Chapter- 1

Introduction
Human being is a dynamic entity which is instrumental in changing the environment. Man and environment interface is one of the most significant aspects for any sort of outcome. It is evident from the history of mankind that men have always struggled to fulfill their needs. At the very initial stage of ‘stone age’ the stones were used as a major tool in killing the animals and even for lighting the fire and performing some other activities but gradually, this scenario started changing and passed through various phases of development and now the world has entered to the cyber era when one can think of a thing to be done, it is done and subsequently, such cyber culture influenced work outcome, work related behaviour and socio-organizational values and culture.

In the domain of work, it is witnessed that performing job activities has passed through various phases starting from manual to more and more sophisticated automation and at present reaching to such a height of cyber culture where there is a high level of dynamic function. Industrial revolution can be considered as one of the major and significant turning point in the history of world of work which took place in 1750 in England and there-after spread over the entire European and American industrial setup and later, gradually to other parts of the world. Industrial revolution was an outcome of the need of the time as mass production was necessitated for the fulfillment of human increasing needs and desires because there was a sharp trend of increasing population. Hence, the saying comes true that ‘need gives rise to innovation and development’. Such development was not only witnessed for industrial and organizational sectors but also in different other spheres, especially agriculture sector where innovative approaches have given tremendous rise in the output of agriculture in many ways. It is a matter of the fact that men have always worked right from their existence on earth but the question of employees efficiency at work was only pointed out in the late 19th century particularly with the work of Taylor who was definitely
instrumental for the development of a discipline called industrial psychology and only there-after, there was an increasing realization among psychologists that they can play significant and pivotal role in enhancing human efficiency at work.

Keeping in view the afore-mentioned fast pace of increasing interest in human efficiency at work that started as ‘task-centered’ approach and then later shifted to employee-centered approach with the work of Mayo. The later approach had given rise to the movement called ‘Human Relation Movement’. Initially the pace of development was slow but gradually it become quite fast that forced psychologist to look into human side focusing human skills, talents, interests, aptitudes, etc., for the maximum utilization of human resources. Hence, history of industrial psychology had witnessed changing orientations broadly from management to employee oriented system that paved the way for developing be-fitting strategies in the form of approaches and theories for motivating people at work.

While writing something on the historical aspect of the development of industrial/organizational psychology, it seems necessarily important to mention the post-human relation movement scenario. It is evident from the history that human relation movement was instrumental in changing the whole orientation at work. It is indeed, true that all motivational theories and the concepts pertaining to work related behavioural outcomes only started pouring-in after the initiation of human relation movement. Human relation movement was at its peak during 1930’s to 1950’s and this was the era when motivation and job satisfaction theories started coming in. The first formal theory of job motivation was given by Maslow in 1943 which was started using as a theory of job motivation and job satisfaction by early 1950’s and thereafter number of motivation and job satisfaction theories have come up and even today the theories are being enriched by incorporating the changing socio-cultural milieu in explaining
motivational behaviour of the modern contemporary men at work. Moreover, work related behavioural outcomes like job involvement- the work on it initiated by Lodahl and Kejner in 1965, and thereafter, the concepts related to work related behavioural outcomes, especially like work/organizational identification and organizational commitment came into being.

To the present researcher the entire scenario of the development of industrial/organizational psychology have been of much more interest that had compelled to work on work related behaviour like organizational commitment and job satisfaction which are very well being considered even today as the means of enhancing individual as well as organizational efficiency and subsequently for achieving highest level of organizational effectiveness. Hence, the whole endeavour of the present investigation was to study organizational commitment and job satisfaction (criterion variables) as a function of self-concept and organizational identification (predictor variables). The details of the meaning and concepts of criterion and predictor variables are being discussed comprehensively in the proceeding writings. First of all criterion variables viz., organizational commitment and job satisfaction will be taken-up one after the other and thereafter, predictor variables—self-concept and organizational identification in the same sequence for comprehensive description that follows:

**Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment is highly valuable concept which has attracted considerable attention of organizational behaviour researcher, psychologist and other behavioural scientist because everyone want committed workforce for their organization. Organizational commitment is an inner force that binds the employees with the organization where they work. Highly committed employees identify with
organizational goals and value them as their own, hence, exert considerable effort. Such employees are energetic, open, devoted and are most likely to perform extra role behaviour beyond the required job duties and ready for doing anything for the success of the organization they belong. Therefore, organizational commitment is regarded as one of the most representative dimension of organizational behaviour for organizational success. The phenomenon and behavioural notion of commitment has been explored extensively from the work of Whyte. In the year 1956, Whyte published his article entitled “The Organization Man”. He described the organization man as a person who not only work for the organization, but also belong to it. Organization men believed in the group as the source of creativity and in belongingness as the ultimate need of the individual. From his description, it can be suggested that employees’ belongingness towards the organization are the main source of organizational commitment. Two years the publication of the article “The Organization Man” Lawrence (1958) writes that “Ideally, we would want one sentiment to be dominant in all employees from top to bottom, namely a complete loyalty to the organizational purpose.” Deviating from Whyte, Lawrence gave importance to the organizational loyalty for high level of employees’ commitment. The concept of organizational commitment in the work place from the perspective of individual relationship with the organization started from the work of Becker’s (1960) who defined organizational commitment as the side-bet theory. According to Becker’s theory, the relationship between employees and organization is based on the “contract” of economic exchange behaviour. Committed employees are committed because they have some hidden investments to which he called it as “side-bets.” The term “side-bets” refers to the accumulation of investments valued by the individual for example pension, seniority, effort and so on (WeiBo et al., 2010). Becker (1960) argued that over a period of time certain costs are build up that
make more difficult for the person to disengage from a consistent pattern of activity, namely, maintaining membership in the organization. The threat of losing these investments, along with a perceived lack of alternative opportunities to replace or make up for the loss of them, compels the person for continuance in the organization.

In contrast to above the approach, Porter et al. (1974) shifted the concept of commitment from side-bets/economic-contract to the psychological attachment to the organization. According to him, employees' commitment not only comes from economic factors but also affective influences are more significant. Organizational commitment has been defined by Porter et al. (1974) as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” and further presented commitment as being characterized by three factors: (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of organization’s goals and values (identification); (2) a willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization (involvement); and a strong desire to maintain membership with the organization (loyalty) (Mowday et al., 1979). Thus, organizational commitment can be defined as a psychological state that includes an individual’s belief in and acceptance of the value of his or her chosen job, and a willingness to maintain membership in that job (Morrow and Wirth, 1989). Porter combined organizational commitment in three different parts: (1) strong acceptance, (2) participation and (3) loyalty; and described it as, those who are highly committed to their organization should be expected to engage in behaviours that would help the employing organization achieve its goals, to exert considerable effort beyond expectations, and to remain in the organization.

O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) opine organizational commitment as “the psychological attachment felt by the person for the organization, reflecting the degree to which the individual internalizes or adopts characteristics or perspectives of the
They proposed three independent dimensions of organizational commitment. These are (1) compliance or instrumental involvement for specific extrinsic rewards; (2) Identification or involvement based on a desire for affiliation; and (3) Internalization or involvement predicated on the congruence between individual and organizational values. Kelman (1958) stated that compliance occur when attitude and behaviour are adopted not because of shared belief but simply to gain specific reward. Identification occurs when an individual accepts influence to establish or maintain a satisfying relationship that is an individual may feel proud to be a part of a group, respecting it's values and accomplishments without adopting them as his or her own. Internalization occurs when influence is accepted because the induced attitudes and behaviours are congruent with one's own values i.e., the values of the individual and the group or organizations are same.

Concept, meaning and dimensions of commitment were discussed by numerous researchers but in the year 1984, Meyer and Allen made a commendable stride in the area of commitment and they proposed one of the leading approaches to study organizational commitment which has been rooted from the earlier approaches of organizational commitment i.e., Porter et al. (1974) and Becker (1960). Meyer and Allen conceptualizes commitment initially in two approach they refer to these approach as affective commitment (emotional attachment), continuance commitment (awareness of cost of leaving), and a third approach was added the normative commitment (feeling of obligation to continue employment) (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Affective commitment has been described as the employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed that anything that increases the quality of one's work experiences, especially one's sense of autonomy and personal competence, will increase affective commitment. Continuance
commitment assess the extent to which employees feel committed to their organization by virtue of the costs that they feel are associated with leaving. This form of commitment should increase over time as people accumulate personal investments or side-bets (e.g., seniority rights; attractive benefits) that would be at risk if the relationship was terminated. Normative commitment a third component refers to employee’s feeling of obligation to continue employment. Normative commitment is affected by socialization and/or culture prior to entry into an organization. Employees can experience these three components to varying degree. Common to these approaches is the view that commitment is a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization (Meyer and Allen 1991).

