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Job Satisfaction: Conceptual Framework

The term "job satisfaction" lacks adequate definition (Herzberg, et al., 1957) as well as a satisfactory theory about its meaning (Evans, 1969; Locke, 1969; Schwab and Cummings, 1970). The differences in a broad spectrum of views seem to be caused by (i) the varied nature of jobs that individuals perform, (ii) the attempts to conceptualize job satisfaction in a variety of ways by different disciplines like Psychology, Sociology, Education and Management, and (iii) the variety of methods employed by various researchers to study job satisfaction.

While noting differences in theoretical viewpoints on job satisfaction, Katzell (1964) remarks that the term has been used in a variety of ways interchangeably with job morale, vocational satisfaction and job attitudes by various authors to describe almost the same thing (Mann and Pelz, 1945; Kretch and Crutchfield, 1948; Kahn and Morse, 1951; Herzberg et al., 1959; Ganguli, 1964). On the other hand Hull and Kolstad (1942), Elum (1956), Siegal (1962), Barrell (1964) and Blum and Naylor (1968) are clearly of the view that job satisfaction and job morale are not the same thing and cannot be used interchangeably. Strong (1958) states preference for
using job satisfaction with reference to the individual and morale with reference to the group. Crites (1969) aptly distinguishes between job attitudes, job satisfaction, vocational satisfaction and morale. He observes:

If it is some specific aspect of the job, such as duties and tasks or working conditions, then the concept which is defined would be job attitudes. If it is the overall job in which the individual is presently employed, then the concept would be job satisfaction. If it is the type of work in which the individual has been trained and/or has gained experience in several jobs (two or more), then the concept would be vocational satisfaction. And, if the referent includes the work-group and/or employing organization, as well as job or vocational satisfaction, the concept would be morale.

The most notable early conceptualization of job satisfaction was that of Hoppock (1935) who defined job satisfaction as "any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, 'I am satisfied with my job'". In this definition the underlying assumption is that it is possible for a worker to balance satisfactions against specific dissatisfactions and thus arrive at compositive satisfaction with the job as a whole. In a similar vein Bullock (1952) has defined job satisfaction as "an attitude which results from a balance and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job". This attitude manifests itself in an evaluation of the job and of the employing organization.

Without placing much premium on the balancing of satisfactions and dissatisfactions, Blum (1956) and Blum and Naylor (1968)
consider job satisfaction as something that results from several attitudes possessed by a worker (in the context of work, supervision, pay, promotional opportunities and co-workers) towards his job. In the same way Smith (1963) proposes: "Job satisfaction is a function of the perceived characteristics of a job in relation to an individual's frame of reference". Job satisfaction has been explained by Gilmer (1966) as a result of various attitudes the person holds towards his job, towards related factors and towards life in general. Schultz (1973) too refers to job satisfaction "as a set of attitudes that employees have about their jobs" and describes it as the psychological disposition of people toward their jobs—how they feel about the work. This involves a collection of numerous attitudes or feelings.

In a slightly different vein, Evans (1969) and Wanous and Lawler (1977) talk of overall satisfaction which, according to them, is the sum of job facet satisfaction across all facets of a job, namely, work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision and co-workers. In terms of equation, this view reads as:

\[
JS = \sum_{\text{Facets}} (JFS)
\]

wherein \(JS\) is equal to overall job satisfaction and \(JFS\) stands for job facet satisfaction.

Job satisfaction has also been conceptualized in terms of need fulfilment when summed across job facets because a particular kind of work provides ample opportunities to an individual to
satisfy his physiological, social and psychological needs. Schaffer (1953) explains that overall satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual that can be satisfied in a job are actually satisfied. The stronger the need, the more closely will job satisfaction depend on its fulfilment. Smith (1955) suggests that job satisfaction is the "employee's judgement of how well his job on the whole is satisfying his various needs". Guion (1958) explains job satisfaction as the extent to which the individual's needs are satisfied and the extent to which the individual perceives satisfaction as stemming from his total job situation. Satisfaction with one's job, in turn, is a function of the degree of need satisfaction derived from or experienced in the job (McCormic and Tiffin, 1965). Lofquist and Davis (1969) state that "job satisfaction is the individual's assessment of the degree and fulfilment of the requirements by the work environment".

Explaining job satisfaction in terms of discrepancy scores, Ross and Zander (1957) and Morse (1953) define job satisfaction as a function of the difference between the amount of some outcome provided by a work role and the strength of a related desire or motive. Porter (1961) explains job satisfaction as the difference between responses to a "How much is there now?" item and responses to a "How much should there be?" item, when responses to these items are asked for in the context of job facets or needs. The difference between these two types of items is computed and the differences are summed across the
job facets to yield a measure of job satisfaction. Putting it in a different way:

Facets

$$JS = X \text{ (Should be - Is now)}$$

Lofquist and Davis (1969) also explain satisfaction in terms of discrepancy. According to them, "Satisfaction is defined in need fulfilment terms as a ... correspondence between the reinforcer system of the work environment and the individual's needs...". When operationalizing this definition, the subjects are asked to respond in terms of the difference between what they would like to receive and what they actually receive. Locke (1969) argues for the use of a discrepancy equation and believes that satisfaction is the result of a comparison between fulfilment ("is now") and desires or ideals ("would like") and that only unfulfilled desires can cause dissatisfaction. In his studies, he sometimes uses a "should be" item and at other times asks to think in terms of an ideal standard or "would like" item.

It is important to distinguish between the "should be - is now" and the "would like - is now" approaches. These approaches suggest two comparisons which an individual can make regarding his job. In the first comparison an individual can ask himself if his present job provides equitable outcomes (Adams 1963, 1965; Homans, 1961; Patchen, 1961) for the inputs it requires. This is an equity comparison and can be measured
by the discrepancy between the "should be" and "is now" items. In the second comparison an individual can ask himself if his present job comes close to his ideal job or desired job. This comparison can be measured by a discrepancy of importance rating as a weight between "would like" item and an "is now" item. He, however, objects to the use of importance weights on theoretical grounds, saying that importance is already included in and reflected by satisfaction ratings. In this framework the importance of a job facet determines the degree of effect produced by a given amount of discrepancy between fulfilment and desires. Hence, Locke (1969) believes that multiplying by importance is redundant. His view is supported by Mobley and Locke (1970). The need to further verify the influence of the perceived importance of job facets on overall job satisfaction has been stressed by Landy and Trumbo (1980).

