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Job satisfaction occupies prominent position literally in general as well as specifically in industrial and organizational psychology. Number of studies on the subject examined that happier people feel more satisfied with their jobs thus leading to better performance an important attribute frequently measured by the organization.

No doubt number of studies have been conducted on job satisfaction still the concept is worth exploring and controversial as it affects the action and behavior of employee's apparent performances because of their positive or negative attitude.

Number of studies observed an adverse relationship between satisfaction and employee's turnover, absenteeism, their physical and mental health, morale, accidents, participation in decision making, job involvement, organizational interpersonal relations, its goodwill and productivity as well. Whereas some researches have also been conducted on the factors that influence the level of job satisfaction in organizations. The emphasis of classical thinkers was on financial aspect but in 1930's the focus shifted from money to human relations (Elton Mayo). As a result the organizations started emphasizing on informal relations than monetary benefits followed by an attempt of scholars to link job satisfaction with job design, job enlargement, job enrichment, job rotation, working conditions, organizational culture, employee involvement, empowerment, autonomous work groups, challenging responsibilities, variety of tasks, advancement opportunities, superior subordinate relationships and employer related strategies formulated to recognize the human factor specially to create employeeship and employeeship culture in the organization.

Considering the employee satisfaction not only a frill but as a foundation of organizational growth, today the focus has been shifted from financial and other fringe benefits to soft contract areas (psychological contracts) where company's expectations are matched with employee's expectations so that employee may be willing to fight for company and company may come in employee's defense. In present day competitive scenario, the organizations can survive, grow and reach to desired level of excellence through learning and innovations which completely depend upon the availability, retention and development of employee talent -acquired by way of their satisfaction on job.

Transformation of education from guru (teacher) to shishya (taught) had been like a tradition in the Indian culture. But today this concept has completely changed
and looks like a forgotten story. When centuries old knowledge centers (temples) were converted into educational institutions, how the problem of job satisfaction can remain untouched, like that in other industries.

With the liberalization of economic policy in 1991 the GDP growth rate increased to 9.7 per cent, and it lead to increase in the demand of skilled human resource tremendously which was unmatched with the supply. Along with, there was a significant increase in total number of industries and the government has also thought to go for privatization of Indian education system, which resulted in mushroom growth of educational institutions. Prior to liberalization of Education Policy the Institutions were established by the Governments and only few private Institutions existed and that too aided by the Government. The liberal education policy of the Government undoubtedly increased participation of private players in this sector but made the situation of the employees working in the field worst in terms of less salary, poor working conditions, less opportunities for development. Privatization of higher education particularly in technical and professional courses was introduced to impart quality education in the country but failed to give the desired results due to either non availability or unsatisfied teaching community which is the core part of the education system.

Teacher was lowest paid as compared to the other employees working in industries, prior to Third Pay Commission resulting in indifferent attitude of talent towards this field. In order to attract the talent in education sector, recommendations were made in fourth pay commission to bring university and college teachers at par with bureaucrats. Inspite of these efforts still the best talent continue to enter corporate sector.

Even after the efforts of the various educational statutory bodies to promote the private participation in education sector, the basic problem of unavailability of competent teaching faculty remain unaddressed. Therefore, the focus of the sixth pay commission has been on attracting the best brains of the nation into education stream by bringing the salary packages as well as the advancement opportunities similar to that of the corporate sector, resulting in inclination of qualified and skilled professionals towards teaching profession.
The privately managed institutions have employed teaching faculty at all levels i.e. Professors, Readers and Lecturers, but perceptually it seems that the level of satisfaction amongst the employed teaching faculty is low. By visualizing the dissatisfaction prevalent amongst the faculty members working in privately managed professional colleges it has become essential to conduct an empirical study to measure their level of satisfaction and its impact on performance. The study will focus on parameters including payment of salaries, allowances, working conditions, availability of the infrastructure for the students and teachers to accomplish their responsibilities effectively, advancement policies and facilities, job security, relationship with management of institution, implementation of service rules and significant feedback from the principal and the students.

AN OVERVIEW OF APPROACHES AND THEORIES OF JOB SATISFACTION

The contributors in the field of motivation have underlined that the concepts of job satisfaction and motivation can not be seen in isolation as it has been proved by the outcomes of various researches that highly satisfied people are much more motivated to accomplish the desired results. The verified reason for this association between the two concepts is that human motives are based on felt human needs and, therefore, managers motivate their subordinates by doing those things for them which they hope will satisfy their motives, desires and needs.

