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Judicial Officers occupy high positions of power, prestige and responsibilities. The nature of their decisions and effectiveness in their work have significant consequences for the society at large. Cox (1991), reported executive work attitudes, their antecedents and consequences to represent an important area of study. Better understanding of these attitudes may provide insight into behaviours at work and resultant performance.

Judge et al. (1994) highlighted the fact that despite of obvious importance of job attitudes, little research exists on this topic currently. The present investigation is an attempt to study the relationship between Effectiveness and Job Attitudes viz., Job Involvement and Job Satisfaction among Judicial Officers.

JOB INVOLVEMENT

The concept of involvement is important not only in the context of behaviour at work place, but it also relates to involvement in other phenomena and activities (Brown, 1996). The same dominant theme underlies each form of involvement. People become more involved in a particular activity or institution when they perceive its potential for satisfying salient psychological needs (Kanungo, 1979, 1982b).

The term 'Job Involvement' is a recent addition to the organizational behaviour literature. While there is no complete agreement over what the term means, a pragmatic definition states that job involvement measures the degree to which a person identifies psychologically with his or her job and considers his or her perceived level of performance important to self worth. Employees with a high level of job involvement strongly identify with and really care about the kind of work they do (Robbins, 1993).

Since the time the job involvement construct was introduced by Lodahl and Kejner (1965), hundreds of empirical studies relating it to a variety of personal and situational characteristics in a diversity of work settings have been conducted. From an organizational perspective, job involvement has been considered as a key to activating employee motivation (Lawler, 1986) and a fundamental basis for establishing competitive advantage in business markets (Pfeffer, 1994). From an individual's
perspective, it has also been considered a key to personal growth and satisfaction within the work place as well as to motivation and goal-directed behavior (Kahn, 1990).

Brown (1996) termed job involvement as an important factor in the lives of most people. Work activities consume a large proportion of time and constitute a fundamentally important aspect of life for most people. People may be stimulated by and drawn deeply into their work or alienated from it mentally and emotionally. The quality of one's entire life experience can be greatly affected by one's degree of involvement in or alienation from work (Levinson, 1976).

Brown and Leigh (1996) stressed the importance of the study of job involvement as they investigated the process by which psychological climate was related to employee involvement, effort and performance.

Job Involvement has been defined as a cognitive belief state of psychological identity with one's job (Kanungo, 1982). Gorn and Kanungo (1980) have conceptualized the notion of job involvement as having two components: (1) the degree to which an individual is involved in a particular job and actively participates in it, and (2) a psychological state of identification relative to other activities (family, leisure) that is, the importance of work in the person's self-image.

Research in the area of Job Involvement has outlined various personal and organizational variables which can be called as the correlates of Job Involvement. Age, Education, Gender differences and Seniority are some of the personal correlates of Job Involvement (Baba 1979; Kanungo, 1982; Steitz and Kulpa, 1984). The organizational correlates of Job Involvement can be categorized as work values; Absenteeism and Job level (Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; Tannenbaum, 1966; Beehr and Gupta, 1978).

Kanungo argued that a person's psychological identification with the job depends on both need saliency and perceptions about the job's potential for satisfying his salient needs. He also argued that the existing scales to measure Job Involvement are inadequate. Of the commonly used scales of job involvement, Kanungo's (1982) scale is based on the clearest and most precise conceptualization of the construct. It clearly identifies the core meaning of the construct as a cognitive state of the individual, not contaminated by items tapping concepts outside this core meaning, and separates job involvement from antecedent and consequent constructs (Brown, 1996).
The present study has also used Job Involvement Questionnaire (Kanungo, 1981) as a measure of Job Involvement and studied the relationship between Job Involvement and Self-Rated Effectiveness.

**JOB SATISFACTION**

Job satisfaction has been, and remains, one of the central areas of research in the field of organizational psychology, and the importance of Job Satisfaction can never be over emphasized (Solanki, 1992). The term job satisfaction, as explained by Mudgil et al. (1992), refers to the perceived feelings which an employee has towards his job. It is a psychological feeling and has both rational and emotional elements.