Katzell (1980) conceptualizes job satisfaction as "an employee's own evaluation of his or her job in terms of supervision, co-workers, pay, promotions and the work itself. This evaluation is actually a comparison between the employee's expectations about these job-related factors and his or her actual experiences on the job".

Vroom (1964) proposed a model in which overall job satisfaction corresponds to a valence for a job. The valence of an outcome for a person is defined as the strength of its positive and negative affective orientation towards it, which
Facets:

\[ JS = \leq (Imp \times Is \; now) \]

The importance of a job facet corresponds to Vroom's valence for the job outcome. One may distinguish between the valence of an outcome to a person and its value to that person. An individual may desire an object but derive little satisfaction from its attainment or he may strive to avoid an object which he later finds to be quite satisfying.

In these definitions, the consensus is on job satisfaction being a generalized attitude. Job satisfaction, however, results from an individual's perception of how well or how badly the job and the conditions surrounding it have fulfilled or are capable of fulfilling his needs. One's judgement and evaluation as to the pros and cons—the positive and negative aspects of a situation—is invariably involved. There is a weighing up of its brighter side and the darker side, the likes and dislikes. As a result of such balancing, a general attitude of satisfaction, or otherwise, with the job is induced. Thus by putting these various elements together it can be stated that job satisfaction is a reintegration of the effect and attitude produced by an individual's perception of the fulfilment of his needs in relation to his work and the situation surrounding it. In fact the various answers that one gets to the questions: "How do you like your job?" or, "How do you find your job?" reveal the
operation of a balancing process—the weighing up of pluses and minuses, the positive and negative aspects of the job—for arriving at a total assessment of satisfaction.

It is, however, observed that satisfaction is not to be taken as something final and static which remains there once the process of evaluation is over. It is something which is in a state of flux, either consciously or otherwise, as long as one stays on the job. One may even cogitate about it after one has left the job. Since the needs of the individual are constantly in a fluid state, job satisfaction is not a permanent attitude nor is it merely momentary. It is a relatively enduring state which undergoes a change with the needs of the individual, the capacity of the work situation in fulfilling these needs, and the individual's own perception of the situation.

Theories of Job Satisfaction

The behaviour of individuals and their organizations is an extremely complex phenomenon. Fortunately, the field of management has systematically accumulated a documented body of knowledge which can be presented in the form of theories of job satisfaction in organizational settings, including educational institutions.

The need hierarchy theory: Men seek to satisfy many of their needs in and through their work. Maslow's (1943, 1974) study of an hierarchy of human needs has provided the basic foundation
for many studies on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction has been primarily based upon the gratification of needs—the stronger the need the more closely does job satisfaction depend on its fulfilment.

Conceptualizing behaviour as goal-directed, caused and motivated, Maslow postulated that people at work are motivated by a desire to satisfy an hierarchy of needs. (He proposed five classifications of needs in their order of prepotency, namely: (from the lowest to the highest) physical needs, safety needs, belongingness and love needs, esteem needs and the need for self-actualization, the implications of which have been useful to understand behaviour in work environments, indicating thereby that the satisfied worker has a greater probability of attaining self-actualization and mental health than the deficiently motivated employee.

Inherent in this hierarchy is the belief that the healthy individual desires to mature, develop and use his native abilities to the extent that he realizes fully his human potential (Hall and Nougaim, 1968). According to this view, human beings are motivated towards personal growth, the fulfilment of which leads to the highest level of satisfaction. Some individuals, however, because of situational variables, insecurity or other personality factors will not be able to achieve self-actualisation (Saleh and Hyde, 1969). The needs
may not always occur in an hierarchical order due to lack of a clear distinction between the various levels (Luthans, 1973; Mairer, 1973; Hodgetts, 1975), e.g. money could either be used to purchase food and clothing, thereby fulfilling one's physiological needs, or be used as a means for obtaining status and recognition which can gratify one's social and esteem needs (Sutermeister, 1976). In other words, the various levels are interdependent and overlapping (McCormick and Tiffin, 1974).

The weakness of the theory, according to Haynes et al. (1975) is that the concept of prepotency becomes less obvious as we move up the hierarchy. They argued that as a matter of fact the term "largely satisfied" is very vague when used to define the point at which one need ceases to motivate and the next one starts. The comments of Wahba and Bridwell (1976), Cofer and Apply (1964) indicate that the self-actualizing theory suffers from vagueness in concept, looseness in language and lack of adequate empirical evidence.

Empirical studies, although using Maslow's framework, too do not generally support his claim. Hall and Nougaim (1968) indicate that the hierarchy theory would predict that top executives have high needs for achievement, ambition or concern with work because their lower order needs have become relatively satisfied. ... Thus these higher-level concerns may have been a cause, not an effect, of their high organization status.

In a practical sense, this optimistic approach to organizational
motivation, like that of McGregor and Herzberg and others, commands wide support in business schools, but it seems unlikely to survive scrupulous examination in its present form.

The motivator-hygiene theory: The rationale of the concept of motivators and hygienes (factors) based upon a theory of motivation proposed by Maslow (1943) underlies three basic assumptions: (a) man's basic needs can be represented diagrammatically as two parallel arrows pointing in opposite directions—one arrow depicting his animal-Adam nature and the other representing man's human-Abraham nature (b) factors involved in producing job satisfaction are separate and distinct from the factors that lead to job dissatisfaction and (c) the satisfiers are effective in motivating an individual to superior performance and efforts, but dissatisfiers are not (Herzberg, 1966). Within this context, Herzberg et al. (1959) argue that job satisfaction is basically a function of having the higher-order needs satisfied. Since jobs are hard to get, not fulfilling these needs would not lead to job dissatisfaction but rather to job-neutrality.

