

Job Satisfaction among Special Education Teachers in Jordan

Mohammed Abushaira

Special Education Department, King Abdulaziz University – Saudi Arabia

Abstract- *This study aimed at investigating job satisfaction among special education teachers in Jordan according to some variables. A survey method was conducted through (nine-dimension) questionnaire on total number of (139) special education teachers (16 males and 123 females). Results revealed that the level of job satisfaction among the participants was moderate. No Significant statistical differences were found in the respondents' level of job satisfaction due to gender. However, significant differences were found in the respondents' level of job satisfaction due to age favoring younger teachers. The study presented a clear view of the job satisfaction level among special education teachers in Jordan, which helps to improve their work efficacy. Further, the study recommends the necessity of providing an appropriate work atmosphere to encourage the teachers who work with the multi-disabled students.*

Keywords: *Job Satisfaction, Multi-disabled students, Special Education, Professional Environment.*

I. INTRODUCTION

JOB satisfaction was thoroughly studied across the world by more than twelve thousand studies were published in the Nineties of the Twentieth century, which indicates the importance of this issue [1]. Job satisfaction is at the top of the priorities list of any institution adheres to keep the rare and distinguished competent staff [2], [3] Despite the fact that job satisfaction is a kind of feelings and attitudes, it is embodied through the worker's behavior during performing his duties [4].

Job satisfaction was defined as the individual's negative or positive attitudes towards his job [5]. It was also defined as the employee's general attitude towards his job, which is related directly to the workers' needs, such as; the professional support, the rewards, the incentives and the job environment and challenges [6]. Al-Twejry [7] defined job satisfaction as the person's attitude towards his job which results from his awareness of the importance of his job. Abd Alridha [8] defined it as the state which leads the employee to interact and integrate with his job on the basis of his ambition and desire to develop and achieve his social and educational goals. In addition, Bader [8] indicated that job satisfaction is

the extent of satisfaction an individual feels by performing a certain task in his job. Meanwhile [9] defined it as an internal feeling that manifest itself as relief and happiness that results from satisfying the individual's needs and desires. This feeling generates satisfaction and allows individuals to accept the job's tasks and duties. Kallberg [10] defined job satisfaction as a general attitude towards the job. Locke also defined it as the individual's happiness and positive feelings arising from what the individual expect from his job and profession [11]. This definition is an important one because it tackles the emotional and cognitive aspects [12].

In America, special education occupies the eighth position among the top ten jobs in terms of job satisfaction, and when it is associated with the level of happiness, special education moves forward to reach the fifth rank [4]. In spite of this, there are a high percentage of people who quit working in this field [13]. Job satisfaction among the special education teachers is associated with the place of work and the work pressure. Researchers classified the factors which affect job satisfaction according to its source to; external factors such as; the social, economic, and institutional aspects and internal factors such as, the teachers' qualification and training.

In a study that investigated the relationship between the efficiency of the special education teachers and their job satisfaction regarding the training they had in the earlier years of their job, [14] studied the feelings and the job satisfaction of 222 teachers from 22 schools in Kentucky State. She studied the teachers' feeling towards their efficiency and job satisfaction by comparing between the level of efficiency and the level of job satisfaction regarding their qualification and the training they had. She concluded that there are no statistically significant differences in job satisfaction among the special education teachers regarding the training they had and they are satisfied with their jobs [14].

The factors that affect the job satisfaction level were investigated in a study conducted in Turkey on 245 special education teachers. The results of this study referred to the following as the factors affecting job satisfaction; the lack of

audio-visual teaching aids, the ineffective assessment, the students' attitudes towards their classrooms, the extra tasks, the low income and the huge amount of paperwork [15].

Hakiem [9] studied the job satisfaction among the male and female public education teachers and the male and female teachers who teach the mental retardation students. The study sample included 300 male and female public education teachers and 35 male and female teachers with mental retardation students. The researcher developed a fifty-item scale to investigate job satisfaction among the sample's members pointing out the reliability and validity coefficients. The scale contains five main dimensions which are; satisfaction with one's salary, satisfying the teacher's needs, the nature of the job and the general atmosphere in the school, the type of management and the social status. The researcher concluded that the level of job satisfaction is generally low among the two previously mentioned groups [9]

Khaliel and Shrier [16] investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and some demographic variables such as; gender, qualification, years of experience and education stage. The study included 360 male and female teachers. It found that there were statistically significant differences regarding job satisfaction in general in favor of the female teachers, the diploma holders and the elementary stage. The results also found that there are statistically significant differences regarding the self-affirmation in favor of female teachers, the diploma holders and the elementary stage, and there are statistically significant differences regarding the work conditions and the relationship with superiors, in favor of female teachers, the diploma holders and the elementary stage. Meanwhile the study found that the experience has no effects on job satisfaction [16].

