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INTRODUCTION

In contemporary society physical education is considered to be an important and integral part of the education process. The technological advancements have tremendously reduced the activity of human being causing thereby lopsided development of personality. It is well documented that a specific and organized physical education programme can bring about the desirable changes in the total personality and help in developing an individual who is physically fit, technically perfect, mentally sound, socially adjusted and emotionally balanced. It also manifests the necessary motor skills to tackle diversified tasks efficiently through the physical movements besides adding vigor and vitality for the healthful living. It is advocated that the routine exercise programme prepared and conducted under the able guidance of an expert can go a long way in helping the individuals for harmonious development of one’s health and fitness. Thus, the physical education teachers have to play a vital role in grooming up the young children. Thus, in modern technological age the responsibilities of physical education teachers have increased manifolds.

Similarly, high sports performance is the byproduct of total personality of an individual. In the pursuit of excellence in a chosen sport, the athletes have to be trained for years together bearing specifically designed critical load in order to improve the training capacity and performance. In the process of attaining excellence, the coach has to play pivotal role.
Using his domain of knowledge and experience he has to plan both long and short term training programmes adhering the principles of planning and periodization. The selection of proper means and methods, determining the load dynamics, administration of training doses, evaluation of progress in performance of athletes and again modifying the plan on the basis of feedback for continuing the processes, necessitate total commitment on the part of a coach. It is the coach who can make or mar the performance of athletes who are being trained under him. A good coach besides imparting instructions also inspires his disciples to put greater efforts in attaining the set goals progressively and thus reaching to his peak form.

The expectations of the society and the nation with regard to physical education teachers and coaches are very high as they are the true experts who can develop and protect the general health, fitness and performance of individuals of the society. It is evidenced that in proportion to the expectations of the society, the physical education teachers and coaches have not been given due place and recognition. They face a lot of problems while carrying out their responsibilities. Poor working conditions, ill equipped infrastructure, heavy work load, lack of administrative backing and improper facilities create impediments in their smooth and efficient functioning. They are forced to work under acute stressful environmental conditions. Keeping in view these assumptions the investigator has made a humble attempt to explore the relationship of job involvement and job satisfaction among physical education teachers and coaches and also to
examine the difference in the relationship scores of these variables.

**Job Involvement**

During the years 1960s when heavy emphasis was already being made in the area of job motivation and job satisfaction, the concept of job involvement came into light. On job involvement studies started in mid 1960s with the pioneering work of Lodahl and Kejner (1965) who for the first time explored many important factors of job involvement. It is a matter of fact that job involvement is an important aspect determining work performance in which the phenomenon of motivation and satisfaction are readily implicit. Actually, the load of researches in 1950s and early 1960s on job satisfaction and job motivation was too heavy; hence, several theories of job satisfaction and job motivation came into light. Maslow's (1954) interpretation of theory of need hierarchy in job context gained popularity and also received criticisms by a lot of psychologists [(Herzberg et al. (1957), Vroom (1964), Porter and Lawler (1968), and Alderfer (1969, 1972)]. Hence, the concept of job involvement evolved out of the heavy load on job motivation studies and the craze for new appropriate concept to determine work performance. The concept of job involvement attracted a lot of interest and attention of psychologists, administrators, managers and supervisors. This all led Lodahl and Kejner (1965) for the first time, to develop a scale for measuring job involvement. Therefore, within a very short span of time the phenomenon of job involvement gained its importance among administrators, managers, supervisors
and psychologists who started considering job involvement as a criterion for measuring work performance. Thus, work on job involvement as witnessed from the literature has advanced from descriptive and theoretical stage to move theoretically and empirically explanative stage.

