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The National Adult Education Programme was launched on 2nd October, 1978. Though it was launched in 1978 till now no related studies have been carried out by the researchers on job satisfaction of field functionaries in adult education nor studies conducted on the job satisfaction of the supervisors in adult education programme. Adult education being an emerging field, there is a need to conduct research in it to implement the adult education programme properly and to solve the problems if any in the field. In this context Bholu (1967) rightly feels that "a professional area like adult education needs not only researchers and research studies but also a research tradition". Draper (1973) says that much research needs to be done on adult education in India. Kapoor and Sarma (1974) writing on gaps and priorities of research in adult education, not only point out that only a few research studies have been conducted in adult education in India, but also say that research efforts are urgently needed in the field of adult education.

Since there are no relevant studies on the subject of the present investigation the investigator thought that the various studies conducted in formal education and industrial area would also serve as a background for the study under investigation. Hence an attempt is made to study the job satisfaction of the adult education supervisors.
2.1 JOB SATISFACTION

The term job satisfaction has been explained by different psychologists in different ways. It may be said that job satisfaction is the pleasant and positive attitudes possessed by an employee towards his job-life, as may be indicated by the job-satisfaction scale.

The job-satisfaction scale is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee towards his job and related factors like wages, supervision, steadiness of employment, conditions of work, opportunities for advancement, recognition of ability, fair evaluation of work, social relations on the job, prompt settlement of grievances, fair treatment by employer etc.

Pestonjee (1973) defines job satisfaction in the light of Herzberg's Two factor theory and concludes that job satisfaction can be taken as a summation of employee's feelings in four important areas. Two of these (Job and Management) encompass factors directly concerned with the job (Intrinsic factors) and the remaining two (social relations and personal adjustment) include factors not directly connected with the job (Extrinsic factors) but which are presumed to have a bearing on job satisfaction.

Therefore, if one is to be happy in one's life, one must be satisfied and happy in one's occupation. To get satisfaction in one's job, in turn, one must choose it wisely. Prestige, power, salary, leisure and other features of a job are no doubt important, but these features become meaningful only to those who value them. The value given by an individual to a particular
feature of a job is in turn determined by his personality and social and psychological background. This is implied in the proposition of Thomson (1947) that jobs differ in their attractiveness from person to person depending upon the need, pattern or value system of the individual.

The traditional model of job satisfaction is that it consists of the total body of feelings that an individual has about his job. This total body of feelings involves, in effect, weighting up the sum total of influences on the job; the nature of the job itself, the pay, the promotion prospects, the nature of supervision and so on. Where the sum total of influences gives rise to feelings of satisfaction the individual is job satisfied and where in total they give rise to feelings of dissatisfaction the individual is job dissatisfied. Improving any one of these influences will lead to the direction of job satisfaction and making any one of these influences less satisfactory will lead to the direction of job dissatisfaction.

Vroom (1964) has defined job satisfaction as the positive orientation of an individual towards the work role which he is presently occupying, which can be restated as an individual liking more aspects of the work than his dislikes.

A man in any working situation is able to apply himself wholeheartedly to his work when he enjoys job satisfaction. This is possible only when he has adjusted himself well to his job and other related factors. Gilmer (1966) defines job satisfaction or dissatisfaction as "the result or various attitudes the person held towards his job, towards related factors and towards life in
general". A more comprehensive approach to the problem of job satisfaction requires that many additional factors, physical, social, temperamental and personality factors be included for correct assessment (Blum, 1956). Job satisfaction is a complex phenomenon, as described by Rao (1970), having multiple intercorrelated casual factors, personal, social, cultural and economic. Again Blum and Naylor (1968) believe that job satisfaction is the result of the various attitudes possessed by the employee which relate to the job and are concerned with several specific job aspects.

The term satisfaction has been defined by English (1934) as "the state of a person whose tendencies have (for the moment, at least) reached their goal". In other words the term is defined as "Affective condition of a person who gained his desires". In support of the above definition Blum (1956) defines job satisfaction as a complex of employee's attitudes. When there is a conflict between opposing drives, needs and desires in the vocational area, it leads to job dissatisfaction. In other words job satisfaction is the employee's judgement of how well his job, on the whole satisfies his various needs.

Job satisfaction is generally defined as affective responses to discriminate characteristics or facets of the task and work environment. These affective responses vary along a like/dislike continuum and reflect a complex process of comparisons between what is experienced on the job, the frames of reference which workers have for evaluating what they experience; their expectations regarding what is a fair and equitable return for their efforts; and alternatives available to the workers. In agreement with this, Wolman (1977) defines job
satisfaction as "Workers satisfaction with different characteristics of their jobs is considered specific instances of the more general class of affective responses labeled attitudes".