Thus, Allen and Meyer (1996) have defined organizational commitment as a psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization.

Employees with a strong affective commitment remain with the organization because they want to, those with a strong continuance commitment remain because they need to, and those with a strong normative commitment remain because they feel they ought to do so (Meyer, Allen and Smith 1993). In order to evaluate level of commitment Meyer and Allen developed a scale for measuring each component separately. These studies examine the psychometric properties of the scales, particularly their discriminant validity and their relationship with outcomes (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Beck and Wilson, 2000; Hackett, Bycio and Hausdorf, 1994; Jaros, 1997; Ko et al., 1997; McGee and Ford, 1987). It has been shown that the three components are distinct and have different antecedents (Dunham, Grube, and Castanedal, 1994) and received considerable empirical support (e.g. Wasti, 2005. Gellatly, Meyer and Luchak,
According to Vandenberghe and Tremblay (2008), Meyer and Allen’s model of organizational commitment is the most popular and comprehensively validated multidimensional model.

After describing conceptual framework of commitment, Meyer and Allen (1997) emphasized that all prior research has focused on the individual component while employees feel more than one form of commitment simultaneously. They referred to it as commitment profile which reflects the relative strength of commitment components in combination and produce a distinct overall commitment experience or mindset in an individual (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001). Here, focus is given to the combination of two commitment components i.e., affective and continuance commitment because of uncorrelated nature (Meyer et al., 2002) which produce four relatively distinct combination of affective (High/Low) and continuance commitment (High/Low) and psychological state associated with each of the four combination explain within the context of self-determination theory (e.g., Deci and Ryan, 2000; Gagne’ and Deci, 2005; Meyer, Becker and Vandenberghe, 2004). Because it is view that overall organizational commitment reflects psychological state or mindset that has a link with motivation (Meyer et al., 2004). Self-determination theory concerned with the motivation behind the choices that people make without any external interference. It proposed that motivational mindset ranging from intrinsic (autonomous) motivation where the activities initiating for their own sake; to extrinsic (external regulation) motivation where the activity are controlled by others, by constraints in situation or by rewards. From, this theory, it is proposed that mindset underlying the component of affective and continuance commitment are associated with autonomous motivation and external regulation respectively. Taken this concept to develop few commitment profiles, Sinclair et al., (2005) referred to these as:
(1) High affective commitment and low continuance commitment as emotionally attached.

(2) High continuance commitment and low affective commitment as trapped.

(3) High affective commitment and high continuance commitment as devoted, and

(4) A combination of low affective and low continuance commitment as uncommitted.

These profiles explain how different combination of affective commitment (AC) and continuance commitment (CC) affect the way one experience commitment. A mindset of autonomous motivation would likely be present when high AC is combined with low CC, and an individual experiencing emotionally attach with their organization. Here, the primary motivation to remain with the organization would likely be the interest, enjoyment, personal identification as well as personal competence. In contrast, when individual experience high CC within the context of low AC, a mindset of external regulation is present and individual feel trapped. Here the primary motivation would be to act (or to stay) to obtain external rewards or avoid cost. Now the feeling of individual has been change from trapped to devotion when high continuance commitment is combined with high affective commitment because motivational mindset reflect both autonomous as well as external regulation. Here, the mindset of individual is to staying in the organization for their own well being, feel sense of freedom, volition as well as their behaviour is instrumental for the organization. This profile reflects strong feeling of desire based and cost based commitment. Finally, combination of low AC and low CC would reflect lack of motivation so an individual experience uncommitted. From the above description it is emphasized that intrinsic and extrinsic motivations are the bases of affective and continuance commitment and their combined effect produce different psychological state which provide clear picture about nature of individual attachment with the
organization. Similar to above study, Somers (2009) also focuses on the combined influence of commitment on work outcomes especially, those associated with employees’ retention and citizenship behaviour. Somers hypothesized eight commitment profiles that include: highly committed, affective dominant, continuance dominant, normative dominant, affective-continuance dominant, affective-normative dominant, continuance-normative dominant, and uncommitted. Out of eight profiles, only five profile emerges as important profiles which were founded by using cluster analysis, these five are highly committed, AC-NC dominant, CC-NC dominant, continuance dominant and uncommitted. Somers suggested that each profile reflect relative strength of commitment that mitigates the potential negative effect of other variable in the organization. The study very clearly suggests that each individual react and behave according to their values and goal and experience each component in varying degrees, when we combine the relative strength of two dominant commitment components then it seem to mitigate the influence of negative effect of other variable.

Cohen (2007) proposed two dimensional approach of organizational commitment viz., timing of commitment and the bases of commitment. The timing of commitment distinguishes between commitment propensity and organizational commitment, which develops before and after entry into the organization respectively. The second dimension, the bases of commitment, makes a distinction between commitment based on instrumental considerations and commitment based on psychological attachment.

Following the above conceptualization, Cohen proposed four forms of organizational commitment, two of these develop before entry into the organization and two develop after becoming the part of an organization. The first two forms are (1) instrumental commitment propensity, which is derived from one’s general expectations
about the quality of the exchange with the organization in terms of expected benefits and rewards one might receive from it and; (2) normative commitment propensity, which refers to the belief that one has a moral obligation to demonstrate loyalty and duty towards the organization. The second two forms are (1) instrumental commitment, which results from one’s perception of the quality of the exchange between one’s contributions and the rewards that one’s receives, and (2) affective commitment, which refers as a psychological attachment to the organization demonstrated by identification with it, emotional involvement and a sense of belonging. These four forms of commitment modified the conceptualization of organizational commitment and solved two problem associated with Meyer’s and Allen’s theory of commitment (Cohen, 2007). First one was, the high correlation between affective and normative commitment (Ko et al., 1997; Meyer et al., 2002; and Bergaman, 2006) that question the contribution of normative commitment to the conceptualization of organizational commitment. Here, in the time dimension, normative commitment considered as a pre-entry commitment propensity that develop during individual past experiences, socialization and background culture, particularly which should be examined before entry into the organization not after entry. While affective commitment refers to a employees’ attachment towards the organization that develop after entry into the organization. From this conceptualization it is clear that the high correlation occur because normative commitment is a propensity to be committed that will lead to affective commitment. Second problem was associated with continuance dimension of organizational commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1991). The researcher contended that Meyer et al (1993) argued that Becker’s (1960) concept of commitment represents a component of attitudinal commitment because he emphasized the awareness of the cost associated with leaving the organization. However, Becker defined commitment as a
“consistent line of activity” such as maintaining membership in the organization and attempted to explain what causes this inconsistency. Ko et al. (1997) stated that Becker’s view of commitment seems to be more congruent with the behavioural rather than attitudinal approach of commitment. In order to avoid this problem, Cohen (2007) changed the orientation and conceptualization of commitment from the cost of leaving (continuance commitment) to the benefit of staying (instrumental commitment) that better represents the notion of exchange. Cohen’s approach is purely an attitudinal approach and which subsequently contributing in the development of organizational commitment by emphasizing time and motivational force as important dimension of commitment.

Mayer and Schoorman (1992) tested two-dimensional model of organizational commitment based on motivational distinction proposed by March and Simon (1958) between employees’ decisions to participate and to produce. According to them, commitment leading to participation was called “continuance commitment” and that leading to production called “value commitment”. They define value commitment as a belief in and acceptance of organization goals and values and a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization. Continuance commitment is defined as the desire to remain a member of the organization. An individual who has value commitment should engage in behaviours that help in achieving its goal. Therefore, value commitment is positively correlated with performance, work satisfaction and OCB. According to Schechter, (1985) an individual with strong continuance commitment should have a positive correlation with intent to stay and negatively correlated with absenteeism and quitting.

Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) defined commitment as the incentive that sustains a line of behaviour towards one or more objectives. Robbins (2005) too,
defined organizational commitment to some extent in the same line, i.e. a state in which
an employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals, and wishes to
maintain membership in the organization. In the same year, Muthuveloo and Rose
(2005) defined organizational commitment as employee’s acceptance, involvement and
dedication towards achieving the organization’s goals. It is the willingness of
employees to accept organizational values and goal, and to work towards achieving
these, and become fully involved and participate in all the activities, both work and non
work related, and to dedicate time and effort towards the betterment of the
organization. In other words, People who are committed to their organization are highly
involved in their organization and identify its goals and values. Such employees feel a
readiness to exert considerable effect on behalf of the organization, and have a strong
desire to remain as an organization member. (Hackett et al., 2001). According to Cole
(2000) who rightly described that a committed worker is one who is a team player, who
is willing to make personal sacrifices for the goal of the organization, who believes in
the organization’s product, who will recommend the organization as among the best
places to work, and who is prepared to stay at the organization for at least the next
several years, even if offered a modest pay increase elsewhere.

Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) pointed out that commitment in the work place
takes various forms and has the potential to influence organizational effectiveness and
well being. Those employees who experience high level of organizational commitment
are engaged in numerous work related behaviour such as organizational citizenship
behaviour and job performance as observed by Jaros (1997). Therefore, the concept of
organization has attracted considerable interest as an attempt to understand the intensity
and stability of employee dedication to work organization (Eisenberger et al., 1990).
Usually it is found that work characteristics in the organization has been linked with
organization commitment such as job content (Iverson and Buttigieg, 1999; Dunham, Grube and Castaneda, 1994), organizational support (Shore and Wagner, 1993) and Human resource management practice (Mayer and Schoorman 1998; Allen, Shore and Griffeth, 2003) that increase the level of commitment. So, it is important to identified factors that influence employees’ level of organizational commitment. Steers (1997) and Mottaz (1988) identified factors which help create intrinsically rewarding situations for employees to be antecedents of affective commitment. These are task significance, autonomy, identity, skills variety and feedback concerning employee job performance, perceived organizational support or dependence (the feeling that the organization considers what is in the best interest of employees when making decisions that affect employment conditions and work environment), and the degree that employees are involved in the goal-setting and decision making processes.

An exhaustive description of the concept and meaning of commitment with work and the organization has clearly revealed that the phenomenon of commitment has widely occupied the importance in this modern world hence, the concept and meaning have been differently vivid by different researcher but one aspect as emerged as a common factor among all description and view point that is the notion of human belongingness and attachment of a job incumbents with the work and the organization. Such work related personality attributes has been variedly described and discussed. However, the present investigators have undertaken the contention propounded by Meyer and Allen, 1991. Therefore, un-rejecting the contentions of others our contention of Meyer and Allen as the present study had undertaken the three aspects of commitment on which what scale we have used in this study is based on.

Having deliberated on organizational commitment, there is another important dependent variable namely job satisfaction which also required attention so far as its
emergence as a concept and meaning are concerned. It is highly important to highlight at this place that job satisfaction is a phenomenon which have been existing right from the very beginning of the existence of men on earth as for example when men started killing animals by using stones, if they are succeeded in killing the animals they could have filled satisfied whereas in the other case the people might have the feeling of dissatisfaction. But the concept of job satisfaction could have taken place only in 1935 with the work of Hoppock that generated a lot of interest among researchers to think of ones job satisfaction because job satisfaction is an ultimate end of all efforts and its tried which people make to achieve. Therefore, the ongoing discussion will pertain to job satisfaction and it might be observed from the increasing importance of the concept of job satisfaction and its related theories and studies. It is still a living concept and will remain till the world survives.

**Job Satisfaction**

In every one’s life work has an important aspect. One spends at least a major part of his adult life in doing some job and serving an organization either as an employee or as an employer. So, work cannot be separated from family and/or social life of individual, work provides opportunity to an individual to exhibit his creative potentials and also to get satisfied his economic needs and subsequently to satisfy all his/her basic and psycho-social needs. In this fast changing world the life of every individual has become very complex because of changing values, value system, socio-cultural milieu, globalization and due to competitiveness that altered the life style of individuals. Therefore, job satisfaction is a key research area and is one of the most frequently studied work attitudes in the field of organizational behaviour (Mitchel and Larson, 1987; Judge and Church, 2000). Job satisfaction considered as an attitude that
an employee has towards his or her job (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951; Nelson and Quick, 1997; Weiss, 2002; Robbins, 2003). As an attitude, job satisfaction is a sum of cognitive, affective and evaluative reactions resulting from experience at work (Locke, 1976; Greenberg and Baron, 1997). The cognitive component refers an individual’s perceptions, opinion, beliefs and expectations regarding the job; the affective component of an attitude represents the feeling evoked by the job either pleasurable or unpleasant; and the evaluative component includes an individual’s overall response to the employing organization which represents like or dislike for the job. When an individual perceives his or her expectations likely to be fulfilled and feel accepted and treated as valued member of the organization and perception of being paid equitable are likely one to evaluate job positively that in turn make an individual to get satisfied with the job. Satisfied worker are likely to be more productive, creative and may have favourable evaluation of their job based on their observations and emotional experiences.

In organizational behaviour literature, there are two major approaches in the conceptualization of job satisfaction. In one approach, the concern is with the employee’s general feelings about his or her job. In contrast to this, the other approach emphasizes feelings about the facets of the job like salary, job security, social aspect of the job, opportunity for advancement on the job, supervision, co-workers and the work itself. In global approach, over all job satisfaction becomes the sum of the expressed degree of satisfaction with the different facets. However, it has been generally accepted that the measurement of job satisfaction would need to assess the job facets (Locke, 1976) because the facet approach provide a clear picture of an individual’s job satisfaction than a global approach.
The term ‘Job Satisfaction’ was brought to lime light by Robert Hoppock (1935) who offered one of the earliest definition of job satisfaction as “any psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say, ‘I am satisfied with my job’. From this definition, it is clear that there are several variables that influence the satisfaction of the individual. According to Drever (1956) “job satisfaction is the end state of feeling”, from this definition, it appears that the words or vocabularies used to define job satisfaction is related to the feeling of an employee that he/she experiences after the accomplishment of a task or activity that takes place during the course of the completion of the task. In the words of Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) job satisfaction is “the feelings the worker has about his or her job”. These feelings were based on the employee’s perception of the difference between what was expected as fair return and what was actually experienced. The comprehensive definition of job satisfaction was given by Locke (1976) which has been described in terms of “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values”. That is, it is the discrepancy between what an employee values and what the situation provides. Thus, job satisfaction is a result of employee’s perception of how well their job provides those things which they view as important. A plethora of definition found in organizational behaviour literatures, which define job satisfaction in various ways. Sinha (1974) stated job satisfaction in terms of reintegration of effect produced by individual’s perception, fulfillment of his needs in relation to his work and the situation in its surrounding. Schultz (1982) defines job satisfaction as “the psychological disposition of people towards their work and this involves a collection of numerous attitudes or feelings”. Dawis and Lofquist (1984) define job satisfaction as the result of the worker’s appraisal of the degree to which the
work environment fulfills the employees’ needs. Siegal and Lance (1982) simply state that job satisfaction is an emotional response defining the degree to which people like their job. In the words of Lofquist and Dawis (1991) “job satisfaction as an employee’s positive affective evaluation of the target environment; result of an employee’s requirements being fulfilled by the target environment; a pleasant affective state; the employees’ appraisal of the extent to which his or her requirement are fulfilled by the environment”. While Igbaria and Guimaraes (1993) referred “job satisfaction to primary affective reactions of individuals to various facets of the job and job experience”. They give importance to various facets of job that compel an employee to say happily, I am satisfied with my job. Spector (1997) believed that job satisfaction “can be considered as a global feeling about the job or as a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job”. This definition suggested that satisfaction is the result of positive affective feeling that an individual has about his/her job and also towards the various facets of a job. Spector identified 9 facets of job satisfaction.

1. Pay —equity of salary.
2. Promotion —opportunities and fairness of promotion.
3. Supervision —supportive and fair
4. Benefits —insurance, paid-vacation, and fringe-benefits
5. Contingent rewards —sense of respect, recognition and appreciation
6. Operating condition —policies, procedures, rules
7. Coworkers —perceived competence and pleasantness of ones colleagues
8. Nature of work —enjoyment of the actual tasks themselves
9. Communication —sharing information within the organization (verbally or in writing) (Spector, 1985).
Job satisfaction conceptualized as an assessment of one’s job in terms of whether it allows the fulfillment of one’s important job values, which are congruent with one’s needs (Hackman and Oldham, 1975; Jayaratne, 1993; Boon, Arumugam, Vellapan, Yin and Wei, 2006). Hackman and Oldham, 1975; Jayaratne, 1993; and Greenberg (2005) outlined five facets of job satisfaction: pay or the extent to which an employee is satisfied with his or her pay in relation to the job he or she does; job security, which measures how secure an employee feels about the tenure of his or her employment; social facet or the degree of satisfaction an employee feels about his or her relationship with coworkers; supervisory facet, which relates to the extent to which people feel that their supervisors are supportive of them at work; and growth facet, which refers to the degree people feel satisfied with their prospect for advancement in the workplace.

