Introduction

Teachers are considered national builder responsible to educate youth to be fully prepared for meeting the future demands of the society. They can play active role in achieving national educational objectives by having satisfaction with their jobs but if they are not satisfied their performance surely will be low which directly affects students learning which is alarming issue needs to be resolved at national level (Bhut, 2020). It is a
global issue whether teachers are content with their working environment or not is oftenly overlooked at all levels (Bascia & Rottmann, 2011). Results of various research studies revealed that teachers who are satisfied with their job feel comfortable and produce higher qualitative teaching in classrooms prove major support for better students’ learning (Collie, Shapka, & Perry, 2012; Kunter et al., 2013). They demonstrate strong professional commitment and very few leave teaching profession (Blömeke, Houang, Hsieh, & Wang, 2017). It was also found from the study of Toropova, Myrberg & Johansson (2021) that teachers’ workload, their cooperation with teaching staff and administration, proper maintenance of students’ discipline in classrooms were the main indicators associated with teachers’ job satisfaction.

Teachers’ job satisfaction refers to the attitude and feelings they show while performing their responsibilities in an educational institution (Bhut, 2020). It indicates they are actively participating in classroom instructional activities and other institutional tasks to be performed in better ways (Toropova, Myrberg & Johansson, 2021). It highlights teachers’ performance and institutional productivity. Teaching force can produce better results if they are satisfied with their jobs at the maximized level (Nigama, et al., 2021). There are many factors responsible for affecting teachers’ job satisfaction including salary, non-cooperative teaching staff behavior, overtime work without payment, stress or anxiety due to management autocratic attitude, belated or less chances of promotion, lack of physical and instructional facilities, teachers/students politics, students’ discipline issues and strict institutional rules and regulations (Melaku & Hunde, 2020). Furthermore, teachers satisfied with their job offer higher instructional quality and better learning support to the students (Klusmann, Kunter, Trautwein, Lüdtke, & Baumert, 2008; Kunter et al., 2013). It was also proved from studies that teachers satisfied with their job show strong job commitment and are very less teaching profession (Blömeke, Houang, Hsieh, & Wang, 2017).

Job satisfaction of teachers’ and use of different teaching methods in classrooms produce quality of teaching are the major indicators for improving students’ learning (Ramli et al., 2014; Arshad, Qamar, Ahmed & Saeed, 2018; Ahmed, Faizi, & Akbar, 2020). Provision of conducive learning environment, physical and instructional facilities to educational institutions and the teachers in classrooms like students seating arrangements, well decorated classrooms, proper lighting system, fresh ventilation, seating arrangements and ICT related instructional material (Earthman, 2002, Tanner & Lackney, 2006; Arshad, Ahmed, & Tayyab, 2019, Imran, Mahmood & Ahmed, 2020). Furthermore, Factors influencing students’ learning are curriculum design, instructional practices, teacher quality, students’ personal attributes, study habits, social interactions with peers, teachers, parents, community problems, family income, poverty, family conflicts, parenting style, poor parental supervision, larger familial and societal structures crime rates, violence can adversely impact students, learning (ULEAD, 2019).

Teachers’ job satisfaction and improvement of students’ learning is closely associated with provision of conducive school environment in educational institutions along with availability and teachers’ proper use of modern innovative instructional technological materials in classrooms. Although it is the state responsibility to provide policy guide lines and financial resources to the provincial governments for proper functioning of public sector educational institutions under their jurisdictional areas, but
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Provinces in country through constitutional powers are made responsible to have fully command and control of all the educational institutions in their respective provinces. It is their responsibility to provide basic educational facilities to the public sector educational institutions for having conducive school environment so that teachers having full job satisfaction can perform their duties in satisfactorily manners and students, learning outcomes can be uplifted. But teachers at all levels across Pakistan with reference to district Bahawalnagar of Punjab province is still facing a lot of challenges of job satisfaction creating hindrances for improving students’ learning at secondary level. There are many indicators responsible for not having proper teachers’ job satisfaction become causes of lowering down students’ learning outcomes in the region, so it was decided to conduct a research study on “Challenges of teachers’ job satisfaction and its effects on students’ learning at secondary level in Pakistan.

