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Discussion

In the previous chapter, it has been recorded the results of this investigation. In the present chapter, Need Achievement, Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement and its various dimensions have been treated as dependent variables. Job Satisfaction has been considered as main dependent variable and the others two Job Involvement and Need Achievement as dummy dependent variables. So, Job Satisfaction has been dealt with extensively with independent variables, locus of control, age, tenure, academic motivational climate in the institution, role stress, participation. Each independent variable has been treated at three levels, i.e., high, medium and low. Three groups have been compared with other (t-ratio) to see whether they differ from each other significantly or not.

Major findings of the study will be discussed in this chapter. For the sake of cohesiveness, discussion will center around issues rather than results of specific analysis.

On the basis of intercorrelation matrix of all the 37 variables dependent variables like Need Achievement and Job Involvement were not so extensively analysed in high medium and low groups because both of them were not at all significantly related with any other variable considered in
the investigation. (These two dependent variables have only been included in the regression analysis with all independent variables).

The results clearly indicated that Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement are distinct and separate attitudes. This conclusion is based not only on the findings of the principal component analysis of Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement but also on the finding that many personal, participation, academic climate and role factors are associated differently to Job Satisfaction and Involvement. However, Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement had common elements which brought Job Involvement closer to the concept of identification and commitment. A teacher's role in the institution together with the conditions under which he carries out his role sum up what the institution has in stock for him. He bases his evaluation of the job and the institution on various extrinsic and intrinsic satisfactions that he derives from the teaching profession. How much a teaching job will identify with his institution depends upon how much it facilitates attainment of his professional goals. If the institutional situations permit the expressions and growth of individual's skills, if the institution is perceived as a provider or facilitator of higher order need satisfaction then professional may link his identity both to his profession
and to his institution. The major purpose of this study is to explore the correlates of Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement and Need Achievement. Attempt was concentrated on antecedents of Job Involvement and Job Satisfaction and outcome correlates were not dealt with.

The findings of the study suggest that Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement and Need Achievement are distinct but related attitudes. Because of their empirical and conceptual distinction it would be desirable to treat them as separate attitude. This will help to understand and demarcate their antecedents and outcomes.

A large number of personality, job, institutional climate, role stress factors selected for studying their relationship to Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement and Need Achievement are spread over all factors negatively or positively.

AGE

Age was positively related to both Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement with Need Achievement. But the relationship was not strong. In the present study, the relationship between age and Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement still existed when the influence of all other variables under study
was controlled. The relationship between Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement and age, however, disappeared with the controlling of other factors. In subsequent regression analysis for a portion of the sample the inclusion of more variables caused the relationship of age to Job Involvement and Job Satisfaction disappear. These findings suggest that the relationship between age and Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement is not direct. An important finding with respect to age was the criticality of forties and early fifties for Job Satisfaction. The criticality of this period is in one's career also recognized. As part of their adjustment they may identify more strongly with their teaching work activities and institution. Involvement is forced upon teacher in later part of the teaching career.

**Tenure**

Tenure and age are very highly related. The relationship of tenure to Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement also showed the same pattern as that of age. Tenure is related to both Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement but the relationship is not strong. Like age, Tenure also does not appear to be critical determinant of Job Involvement. What a teacher experiences on the job and the process of adjustment with the institution seem to be more important. The critical period
Internal Locus of Control emerged a significant personality factor affecting Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement and Need Achievement in most regression analysis. Teachers who believe that they can significantly influence their outcomes by their own teaching work have internal locus of control. For understanding why is locus of control does to a teacher, Job attitudes are determined by how a job is evaluated by the job holder. Notion like exchange, and inducement -- contribution ratio tell us that the evaluation is determined by what one expects from the job and what one receives reinforce his attitudes and behaviour. The internals believe that they control their reinforcements. Such a belief would provide a buffer against attributing the failure to receive positive rewards to external situations. The present results showed that locus of control is the most important personal determinant of Job Involvement. Apparently, it is one of those factors that provide stability to attitudes of identification. Internal locus of control can also be expected to be a strong moderator of the relationship of various job situational variables.