Lodahl and Kejner (1965), pioneer in the area of job involvement, contended that “job involvement is the internalization of values about the goodness of work, the importance of the work in the growth of persons, and perhaps it, thus, measures the case with which the person can be further socialized by an organization.” Lodhal and Kejner’s (1965) contention about the explanation of the concept of job involvement laid heavy emphasis on the internalization of values. It is, therefore, quite reasonable to mention that value orientation towards work is learnt in early socialization process. Lodahl (1964) himself had realized that during the process of socialization certain work values are infected into the self of the individuals that remain dynamically active even at the later stage in the form of employees reaction and attitude towards job. For example, “work is worship” in Hindu mythology. Hence, Hindu’s religious values play a very important role in work activities. Similarly, in Islam, greater emphasis has been put on earning a living through the Godly ways (pious means) which put its emphasis on honesty, sincerity and responsibility in performing any work actively. It indirectly changes employee’s behaviour positively in the work context. In the same way, all other religions in the world emphasize directly or indirectly to certain work values that develop commitment. According to the social environment
where everyone is working and enterprising, and to be enterprising becomes social norm which works as a compelling force for the people to get socialized by internalizing the socio-cultural norms and consequently get committed and job involved.

In nut shell, the job involvement can be referred to as ‘the attitude of employees towards work’. It is, therefore, clear that values which are internalized due to impact of these aspects, then during the course of socialization are the major outcomes of socio-environmental influences. If there is a positive impact of these aspects then an individual gets committed and job involved. Different thinkers have opted different styles in defining the phenomenon of job involvement. Lodahl and Kejner (1965) defined it as “the degree to which a person identifies psychologically with his work for the importance of his work in his total self image is regarded as job involvement”, while according to Lawler and Hall (1970) job involvement refers to “Psychological identification of one’s own work as well as the degree to which the job situation is central to person and his identity”. Job involvement that job involvement measures the degree to which a person identifies psychologically with his or her job and considers his or her perceived performance level important to self worth (Blau and Boal, 1987).

There has usually been criticism and controversy regarding every new concept. Thus, job involvement is not an exception. Patchen (1970) has pointed out that ‘general interest’ in the job is more or less similar to the concept of job involvement but he himself accepted that in spite of some
similarities between these two, 'general interests' can not termed as job involvement. Kanungo, Mishra and Dayal (1975) pointed out that job involvement attitude represents the degree to which the total situation is thought as being central to one's life self-concept while, Saleh and Horek (1976) have proposed four different conditions in which an individual may be job involved: (I) When work to him is a central life interest. (II) When he actively participates in his job. (III) When he perceives performances as consistent to his self concept, and (IV) when he perceives performance as central to his self esteem.

Kanungo (1979) classified job involvement into two different contexts. (i) Involvement with "specific job". And (ii) involvement with "work in general".

In fact, he focused on sociological and psychological approaches to job involvement after criticizing traditional interpretation of the concept. Kanungo (1982) defined the phenomenon of job involvement as a "cognitive state of psychological identification with the job and depends on the degree to which the job is perceived to meet one's salient need, be they intrinsic or extrinsic." Boal and Cidambi (1984) reported that high levels of job involvement have been found to be related to fewer absence and lower resignation rates. Blau (1986) vindicated the study of Boal and Cidambi (1984).

Broadly, there are three important sets of factors which are considered determiners of job involvement and have been identified after reviewing the definitions given by various
psychologists. These factors include job incumbents, aspects of work itself and organizational conditions.

**Job Satisfaction**

The significance of work experience and its impact on attitudes and values about work is of great significance for an individual as well as the organization. The success or failure of an organization to a great extent lies upon a satisfied/dissatisfied work force, because, people spend a sizable portion of their working life in that organization. Thus, by and large this period of their working life seems to be pleasant, agreeable and fulfilling. Dissatisfied work force can distort and blur the organizational game plan. Hence, it becomes essential for every organization to maintain a congenial and conducive work environment, which may evoke high level of job satisfaction among employees and makes it a better place to pursue its objectives.

The term "Job Satisfaction" was brought to limelight in the research literature by Hoppock (1935). He reviewed numerous studies on job satisfaction conducted prior to 1933 and found that job satisfaction is a combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person to say that "I am satisfied with my job".