Literature Review

Job satisfaction refers the degree to which employees like recognition, appreciation and fulfillment of their needs being met (Evans, 1997). It is the degree to which employees feel positively satisfied or negatively dissatisfied about their jobs, where they are serving. It has been defined as an employee’s positive or negative attitudes and feelings toward their profession (Sunal, Sunal, & Yasin, 2011). It is sense of contentment, gratification, actualization, enjoyment and pride felt by them who enjoy hard working for attaining organizational goals in better ways (Kumari, 2008). Employees who are satisfied with their jobs show better performance due to their dedication, commitment, professionalism, loyalty and faithfulness to their organizations (Judge, 2001). It also refers to how an employee’s performs better a job offers fulfillment of the needs they desire to be met. Similarly, an employee’s job satisfaction affects their productivity at the workplace. It was found from research that positive work environment contributes to employees job satisfaction (Tran & Le, 2015; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011), whereas, negative work environment leads to low job satisfaction due to high levels of workload and stress (Black, 2004; OECD, 2014; Åkerwall & Johansson, 2015).

Teachers’ higher level of job satisfaction positively effects on their performance, as it motivates them to provide qualitative teaching in classrooms, which is a major indicator of improving students’ learning outcomes (Demirtaü, 2010). Similar views were found from research work of Ho & Au (2006) that job satisfaction has broad concept comprising on all characteristics of the job directly related in working in conducive working environment of institution, teachers’ services to be acknowledged by school heads, students and the society. Researchers like Güleryüz, Güney, Aydıñ & Aydın (2008) were of the opinion that teachers’ job satisfaction includes age, higher academic qualifications, participation in professional development courses/ trainings, teaching experience, communication skills, professional commitment, and relationship with school administration, teachers and students. Snipes et al. (2005) stated that teachers’ job satisfaction consists of many factors including good relationships with school heads, conducive working environment, high salary packages and promotional advancement opportunities. Similarly, overburden teaching and office workload develop elements of stress and frustration not only effects teachers’ performance but also prove a major cause of students’ down gradation of result and even compels novice teachers to leave job (Ingersoll, 2017; Perryman, Ball, Maguire, & Braun, 2011; Zeichner, 2014).
Students’ learning is a process for seeking knowledge or skills, educational institutions are responsible to felicitate them in achieving this national educational goals (Lawal, 2014). Teachers are made responsible to use various teaching methods and pedagogical skills in classrooms to teach students in better ways for achieving fruitful results of students’ learning outcomes (Ramli et al. 2014). It consisted on teachers’ professional commitment, dedication, devotion, collaborative close interaction between teachers and students, active participation of students in classroom learning activities, teachers’ use of advanced innovative modern ICT related instructional aids in classrooms (Earthman, 2002, Tanner & Lackney, 2006). Research also pointed out that students face cognitive challenges, reading materials, language barrier, instructional problem, language barrier, burden of school work, time management, and cultural differences develop problems for students (Fook & Sidhu, 2014). Conducive and safe learning environment is very important for every student, as it plays leading role for uplifting their learning. In the absence of conducive learning environment students feel insecure disconnected with studies and teachers, uncomfortable and involve discipline issues especially in bullying, act of violence, criminality or other destructive behavioral activates, become cause of down gradation of their result (Yogeeswaran, Afzal, Andrew, Chivers, Wang, Devos, & Sibley, 2019).

There are many factors responsible for teachers’ job dissatisfaction. These not only affect on their performance but also have negative impacts on students learning. There are many Unconducive working environment and less salaries are major indicators for teachers’ dissatisfaction with job (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Tema Nord, 2010). Moreover, unconducive or inadequate working conditions of a school directly undermine the working capabilities of teachers indirectly affects students’ learning (Ingersoll, 2001). Many novice and even highly qualified and experience teachers did their best to transfer other school even leave teaching profession by joining other profession just due to autocratic attitude of school heads and other school related problems (Ingersoll, 2017; Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016; Ingersoll, 2017; Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, & Carver-Thomas, 2016). Moreover, a teachers’ students’ relationship, teachers’ parents’ students relationship and teachers relationship with administration are another factors of satisfaction or dissatisfaction among teachers (Ball, 2003) and becomes cause of higher risk of attrition compared to problems for teachers (Ingersoll & May, 2012; Sibieta, 2018). It was also found from research of Borman & Dowling (2008) found that schools offering administrative support and mentoring facilities to teachers prove helpful indicators to stop teachers’ retention and dissatisfied elements among teachers.