As can be seen from the Table 10, the internals (LSG)
have scored better on every aspect of satisfaction as compared to the externals (HSG) and these differences are statistically significant in the case of satisfaction with the management of the college (t = 2.22, P < .05; Table 11), personal adjustment (t = 2.323, P < .05) and satisfaction with on-the-job area (t = 2.72, P < .01). It is also to be observed that the medium score group has also scored better than the external group (Table 10) but the difference have turned out to be significant only in the case of on the job area (t = 2.33, p < .05; Table 11). In the case of HSG Vs. LSG, none of the differences turned out to be statistically significant (Table 12). The x^2 tests have yielded a significant difference only in the case of institutional area (x^2 = 2.80, p < .10). As can be seen from the regression analysis table, the coefficients of relationship between various dimensions of Job Satisfaction and Locus of Control tend to be insignificant except for the personal adjustment area (r = -240, p < .05; Table 2 and 9A).

All the above observations do indicate that a person's belief about the control may affect his level of Job Satisfaction. The above observations have been substantiated by some previous studies as well. For example, a study by Pryer and Di Stefano (1971) correlated the five scales of the Job Description Index (Smith, Kendall, and Nulin, 1969) with L2 scale for three sample nurses, and found that externals have less satisfied with
their jobs. In another investigation of the relationship between locus of control and job satisfaction, Mitchell, Myser and Weed (1975) have also confirmed the above findings. They also observe that the internals are more satisfied with participative management style than the externals; the reverse is true for a more directive style.

Here, one should be reminded of the fact that although the above cited studies are consistent with each other, the relationship is not very strong. As a matter of fact, in most of the above cited studies it has been very low and as evident in the present investigation have hardly reached the level of significance in the case of personal adjustment dimension of satisfaction only \( r = -.240, p < .05 \) Table 2 & 9A.

**Academic Climate (Institutional) Motivational**

Institutional Academic Climate has many facets that should refer to an area of research rather than a construct with particular set of dimensions. It means environment, work groups having many climates, (e.g., creativity, motivation, attractiveness, importance, growth deficiency, exchange, investments, etc. It is generally agreed that processes, task and role attributes, and so forth will be more heavily represented in the set of perceptual dimensions referred to as
psychological climate than will structural and macro-organizational characteristics (Jones and Jones, 1976).

Schneider (1975) explains climate as a set of macro perceptions derived from micro perceptions of specific events, conditions, and experiences via the psychological processes of abstraction and concept formation. Within the above definition limits, Perce (1979) has prepared and standardized an instrument to measure various types of motivational climate. It is similar to Litwin and Stringer's (1968) questionnaire to some extent but differs in the sense that it uses ranking rather than rating procedure. The measurement of institutional climate has been performed by this instrument. The higher scores on this scale indicate perception of poor climate and vice versa.

In the present investigation, six different types of motivational climates namely, achievement, expert influence, extension, control, affiliation, and dependency have been studied in relation to job satisfaction and its various dimensions. The results of the various types of statistical analysis are recorded in Tables 13 to 29.

As can be seen from the Table 11, the perceivers of high achievement climate (LSC) have scored better on every dimension of satisfaction in comparison to those who perceive a low achievement climate (NSC) except in the case of social
relations area of the inventory. However, the t-test for significance indicates that these differences are statistically meaningful only in the case of satisfaction in the institutional area \( (t = 3.36, p < .01) \), on-the-job area \( (t = 2.03, p < .01) \) and overall satisfaction \( (t = 2.36, p < .05) \) (Table 18). It is interesting to note that none of the differences between M5G and MSG have turned out to be statistically significant while in the case of MSG and LSG groups the differences are significant in the institutional area \( (t = 2.56, p < .05) \) and on the job area \( (t = 2.41, p < .05) \) (Table 18). This indicates that the relationship between achievement climate and job satisfaction is not perfectly linear. That is, for high levels of job satisfaction one should perceive a fairly high levels of achievement climate in his institution and that a minimal level of achievement climate is necessary, for institutional functioning. The results of Table 10 have been further strengthened by the outcome of \( \chi^2 \) analysis - Table 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. From the Tables, one can see that achievement climate affects almost all the aspects of job satisfaction, namely, job area \( (x^2 = 2.79, p > .10) \), institutional area \( (x^2 = 6.01, p > .02) \), personal adjustment area \( (x^2 = 3.44, p > .10) \), on the job aspects \( (x^2 = 7.37, p > .01) \), and off-the-job aspects \( (x^2 = 3.79, p > .10) \), except the social relations area \( (x^2 = .394, p = NS) \). These findings, thus, suggest that
one's perception of high achievement climate in his institution increases his job satisfaction. Since achievement motivation can be characterised by a concern for excellence expressed in a tendency to compete with standard excellence, the perception of high achievement oriented climate may increase job satisfaction.