Employees expect some rewards by doing their work. If the job in which they are involved will not provide their expected rewards, then they will be dissatisfied. Porter and Lawler (1965) concluded that an individual's satisfaction was a function both of the magnitude and the frequency of rewards he would receive as well as his expected equitable rewards. This model predicts a low but positive relationship between job satisfaction and performance because of the imperfect relationship between performance, rewards and satisfaction. A similar type of definition has been given by Smith, et.al., (1969). According to him "Job satisfaction represents the difference between 'what is expected' and 'what is experienced' in relation to the alternatives available in a given situation". This difference is termed as job discrimination index, which is intended to measure the affective responses to this different facets of job satisfaction. Porter and Lawler (1968) describe job satisfaction as a function of "the extent to which rewards actually received meet or exceed the perceived equitable level of rewards." The greater the failure of 'rewards actually received' to meet the 'perceived equitable level of rewards' the greater is the dissatisfaction.

For a deeper understanding, some of the theories developed on job satisfaction are reviewed under here.
2.2 THEORIES OF JOB SATISFACTION

Several theories exist concerning the dynamics of job satisfaction and its general impact upon worker behaviour. A brief mention of the prominent of these may be appropriate. Brophy (1959) classifies theories of job satisfaction into four types - needs, explanation, role and self.

The need theory was proposed by Morse (1953). According to this, a worker's satisfaction depends upon the function of two factors: how much his needs are fulfilled by being in a particular situation, and how much his needs remain unfulfilled; thus, for calculating the amount of satisfaction the following equation may be used: \( S = F (T_1 - T_2) \); where 'S' is satisfaction, 'T_1' is worker's initial tension level and 'T_2' is the tension level after exposure to the vocation.

The second type of theory is based upon the hypothesis that an individual's degree of satisfaction with an activity leading towards a goal is an inverse function of the level of his perceived probability of attaining the goal both in a situation when the goal is attained and in a situation when it is not attained. Ketzell's (1964) theory is also based on this model.

The characteristics of the sociological role theory are 1) it involves an evaluation of the environment from a viewpoint external to the individual's rather than from his own phenomenological frame of reference; 2) It considers an aggregate of the individual positions as a single position, and 3) It focusses
on people rather than upon a single person and his interaction with the environment.

According to the self theory, vocational satisfaction is a function of agreement among the worker's self-concept, both real and ideal, and the occupational roles he perceives or plays in the world of work.

2.2.1 Need Satisfaction Theory:

Apart from the above classification of the theories of job satisfaction, there are a few individual theories, of course, with a little bit overlap from the above mentioned theories. Maslow (1943) proposes an interesting theory concerning human needs and their effect upon human behaviour. He suggests that human needs may be classified into five different groups as 1) Physio - Psychological needs, 2) Safety needs, 3) Love needs, 4) Esteem needs, and 5) self - actualization needs. His basic premises are that 1) The behaviour of any person is dominated and determined by the most basic groups of needs which are unfulfilled; 2) The individual will systematically satisfy his needs, starting with the most basic and moving up the hierarchy; and 3) More basic groups of needs are said to be prepotent in that they will take precedence over all those higher in the hierarchy. Maslow enumerates eight needs which he arranges in a rank order. The extent to which the total job environment or the various segments of the job environment contribute to the satisfaction of these needs determines the job satisfaction of workers.
Following this theory of job satisfaction, many psychologists and researchers in the field of personal management have proposed slightly varied hypotheses. To maintain a few, Schaffer (1953) he proposes a hypothesis that overall satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual which can be satisfied in a job are actually satisfied, the stronger the need, the more closely will job satisfaction depend on its fulfilment. Similarly Pestonjee (1973) observes that the job satisfaction is generated by the individual's perception of how well his job, on the whole, is satisfying his various needs.

Porter (1961) developed a questionnaire containing 15 items designed to provide information about five different motivational need classes which were derived from Maslow. Porter defines need fulfilment as the difference between 'how much there should be' and 'how much is now' connected with each of the fifteen items. Blai (1982) hypothesised that, in the work environment, degrees of self-assessed job satisfaction vary with the strength of the psychological needs satisfied.

2.2.2 Two Factor Theory:

Iherzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959) proposed a model of job satisfaction called two factor theory. No theory of job satisfaction has received as much attention or has been subjected to as much criticism as has this model. The original study was concerned with an investigation into the causes of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Each worker was asked to describe, in detail, the times when he felt exceptionally 'good' or exceptionally 'bad'.

about his job. The responses were then content analysed. Thus, the theory was derived from research using semi-structured, critical incident interviews. The results of their study did indicate that things which were associated with high satisfaction (satisfiers) were somewhat different from the things which were associated with situations of low satisfaction (dissatisfiers). They found that the descriptions of good periods included such things as achievement, recognition, advancement, responsibility, etc. All of these things seemed to relate to the actual content of the job and therefore, they were called 'intrinsic' or 'content' factors or motivators. Descriptions of bad work periods seemed to be filled with items dealing with company policy, supervision, salary and working conditions. These items seemed to relate to the context in which a person performed his task and were, therefore, referred to as 'intrinsic' or 'context' or 'hygiene' factors. Because the model postulates two general classes or variables - one class which can satisfy but not dissatisfy and one which causes dissatisfaction but not satisfaction - the model has been designated as 'Herzberg's two factor theory'.