Material and Methods

Research Design

The design of this study was descriptive type in nature, so survey method was used for answering research questions. Descriptive research method is very common procedure for conducting research social sciences research studies (Nassaji, 2015). It is also used to elaborate population characteristics and variation. It also helps researchers for description of samples as per demands of the study for further description of educational phenomena (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2009; Leob et al., 2017).
Population

Population in research studies is consisted on large group of persons having requisite characteristics meeting desired standard to collect required information which will be comprised on all persons constitute a known as a whole (Asiamah, Mensah & Oteng, 2017). It is also comprised on whole set of cases from which required sample to be taken out for research purposes (Mills & Gay, 2018; Alvi, 2016). Punjab province of Pakistan, comprised on 9 divisions including Bahawalpur Division, which is further consisted on three districts namely Rahim Yar Khan, Bahawalnagar and Bahawalpur. Furthermore district Bahawalnagar was randomly chosen as population of the study.

All the teachers 4237 (2257M+1980F) teaching secondary classes in 212 (113M+99F) Govt. High Schools of Bahawalnagar district were selected as population of the study. Further detail of the distribution of the population was tabulated below;

| S/No. | District Bahawalnagar | School Distribution | Teachers' Distribution |
|-------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
|       |                       | Male    | Female   | Male    | Female   |
| 1.    |                       | 113     | 99       | 3357    | 1980     |
| Total |                       | 212     |          | 4237    |          |

Sample

Sampling is a subset of population used for making inferences. It consisted on a small number of individuals chosen from the population for research investigational purposes. In present study, simple random sampling technique was applied to select sample from the population, due to the reason because in this type of sampling technique each respondent has equal chances of selection as sample of the research study (Mills & Gay, 2018; Best, 2016; Alvi, 2016).

Sample of the study comprised on 300=(150M+150F) teachers (5 teachers from each school) teaching secondary classes both from urban and rural areas of 60=(30M+30F) Govt. High Schools (B/G) of Bahawalnagar district were randomly selected for receiving required information from respective respondents. Further detail of the distribution of the sample was tabulated below;
Table 1

Distribution of Sample

| S/ No. | District | School Distribution | Teachers' Distribution |
|--------|----------|---------------------|------------------------|
|        | Bahawalnagar | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1.     | Total     | 30   | 30     | 150  | 150    |

Table 3

Salaries of teachers is satisfactory

| Gender          | Responses | Res | N | Percentage | Mean score | SD  | t-value | Sig.  |
|-----------------|-----------|-----|---|------------|------------|-----|---------|-------|
| Male Teachers   | SA        | 22  |   | 14.7       | 3.88       | .851|         |       |
|                 | A         | 108 |   | 72.0       |            |     |         |       |
|                 | UD        | 4   |   | 2.7        |            |     |         |       |
|                 | DA        | 12  |   | 8.0        |            |     |         |       |
|                 | SDA       | 4   |   | 2.7        |            |     |         |       |
| Female Teachers | SA        | 49  |   | 32.7       | 3.71       | 1.338|         |       |
|                 | A         | 60  |   | 40.0       |            |     |         |       |
|                 | UD        | 8   |   | 5.3        |            |     |         |       |
|                 | DA        | 15  |   | 10.0       |            |     |         |       |

Material and Methods

Keeping in view objectives of the study, a self-developed questionnaire, based on three parts comprised on 5 points Likert scale validated through pilot testing administered for collection of data from respective respondents. The first part of the questionnaire related to demographic data of teachers such as gender, academic and professional qualification and part two was consisted on teachers’ opinions about teachers’ job satisfaction challenges part three is used to find out effects of its effects on students’ learning at secondary level. To collect required information from teachers belong to sampled institution researcher personally visited each schools and after seeking proper permission from respective Heads of the schools heads, questionnaire was administered to give to respective respondents with request to fill them as per given guidelines and researcher also helped them for filling them properly. So, proper prescribed data was collected from teachers in due course of time as per demands of the research study.