The next motivational climate measured in this study is expert influence. They are influential in decision-making, resolving conflicts and problems and are highly respected in the institution. As is evident in Table 14, those who perceive high expert influence (HSG) have scored better on each dimension of job satisfaction in comparison to those who perceive less expert influence (HSG). These differences are significant in the case of job area (t = 2.17, p <.05), institutional area (t = 2.42, p <.05) and on-the-job area (t = 2.80, p <.01) as well as in the case of overall job satisfaction (t = 2.19, p <.05). However, as one can see - Table 25 to 29, in the cases of HSG Vs HSG and MSG Vs LSG, comparisons none of the differences were found to be statistically significant. The results of $\chi^2$ = analysis are also indicative of the same. It can be seen that a significant association between expert influence and job satisfaction dimension has been found only in the case of the institutional area ($\chi^2 = 2.83$, p <.10).
The obtained correlation coefficients between expert influence and various job satisfaction dimensions are very weak and statistically non-significant. (Regression analysis Table 2, 6 & 8).

The next type of motivational climate studied is extension. As can be seen from Table 15, the perception of high extension climate is accompanied with high job satisfaction and vice versa. That is, those who perceive with high extension climate (HIG) have high job satisfaction in all areas as compared to those who perceive low extension climate and these difference are statistically significant in the institutional area.

A further test of $x^2$ has also yielded significant values in the case of management area ($x^2 = 9.90, p > .01$) and on-the-job ($x^2 = 5.23, p > .05$) - Table 20. As evident from the Table 8, highly significant correlation coefficient correlation coefficients have been obtained in the case of management area ($r = .398, p > .01$), on-the-job ($r = .312, p > .01$) and overall job satisfaction ($r = .280, p > .01$). These results clearly indicate that one's perception of supportive climate increases his feelings of being highly satisfied.

The next climate measure used in this study is control. (Table 16). Its dominance indicates that teachers enjoy
status, power and authority for its own sake, superior or aged experienced teachers like to control their junior teachers. Communication is selective only to some people and is used as a mechanism of control. Results recorded in Table 16 show that the perception of high control (low control climate) have scored better on all job satisfaction dimensions in comparison to those who perceive high control climate (LSC). However, the differences between the scores on the various job satisfaction dimensions for the HSC and LSC groups were statistically significant only in the case of the job area \( t = 2.08, p > .05 \), management area \( t = 3.48, p > .01 \), on-the-job \( t = 3.12, p > .01 \), and the overall satisfaction \( t = 2.15, p > .05 \). No significant differences were found in the case of HSC and LSC scores on job satisfaction dimensions. Significant associations between the climate of control and job area \( x^2 = 6.20, p > .02 \), management area \( x^2 = 9.48, p > .01 \), on-the-job \( x^2 = 9.45, p > .01 \), and overall \( x^2 = 3.50, p > .05 \) were found (Table 22). Product moment correlation coefficients have also been found to be significant in the case of job area \( r = .290, p > .01 \), management area \( r = .434, p > .01 \) on-the-job \( r = .413, p > .01 \) Table 8. Thus, it is evident from the results that high climate of control decreases one's job satisfaction and vice-versa.