Abduljabar [17] examined the job satisfaction among the public education teachers and the special education teachers. The sample included 251 teachers from the Ministry of Education elementary schools in Riyadh. He used a scale of two dimensions; the job satisfaction dimension and the job dissatisfaction dimension. The results of the study generally indicated that the level of satisfaction among the two groups was around mean with some statistically significant differences in job dissatisfaction among the public education teachers [17].

In a study titled "Job Satisfaction: Perceptions of a National Sample of Teachers of Students Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing", [18] studied job satisfaction among (610) teachers teaching students who are deaf or hard of hearing. The results

indicated that teachers are generally satisfied and that the level of satisfaction regarding the relationship between fellows is high, while its level is low regarding the paperwork, the assessment, and the lack of communication with the students' families [18].

Another study on job satisfaction and its relation to the work load and rewards among the special education principals included 267 principals and found that 65% of the participants are satisfied with their jobs and that 91% of them thought that they are over loaded with tasks while 84% of the participants believe that they have duties unrelated to special education [19].

Stempien and Loeb [20] conducted a comparative study between job satisfaction among the special education teachers working with the emotional disordered students and the general education teachers. The study found that the level of job satisfaction among the special education teachers is less than the level of job satisfaction among the general education teachers. The study also found that there is a relationship between certain factors and the job pressure from within the classroom and from outside it, such pressure is more prevalent among the new and less experienced special education teachers [20].

Yahia [21] studied job satisfaction among (112) female teachers working in mental retardation centers. According to the results of her study, there are statistically significant differences in job satisfaction regarding the level of income and incentives [21].

In a study done by [22] to identify the factors leading to job satisfaction among the elementary teachers in California, and included 160 male and female teachers, it was found that the most effective variables are; the democratic leadership, the salaries, the promotion opportunities, the achievement rewards and the principle's recognition of the teacher's value [22].

This study arises out of the fact that there are few studies that tackle job satisfaction among the special education teachers in Arab world. This study can help in identifying the factors, that, affect the level of job satisfaction in the present and consequently foretelling the future of the teachers and whether they intent to stay in their current jobs or not. The results of this study can also help the administrations to improve the level of job satisfaction among these teachers.

The present study was guided by the following research questions

1. What is the job satisfaction level among special education teachers in Jordan?
2. Are there any significant differences ($\alpha=0.05$) in job satisfaction means that can be attributed to the type of disability?
3. Are there any significant differences ($\alpha=0.05$) in job satisfaction means that can be attributed to the gender?
4. Are there any significant differences ($\alpha=0.05$) in job satisfaction means that can be attributed to the age?

II. METHODS

A. Subjects

A total number of (139) males and females were recruited from ten private and public institutions that work in the special education field. Table I shows the sample characteristics according to the type of disability, age, and gender:

TABLE I
PARTICIPANTS' CHARACTERISTICS ACCORDING TO THE TYPE OF DISABILITY, AGE, AND GENDER

Type of disability	Frequency	%
Hearing impairments	78	56.1
Visual Impairments	17	12.2
Physical disability	18	12.9
Mental retardation	8	5.8
Multi-disabilities	18	12.9
Total	139	100.0
Age	Frequency	%
Thirty years old or less	75	54.0
Older than thirty years	64	46.0
Total	139	100.0
Gender	Frequency	%
Male	16	11.5
Female	123	88.5
Total	139	100.0

B. Measurement

The researcher developed a questionnaire to investigate job satisfaction among the special education teachers in Jordan. The questionnaire covered the following nine dimensions; the income, the job demands, the administrative aspects, the work atmosphere, the professional environment, the work team, the attitudes towards the job, the attitudes towards the disabled and the academic and vocational qualification. The questionnaire contains 68 items, for each the participant must choose from the following options (agree very much, agree undecided, disagree and disagree very much). The

psychometric characteristics of the test were verified as the following:

The reliability and validity coefficients were calculated using the responses of the pilot study sample. It was randomly selected and its size was (33) people (out of the original sample). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale is (0.87) which indicates the reliability of the sample.