Studies using this technique consistently yielded results in which motivators were cited primarily as sources of satisfaction and hygienes primarily as sources of dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1960) and provided the primary evidence in support of the theory. Holdaway (1978) found a substantial positive relationship between overall satisfaction and achievement, career orientation, recognition and stimulation. These latter variables were described by Herzberg as 'motivators', facets receiving the highest percentage 'satisfied' mainly involved interpersonal relationships, and freedom in the teaching assignment. Facets receiving
the highest percentages 'dissatisfied' mainly involved societal and parental attitudes, preparation time and decision - making procedure. Myers(1964) found that satisfaction was related to intrinsic work factors and dissatisfaction to extrinsic factors. Similar results were obtained by Schwartz, Jenusaitis and Stark (1963) in favour of the two factor theory.

Blum and Naylor (1968) while reviewing the literature, pointed out that the factors involved in the feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction do not appear to divide as neatly as assumed by Herzberg's original studies. Ewen et al, (1968) tested a number of hypotheses by using the data provided by 793 employees from various jobs. They found that the results supported neither Herzberg's two - factor theory nor the traditional theory. Instead, results indicated that intrinsic factors were more strongly related to both overall satisfaction and overall dissatisfaction than the extrinsic factors. Armstrong (1971) also concluded that the Herzberg's dichotomy was not supported. Sarveswara Rao (1972) found that both motivators and hygienes contributed to satisfaction and also to dissatisfaction. Limited support for the hypothesis that the dimensional independence of satisfaction and dissatisfaction was found and hence the assumption underlying the two - factor theory was questioned. Locke and Whiting (1974) also tested Herzberg's two - factor theory and concluded that it was not supported.

2.2.3 Valence Theory of Job Satisfaction :

Vroom (1964) proposed a theory of human motivation which took as its context the individual in the world of work. He used the basic concept
of 'valence' as a key notion. He defines valence as "the attractiveness of a goal or outcome". Another definition was "the anticipated satisfaction from an outcome". Vroom suggested that job satisfaction was a reflection of how desirable a person found his job. Thus, it was a measure of a person's valence for his work situation. His model predicted the direct relationship between the valence of his job and turnover and absenteeism. Vroom equated job satisfaction with the valence of the job or work role. The overall valence of work role is useful in predicting behaviour in relation to the total work role.

2.2.4 Other Theories:

The other theories of job satisfaction are not so popular as the above theories. But a few researches were undertaken applying these theories. They are very briefly described one by one. Scott (1966) suggested that 'activation theory' was a very appropriate model for understanding the behaviour in work environments. Briefly, the activation theory states that the human organism needs stimulation and variety in its environment; without this, motivation will suffer and frustration may result. Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) define job satisfaction as feelings of effective responses to the work situation. In addition, they posited that these responses are best explained by a discrepancy between the work motivation attitudes and the incentives offered by the organisations. Similar conceptualisations are the inducement - contributions theory (March and Simon, 1958), the cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) and the inequity theory (Adams, 1963). The basic postulate of these positions is that job satisfaction levels are related to the perceived difference between what is expected or desired as a fair and reasonable return (individual motiva-
tion) and what is actually experienced in the job situation (organisational incentives).

2.3 LEVEL OF DISSATISFACTION:

The percentage of dissatisfaction among workers in different professions at various cadres varies due to many reasons. The factors causing dissatisfaction may be different for different people in different jobs. Similarly the level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction also varies from job to job. Hoppock (1935) reported that the job satisfaction varied almost from '0' to '100' percent, depending on the job. In the study on early community wide survey in the town of New Hope, Hoppock (1935) found that 15% of the sample had negative attitudes or job dissatisfaction. In another instance, he stated that the majority of the gainfully employed, tended to have job satisfaction or were at least neutral and only a small percentage were dissatisfied. When Hoppock (1935) reviewed 32 investigations, it was found that 2/3 of the studies showed less than 1/3 of the workers to be dissatisfied. Again in his study, when the subjects were invited to take their choice of all the jobs in the world, 36% indicated that they would have their present occupations 66% got more satisfaction from their jobs than from the things they did in their spare time.