The next motivational climate studied is affiliation.
As can be seen from the Table 17, there is no significant difference between the job satisfaction scores either between (HSG) and (LSG) or (HSG) and LSG comparison groups except in the case of management area for HSG Vs MSG groups ($t = 2.26, p > .05$). It indicates that, at least for this sample, the climate of affiliation is not an important factor in increasing job satisfaction of teachers. This results are supported by the $x^2$ analysis recorded in Table 23. The coefficient of correlation (Table 8) between various dimensions of job satisfaction and affiliation climate is significant only in the case of management area ($r = .314, p > .05$). All these results indicate that perhaps the climate of affiliation might be helpful in providing a better interpersonal relationship between the teachers.

The last aspect of motivational climate in this study is dependency. The results recorded in Table 18, show that the differences in the job satisfaction levels of those who perceive high dependency climate (LSG) and those perceiving a low dependency climate (HSG) are not significantly different and can be attributed to chance factors. The results of regression analysis intended to find whether climate does have any significance effect on various dimensions of job satisfaction or not shows that motivational climate is an important factor in explaining variance. However, in
t-test, and \( \chi^2 \)-analysis dependency has not shown significant effect on any of the job satisfaction dimensions. These contradictory results might be indicative of the fact that dependency may not be an important factor in explaining job satisfaction alone but in combination with other factors as a powerful variable in explaining one's satisfaction with management (Table 24).

**Psychological Participation**

The results recorded through Table 30 to 40 describe the findings with the effects of various components of participation on various job satisfaction dimensions. It is evident from the tables that those who scored high (HSG) on decision-making aspect of participation have been more satisfied in all area of job satisfaction in comparison to those who have scored low on decision-making dimension (LSG). However, these differences are statistically significant only in the case of HSG vs LSG in the management area \((t = 2.61, p > .01)\). All the other differences can be attributed to chance factors, such as sampling fluctuations, etc. However, the \( \chi^2 \)-analysis have yielded statistically significant results in the case of job area \((\chi^2 = 30.3, p > .10)\) management area \((\chi^2 = 1.14, p > .03)\), social relations area \((\chi^2 = 2.74, p > .10)\), on the job area \((\chi^2 = 6.66, p > .81)\) and overall satisfaction area wise as well.
The obtained correlation coefficients (Table 9A) further confirm these findings. It can be seen that decision making is significantly related with management area ($r = .286, p < .01$) and on the job area ($r = .19, p > .05$).

Thus, one can conclude that a higher level of perceived participation in decision making provides one a feeling that one is a highly satisfied with his management and also with his job. These results are slightly different. The second dimension of psychological participation studied here is autonomy. As it is evident from the Table 30 and 40, those who have scored high on the autonomy dimension are found to be significantly better on many dimensions of job satisfaction in comparison to those who have scored low on autonomy dimension. For example, HAG (High Autonomy Group) has scored better in management area ($t = 2.39, p < .05$), social relations area ($t = 2.33, p < .05$) in comparison to Low Scoring Group (LSG) (Table 35). The results of the $X^2$-analysis have confirmed these results. Statistically, significant results have been obtained in the case of management area ($X^2 = 6.67, p < .01$) social relations area ($X^2 = 4.30, p < .05$) and overall satisfaction ($X^2 = 9.51, p < .01$).