One view in relation to nature of people has been expressed by [Irving Fisher](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Irving_Fisher), the great economist that human is an economic man and, therefore, if we wish to motivate employees for better performance, they are to be paid more to satisfy their needs. Based on his observations at shop floor level, [F. W. Taylor](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/F._W._Taylor) has also realised that energetic employee should be paid at the higher rate than the normal one. Prior to 1932, even [Henry Fayol](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_Fayol) too supported the concept of fair remuneration i.e. remuneration to be paid to the employees upto their satisfaction, however, the Hawthorne experiment conducted by [Elton Mayo](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elton_Mayo) observed the significant role of informal relations in the organisation to motivate employees achieving the need for social satisfaction. Many managers assume that employee motivation goes hand in hand with employee satisfaction as satisfaction and motivation both are psychological state of a person which indicate how an individual feels about his/her situation and how external and internal forces stimulate, direct or maintain behaviour.
therefore, the relationship between employee motivation and employee satisfaction is a bit complicated.

Understanding employees motivation and satisfaction has long been of interest to researchers and leaders of organisations irrespective of their nature. As stated above, satisfied employees perform their jobs somewhat better than dissatisfied employees. But understanding satisfaction is also important due to some other non job related reasons. Therefore, to examine various dimensions of motivation and satisfaction, different theories could be grouped into four approaches namely the managerial approach, the job design approach, the organisational approach and the individual differences approach.

The focus of the **Managerial Approach** is on how the behaviour of manager influence the satisfaction and motivation of employees. According to this approach managers can directly motivate and satisfy employees through personal communication, by setting realistic goals, and by offering recognition, praise, and monetary rewards to those who achieve these goals.

The **Job Design Approach** focuses motivating employees through designing jobs by managers for the employees to whom they supervise by taking care of job characteristics like – skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback and also by considering the kind of technological changes. Job characteristics theory considers individual differences which are important in determining how people react to job contents. The outcomes of researches indicates that employees with strong growth need respond more favourably to enriched jobs, whereas, employees with a weak growth need may experience enriched jobs as frustrating and dissatisfying.

The **Organisational Approach** describes human resource policies and practices pertaining to appropriate benefits (e. g. paid vacancies, sick leave, insurance and child and older care), reward structure (e. g. bonuses, promotions etc.) and development opportunities etc. may attract better employees to the organisation. The satisfaction level of employees depends partly on whether employees perceive them to be fair and equitable (Two Factor Theory and Equity Theory). According to Hergbergs’ two factor theory the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation is complicated one. To understand the relationship during the interview of 200 accountants and engineers he asked participants to describe job experiences that produced good and
bad feelings about their jobs and discovered that the presence of job characteristics like - work environment, working conditions, organisational policies, supervision, salary, formal status, compensation and job security (Hygiene Factors) and achievements, the challenge of the work itself, responsibility, recognition, advancement and growth (Motivating factors) might increase job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Whereas, according to equity theory, employees judge whether they have been treated fairly by comparing the ratio of their outcomes and inputs to the ratio of others doing the similar work.

**Individual Approach** to satisfaction and motivation treats both as characteristics of individuals and these are stable aspects of an employees’ psychological makeup and managers have limited ability to change them. And, therefore, the managers should use their understanding of individual differences to motivate and satisfy people with a wide range of personal characteristics instead of treating everyone alike. During the past century, psychologists conducted thousands of studies on people having different abilities, personalities, values and needs to improve understanding of such differences for better employees’ motivation and satisfaction.

The traditional nature of people, according to McGregor has been characterised under two sets of assumptions- ‘Theory X’ and ‘Theory Y’ where ‘X’ is pessimistic, static and rigid and in contrast to ‘X’, theory ‘Y’ is optimistic, dynamic and flexible with an emphasis on self direction and integration of individual needs with organisational demands and, thus, in the long term ‘Y’ assumptions are more satisfying and motivating the employees.