Analysis of the responses in interviews of 200 engineers and accountants of 11 different firms in the Pittsburgh area by Herzberg et al. (1957) showed that the subjects most often talked about job experiences or factors related to a good feeling about the job in terms of job content. Factors or
experiences mentioned in connection with a bad feeling about the job were not often related to the surroundings or peripheral aspects of the job. They classified the content factors as satisfiers and context factors as dissatisfiers. On a bipolar continuum of job satisfaction-dissatisfaction, there would be some factors which, if present, would make one satisfied and others would make one dissatisfied, if absent, thus producing the opposite effects.

Many studies confirm the motivator-hygiene theory of Herzberg et al. (1959), for example, those of Myers (1964), Schwartz et al. (1968), Chastin (1977), and Abreu (1980), thus concluding that an appropriate relationship exists between satisfaction-dissatisfaction and intrinsic-extrinsic factors.

The theory, widely accepted by practitioners, has, however, come under heavy attack from most academicians (Luthans, 1973) on grounds of having narrow sampling (Ewen 1964; Dunnette and Kirchner, 1965), arbitrary assumption (House and Wigdor, 1967; Backman, 1971) weakness of methodology (Vroom, 1964; Lindsay et al., 1967; Schwab et al., 1971; Coffey, et al., 1975). Hinton (1968) reviewed 22 studies on a two-factor theory and explained that the research results were extremely inconsistent and confusing. Dunnette et al. (1967) too pointed out that the theory was shackled to a non-quantitative methodology and the results were biased by defensive behaviour reactions on the part of respondents. Therefore, it represents
an over-simplification of the relationship between motivation and satisfaction and the sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

The structural theory: Arguing that Herzberg's method suffers from built-in biases and logical deficiencies in his incident classification system and that even when these built-in deficiencies are corrected his basic findings are not replicated, Schneider and Locke (1971) developed a job satisfaction classification which is based on two dimensions—event and agent. Event refers to "what happened" while agent refers to "those who made it happen". Event is divided into task and non-task elements and agent is divided into self and non-self elements. The number of events and agents is theoretically unlimited and dependent upon the researcher's decision. Locke (1976), however, subsequently suggests that the particular division of event and agent "would best be made in terms of the purpose of the researcher than in terms of statistical consideration".

Broadly accepting the above mentioned event-agent framework of job satisfaction, Ben-Porat (1977) suggested that an intercorrelation matrix of job satisfaction variables tend to have a radex structure. The circumplex and radex are geometric solutions for intercorrelations among certain variables (correlation matrix). The geometric solution in space is determined by the nature of the variables that are mapped into points in the space and the similarity of coefficients computed
between all pairs of variables. The relative magnitudes of these coefficients are represented by an intervariable—the distance in the space—and thus determine the structural properties of the space (circumplex, radex or other). A circumplex is a system of variables which has a circular law of order (Guttman, 1954). A radex is described by Degerman (1972) in the following manner:

The structure is that of a generalized circumplex with the addition of a nested quantitative attribute proceeding radially from the origin to the surface of the circumplex. This structure differs from the pure circumplex in that here a definite origin is implied.

Guttman (1970) claims that if a matrix of correlation is either constructed or selected according to two particular domain facets, the matrix tends to be a radex structure if one facet is a polarizer with the variables related to this facet, corresponding to different directions in empirical space, and the other facet is a modulator—referring to the distance of the variable from the origin.

Ben-Porat's (1981) point of departure from that of Schneider and Locke (1971) is that he considers the concepts of event and agent as the two facets of a definitional system for a universe of content of job satisfaction. The original definitions of event and agent are accepted as such and the facets specified into elements and their internal order determined. Be specified an event facet as a polarizer and the
elements (the different events) as corresponding to different directions according to their particular content. The results confirmed his previous conclusions (Ben-Porat 1978) that job factors tend to constitute a circular order divided by an extrinsic-intrinsic dimension. The event facet is a polarizer. The location of the items in the space scattergram pointed out that the agent factor is a modulator and that the greater the self-influence perceived by the individual employee the closer the distance of the item to the criterion.

The facets and their specification were formulated into a mapping sentence:

\[
\text{A Event} \quad \text{B Agent}
\]

\[
\text{A person(x) refers to } \begin{cases}
(a_1 \text{ work}) \\
(a_2 \text{ reward}) \\
(a_3 \text{ context})
\end{cases} \text{ and to } \begin{cases}
(b_1 \text{ Self}) \\
(b_2 \text{ Non-self})
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\text{job and the range is ordered: } \begin{cases}
\text{high} \\
\text{low}
\end{cases} \text{ job satisfaction}
\]

The mapping sentence of the facets and their internal specifications provides the notion of order for the job factors as related to job satisfaction.

This theory, being very recent in origin, has not been thoroughly studied as yet and further research efforts are required to define more relevant facets to cover the complete relevant psychological phenomenon.
The equity theory: The development of equity theory can be traced to several prominent theorists working somewhat independently within the same general parameters. These variations on the theme are variously termed as the "cognitive dissonance" theory (Festinger, 1957; Heider, 1958), the "distributive justice" or "exchange theory" (Homans, 1961; Jacques, 1961; Patchen, 1961) and the "equity" or "inequity" theory (Adams, 1963; 1965; Weick and Nesson, 1968). While each of these models differs in some respects from the others, the general thrust of all of them is towards one basic unit of analysis. Specifically, such theories argue that a major determinant of job satisfaction is the degree of equity or inequity that an individual perceives in a work situation. The degree of equity is defined in terms of a ratio of an individual's inputs (such as effort) to outcomes (such as pay).

The important distinction between the equity theory and the other theories of job satisfaction (need hierarchy theory, motivator-hygiene theory) is that the latter focus on the identification of specific factors in the individual or his environment which determine behaviour, whereas the former (as the expectancy-valence theory) concentrates on an understanding of the process by which behaviour is energized and sustained.

Another major distinction that differentiates the equity theory from the other theories is that most of motivated behaviour is based on the perceived situation and not necessarily
on the actual set of circumstances. Where Maslow saw behaviour largely in terms of personality need variables, Herzberg saw behaviour largely in the context of objective job content and context factors./ The equity theory generally argues that it is the perceived equity of the situation that stimulates behaviour and satisfaction.