Hackman and Oldham (1976) proposed Job Characteristics Model (JCM), which is widely used as a framework to study how particular job characteristics impact on job satisfaction. The model states that there are five core job characteristics i.e., skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback which impact three critical psychological states (experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of the actual results), in turn influencing work outcomes i.e., internal work motivation, quality work performance, job satisfaction, absenteeism and turnover. When all these five characteristics presents in the job then it will lead to high quality work performance, job satisfaction, work motivation and lower level of absenteeism and turn over. A meta-analysis of study that assesses the framework of the model provides support for the validity of the JCM (Fried and Ferris, 1987).

Job satisfaction has been received increasing attention in organization behaviour because satisfied worker are more likely to be motivated, committed and happy with
their job that will lead to high quality performance, increase work productivity, organizational effectiveness and reduce employees’ turnover, absenteeism. Job satisfaction also plays an important role in improving the financial standing of organizations (Aronson et al., 2005). In this respect job satisfaction is an organizational variable which should be understood and constantly monitored for the welfare of any organization. Thus, job satisfaction being an important attribute which organizations desire of all their employees (Oshagbemi, 2003). In fact, most organizations do wisely monitor the satisfaction levels of their employees (Terpstra and Honoree, 2004), and identified factors that influence level of satisfaction like co-workers, supervision, nature of the work, salaries, fringe benefits, achievement, autonomy, recognition, communication pattern, working conditions, job importance, degree of professionalism, organizational climate, interpersonal relationships, supervisory support, positive affectivity, job security, workplace flexibility, working within a team environment, age, gender, equal treatment by management, job design and income (Robbins, 2005; Onu et al., 2005; Sur et al., 2004; Tutuncu and Kozak, 2006; DeVaney and Chen, 2003; Greenberg, 1986). The job aspects that are most frequently perceived as responsible for low satisfaction are pay (Kusku, 2003; Oshagbemi, 1997; Kelly, 1989), administration policy, availability of resources, working conditions (Kelly, 1989), promotion systems (Lacy and Sheehan, 1997; Oshagbemi, 1996). Moreover, Rad and Yarmohammadian (2006) identified factors which are associated with low satisfaction are unskilled or inappropriately trained staff, laborious tasks such as documentation, repetition of duties, tensions within role expectations, role ambiguity, role conflict, feeling overloaded, the increasing need to be available for overtime, relations with co-workers, personal factors and organizational factors.
Researchers interested in job satisfaction because of the fact that, job satisfaction has the potential to affect a wide range of behaviours in organization and contribute to employee’s level of well being (George and Jones, 2008). It is also related to the assumption that more satisfied workers are also more productive. Ghazzawi (2008) pointed out four main general factors that may lead to job satisfaction. These are:

1. The worker’s personality
2. The worker’s values
3. The social influence; and
4. The work situation itself

Employee’s personality traits either extraversion or introversion has significantly influence the level of job satisfaction. An employee who is highly extrovert has a significantly high level of job satisfaction as compared to those who is low on the same trait (George and Jones, 2008). An employee who valuing the job itself is more likely to be satisfied when compared to a employee, who valuing the outcomes of the job. The social influence is also an important factor that accounts in job satisfaction. It is related to the individuals and group evaluation of the job either being positive or negative (George and Jones, 2008). Finally, the work situations are also considered as an important determinant of job satisfaction. The degree of challenges, the type of task and responsibilities, or the types of interactions that an employee might have on work are commonly used predictors of job satisfaction (Huselid, 1995; Yazel, 2001).

There have been many theories used in the study of job satisfaction. The most used theories are Maslow hierarchy of needs, Herzberg two factor theory, Expectancy theory, and Equity theory.
Maslow (1943) proposed theory of hierarchy of need based on human need and motivation. In this theory, he categorized human need into five hierarchical order namely physiological, security, social, esteem need and the self actualization need. According to him, once an individual satisfied one need in hierarchy it ceases to motivate their behaviour and they are motivated by the need next in hierarchy. Therefore, an individual may continue on toward satisfaction of all his/her need. Furthermore, this theory also contended that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction share same continuum that mean if presence of certain need led to satisfaction then it absence lead to dissatisfaction.

 Originally, Maslow's theory was not intended as an explanation of motivation in the work place. However, many managerial theorists have enthusiastically adopted it, like Blackler and Williams (1971) stated that Maslow’s theory was first presented to work organization by Douglas McGregor in 1960. This presentation was not carried out in the terminology normally associated with Maslow’s theory, but rather in terms of the now well known theory X and theory Y. In that he grouped the hierarchy into “lower order” (theory X) needs and “higher order” (theory Y) needs. Furthermore, Haire in 1964 acknowledged the utility of the theory in work place setting. According to him, employees are motivated by the desire to satisfy their strongest needs at any given time. Consequently satisfaction at work would be connected to the opportunities that are available within the organization to satisfy these basic needs. The more the job allows fulfillment of these needs, the more likely the individual is to report satisfaction with his/her work or job.

 In spite of wide recognition of Maslow’s effort, researcher has failed to offer strong support to validate the theory (Robbins et al., 2003; Ifinedo, 2003; Lawler and
Suttle, 1972). Maslow himself did not provide any empirical support. Although, many continue to find hierarchy model very attractive (Naylor, 1999).

Herzberg and his associate namely Mausner and Snyderman (1959) refuted the concept of single continuum and presented two-factor theory, which looks at motivators and hygienes and proposed that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction caused by two different and independent sets of factors. He found that when people are satisfied, they attribute their satisfaction to the work itself, while when people are dissatisfied with their job, they are concerned about the environment in which they work. Therefore, it can be say that job satisfaction is cause by a set of factors related to the work itself such as nature of work, responsibility, recognition, achievement, and personal growth and advancement. Herzberg regards them as motivators because the presence of these factors satisfied worker and motivate for higher performance and but their absence did not lead to dissatisfaction. On the other hand, job dissatisfaction is related to circumstances close to the work environment such as supervision, salary, working condition, policies, security, and relationship with colleagues. Herzberg regards these factors as hygiene's. Hygiene factors produced an acceptable working environment but did not increase satisfaction their absence did however caused job dissatisfaction.

Herzberg theory is one of the unique theories in the area of organizational psychology (Furnham, 1997). Therefore, this theory has wide implications for the management who wants to use human resource successfully.

Despite its intuitive appeal, two factors theory has been criticized by researcher, because they found many flows in Herzberg methodology (Locke, 1969). Studies which support Herzberg theory come from Herzberg's sample and methodology. Numerous empirical studies have attempted to replicate and test Herzberg's finding with independent data and methods found little success (e.g. Hulin and Smith, 1967).
Contrary to Herzberg claims, researcher has consistently shown that intrinsic and extrinsic factors contribute to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Wernimont, 1966). Furthermore, theory does not allow individual differences, such as particular personality traits, which would affect individual unique responses to motivation or hygiene factors (Hackman and Oldham, 1976).

Adams (1963) presented an equity-based theory and proposed that employees perceive their job as a series of inputs (such as effort, ability and experience) and outcome (include things like salary, recognition, and opportunity) ratio. According to this theory employees seek equity in rewards they receive for their performance. It means that job satisfaction is the direct result of employees’ perceptions of how fairly they are being treated in comparison to those workers who have almost similar job, having similar skill, capabilities, work load, seniority etc. When input to a job and the resulting outcomes are equal to what their coworkers have then this condition is likely to be instrumental in enhancing motivation and satisfaction of employees. On the other hand, if there is any inequity that take place between input and outcome factors then this may most likely to lead to over satisfaction or dissatisfaction, hence, in both the conditions employees do not successfully fulfill their duties and subsequently their performance are deteriorated. This social equity is not limited to others within the same workplace, an equity comparison often reach to other organizations that are viewed as similar place of employment (Milkovich and Newman, 1990). Researches by McKenna (2000) and Sweeney (1990) confirm equity theory as one of the most useful frameworks for understanding work motivation.

Two aspects of equity theory have been subject to examination and criticism: negative outcome/input ratios (Alessio, 1980; Harris, 1976; Walster, 1975; Walster, Berscheid, and Walster, 1973; Zuckerman, 1975) and the multidimensional nature of
inputs (Alessio, 1980; Anderson, 1976; Anderson and Farkas, 1975; Farkas and Anderson, 1979; Leventhal, 1976.)