Results and Discussion

The information collected through questionnaire from respective teachers teaching secondary classes serving in sampled educational institutions was properly tabulated by using requisite statistical tools like percentage, frequency score, mean score, standard deviation and t test for analysis of data. Detailed descriptions of results received from data analysis to find out effects of teachers’ job satisfaction at secondary level tabulated in the given below tables;
The above table shows that 86.7% (14.7% + 72.0%) male and 72.7% (32.7% + 40.0%) female teachers were agreed, whereas 32.7% (10.0%) of male and 22.0% (10.0% + 12.0%) were disagreed with the statement that salaries of teachers is satisfactory. Mean score (3.88) of male teachers is greater than female teachers (3.71). The standard deviation increases from (0.851) to (1.338) and t-value (1.326) is significant at (.187) for male teachers and female teachers. So, was also found that there was significant difference between male teacher female teachers' responses. Furthermore, it was clear indication that majority (86.7%) of the male teachers were agreed that salary of teachers is satisfactory.

Table 4

| Teachers, Promotion criteria is according to the policy |
|--------------------------------------------------------|
| **Gender** | **Responses** | **Mean score** | **SD** | **t-value** | **Sig.** |
|------------|---------------|----------------|--------|-------------|---------|
|            | **Res** | **N** | **Percentage** |       |           |         |
| Male Teachers | SA | 39 | 26.0 | 3.55 | 1.277 |            |
|              | A    | 59  | 39.3 |      |       | -        |
|              | UD   | 8   | 5.3  |      |       | 2.355    |
|              | DA   | 34  | 22.7 | 3.87 | 1.271 | .020     |
|              | SDA  | 10  | 6.7  |      |       |          |
| Female Teachers | SA | 59 | 39.3 | 3.87 | 1.271 | .020     |
|               | A    | 54  | 36.0 |      |       |          |
|               | UD   | 8   | 5.3  |      |       |          |
|               | DA   | 17  | 11.3 |      |       |          |
|               | SDA  | 12  | 8.0  |      |       |          |
|                |      |     |      | df=149, N =300, t-value at 0.05= -2.355 |

Table 4 describes that 65.3% (26.0% + 39.3%) male and 75.3% (39.3% + 36.0%) female teachers were agreed, whereas 29.4% (22.7% + 6.7%) male and 19.3% (11.3% + 8.0%) female teachers were disagreed with the statement teachers promotion criteria is according to the policy. Mean score (3.55) of male teachers is less than the mean score (3.87) of female teachers. The standard deviation decreases from (1.277) to (1.271) and t-value (-2.355) is significant at (.020) for male teachers and female teachers. So, was also found that there was significant difference between male and female teachers' opinions. Furthermore, it was clear that majority (75.3%) female teachers were agreed that teachers' promotion criteria is according to the policy.

Table 5

| Teachers are satisfied with school environment |
|----------------------------------------------|
| **Gender** | **Responses** | **Mean score** | **SD** | **t-value** | **Sig.** |
|------------|---------------|----------------|--------|-------------|---------|
|            | **Res** | **N** | **Percentage** |       |           |         |
| Male Teachers | SA | 74 | 49.3 | 3.63 | 1.645 | 1.268 .207 |
|               | A    | 24 | 16.0 |      |       |          |
|               | UD   | 6  | 4.0  |      |       |          |
|               | DA   | 14 | 9.3  |      |       |          |
Table 5 indicates that 65.3% (49.3%+16.0%) male and 55.3% (41.3%+14.0%) female teachers were agreed, whereas, 30.6% (9.3%+21.3%) male and 40.0% (23.3%+16.7%) female teachers were disagreed with the statement teachers satisfied with school environment. Mean score (3.63) of male teachers is greater than the mean score (3.40) of female teachers. The standard deviation decreases from (1.645) to (1.597) and t-value (1.268) is significant at (.207) for male teachers and female teachers. So, was also found that there was significant difference between male and female teachers’ opinions. Furthermore, it was clear that majority (65.3%) of the male teachers agreed that I am satisfied with school environment.