Fulfilment Theory argued that job satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual, which can be satisfied, are actually satisfied Schaffer (1953). In his description Varoom (1964) also saw job satisfaction in term of the degree to which a job provides the person with positive valued outcomes. He equated satisfaction with valence and added, if we describe a person as satisfied with an object, we mean that the object has positive valence for him. However, satisfaction has a much more restricted usage. In common parlance, we refer to a person’s satisfaction only with reference to objects which he possesses. Researchers who have adopted the fulfilment approach, measured employees’
satisfaction simply by asking how much have a given facet or outcome they are receiving.

Thus, a great deal of research shows that people’s satisfaction is a function both of how much they receive and of how much they feel they should and/or want to receive (Locke, 1969). Thus, people’s reactions to what they receive are not simply a function of how much they receive; their reactions are strongly influenced by such individual difference factors as what they want and what they feel they should receive. Individual difference factors suggest that the fulfilment theory approach to job satisfaction is not valid, since this approach fails to take into account differences in people’s feelings about what outcomes they should receive. Morse (1953) stated his point of view as ‘At first we thought that satisfaction would simply be a function of how much a person received from the situation or what we have called the amount of environmental return. It made sense to feel that those who were in more need-falling environments would be more satisfied. But the amount of environmental return did not seem to be the only factor involved. Another factor obviously had to be included in order to predict satisfaction accurately. This variable was the strength of an individual’s desires, of his level of aspiration in a particular area. If the environment provides little possibility for need satisfaction, those with the strongest desires, or highest aspirations, were the least happy’.

Many psychologists have argued for a Discrepancy Approach to thinking about satisfaction. They maintain that satisfaction is determined by differences between the actual outcomes a person receives and some other outcome level. The theories differ widely in their definitions of this other outcome level. For some researchers it is the outcome level the person feels should be received and for others it is the outcome level the person expects to receive. All of the theoretical approaches argue that what is received should be compared with another outcome level, and when there is a difference - when received outcome is below the other outcome level – dissatisfaction results.

Like many other scientists, Katzell (1964) sees satisfaction as the difference between an actual amount and some desired amount, but unlike most discrepancy theorists, he assumes that this difference should be divided by the desired amount of the outcome.
Locke (1969) has stated a discrepancy theory that differs from Katzell's in many ways. Locke emphasizes that the perceived discrepancy and actual discrepancy both are important and satisfaction is determined by the simple difference between what the person perceives and what he receives. The more his wants and what he receives, the greater his dissatisfaction. Locke says, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived, relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it is offering.

Porter (1969) while measuring satisfaction asks people how much of a given outcome there should be for their job and how much of a given outcome there actually is and he considered the discrepancy between the two answers to be a measure of satisfaction. This particular discrepancy approach has been the most widely used. But it differs from Locke's approach, since it sees satisfaction as influenced not by how much a person wants but by how much he feels he should receive.

Like the fulfillment theorists, many discrepancy theorists also argue that total job satisfaction is influenced by the sum of the discrepancies that are present for each job factor. Thus, a person's overall job satisfaction would be equal to his pay-satisfaction discrepancy plus supervision-satisfaction discrepancy and, so on. In computing such a sum it is important to weight each of the discrepancies by the importance of that factor to the person, the being that important factors influence job satisfaction more strongly than unimportant ones. Locke (1969), however, argue that such a weighting is redundant, since the discrepancy score is a measure of importance in itself because large discrepancies tend to appear only for important items.

Most discrepancy theories allow for the possibility of a person saying he is receiving more outcomes than he should receive, or more outcomes than he wants to receive. However, the theories don't stress this point, which presents some problems for them. It is not clear how to equate dissatisfaction (or whatever this feeling may be called) due to over-reward with dissatisfaction due to under reward. Are they produced in the same way? Do they have the same results? Do they both contribute to overall job satisfaction? These are some of the important Questions that discrepancy theory has yet to answer.

The equity theory of motivation focuses on the employee's perception of treatment meted out to him/her as 'an important determinant of his or her level of
motivation. Every person desires to be treated fairly or equitably by being given what he or she considers the fair rewards for work done.