Vroom (1964) proposed expectancy theory that emphasized, people are motivated at work when they perceive a link between effort and reward. He incorporates the expectation of individuals into his theory, i.e., individual expectation of more effort and better performance at work will result in positive outcome (means rewarded accordingly). Any discrepancy between expected reward and actual outcome will result dissatisfaction. He generates three variable equations for determining job satisfaction. Expectancy is the first variable that defines it as individual's perception of how well he/she can carry out the given task. Instrumentality is the second variable and refers to the individual’s confidence that he/she will be rewarded fairly for performing the task. Valence is the third variable, which considers the value of the expected reward to the employee. In this theory all three variable considered as important because when these factors high on their degree it will lead to workers satisfaction and motivation. If any of the factors are low, worker performance and motivation decline and they will be dissatisfied.

The preceding writings had deliberated on the two important criterion variables namely, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. It is warranted here to emphasize upon the fact that organizational commitment and job satisfaction are the two important behavioural phenomena that are most likely to enhance individual as well as organizational efficiency and subsequently to organizational effectiveness—a hallmark of organizational success. These two behavioural aspects seem to be the outcome of certain factors and to the present investigator self-concept and organizational identification are likely to play more important role. Therefore, self-concept and organizational identification were chosen as predictor variables to see their
pattern of predictive influence through empirical investigation. Since the two predictor variable viz., self-concept and organizational identification are the part of whole endeavour in pursuit of PhD work, so their descriptions and explanations are also necessary as have already been given in case of criterion variables. Hence, ongoing deliberation will pertain to self-concept and organizational identification.

Self-Concept

Self-concept is the most important personality variable that determines ones behaviour. It is imperative to mention at this juncture that everyone has self-concept either at conscious or unconscious level or people exercise the understanding of oneself either voluntarily or involuntarily. However, everyone behaviour is most likely to be directed by his/her self-concept. But the variation in success-failure, appropriateness-inappropriateness and so on are the outcome of one’s realistic or unrealistic understanding about his/her self. Moreover, the literature on self-concept synonymously have undertaken self esteem, optimism-pessimism and realistic and unrealistic. To the present investigator realistic and unrealistic understanding about oneself depict the real meaning of self, although we have liberally included the notion of positive-negative, low-high and optimism-pessimism.

With these above assertions, the ongoing description of self-concept will see the relevance of this phenomenon from its historical perspectives.

Modern men have also placed significant importance to self-concept and according to them self-concept identified as an important construct in organizational science, because it is related to the positive outcomes of the organization. Self-concept is the person beliefs and understanding about oneself that develop from the experiences that he/she gains from the interaction in social world and are concerned with one’s
personality traits, abilities, physical features, values, goals, and social roles. The need to think positive and feel positive about oneself helps in the achievement of individuals and organizational goals. More generally, in every walk of life, individuals can achieve more, if they feel competent in what they do (in realistic sense), are self confident, and feel positively about themselves. Those employees who think and feel more able to perform particular tasks, will actually perform better on these task, will persist in the face of adversity, and will cope more effectively with change are viewed by Parker (1998). In view of Pierce and Gardner (2004) organizational researchers have shown that employees who believe themselves to be valuable persons in organizations have higher work motivation and more favourable attitudes toward their jobs and organizations than those who do not. Therefore, researcher agreed that one’s self-concept was extremely valuable and must be protected and enhanced (Grubb and Grathwohl, 1967; Belk, 1988).

The notion of self-concept is evident from the writing of William James in “Principle of Psychology”. James (1890) divided the self into the empirical "me" and the knower "I," thus providing the duplex of self as both the source and object of thought. James (1892) proposed that, “... a man’s self is a sum of all that he can call his, not only his body and psychic powers, but his clothes and his house…” This implies that one’s view of one’s self extends beyond his/her personal being and includes assets and other external elements. James (1890/1901) referred to self as the empirical self and divided the constituents of the self into four sub-categories: (1) the material self which includes the body, family, home, and other person, (2) the social self, which include the recognition that the individual gets from others, (3) the spiritual self, which is a man’s inner or subjective being and, (4) the pure ego, the most enduring and intimate part of the self. These four classes constitute an actual self. James believed
that individual choose the type of self they want to become or perceived as personally relevant and as suiting their private interests. Soon after James ‘empirical self’, Cooley (1902) published his theory concerning a ‘looking-glass self’, that is influenced by the school of thought known as symbolic interactions. Cooley’s theory asserts that one’s self-concept is a reflection of one’s perceptions about how one appears to others. Cooley developed the idea of the looking-glass self and stated that the self is inseparable from social life and necessarily involves some reference to others. Cooley observed that, “a self idea of this sort seems to have three principle elements: the imagination of our appearance to the other person; the imagination of his judgment of the appearance, and some sort of self feeling such as pride or mortification” (1902). According to Cooley looking-glass self is reflective of the way in which significant other’s perceived us to be.

Raimy (1943) who was the first defined the self-concept as “the self-concept is the more or less organized perceptual object resulting from present and past self observation ...(i.e.,) what a person believes about himself. The self-concept is the map which each person consults in order to understand himself, especially during moment of crises or choice”. According to Raimy point of view, self-concept serves as an executive in that it represents for the individual a way to make a variety of decision with some consistency. Varied nature and meaning of the self-concept have been viewed differently by different people, which are being presented here for perusal.

Self-concept has been viewed within various theoretical frameworks as Rogers (1951) defined self-concept as “an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one’s characteristics and abilities, the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment, the value qualities which are perceived as associated
with experiences and objects, and the goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive or negative valence.” Roger proposed a new dimension to self-concept by classifying self-concept as real and ideal self-concept. The real self-concept is the self as actually perceived and the ideal self-concept is the self as ideally desired. In Rogers’ view, the self is the central ingredient in human personality and personal adjustment, hence, according to Turner and Vanderlippe (1958) any discrepancy between the real and ideal self indicate lack of adjustment. Rogers described the self as a social product, developing out of interpersonal relationships and striving for consistency. Purkey & Schmidt (1987) pointed out that Rogers maintained that there is a basic human need for positive regard, both from others and from oneself and he also believed that in every person there is a tendency towards self-actualization and development so long as this is permitted and encouraged by an inviting environment.

Lowe (1961) referred self-concept as one’s attitude towards self, and Pedersen (1965) contends it as an organized configuration of perception, beliefs, feelings, attitudes and values which the individual views as a part of his/her characteristics. Coopersmith (1967) viewed self-concept as being a personal judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes of the individual who holds toward him/herself as capable, significant, worthy, or successful. Purkey (1970) emphasized that the self-concept is not a static entity, but a dynamic construct, constantly evolving internal state. The self has been seen as instinctive, but developing as a process of experience, possessing infinite capacity for growth and change. The self is seen as both object and process, with behavior being dependent upon perceptions. Gordon (1968) self-concept is viewed as a determining element in behavior. A basic assumption has been postulated that behavior is a function of perception; and perception is a function of self-concept.
Rosenberg (1979) defined self-concept as "... the totality of the individual’s thoughts and feelings having reference to himself as an object". Similarly, Shavelson, Hubner and Stanton (1976) posited that ‘self-concept in general terms is one’s perception of self. These perceptions are derived from one’s experience with and interpretation of one’s environment and is influenced by environmental reinforcements and significant others’. Further, Shavelson et al. (1976) identified a number of distinctive features of self-concept such as:

1. Organized
2. Multifaceted
3. Hierarchical
4. Stable (general self-concept)/ Unstable (situational)
5. Developmental
6. Evaluative or descriptive
7. Differentiable or Separate

The first feature of self-concept is its organized or structured categorization given to experiences and the experiences perceived meaning. Secondly, the self-concept is multifaceted in that the self-concept's category system has different areas such that the general construct of self-concept can be divided into academic, social, emotional, and physical spheres. Self-concept is hierarchical in that facets of general self-concept are built upon particular situations from specific individual experiences. The fourth feature of self-concept is that the general self-concept which is stable. Situational self-concept appears more unstable as it has greater dependency on and more direct relation to situation-specific experiences. This is a case in which the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. The fifth feature of self-concept is its developmental nature. As the infant matures and learns to differentiate self from
environment, the self-concept begins to develop. The child's self-concept is global, undifferentiated and situation-specific, but with age and increased experiences, the self-concept develops into a more specific, differentiated, individual construct. The sixth feature involves the evaluative character of self-concept. Self-evaluation can be a comparison against absolute standards (an ideal), relative standards (peers), or the perceived evaluation of significant others. The final feature in Shavelson et al.'s construct definition is that self-concept is differentiable from other constructs to which it is theoretically related.