Hoppock (1935) enumerated the following six major factors of job satisfaction in the epilogue to his study:

(i) The way the individual reacts to unpleasant situations;  
(ii) the facility with which he adjusts himself to other persons; (iii) his relative status in social and economic
group with which he identifies himself; (iv) the nature of work in relation to his ability, interest, and preparation; (v) security and (vi) loyalty.

According to Drever (1956) job satisfaction can be defined as "the end state of feeling". In this definition the use of word 'end' is emphasized that the feeling is experienced by an individual after a task is accomplished or an activity that has taken place whether it is highly individualistic effort or collective endeavour in completing the task. The tasks or the activities could be very minute or large. They could be easily observable or could just be experienced. But in all cases they could be satisfying certain needs. The feeling might be positive or negative depending upon whether the need is satisfied or not and could be function of the efforts of the individual on the one hand and situational opportunities available to him on the other hand.

Bullock (1952) considered satisfaction as "an attitude which results from balance and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job. These evaluations may rest largely upon one's own success or failure in the achievement of personal objectives and upon the perceived contribution of the job and organization towards these ends". Smith (1955) suggested that job satisfaction is "the employee's judgment of how well his job on the whole is satisfying his various needs".

According to Blum (1956) job satisfaction is a resultant of many attitudes possessed by a worker. He defined it as "a general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes
in three areas, namely, specific job factors, individual characteristics, and group relationships outside the job”.

Schaffer’s (1953) theory of job satisfaction also throws some light on the nature of this concept. He observed that “overall satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual which can be satisfied in a job are actually satisfied; the stronger the need, the more closely will job satisfaction depend on its fulfillment”.

French, Kornhauser and Marrow (1946) have compiled a list of on-the-job and off-the-job factors which various investigators found as underlying causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction of workers. These are:

(i) Factors in the individual: Ability, health, age, temperament, desires and expectations, neuroticism, tendencies, unconscious conflicts etc. (ii) Factors in life away from work: Home conditions, recreation, consumer problem, labour union activities, socio-politico-economic conditions etc. (iii) Factors in employment relations: Wages or earnings, steadiness of employment, transfer, lay-off, retiring procedures, kind of work performed, supervision, training, conditions of work, opportunities for advancement, opportunity to use abilities, social relationships on the job recognition and fair evaluation of work, opportunities for participation, free interchange of ideas, prompt and fair settling of grievances, understanding and respect by employer.
The above classification suggested that workers’ satisfaction does not arise merely from factors on the job but runs whole gamut of man’s needs and aspirations.

Siegel (1962), on the basis of his review of job satisfaction studies, came to the conclusion that all the results may be conveniently grouped under two headings on the basis of their pertinence to factors: (i) Intrinsic or (ii) extrinsic to the job itself. Factors intrinsic to job include pay, job security, participation and personal recognition, working hours, working conditions and occupational status. Among factors extrinsic to job are perceptions about supervision, sex, age, level of intelligence, job experience or length of service and personal adjustment.

Job satisfaction as suggested by Ghiselli and Brown (1955) has many different points of reference and few workers indeed are satisfied with all aspects of their job. Brayfield and Crockett (1955) considered three social systems to be important in workers motivation, viz., fellow workers, the organization and the community.

Herzberg and his associates (1957), in their review of job attitude studies, revealed ten major factors constituting job satisfaction with nearly 150 specific aspects. The major factors are as follows: (i) Intrinsic aspects of job, (ii) supervision, (iii) working conditions, (iv) wages, (v) opportunity for advancement, (vi) security, (vii) organization, (viii) social aspects of job, (ix) communication and (x) benefits.
Twery, Schmid, and Wrigley (1958) inferred the following five common factors on the basis of their factor analysis: (i) General attitude towards the job, (ii) satisfaction with the supervisor, (iii) satisfaction with higher echelon, (iv) satisfaction with living conditions and (v) satisfaction with co-workers. In addition, the investigators also found "monotony-variety" factors.