The process of perceived inequity (over and under-rewarded) creates tension, which motivates people to reduce it by bringing their input-output in balance. Though they may tolerate inequity for a short period of time, they will eventually re-establish equity. Mostly, people who feel over-rewarded may try to increase their productivity or improve the quality of their work if they are able to do so (Middlemist and Peterson, 1976). If they are not able to change their input levels, they may select a new set of referent (co-workers) persons for comparison or even attempt to lower their rewards by producing less under incentive systems. On the other hand, people who feel under-rewarded attempt to increase their rewards (outputs) by increasing the number of products under incentive systems or attempt to reduce the quality as well as quantity of their work under non-incentive systems.

In case people are not able to alter the input-output balance by actually changing their productivity or the quality of their work, they may attempt to change the balance by cognitively distorting their perceived input-output ratios.
For example, the feeling of being underpaid can be reduced by increasing intrinsic job satisfaction. An employee may insist that his pay is lower than others, but he does not mind because he likes his job. Another way of reducing perceived inequity is to use one's socio-economic, education and racial backgrounds to modify one's own and/or others' input.

The expectancy/valence theory: This theory goes under several names, including "expectancy theory", "instrumentality theory", "path-goal theory" and "valence-instrumentality expectancy (VIE) theory". Here the term "expectancy/valence theory" is used as being more descriptive of the two major variables of the formulation. It can be considered a process theory as it attempts to identify relationships among variables in a dynamic state as they affect individual behaviour. In the expectancy/valence theory, like in the equity theory, it is the relationship among inputs that is the basic focal point rather than the inputs themselves.

Most of the theoretical and empirical work by expectancy/valence theorists has focussed on the motivation to work. Motivational force to perform or attempt is a multiplicative function of the expectancies or beliefs that individuals have concerning future outcomes. Vroom (1964) defines "expectancy" as "an action outcome association". It is a statement of the extent to which an individual believes that a certain action will result in a particular outcome. Theoretically, expectancy can take on a
Mathematical value from "0" (absolutely no belief that an outcome will follow a particular action) to "1" (complete certainty that an outcome will follow a particular action). Usually, however, an expectancy would take on a probability value somewhere between these two extremes.

Recently, the generalized concept of expectancy has been divided into two specific types—"E→P expectancy" and "P→0 expectancies" (Campbell et al., 1970; Lawler 1973). An E→P expectancy represents a belief that an effort, such as a sales person's increasing the number of calls made per day, will lead to the desired performance, namely, increased sales. That is, the closer the perceived relationship between effort and resulting job performance, the greater the E→P expectancy. P→0 expectancies, on the other hand, are beliefs or anticipations that an individual has concerning the likelihood that a performance will in fact lead to particular outcomes. A sales person, for example, may be almost certain of receiving a raise or a bonus if he or she succeeds in increasing sales (that is, high P→0 expectancy). The multiplicative combination of these two types of expectancies determines the "expectancy" part of the expectancy/valence equation.

Valence, the second major component of the theory, can be defined as the value, or preference, which an individual places on a particular outcome. Valence may take on theoretical values from 1 to -1. That is, a person may be strongly attracted
to a particular outcome, such as a pay-rise, and may assign the outcome a high positive value; or the person may very strongly want to avoid the outcome, such as being fired, and may assign a negative value to it.

Vroom (1964) defines job satisfaction as a valence of outcomes or an anticipation of need satisfaction. People are attracted to an object or incentive because it is perceived to be able to satisfy their needs. Job satisfaction is measured by the total amount of outcome valences available to an employee. This theory can be compared with the need hierarchy theory with the difference that the latter theory defines job satisfaction as the amount of satisfied needs which reduces search behaviour. It can also be compared with the two-factor theory, which defines job satisfaction as a source of reinforcement which increases search behaviour; and with the expectancy/valence theory, which defines job satisfaction as an anticipation of receiving valued outcomes. In spite of specific differences, all these theories seem to agree that satisfied needs do not serve as determinants of behaviour, but that unsatisfied needs stimulate behaviour. The role of a satisfied need is to activate unsatisfied needs, strengthen stimulus response association and serve as the basis for estimating the level of anticipated need satisfaction.

While there is an obvious need for substantial additional research on the validity of this theory and on the determinants of valence, instrumentality and expectancy
perceptions, it has been hypothesized, for example, that the valence of second-level outcomes is a function of the satisfaction derived from their past attainment (Porter and Lawler, 1968) and their perceived equity (Lawler, 1968b). A number of specific variables have been hypothesized as influencing instrumentality. In general, they all pertain to the nature of the actual relationships between performance and second-level outcomes and not to the relationships between anticipated outcomes and job satisfaction.

Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction:

The theoretical formulations cited above make it abundantly clear that job satisfaction is a complex phenomenon derived from the weighing up of positive and negative feelings towards various aspects of the job of an individual. Its determinants too are complex and are inclusive of the interaction of several "on the job" and "off the job" variables. For the present study, selected factors under investigation have been grouped into three categories, namely (i) personal characteristics, which include age, intelligence, Socio-economic status and need satisfaction (ii) professional characteristics, which include experience, salary and qualifications, and (iii) organizational variables, which include the organizational climate and leadership behaviour.

Personal Characteristics

Age: Job satisfaction and age are viewed to be linearly
related to each other by Larouche (1972), Lavan (1979), Grochek (1979), Barber (1980) and Manfort (1981), are of the opinion that with the advancement in age a job becomes stable, and brings proficiency in the use of skills and abilities, resulting in greater satisfaction. A vertical rise in the status of the person leads to a sense of increased responsibility, freedom in decision making and the ability to carry out plans independently where a greater sense of accomplishment and satisfaction is felt.

The development of job satisfaction with age on the other hand has been conceived of as cyclical by Hoppock and Super (1950), Stagner et al. (1941), Mann (1953) and Kessler (1954). That job satisfaction is high among young workers and tends to go down during the first few years of employment was noted by Herzberg et al. (1957). The low point is reached when workers are in their middle and late twenties or early thirties. After this period satisfaction climbs steadily with age. This fluctuation particularly can be accounted for by age differences in occupational levels, but more frequently it is attributable to the developmental characteristics. Super (1939) reasoned that young men just getting a start in the world of work are glad to have almost any job and feel confident of their ability to get ahead. Then, after the age of about 25, comes a period of dissatisfaction with the old job, of wanting to get ahead more rapidly. Another reason for the
waning of the initial high level of satisfaction can be the contrasting regimen of school and work (Herzberg et al. 1957). It is not improbable, therefore, that the young worker becomes increasingly discouraged and dissatisfied as he attempts to adjust not only to a new job but also to a new way of life predicated upon unfamiliar values. Additional effort is expended and increasing age brings greater achievement and greater satisfaction. Again, after the age of 45 there is a relative increase in dissatisfaction due to a change in the emphasis of interest, that is, work loses some of its attractions and other types of satisfactions have not yet been developed. After a period of readjustment, new non-vocational sources of enjoyment are found and the improved general adjustment is shown in increased job satisfaction. The upswings in satisfaction come as the individual matures and his interests broaden and as improved status leads to the realization of higher goals and greater control over his own work and that of others.