In order to check the instrument's validity, construct validity method was used by calculating Pearson Correlation Coefficient for each dimension as illustrated in Table II

TABLE II
PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

Dimension	Correlation Coefficient	Significance
Income	0.211	Insignificant
Job Demands	-0.358*	Significant
Administrative Aspects	0.809**	Significant
Work Atmosphere	0.735**	Significant
Professional Environment	0.828**	Significant
Team Work	0.803**	Significant
Attitudes Towards the Job	0.614**	Significant
Attitudes Towards the Disabled	0.601**	Significant
Academic and Vocational Qualification	0.406*	Significant

* significant ($p < 0.05$) ** significant ($p < 0.01$)

Table II clarifies that the construct validity coefficients were significant at significant ($p < 0.05$) for all the dimensions except the income dimension, thus; the scale can be considered generally valid. Furthermore, the questionnaire was submitted to five arbitrators in order to validate its items and dimensions, and all the items that were agreed upon by the arbitrators with a ratio of 80% or more were established.

C. Study Design

A descriptive design was utilized in this study. The means and standard deviations of the sample responses regarding job satisfaction were used. One-Way ANOVA and t-test for independent samples were used to compare means for the sample groups. The "least significant difference (LSD)" test was used as a post-hoc examination for multiple comparisons.

III. RESULTS

The data collected from the participants' were analyzed and the following results were obtained;

Question one: What is the job satisfaction level among special education teachers in Jordan?

Means and the standard deviations of the sample's responses regarding job satisfaction dimensions were used by using the sample's responses to the items of each dimension. Table III illustrates that.

TABLE III

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE SAMPLE'S RESPONSES

Dimension	Items	Mean	SD	Order
Income	1	3.47	1.38	2
	2	1.96	0.95	5
	3	2.29	1.04	3
	4	3.57	1.30	1
	5	2.01	1.05	4
	Total	2.66	0.59	
Job Demands	6	2.16	1.15	5
	7	2.63	1.19	1
	8	2.38	1.13	3
	9	2.34	0.86	4
	10	2.09	1.15	6
	11	2.45	1.12	2
Total	2.34	0.75		
Administrative Aspects	12	3.61	1.02	4
	13	3.87	0.82	3
	14	3.87	0.82	2
	15	3.32	1.08	8
	16	2.82	1.10	11
	17	3.32	1.10	7
	18	3.26	1.19	9
	19	4.16	0.89	1
	20	2.80	1.23	12
	21	3.22	1.11	10
	22	3.50	1.17	5
	23	3.43	1.20	6
Total	3.43	0.71		
Work Atmosphere	24	2.56	1.19	8
	25	3.45	1.08	4
	26	4.03	0.92	1
	27	3.07	1.24	5
	28	3.06	1.05	6
	29	2.56	1.18	7
	30	3.46	1.15	3
	31	3.76	0.94	2
	Total	3.24	0.63	
Professional Environment	32	3.19	1.31	6
	33	3.79	1.19	1
	34	3.56	1.20	3
	35	3.40	1.10	5
	36	3.48	1.16	4
	37	2.91	1.26	9
	38	2.78	1.45	10
	39	3.02	1.33	8
	40	3.12	1.20	7
	41	3.60	1.09	2
Total	3.28	0.84		
Work Team	42	3.70	1.09	3
	43	3.53	1.10	4
	44	3.87	0.97	2
	45	1.91	1.12	6
	46	2.40	1.05	5
	47	4.34	0.79	1
Total	3.29	0.42		
Attitude Towards the Job	48	3.66	1.16	3
	49	2.69	1.24	5
	50	2.63	1.18	6
	51	3.23	1.26	4
	52	2.19	0.91	7

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

	53	4.39	0.78	1
	54	3.86	0.94	2
	55	1.80	0.89	8
	Total	3.06	0.36	
Attitudes Towards the Disabled	56	4.58	0.76	1
	57	1.98	1.18	8
	58	3.19	1.32	5
	59	3.60	1.24	3
	60	1.81	0.78	9
	61	3.19	1.28	4
	62	3.68	1.00	2
	63	2.12	0.93	7
64	2.93	1.37	6	
Total	3.01	0.36		
Academic and Vocational Qualification	65	3.35	1.34	4
	66	3.46	1.22	3
	67	3.78	1.14	2
	68	4.03	1.14	1
Total	3.65	0.73		
All items		3.14	0.38	