According to Burns (1980) self-concept is “a composite image of what we think we are what we think others think of us and what we would like to be”. There are also people like Secorg and Backman (1974) and Shibutani (1961) who contend that “self-concept determines one’s behaviour pattern to a large extent because we all strive to act in consistence with our self-concept”.

Kalliopuska (1984) enumerated three components which help in building self-concept of an individual. These are (1) cognitive components, which are connected with the qualities and functions of self evaluation and social interaction, (2) affective components, which illustrates the person’s feelings towards himself/herself, (3) behavioural components, which refers to those connotations with which the individual behaves in ways, which may either underestimate or appreciate himself/herself.

Baumeister (1997) described the term self-concept as “the totality of inferences that a person has made about himself or herself” that represents evaluative aspect of individual self in terms of positive or negative self. Individual with positive self-concept evaluate him/herself positively and build positive inferences about him/her while with negative self-concept individual evaluate negatively and have negative inferences. An individual's evaluation of him/herself will greatly influence his
behavior, and thus, the more valued the self, the more organized and consistent becomes his behavior or vice versa. Purkey (1998) defined self-concept “as the cognitive or thinking aspect of ‘self’ related to one’s self-image and generally refers to the totality of a complex, organized and dynamic system of learned beliefs, attitudes and opinions that each person holds to be true about his existence”. Schiffman et al. (2001) described that self-concept consist of four components, actual self-concept, ideal self-concept, social self-concept and ideal social self-concept. Within this framework, actual self-concept refers to the present way in which individuals perceive themselves (reality), whereas, the ideal self-concept represents the manner in which they would like to perceive themselves. Social self-concept represents the way individuals believe others perceive them, while ideal social self-concept represents the way the individual desires to be perceived by others.

Self-concept has been conceptualized as both a unidimensional and a multidimensional construct or multi-level, as referred to by self-concept theorists. A commonly used multi-level conceptualization is seen in Brewer and Gardner (1996) model, which distinguishes between three aspects of self-concept, the personal, relational, and collective self. The personal self is defined as the sense of unique identity that differentiates individuals from others and is considered to be trait based in its formation (Brewer and Gardner, 1996). In other words, as cited in Johnson and Chang (2006) at individual level, attitudes and behaviour reflect motivation driven by a concern for one’s own advantage and well-being (Brewer and Gardner, 1996; Lord and Brown, 2004), where personal goals are most important and the criterion for performance is personal success. The emphasis that employees with strong individual self-concept levels give weight age to their own achievement that leads to interpersonal comparisons where self-worth is derived via one’s sense of uniqueness and
exceptionality and parallels the process of differentiation as a means to develop individuality (Kampmeier and Simon, 2001; Simon and Kampmeier, 2001 in Johnson and Chang, 2006). In organizational settings, employees with activated individual self-concepts are particularly sensitive to information pertaining to personal outcomes (e.g., pay, benefits) that represent visible benchmarks of personal success and standards for comparing oneself to others (Johnson and Chang, 2006). Second is the relational self which is derived from dyadic interpersonal relationships (e.g., parent-child relationship), is based on roles, and is focused on the needs of others (Brewer and Gardner, 1996). In other words, The relational level involves defining oneself in terms of specific others and acting in accordance with the role expectations of the other person, appropriate role behavior regarding a specific person determines self-worth (Brewer and Gardner, 1996; Markus and Kitayama, 1991; in Johnson and Chang, 2006). The third one is the collective self that is described in terms of social identification and the internalization of norms and characteristics of important reference groups, and is focused on group welfare (Brewer and Gardner, 1996). As described by Johnson and Chang (2006) the collective level involves motivation that is concerned with the welfare of one’s group, which serves to promote social systems and collective interests (Brewer and Gardner, 1996; Tajfel and Turner, 1986; Turner et al., 1987). At this level, the self is defined in terms of group membership. Hence, the individuals are likely to internalize the goals and norms of their group and may derive satisfaction when they successfully fulfill their social roles and obligations. Rather than engaging in interpersonal comparisons. Individuals with collective self-concepts differentiate by contrasting the groups they belong to with those they do not. This coincides with the self-aspect model which suggests that a collective self is found to be based on self-aspects that one shares with some people but not others.
From the above description with regard to self-concept, it is amply clear that self-concept is a key to success which is most likely to determine behaviour, especially here in case of work related behaviour viz., organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Similarly, organizational identification is another predictor variable which was taken in the present study to see its nature of predictive influence or relationship to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. It seems, in fact true that organizational identification and self-concept may also have a positive relationship with each other. However, over-looking the significance of the two predictor variables, it is warranted here to describe the concept and meaning of organizational identification and its probable impact or relationship on/to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The detailed descriptions of the phenomenon of organizational identification follow:

Organizational Identification

The notions of identification appear very early propounded by psychoanalytic theory. Gautam, Van Dick and Wagner (2004) stressed that Freud (1922) considers identification as ‘an emotional tie with another person.’ Here, emphasis is given to affective attachment of employees with others. Freud (1949) described identification as “the endeavour to mould a person’s own ego after the fashion of one that has been taken as a model.” From his assertion, it can be said that identification is a subjective experience that arise in social context, embed the individual to change their sense of self when identified. Sanford, (1955), Kagan (1958) and Kelman (1958) have highlighted that most of the personality theories emphasize identification as a process to internalize social value during the process of socialization in childhood period.
Organizational identification refers to the sense of belongingness an individual holds pertaining to work organization. Tolman (1943) refers it as oneness between an individual and his/her work organization which has gained increasing attention in organizational behavioural science, because it affects both the satisfaction of an individual as well as the effectiveness of an organization.

An individual who identified strongly with his/her organization is most likely to strike hard in the accomplishment of organizational goals and sometimes such people are motivated in the accomplishment of organizational goals beyond their capacities were the contentions of Katz and Khan (1978). Organizations with high levels of employees identification with, therefore, may have more cohesive work atmosphere and greater levels of cooperation, involvement and altruistic behaviour, including greater levels of citizenship behaviour and support for the organization. Furthermore, organization with high level of employee’s identification increases the likelihood opportunities to make decisions that are in the interest of organization’s strategies, when faced with choice (Whetton and Godfrey, 1998). On the other hand, employees can benefit from positive self-esteem and the satisfaction of the human need to belong (Ashforth and Mael, 1989; Rousseau, 1998).

In an organizational context, Foote (1951) for the first time used the term identification and considered identification as a basis for motivation (Bartel, 2006). Foote (1951) also described organizational identification as ‘appropriation of and commitment to a particular identity or series of identities that describes human beings tends to identify with members in groups; that they categorize the social world around them in order to regularizes their doings; and that these categorizations of experiences motivate behaviour through the necessary commitment of individuals in all situations. According to Foot, organizational identification is the conception of the individual as a
member of the organization that is most likely to motivate individuals to act on behalf of the organization. Brown (1969) contended identification as ‘a self-defining response, set in specific relationship between the individual and his or her organization.’ Brown’s approach on identification focuses on four aspects of involvement: (1) attraction to the organization, (2) consistency of organizational and individual goals, (3) loyalty toward the organization, and (4) reference of self to organizational membership. These aspects constitute the basic components of organizational identification.

Lee (1971) defined organizational identification as ‘the degree of the individual’s broad personal identification with the organization’. His approach emphasized three main aspects of organizational identification viz., (1) belongingness—a sense of belongingness resulting from common goals shared with others or employees’ feelings that their function fulfils their personal needs, (2) loyalty— which addressed attitudes and behaviours like support for organizational goals, taking pride in the tenure in the organization or defending the organization to the outsiders, and (3) shared characteristics implies a certain similarity in quality between the individual and others within the organization. Almost in the same pace of time a third approach of identification was offered by Patchen (1970) in his book ‘Participation, Achievement and Involvement in the Job’. Patchen conceptualized organizational identification as involving a composite of the three phenomena that include (1) a perception of shared characteristics with organizational members, where an individual possesses shared interest and goals with other organizational members, (2) a feeling of solidarity with the organization, where the individual feels a sense of belongingness to that organization, and (3) support of the organization, where the individual supports and defends the organizational goals and policies. Furthermore, Hall, Schneider and Nygren (1970) saw organizational identification as ‘the process by which the goals of the organization and
those of the individual become increasingly integrated or congruent’. Edwards (2005) writes about Hall, Schneider and Nygren (1970) description that their approach on organizational identification emphasized on two aspects: (1) goal and value acceptance and (2) emotional commitment to the organization. According to their definition they used the notion of self that is integrated with the organization by integrating goals and values of organization into one’s own identity. This goal and value acceptance and their integration into the individual’s own value and goal system lead to a degree of emotional commitment to the organization.

