Chapter-II

THEORETICAL VIEWS

Theoretical views have been presented in this chapter so as to have conceptual understanding of the criterion and predictor variables under consideration.

JOB SATISFACTION

Job is an occupational activity performed by an individual in return for a monetary reward, while satisfaction is a word which is difficult to define. Webster's Encyclopaedia Dictionary of English language defines it as "the act of satisfying or state of being satisfied, contentment in possession and enjoyment and to satisfy is to grant fully the wants, wishes or desires". So job satisfaction is nothing but the state of an organism obtained through the work situation or work position while performing various tasks and while serving an institution.

In Bullock's (1952) opinion, job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee towards his job. These attitudes are related to specific factors, such as wages, conditions of work, advancement
opportunities, prompt settlement of grievances, fair treatment by employers and other fringe benefits.

Morse (1953) presented an interesting hypothesis, according to which satisfaction is increased directly by the amount individual's tensions are reduced and decreased directly by amount of increased tension.

Kuhlen (1963) finds that job satisfaction is proportionate to the degree that the elements of the job satisfy the particular needs which the person feels most strongly. According to Gorton (1976), employee satisfaction and morale are attitudinal variables which reflect positive or negative feelings about particular persons or situations. Frequently, these two terms are used synonymously in the educational literature and when the two concepts are analysed, there appears to be considerable conceptual overlap in them.

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 a composite satisfaction with the job as a while.

Job satisfaction has also been conceptualized in terms of need fulfilment 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 than can be satisfied in a job are actually satisfied. The stronger the need, the more closely job satisfaction depends 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) also explains job satisfaction as the extent to which the individual perceives satisfaction as stemming from his total job satisfaction. 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). Human beings are motivated towards personal growth, the fulfilment of which leads to the highest level of satisfaction. However, the needs may not always occur in an hierarchical order because of a lack of clear distinction between the various levels (Luthans, 1973; Maier, 1973; Hodgetts, 1975). According to Haynes et al. (1975) the
weakness of this theory is that the concept of prepotency becomes less obvious when one moves up the hierarchy.

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

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". A theoretical analysis by Locke (1970a) states that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are properly conceived as outcomes of action. The effect of performance on satisfaction is viewed as a function of the degree to which it leads to the attainment of the individual's dominant job values. Dissatisfaction with one's past performance generates the desire to change one's performance, whereas satisfaction with one's performance produces the desire to repeat or maintain one's previous performance level.

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, etc.) towards his job. Smith (1963) considers job satisfaction as "a function of the perceived characteristics of a job in relation to an individual's frame of reference". Gilmer (1966) explains job satisfaction as "the result of various attitudes the person holds towards his job, towards related factors and towards life, in general". And this viewpoint was taken into
consideration by Gupta and Srivastava while developing their Teacher's Job Satisfaction Scale which has been used in the present study. Schultz (1973) also refers to job satisfaction as "a set of attitudes that employees have about their jobs" and describes it as the psychological disposition of people towards their jobs and this involves a collection of numerous attitudes.

Job satisfaction is also a function of an individual's level of aspiration and a worker with a high level of aspiration is likely to be less happy, whereas another with a moderate level of aspiration can derive more happiness from the same job and, thus, dissatisfaction with the job increases when the gap between aspiration and its attainment increases.

Explaining job satisfaction in terms of discrepancy scores, Morse (1953) and Ross and Zander (1957) 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.

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 Nesset, 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 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 input (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 it 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 expectancy/valence theory goes under several names, including "expectancy theory", "instrumentality", "path-goal theory" and "valence-instrumently expectancy theory". Here the term "expectancy valence theory" is used as being more descriptive of 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 "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. Vroom (1964) has defined job satisfaction as a valence of outcomes or an anticipation of need satisfaction and is measured by the total amount of outcome valence available to an employee.

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 interaction of several "on the job" and "off the job" variables.

ADJUSTMENT

The concept of adjustment is as old as human race on earth and systematic emergence of this concept started with Darwin. In those days, adjustment was taken as purely biological and he used the term 'adaptation'. The adaptability to environmental hazards goes on increasing as we proceed on the phologenetic scale from the lower extreme to the higher extreme of life. Insects and germs cannot
withstand the hazards of changing conditions in the environment and, that is why, hundreds of species of insects and germs perish as soon as the winter begins. Among the living beings, man has the highest capacity to adapt to new situations and he adapts himself not only to physical demands but also adjusts to social pressures in the society.