The Fortune Quarterly Survey XI (1938) reported that 60% of the factory workers were dissatisfied with their jobs, as where only 30% of the professionals were dissatisfied. Form (1946) reported that almost half of a group of clerks and manual workers stated that they were very happy with their occupations, but only 17 per cent said that they would like to enter their present occupation
again. Robinson and Hoppock (1952) collected the data on 191 asserted studies reporting percentages of job dissatisfaction and found that the median figure of dissatisfied persons was 18 per cent. Similarly Herzberg et al. (1957) from their review of 22 studies found that the average figure of job dissatisfaction in different industries was around 13 per cent.

Parasiva Murthy (1966) studied 44 out of 176 employees in an organisation and found that 43.18% of the workers were satisfied and 4.55% of them were dissatisfied with their job.

Gobèl (1977) showed that a majority of workers, in a job satisfaction survey, on brioler processing plant, were dissatisfied with their work. Sheppard and Herrick (1972) reported that the dissatisfaction with the dehumanising aspects of technology was wide spread among the nation wide white and blue-colour union members and youthful workers.

2.4 CAUSES OF DISSATISFACTION OR SATISFACTION:

A review of past studies is necessary to indentify the most common factors causing either satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Hoppock (1935) explained a dissatisfied person as one who has indicated a distinct and conscious discontent with his job as a whole, according to certain criteria. Herzberg et al. (1957) concluded after their review of research on job attitudes that 'sustained job - interest' was very much important for professional people.
Sud (1972) observed that the need for motivating workers arose because of the following reasons:

1) The employee's usual remuneration (Pay or Salary) might be insufficient for his paramount needs.

2) The remuneration might be in commensurate with the work effort required of the employee.

3) The employee might be expected to perform his tasks in a way which prevented him from deriving adequate satisfaction from other activities.

2.5 JOB SATISFACTION – FACTORS INFLUENCING JOB-SATISFACTION/
DISSATISFACTION:

In the process of identifying different facets or factors which contribute to either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, many studies were undertaken both in the field of industrial management and in the field of education. The aim of all these researches was to locate the bad situations causing worker dissatisfaction by which the management might be informed to eliminate those situations to maximise the satisfaction in the work and thereby increase the morale of the organisation.

More widely used measures of job satisfaction have generally assessed satisfaction with the work itself, working conditions, pay, promotional opportunities and policy, supervision, co-workers and career future and security. Blum and Russ (1942) stated that in the mind of the employee a minimum of five drives were likely to operate on the job. They were 1) advancement, 2) hours of work, 3) salary, 4) security and 5) superior relationships. Roube (1947)
reported that the employees ranked job security, compensation, opportunities for advancement, employees financial benefits and informing employees about their job's status as the five most important job factors.

Stagner (1950) stated that neither executives nor workers were concerned about pay as such except when economically pinched. At other times they preferred ego satisfactions such as prestige, power, recognition, security and individual treatment.

Blum and Naylor posed some general comments on job satisfaction which again proved to be important specific job factors in contributing to either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. They were: 1) If one could not get along with his co-workers the job was unsatisfactory, 2) If an individual was to have job satisfaction, he must feel that he was on par with his friends, 3) a person, who was 'too good' or 'not good enough' for a job in terms of his abilities and interests, was not likely to be satisfied with his job, 4) Security contributed to job satisfaction, but security was both social as well as economic, 5) Loyalty was one of the pre-reqesities to have job satisfaction. The feeling that the worker had for his firm or boss or both contributed to job satisfaction, and 6) The opportunities for satisfaction that the job itself affords the individual was one of the most important item to be considered in understanding job satisfaction.

Friedlander (1964) and Starcevich (1972) found that job content factors - feeling of achievement, work itself, use of best abilities, challenging assignments, growth in the job, recognition, responsibility and promotion - were more important
for feelings of both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, while job content factors - relations with supervisors, job security, work groups technical supervision, management policies, working conditions, relations with co-workers, merit increases, home life, employee benefits - were of minor importance.

Two important sources of job satisfaction have been suggested by Faris (1977). The motivation factors commonly associated with meaningful work experiences appeared to provide an intrinsic source of job satisfaction. In addition to this, perceived success attained through achievement on the job and advancement through the organisational hierarchy appeared to be major determinants of job satisfaction.

Siedmen and waterson (1940) found that recognition, friendly associations, work fitted to vocational level and variety of duties were more important contributing factors job satisfaction than salary. Vroom (1964) conjectures that "the amount of satisfaction obtained from a given amount of influence might vary considerably with the nature of the decision, the desires of the person and the nature of the social situation in which the influence is exercised. Taking such variables into account may help explain discrepencies in findings". Lafollette and Sims (1975) found that organizational climate and organizational practices were related to job satisfaction. In a study conducted by Glicken (1977) on the job satisfaction of social workers, it was found that co-workers, supervision, work itself, pay and promotional opportunity were the most important factors contributing to the job satisfaction.
Supervision has been found to have a significant relation to job satisfaction by several investigators. A number of investigators believe it to be one of the important, if not the most important, factors. One of the significant findings of the Ilawthrone studies was that it was possible to change the attitudes of the employees by developing a co-operative spirit between workers and supervisors (Roethlisberger and Dickson 1939).