From the above approaches, it has been clear that several conceptualization of organizational identification emerged but the most dominant approach to organizational identification is associated with social identity theory and self categorization theory (Tajfel, 1972; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel and Turner, 1979). According to social identity theory (SIT), the self-concept comprises of two components i.e., a personal identity that encompass an individual’s unique sense of self (like bodily attributes, abilities, psychological traits, interest) and a social identity that defined as “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership.” Therefore, according to Tajfel and Turner (1985) in order to construct their self-concept, especially the social part, people tend to classify themselves and others into various social categories (like organizational membership, religious affiliation, gender and age cohort) and assign themselves as the member of a particular group. Earlier Tolman (1943) had already stressed upon that through categorization processes, individual identify themselves as members of particular groups and perceive themselves as psychologically knotted with the group’s fate, sharing its common destiny, and experiencing its successes and failures. This social categorization and
identification is one part of the theory, the other part of the theory concerning that individuals have a tendency for social comparisons in order to understand social environment, they compare themselves to others on the basis of their membership of particular groups. Additionally, theory also described that individual has self esteem needs, and people will try to enhanced positive self image either by trying to enhance their personal identity or social identity.

Ashforth and Mael (1989) were the first researchers, who draw the idea of social identity theory in explaining organizational identification. Social identification is the perception of belongingness to a group and a sense of oneness with the group and organizational identification is a specific form of social identification where the individual defines him or herself in terms of their membership in a particular organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Moreover, the most important social identification component Ashforth and Mael (1989) refer to is the idea of self-categorization. This means that, greater levels of organizational identification occur when members categorize themselves into a social group (the organization), on the basis of distinctiveness and prestige of the organization. By identifying with an organization, employees perceive themselves as psychologically intertwined with the organization’s fate, sharing its common destiny, and experiencing its successes and failures. After three years of Ashforth and Mael (1989) contribution, Mael and Ashforth (1992) formally defined organizational identification as ‘the perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization, where the individual defines him/herself in terms of the organization(s) in which he/she is a member’. By definition organizational identification is organization specific, employees may suffer from a psychic-loss, if an organization to which they identify merge into a new entity (Levinson, 1970). Based on
their definition given in 1992, Mael and Ashforth developed a six items scale measuring organization identification.

A little later, Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) said about identification as the idea of a ‘person’s self-concept containing the same attributes as those in the perceived organizational identity’. This means that when employees identify strongly with the organization, the attributes they use to define themselves are also used to define the organization. In other words, organization identification means that ‘an individual has accepted the organization’s goal and values to the degree that these goals and values are identical to what he/she sees as central, distinctive and enduring about their organization’ (Dutton et al, 2004). Thus, organizational identification is one form of psychological attachment that occurs when individual adopt the defining characteristics of the organization as defining characteristics for themselves (Dutton et al., 1994). Note from the definition that identification is based on self-perception rather than the person’s perception of an organization. Dutton et al. (1994) emphasized that an employees identity as an organizational member can be more important than alternative identities. Furthermore, if some one’s self-concept has many similar characteristics as the organization, it is more likely that he or she will define the organization as a social group. In view of Edwards (2005) there view strongly embedded in social identity theory but in contrast with the earlier concept, they introduce the term perceived organizational identity in their review. Otherwise, this approach has some overlap with earlier concept of organizational identification in which terms like shared characteristics are used.

In view of Pratt (1998) ‘organizational identification occurs when an individual’s beliefs about his or her organization become self-referential or self-defining’. Self-referential occurring through “affinity”, which one is recognized as a
collective or role “deemed similar to one’s self”. And self-defining occurs through “emulation” where one changes “to become more similar” to the collective or role. Pratt’s (1998) view involves the integration of “beliefs about one’s organization into one’s identity” and that “identification explicitly refers to the social aspects of a person’s identity”.

Rousseau (1998) defined identification as a psychological state in which individuals perceive themselves to be part of a large whole, specifically the organization. According to him, identification is cognition of the self in relation to the organization. Rousseau (1998) has used slightly different approach and divided identification into two processes:

(1) Situated identification refers to ‘a perception of a discrete work setting, created by situational cues signaling shared interests’. Here, she emphasized that employees carry out work that is expected of them in their role and situational cues that encourage a perception of shared interests. This perceived shared interest, where individuals see themselves as part of a large organizational identity due to situational cues, is what Rousseau called situational identification. This form of identification can form quickly and can also disappear as situational cues are removed. Thus, situational identification remains salient as long as the cues persist;

(2) A deep structured identification is develop where the employees formed such a connection with the organization that involves cognitive (self) schemas in which employees’ relationships has in some respects altered the mental model that they have of themselves. This second form of identification occurs across situations and overtime and lead to congruence between people’s self at work and their broader self-concept as contended by Turner (1978). To the large extant all the above approach mentioned that identification is perceived as a cognitive process. Johnson, Johnson and Heimberg
(1999) defined organizational identification as “a process of internal and external persuasion by which the interests of an individual merge with the interest of an organization, resulting in the creation of identification based on those interests”. This concept described organizational identification as a social and psychological process whereby, members of an organization develop and maintain an attachment with an organization, and behave in ways that represent the best interest of the organization.

Van Dick (2001) examined Ashforth and Mael’s (1989) definition of organizational identification. He opined that Ashforth and Mael’s definitions focus on cognitive aspects of identification. Based on the assumptions of social identity theory, several authors (e.g. Bergami and Bagozzi, 1996; Van Dick, 2001) expanded the scope of organization identification. Van Dick (2001) stated that identification emphasizes four different components that are as follow:

1. A cognitive component, which is the knowledge of a certain group membership (i.e. the acceptance of being seen as the member of a certain group),

2. An affective component, which describes the emotional attachment to this group (i.e. the individual’s assignment of positive feelings with the group),

3. An evaluative component which is the value connotation assigned to that group (i.e. the perception of positive and negative assessments from outside), and

Van Dick emphasized above three components based on social identity theory given by Tajfel and Turner (1979) and they added fourth component based on the work of ethnic identity. Research on ethnic identification has shown that a person’s identification is also indicated by his or her participation in (ethnic) group behaviours (Phinney 1991). Therefore, it could also included a fourth component namely

4. A conative (i.e. a behavioural) component which include actual behaviour (i.e. participation in actions which are relevant for the group).
Van Dick recognized cognitive as well as affective component in the process of identification while evaluative and behavioural components as an outcome of identification process than the process itself.

Identification has important implications at the individual, group, and organizational levels specifically, identification with the organization cultivates a sense of belongingness, meaning, and control in employees as have been observed by Ashforth (2001) and has been positively associated with performance has been emphasized by Mael and Ashforth (1995). Riketta (2005) explained that a recent meta-analysis of identification research found that organizational identification has a strong positive correlation with affective commitment, occupational and work group attachment, job and organizational satisfaction and job involvement, and a strong negative correlation with turnover intention. It is very important to mention here that individuals who identify strongly with their organization experience a “Psychic loss” if they leave their organization. This contention was also highlighted by Mael and Ashforth (1992). Hence, employees’ attitudes and behaviour are seem to be highly important for organizations to develop identification. As employees are identified strongly with their organization, they are willing to go extra mile in acting on behalf of the organization. This is not only relevant for the internal organization, employee’s positive organizational behaviour may also have its effects on the organization’s environment.

In addition to identification, organizational theorist moved beyond the organization identification to see the other forms of attachment to/with organization (Ashforth, 2001; DiSanza and Bullis, 1999; Dukerich et al., 1998; Elsbach, 1999; Pratt, 2000; Kreiner and Ashforth, 2004). The purpose behind this expansion is that identification drives a sense of self in relation to organization and highlight important
outcomes. Here, focus is given on the overlapping of identities at the cost of exploring other forms of self-definition. How might individuals see him/her self different from or in conflict with the organization? What if, when individual defines him/her self as partially same as and partially different from the organization? And what effect would this has on individual and organization? In order to answer these question researcher examined the “expanded model of identification” that includes multiples ways peoples can define themselves through organizational attachment (Kreiner and Ashforth, 2004). Hence, three new different forms have been introduced: disidentification, ambivalent identification, and neutral identification (Dukerich et al., 1998; Ellemers et al., 2002; Kreiner and Ashforth, 2004; DiSanza and Bullis, 1999; Elsbach 1999, Pratt, 2000, and Ashforth 2001).