Biologists used the term 'adaptation' strictly for physical demands of the environment but psychologists use the term 'adjustment' for varying conditions of social or inter-personal relations in the society. Thus, adjustment implies reaction to the demands and pressures of social environment imposed upon the individual. The demands may be external or internal. A child is asked to do this and that and he has to follow certain beliefs and set of values which the family follows and, thus, his personality develops in the continuous process of interaction with his family environment. Demands like hunger, water, oxygen, sleep etc. may be termed as internal and the non-fulfilment of these demands makes a child uncomfortable. With the development of the child into adulthood, these physiological demands go on increasing and become more complex. These two types of demands, sometimes, come into conflict with each other and, resultanty, make the adjustment a complicated process for the individual. The need which is not gratified produces
frustration and may lead to abnormal behaviour.

Psychologists have interpreted adjustment from two important points of view - adjustment as an achievement and adjustment as a process. The first point of view emphasizes the quality or efficiency of adjustment and the second, lays emphasis on the process by which an individual adjusts in his external environment.

Schneiders (1960) defined adjustment as "......a process, involving both mental and behavioural responses, by which an individual strives to cope successfully with inner needs, tensions, frustrations and conflicts and effect a degree of harmony between those inner demands and those imposed on him by the objective world in which he lives".

Shaffer (1961) defined adjustment as "the process by which living organism maintains a balance between its need and the circumstances that influence the satisfaction of these needs". Shaffer's definition lays stress on needs and their satisfaction. One feels adjusted to the extent one's needs are gratified or in the way of being gratified. The individual tries to bring changes in his circumstances in order to overcome the difficulties in the realisation of his needs. Sometimes, he reduces the quantum of his need so that he may feel satisfied within the limited resources of needs and, in this way, he tries to keep a balance between his
needs and the capacity of realising these needs. As long as 
the balance is maintained, he remains adjusted. The very 
moment it is disturbed, he drifts towards mal-adjustment.

According to Shaffer (1969), the adjustment process 
involves four parts: (1) a need or motive in the form of a 
strong persistent stimulus; (2) the thwarting or non-
fulfilment of this need; (3) varied activity, or exploratory 
behaviour; leading to (4) some response that removes or 
atleast reduces the initiating stimulus and completes the 
adjustment.

Of greatest importance in complex human adjustments 
are the social motives involved in interactions with other 
persons, including needs for security, approval, 
recognition, affection, conformity, prestige, mastery, self-
realization and the like.

Anxiety, has an especially important role in the 
process of adjustment. The feeling tone of anxiety is much 
like that of fear, but there are differences. Fear is evoked 
by a present external stimulus; anxiety by an apprehension 
of threat and a feeling of helplessness.

Two kinds of thwarting may prevent the fulfilment of 
motives - frustration and conflict. A frustration is an 
external circumstance or an act of another person which 
prevents the satisfaction of an aroused motive and it
usually leads to increased effort, anger and aggressive impulses or immature and ineffective behaviour, but does not often result in serious psychological difficulties. A conflict is the arousal of two or more strong motives that cannot be solved together and it exists when the reduction of one motivating stimulus involves an increase in another, so that a new adjustment is demanded. Every person experiences some frustrations and conflicts, but is able to solve most of them normally with his own resources. A person engages in exploratory behaviour, trying one act and, then, another until he discovers one that overcomes the frustration, resolves the conflict or at least reduces its intensity.

Adjustments vary in quality. Suppose a university student fails in examination. This situation demands adjustment, for it not only thwarts his educational and vocational plans but also evokes conflicts about his personal adequacy. The student may adjust himself by finding and remedying the cause of his difficulties, by increasing effort or by making a rational change in his goals, all of which are direct and constructive solutions. Or, he may adjust himself by blaming others for his failure, by emphasizing his attainments in other areas (as in athletics), by daydreaming of imaginary successes or by
developing an apparent illness that execues his failure. These acts do not solve his problems, but they are adjustments because they help him relieve his tension and reduce his anxiety. The indirect, substitutive methods of adjustment, are often called adjustment mechanisms.

