

Impact of Decentralization in Education on Head Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Public Schools of Punjab

Ayaz Muhammad Khan, Munawar S. Mirza

Email: ayaz@ue.edu.pk

This study explored head teachers' (HTs') job satisfaction in the devolved educational system in Punjab, Pakistan. Government schools were controlled academically, administratively and financially by the provincial government before devolution in education from provinces to district. When Devolution Plan 2000 was materialized by the promulgation of Local Government Ordinance 2001, all these powers were devolved from provinces to district government. On one hand, HTs became accountable to district bureaucracy and on the other hand, to the political leadership at the three levels in the district (union council, town council and district councils). Accountability of the HTs increased many fold. Moreover, parents' involvement in school matters increased due to school councils. The study employed ex-post-facto cross sectional quantitative survey design supplemented with an open ended question. Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was used as the instrument to measure job satisfaction. Results of JDI and their open ended responses have shown that HTs were significantly more satisfied with their work on 'Work on Job', 'Opportunities for Promotion', 'Supervision', 'Co-workers' and 'Job in General' subscales of JDI during pre-devolution period. Devolution in education has no significant effect on the pay on 'Pay sub scale of JDI' of the HTs before and after devolution. HTs were highly dissatisfied with their pay before and after devolution periods.

Keywords: decentralization, devolution in education, school leadership, job satisfaction, promotion, supervision,

Introduction

Devolution is the transfer of powers to the independent local authorities with no influence from higher authorities. It also means giving back the power and authority from whom it was taken. Decentralization by devolution or territorial decentralization makes it possible for inhabitants of a town, a department, or a region to settle their administrative affairs through their elected representatives. It involves the transfer of powers to a local institution or association, with broad autonomy, legal status, and they are representative of the people (Hanson, 1998).

Educational decentralization is the transfer of authority from the center, or the national education ministry usually located in the capital city, to the periphery. It usually transfers powers and responsibilities to either the region i.e.,

regional governments like states or provinces, or the regional offices of the education ministry; the locality i.e., local governments like municipalities or districts, the local offices of the education ministry, the school i.e., either the head of the school or a governing school board' (Cummings & Riddell, 1992; Winkler, 2005).

It is a complex process, "comprising the changes in the way school systems go about making policy, generating revenues, spending funds, and training teachers, designing curricula, and managing local schools". This, in a way, changes parents, students and teachers' attitude towards the school (Fiske, 1996).

Pakistan is a federation composed of four provinces, Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) and Gilgit Baltistan. The form of

decentralization that has been implemented in Pakistan was devolution. The provincial governments promulgated the Local Government Ordinance, 2001 in their respective provinces to install a new integrated Local Government System with effect from 14th August 2001 to function within the provincial framework and adhere to the federal and provincial laws. The new system allowed public participation in decision-making. The essence of this system was to make the local governments accountable to citizens for all their decisions and actions.

Under the devolved system, planning, management and monitoring/evaluation have been decentralized to district level. The district government was now made responsible for the management of elementary and secondary schools. The Executive District Officers (EDO) Education bears the major responsibility for ensuring the educational needs of the district. They are also responsible for planning and establishing new institutions where necessary. Duties and functions of EDO Education include: implementing the provincial education policy through the district education policy and plan; preparing plans for development of education in the district covering the levels that fall within the responsibility of the district; and preparing the annual educational budget of the district (ADB, DFID, WB, 2004, Zaidi, 2005 & GoP, 2005).

Job satisfaction of head teachers. Job satisfaction is considered as a pleasurable or positive emotional state that results from appraisal of one's job or job experience. It is difficult to describe job satisfaction as a single construct (Morrice & Murry, 2003). The literature on job satisfaction reveals that bureaucratic type school tend to have hierarchical structure of control, authority and communication with little shared decision making, little emphasis on professional expertise in both subject matter knowledge and

instructional methodology resulting in low job satisfaction among teachers (Lunenberg & Orstein, 1996).

Job satisfaction is one of the indicators that reflect how well the school organization is functioning. All factors that clarify the teachers' job help to promote high level of satisfaction (Miskel, Fevrly & Steewan, 1979). Studies have manifested that school effectiveness is related to satisfaction of teachers with coworkers, with supervisors and with the work itself (Knoop & O, Reilly, 1978). Job satisfaction results in less absenteeism among elementary school teachers. (Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

Role ambiguity and stress have inverse relationship with the job satisfaction among teachers and head teachers (Nisa, 2003). The job satisfaction of college teacher was positively and significantly correlated with open and autonomous climates (Hayat, 1998).

