights</i>)		
Recognition and Promotion:		
22- Receiving recognition for my successful teaching.	3.06	1.30
23- The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.	3.19	1.29
24- The chance for promotion in my job.	2.87	1.22

Inferential Statistical Results

Table (4) shows no significant difference between male and female teachers' level of satisfaction, with the exception of teachers' satisfaction regarding non-teaching responsibilities, as the p -value was $>.05$ for this scale. Male teachers ($m = 2.23$) were more unsatisfied than female teachers ($m = 2.53$) in non-teaching responsibilities in their profession.

The results of the ANOVA test in Tables (5) and (6) indicate no statistically significant differences between teachers in elementary, middle, and high schools or between teachers with different lengths of experience in terms of teachers’ satisfaction. The *p*-value for each was $>.05$. Statistically significant differences emerged between teachers with different teaching experiences in recognition and promotion (see Tables (6) and (7)), as teachers with more than 20 years of experiences ($m = 3.43$) were more satisfied than teachers with 1–9 years ($m = 2.99$) and 10–19 years ($m = 3.02$) of experience.

Table (4): The independent samples t-test of gender

Scale	Grouping variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	P-value
Supervision	Female	607	3.07	1.21	.053	.69
	Male	410	3.04	1.22	.065	
Colleague	Female	607	3.05	1.14	.046	.80
	Male	410	3.03	1.22	.060	
Work Conditions	Female	607	2.25	1.02	.041	.75
	Male	410	2.23	1.01	.049	
Salary & Financial	Female	607	2.81	1.03	.042	.17
	Male	410	2.71	1.09	.054	
Non-teaching	Female	607	2.53	1.11	.045	.0001
	Male	410	2.23	.99	.049	
Work itself	Female	607	2.90	1.20	.048	.70
	Male	410	3.04	1.17	.057	
Security	Female	607	2.67	1.14	.046	.91
	Male	410	2.67	1.10	.054	
Recognition and promotion	Female	607	3.04	1.21	.055	.82
	Male	410	3.06	1.19	.058	

Table (5): ANOVA results of School levels

Scale	Grouping variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P-value
Supervision	Between Groups	.944	2	.472	.271	.76
	Within Groups	1765.12	1014	1.741		
	Total	1766.05	1016			
Colleague	Between Groups	.046	2	.023	.017	.98
	Within Groups	1406.54	1014	1.387		
	Total	1406.58	1016			
Work Conditions	Between Groups	4.747	2	2.374	2.28	.10
	Within Groups	1053.25	1014	1.039		
	Total	1058.00	1016			
Salary & Financial	Between Groups	3.233	2	1.617	1.43	.23
	Within Groups	1143.27	1014	1.127		
	Total	1146.50	1016			
Non-teaching	Between Groups	6.091	2	3.045	2.63	.07
	Within Groups	1173.57	1014	1.157		
	Total	1179.66	1016			
Work itself	Between Groups	1.375	2	.687	.481	.61
	Within Groups	1447.93	1014	1.428		
	Total	1449.30	1016			
Security	Between Groups	.968	2	.484	.378	.68
	Within Groups	1297.06	1014	1.279		
	Total	1298.03	1016			
Recognition and promotion	Between Groups	1.518	2	.759	.445	.64
	Within Groups	1730.91	1014	1.707		
	Total	1732.43	1016			

Table (6) ANOVA results of experience groups

Scale	Grouping variable	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P-value
Supervision	Between Groups	.743	2	.371	.213	.80
	Within Groups	1765.31	1014	1.741		
	Total	1766.05	1016			
Colleague	Between Groups	3.223	2	1.612	1.16	.31
	Within Groups	1403.36	1014	1.384		
	Total	1406.58	1016			
Work Conditions	Between Groups	.064	2	.032	.031	.97
	Within Groups	1057.93	1014	1.043		
	Total	1058.00	1016			

Scale	Grouping variable	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P-value
Salary & Financial	Between Groups	.575	2	.287	.254	.77
	Within Groups	1145.93	1014	1.130		
	Total	1146.50	1016			
Non-teaching	Between Groups	3.698	2	1.849	1.59	.20
	Within Groups	1175.97	1014	1.160		
	Total	1179.66	1016	4		
Work itself	Between Groups	5.257	2	2.628	1.84	.15
	Within Groups	1444.04	1014	1.424		
	Total	1449.30	1016	6		
Security	Between Groups	.228	2	.114	.089	.91
	Within Groups	1297.80	1014	1.280		
	Total	1298.03	1016			
Recognition and promotion	Between Groups	15.262	2	7.631	4.50	.01
	Within Groups	1717.16	1014	1.693		
	Total	1732.43	1016	6		