In spite of the availability of these views expressed on the subject, our knowledge about the nature of the relationship between age and job satisfaction, whether it is linear or cyclical, is not yet conclusive.

Intelligence: By itself, a person's level of intelligence does not appear to be of major importance in influencing job satisfaction. But, when considered in relation to the kind of work being performed, intelligence serves as a
significant factor in job satisfaction. It is often asserted that an individual derives satisfaction from a job which permits him to use his potentialities and is in accordance with his mental level.

For many occupations and professions, there is a range of intelligence associated with efficiency of job performance and job satisfaction. Persons with capabilities beyond the required level, i.e. either too high or too low, are likely to experience boredom or frustration and dissatisfaction with the job. Intelligent individuals in less challenging and repetitive work situations become bored and dissatisfied as they fail to satisfy their mental urge. On the other hand, those in jobs that require a higher level of intelligence than they possess will be frustrated because they are unable to handle the demands of the job.

Socio-economic Status: Socio-economic status (SES) plays a significant role in determining vocational aspirations, vocational development, crowd or clique relationships and the achievement motivation of an individual. Therefore, it affects the job satisfaction of the individual. The social status of an individual facilitates communication and co-operation and it can be used as an incentive to motivation.

People belonging to a low socio-economic status have meagre resources and they are not able to fulfil their basic
needs. The institutions from which they acquire their education are generally equipped with untrained staff and inadequate equipment and material. So the maximum development of abilities does not take place and the inadequate utilisation of abilities in work situations hinders the vocational development of an individual, which leads to a lesser amount of job satisfaction. On the other hand, people from a higher SES are in a position to fulfil their needs and are exposed to better educational opportunities. Thus the handling of vocational developmental tasks becomes easier for them and they exhibit higher levels of job satisfaction.

The degree of achievement motivation which affects the involvement in particular tasks varies in people with high or low SES. Individuals belonging to a higher SES have higher levels of aspiration and a tendency to participate in the day-to-day work of the institution and in risk-taking situations. The greater involvement on their part leads to greater satisfaction. On the contrary, individuals with a low SES are less prone to taking risks, less inclined to gain more recognition and less involved in the work environment. The handling of vocational developmental tasks remains difficult for them, or they remain vocationally less mature and thus exhibit a lesser amount of satisfaction.

However, social class disparities in aspirations, opportunities and actual performances have been shrinking
somewhat as the total number of people with higher educational qualifications has risen and because increased efforts have been made to provide greater opportunities for socio-economically disadvantaged youth.

Need Satisfaction: Work occupies an important place in the life of man. It is a major source for the satisfaction of the biological, psychological and social needs of the individual (Roe, 1956). Gratification of human needs generates satisfaction and non-gratification generates dissatisfaction. This is also true of a work situation and one can state that satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the job will depend upon the extent to which individual needs are satisfied in and outside the work.

The most prepotent needs of an individual are physiological needs such as thirst, hunger and shelter. These needs may be called basic existence-needs. In developed countries, where food is abundant and distribution equitable, psychologists often relegate the need for food, clothing and shelter to a position of lesser importance. Herzberg et al. (1957) believe that basic needs are guaranteed by society and it is only the fulfilment of higher-order needs which leads to job satisfaction. On the other hand, three-fourths of the human race concentrated in developing and underdeveloped countries still look for food, shelter and clothing as potent needs for joining the world of work. Ganguli (1957) points out that
to a majority of the workers in India, fulfilment of basic needs contributes to job satisfaction. So the type of needs which contribute to job satisfaction may vary with the individuals and prosperity of society.

In India, financial incentives are still of topmost importance for workers because money can fulfil their basic needs and can be considered as an important variable associated with job satisfaction.

Security is one of the important human needs. For most individuals, it is more important than either pay or advancement (Ganguli, 1964). According to Maslow (1974), security is one of the two most prepotent needs in human beings. Security has an economic as well as psychological dimension. An individual who is sure of a steady income, not only in the present but in the future as well, also develops a sense of psychological satisfaction.

In Indian culture this need seems to be dominant and over-emphasized. Generally speaking, in the Indian family system the children develop in a protected environment and even when they grow up they are constantly reminded to make their future secure. It is even suggested that it is better to have a secure not-so-well-paid job rather than a well-paid but insecure job.

The research evidence on the need for security as a factor
in job satisfaction from the Western countries is not congruent with that of Asian countries. In the Western countries, very much like basic needs, it has been emphasized that the need for security is rather unimportant for managers and is emphasized more for the working class (Blai, 1964). Certain authors have gone to the extent of suggesting that satisfaction of security needs is more or less assured for the workers and is not an important motivator (McGregor, 1960). This is why workers change their jobs so frequently rather than sticking to one. However, Murray (1947) viewed satisfaction of security needs as an important factor for workers. In general it appears that research in Western countries is suggestive of security needs being important motivators for workers, but not for executives.

The differences in the research findings between the Indian and Western contexts seem to be more because of the ample opportunities of work, better salaries and the State's responsibility to provide jobs for all, rather than due to cultural factors.

Social needs too are related to job satisfaction. Human beings are characterized by an important urge to belong to a group and to have pleasant relations with their group members. An individual makes constant efforts to seek an optimum level of adjustment to the demands made by the work group and the members of the family. These are a strong
expression of his desire to satisfy his need (social) for belongingness. Women place greater emphasis on good co-workers (Jurgenson, 1947; Hardin et al., 1951; Kuhlen, 1963; centers and Bugental, 1966). Family happens to be the cohesive and basic unit of grouping to which an individual is attached and the primary source of fulfilling social needs. Blum and Naylor (1968) state that family relations, recreational outlets and participation in activities of voluntary associations contribute ultimately to job satisfaction. Likewise, when an individual adjusts in the work situation and is happy with his co-workers, he is more satisfied with his job.