Equity theory as propounded by Adams, J. S. (1965), Adams and Jacobson (1964), Adams and Rosenbaum (1962) combines the notions of cognitive dissonance with those of social exchange to address the issue of the effects of money on behavior in varied work settings. According to Adams (1965), equity theory, people hold certain beliefs about the outputs they get from their jobs and the inputs they bring to bear in order to obtain certain outcomes. The outcomes of a job situation include actual pay, fringe benefits, status, intrinsic interest in the job or other factors that the individuals perceive to have utility or value to them and that result from their job relationship. In turn, the inputs include any and all of the factors that individuals perceive as being their investment in the job or that they perceive as something of value that they bring or put into their job. The inputs could include people's general qualifications for job, his or her skill, education level, effort, and other similar factors. The various specific outcomes and inputs as an individual perceives them are weighted according to his or her judgement for their relative importance to form a total outcome and a total input. These two totals combine to form an outcome/input ratio. According to Adams' theory a person is said to consciously or unconsciously compare his or her outcome/input ratio with that of other persons or other classes of persons whom he or she perceives as relevant for this purpose. Equity is said to exist when an individual perceives his or her own outcome/input ratio to be equal to that of other persons.

Two factor theory Herzberg et al. (1959) says that satisfaction and dissatisfaction do not exist on a continuum running from satisfaction through neutral to dissatisfaction. Two independent continua exist, one running from satisfied to neutral and another running from dissatisfied to neutral, second, the theory stresses that different job facets influence feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. As stated earlier, Herzberg et al. study results show that factors such as achievement, recognition, work itself, and responsibility are mentioned in connection with satisfying experiences while working conditions, interpersonal relations, supervision and company policy are usually mentioned in connection with dissatisfying experiences. The most interesting aspect of Herzberg's theory is that at the same time a person can be very satisfied and very dissatisfied. The theory also implies that
factors such as better working conditions cannot increase or cause satisfaction, they can only affect the amount of dissatisfaction that is experienced. The only way satisfaction can be increased is by effecting changes in those factors that are contributing primarily to satisfaction. Significantly, while considerable research has tried to determine which factors contribute to satisfaction and dissatisfaction, little attention has been directed toward testing the motivation and performance implications of the theory. Herzberg himself asked while conducting a study the subjects (Engineers and Accountants) to report how various job factors affected their performance. In agreement with the theory, the subjects reported that the presence of satisfiers boosted performance, while the presence of dissatisfies reduced performance. The results of this study give weak evidence that these job factors influence performance as suggested by the theory. Only self-reports of performance were used and in many cases the subjects were reporting on events that had happened some time prior to the date of the interviews. The evidence, although not at all conclusive at least suggests the kind of experiences that might lead to a strong motivation to perform effectively unfortunately, Herzberg et al. did not develop any theoretical concept to explain why the job factors should affect performance. Their theory contains little explanation of why outcomes are attractive, and it fails to consider the importance of associative connections in determining which of a number of behaviors a person will choose to perform in order to obtain a desired outcome. Thus, it is not a theory of motivation; rather it is a theory primarily concerned with explaining the determinants of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

DETERMINANTS OF JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction is derived from and is caused by many interrelated factors. Although, these factors can never completely be isolated from one another for analysis, they can by the use of Statistical techniques, be separated enough to give an indication of their relative importance to job satisfaction. The satisfaction which people experience in their jobs is at large the consequence of the extent to which the various aspects of their work situation tend to be relevant to their job related value system.

People differ in the degree to which their jobs are satisfying them and factors differ from person to person in relation to their effect on job satisfaction. To say there is no specific factor that alone effect job satisfaction rather various factors in
The most satisfied groups typically earn higher salaries than do the other occupational groups. In recent years, there may have been a tendency to underestimate the role of income in determining job attitudes. This is not to say that money is the only consideration or even the most important consideration of job satisfaction. Many people would agree that insufficient pay or perceived inequitable pay is a more decisive determinant of dissatisfaction than sufficient or fair pay is of satisfaction.

Professionals and managers enjoy much more autonomy in their work than do other groups. They set their own hours, their own pace and most of the time they are free from close supervision. They unilaterally make large number of decisions about how they do their work. Perhaps most important, is that professionals derive a greater measure of intrinsic rewards from work. Their work is varied and often stimulating as it offers a challenge to prove their capabilities. It also allows them to use their skills and knowledge they are most proud of. Further it offers opportunity for continual self-development, learning and growth. Studies conducted on these indicators revealed that professionals and managers report greater satisfaction of their needs for achievement and self-actualization than do other occupational groups. Herzberg (1955) averaged the findings of 16 such studies, involving a total of over 11000 employees to rank various aspects of their work which ascertained job satisfaction and found that the first ranked factor was security, the second was the interest from intrinsic aspects of the job, the third was opportunity for advancement and the fourth was considerable and appreciative supervision. However, wages ranked seventh.