In a similar study Morse (1953) considered job satisfaction as depending upon: (i) Job content, (ii) identification with organization, (iii) financial and job status and (iv) pride in group performance.

Worthy (1950) assessed job satisfaction with the help of the following six factors: (i) Organization in general, (ii) the local organization, (iii) local management, (iv) immediate supervision, (v) co-workers and (vi) working conditions.

On the basis of inter-correlations between the factors, Grove and Kerr (1957) concluded that 'wages' and 'liking' for work associates appear to be the major components of job satisfaction.

Hammond (1954), on the basis of factor analysis of his 90-items questionnaire, found the following five group factors: (i) Financial success, (ii) personal social success, (iii) technical satisfaction, (iv) social contact satisfaction and (v) social services satisfaction.

Jurgassen (1947; 1948) assessed the importance of job factors using a questionnaire. The questionnaire was
administered on 400 job applicants. Factors were ranked in the following order: (i) Job security, (ii) opportunity for advancement, (iii) type of work, (iv) pride in an organization, (v) pay, (vi) co-workers, (vii) supervisor, (viii) hours, (ix) working conditions and (x) benefits.

Broadly speaking, we can define job satisfaction as an individual's overall attitude toward his/her job. Locke (1976) has given a comprehensive and universally popular definition of job satisfaction. He defines job satisfaction as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience”. It is an end state of feelings and consists of an employee’s cognitive, affective, and evaluation reaction to his/her job.

Pareek (1981) in his integrated model of work motivation states that the final psychological outcome of the person’s working in an organization is the satisfaction he/she derives from his/her work and role.

Job satisfaction has been regarded both as a general attitude as well as satisfaction with specific dimensions of the job such as pay, the work itself, promotion opportunities, supervision, co-workers and so forth. These may interact in different ways to create the feeling of satisfaction with the job. The degree of satisfaction may vary with how well outcomes fulfill or exceed expectations. Mumford (1991) analyzed job satisfaction in two ways. First, in terms of the fit between what the organization requires and what the employee is seeking and second, in terms of the fit between
what the employee is seeking and what he/she is actually receiving.

Since an average employee spends almost one third of his/her life in the organization, there are some concerns that have to be addressed particularly in the context of job satisfaction. These have to do with stability of satisfaction, work context, and supervisory behaviour. In an intriguing research by Straw and Ross (1985), it was found that job satisfaction is a comparatively stable disposition and does not change over time. In their survey of over 5000 men who changed jobs between 1969 and 1971, it was found that the expressions of job satisfaction were relatively stable. Although they had different types of jobs, employees who were satisfied or dissatisfied in 1969 felt equally satisfied or dissatisfied in 1971 too. Although some researches have challenged the disposition of stability of job satisfaction, follow-up researchers have, nevertheless, supported it.

Work is inextricably bound with human existence. The content and context of work should therefore promote, rather than damage human dignity. Kanungo (1992) pointed out that managers have the moral obligation to empower subordinates and thereby promote their growth and development. He strongly emphasized the need to analyse work norms and conditions to see whether such practices promote productive behaviour, high job satisfaction, and overall improvement of work life and that they are consistent with the dignity of the employees as human beings. In an interesting study Page and Wiserman (1993) asked workers from USA, Mexico, and Spain to indicate how satisfied they were with their work and the
behavior of their superiors. Not only were their average responses to both questions quite high but uniformly so in all three countries. These people do not select jobs randomly. They tend to be attracted towards jobs that are compatible with their interests, values and abilities. Hence different people join different jobs for different reasons, which make job satisfaction a complex and multifaceted concept which can mean various things to different people.

Keeping in view the above conceptual framework, job satisfaction was taken as a summation of employees’ feelings in four important areas. Two of these areas encompass factors directly connected with the job (intrinsic factors), and the other includes factors not directly connected with the job but are presumed to have a bearing on job satisfaction. These four areas with their related aspects are as follows:

(i) **Job:** Nature of work- “dull, dangerous, interesting”, hours of work, fellow workers, opportunities on the job for promotion and advancement (prospects), overtime regulations, interest in work, physical environment, equipment and instruments etc.