Although not very high, a significant coefficient of correlation has been found between autonomy and management area ($r = .29, p < .01$), social relations area ($r = .230, p > .05$)
on the job area \( (r = .200, p > .05) \). Thus it is evident from these results that one’s perception of autonomy is positively related with his job satisfaction. In the present study, social relationship has significant relationship with his perceived autonomy on the job \( (r = .230, p > .05) \) (Table 7). The next dimension observed under perceived participation is opinion-seeking (Table 31). This dimension means very close to upward communication. However, it is more than communication. It involves the process of keeping teachers informed about intuitions, opinions, results or decision on matters that interest them, although the effective two-way communications in necessary to successful participation. As is evident from the results recorded in Table 31, those who have scored high on the opinion-seeking dimension of participation have also scored better on each dimension of job satisfaction in comparison to low and medium scores and these differences are statistically significant in most of the cases. The results of \( \chi^2 \)-analysis recorded in Table 40 also lend support to these findings. The correlation coefficients computed between opinion seeking and various dimensions of job satisfaction have yielded moderate but significant correlation coefficients between opinion-seeking and management area \( (r = .49, p > .01) \), social relations \( (r = .336, p > .01) \), on the job \( (r = .316, p > .01) \), off the job \( (r = .312, p > .01) \).
and overall job satisfaction ($r = .35$, $p > .01$). The fourth and the last dimension of psychological participation studied have is involvement (Table 32). It is an index of teacher's inclination to participate in the required activities of the institution. A teacher is involved in his job is one who takes it seriously, for whom important values are at stake in the job, whose moods and feelings are significantly affected by the job experiences and mentally who is pre-occupied with the job. (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). The inclusion of involvement as a participation dimension can be justified by the suggestions made by Haire (1956) who contends that participation probably involves ego need satisfactions because of the persons involvement in the decision. These additional motives almost certainly provide new driving forces acting to push the level up. The results recorded in (Table 43) indicate that those who have scored higher on involvement dimension (H30) have scored better on all the dimensions of the job satisfaction in comparison to those who have been average (M30) and low (L30) on this dimension.

The results of $X^2$-analysis recorded in the Table 39 also supported these findings. The involvement job satisfaction association has been found to be significant in the case of job area - Table 39 ($X^2 = 4.66$, $p > .05$), management
area ($X^2 = 8.09, p > .01$), on the job ($X^2 = 5.18, p > .05$), off the job ($X^2 = 3.31, p > .01$) as well as in the case of overall satisfaction ($X^2 = 6.03, p > .02$). Correlation coefficients between involvement and various job satisfaction dimensions are significant in the case of management area ($r = .39, p > .01$), personal adjustment ($r = .20, p > .05$), social relations area ($r = .34, p > .01$), on the job ($r = .320, p > .01$), off the job ($r = .32, p > .01$), and also with overall job satisfaction ($r = .36, p > .01$) (Table 7).

All these indicate that one's involvement in decision-making is an important factor in increasing his or her job satisfaction. These results are complimentary to the previous findings regarding job involvement and job satisfaction.

**Role Stress**

Every teacher has his own problems, some acute or chronic. There are teachers who deal with them effectively, and thus, are able to perform satisfactorily. There are others who fail to deal with them effectively or are at least less effective in coping with them. As can be seen from Table 24-25, those who have scored high on self-role distance (Table 41) measures (HSG) of role stress are less satisfied in comparison to those who have scored medium (M5G)
or Low (LSG) this measure. The trend is similar for all the areas of job satisfaction, viz., job, management, personal adjustment, social relations, on-the-job, off-the-job, as also in the case of overall job satisfaction. The differences are statistically significant for all the dimensions of job satisfaction except in the case of management area for MSG vs LSG comparisons. When MSG and LSG were compared, a t-ratio of 3.71 (p > .01) was obtained for job area, 1.99 (p = .03) for management area, 3.09 (p > .01), for personal adjustment area, 2.22 (p > .05), for social relations area, 3.36 (p > .01), for on-the-job area, 3.36 (p > .01), for off-the-job area, and 3.70 (p > .01) for overall job satisfaction. However, no significant differences were obtained when job satisfaction scores of MSG and LSG were compared by obtaining t-ratios. These results are supported by the results obtained through $X^2$-analysis (Table 51) self-role distance has been found to be significantly associated with job area ($X^2 = 10.77$, $p < .01$), personal adjustment area ($X^2 = 5.57$, $p < .01$), on the job area ($X^2 = 7.26$, $p < .01$), off the job area ($X^2 = 8.34$, $p < .01$). The obtained correlation coefficient in the case of self-role distance and job area ($r = -.437$, $p < .01$), management area ($r = -.272$, $p < .01$), personal adjustment area (Table 94) ($r = .346$, $p < .01$) as also with overall job satisfaction ($r = .436$, $p < .01$). Thus, from the above discussed results it is apparent that the stress on resulting
through the person's feeling of incompatibility between that he wanted to do and what he has to do is detrimental to all aspects of job satisfaction as also to life satisfaction since off-the-job satisfaction measures represent one's satisfaction with situations away from his job.