Chaplain (2001) reported levels of perceived stress and job satisfaction among primary head teachers. Around half of them reported high levels of occupational stress but some half were satisfied with their work. Sources of stress and job satisfaction were examined under four headings: managing oneself and others; managing finances; managing the curriculum; and managing change. The highest levels of satisfaction came from personal factors and organizational factors. School organization was a source of stress and of satisfaction. The lowest level of satisfaction was with the level of social support. There were no significant differences between headmasters and teachers on two burnout dimensions, namely emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, and job satisfaction. Females had higher job satisfaction than their male counterparts. In relation to their work experiences, more experienced subjects had higher emotional exhaustion and depersonalization than their less experienced

colleagues, and also less job satisfaction than less experienced counterparts (Hakan, 2004). Head teachers derive more satisfaction from their job from their relationship with the people and their autonomy. They consider that central government; board of governors and parents' more involvement in schools has been curtaining their autonomy (Hill, 1994).

There is a scarcity of research on how decentralization of education has affected job satisfaction of the head teachers. After devolution in 2001, head teachers had to face many novel challenges. They are answerable to district governments and people are more involved in schools than the past. Moreover, they are at the disposal of district monitoring committees which frequently visit schools to check teachers' absentees, and see the cleanliness conditions in the school. This has affected their job satisfaction level after devolution.

The effectiveness of any educational institution in this era of innovation and dynamics mainly depends on the type of leadership it is having. Whereas the leadership is in the hands of heads of the institutions and it requires particular attention as this is a vital characteristic if schools are to continue to increased levels of performance. Psychologically, it can be easily acceptable that the hunger of performance and the striving future of the institution are prominently feeding on the chunks of satisfaction a head teacher gulps at every pace of the maturity of his job. Thus it is very necessary to oversee the underlying factors of job satisfaction. Studies of job satisfaction can be seen in 1900's when Conley et al (1989) indicated the job satisfaction as a component of work environment and organizational climate. Johnson and Holdaway (1994) mentioned the importance of research in job satisfaction on school head teachers. They pointed out three main reasons for this i.e., negative phenomena (absenteeism and

turnover), strong association (between job satisfaction and the overall quality of life) and new challenges (modernization, technology and accountability). These reasons impose a great deal of pressure upon head teachers and draw attention to the need for more concern over job satisfaction (Alzaidi, 2008).

It is clear that high satisfaction on the part of school personnel are generally observed as desirable goals for school organizations (Ghazi & Khan, 2008). Job satisfaction inclinations can impinge on behavior and influence volume of work and effort, employee absenteeism and staff turnover. Moreover, job satisfaction is well thought-out a strong interpreter of individual's comfort by and large (Serrano and Vieira, 2005), as well as a good predictor of job leaving intentions (Gazioglu & Tansel, 2002). According to Herzberg (1968) five factors that boost job satisfaction are: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement.

While factors, which if scarce can knock satisfaction were: salary, possibility of growth, interpersonal relations (subordinates), status, interpersonal relations (superiors), interpersonal relations (peers), supervision-technical, company policy and administration, working conditions, personal life, and job security.

Rose (2003) identified a number of possible influences on job satisfaction including individual well-being, working hours, work orientation, financial variables, the employment contract, and market and job mobility.

Head teachers' role in schools is pivotal in sustaining the change. If a head teacher is a part of the process of change, the chances of the success of any system become great. Similarly the quality and efficiency of school depends to a large extent on the effective school leadership. Plank (1987) in his study pointed out some of the cause of the failure of educational reform

initiatives. One of them is the disregard shown to role of school heads in the making and implementation of these reforms. Decentralization in education in Pakistan is a new initiative where educational planners have to seek their role in the new scenario. Head teachers in Punjab operate as link between school and district or provincial government. Little was known about the level of their job satisfaction after decentralization in education.

Objective of the study

The major objective of the study was to explore the impact of decentralization on HTs' job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction. The extent to which the HTs like their job. Some of the indicators of job satisfaction are attitude towards the duties, working conditions, emoluments, supervision, reward systems and promotion possibilities.