Table 6

| Gender           | Responses | Mean score | SD  | t-value | Sig. |
|------------------|-----------|------------|-----|---------|------|
|                  | Res      | N   | Percentage |       |      |
| Male Teachers    | SA        | 82  | 54.7       | 3.75  | 1.623|
|                  | A         | 20  | 13.3       |       |      |
|                  | UD        | 4   | 2.7        |       |      |
|                  | DA        | 16  | 10.7       |       |      |
|                  | SDA       | 28  | 18.7       |       | -.997|
| Female Teachers  | SA        | 81  | 54.0       | 3.92  | 1.440|
|                  | A         | 28  | 18.7       |       |      |
|                  | UD        | 5   | 3.3        |       |      |
|                  | DA        | 20  | 13.3       |       |      |
|                  | SDA       | 16  | 10.7       |       |      |

Results of the above table describes that 68.0% (54.7%+13.3%) male and 72.7% (54.0%+18.7%) female teachers were agreed, whereas, 29.4% (10.7%+18.7%) male and 24.0% (13.3%+10.7%) female teachers were disagreed with the statement Head teachers treat teachers cordially. Mean score (3.75) of male teachers is less than the mean score (3.92) of female teachers. The standard deviation decreases from (1.623) to (1.440) and t-value (-.997) is significant at (.320) for male teachers and female teachers. So, was also found that there was significant difference between male and female teachers’ opinions. Furthermore, it was clear that majority (72.7%) of the female teachers were agreed were that Head teachers treat teachers cordially.
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Table 7
Teachers are provided professional training opportunities

| Gender          | Responses | Mean score | SD  | t-value | Sig. |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|-----|---------|------|
| Male Teachers   | SA        | 3.88       | .851|         |      |
|                 | A         |            |     |         |      |
|                 | UD        |            |     |         |      |
|                 | DA        |            |     |         |      |
| Female Teachers | SA        | 3.94       | 1.171|         |      |
|                 | A         |            |     |         |      |
|                 | UD        |            |     |         |      |
|                 | DA        |            |     |         |      |

df=149 N =300 t-value at 0.05= -.478

Table 7 reveals that 86.7% (14.7%+72.0%) male and 78.0% (38.0%+40.0%) female teachers were agreed, whereas, 10.7% (8.0%+2.7%) male and 16.6% (11.3%+5.3%) were disagreed with the statement teachers are provided professional training opportunities. Mean score mean score (3.88) of male teachers is less than the mean score (3.94) of female teachers. The standard deviation increases from (.851) to (1.171). The table reflects that t-value (-.478) is significant at (.634) for teachers and students. So, was also found that there was significant difference between male and female teachers’ opinions. Furthermore, it was clear that majority (86.7%) of the male teachers were agreed were that Head teachers treat teachers cordially.

Table 8
Teacher’s job satisfaction helps them to work more effectively

| Gender          | Responses | Mean score | SD  | t-value | Sig. |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|-----|---------|------|
| Male Teachers   | SA        | 3.85       | 1.382|         |      |
|                 | A         |            |     |         |      |
|                 | UD        |            |     |         |      |
|                 | DA        |            |     |         |      |
| Female Teachers | SA        | 3.43       | 1.615|         |      |
|                 | A         |            |     |         |      |
|                 | UD        |            |     |         |      |
|                 | DA        |            |     |         |      |

df=149 N =300 t-value at 0.05=.144

This table reveals that 71.4% (46.7%+24.7%) male and 59.4% (40.7%+18.7%) female teachers were agreed, whereas, 23.3% (14.0%+9.3%) male and 36.7% (16.7%+20.0%) female teachers were disagreed with the statement teacher’s job satisfaction helps them to work more effectively. Mean score mean score (3.85) of male teachers is greater than the mean score (3.43) of female teachers. The standard deviation
decreases from (1.382) to (1.615) and t-value (-.478) is significant at (.886) for male teachers and female teachers. Furthermore, it was clear that majority (71.4%) of the male teachers were agreed that teacher’s job satisfaction helps them to work more effectively.