The next role stress dimension studied is **inter-role stress**. This type of stress is experienced when a person occupies more than one role within compatible demands. For example, when a teacher often faces the conflicts between his family role and the management role. The demand from his wife and children to share time may be incompatible with management demands on him.

From the results recorded in Table 42, one can see that those who have scores high on inter-role distance (HSG) have comparatively low on all the dimensions of job satisfaction in comparison to those who have medium (MSG) and low scores (LSG) on inter-role distance. When t-ratios were computed to find out whether these apparent differences on job satisfaction dimensions are real, statistically significant differences were found in the case of all the job satisfaction dimensions as also for overall satisfaction except in the case of social relations area ($t = 1.78$, $p = NS$) for MSG vs LSG, comparisons (Table 26).
The results of $X^2$-analysis also substantiate these findings (Table 31). The obtained $X^2$ are significant in the case of job area ($X^2 = 5.232$, $p < .05$), management area ($X^2 = 4.257$, $p < .05$), personal adjustment area ($X^2 = 10.77$, $p < .01$), off the job area ($X^2 = 4.66$, $p < .05$) also for overall job satisfaction ($X^2 = 6.564$, $p < .01$). These results have been further confirmed by the significant correlation coefficients obtained between inter-role distance and job area ($r = -.479$, $p < .01$), management area ($r = -.317$, $p < .01$), personal adjustment area ($r = -.367$, $p < .01$), on the job ($r = -.456$, $p < .01$), off the job area ($r = .308$, $p < .01$) and overall job satisfaction ($r = -.450$, $p < .01$) (Table 9A). Thus, from these results it is evident that inter-role conflict is an important source of stress and detrimental to one's job and life satisfaction (Table 9A).

The next dimension of role stress studied here is role stagnation (Table 43). Role stagnation, as suggested by Parseek (1961) is the problem of role growth. There are number of studies available in the past who deal with such related concepts as career progression. In the present study, an attempt is made to see the effect of role stagnation on various aspects of job satisfaction relating to on-the-job and off-the-job situations. As is evident (from Table 43),
those who have scored low on role stagnation dimension of stress have scored better on almost all the dimensions of job satisfaction in comparison to those who have scored medium (HSG) or high (LSG) on the role stagnation. When the t-ratios were computed to find out whether the apparent differences in the job satisfaction of HSG and LSG are real, or are the artifact of sampling fluctuations, statistically significant t-ratios were observed on all the job satisfaction dimensions except for social relations area \((t = 1.804, p = NS)\). In the case of HSG Vs MSH also the differences were significant on almost all the dimensions except in the case of personal adjustment area \((t = 1.150, p = NS)\). The results of \(X^2\)-analysis however failed to record such differences yielding all the values statistically insignificant. A look into Table 43, however, suggests that the results observed through t-ratio analysis should hold since role stagnation has been found to be significantly related to job area \((r = -.265, p < .01)\), management area \((r = .365, p < .01)\), personal adjustment area \((r = -.323, p < .01)\), on the job area \((r = -.360, p < .01)\), off the job area \((r = -.26, p < .01)\) as also in the case of overall job satisfaction \((r = -.380, p < .01)\).

In general, these findings support the previous observations that the problem of career growth is a potent source of job dissatisfaction as also mental well being. As we can
see, one's feeling of being stagnant may not be reflected on various aspects of job and life satisfaction unless it is very pronounced. However, even a low profile on stagnation dimension may affect one's adjustment.

The next role stressor studied here is role ambiguity (Table 44) which usually the outcome of the situations where the individual is not clear about the various expectations teachers have from his role. Role ambiguity may be due to the lack of information available to the role occupant, or due to the lack of understanding the cases available to him. (Pareek, 1981).