Almost two decades later, Sheppard and Herrick found some changes in the ranking of job dimensions i.e. Interesting work was ranked first, second, third and fourth respectively were enough equipment, information and authority to get the job done. Good pay ranked fifth and Job security being so important in the 1940s and early 1950s had dropped to seventh.

Workers continued to place a high value on the inherent interest afforded by the job and the leadership styles of supervisors especially with regard to consideration displayed and also related to that of work structure. Work environment and economic benefits were still accorded of substantial importance. The role of the work group in determining job satisfaction can not be over looked. The Hawthorne researches in the
1920s and 1930s and Rathisberger and Dickson (1964) found that people working on isolated jobs were more apt to express irritation, dissatisfaction or feelings of depression on the job. In the study conducted by Walker and Guest (1952) pertaining to automobile industry workers it was found that isolated workers disliked their jobs. Seashore (1954) noted that cohesive industrial work groups were likely to be less adversely affected by pressure for production and expressed negligible anxiety for their jobs in comparison to that of non-cohesive work groups. The opportunity for pleasurable interaction with co-workers appeared a little bit inviting some other problems related to the job, such as uncomfortable working conditions or tedious work.

In fact, researches conducted on determinants of job satisfaction are based on the rationale that job satisfaction is derived from many interrelated factors. Importance-wise these factors differ not only from factory to factory but from individual to individual and that is too from time to time in varied situations. Hoppock (1935), the earliest investigator in the field, identified six major components of job satisfaction, and these are: the way an individual reacts to unpleasant situations; the facility in which he adjusts himself with other persons; his relative status in the social and economic group he identifies himself; the nature of work in relation to the abilities, interest and preparation; security; and loyalty.

After reviewing more than hundred and fifty studies Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell (1957) listed various job aspects in ten different categories, each representing on the job components of job satisfaction. These are: Intrinsic Aspect of Job; Supervision; Working conditions; Wages; Opportunity for Advancement; Security; Company and Management; Social Aspects of the Job; Communication and Benefits.

Zaleznik, Cristensen and Roethlisberger (1958) studied the components of job satisfaction and identified six factors as accountable for various degrees of job satisfaction: Intrinsic characteristics of one's job - the degree of an outlet for the technical work skills an employee feels for the job provided to him; the extended features of his job - His feelings about the pay, the physical working conditions, benefits etc.; The supervisor - The worker's feelings toward his foreman as a boss; His associates at work - His feelings in working with particular people in the department; The company - His emotions in relation to working with particular organization; The
Union – His feelings being a member of his particular union.

**Worthy** (1950), reported six factors comprising Job Satisfaction, namely: Company in general; The local organization; Local management; Immediate supervision; Co-workers and Working conditions. Whereas, **Grove and Kerr** (1951) concluded that Wages and Liking for Work Associates are the major components of Job Satisfaction and **Morse** (1953) identified: Job content; Association with the company; Financial Factors; Job Status and Pride in-Group Performance, as basic ingredients of Job Satisfaction.

**Evans and Laseau** (1950) gone through a number of factors in relation to job satisfaction components and identified eleven such factors, reported by more than 30 respondents. The factors, in order of preference were found to be as: Income; Interesting and Important job; Pride to be with company; Fellow workers; Immediate boss; Management; Working conditions; Security; Chance to get ahead; Benefit plans; Safety and Other facilities.

**Jurgenson** assessed the importance of several job factors on the basis of responses obtained from approximately 4000 subjects. Nine factors emerged from the study, ranked in order of preference are: Job Security; Advancement Opportunity; Type of Work; Pride to be in Company; Pay and Co-workers; Supervisor; Working Hours; Working Conditions and Benefits.

Further, individual expectations from the job are the most crucial variable in the development of attitude for job regardless of what the job offers (the level of pay, autonomy, interest, challenges, or social gratification) and if an individual expects more, he or she is likely to be less satisfied. But if the general level of job satisfaction in the labour force has declined in recent years, that is certainly not due to worsening of job conditions or characteristics. Today, Jobs carry more collective benefits, paid highly, performed under better physical conditions, more free from arbitrary or capricious intervention by employees and bosses, and probably even with more intrinsic appeal than the jobs did a quarter of century ago. However, it appears that expectations have risen at a faster rate than such improvements.