In Locke and Whiting's (1974) study, blue collar workers saw their supervisors and co-workers as agents of dissatisfaction, while white collar employees attributed dissatisfying events to subordinates and the Union.

Arvey, Dewhirst and Boling (1976) found that supervisory goal-clarifying and planning activities and participation in goal-setting are positively associated with satisfaction of subordinates.

Schmidt (1976) found that supervision was one of the highly dissatisfying factors to the administrator.

2.6 JOB SATISFACTION – ATTITUDE:

According to Crites (1961), the attitudes and motivations of a worker are influenced both by his self-image and his career situation. If it is some specific aspect of the job such as duties and tasks or working conditions the concept, which is defined, would be job attitudes. If it is the over-all job in which the individual is presently employed, then the concept would be job satisfaction......". And if the referent includes the work group and/or the
employing organisation as well as job or vocational satisfaction, the concept would be morale". Similarly, Blum (1956) clarified the confusion in the terminology as follows. He made the point that 'employee attitudes', 'job satisfaction and industrial morale' were not synonymous. An attitude might contribute to job satisfaction, since the latter comprised a number of attitudes. Similarly, job satisfaction was not the same as industrial morale, although it might contribute to the morale.

Herzberg and other (1957) revealed in their review of job attitude studies that major factors constituting job satisfaction were 1) intrinsic aspects of the job, 2) supervision, 3) working conditions, 4) wages, 5) opportunity for advancement, 6) security, 7) company and management, 8) social aspects of the job, 9) communication and 10) benefits. Siegel (1962) comes to the conclusion, on the basis of his review of job satisfaction studies, that all the results may be conveniently grouped under two headings on account of their pertinence to the following factors: i) intrinsic and ii) extrinsic to the job itself. Factors intrinsic to the job include 1) pay, 2) job security, 3) participation and personal recognition, 4) hours of work, 5) working conditions and 6) occupational status. Among factors extrinsic to the job perceptions are 1) supervision, 2) sex, 3) age, 4) level of intelligence, 5) job experience of length of service and 6) personal adjustment. But a study by Sarveswara Rao and Ganapathi Rao (1973) revealed that motivators and hygiene were not unidimensional. Both contributed to overall satisfaction and both groups of factors were considered important in their relationship to the dependent variable i.e., job satisfaction/dissatisfaction.
2.7 JOB SATISFACTION - JOB INVOLVEMENT:

The emphasis placed on job satisfaction variables has resulted in a relative neglect of the job involvement variable. This is perhaps due to a lack of conceptual differentiation between job satisfaction and job involvement and to an apparent failure to realize that it was possible for some persons to be highly satisfied, but not involved and for others to be highly involved, but not satisfied. Moreover, some sources of job satisfaction are probably more likely to be related to job involvement than are others (Wessenberg and Gruenfeld 1968). They considered job involvement to be a quasi-indicator of motivation and Lawler and Hall (1970) found that job satisfaction and job involvement were factorially independent and relatively distinct variables.

The definition of job involvement is complex. Lodahl and Kejner (1965) considered it to be indicative of an individual's work commitment. Bass (1965) views it as representative of the employee's ego involvement in his job and thus relates it to performance. Bass finds that the following conditions lead to the strengthening of job involvement: 1) Opportunity to make more of the job decisions, 2) the feeling that one is making an important contribution to company success, 3) recognition, 4) achievement, 5) self-determination, and 6) freedom to set one's own work place.

March and Simon (1958) suggest that job involvement may also be related to the decision to participate and the decision to produce. The implications of job involvement according to Katz and Khan (1966) are as follows: 1) job involvement is a necessary condition if the individual is to accept fully the
organisational demands placed upon him by his membership in an organisation, 2) the degree of job involvement is related to the level of aspiration and the degree of internalization of organisational goals, and 3) job involvement is a moderator variable in the relationship between satisfaction and performance. Thus job involvement can be considered to be an important measure of organisational effectiveness that may be, at least in part, influenced by job satisfaction.

Lodahl and Kejner (1965) defined job involvement at two contexts in their article. In the first context they defined, "It is the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work, or the importance of work in his total self-image". In the second context they defined, "job involvement is the degree to which a person's work performance affects his self-esteem". The second definition is similar to Vroom's ego involvement. Allport (1947) defined ego involvement as "the situation in which the person engages the status seeking motive". Guion's (1958) definition of morale is relevant to job involvement. He defined morale as "ego involvement in one's job. There is something to be said for the attitudinal frame of reference in which a man perceives his job to be so important to himself, to his company, and to society that his supervisors' blunders' are not to be tolerated".