The terms job satisfaction and job attitude are usually used interchangeably. Both refer to affective orientations on the part of individuals towards work roles that they are presently occupying. Positive attitudes towards the job are conceptually equivalent to job satisfaction while negative attitudes towards the job are equivalent to job dissatisfaction (Vroom, 1995).

The job satisfaction, having global aspect is affected by a large array of variables such as salary, promotions, age, experiences, primary and secondary needs, opportunity for advancement, congenial working conditions, competent and fair supervision, degree of participation in goal setting and perception of the employees.

**Definitions**

Hoppock (1935) has aptly defined job satisfaction as "any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that make a person satisfied with his job". According to Steers and Porter (1971), "Job satisfaction results when there is a fit between job characteristics and the wants of the employers or employees. It expresses the amount of congruence between one's expectations of the jobs and the rewards that the job provides".

According to Ghosh and Ghorpade (1980), "Job satisfaction is a generalized attitude resulting from many specific attitudes in three areas:

(i) Specific job factors,
(ii) Individual adjustment, and
(iii) Group relationships."
Rao (1986) defined job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job experience." Job Satisfaction is an attitude that individuals maintain about their jobs. This attitude is developed from their perceptions of their jobs (Reilly et al., 1991).

Solanki (1992) also referred to Job satisfaction as "the degree to which an individual feels positively or negatively about various facts of job tasks, the work setting and relationship with co-workers".

**Dimensions of Job Satisfaction**

Quarstein et al. (1993) reported that a number of factors influenced job satisfaction. For example, one recent study even found that if college students' major coincided with their jobs, this relationship predicted subsequent job satisfaction (Fricko and Beehr, 1992). The main influences can be summarized along such dimensions like the ones suggested by Smith et al. (1969). They suggested that there are five job dimensions that represent the most important characteristics of a job about which people have affective responses. These are:

(i). *The Work Itself*. The extent to which the job provides the individual with interesting tasks, opportunities for learning and the chance to accept responsibility.

(ii). *Pay*. The amount of financial remuneration that is received and the degree to which this is viewed as equitable vis-a-vis that of others in the organization.

(iii). *Promotion Opportunities*. The chances of advancement in the hierarchy.

(iv). *Supervision*. The abilities of the supervisor to provide technical assistance and behavioural support.

(v). *Co - Workers*. The degree to which fellow - workers are technically proficient and socially supportive.

In a study of college teachers Bhatt (1987) found that job satisfaction depended upon a variety of factors viz., internal as well as external conditions of work, e.g. salary, advancement, recognition, feeling of achievement, responsibility, principal's dealings, relations, attitude of management, future prospects, and security of the job. These are some of the extraneous factors determining job satisfaction.
Natesan and Radhai (1990) attempted to find the extent of job satisfaction among executives in order to identify factors that promote job satisfaction. However, majority of executives were found to be low on job satisfaction. Salary, opportunity for advancement, security of job and working conditions were also found to be important factors for job satisfaction by most of the executives.

For more than twenty-five years social scientists have been using quantitative methods in an attempt to ascertain the events and conditions that result in different levels of job satisfaction. The outcome of this research has been a general picture of a 'satisfying work role'. A work role most conducive to job satisfaction appears to be one that provides high pay, substantial promotional opportunities, considerate and participative supervision, an opportunity to interact with one's peers, varied duties, and high degree of control over work methods, and work place (Vroom, 1995).

Callahan and Kidd (1986) found that subjects high in job satisfaction were achievement oriented, co-operative, tactful, social, self-confident with sex appropriate roles. Subjects low in job satisfaction were self-critical, suffered from inferiority feelings and displayed maladaptive tendencies.

Mitchell and Larson (1987), called job satisfaction to be a result of employees' perception of how well their job provides those things which are viewed as important. It is generally recognized in the organizational behavior field that job satisfaction is the most important and frequently studied attitude.

Holdnak et al. (1993) found two correlations between leader's behavior style and job satisfaction suggesting that a leader who uses consideration in leadership has a positive impact on subordinates' job satisfaction and that leaders who use an initiating structure style will see a decrease in their employees' level of job satisfaction.

Poole (1997) found that for executives, a consideration leadership style improved the prediction of job satisfaction by 9.9 percent. A significant and positive relationship between work motivation and job satisfaction was found in various earlier studies too (Locke and Latham, 1990; Kanin-Lovers and Spunich, 1992; Berry, 1993).