Table III clarifies that the sample's general level of job satisfaction is intermediate, that the general mean is (3.14) and the standard deviation is (0.38). Regarding the job satisfaction's dimensions, the sample's opinions represent themselves as the following; the "academic and vocational qualification" dimension takes the first order with a high degree, its mean is (3.65) and its standard deviation is (0.73). The "administrative aspects" dimension takes the second position with a high degree, its mean is (3.43), and its standard deviation is (0.71). In the third place comes the "work team" dimension with a more-than-intermediate degree, its main is (3.29), and its standard deviation is (0.42). In the fourth position comes the "professional environment" with a more-than-intermediate degree, its mean is (3.28) and its standard deviation is (0.84). The "work atmosphere" dimension takes the fifth position with a more-than-intermediate degree, its mean is (3.24) and its standard deviation is (0.63). In the sixth order comes the "attitude towards the job" dimension with an intermediate degree, its mean is (3.06) and its standard deviation is (0.36). The "attitude towards the disabled" dimension takes the seventh position with an intermediate degree, its mean is (3.01) and its standard deviation is (0.36). The "income" dimension takes the eighth position with a low degree, its mean is (2.66) and its standard deviation is (0.59). In the last position comes the "job demands" dimension with a low degree, its mean is (2.34) and its standard deviation is (0.75).

Question two: Are there any significant statistical differences at ($p \leq 0.05$) in job satisfaction means and its dimensions due to the type of disability?

TABLE IV
THE RESULTS OF ONE-WAY ANOVA TEST FOR THE 'TYPE OF DISABILITY' VARIABLE

Dimension	Source of Variation	Sum Sq.	Degree of Freedom	Mean Sq.	F Value	Level of Significance Sig	LSD Summary
Job Satisfaction in general	between groups	5.57	4	1.39	12.65	0.0001*	multi-disabilities over the other disabilities
	within groups	14.76	134	0.11			
Income	between groups	8.31	4	2.08	6.93	0.0001*	multi-disabilities over the other disabilities
	within groups	40.14	134	0.30			
Job Demands	between groups	19.70	4	4.92	11.48	0.0001*	multi-disabilities over the other disabilities
	within groups	57.46	134	0.43			
Administrative Aspects	between groups	12.05	4	3.01	7.08	0.0001*	multi-disabilities over the other disabilities
	within groups	57.05	134	0.43			
Work Atmosphere	between groups	8.53	4	2.13	6.24	0.0001*	multi-disabilities over the other disabilities
	within groups	45.79	134	0.34			
Professional Environment	between groups	16.92	4	4.23	7.02	0.0001*	multi-disabilities over the other disabilities
	within groups	80.80	134	0.60			
Work Team	between groups	3.31	4	0.83	5.29	0.0005*	multi-disabilities over the other disabilities
	within groups	20.92	134	0.16			
Attitude Towards the Job	between groups	0.63	4	0.16	1.25	0.2927	No differences were found
	within groups	16.82	134	0.13			
Attitude Towards the Disabled	between groups	0.36	4	0.09	0.67	0.6110	No differences were found
	within groups	17.77	134	0.13			
Academic and Vocational Qualification	between groups	8.52	4	2.13	4.44	0.0021*	Differences favor Physical disability, Mental retardation, and multi-disabilities over the hearing and visual impairments.
	within groups	64.28	134	0.48			

significance (p <0.05).

Table IV indicates that there are no statistically significant differences between the sample members' responses regarding; the attitude towards the job, the attitudes towards the disabled according to the type of disability since the level of the F test significance value ($p < 0.05$).

Meanwhile, the table indicates that there are statistically significant differences between the sample members' responses regarding; job satisfaction in general, the income, the job demands, the administrative aspects, the work atmosphere, the professional environment, the work team and the academic and vocational qualification according to the type of disability since the F test significance value ($p < 0.05$).

To identify which group of disability type was favored in the means differences, the least significant difference test was used as shown in Table V which clarifies that regarding job satisfaction in general and the following dimensions; the income, the job demands, the

administrative aspects, the work atmosphere, the professional environment and the work team the significant differences were in favor of the teachers who deal with multi-disabled students. Regarding 'the academic and vocational qualification' dimension, the significant differences were in favor of the teachers who teach the children with the following disabilities; Physical disability, Mental retardation and multi-disabilities in comparison with the children with the hearing and visual impairments. However, no differences were found in two dimensions, namely, attitudes toward the job and attitudes toward the disabled.

Question three: Are there any significant statistical differences at ($p \leq 0.05$) in job satisfaction means and its dimensions due to the respondents' gender?

To answer this question, the researcher used the t-test for independent samples as illustrated in Table V.