All the above definitions have a common core of meaning in that they describe the job involved person as one for whom work is a very important part of life and as one who is affected very much personally by his whole job situation, the work itself, the co-workers, the company etc. On the other hand the non-job involved worker does his living off the job. Work is not as
important a part of his psychological life. His interests are elsewhere and the core of his self image, the essential part of his identity, is not greatly affected by the kind of work he does or how well he does it (Lodahl and Kejner). They pointed out that the literature on job involvement was sparse. It was reported that job involvement emerged as a separate factor in factor analysis, and it was also found that job involvement was more stable than the other variables.

As already described, the relationship between job involvement and job satisfaction is not consistent. Guion (1958) is of the opinion that the job involved worker is not necessarily happy with his job; in fact, very angry people may be just as involved in their jobs as very happy ones. So, it can be concluded that the two variables may not be related.

White (1966) found that those who had left the profession reported that they were significantly less job involved while employed, than those who remained with in the profession. Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) also hypothesized that job satisfaction was one of the determinants of job involvement. The results showed that job involvement was related to satisfaction with recognition, achievement, responsibility and with interpersonal relations with the supervisor. Similarly Gannon and Hendrickson (1973) found that 'career orientation job involvement' was positively and significantly related to job satisfaction.

Wood (1974) supported the hypothesis that significant relationships occur more frequently between job satisfaction and job involvement, for those employees who were least job involved. Gechman and Wiener (1975) recorded the time devoted to work related activities and self reported measures of job satisfaction,
job involvement and mental health of 54 elementary school teachers. The findings of them indicated that there was a positive association between job involvement and the time devoted to work related activities, but the time and job satisfaction were unrelated. Mental health was positively related to job satisfaction but did not correlate significantly with involvement. Hence the authors concluded that the satisfaction and involvement were separate and distinct job attitudes. Thus it can be concluded that the association between the two variables is contradictory from situation to situation.

2.8 JOB SATISFACTION - PERSONALITY TRAITS:

The study of personality covers a varied and complex domain. It seeks to discover the reasons for a wide range of human behaviours, to account for their occurrence, and to assess their roles in the total person (Gordon, 1963). So there is no need for a special emphasis on the relationship between job satisfaction and personality variables. When the personal, demographic and situational factors are capable of influencing the individual's satisfaction in either way, one's personality will certainly play a vital role in determining the job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. As rightly pointed out by Vroom (1964) any study of job satisfaction should include both sets of variables viz., work role and personality variables.

There are so many definitions of personality as it covers a varied and complex domain. As Allport (1937) listed, there exist some 50 meanings of the term personality and no doubt even this list is not all inclusive. While consolidating the definitions of personality, Gage (1963) wrote that the definitions of
personality were often contradictory, and observations based on one definition will contradict the observations based on another definition. He classified the more common definitions under three main-categories: 1) behavioural definitions treating personality as the totality of a person's usual behaviour, 2) social stimulus definitions treating personality as the response made by others to the individual as the stimulus, and 3) depth definitions treating personality as the dynamic organisation within the individual that determined his unique behaviour as socially perceived. As used in the 'dramatia personae', personality has another meaning, that is, the role or function an individual has in a group. In this sense, the personality of the teacher would be defined narrowly by what he does as a teacher. In a third and broader sense, personality means the person as a psychological or unique whole and refers to the dynamic organisation of motives with in the individual.

Guilford (1954) says that an individual's personality is 'an integrated pattern of traits'. Koul (1974) defined personality, as it is now generally meant, that "it is an organisation and integration of a large number of human habits". Crowne's (1979) definition of personality is brief: "personality is the organised system of potentialities for behaviour". According to Cattell (1950) "personality is that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation". His theory is based on personality sphere concept (Cattell, 1946, 1956, 1964), a design to ensure initial item coverage for all the behaviour that commonly enters rating and the dictionary description of personality. If focusses heavily on source traits.
Weitz (1952) pointed out that it was possible to look into the relationship between personality and general satisfaction with non-job conditions. One such study by him indicated a fairly high correlation between general and job satisfaction. This would indicate the possibility that some job dissatisfaction is caused by the personality traits that made these employees unhappy of the job. Stern, et al., (1960) found that each of the twenty nine teachers interviewed "expressed a number of different sources of satisfaction in teaching".