Table 9

| Gender       | Responses | Mean score | SD  | t-value | Sig. |
|--------------|-----------|------------|-----|---------|------|
|              | Res       | N          | Percentage |
| Male Teachers| SA        | 61         | 40.7          |
|              | A         | 22         | 14.7          |
|              | UD        | 3          | 2.0           |
|              | DA        | 33         | 22.0          |
|              | SDA       | 31         | 20.7          |
| Female Teachers| SA      | 71         | 47.3          |
|              | A         | 39         | 26.0          |
|              | UD        | 6          | 4.0           |
|              | DA        | 17         | 11.3          |
|              | SDA       | 17         | 11.3          |

df=149 N =300 t-value at 0.05= -3.265

This table reveals that 55.4% (40.7%+14.7%) male and 73.3%(47.3%+26.0%) female teachers were agreed, whereas,42.7% (22.0%+20.7%) male and 22.0% (11.3%+11.3%) female teachers were disagreed with the statement teachers’ job satisfaction has positive impact to improve students’ learning. Mean score mean score mean score (3.33) of male teachers is less than the mean score (3.87) of female teachers. The standard deviation decreases from (1.653) to (1.408). The table reflects that t-value (-3.265) is significant at (.001) for teachers and students. Furthermore, it was clear that majority (73.3% of the female teachers were agreed that teachers’ job satisfaction has positive impact to improve students’ learning.

Discussion

Teachers’ job satisfaction is the key pillar plays active role not only provision of qualitative education but also helps improve their learning outcomes. Various research studies conducted in past prove that teachers must provided conducive school related physical and instructional facilities along with modern ICT related facilities so that they can perform their responsibilities in better ways (Arshad; Ahmed. &Tayyab,2019, Ahmad,et al, 2010). Results of the study indicated that majority of the teachers were of the opinion that good salary, proper promotion on merit as per rules, conducive school environment, head teachers cordially relationship with teachers, provision of professional trainings, maintenance of discipline are the main indicators help teachers to teach students in better ways. It also prove a major source to provide qualitative teaching to students ultimately improve their results. It was also revealed that teachers who are satisfied with their job feel comfortable and produce higher qualitative teaching in classrooms prove major support for better students’ learning (Collie, Shapka, & Perry, 2012; Kunter et al., 2013; Blömeke, Houang, Hsieh, & Wang, 2017).Teaching force can produce better results if they are they are satisfied with their jobs at the maximized level.
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(Nigama, et al., 2021). It was further found that from research that many factors influencing students' learning and teachers' job dissatisfaction are curriculum design, instructional practices, teacher quality, students' personal attributes, study habits, social interactions with peers, teachers, parents, community problems, family income, poverty, family conflicts, parenting style, poor parental supervision, larger classes and societal structures crime rates, violence can adversely impact students, learning (ULEAD, 2019). Furthermore it was also revealed that salary, non-cooperative teaching staff behavior, overtime work without payment, stress due to management autocratic attitude, belated or less chances of promotion, lack of physical and instructional facilities, students' discipline issues and strict institutional rules and regulations are the main factors responsible for affecting teachers' job satisfaction and lowering down students' learning outcomes (Melaku & Hunde, 2020).

Conclusion

It was concluded that teachers' job satisfaction has positive impact on students' learning. There are many indicators responsible for teachers' job dissatisfaction compelling them to get transfer from one school to other or leave teaching profession and join other jobs. But these problems can be controlled or to some extent minimized if teachers are provided good salary, school heads positive attitude with teachers, provision of conducive working school environment to teachers, maintenance of proper discipline, provision and proper use of available physical and instructional facilitates in classrooms. Furthermore teachers may be provided professional modern ICT related training facilities so that they can update their knowledge and pedagogical skills according to global changing scenario rapidly going on in the field of education.
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