Method / Design

The study utilized a quantitative approach using ex-post-facto research employing quantitative cross sectional survey design soliciting data supplemented with an open ended

response.

Population of the Study

Heads of secondary schools (Head teachers) were the population of this study.

Head teachers of all 4463 secondary schools of the Punjab constituted in population of the study.

Sample

A two stage sampling technique was used. In the first stage districts were selected randomly out of three categories of districts with respect to literacy rate. Four districts were selected from each category yielding a total number of 12 districts (See table 1).

In the second stage schools were selected randomly out of the selected districts. Head teachers of those schools constituted the sample. The minimum sample size required for 5% margin of error around the parameter estimation at the .95 confidence level was 387 (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh 2002). So sample for the study comprised a total of 387 head teachers (Male 223, Female 166) of the accessible population of 2070 head teachers (Male 1250, Female 820).

Table1 Selected Districts from each Category for Questionnaires

Sr. No	Category	Total districts	No. of selected districts	Sampled districts
1	A	12	04	Attock, Lahore, Rawalpindi, Chakwal
2	B	12	04	Mianwali, Okara Sargodha, Sheikhupura
3	C	11	04	Bhakkar Bahawalpur, Nankan Sahib, Bahawalnagar
	Total	35	12	

Instrumentation

The main instrument for this study was Job Descriptive Index. Job satisfaction, an attitude towards work environment can be measured by many methods. In the light of review of literature the Researcher found the JDI being an ideal instrument for this research study since it is extensively used and its reliability and validity were well documented and proven. Many experts had verified it to be very valid instrument having good content validity, impressive construct validity and adequate reliability. Moreover, it was short and easy to fill out that was the main cause of its wide usage throughout the world. Permission was sought to use the questionnaire.

The JDI consisted of 90 items designed to measure respondent satisfaction with a global scale (job in general), and five other scales of a job: (1) work on present job (work), (2) present (pay), (3) opportunities for (promotions), (4) supervision on present job, and (5) people on present job (co-workers). Each scale was composed of several single word or phrase descriptions, some of which were purely descriptive and some of which were affective and evaluative.

Analytical procedure. According to this

scoring system, a score of “3” is assigned to positive items with a “Y” response and negative items with a “N” response. A score of “1” is assigned to any item with a “?” response. A score of “0” is assigned to positive items with a N response or negative items with a “Y” response. Thus, the score range on an individual item is zero 0-3, where the bottom of the scale represents dissatisfaction and the top of the scale, satisfaction. In computing the score for the two 9-items scales, the raw total is doubled, so that the resulting score will be comparable to the other item scales. The highest possible score is 54 and the lowest possible score is 0 (JDI, 1997).

The level of satisfaction is operationalized by the JDI team in the way as described in the table 2 given below.

Impact of Devolution on Job Satisfaction of HTs

Out of 341 respondents, 252 HTs had more than ten years of experience. So, they were in a position to opine about how devolution had affected their job satisfaction. Out of 252 respondents, 67.85% were men HTs and, 32.15% were women HTs.

Table 2 Operationalization of the level of Job Satisfaction

Score	Level of satisfaction
13.5 or below	Highly dissatisfied
13.5-27	Moderately dissatisfied
27-40.5	Moderately satisfied
above 40.5	Highly satisfied

Comparison of HTs' job satisfaction on work on job subscale of JDI during pre and post-devolution periods. The mean scores difference of HTs' job satisfaction on work on job subscale of JDI was calculated and following null hypothesis was tested.

Ho1 There is no significant difference between HTs' mean scores on work on job subscale of JDI for the pre and post-devolution periods.

The null hypothesis was tested using 't' test on mean scores during pre and post- devolution periods for the whole group and separately for male and female HTs. The summary is presented in the table no 3.

Above table shows that t-value was significant beyond 0.01 level of significance for all HTs. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating no significant difference between HTs' mean scores on work on job subscale of JDI for the pre and post-devolution periods was rejected. Mean score for HTs' job satisfaction during pre-devolution period was found to be higher as compared to post-devolution period. Similar

results were found for male and female HTs. Hence it can be concluded that HTs were more satisfied with their work during the pre-devolution period as compared to the post-devolution period.