(ii) **Management:** Supervisory treatment, participation, rewards and punishments, praises and blames, leave policy, favoritism etc.

(iii) **Social relations:** Neighbours, friends and associates, attitude towards people in community, participation in social activities, sociability, caste barriers etc.
(iv) **Personal adjustment:** Emotionality, health, home and living conditions, finances, relation with family members etc.

The investigations cited above and the work of Super (1939) and Vanzelst (1957) established beyond doubt that the above cited factors are important to a study of job satisfaction.

Thus, we may conclude that job satisfaction is governed to a large extent, by perceptions, aspirations or expectations. Men work to satisfy their needs and they aspire or expect their work life to fulfill their needs for perfect job satisfaction. There should exist a one to one relationship between the perception of how well the job life fulfills the various needs and expectations or aspirations of the individual regarding the extent to which these needs should have been fulfilled. Any discrepancy between aspirations and perceptions accounts for dissatisfaction. As mentioned earlier, the perceived or imagined judgment of how well the job life is satisfying the various needs, accounts for the degree of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

**Significance of the Present Study**

The review of related studies reveals that although numerous investigators have tried to explore the influence of psychological variables such as achievement motivation, locus of control, psychological well being, self-concept and adjustment etc. But to the best of knowledge of the present researcher, job involvement and job satisfaction have not been
studied in the context of physical education teachers and coaches. Thus, the present investigator has made a humble effort to study job involvement in relation to job satisfaction among various levels of physical education personnel with certain demographic characteristics.

Job involvement and job satisfaction of physical education teachers and coaches have been considered as an important area of investigation by the researcher with a view that job involvement and job satisfaction improve the performance as well as effectiveness of an individual irrespective of the nature of work. It is believed that any professional who is involved with the job generally enjoy job satisfaction. The physical education teachers and the coaches can contribute to the well-being of his trainee. On the basis of earlier evidence it may be inferred that studies on job satisfaction of physical education teachers and coaches are rather scanty. However, investigator has not come across a single study of job involvement among physical education teachers and coaches. Therefore, the present investigator considered job satisfaction and job involvement as the important variables to be studied in the present investigation.

**Objectives of the Present Study**

The researcher has identified the following objectives of the present investigation:

1. To determine the relationship between job involvement and job satisfaction scores among various levels of physical education personnel - School teachers, college teachers,
teachers of residential institutions, teachers of non-residential institutions, coaches of residential institutions, coaches of non-residential institutions, temporary teachers, permanent teachers, temporary coaches, permanent coaches, married teachers, unmarried teachers, married coaches, unmarried coaches.

2. To examine the difference between school teachers and college teachers, teachers of residential institutions and coaches of residential institutions teachers of non-residential institutions and coaches of non-residential institutions, temporary teachers and temporary coaches, permanent teachers and permanent coaches, married teachers and married coaches, unmarried teachers and unmarried coaches in the relationship scores of job involvement and job satisfaction.

3. To examine the difference between school teachers and college teachers in the relationship scores of job involvement and job satisfaction.

4. To examine the difference between teachers of residential institutions and coaches of residential institutions in the relationship scores of job involvement and job satisfaction.

5. To examine the difference between teachers of non-residential institutions and coaches of non-residential institutions in the relationship scores of job involvement and job satisfaction.
6. To examine the difference between temporary teachers and temporary coaches in the relationship scores of job involvement and job satisfaction.

7. To examine the difference between permanent teachers and permanent coaches in the relationship scores of job involvement and job satisfaction.

8. To examine the difference between married teachers and married coaches in the relationship scores of job involvement and job satisfaction.

9. To examine the difference between unmarried teachers and unmarried coaches in the relationship scores of job involvement and job satisfaction.