TABLE V
THE RESULTS OF T-TEST FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES FOR THE 'GENDER' VARIABLE

Dimension	Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	DF	Sig																																																																																						
Job Satisfaction in general	Male	3.19	0.30	.5890	137	.5570																																																																																						
	Female	3.13	0.39				Income	Male	2.84	0.63	1.274	137	.2050	Female	2.64	0.59	Job Demands	Male	2.67	0.65	1.871	137	.0630	Female	2.30	0.75	Administrative Aspects	Male	3.61	0.48	1.111	137	.2690	Female	3.41	0.73	Work Atmosphere	Male	3.03	0.54	-1.446	137	.1510	Female	3.27	0.63	Professional Environment	Male	3.19	0.76	.4560-	137	.6490	Female	3.30	0.85	Work Team	Male	3.44	0.41	1.490	137	.1390	Female	3.27	0.42	Attitude Towards the Job	Male	2.98	0.28	.8530-	137	.3950	Female	3.07	0.36	Attitude Towards the Disabled	Male	3.07	0.29	.7100	137	.4790	Female	3.00	0.37	Academic and Vocational Qualification	Male	3.73	0.48	.655	137
Income	Male	2.84	0.63	1.274	137	.2050																																																																																						
	Female	2.64	0.59				Job Demands	Male	2.67	0.65	1.871	137	.0630	Female	2.30	0.75	Administrative Aspects	Male	3.61	0.48	1.111	137	.2690	Female	3.41	0.73	Work Atmosphere	Male	3.03	0.54	-1.446	137	.1510	Female	3.27	0.63	Professional Environment	Male	3.19	0.76	.4560-	137	.6490	Female	3.30	0.85	Work Team	Male	3.44	0.41	1.490	137	.1390	Female	3.27	0.42	Attitude Towards the Job	Male	2.98	0.28	.8530-	137	.3950	Female	3.07	0.36	Attitude Towards the Disabled	Male	3.07	0.29	.7100	137	.4790	Female	3.00	0.37	Academic and Vocational Qualification	Male	3.73	0.48	.655	137	.5180	Female	3.64	0.75						
Job Demands	Male	2.67	0.65	1.871	137	.0630																																																																																						
	Female	2.30	0.75				Administrative Aspects	Male	3.61	0.48	1.111	137	.2690	Female	3.41	0.73	Work Atmosphere	Male	3.03	0.54	-1.446	137	.1510	Female	3.27	0.63	Professional Environment	Male	3.19	0.76	.4560-	137	.6490	Female	3.30	0.85	Work Team	Male	3.44	0.41	1.490	137	.1390	Female	3.27	0.42	Attitude Towards the Job	Male	2.98	0.28	.8530-	137	.3950	Female	3.07	0.36	Attitude Towards the Disabled	Male	3.07	0.29	.7100	137	.4790	Female	3.00	0.37	Academic and Vocational Qualification	Male	3.73	0.48	.655	137	.5180	Female	3.64	0.75																
Administrative Aspects	Male	3.61	0.48	1.111	137	.2690																																																																																						
	Female	3.41	0.73				Work Atmosphere	Male	3.03	0.54	-1.446	137	.1510	Female	3.27	0.63	Professional Environment	Male	3.19	0.76	.4560-	137	.6490	Female	3.30	0.85	Work Team	Male	3.44	0.41	1.490	137	.1390	Female	3.27	0.42	Attitude Towards the Job	Male	2.98	0.28	.8530-	137	.3950	Female	3.07	0.36	Attitude Towards the Disabled	Male	3.07	0.29	.7100	137	.4790	Female	3.00	0.37	Academic and Vocational Qualification	Male	3.73	0.48	.655	137	.5180	Female	3.64	0.75																										
Work Atmosphere	Male	3.03	0.54	-1.446	137	.1510																																																																																						
	Female	3.27	0.63				Professional Environment	Male	3.19	0.76	.4560-	137	.6490	Female	3.30	0.85	Work Team	Male	3.44	0.41	1.490	137	.1390	Female	3.27	0.42	Attitude Towards the Job	Male	2.98	0.28	.8530-	137	.3950	Female	3.07	0.36	Attitude Towards the Disabled	Male	3.07	0.29	.7100	137	.4790	Female	3.00	0.37	Academic and Vocational Qualification	Male	3.73	0.48	.655	137	.5180	Female	3.64	0.75																																				
Professional Environment	Male	3.19	0.76	.4560-	137	.6490																																																																																						
	Female	3.30	0.85				Work Team	Male	3.44	0.41	1.490	137	.1390	Female	3.27	0.42	Attitude Towards the Job	Male	2.98	0.28	.8530-	137	.3950	Female	3.07	0.36	Attitude Towards the Disabled	Male	3.07	0.29	.7100	137	.4790	Female	3.00	0.37	Academic and Vocational Qualification	Male	3.73	0.48	.655	137	.5180	Female	3.64	0.75																																														
Work Team	Male	3.44	0.41	1.490	137	.1390																																																																																						
	Female	3.27	0.42				Attitude Towards the Job	Male	2.98	0.28	.8530-	137	.3950	Female	3.07	0.36	Attitude Towards the Disabled	Male	3.07	0.29	.7100	137	.4790	Female	3.00	0.37	Academic and Vocational Qualification	Male	3.73	0.48	.655	137	.5180	Female	3.64	0.75																																																								
Attitude Towards the Job	Male	2.98	0.28	.8530-	137	.3950																																																																																						
	Female	3.07	0.36				Attitude Towards the Disabled	Male	3.07	0.29	.7100	137	.4790	Female	3.00	0.37	Academic and Vocational Qualification	Male	3.73	0.48	.655	137	.5180	Female	3.64	0.75																																																																		
Attitude Towards the Disabled	Male	3.07	0.29	.7100	137	.4790																																																																																						
	Female	3.00	0.37				Academic and Vocational Qualification	Male	3.73	0.48	.655	137	.5180	Female	3.64	0.75																																																																												
Academic and Vocational Qualification	Male	3.73	0.48	.655	137	.5180																																																																																						
	Female	3.64	0.75																																																																																									