The mean score of male ($M= 39.14$) and female ($M= 38.33$) head teachers on work on job scale showed that they were close to highly satisfied level before devolution. But after devolution it decreased to stand at (29.13) for male and (32.61) for female which means they were moderately satisfied. Male head teachers were less satisfied with their work on job than female head teachers.

Comparison of HTs' job satisfaction on 'pay subscale of JDI' during pre and post-devolution periods. The mean scores difference of HTs' job satisfaction on pay subscale of JDI was calculated and following null hypothesis was tested.

Ho2 There is no significant difference between HTs' mean scores on pay subscale of JDI for the pre and post-devolution periods.

Table 3 Comparison of HTs' Job Satisfaction on Work on Job Subscale of JDI during Pre and Post-Devolution Periods

		Period	N	Mean	SD	t-test for Equality of Means ($\alpha = 0.05$)		
						T	Df	Sig.
Total	Pre-devolution	252	39.05	9.21				
	Post-devolution	252	30.31	13.21	8.753	251	.000	
Male	Pre-devolution	173	39.14	9.37				
	Post-devolution	173	29.19	13.10	8.079	172	.000	
Female	Pre-devolution	79	38.20	8.87				
	Post-devolution	79	32.60	13.25	3.48	78	.001	

Table 4 shows that t-value was not significant beyond 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating no significant difference between HTs' mean scores on pay subscale of JDI for the pre and post-devolution periods was accepted. Similar results were found for males and females HTs. Hence it can be concluded that devolution has no effect on pay subscale of the JDI.

The pay was found to be a source of dissatisfaction before and after devolution except for females who were moderately satisfied with their pay after devolution. A slight difference was found between the mean scores of male ($M=24.77$) and female ($M=25.46$) head teachers' satisfaction level before devolution. While, majority of female head teachers ($M=28.25$) were more satisfied regarding pay issues after devolution than male head teacher ($M=25.86$). This might be due to the fact that most of the women had their husbands earning as well.

Comparison of HTs' job satisfaction on 'opportunities for promotion subscale' of JDI during pre and post-devolution periods. The

mean scores difference of HTs' job satisfaction on opportunities for promotion subscale of JDI was calculated and following null hypothesis was tested.

Ho3 There is no significant difference between HTs' mean scores on opportunities for promotion subscale of JDI for the pre and post-devolution periods.

Table 5 shows that the t-value was significant beyond 0.01 level of significance for the total sample. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating no significant difference between HTs' mean scores on opportunities for promotion subscale of JDI for the pre and post-devolution periods was rejected. Mean scores for HTs' job satisfaction on opportunities for promotion during the pre-devolution period were greater as compared to the post-devolution period. Similar results were found for males HTs. The mean scores for male HTs' job satisfaction on opportunities for promotion subscale during pre-devolution period was greater as compared to post-devolution period.

Table 4 Comparison of HTs' Job Satisfaction on Pay Subscale of JDI during Pre and Post-Devolution Periods

		<u>Period</u>	N	Mean	SD	<u>t-test for Equality of Means ($\alpha = 0.05$)</u>		
Total	Pre-devolution	252	24.99	15.13		T	Df	Sig
	Post-devolution	252	26.61	17.11	1.268			
Male	Pre-devolution	173	24.77	15.17		.658	172	.512
	Post-devolution	173	25.86	16.95				
Female	Pre-devolution	79	25.46	15.13		1.48	78	.14
	Post-devolution	79	28.25	17.41				

Table 5 Comparison of HTs' Job Satisfaction on Opportunities for Promotion Subscale of JDI during Pre and Post-Devolution Periods

		Period	N	Mean	SD	t-test for Equality of Means ($\alpha = 0.05$)		
						T	Df	Sig.
Total	Pre-devolution	252	28.96	16.42				
	Post-devolution	252	25.03	17.89	2.743	251	.007	
Male	Pre-devolution	173	29.79	16.42				
	Post-devolution	173	23.91	17.89	3.207	172	.002	
Female	Pre-devolution	79	27.13	15.16				
	Post-devolution	79	27.49	17.83	.168	78	.867	

Therefore, it can be concluded that male HTs were more satisfied with opportunities for promotion subscale of JDI during the pre-devolution period as compared to post-devolution. But no significant mean score difference was observed for females on opportunities for promotion subscale of JDI during the pre and post-devolution periods.