Table (7) Tukey’s HSD post hoc test, experience groups

Recognition & Promotion		N	Mean	Mean Difference	
				10-19 years	More than 20 years
Experience Groups	1-9 years	466	2.99	.036	.443*
	10-19 years	460	3.02		.406*
	More than 20 years	91	3.43		

Discussion and Recommendations

This study assessed teachers’ satisfaction with their jobs. First, supervision style could have an effect on teachers’ satisfaction, as teachers pay attention to suggestions and assistance from their supervisors. In addition, through an equitable supervision style, teachers can discuss their decisions and supervisors can listen to them. These elements in supervision style contribute to teachers’ positive feelings about their jobs. These results are in line with Mahmmod et al. (2011), who also found that supervision styles—specifically, listening to teachers and accepting their suggestions—made a difference in teachers’ satisfaction. Furthermore, the effect of cooperation with colleagues or the relationship between

teachers at work on teachers' satisfaction cannot be overlooked, as positive relationships and cooperation help teachers perform well by providing support, receiving and providing feedback, and sharing their experiences about teaching. This result is in the line with studies that have considered the effect of colleagues' relationships, such as Rhodes et al. (2004).

Similarly, this study found that the work itself could make a difference regarding teachers' satisfaction with their jobs. Teachers who have the freedom to make decisions about instruction (e.g., pedagogies and student assessment) and receive support allowing them to be creative are more satisfied with their jobs. Nevertheless, teaching workload and responsibilities as teachers (e.g., follow-up, planning, number of classes) should be considered and should not affect their personal life, as found by both Marvel et al. (2007) and Rhodes et al. (2004). Similarly, receiving recognition and perceptions of accomplishment as well as promotions has a positive effect on teachers' feelings towards their profession, as also supported by Marvel et al. (2007) and Rhodes et al. (2004). In addition, the length of teachers' experience has a strong relationship with job satisfaction, as teachers with long experiences are more satisfied with their jobs compared to other teachers regarding recognition and promotions. The reason behind this difference is that a promotion to the head department and as head teachers may be delayed for less experienced teachers. This result is inconsistent with findings from Narayan (2016) and Zembylas and Papanastasiou (2003), who found that teachers' experience does not affect their job satisfaction, but it supports Liu and Ramsey's (2008) claim that years of experience in teaching are related to satisfying or dissatisfying teachers.

This study further supported the findings of previous studies (Ingersoll, 2001; Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2003) regarding the effect of salary on teachers' satisfaction and retention. Other financial supports might affect teachers' satisfaction with the job, teachers need different types of scholarship to develop and improve their knowledge and subsequently their performance to feel satisfied. Teachers also need an annual bonus, similar to other professions outside the educational field, as this may show that their performance is appreciated, which could have an effect on their satisfaction.

This study found that, not only salary and financial support, but also non-teaching responsibilities had an effect on teachers' satisfaction; thus, these factors should be considered, because non-teaching responsibilities might affect teacher turnover. Differences emerged between teachers' participation in school activities and organisation of school activities (e.g., compelling teachers to do workshops to show up) versus their non-teaching duty (e.g., monitoring and supervising students outside of classes and sessions), as these have a negative effect on teachers' satisfaction. This study revealed that female teachers were happier with non-teaching responsibilities than male teachers were, perhaps because female teachers might be happier than male teachers when working with children. However, this does not mean that female teachers prefer to engage in non-teaching activities rather than teaching duties.

Furthermore, the lack of professional development opportunities also showed a negative effect on teachers' feelings towards their jobs, as teachers are ambitious and want to develop their skills and knowledge. The importance of professional development in teachers' satisfaction was also noted by Giacometti (2001) and Johnson and Birkeland (2003). In addition, the degree of security in their teaching jobs contributed to teachers' satisfaction because it could ensure that they would not be laid off. This result is in line

with Isaiah and Nenty's (2012) finding and confirmed Luekens et al.'s (2004) result that security in teaching job is not the only reason for remaining in the profession. The current study found that the law that protects teachers during incidents involving students and parents (e.g., yelling at, engaging in inappropriate comments or behaviour) could make a difference in teachers' satisfaction, as the absence of teachers' protection under the law had a strong negative effect on teachers' satisfaction and their decision to stay.