Table V indicates that there are no statistically significant differences at ($p < 0.05$) level between the sample responses regarding job satisfaction in general and

all its dimensions according to gender. This means that males and females have the same level of job satisfaction.

Question four: Are there any significant statistical differences at ($p \leq 0.05$) in job satisfaction means and its dimensions due to the respondents' age?

To answer this question, t-test was used for independent samples as illustrated in Table VI.

TABLE VI
THE RESULTS OF T-TEST FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES FOR THE AGE VARIABLE

Dimension	Age	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	DF	Sig
Job Satisfaction in general	30=> years	3.17	0.45	1.225	137	.223
	30< years	3.09	0.28			
Income	30=> years	2.74	0.58	1.756	137	.081
	30< years	2.57	0.59			
Job Demands	30=> years	2.42	0.81	1.438	137	.498
	30< years	2.24	0.65			
Administrative Aspects	30=> years	3.47	0.80	.679	137	.498
	30< years	3.39	0.58			
Work Atmosphere	30=> years	3.29	0.70	.997	137	.3200
	30< years	3.19	0.53			
Professional Environment	30=> years	3.37	0.97	1.313	137	.192
	30< years	3.19	0.65			
Work Team	30=> years	3.38	0.44	2.764	137	.006*
	30< years	3.19	0.37			
Attitude Towards the Job	30=> years	3.07	0.33	.390	137	.697
	30< years	3.04	0.39			
Attitude Towards the Disabled	30=> years	2.93	0.35	-2.718	137	.007*
	30< years	3.10	0.36			
Academic and Vocational Qualification	30=> years	3.63	0.76	-.432	137	.666
	30< years	3.68	0.69			

significance ($p < 0.05$).

Table VI indicates that there are no statistically significant differences at ($p < 0.05$) level between the sample members' responses regarding; job satisfaction in general, the income, the job demands, the administrative aspects, the work atmosphere, the professional environment the attitude towards the job and the academic and vocational qualification according to the teachers' age since the t- test significance value ($p < 0.05$).

However, the results indicated that there were statistically significant differences at the level of ($p < 0.05$) regarding the work team and the attitudes towards the disabled due to the teachers' age since the F test significance value ($p < 0.05$).

The differences are in favor of the younger teachers regarding "the team work dimension", while the differences are in favor of the older teachers regarding "the attitudes towards the disabled" dimension. The results showed that the level of job satisfaction for the young teachers was higher than the older ones, while the older teachers reported higher level of satisfaction than the

younger ones regarding dimension of attitudes towards the disabled.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The general level of job satisfaction was around the average in view of the fact that the overall mean was 3.14 with standard deviation of 0.38. The results were consistent with [17], who concluded that the job satisfaction among the special education teachers and the public education teachers is around average according to the tool he used. However, the results contradict to the results of [21], [9], and [20] who indicated that the job satisfaction among special education teachers is generally low. Moreover, the results were contradicted to the results of [14], [23] and [18] who claimed that the special education teachers in general are satisfied with their jobs. The researcher ascribes these differences to the learning environment.