Thus based on above description it could be summarized that prominently the factors that affect job satisfaction can be personal factors; factors inherent in the job; factors related to superiors or related to organization where a person works. Personal
factors may be General - Age, Sex, Marital Status, Education, Intelligence, Personality etc. or Social - Community Conditions, Relation With Others, Time With Job etc or Economical - Pay, Security, Needs etc or Self Esteem. Factors Inherent in the Job includes Type of work, Skills required, Occupational status, etc. and factors related to organization may be Work Groups, Employees Strength and Management Policies etc.

PERSONAL FACTORS

General Factors

• Age: Number of studies conducted by Natraj and Hafeej (1965); Sinha and Nair (1965); Ghosh and Shukla (1967); Rao (1970); Vasudeva and Rajbir (1976); Bhatt (1992); Vasagam (1997) and Nazir (1998) found no significant relationship between age and job satisfaction, thus according to them job satisfaction is independent of age. Rather in certain cases older employees found to be less satisfied with their jobs than younger ones, probably because of their increasing expectations due to higher experience. Contrary to this, studies conducted by Guha (1965) and Sinha and Agarwala (1971) supports that as the person grow older he would get greater satisfaction with his job particularly because of his experience.

• Sex: Surprisingly, few differences between men and women in relation to job satisfaction have been observed, in past, as men has often been reported with higher job satisfaction level than women. However, some of such difference seemed to be declining in recent investigations, may be, because of the removal of barriers to female employees advancement. A study conducted by Varca, Shaffer and Mc Cauley measured job satisfaction among hundred college graduates (50 per cent male and 50 per cent female). Intriguing differences between the sexes were unfolded with respect to satisfaction in relation to pay and promotional opportunities. Among employees holding relatively high-level jobs like marketing managers, males found with higher satisfaction than females. In contrast employees with low-level jobs the pattern was just reverse. This interpretation should only be considered tentative in nature and not conclusive.

• Marital status: Cole (1940) found attitude toward salary unaffected by marital status as both the married and single men gave approximately same
importance to salary, supervision and working hours. Security was found more important for the married and advancement for the single men. Statistically no significant differences among the various incentives were found in case of the single women except hours of work and its importance was much higher in case of the married women. The married women gave more importance to the supervisor than do the married men and this difference was also seen while comparing the single men and women. Study conducted by Sinha and Sharma (1992) shows that married employees are more satisfied with their jobs, whereas, other study of Rao (1970) indicated that single employees are more satisfied. However, one can assume that with increasing responsibilities of an individual due to marriage, he would value his job more than an unmarried employee. But the results suggest that generally marital status has nothing to do with job satisfaction.

• Education: The study carried out by Capwell, Herzberg, Mausner and Peterson (1957) involving over 11000 employees indicated a contrast relationship between education level and job satisfaction. Less educated workers were found more satisfied than highly educated ones. For people with higher educational levels intrinsic aspects of the job go up in importance, while security go down considerably, no doubt because of the better market value possessed by people in the higher occupational categories. A study of white-collar workers also indicated that those who had not completed even high school, were the most satisfied (Morse, 1973). Studies conducted by Sinha and Agarwala (1971), Rao (1970), Pandey (1992), Vasagam (1997) and Nazir (1998) used samples of research assistants, station masters, employees of N. L. Corporation and bank clerks respectively and found that the higher the education the higher was job satisfaction. However, no clear cut explanation for such findings were provided by the scholars.

• Intelligence: Snow (1927) viewed dull individuals with least dissatisfaction in highly repetitive work. After wards in an investigation on 50 female employees of Kimberly-Clark Corporation it was found that the above average 16 were more dissatisfied than the average 25, found indifferent, and only 9 were satisfied, Kornhauser and Sharp (1932). No doubt, intelligence affect job satisfaction and cause a slight variation in employees work attitude, its
relation, of course, depend upon the level of intelligence and challenge involved in the job as had been revealed by Uhbrock (1934) in his study on clerical workers of Procter and Gamble.