The results of a study by Poole (1997) also revealed work motivation to be the most powerful predictor of job satisfaction for the aggregate population. A positive correlation emerged illustrating that those participants with a strong motivation to work are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs.
Theories of Job Satisfaction

The various theoretical constructs that evolved over the years concerning job satisfaction and its general impact upon behaviour at work have been categorized into six general orientations of theories of job satisfaction by McCormik and Ilgen (1984). All of these describe the process by which job satisfaction is determined by the individuals:

(i) Comparison process theory advocated by Schaffer (1953) and Morsh (1953).
(iii) Herzberg's Motivator - Hygiene theory (Herzberg et al., 1959).
(iv) Vroom's Instrumentality theory (Vroom, 1964).
(v) Equity theory (Adams, 1956).

Determinants of Job Satisfaction

Vroom (1995) states that a substantial advancement in our knowledge of the causes of job satisfaction requires that one should discard the assumption on which so much existing work is based, that differences in job satisfaction are the exclusive results of differences in work roles. Job satisfaction must be assumed to be the result of the operation of both situational and personality variables. It is only through simultaneous study of these two sets of factors that the complex nature of their interactions can be revealed.

Wages

There has been a persistent controversy over the importance of wages in the satisfaction of employees. Economists as well as many executives are prone to stress the importance of the size of pay check in determining job satisfaction while scientists associated with 'human relations movement' stress the importance of satisfaction of ego needs.

Co-relational evidence reveals income level to be positively associated with job satisfaction (Thompson, 1939; Barnott et al., 1952; Terman and Oden, 1959; Lawler and Porter; 1963). Smith et al. (1969) reported a correlation of .78 between the mean annual earnings of men in twenty-one plants and their mean job satisfaction as measured by Job Descriptive Index. Hoppock (1935), however, found no such relationship.
Patchen (1961) formulated the problem of satisfaction with wages in terms of social comparison theory. His findings supported the long-held contention of many personnel managers that satisfaction is dependent on relative rather than absolute wage levels.

**Promotional Opportunities**

There is a discrepancy between the Spector's finding of higher morale among those with low promotional expectations and those of Morse (1953) and Sirota (1959) of a positive correlation between promotional expectations and satisfaction. According to Vroom (1995), a person's evaluation of his present position is directly related to his expectations regarding promotion. However, receiving a promotion will be more rewarding to persons who do not expect it than to those who do. Consequently, it can be predicted that receiving a desired promotion would result in a greater increment in job satisfaction on the part of workers who do not expect it than on the part of those who do expect it. Vroom (1995) further states that given these assumptions, it follows that the effects of promotional expectations on job satisfaction would vary from positive, before information about success and failure in attaining the promotion was received, to negative after it was received.

**Hours of Work**

The work role occupied by a person affects not only how he will use his working hours but also how he can spend his leisure time. A person's job usually influences the community in which he lives, the way in which other members of the community respond to him, and the amount of time he can spend with his children (Vroom, 1995).

**Personality Variables**

Although environmental factors have received the greatest amount of attention as determinants of job satisfaction, some investigators have focused their explanations on the personalities of workers. Persons who are satisfied with their jobs are assumed to differ systematically in their personalities from those who are dissatisfied (Vroom, 1995).

To understand the role of personality as a determiner of job satisfaction, early Social Psychologists conducted studies directed towards relationship between personality traits or abilities and attitudes. This relationship has been based on empirical
work representing an effort to establish a link between measures of adjustment or neuroticism and job satisfaction. Herzberg et al. (1957) summarize the results with the following descriptions of satisfied and dissatisfied employees:

"The satisfied worker is, in general, a more flexible, better adjusted person who has come from a superior family environment, or who has the capacity to overcome the effects of an inferior environment. He is realistic about his own situation and about his goals. The worker dissatisfied with his job, in contrast, is often rigid, inflexible, unrealistic in his choice of goals, unable to overcome environmental obstacles, generally unhappy and dissatisfied".