The dimensions of job satisfaction were arranged in the following order; 1) academic and vocational qualification, 2) administrative aspects, 3) work team, 4) professional environment, 5) work atmosphere, 6) attitude towards the job, 7) attitude towards the disabled, 8) income, 9) job demands. The results regarding ‘‘job demand’’ were consistent with the results the Council for Exceptional Children CEC which indicated that 62% of the special education teachers complain of the job demands [24], and this what leads 10% of them to leave their jobs early [25], and sometimes reach 20% according to other studies, such as the study of Alabdul-Jabbar [17]. Also the results of this ordering were consistent with [18] who ordered the levels of job satisfaction regarding its dimensions as the following; the relationship among colleagues, the availability of teaching aids and finally the satisfaction with the paper work at the bottom of the job satisfaction scale.

These results further were consistent with [15] who referred to; the lack of teaching aids, the insignificant support, the ineffective assessment, the lack of promoting opportunities, the colleagues conflicts, the extra tasks, the income and the overtime as the factors that affect job satisfaction.

The results of the differences in the respondents’ means of job satisfaction in general and its following dimensions; the income, the job demands, the administrative aspects, the work atmosphere, the professional environment and the work team were in favor of the teachers working with multi-disabled students, which relatively were consistent with [26], who indicated that job satisfaction among teachers dealing with severe disabilities is higher than the level of job satisfaction among teachers dealing with moderate or mild disabilities [26]. This can be explained in the light of the following; the severe disabilities need more cooperation between the work team which increases the intimacy between them, the severe disabilities require more tools and facilities, and the severe disabilities force the administrations to be more understanding. Moreover, the teachers who work with severe disabilities usually gain more allowances and financial rewards, which increase their income and consequently increase their job satisfaction. However, these results were contradicted to [13] who didn’t find any differences regarding the level of disability, while she found differences in job satisfaction on favor of those working with the emotionally disordered students.

Results regarding the gender differences showed that there were no statistically significant differences at the general scale of job satisfaction and at its dimensions. This is because male and female teachers were working together under the same circumstances with the same privileges and in the same location in Jordanian centers of special education which is consistent with [13]. However, these results were contradicted to the results of [27] who found differences in job satisfaction regarding gender, and [28] who indicated the existence of differences in job satisfaction regarding gender in favor of male teachers [28]. The results also contradict to the results of [1] which concluded that there is a difference in the level of job satisfaction regarding gender in favor of female teachers [1].

Results regarding the age differences showed that there were no statistically significant differences at the general scale of job satisfaction while differences were found in one dimension, namely, ‘‘teachers’ attitudes towards the team work’’. This result contradicts to the results of [29] and [21] which indicated that there are differences in the job satisfaction levels regarding age. For the dimension of ‘‘teachers’ attitudes towards the team work’’, results showed that the older teachers are more satisfied than the younger ones regarding attitude towards disabled, which can be explained by the high level of patience demonstrated by the older teachers than the younger ones. Further, the younger teachers are more satisfied than the older ones regarding the work team, which can be contributed to the fact that they are more enthusiastic than the older teachers and this is what makes them more cooperative with others and grants more eagerness to gain more experience.

Based on the Study results, the researcher recommends the following;

- The necessity of providing teachers with an appropriate work environment –both in material and moral aspects - to achieve the ultimate goals of special education.
- Encouraging the teachers who work with multi-disabled students by granting them more incentives in order to be more successful in their work.
- Conducting further researches to compare the levels of job satisfaction among the special education teachers regarding other variables like: sector (public, private, voluntary), marital status and income.