- **Abilities and Interests:** A person who is ‘too good’ or ‘not good enough’ for a job, in terms of his abilities and interests, is not likely to be satisfied with his job. People cannot be working for a long time on a job, which they feel, is not of their interest or below their abilities, same is also applicable in case of people who do not possess the necessary abilities.

- **Personality:** Personality is one of the contributors to job satisfaction. One of dimensions of personality is emotional stability or ‘neurotic tendency’. An individuals’ emotional stability is likely to manifest itself in satisfaction or dissatisfaction on a specific job. As stated by Fisher and Hanna (1931) major large part of vocational maladjustment and industrial unrest was because of the reflections of one’s emotional personality. Not to say when everything is in line and going on smoothly, the emotional stability and the instability hardly mark any difference on the job but when pressure is on and difficult situations develop, petty annoyances assume significance.

- **Loyalty:** Loyalty is not to be overlooked in job satisfaction. The feeling that the worker has for his firm or boss or both, contribute to job satisfaction. Though, today it is not likely to be as strong as the 1001 spirit, evidenced by loyal sons of Alma Mater, still it is present in employees. It is the factor that leads people to sacrifice their own needs and purposes and prompts their service beyond the assigned duty in relation to job requirement.

- **General satisfaction:** Weitz (1952) raised a point that a measure of general satisfaction of an individual should be taken in relation to that individuals’ job satisfaction. He tested the hypotheses that high general dissatisfaction leads to low job dissatisfaction and found that people with high level of general satisfaction were less likely to quit than those with low level general dissatisfaction scores.

### Social Factors

- **Community conditions:** Employees usually compare their conditions with community conditions. Persons surrounded by poor community conditions tends to be satisfied with job even while working with average job conditions
as they feel themselves relatively well off.

- **Relations with others:** Research findings observed individuals expressing higher satisfaction with job when they enjoy positive, friendly relations with co-workers and supervisors than when it is not so. Positive social relations work as a major source of reward for many individuals. These relations, in turn, are facilitated when employees feel that the persons around them share their major beliefs and values, but in contrast satisfaction may decrease when they perceive that they have to work with people holding different views from them.

- **Time with Job:** As had been revealed in several investigations that job satisfaction stand relatively high at the start, drop slowly in the fifth or eighth year, and then rise again with passage of time on the job (Hull and Arthur, 1942). The highest satisfaction level is attained only in the last phase of job.

- **General Life Adjustment:** Adjustment of the people in the outside world affects their adjustment in the job also. A female secretary who is not getting along well with her social life or a male worker who had an hot argument with his spouse wife suddenly looked somewhat dissatisfied with the job. Of course this dissatisfaction disappears suddenly as soon as the situations in social life become normal.

**Economic Factors**

- **Pay:** Biological needs such as food, shelter and clothing are satisfied through money. Hence, it has great influence on human psychology and his attitude. Monistic theories take money to be the prime motivator. Physiologically income has been identified as the main feature in relation to job satisfaction even in Indian context also, as employees often see pay as a reflection of how management views their contribution to the organization. Considered opinion of Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) was that amount of financial remuneration received and the degree to which it is viewed as equitable with others in the organization is very important factor in determining job satisfaction. Then it was supported by Lawler (1971) and other 27 per cent of the studies conducted in relation to job satisfaction and the salary paid by the organization to its employees. Several studies of Sharma (1980), Vaudeva and Rajbir (1976), Narchal, Alag and Kishor (1984), Parikh and Sharan (1994) and Nazir
(1998) found significant positive relationship between income and job satisfaction irrespective of nature of job and nature of organization.

- **Security**: As concluded by Blum (1952) the most wanted by industrial employees is, steady work. Of course, security is of less important to highly educated persons as they feel more confident of being able to find other job if needed by the situation. Contrary to this survey carried out by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Campwell (1957) reported that security in respect to job is the most important variable affecting job satisfaction. And in this regard an interesting observation has been made by Knutson (1952) that for some security or insecurity is an adjustment or maladjustment related to high or low morale. Knutson further stated that the patterns of security of very similar occupational groups are more alike than those of more distantly related occupational groups.