The problem of defining what is a "good" adjustment is clarified by the concepts of integrative and nonintegrative behaviour. An integrative adjustment is one that not only satisfies the present motive but also facilitates the solution of subsequent problems. A nonintegrative adjustment, in contrast, reduces the anxiety of the moment but leads to more trouble in the future. A person who is one-sided in his satisfactions, who reduces one intense need at the expense of thwarting the rest, is nonintegratively adjusted. Such a person is usually so preoccupied with the overpowering need to reduce his immediate anxiety that he is blinded to other considerations more relevant to his ultimate welfare.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING

Attitude is readiness to react towards or against some situation, person or thing in a particular manner. The attitudes, ideas, feelings and interests of a child are influenced by the organisation of his family, thinking of
parents and customs of the society. Personality of parents, their education and their behaviour towards the children is the basis of development of attitudes. There are two types of attitudes - optimistic and pessimistic. An optimistic person is one who has positive attitude, positive outlook towards life and positive goals; whereas a pessimistic person is one who has negative attitude, a negative outlook towards life and has no definite goals.

The conceptual definition of 'attitude' has been given in many ways by different authors. The term 'attitude' was first used to denote "the sum-total of a man's inclinations and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats and convictions about any specific topic" (Thurstone and Chave, 1929). Later, however, when motivational affective characters of attitude were emphasized, Thurstone (1931) defined attitude as "the affect for or against a psychological object". Attitude was defined by Allport (1954) as "a mental and neutral state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related". The affective quality of attitude was also emphasized by Krech and Crutchfield (1948). They defined attitude as an "enduring organisation of motivational,
emotional, perceptual and cognitive processes with respect to some aspect of the individual's world". The attitudes are viewed by Fishbein and Ajzen (1972) as disposing the individual to think, feel and act in certain ways and are inferred from these three sources. It is evident, therefore, that attitudes consist of cognitive, affective and behavioural components. However, the affective component remains the central aspect of attitude. According to Sorenson (1977), "An attitude is a particular feeling about something. It, therefore, involves a tendency to behave in a certain way in situations which involve that something, whether person, idea or object. It is partially rational and partially emotional and is acquired, not inherent, in an individual".

Most contemporary educational psychological research on attitude change has failed to focus on the integrative, dialectical and socio-political aspects of the change process. The educational taxonomies for classifying educational objectives divide educational experience and learning into three domains - cognitive, affective and motor - reflecting the traditional divisions of educational and psychological research and placing attitudes in the affective domain (Bloom et al., 1956; Krathwohl, 1964).

There are four major psychological theories or models
of attitude change: Freudian psychology and psychoanalysis, a congruity model, a balance model and a dissonance model.

Freud (1953-1964) described the internal conflict which rages within the individual, particularly between the id, the libido and the superego. Psychoanalysis seemed to be primarily concerned with generating some sort of balance between the aggressiveness and sexuality of the id and the guilt of the superego. But neither Freudian psychological theory nor psychoanalysis as therapy explains very well the many cases in which patients become fairly well reconciled to what has happened to them as children and change their interpersonal styles but still find themselves in considerable conflict with infantilisms which survive as social norms.

The congruity model was developed by Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum in 1957. It is used to explain the nature and degree of attitude change we undergo when we experience attitudes which are inconsistent with our own. We try to reduce the dissociation by making the inconsistent attitudes more congruent. The congruity model predicts that the size of the change is inversely proportional to the degree of polarization.

The balance model deals with the relationship of attitudes (Abelson and Rosenberg, 1958). Imbalance and
thereby the opportunity for change, occurs when one of these attitudes changes. Rosenberg et al. (1960) suggest an additional alternative, which does not really restore balance but at least dissociates belief and friendship so that both survive. The technique is called compartmentalization — you stop thinking about the attitudinal imbalance you have fallen into (Newcomb et al., 1965).

The dissonance model was developed by Leon Festinger (1957). Cognitive dissonance is Festinger's term describing the individual's state of tension — obviously a state of disharmony, disequilibrium and inconsistency. To find inner peace, the individual must transform dissonance or inconsistency to consistency or consonance.

Defining 'attitude' operationally, Himmelfarb and Eagly (1974) refer to "any reports of what people think or feel or of the ways in which they intend to act". The operational definition means the use of some kind of tools for obtaining responses from the subjects. The most commonly used instrument in the studies on attitudes is some kind of questionnaire or scale. These questionnaires or scales assess attitudes through self-reports of opinions, beliefs, feelings, behaviour or intended actions. Statements are generally scaled to express 'favourability' or
'unfavourability' towards the object and these dimensions formed the corner stone of Thurstone's attitude scaling procedures. Ahluwalia's Teacher Attitude Inventory (1978) is also such an inventory, which has been used in the present study measure the attitude of teachers towards teaching.