**The Joint effects of Work Role and Personality Variables**

Last few years have witnessed the proposal by a number of different researchers, that work role and personality variables play a joint role in Job Satisfaction. There is considerable evidence that the prediction of job satisfaction can be improved by considering the individual differences in motivational variables as well as differences in the nature of work role (Morse, 1953; Tannenbaum and Allport, 1956; Vroom, 1960; 1995).

**Life Satisfaction as a determiner of Job Satisfaction**

A number of studies have supported the effect of job satisfaction on life satisfaction. Causal research has suggested that job satisfaction and life satisfaction are reciprocally related (Judge and Watanabe, 1993). The effect of life satisfaction on job satisfaction is not a very well understood relationship. Some researchers have argued that it represents a dispositional effect (Staw et al., 1986).

Considerable research from the social cognition literature has suggested that individuals in positive affective states recall positive material more often (Bower, 1981). This suggests that individuals satisfied with their lives are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs because their general state of satisfaction influences their encoding, recall and evaluation of job conditions and past job events. Given that positive affect and life satisfaction are closely related (Diener, 1984; Judge and Hulin, 1993), judgements of one's job may be influenced by life satisfaction because how individuals feel about their lives influences how they process job information.

People who feel bad about their work are apt to feel bad about many things including leisure activities and even about life itself (Hammer and Organ, 1978; Singh
and Dewan, 1983; Nair and Kulkarni, 1984; Henne and Locke, 1985). Thus, satisfaction in life and at work are reciprocally related.

Life satisfaction is typically defined as the degree to which individuals judge the quality of their lives favourably, and it can be equated with happiness (Veenhoven, 1991). Researchers often consider life satisfaction, happiness and positive and negative affect as comprising the same construct, labelled subjective well-being (Veenhoven, 1991).

Research has indicated that the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction is significant (Tait, et al., 1989), while job satisfaction appears to exert a causal effect on life satisfaction (Judge and Watanabe, 1993). The rationale for the effect of job satisfaction on life satisfaction is intuitive when one recognizes the considerable impact of work on individuals’ lives (Judge and Hulin, 1993).

The result of the study by Judge et al. (1994) supported the hypothesized model of executive attitudes that posited inter-relationship among job satisfaction and life satisfaction. The positive reciprocal relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction is consistent with the past research (Judge and Watanabe, 1993). The effect of job satisfaction on life satisfaction is compatible with a dispositional perspective suggesting that general affective states "spill over" on to judgements of job satisfaction (Judge and Locke, 1993; Staw et al., 1986).

It seems reasonable, therefore, to infer that job satisfaction would be positively related with Effectiveness. The same relationship will be explored in the present study.

**JOB ATTITUDES AND EFFECTIVENESS**

The notion that Job Satisfaction and Job Attitudes are related to job performance continues to intrigue organizational researchers (Ostroff, 1992). Writers in the areas of organizational theory and organisational effectiveness have argued for satisfaction-performance relationships. It has been proposed that satisfaction and the happiness of personnel enhance organizational effectiveness. Organizations that alienate workers through their practices will be less effective and efficient. Satisfied employees usually work harder and better than frustrated ones (Gross and Etzioni, 1985).
Both Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement represent reactions to a particular job, hence the expectation that these attitudes will also influence the ultimate effective or ineffective outcomes on that particular job.

Job Satisfaction refers to the 'emotional' state of liking one's job (Brooke et al., 1988 and Locke, 1976). Job Involvement also refers to the cognitive state of psychological identification with the Job (Lawler and Hall, 1970; Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977; Kanungo, 1982a). Meta-analytic studies have consistently found strong relationship between Job Involvement and Job Satisfaction (Brown, 1996; correlation being .451 in 87 studies, with a cumulative sample size of almost 28,000).

Although it is logical to posit that work outcomes such as performance are primarily consequences of job involvement (Lawler, 1986; Blau and Boal, 1987, 1989), the aggregated data reveal only weak relationships.

In a meta-analytic review of organizational research on Job Involvement, Brown (1996) found Job Involvement to be strongly related to Job and work attitudes but not to role perceptions, behavioural work outcomes and negative "side effects". Relationships between Job Involvement and work behaviours, like performance, were generally weak. Only one (combination measures of performance) was statistically significant. A medium relationship between Job Involvement and efforts was obtained. The weakest relationship was between job involvement and performance ($r = .088$, overall).