The results recorded in Table 28 do indicate that those who score low on the ambiguity measure have scored high on the various job satisfaction dimensions as also on overall job satisfaction in comparison to those who have been either medium (MSG) or high (HSO) on the ambiguity measure. $x^2$-analysis have also substantiate these findings (Table 51). It can be seen that all ten values are statistically significant except in the case of social relations area ($x^2 = .014$, $p = .85$) which have been the case using t-test also. As can be seen from the (Table 9A) the coefficients of correlation between role ambiguity and various job satisfaction dimensions are significantly negative and at the moderate level except in the case of social relations area where a negligible but negative
correlation has been obtained ($r = -.052, p = NS$). In the other case the obtained correlation coefficients are slightly high, for example, in the case of job area it is $r = -.369 (p < .01)$, in the case of management area it is $r = -.299 (p < .01)$. In the case of personal adjustment area $r = -.384 (p < .01)$, in the case of on the job area, it is $r = -.382 (p < .01)$, in the case of off the job area, it is $r = -.260 (p < .01)$, and in the case of overall satisfaction it is $r = -.380 (p < .01)$ (Table 9A).

The next stressor studied in the study was role overload (Table 45). This term has been popularized by Kahn et al. (1954). Kahn and Quinn (1970) have suggested some conditions under which role overload is likely to occur. According to them, role overload is likely to occur more in the absence of mechanisms of role integration, in the absence of power of role occupants, in the large variations in the expected output. Role overload has been classified into two - quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative refers to having 'too much to do' while qualitative refers to the work that is 'too difficult'.

As can be seen from the Table 45, those who are on role overload (HSG) are less satisfied on all the dimensions of job satisfaction in correlation to those who experience medium (MSG) or low (LSG) role overload except in the case of social relations aspect of job satisfaction. However,
these findings are not fully supported by the results obtained through $X^2$-analysis statistically significant $X^2$'s have been obtained only in the case of job area ($X^2 = 2.91, p < .01$) and overall job satisfaction ($X^2 = 3.89, p < .05$). These differences could be attributed to the same reasons discussed previously. When correlation coefficients were computed to see the relationship between role overload and various dimensions of job satisfaction, role overload was found to be significantly related with all the aspects of job satisfaction. The obtained correlations are in the range of $r = -.195$ (with social relations area) to $r = -.434, p < .01$ (personal adjustment area).

The next role stressor incorporated in the study is **role isolation** (Table 46) which occurs when in a role set, the role occupant may feel that certain roles are psychologically nearer to him, while some other roles are at a distance. The main criterion of role isolation is the frequency and ease of interaction. When linkages are strong, the role isolation will be low and vice versa (Pareek, 1981, p.21). The results recorded in Table 46 show that those who have high violation (HSO) are less satisfied in all the satisfaction areas as also on overall satisfaction than those who have scored medium (MSO) or low (LSO) on isolation measure. These results are further
verified by the $x^2$-analysis. Statistically significant $x^2$
were observed in the case of job area ($x^2 = 6.184, p < .02$),
management area ($x^2 = 9.900, p < .01$), off the job area
($x^2 = 2.933, p < .01$), and the case of overall job satisfaction
also ($x^2 = 5.521, p < .05$). A significant but negative
correlation coefficients was obtained between role isolation
and job area ($r = -.280, p < .01$), management area ($r = -.347,
p < .01$), personal adjustment area ($r = -.272, p < .01$), on
the job ($r = -.358, p < .01$), and overall job satisfaction
($r = -.314, p < .01$) (Table 9A). Thus, it can be concluded that
the individuals working on highly isolated roles are less
satisfied with job, management, personal adjustment and
with overall on the job and off the job activities than
those working in highly interactive and warm relationship
environments.

The next role stressor studied in this investigation
is role erosion (Table 47) which is the objective feeling of
an individual that some important role expectations he has
from his role do not match with the expectations other
roles have for him. The results recorded in (Table 31)
indicate that those who feel less role erosion (LSO) have
scored high on such job satisfaction dimensions as job area,
management area, personal adjustment area, on the job, as
also on overall job satisfaction measure in comparison to
those who feel high role erosion. However, $X^2$-analysis shows somewhat different picture. Except in the case of personal adjustment area ($X^2 = 0.180, p = NS$) and on the job area ($X^2 = 0.410, p = NS$), the association between role erosion and all the other dimensions of job satisfaction are statistically significant. However, the results obtained through t-test seem more convincing since the obtained correlation coefficients are statistically significant only in the case of management area ($r = -.274, p < .01$) and on the job area ($r = -.229, p < .05$).