Before devolution males were found ($M=29.79$) to be moderately satisfied with the promotion possibilities but after devolution the level of satisfaction dropped ($M=23.91$) to stand at moderately dissatisfied level. Female head teachers' satisfaction over promotion remained almost the same. No change came in the promotion policies of the employee after devolution. Initially as literature identified that district management group would be established but no step was taken in this regard.

Comparison of HTs' job satisfaction on supervision sub scale of JDI during pre and post-devolution periods. The mean scores difference of HTs' job satisfaction on supervision subscale of JDI was calculated and following null hypothesis was tested.

H₀₄ There is no significant difference between HTs' mean scores on supervision subscale of JDI for the pre and post-devolution periods.

Table 6 shows that t-value shown in above table was significant beyond 0.01 level of significance for the total sample. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating no significant difference between HTs' mean scores on satisfaction with the supervision subscale of JDI for the pre and post-devolution periods was rejected. Mean scores for HTs' job satisfaction on supervision subscale during the pre-devolution period was greater as compared to the post-devolution period. Hence it can be concluded that HTs were more satisfied with supervision subscale of JDI during the pre-devolution period as compared to post- devolution. Similar results were found for males HTs. But no significant mean score difference was observed for females on supervision subscale of JDI during the pre and post-devolution periods.

Table 6 Comparison of HTs' Job Satisfaction on Supervision Subscale of JDI during Pre and Post-Devolution Periods

		Period	N	Mean	SD	t-test for Equality of Means ($\alpha = 0.05$)		
						t	Df	Sig
Total	Pre-devolution	252	35.36	12.57				
	Post-devolution	252	31.65	13.51	4.614	251	.000	
Male	Pre-devolution	173	34.94	12.72				
	Post-devolution	173	30.32	13.22	4.492	172	.000	
Female	Pre-devolution	79	36.36	12.28				
	Post-devolution	79	34.54	13.77	1.43	78	.155	

Women head teachers were found to be more moderately satisfied ($M=36.30$) than male ($M=34.94$) before devolution. But, after devolution supervision affected the job satisfaction level negatively and though it remained within moderately satisfied boundary yet, the mean score fell to ($M=30.38$) for male head teachers and ($M=34.54$) for female head teachers. One of the reasons was the frequent visits of the monitoring teams to school. The local Union Nazims also used to visit school for the above said purpose which might have caused the low satisfaction means score after devolution.

Comparison of HTs' job satisfaction on co-worker subscale of JDI during pre and post-devolution periods. The mean scores difference of HTs' job satisfaction on co-workers subscale of JDI was calculated and following null hypothesis was tested.

H05 There is no significant difference between HTs' mean scores on co-worker subscale of JDI for the pre and post-devolution periods.

Table 7 shows that t-value for the total sample was significant beyond 0.01 level of significance for the total sample. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating no significant difference between HTs' mean scores on co-worker subscale of JDI for the pre and post-devolution periods was rejected. Similar results were found for male HTs. Mean score for HTs' job satisfaction on co-worker subscale during pre-devolution period was greater as compared to post-devolution period. Hence it can be concluded that HTs were more satisfied with 'co-worker subscale of JDI' during the pre-devolution period as compared to the post-devolution. But no significant mean score difference was observed for female head teachers on co-worker subscale of JDI during the pre and post-devolution periods.

Mean scores of male ($M=41.65$) and female ($M=43.76$) head teachers before devolution showed that they had highly satisfactory relations with their coworkers. After devolution satisfaction level with the coworkers slightly fell down for male ($M=37.89$) to moderately satisfied level. For women it remained at the same level.

Table 7 Comparison of HTs' Job Satisfaction on Co-Worker Subscale of JDI during Pre and Post-Devolution Periods

		t-test for Equality of Means ($\alpha = 0.05$)					
	Period	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	Sig.
Total	Pre-devolution	252	42.30	12.76			
	Post-devolution	252	39.26	12.72	3.617	251	.000
Male	Pre-devolution	173	41.64	12.86			
	Post-devolution	173	37.89	13.45	3.44	172	.001
Female	Pre-devolution	79	43.75	12.51			
	Post-devolution	79	42.92	10.72	1.217	78	.226

Comparison of HTs' job satisfaction on 'job in general subscale' of JDI during pre and post devolution periods. The mean scores difference of HTs' job satisfaction on job in general subscale of JDI were calculated and following null hypothesis was tested.