This finding suggests that job involvement, in and of itself, does not directly stimulate significantly higher levels of work performance. It appears likely that other psychological and behavioural variables (e.g., motivation and effort) may intervene between job involvement and performance (Brown, 1996).

Stumpf (1981) concluded that both work performance and work satisfaction had antecedent influence on job involvement. Smith and Brannick (1990) concluded that Job Involvement influences job satisfaction both directly and indirectly. Satisfaction at work further leads to better performance. (McGregor, 1960; Kopelman et al., 1990).

In addition to studies of Job Involvement and motivational and goal-directed behaviour (Bagozzi et al., 1995), linkage between Job Involvement and effort posit that effort is a behavioural outcome of job involvement which may also link
involvement to performance (Brown and Leigh, 1996).

Brown (1996), also stresses that Job Involvement and Performance relationship involves not only studying job involvement in relation to working "hard" (i.e., effort), but it would also be useful to study it in relation to working "smart" (employee's innovativeness, creativity, flexibility, ability to adapt or other desirable abilities and behaviours). Such behaviours may link job involvement to work performance and contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of organizations.

Lawler (1992) described the "high-involvement" organization in which information and decision making authority are provided to the lowest level employees in the organization, which results in the organizational benefits from all employees' full motivational and performance potential.

However, as Brown (1996) concludes "it remains for future researchers to demonstrate the process by which job involvement unleashes the power of human potential in the work place." Ripinen (1997) found Job Involvement based on need congruence to be related to a high level of well - being. Thus Job Involvement is positively related to well - being which is a variable that further promotes Effectiveness. Earlier Castro (1986), Wiener et al. (1987) also found a high positive relationship between Job Involvement and well - being.

Review of past research in Job Satisfaction relates it positively to effectiveness. Theorists taking the human relations or human resources approach (Mayo 1933; McGregor, 1960; e.g. Likert, 1961) suggest that satisfied workers are productive persons.

Whether or not an employee will give his or her services whole - heartedly to the organisation and produce up to potential depends, in large part, on the way the worker feels about the job, fellow workers, and supervisors. Satisfaction and positive attitudes can be achieved through maintaining a positive social organizational environment, such as by providing good communication, autonomy, participation and mutual trust (Likert, 1961; Argyris, 1964).

The satisfaction and attitudes of employees are important factors in determining their behaviour and responses at work, and it is through these behaviours and responses that organisational effectiveness can be achieved. Thus, the satisfaction and well-being of employees can result in organizational effectiveness through the
salient productivity-related behaviours of employees (Roethlisberger, 1959, McGregor, 1960; Kopelman et al., 1990).

Are satisfied executives more effective than their less satisfied counterparts? This "satisfaction-performance controversy" has raged over the years. Although most people assume a positive relationship, the preponderance of research evidence indicates that there is no strong linkage between satisfaction and productivity (Luthans, 1995).

Although Angle and Perry (1981) found empirical evidence of a strong positive linkage between employee satisfaction and performance, yet a comprehensive meta-analysis of research literature found only a .17 average correlation between job satisfaction and productivity (Iffaldano and Muchinsky, 1985).

Satisfied workers will not necessarily be the highest producers. There are many possible mediating variables, the most important of which seems to be rewards. If people receive rewards they feel are equitable, they will be satisfied and this is likely to result in greater performance effort (Podsakoff and Williams, 1986).

Recent research evidence indicates that satisfaction may not necessarily lead to individual performance improvement, but it does lead to organisational-level improvement (Ostroff, 1992).

Moreover, there is still considerable debate whether satisfaction leads to performance or performance leads to satisfaction. There is some evidence that satisfaction represents a fairly stable dispositional trait of employees (Staw and Ross, 1985). If this is the case, then organisational performance should not be the case of employee satisfaction, but it could be argued that the satisfaction and attitude of employees are predictors of effectiveness. It should be noted that the nature of the causal direction is debatable. Performance could lead to satisfaction in that employees in higher performing organizations become more satisfied than those in organizations with poor performance.

This will be the subject of the present study.