The next and the last role stressor included in the investigation is role inadequacy which refers to two types of feelings, (a) that the role occupant does not have adequate resources to perform the role effectively and (b) that he is not fully equipped (lacks internal resources) for effective performance of the role. The results recorded in (Table 48) for effective performance indicate that those who are high on inadequacy are less satisfied in every area of job satisfaction in comparison to those who are low on role inadequacy and those differences are actual at least in the case of the job area ($t = 2.488, p < .05$), management area ($t = 4.798, p < .01$), and overall job satisfaction ($t = 3.603, p < .01$). The above findings are in accordance with the results obtained through $X^2$-analysis. Except in the case of management area ($X^2 = 2.058, p = NS$), and on the job
area \( (x^2 = 1.777, \, p = .85) \) all the obtained \( x^2 \)'s are statistically significant indicating an association between role inadequacy and various job satisfaction dimensions. The obtained product moment correlation coefficients also support the above findings for they have been statistically significant in the role inadequacy and job area \( (r = -.241, \, p < .05) \), management area \( (r = -.355, \, p < .01) \) and overall job satisfaction \( (r = -.351, \, p < .01) \), personal adjustment area \( (r = -.355, \, p < .01) \). Thus, the obtained results indicate that role inadequacy is a potential source of job satisfaction. As a matter of fact, incompetence of any sort, whether in terms of resources available to perform the job effectively or in terms of personal incompetence to handle the job effectively, is bound to lower down one's morale and job satisfaction (Table 51).

In Table 48, it has been recorded the mean and S.D. scores on various job satisfaction dimensions for those who have scored high (HSG), Low (LSG) and medium (MSG) on overall role stress.

In Table 2, 3, 4, 5 and 9A, it has been recorded that the results of regression analysis using locus of control, various types of academic climate, different dimensions of participation and role stress as independent variables and various
job satisfaction dimensions (keeping two dummy dependent variables job involvement and Need Achievement) as dependent variables. In Table 7, participation and role stress dimensions have been used as separate independent variables while in Table 9A the aggregate scores on these dimensions are used in the regression equation. It can be seen from Table 9A that when used together all these variables, namely, locus of control, motivational climate of achievement, expert influence, extension, control, dependency, and affiliation, psychological participation dimension such as decision-making, autonomy, opinion seeking and involvement and various role stressors such as self-role distance, inter-role distance, role stagnation, role ambiguity, role overload, role erosion, role isolation and role inadequacy have accounted for about 49.4 percent variance in the case of job area, \( R^2 = .494, F(19,81) = 4.155, p < .01 \) 55 percent in the case of management area, \( R^2 = .550, F(19,81) = 5.205, p < .01 \) 43.2 percent in the case of personal adjustment area \( R^2 = .432, F(19,81) = 3.240, p < .01 \) 38.2 percent in the case of social relations \( R^2 = .382, F(19,81) = 2.631, p < .057 \) 44.4 percent in the case of on-the-job area \( R^2 = .444, F(19,81) = 5.206, p < .01 \) and 43.9 percent in the case of overall job satisfaction \( R^2 = .559, F(19,81) = 5.406, p < .01 \).
In the summary of regression analysis, if one can take the birds' eye view of the results, job satisfaction 37.60, job involvement 10.13 and need achievement 49.15 constants. The summary as a whole indicates slightly different results as the samples are fluctuating at certain levels of growth study as the teachers are reluctant to cooperate and showing less interest in filling the forms and inventories. Most of the teachers are not growth-oriented but deficiencies oriented (Table 2).

The results, thus generally support the hypotheses proposed that Age, Tenure, Locus of Control, Climate Participation, and Role Stress related with various aspects of Job Involvement, Need Achievement and Satisfaction.