Vroom (1964) asserts that explanation of satisfaction requires the use of both work role and personality variables. These two sets of variables have been found interacting with each other. McConaughy and Palmer (1969) determined that personality traits of federal field executives in South California were related to their job satisfaction significantly. They suggested that personality testing should be included in recruiting and promotion procedure. Murthy (1969) and Mehdi and Sinha (1971) concluded that there might exist a definite relationship between personality and job satisfaction.

Studies conducted by Hoppock (1935), Blum (1956), Smith (1954, 1956), Gellmon (1939), Kates (1950) and Inlow (1951) indicated that there was a positive relation between personality factors and job satisfaction. On the other hand, Hulin (1977) indicated that the relationships among personality measures and job satisfaction had shown no trends which were of sufficient generality to be summarised. Marsteller and Slocum (1972) also pointed out that the Bornreutor personality Inventory and demographic variables had limited usefulness and understanding or predicting managerial psychological need satisfaction. Similarly
Hughes (1972) reported that employed subjects tended to be not possessing consistently the personality orientation appropriate to their jobs; and when the subjects were classified into two groups 'consistent' and 'inconsistent', it was found that there was no significant difference between the two groups mean job satisfaction scores. Smith (1955) disclosed that many persons assumed that job satisfaction was primarily affected by personal maladjustment.

Bernardin (1977) administered 16 PF to 150 non-supervisory and non-secretariat employees and recorded measures of turnover and absenteeism for each employee to investigate common correlates. The results indicated that only 2 factors 'G' and 'Q4' accounted for most of the predictable variance in both indices of turnover and absenteeism.

2.9 JOB SATISFACTION - PERSONAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES:

In many of the studies related to job satisfaction it was found that some of the persons and demographic variables influenced the area of the job satisfaction. Hence a few studies relevant to the present study are reviewed hereunder.

Many investigators considered 'sex' as one of the variables, which would contribute to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Some researchers proved that women employees enjoyed more satisfaction with their job than their counterparts and some others proved just the reverse. A few studies showed that there was no any significant difference between both the sex groups as far as their satisfaction with their jobs was concerned. Hence the relationship between
job satisfaction and sex appears to be a controversial aspect. The following review includes all such studies.

Learnard (1932) found that the dissatisfaction among men was twice as much as among women. In response to the question, "Are you satisfied with your present occupation?" 30% of 101 men and 15% of 124 women answered 'no'. Bange (1944) and Stockford and Kunze (1950) found that women workers were more satisfied than men. But Peck (1936), in a study of teachers, found that women were more critical of their jobs and were less adjusted with work than men.

Hulin and Smith (1964) conducted a study on employees of 4 different plants and found that in 3 plants the female workers were significantly less satisfied than their male counterparts while in the fourth plant there was no significant difference. A study by Belesco and Alutto (1972) disclosed that women teachers tended to be more satisfied with their jobs than men teachers working in elementary and secondary schools. Anand (1972) found that the job satisfaction of male and female teachers was significantly different and hence he concluded that sex was related to job satisfaction.

Farely (1974) surveyed nearly 7000 employees and found that women, who in general were at the university for a shorter time and in lower skilled jobs, did manifest less work satisfaction. In addition, there was a trend that women in 'men's fields' were likely to be less satisfied than their colleagues in fields traditional for their sex.
Hulin (1977) observed that women were typically less satisfied with most aspects of their jobs than men, but those differences depended to a large extent on the type of job that was being studied. When the workers being studied were in what are normally regarded as 'male jobs', women would be less satisfied and vice versa.

Thus it was found that the sex of the employee was a significant variable in influencing facet/overall satisfaction. But there are some studies where in sex is proved to be an insignificant variable in affecting the job satisfaction of the workers. Englehardt (1973) did not find any significant difference between men and women workers with regard to their job satisfaction. Weaver (1977) found that there was no any influence of sex on job satisfaction.

Chen (1977), Gobel (1977), reported greater job satisfaction among men comparative to women. Englehardt (1973), Atterberry (1977), Cohen (1977) and Weaver (1977) observed no significant difference between the level of the job satisfaction of the two sexes.

Age is also one of the most important demographic variables in exercising its influence on job satisfaction. But the relationship between them is again complex as pointed by Hulin (1977), since it is confounded with job level, income, personal and family needs and expectations.

Some studies investigated the relationship between satisfaction with specific job factor and age. Morse (1953) found that there was higher satisfaction with intrinsic factors of job but lower satisfaction with financial rewards and status
of job among older white collar employees. In a study 'Fantasies and Facts in Corporations', published in California Institute of Technology Bulletin (1955), it was revealed that older workers were less interested in advancement than younger ones, perhaps because a man would obtain most of his advancement in his earlier years and settle in one or two jobs in his last twenty years of working. Altimus and Tersine (1973) found that younger workers were significantly lower in satisfaction with work itself, esteem, self-actualisation and total work satisfaction. Richard and Dewhirst (1979) disclosed that age demonstrated a significant positive relationship with extensive satisfaction and there was no such relationship between age and intrinsic satisfaction.