Ego needs, which have been called higher-order needs by Maslow (1943), have a strong impact on job satisfaction. An individual continues to do many things to satisfy his ego. To begin with, one may go to the extent of accepting any kind of work because to be unemployed is a threat to the ego. Later on, the more the satisfaction of ego needs in a job, the greater the likelihood that it brings a higher degree of job satisfaction. Vroom (1962) asserts that jobs which afford exercise of individual judgement and initiative, provide for the use and development of aptitudes and permit some knowledge of results of a person's performance are more ego satisfying than those which do not have these characteristics. As one goes up in the occupational hierarchy it provides more opportunities for ego satisfaction and hence greater job satisfaction.
Professional Characteristics

Experience: The relationship between job satisfaction and the number of years on the job is complex and closely parallels the relationship of age and job satisfaction ("U" shaped). During the early stages of employment, new workers tend to be rather satisfied with the job. This early period on the job involves the stimulation and challenge of learning new skills and developing new abilities. Besides, the work may seem attractive at first just because it is new.

Unfortunately, early satisfaction wanes unless employees receive constant evidence of their progress and growth. After a few years on the job, growing discouragement is common, brought on by the feeling that the worker is not advancing as rapidly as he or she would like. Besides, in times of inflation and rapidly rising starting salaries, an employee with a few years of experience finds that he is making little more than beginning employees, despite the fact that his salary has increased.

Job satisfaction begins to increase again after six or seven years of employment and improves steadily thereafter, reaching a maximum for workers who have remained with a company for about 20 years (Hull and Kolstad, 1942). With seniority, they gain better positions and opportunities to exercise their power and ability in decision making. Thus
higher order needs are fulfilled, making them more satisfied.

Salary: The question of the importance of salary in job-satisfaction is complicated and seems to vary with the individual. There has been a persistent controversy over the importance of salaries to workers. Economists and many executives are prone to stress the importance of the size of the pay cheque in determining a worker's job satisfaction and the probability that he will remain in his job. This assumption is decried by social scientists associated with the human relations movement, who typically view economic factors as highly over-emphasized and stress the importance of the satisfaction of social and ego needs.

Both sides can find some support. When workers are asked to rank different aspects of the work role in terms of the importance of these, wages tend to be rated as less important than other factors. However, when they are asked to describe what makes them satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs, wages are found to be the most frequent source of dissatisfaction and the least frequent source of satisfaction.

It has been suggested that satisfaction from receiving a salary is dependent on the relationship between that amount and some standard of comparison used by the individual. (The standard may be an adaptation level (Helson, 1947) derived from the salary received at previous times or a conception of the amount of salary received by other people.) Patchen (1961)
assumes that individuals compare their own earnings with those of others and evaluate differences or similarities in terms of their relative standing on dimensions believed to be the basis of pay, e.g. skill, seniority and education. Satisfaction with a specific wage comparison was hypothesized to be a function of the objective dissonance of the comparison. If one person were to compare himself with another who was earning more but who was similar in his standing on dimensions related to pay, the comparison would be dissonant and would be expected to lead to dissatisfaction on the part of the comparer.

The amount of income considered sufficient is also related to the standard of living desired and to the cost of living in a geographical location. A salary that brings a better-than-average living standard in a small town may be totally inadequate in a big city. Also, the salary that provides a comfortable standard of living for one family may be insufficient for another in the same area. Those with a high need for status for example, require a higher income than those who care little for status and if they do not get an adequate salary, there is dissatisfaction. This leads to the argument that satisfaction is dependent on relative rather than absolute wage levels. This variable also has the capacity to fulfil an increasing number of needs, thereby meeting the proposed personal fulfilment component of job satisfaction.
Qualifications: A person's educational qualifications are an important variable in the determination of the level of job satisfaction. The qualifications are directly related to one's occupational position. Generally, highly qualified persons are attached to higher status jobs. The more qualified a person is, the better are the chances that he will be able to cope with complex work situations. Under-qualified persons, on the other hand, may be unable to give good guidance to their subordinates as also adequate cooperation to their superiors, thereby depicting a less effective environment, which consequently makes them less satisfied with their jobs.

Better educated persons are more satisfied as they are associated with higher job levels. Higher job levels are associated with higher salaries and better paid persons are more capable of satisfying their higher-order needs (psychological), making them more satisfied with their jobs.

(For making children capable of getting good jobs, parents spend a fair amount of money. Education is a good investment for the parents as well as the country. Losing a technically skilled person can amount to 10 times the loss of his salary to the management (Lawler, 1974)—caused by the hampering of production in the process of a fresh selection and subsequent adjustments. It is in the interest of any management to take more care of highly qualified and professionally trained persons in terms of recognition, thus making them
more satisfied with the job. The more the education a person has received the greater is the need for providing opportunities to control and use his creative ideas. And when job situations provide such challenges to the individual, there is greater likelihood of his being satisfied, but in situations which fail to stimulate creative thinking, he remains dissatisfied with the job. Work involving variety, control, purpose and responsibility is more satisfying (Blauner, 1964) than other kinds.

Organizational Variables

Organizational Climate: Individual's development and behaviour is very much affected by interpersonal relationships. These influences are often so subtle that it is hard to identify them separately. Indeed, these may appear to be a part of the atmosphere. In any group or organization there exists a system of subtle and pervasive interpersonal effective relationships called climate. A wholesome climate is one where individuals feel secure and which enables individuals to function effectively.

A school, college or university exists in a larger environment, which is composed of social and physical elements. Each institution has its own particular organizational climate with its own ideals and traditions. It reflects both the norms and values of a formal system and their reinterpretation into an informal system, internal and external struggles, the types of people it attracts, its work processes and physical
layout, the modes of communication and the exercise of authority within the system (Waller, 1932). This kind of a climate affects all those individuals who work in the organization in some other capacity or the other. An organizational climate, as described, by Halpin (1960), can be open, autonomic, controlled, familiar, paternal or closed. An open climate is characterized by high scores on esprit, thrust and consideration and low scores on disengagement, hindrance and production emphasis, where subordinates get equal opportunity to give their opinions in policy making or decision making and get full cooperation, indicating greater job satisfaction.