Finally, administrators should be careful when applying school policies. Policies should be stated clearly, as these elements affect teachers and their work. The absence of work conditions and a lack of awareness of the physical environment in schools make teachers feel dissatisfied. This result confirms Herzberg et al.'s (1959) findings that work conditions are one of the hygiene factors, and their absence can lead to dissatisfaction.

Overall, teachers in Kuwait indicated an average level of satisfaction. Although it is not entirely possible to determine all the reasons that motivate teachers to leave the field or lead to difficulties of the MOE to attract Kuwaitis to the teaching profession, it is possible to consider some of them. This study found that supervision styles, cooperation with colleagues, recognition and promotion, and the work itself are not the reasons for teacher turnover, because the teachers in our study were moderately satisfied with these factors. However, teachers earn a high salary in Kuwait, and they are generally satisfied with their salary. Nevertheless, the MOE should also provide different types of scholarships, as the teachers indicated that they were dissatisfied with the types of scholarship available to them. This finding was also confirmed by Almutairi (2016), who found that scholarship and travel bursaries to attend conferences should be available to teachers

as other rewards in addition to salary. Offering both a good salary and good scholarship opportunities could make the teaching profession more attractive, and the MOE can then clarify the conditions of scholarship for teachers to motivate them do better work.

Although teachers are generally protected from being laid off, protecting teachers from incidents involving students and parents is also necessary. In Kuwait, it is necessary to pass a law protecting teachers. Such a law has been proposed in the last 15 years, but the government refuses to legislate it (Kuwaiti Teachers Society, 2017). By applying a special law to protect teachers, the number of teachers leaving the field may decrease, and the crisis of the recruitment of new teachers may be resolved.

Moreover, the policies applied in schools on behalf the Kuwaiti MOE should be clear to teachers and school administrators. The MOE has been having trouble applying the new policies or programs in the last 20 years, as evident through many reports and press conferences as well as the ways in which the MOE applies a new vision or project. Furthermore, because the MOE frequently replaces its ministers, a new vision or project is often cancelled or changed by the new minister or her/his policy-maker team. Consequently, this study found a high level of dissatisfaction among teachers regarding putting the policies into practice and clarifying these policies.

Finally, to encourage new graduates from the School of Education in Kuwait to become teachers and to retain teachers in the educational field, non-teaching duties, such as organising activities or monitoring and supervising students outside of classes and sessions, should be assigned to assistants to help teachers focus on teaching and increase their level of satisfaction as well as provide assistantship opportunities to others.

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that:

- The Kuwaiti MOE follow the solutions provided herein and consider the aspects that increase teachers' satisfaction with their profession.
- As many previous studies in the field of education in Kuwait have suggested, the MOE should initiate dialogues with teachers to understand their problems and needs, and teachers should always be involved in the decision-making process.
- The MOE should have teams of experts who are responsible for new projects and vision even when the minister changes.
- The instrument designed for this study should be applied in future studies, as it met the accepted standards of reliability and showed evidence of validity.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflict of interest with respect to the research, author-ship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Akiri, A. (2014). Teachers' career satisfaction and students' academic performance in delta public secondary schools. *Journal of Educational and social Research*, 4(1), 267-272.
- Almutairi, T. (2016) *Teacher evaluation in Kuwait - Evaluation of the current system and consideration of Risk-Based Analysis as a principle for further development*. (Doctoral dissertation, Durham University, England). Retrieved from <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/11857/>
- Best, J., & Kahn, J. (2006). *Research in education* (10th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Coakes, S., & Steed, L. (2009). *SPSS analysis without anguish: Version 16.0 for windows*. Milton-Brisbane: Wiley.
- Coe, R., Aloisi, C., Higgins, S., & Major, L. (2014) *What makes great teaching? Review of the underpinning research*. London: Sutton Trust.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007) *Research method in education* (6th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Cooper, D., & Schindler, P. (2001). *Business research methods* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Creswell, J. (2012) *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.) Boston: Pearson Education.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Cook, C., Jaquith, A., & Hamilton, M. (2012b). *Creating a comprehensive system for evaluating and supporting effective teaching*. Stanford, California: Stanford Centre for Opportunity Policy in Education.