Like identification, the phenomenon of disidentification also takes place that has been taken care of by behavioral scientists. Disidentification is defined as “a self-perception based on (1) a cognitive separation between one’s identity and one’s perception of the identity of an organization, and (2) a negative relational categorization of oneself and the organization” (Elsbach and Bhattacharya, 2001). In the words of Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail’s (1994) organizational identification is defined as the degree to which a person defines him/herself as not having the same attributes as their organization. A disidentified member maintains “a sense of self-distinctiveness through perceptions and feelings of disconnection” (Elsbach and Bhattacharya, 2001). It is important to note that disidentification is not merely the opposite of identification. It is a bipolar, unidimensional variable. Past researches have shown that (Ashforth, 2001; DiSanza and Bullis, 1999; Dukerich et al., 1998; Elsbach, 1999, 2001; Pratt, 2000) disidentification is a separate variable that has a unique psychological state consisting of disconnecting (typically negative) aspects of the
organization from oneself. Whereas, identification consists of connecting (typically positive) aspect of the organization to oneself. Disidentification represents a state of intense conflict felt between individual and organization and is simply unwilling to trust the organization and subsequently to stay with it. Kreiner and Ashforth (2004) rightly stated that both turnover and retention of strongly disidentified employees can be harmful to the organization. According to them negative reputation, negative affectivity and cynicism have been positively associated with disidentification.

Ambivalent identification or schizo-identification occurs when members simultaneously identify and disidentify with the organization (Elsbach, 1999) and ends up with “mixed feelings” about their organization (Pratt and Doucet, 2000). Members with ambivalent feelings are incapable of establishing a positive and strong relationship with their organization and their severe lack of determination leads to a state of lethargy (Pratt and Doucet, 2000). To the degree that organization members experience ambivalent identification, they (1) use valuable cognitive and emotional resources that could otherwise be spent on organizationally helpful pursuits, and (2) likely are reluctant to go above and beyond the required level of job performance as are usually shown by employees having high identification. The component of ambivalence reflects positive associations would be encouraged by most organizations, whereas, the negative component would be discouraged. This mixed action may most likely create isolation and stress for the ambivalent individuals as well as perceptions of hypocrisy and pressures to conform (Meyerson and Scully, 1995 in Kreiner and Ashforth, 2004). Kreiner and Ashforth (2004) found intra-role conflict and organizational identity incongruence to be an important antecedent of ambivalent identification. Neutral identification exists when members neither identify nor disidentify with the organization. In the words of Elsbach (1999) neutral identification is self-perception
that may be based on the explicit absence of both identification and disidentification with an organization. Here, members consciously choose to remain neutral toward the organization and this neutrality is self-defining to them. Kreiner and Ashforth (2004) viewed that members who remain neutral toward the organization are less likely to exert effort on behalf of the organization and are mainly driven by self-serving interests and moreover, they also emphasized that strong organizational identity and individualism are considered as an antecedents of neutral identification.

A comprehensive details of the concept and meaning of organizational identification have given above are evident of the fact that organizational identification has been differently viewed by different people, especially the behavioural scientists but attitudinal aspect seems to be an inherent notion which has been highlighted by everyone either directly or indirectly. Amidst the discussion on organizational identification, it is found here necessary to make differentiation between organizational identification and organizational commitment as these two variables seem to be similar to each other, though, these two are functionally different. The distinctions between the two are being deliberated below:

The construct of organizational identification appears to be similar to the construct of organizational commitment. In fact, organizational identification is conceptually and functionally different from organizational commitment. Organizational commitment has been defined differently by different researchers, but the two most widely similar or confusing are those of Mowday et al. (1979) definition of organizational commitment and Meyer and Allen (1991) definition of affective commitment, which were given earlier, create problem in understanding organizational identification as a separate concept. So, it is important to mention here that the concept of organizational identification is rooted in social identity theory with its emphasis on
self definition via organizational membership whereas neither Mowday et al. nor Meyer and Allen conception of identification does not emphasized on it (Mael and Ashforth, 1995; Pratt, 1998; van Dick, 2004; van Knippenberg and Sleebos, 2006; and Ashforth, Harrison and Corley, 2008). Affective Commitment shows positive attitude toward the organization and consider the self and the organization separate entities. In contrast, organizational identification is defined as a perceived sense of oneness with the organization, necessarily implicating one’s self-concept toward the organization (Pratt, 1998; Edwards, 2005; Riketta, 2005; Ashforth, Harrison and Corley, 2008).

“Organizational commitment is often associated with, ‘How happy or satisfied am I with my organization? While organizational identification is concerned with the question, ‘How do I perceive myself in relation to my organization?’” as according to Pratt (1998). Organizational identification is organization specific whereas commitment may be more readily transferred to other organizations that inspire a similar positive attitude (Ashforth et al., 2008). Furthermore, some researcher argued that organizational identification is more strongly associated to the variables that suggest an attractive, distinctive, and internally consistent organizational identity, share fate with the organization, salient rival organizations, self-sacrifice on behalf of the organization (Dutton et al., 1994; Edwards, 2005; Gautam et al., 2004; Mael and Ashforth, 1992; Pratt, 1998; Van Knippenberg and Sleebos, 2006) and extra role performance (Riketta, 2005). Whereas, organizational commitment is more strongly related with attitudinal variables such as job satisfaction (Riketta, 2005; Van Knippenberg and Sleebos, 2006; Cole and Bruch, 2006 and Ashforth et al., 2008), employee involvement and quality of exchange relationships (Mowday et al., 1982; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rousseau and Parks, 1993; Meyer and Allen, 1997; Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). Edwards (2005) concluded that organizational commitment focuses more on what an organization does,
whereas identification antecedents are more related to what the organization is. In spite of these conceptual differences, results have often illustrated strong correlations between commitment and identification (Witt, 1993; Ashforth and Saks, 1996; Siegel and Sisaye, 1997; Van Dick, 2004; Harris and Cameron, 2005; Riketta, 2005). However, most researchers stated that (affective) commitment differs from identification (Ashforth and Mael, 1989; Pratt, 1998; Van Knippenberg and Van Schie, 2000; Mael and Tetrick, 1992; Van Knippenberg and Sleebos, 2006; Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher and Christ, 2004; Van Dick et al., 2004; Meyer, Becker and Vandenberghe, 2004; Bedeian, 2007; Bergami and Bagozzi, 2000; Cole and Bruch, 2006; Gautam, Van Dick and Wagner, 2004; Herrbach, 2006; Mael and Tetrick, 1992).

Despite inconclusive findings, organizational identification and commitment are still one of the most important issues in organizational behaviour research in quest of motivating people at work and for achieving high predictive efficacy. Here in this context, organizational identification is used as a distinguishable concept from organizational (affective) commitment.

In view of the preceding descriptions, it is certainly appeared that there are no studies which have been undertaken earlier simultaneously taking all the two predictor variables as well as criterion variables. Since, there is no conclusive trend found with regard to the relation of the predictor variables with criterion variables, therefore the present piece of research work may be considered as one of the larger studies ever taken in Indian sub continent.

**Objectives and Relevance of the Study**
In the light of theoretical and empirical evidences, the major objective of the present investigation was to examine the predictive efficacy of self-concept and organizational identification on organizational commitment and job satisfaction of the university teachers. Since, to the present investigator organizational commitment and job satisfaction could have very well attracted so far as individual as well as organizational efficiency leading to organizational effectiveness are concerned, therefore, in-depth investigation of these two work related behaviours were undertaken as a function of self-concept and organizational identification. The sub-objectives of the study were manifold that are being deliberated as below:

— Determination of the predictive influence of self-concept on organizational commitment and job satisfaction and their various facets for total as well as for the three hierarchies of university teachers, and

— Looking into the predictive influence of organizational identification as well as its seven facets in determining organizational commitment and job satisfaction and with their various dimensions for total, as well as, for the three hierarchies of university teachers.

In addition to the above major and sub-objectives, the study was also endeavoured to investigate the quantum of contribution of each significant predictor on organizational commitment and job satisfaction and their numerous determinants.

Having accomplished the objectives of the investigation, the researcher has come across the various facts, if those could have been properly managed in boosting organizational commitment and job satisfaction of the employees at work place then these will help the organization to develop or create such an environment and opportunities where organizations may work with higher efficiency leading to enhance