There is a well-established and systematic relationship which exists between organizational climate and job satisfaction. A democratic climate in an organization provides more opportunities or an environment for growth and development. The employer thus involves staff in day-to-day activities of the institution, develops a sense of worth and importance in employees and makes them more satisfied.

In a closed climate, members merely go through the motions to complete a task. There is little motivation on the part of the leader to challenge members in a human way. These conditions generate frustration and lead to dissatisfaction.

Leadership behaviour: The personal characteristics of a leader play a vital part in his relationship with staff members. The
leader's responsibility is to assist his group in developing and maintaining goals and, in a formal group or organization, the leader has a particular position within the structure. Stogdill (1948) identified leadership as a process of influencing the activities of the organization in the task of goal setting. According to Koontz and Donnell (1959), leadership is influencing people to follow in the achievement of a common goal.

Job satisfaction among subordinates is affected by leadership behaviour and to a large extent by the attributes (traits) of the person who provides leadership. A trait approach to job satisfaction in the context of leadership, however, has not proved fruitful as it could not provide great insight into the characteristics of a leader or to the process of leadership. The focus of research, therefore, has shifted to the behaviour of the leader, i.e. to the kinds of activities that the leader engages in in carrying out the task of leadership.

The two major behavioural dimensions in leadership can be identified as "consideration" and "initiating structure". These two dimensions represent the two major classes of leadership viz. behaviour which is interpersonal in orientation (i.e. consideration) and behaviour which is goal or task oriented (i.e. initiating structure). Consideration reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job-relationships, characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas and consideration for their feelings. The initiating
structure reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his role and that of his subordinates toward goal attainment.

Considerate leadership is an important contributor to job satisfaction. A worker wishes to cooperate fully and utilize his abilities to the maximum when he has good relations with his superiors. High correlations were found for consideration and job satisfaction (Korman, 1966). Kerr et al. (1974) have suggested the following propositions for which there is empirical evidence (the details are given in the next chapter dealing with the review of literature):

Subordinates are more satisfied when their expectations and observations of the leader's consideration and initiating structure are congruent. Thus a situation high on consideration and high on initiating structure is ideal.

When the subordinates are dependent on their supervisor for satisfaction, freedom and physical and financial resources, they feel more satisfied with the job.

In situations where the management shows support for the high consideration of the leader, the workers are more satisfied as such situations provide the individual with more opportunities in the decision making processes.

Need of the Study

Job satisfaction is acquiring an increasingly important
role in modern society, in which man spends most of his time on his job. Basically considered to have been undertaken for payment received in lieu of it, a job has lately been recognized as a source of intrinsic satisfaction to the incumbent. Katz (1954) rightly remarks, "It is important to know the nature and degree of gratification and deprivation in job performance itself".

Job satisfaction is important to the worker and also to his employer. Substantial evidence exists to show that job satisfaction is one of the job variables which to some degree affects the probability of resignation (Jurgenson, 1947; Brayfield and Crockett, 1955; Herzberg et al., 1957; Ross and Zander, 1957; Vroom, 1964; Lawler and Porter, 1967; Hulin, 1968; Wild, 1970; Ronan, 1970) and absenteeism (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955; Vroom, 1964; Korman, 1971). This fact should make knowledge of job satisfaction a good tool for the manager to use in taking preventive action. In other words, administrators and managers must try every possibility to eliminate these negative effects to successfully accomplish organizational goals.

Greater job satisfaction is likely to lead eventually to more effective functioning of the individual and the organization as a whole. In fact working life is to be evaluated not simply in terms of the amount of goods turned out, the productive efficiency and the profit it brings, but also in terms of the satisfaction that the participants derive from it. The satisfied worker is in general a more flexible and better adjusted
person 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 and generally unhappy and dissatisfied (Herzberg et al., 1957). Being efficient and successful on the job, the satisfied worker is likely to experience a sense of competency which gets reflected in better adjustment scores. This may be one of the explanations for satisfied workers showing better adjustment."

As job satisfaction can support an already healthy self-concept, or can bolster low esteem, this can lead to greater job satisfaction, the feeling of accomplishment and self-actualization (Kalish, 1973).

Unhappiness at work can affect one's physical and emotional health. A 15-year study of the aging process (Work in America, 1973) found that the single greatest predictor of longevity was work-satisfaction. Heart disease, ulcers, arthritis, psychosomatic illness, anxiety, worry and tension have also been shown to be related to stress and dissatisfaction at work.

A discontented worker, whatsoever may be the underlying cause of his discontent, is far more interested in his misfortunes than in his job. The workers dissatisfied with the nature of their jobs may become militant in their attitude towards the
management. Disgruntled workers may cause wilful damage to machinery and interfere with the smooth working of the plants as a means of giving vent to their resentment. Another way in which dissatisfaction may find expression is in the adoption of attitudes hostile to business interests. A dissatisfied teacher too can do more harm than good because he will neither work wholeheartedly nor try to contribute anything to education. A dissatisfied teacher will produce frustrated students who may destroy the nation.

A study of job satisfaction can classify and categorise the conditions and factors that lead to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. One could thereafter weed out or improve the conditions that lead to dissatisfaction. Besides, one could reinforce the conditions that make work satisfying and fulfilling instead of dull and disappointing. Most of us spend at least one-third of 40 to 45 years of our life at work. This is a long time to be frustrated and unhappy, especially since unhappiness at work spills over into other aspects of life—disrupts relationships with one's family and friends and influences physical and mental health.

Workers nowadays are better educated. This increases the pool of skilled or trained workers available in industry, but also means that they need more meaningful and challenging work. Routine, repetitive and unstimulating jobs do not provide adequate satisfaction for workers with a higher
education. Thus the number of potentially dissatisfied and frustrated workers increases every year. This, in turn, has a deteriorating effect upon productive efficiency, personnel relationships and discipline.