Sinha and Sarma (1962) and Anand (1972) observed a significant relationship between age and job satisfaction. Carrell and Elbert (1974) found that the age was one of the significant influential factors on job satisfaction among postal employees. Steers (1975) also found a positive significant co-efficient of correlation between job satisfaction and age among 133 female first-level supervisors in a large public utility. Neeraja Dwivedi and Pestonjee (1975) reported that age was an important factor which palyed a significant role in the determination of job satisfaction. Holdaway (1978) reported that both facet and overall satisfaction were related to the age of the teacher. Three studies conducted by Rao (1970), Pestonjee and Singh (1973), and Anand (1977) reported that there was no significant relationship between age and job satisfaction among workers.

Hull and Kolstand (1942) observed the results of several investigation and concluded that job satisfaction was relatively high at the start, dropped slowly in the fifth or eight year, then rose again with more time on the job.
The highest morale was reached after the twentieth year. Herzberg, et al, (1957) in their review of research and opinion also reported that in general job satisfaction was high among young workers, low among middle aged employees and it would increase again after the middle age.

Like age, experience may also influences one's satisfaction with one's job. Siegal (1969) reported that there was relationship between experience and job satisfaction. But Rao (1970) found that there was no association between job satisfaction and experience. Neerja Dwivedi and Pestonjee (1975) found that job satisfaction increased with increasing experience for a period of 10 years, and after that it started going down. Age and experience (tenure of service) are more effective correlates of job satisfaction than income and marital status.

Hodge (1977) observed that the level of job satisfaction increased for both Negro and White professors as years of employment at the institutions increased in number.

Education brings changes in the attitudes, perception, capacities, interests, values etc., and in human behavioural as a whole. So the level of education one possesses may certainly influences his job satisfaction in one way or the other.

In a study on 635 white-collar workers, Morse (1953) revealed that those who had not completed high school education were the most satisfied. Rao (1970) found that there was a strong association between job satisfaction and
education. Carrell and Elbert (1974), in a study on postal clerks, found that the educational qualifications of the employees was one of the significant determinants of job satisfaction. Quinn, Mandilovitch and Martha (1977) investigated the relationship between education and job satisfaction by analysing the previous studies. Findings for non-college trained workers indicated that the job satisfaction did not increase with each succeeding year of education and that there was no relationship between educational level and job satisfaction. But it was identified that the persons who had obtained college degrees were consistently more satisfied with their jobs than were other workers.

Hoppock (1935) in his pioneering work on job satisfaction of various occupations, found that there was no relationship between the level of education and job satisfaction. Sinha and Sarma (1962) also reported no significant relationship between education level and job satisfaction. Anand (1972) revealed that the academic attainments of teachers and their performance in school, college or university, were not significantly related to their job satisfaction. Weaver (1974) in his study on a nation wide sample of 4000 employees, concluded that there was little variation in the job satisfaction of workers with varied levels of education. Vollmer and Kimmely (1955) found a negative relationship between educational level and job satisfaction.

Neerja Dwivedi and Pestonjee (1975) conducted a study on a group of 240 blue-collar workers who were working under a financial incentive scheme in a leading locomotive works and found that as far as marital status was concerned married workers showed higher job satisfaction than unmarried workers.
Smith (1977) found that the husbands marital adjustment was correlated with women’s job satisfaction. Those who were generally happy and satisfied, tended to reflect that feeling in both the major areas of their lives - work and family.

The American Association Research Bulletin (1941), McLaughlin and Shea (1960), Hunter (1955), Rudd and Wiseman (1962) found that job satisfaction was related to the facilities available for doing the job. Eckert, Sticklein and Sagan (1959) quoted salaries as one of the most common results for job satisfaction.

Hutchinson (1952) found positive and significant relationships between measured vocational interests and job satisfaction. Chase, (1951), Belsco and Allotto (1972), Bernard and Kulanlivel (1976), Anand (1977) and Shaver (1977) observed that the biggest contribution among journalism graduates to job dissatisfaction was low salary. In the same line, Schmidt (1976) concluded that salary was highly dissatisfying factor to the administrators.

As found by several researchers, job satisfaction depends on a multiplicity of several internal and external factors which include job satisfaction of supervisors, motivational patterns, personality profiles, attitudes, interests, job involvement, cordial relations, congenial work environment, salaries, job conditions, promotions, rewards etc. Hence the present study was intended to study job satisfaction of adult education supervisors in relation to several factors.
Thus the review of the relevant literature indicates that no systematic attempt has been made by the researchers for identifying the associated factors with the job satisfaction. Hence the investigator proposes to undertaken the study on "Job Satisfaction of Adult Education Supervisors".