H₀6 There is no significant differences between HTs' mean scores on Job in general subscale of JDI for the pre and post-devolution periods.

Table 8 shows that t-values for the total sample was significant beyond 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating no significant difference between HTs' mean scores on job in general subscale of JDI for the pre and post-devolution periods was rejected. Mean score for HTs' job satisfaction on job in general subscale during the pre-devolution period was greater as compared to the post-devolution period. Similar results were found for males and females HTs separately. Hence it can be concluded that HTs were more satisfied with job in general subscale of JDI during the pre-devolution period as compared to post-devolution.

When the satisfaction level on job in general scale was evaluated, the researcher found that head teachers were highly satisfied with their jobs before devolution but after devolution male satisfaction level with their job in general ($M=38.54$) decreased to be moderately satisfied level. There was a slight decrease in female head teachers satisfaction level from ($M=43.59$) to ($M=40.09$) after devolution but it remained at highly satisfied level.

Opinion of HTs about Monitoring System through Open Ended Question

Narrative opinion about the pre and post devolution monitoring and supervisory system was solicited through an open ended question at the end of in questionnaire. The responses supported the quantitative data of increasing dissatisfaction after devolution provided glimpses of the reasons of dissatisfaction. None of the male or female HTs was satisfied with the supervision system after devolution. One of them said, "Now we feel that we are 24 hours under surveillance. One week, EDO is coming, next week monitoring team is visiting us and the Nazim can come any time he wants. Last month we were in the school even on the weekend."

Table 8 Comparison of HTs' Job Satisfaction on Job in General Subscale of JDI during Pre and Post-Devolution Periods

		<u>Period</u>	N	Mean	SD	t-test for Equality of Means ($\alpha = 0.05$)		
						T	Df	Sig.
Total	Pre-devolution	252	42.88	8.93				
	Post-devolution	252	39.01	10.22	5.557	251		.000
Male	Pre-devolution	173	42.88	9.12				
	Post-devolution	173	39.01	10.34	4.45	172		.000
Female	Pre-devolution	79	43.59	8.49				
	Post-devolution	79	40.08	9.93	3.348	78		.001

One of the HT said: “*There was a clear policy about school visit before devolution and we were always informed well in advance about an upcoming visit from a higher official. But now, it's very confusing, we got visits by Nazim and Niab Naizm, by the D.E.O, and D.D.E.O and by Chief Minister's Monitoring team. If we have a visit in any given week, we can't focus on the class work, and whole week is wasted in preparation of such supervisory visits*”.

Similarly, another HT mentioned: “*I remember that before this new system of devolution, we only got visits by the Education Department and people somewhat related to the field of education. But, now it's totally different. Political parties' representatives come to the school more often than the real experts of the field of education.*” Female HTs were also unhappy about the supervision process and shared similar views. During the analysis, the researcher noted that all HTs were full of anger and disappointment about the process of supervision and unscheduled supervisory visits by a number of different authorities.”

Findings and Discussion

Results have shown that HTs were significantly more satisfied with their work on ‘Work on Job’, ‘Opportunities for Promotion’, ‘Supervision’, ‘Co-workers’ and ‘Job in General’ subscales of JDI during pre-devolution period. Devolution in education has no

significant impact on ‘Pay’ sub scale of JDI of the HTs before and after devolution. HTs , males and females, were highly dissatisfied with their pay during before and after devolution periods.

Male HTs satisfaction level dropped on the other four indicators as well, that is, work on job, promotion, supervision and relations with the co-workers. Women HTs did on elements of the not feel much heat after devolution except required job performance. They became less satisfied with the work on job requirements.

The pay was found to be a source of dissatisfaction before and after devolution except for females who were moderately satisfied with their pay after devolution. Female head teachers' satisfaction over promotion remained almost the same. Though no change came in the promotion policies of the employee after devolution yet among males the satisfaction level dropped from moderately satisfied level in the pre devolution period to moderately dissatisfied level.

When the satisfaction level on job in general scale was evaluated, the researcher found that overall head teachers were highly satisfied with their jobs before devolution but after devolution male satisfaction level with their job in general decreased to be moderately satisfied. On the other hand among the female HTs remained

almost the same.