The same is very much true for teachers also. In the education line, there has been an increasing awareness of the demands of teachers. Of course the schools, colleges and universities, as humanizing and educating institutions, have a major goal—the growth and development of the students they serve. But the social well-being, advancement and growth of pupils depend to a great extent on the enthusiasm, efficiency and professional skills of the teachers. The teacher is a great force in building future citizens and inspiring the young nation. The progress and the future of education, its quality and ideals, will depend upon how and by whom young persons are educated.

Therefore, the job satisfaction of teachers is of much value to administrators who frame policies, take decisions and create conditions in which teachers try to maximize their potential and thus derive greater job satisfaction.

(In this context, therefore, a study of job satisfaction can provide information for educational administrators to help them understand teachers better and explore the best possible ways to maximize the career adjustment of these educationists.)
To date, several steps have been taken to recognise the demands of the teaching community. However, these steps have generally been limited to matters of compensation and working conditions. There is a need to identify other job factors, besides working conditions and compensation, which are of importance to the teaching community. The improvement or preventive measures concerning these other factors will certainly help in improving staff satisfaction (Chen, 1977).

Persisting presence of certain annoying factors create tension in the work of a teacher, which permeates through his total personality and outlook. Such a mental set-up in which the whole organism is tense results in several kinds of physical and psychological maladies. Its bad effects are not restricted to the teacher alone, but engulf the whole of society as such.

The reasons for a teacher's dissatisfaction are the internal and external barriers which interfere with his or her goal-directed behaviour. Internal barriers include such personal factors as intelligence, skill, personality, and motivation. External barriers include organizational factors such as structure, work-group and the job itself. Argyris (1957, 1973) pointed out that a number of organizational barriers prevent persons from satisfying their needs. Rigid organizational structure, control, authoritarian leadership and inflexible reward and punishment systems tend to increase
individual dependency on the organization and depress personal growth. On the other hand the considerate behaviour of a leader leads to an increase in the job satisfaction of the subordinates. Thus it becomes necessary that a study of the job satisfaction of teachers should be made, taking into account the personal, professional as well as organizational factors, so that situations of dissatisfaction can be avoided and job satisfaction be enhanced.

Most of the research work on job satisfaction done so far has been restricted to the industrial workers. Lately, however, other occupational groups, including teachers, have been included in studies on job satisfaction. But still there is a scarcity of attempts to probe the job satisfaction of teachers in general and Home Science teachers in particular. Anjaneyulu (1968) has concluded that

the category worst hit in job satisfaction was the special teachers. The important factors of dissatisfaction among them were lack of social status, indiscipline among pupils and non-availability of suitable equipment and furniture.

Besides, few attempts have been made to do a comprehensive study of teachers working at different levels of the education ladder, i.e. the school, college and university levels and to study the job satisfaction of teachers in relation to personal, professional and organizational factors. Thus the area of job satisfaction among teachers leaves much scope for further study.
Statement of the Problem

"Job Satisfaction of Home Science Teachers: Its Relationship with Personal, Professional and Organizational Characteristics"

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the relationship between personal characteristics and job satisfaction of Home Science teachers.

2. To examine the nature of the relationship between professional characteristics and job satisfaction of Home Science teachers.

3. To study the relationship between organizational characteristics and job satisfaction of Home Science teachers.

4. To identify the factor structure underlying personal, professional and organizational characteristics and job satisfaction of Home Science teachers.

5. To find out the individual and conjoint predictability of predictor variables towards the criterion variable of job satisfaction and to locate the best combination of predictor variables explaining the maximum criterion variance.

Operational Definitions of the Terms

In order to ensure clarity of the problem and precision
in the discussion later on, the operational definitions of the various terms used in the study are being given below:

Job Satisfaction: In accordance with Gilmer's (1966) view, job satisfaction in the present study is defined as a result of various attitudes the person holds toward his job, toward related factors and toward life in general. In terms of its measurement, job satisfaction covers 20 dimensions namely, salary and fringe benefits, interpersonal relations among colleagues, teacher-principal relations, profession, teacher-student relations, institution, working conditions, work load, ability utilization, achievement activity, community aspect, supervision, family life, freedom, policies and practices, possibility of growth and development, library policies and practices, security and recognition and status. Cumulative score on 20 dimensions gives over all job satisfaction score.

Personal Characteristics: Personal characteristics refer to the characteristics of the subject and are inclusive of his age, intelligence, socio-economic status and need satisfaction in the present study.

Professional Characteristics: Professional characteristics refer to professional qualities of the person namely, his teaching experience, salary and qualifications.

Organizational Variables: Organizational variables include (a) organizational climate of the institution and (b) leadership
behaviour of the principal or head of the institution. Organizational climate in the present study refers to eight dimensions namely, disengagement, hindrance, esprit, intimacy, aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration. Leadership behavior refers to its two dimensions, initiating structure and consideration. The cumulative score of the two dimensions shows that leader is strong in initiating structure and has high consideration for the members of his work group.

Delimitations of the Study

1. The study was limited to graduate and post-graduate Home Science teachers. The undergraduate Home Science teachers do not fall within the scope of the sample of the present study.

2. A limited number of selected variables has been taken under the personal, professional and organizational characteristics. Personal characteristics include four variables namely, age, intelligence, socio-economic status and need satisfaction (need satisfaction further has five sub measures, physical, security, social and ego need satisfaction and a total need satisfaction); Professional characteristics are limited to three variables namely, experience, salary and qualifications; and organizational characteristics relate to organizational climate in respect of its eight measures (disengagement, hindrance, esprit, intimacy, aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration); and leadership
behavior includes two dimensions of initiating structure and consideration and a cumulative score of the two dimensions.

Organization of Chapters in the Report

The introductory chapter of the report presents theoretical viewpoints on job satisfaction, the need of the study, and the statement of the problem along with its objectives and delimitations. The second chapter gives a review of related literature. Methodology and procedure adopted for the completion of the study are delineated in Chapter III. The description of data has been presented in Chapter IV. The next three chapters (V, VI and VII) deal with the analysis of the data and simultaneous discussion of results pertaining to correlations, factor analysis and step up regression equations respectively. The final chapter VIII contains a summary and conclusions of the present study along with the educational implications of the findings and suggestions for further research. A bibliography and appendices follow at the end of the research report as usual.