- Demirdag, S. (2015). Assessing teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Middle school teachers. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World (WJEIS)*, 5(3), 35-43.
- Deneire, A., Vanhoof, J., Faddar, J., Gijbels, D., & Van Petegem, P. (2014). Characteristics of appraisal systems that promote job satisfaction of teachers. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 41 (2014), 94-114.
- Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Giacometti, K. S. (2005). *Factors affecting job satisfaction and retention of beginning teachers*. (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Tech, USA). Retrieved from <https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/handle/10919/29595>
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Ingersoll, R. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American educational research journal*, 38(3), 499-534.
- Isaiah, M., & Nenty, H. (2012). Predicting job dissatisfaction among community junior secondary school teacher in Botswana. *Psychology*, 3 (3), 277-283.
- Johnson, S., & Birkeland, S. (2003). Pursuing a “sense of success”: New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 581-617.

- Kuwaiti Teachers Society. (2017). The role of Kuwaiti Teachers Society for applying teacher protection law. *Journal of Kuwaiti Teachers Society, April* (2017).
- Lester, P.(1987). Development and factor analysis of the teacher job satisfaction questionnaire (TJSQ). *Educational and psychological Measurement, 47*(1), 223-233.
- Luekens, M., Lyter, D., and Fox, E. (2004). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the teacher follow-up survey, 2000–01* (NCES 2004–301). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Liu, X., & Ramsey, J. (2008). Teachers' job satisfaction: Analyses of the teacher follow-up survey in the United States for 2000–2001. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24* (5), 1173-1184.
- Mahmood, A., Nudrat, S., Asdaque, M., Nawaz, A., & Haider, N. (2011). Job satisfaction of secondary school teachers: A comparative analysis of gender, urban and rural schools. *Asian Social Science, 7*(8), 203-208.
- Marvel, J., Lyter, D., Peltola, P., Strizek, G., and Morton, B. (2006). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2004–05 Teacher Follow-up Survey* (NCES 2007–307). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.
- Ministry of Education, Kuwait. (2017a). *Replacing policy in the ministry of education in Kuwait*. Kuwait: MOE.
- Ministry of Education, Kuwait. (2017b). *Replacing policy report in 2017*. Kuwait: MOE.
- Ministry of Education, Kuwait. (2017c). *Formal answers from the minister regarding Kuwaiti teachers number*. Kuwait: National Assembly in Kuwait.

- Moore, C. M. (2012). The role of school environment in teacher dissatisfaction among US public school teachers. *Sage Open*, 2(1), 1-16.
- Morris, M. (2016). *School and district leadership and the job satisfaction of novice teachers: The influence of distributed leadership* (Doctoral dissertation, Boston College, USA). Retrieved from <https://dlib.bc.edu/islandora/object/bc-ir:106713/datastream/PDF/view>
- Muijs, D., & Reynolds, D. (2017). *Effective teaching: Evidence and practice*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Narayan, N. (2016). Factors influencing teacher career satisfaction, teacher collaboration and everyday challenges: An exploratory factor analysis. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(3), 24-38.
- Newby, P. (2014). *Research methods for education* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- OECD. (2014). *Talis 2013 results: An international perspective on teaching and learning*. OECD Publishing. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264196261-en>
- Rane, D. B. (2011). Employee job satisfaction: An essence of organization. *HRM Review*, 11(7), 10-16.
- Rhodes, C., Nevill, A., & Allan, J. (2004). Valuing and supporting teachers: A survey of teacher satisfaction, dissatisfaction, morale and retention in an English local education authority. *Research in Education*, 71(1), 67-80.
- Singhai, M., Shweta, D., Hyde, A., & Patel, R. (2016). Job satisfaction: A Review. *Research Journal of Management Sciences*, 5 (9), 66-68.

- Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. (1969). *The Measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Spector, P. (1997) *Job Satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.
- Thorndike, R., & Thorndike-Christ, T. (2010). *Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education* (8th ed.). London: Pearson Education.
- Tymms, P (2012). Questionnaire. In J. Arthur, M. Waring, R. Coe & L. Hedges. (Eds.), *Research methods and methodologies in education*. London: SAGE.
- Weiss, D., Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, xxii, 1-119.
- Zarafshani, K. & Alibaygi, A. (2008). Predictors of job satisfaction among academic in Iranian university. *NACTA Journal*, December, 2-9.
- Zembylas, M., & Papanastasiou, E. (2004). Job satisfaction among school teachers in Cyprus. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(3), 357-374.