REFERENCES

- [1] Gazzawi, I. (2008). Job satisfaction Among Information Technology Professional in the US: An Empirical Study. *Journal of American Academy of Business Cambridge*, Vol. 13, no. 1. March 2008 .ISSN 1540 - 1200
- [2] Assa'd, Mohamed & Raslan, Nabeel. (1982). Job Satisfaction for the human power at Saudia Arabia. *Center of research and development*. King Abdul-Aziz University. Jeddah City
- [3] Droege, S. B. & Hoobler, J. M. (2003). Employee turnover and tacit knowledge diffusion: A network perspective . *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 15(1), 50-64.
- [4] Smith, Tom W. (2007). *Job satisfaction in the United State . EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE*. APRIL 17, 2007
- [5] Greenberg, A. R., & Baron, A. R. (2003). *Behavior in organizations, 8th ed. Upper Saddle Rive*.
- [6] Ostorff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction ,attitudes and performance : an organizational level anafyrsis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, pp.963-74.
- [7] Al-Twejry, Mohammed. (1988). Career Positions and Job Satisfaction for Saudi and Non-Saudi Workers in multi-national companies. *Arab Journal for Administration*. Vol,12. No3.53-78
- [8] Abd Alridha, Bader. (1983). Job satisfaction for Trade, Economy & Political science faculty members. Kuwait University, *Social science Journals*. NO,8.231-227
- [9] Hakiem , Ab. (2009). Job satisfaction among public education teachers And special education teacher comparative study. *Journal of Reading and Knowledge* . 94, 14-30.
- [10] Kallberg, A. L., B. F. Reskin, & K. Hudson., (2000) “Bad Jobs in America: Standard and Nonstandard Employment Relations and Job Quality in the United States.” *American Sociology Review* 65(2):256-278.
- [11] Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- [12] Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2004). EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES AND JOB. *Human Resource Management, Winter 2004, Vol. 43, No. 4, Pp. 395–407*.
- [13] DeVito, J. A. (1998). *Special Educators and Job satisfaction. MA Tesis ,Special ducation Graduate Program,Rowan University*.
- [14] Voris, B. C. (2011). *Teacher Efficacy, Job Satisfaction, and Alternative. A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctorate of Education in Instruction and Administration, with a program emphasis in Educational Leadership in the College of Education at the University of Kentucky*.
- [15] Ari , M., & Sipal, R. (2009). Factors affecting job satisfaction of Turkish special education professionals: predictors of turnover. *European Journal of Social Work (EUR J SOC WORK)*. 2009 , Dec 12(4): 447-63 (54 ref)
- [16] AlShiekh Khalil, J. M. & Shrer, A. A. (2008) Job Satisfaction and its Relationship to Selected Demographic Variables. *University Journal, Humanities Studies*, V(6), I(1).
- [17] Alabd Aljabar, Abdulaziz. (2004). Job satisfaction for special education teachers and public education. *Arab Journal of special education*. No,7. Sept,2004.Riyadh- KSA.
- [18] Luckner , J., & Hanks, J. (2003). Job satisfaction: perceptions of a national sample of teachers of students who are deaf or hard of hearing. *American Annals of the Deaf* 148(1), 5-17.
- [19] De Pierro M. I & May, G. M. (2003). *Special education administrators: Job satisfaction, workload and turnover .Ph degree Dissertation, Education department, Seton Hill University*.
- [20] Stempien, L. R., & Loeb, R. C. (2002). Differences in Job Satisfaction Between General Education and Special Education Teachers :Implications for Retention. *Remedial and Special Education* Volume 23, Number 5 September/October 2002, Pages 258–267.
- [21] Yahia, Kh .(1994). Job Satisfaction for female worker at mental retardation centers in Amman City. *Human Research Journal* ,Vol.21.NO,3.142-168
- [22] J Yong. (1988) .Teacher job satisfaction: A study of the overall job satisfaction and work fact satisfaction of teachers . *Dissertation Abstract International*, 49 (7-A), 1665.
- [23] Ng Wai-Fuin. (1995). *Job Satisfactionof senior teacher in Hong Kong Special Education School for Children with Mental retardation .master unpublished master thesis.hong kong univrsity hong kong* [24]The Council for Exceptional Children(1999) Special Educator shaire their thoughts on special education teaching conditions . *CEC Today* ,5(9),1,5.
- [25] Singer, J. (1993) . Are special educators career paths special?Results from 13 -year longitudinal study . *Exceptional Children*,59,26-279.
- [26] To Sung-Sung. (1999). *Job Satisfaction among Special EducationTeachers of Special Schools for Severe Grade mentally Handicappedchildren in Hong Kong .master thesis ,Hong Kong University,Hong Kong*.
- [27] Olaimat, Moh. (1994). Job satisfaction for secondary school's teachers. *Alyarmok Research Jurnal*.Vol,10.,1, 197-216
- [28] Alaajiz, Fu'ad & Nashwan,Jameel. (2004). Job satisfaction factors and improving worker efficacy of teacher performance at UNARWA schools- Gaza strip. *Ist Educational Conference, Faculty of Education - Islamic University*.
- [29] Günbayi, İ., & Toprak, D. (2010, jan). A comparison of primary school teachers and special primary school teachers' job satisfaction levels. *Ilkogretim Online; 2010, Vol. 9 Issue 1, Special section p150-150*.