There might be many causes of downfall in the satisfaction level of the HTs after devolution in education. But, the foremost reason appears to be the increasing monitoring of the schools by different authorities and the stakeholders. Hidden behind this monitoring could be possible politicised interference. Intensive studies are suggested to explore into the nature of visits made by different authorities and stakeholders. It is also hard to speculate the reason of increasing dissatisfaction with the on job promotions when there was absolutely no change in the promotion policies. HTs might be fearing political influence in promotion cases. Further research into this aspect would be helpful in identifying the real causes.

Now talk about District Management Group what was it and how it compress to the now concept of District Education Authority. Factors might be the causes of this dissatisfaction. Moreover, frequent visits of the monitoring teams to school and Union Councils Nazims' visits might have caused the low satisfaction means score after devolution

No change came in the promotion policies of the employee after devolution. Extensive researches should be conducted to find out this degradation of the job satisfaction among HTs.

References

- ABD, D. W., & DfID. (2004). *Devolution in Pakistan-Recent History*. World Bank.
- ABD, DfID, World Bank (2004). Devolution in Pakistan - an assessment and recommendation for action.
- Alzaidi, M. A. (2008). Secondary School Head Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Saudi Arabia: The Results of a Mixed Methods Approach. ARECLS, Vol.5, 161-185.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education*. Wadsworth Thomson Learning. New York.
- Bray, M. (1994). Centralization /decentralization and privatization/ publicization: conceptual issues and the need for more research. In W.K. Cummings& A. Riddle (Eds), *Alternative Policies for the Finance, Control and Delivery of Basic Education]. Special Issue of the International Journal of Educational Research*.21 (8), 817-824
- Conley, S. H., Bacharach, S. & Bauer, S. (1989). The school work environment and teacher career dissatisfaction. *Educational administration quarterly*. 25 (1), 58-81.
- Cummings, W., & Riddell, A. (1992). *Alternative policies for the finance, control and delivery of basic education*. Cambridge.
- Fiske, E. B. (1996). *Decentralization of education; politics and consensus*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Gazioglu, S. & Tansel, A. (2003). *Job Satisfaction, Work Environment and Relations with Managers in Britain*. ERC Working Papers 0304, ERC - Economic Research Center, Middle East Technical University, revised Apr 2003.
- Ghazi, S. R. & Khan, U. A. (2008). Measuring Job Satisfaction: Influence of Gender and School Location. *The S.U. Journal of Education*. Vol. XXXVII, Pp. 17-30
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 52-62.
- Hakan, S. (2004). An analysis of burnout and job satisfaction among Turkish special school head teachers and teachers, and the factors affecting their burnout and job satisfaction. *Educational Studies*.30 (3) 291-306 Sep

- 2004 ERIC Document Service no EJ680673.
- Hanson, M. E. (1998). Strategies of educational decentralization: key questions and core issues. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36 (2) , 111-128.
- Hayat, S. (1998). A study of organizational climate, job satisfaction and classroom performance of college teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Lahore: University of Punjab.
- Hill, T. (1994). Primary head teachers: their job satisfaction and future career aspirations. *Educational research*. 36 (3). 223-235
- Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (2001). Educational administration: theory, research and practice. (4th edition). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Johnson, N., and Holdaway, E. (1994). Facet importance and the job satisfaction of schoolPrincipals. *British Educational Research Journal*, 20(1), 17-33.
- Plank, D. (1987). School administration and school reform in Botswana. *International journal of educational development*. 7(2), pp 126-199.
- Lunenberg, A., & Orstein, A. (1996). *Educational administration concepts and practices*. Wadsworth Publishing Company, USA.
- Morrice, L., & Murry, J. (2003). Compensation and teacher retention: A success story. *Educational Leadership* 60(8) , 40-43.
- Rose, M.(2003). Good deal, bad deal? Job satisfaction in occupations. *Work Employment and Society*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 503-530.
- Serrano, L. D. & Vieira, J. A. C. (2005). "Low Pay, Higher Pay and Job Satisfaction within the European Union: Empirical Evidence from Fourteen Countries," *IZA Discussion Papers 1558, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA)*
- Winkler, D. R. (2005). *Understanding Decentralization*. Retrieved February 20, 2006, from Net Docs: <http://www.equip123.net/docs/e2Understanding%20Decentralization.pdf>