- **Needs**: Schaffer (1953) proposed hypotheses was that 'overall satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which the needs of an individual are actually satisfied from a job, i.e. as soon as the need arise, the closeness of job satisfaction depend on its fulfillment'. Schaffer investigated 12 needs divided in two clusters- one contained hostility needs, which possessed restraining nature; the other contained the assertive and aggressive needs employing a sample of employed men, mostly of the professional any semi professional occupational groups. He found a high correlation existing between the person's two strongest needs and over all job satisfaction. Among the strongest needs reported in the sample were creativity and challenges an employee's mastery and achievements leads him to satisfaction on job.

- **Number of Dependents**: Results of most of the studies highlighted that more the dependents one have, less satisfied he will be with his job. Perhaps the stress of greater financial needs brings greater dissatisfaction with one's job.

**Self Esteem Factors**

- **Desire to be Appreciated**: Human beings in their nature have a strong desire to be appreciated and respected by others, especially by near and dear friends. To have job satisfaction, an individual must feel himself atleast par with his friends. The worker whose friends also work in same factory when get appreciation feel more satisfied with his job in comparison to those who are
over looked.

- **Level of Aspiration:** One of the underlying generalizations offered by Morse is that level of satisfaction is a combination of both level of aspiration or need—tension level and amount of return from organizational environment. Person is satisfied when these two are in line, and job satisfaction exists when the return from the organizational environment is higher than the need level of the individual.

**FACTORS RELATED WITH JOB**

- **Working Conditions:** If working conditions are good the personnel will find it easier to carry out their assigned jobs. Though not much importance is attached to working conditions still the relationship between work environment and the job satisfaction can not be denied.

- **Technology:** One of the best-known and least understood books on job satisfaction also established a relationship between ‘technology’ and ‘satisfaction’. Robert Blauner’s work titled ‘Alienation and Freedom’ had been quoted for describing the American worker as alienated and highly dissatisfied due to the impact of technology. As had been shown by Blauner in his study that alienation and dissatisfaction are more complexly related to technology. In industries with moderate technology, such as automobile and textiles, he indeed found workers alienated, isolated and resentful. But in industries with more sophisticated technology, such as printing and chemical industries, he found both freedom and integration. In these industries, automation had in fact increased the worker's control over his job and checked the further division of labour, with correspondingly high levels of job satisfaction.

- **Level of Occupation:** The positive relationship between occupational level and job—satisfaction stems from reference group theory. Some jobs in the society are considered more prestigious than others. Hence, people like more valued jobs in comparison to non-valued jobs. People who want to have their needs fulfilled in order to be satisfied are more likely to find the higher-level value jobs rather than the lower level valued ones.

- **Responsibility:** In their study, Hull and Arthur (1942) found morale scores of employees higher who had more responsibility. Most of persons strongly preferred to know just what is expected of them at work.
• **Job Itself and Expectations:** Job itself is the basic source of job satisfaction. One cannot live without doing work but feeling of satisfaction comes only when a person gets pleasure at work. Satisfaction from job itself may increase by making fundamental changes in the nature of job that can be possible by making it more challenging and interesting through its rotation, enlargement and enrichment. When individuals join the company, and find their expectations in relation to jobs, not met, they may get dissatisfied, and try to seek employment elsewhere. Therefore, expectations with one's job are important variable of job satisfaction. To avoid such reactions, Wanous and other researchers recommended adoption of a realistic job previews' procedures through which applicants can be provided with accurate descriptions of the jobs they will have to perform. Later on, results of several studies revealed contribution of strategic realistic job previews to job satisfaction. Whatever may be the precise conditions of beneficial effects of realistic job previews, one fact is certainly clear that individual's expectations regarding ones job; the likings, the problems and rewards it carries, exert powerful effects on his attitudes towards job.

• **Opportunity for Advancement:** Promotional opportunities have a varying effect on job satisfaction. Promotions may assume different forms and could be accompanied by a variety of rewards. On the basis of 16 different studies involving 11000 employees in this context, Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell (1957) had revealed that opportunity for advancement, stands second important variable in relation to job satisfaction.

• **Benefits/Rewards:** In their study Jones and Jeffrey (1964) evaluated preferences of electrical workers for alternate forms of job compensation from four different compensation dimensions i.e. Hourly wage Vs Weekly wage; Merit incentive Vs No merit incentive; Piece work incentive Vs No piece work incentive; and Regular pay rate Vs Higher pay rate, and found that non-union workers significantly preferred all i.e. the weekly wage, the merit incentive, the piece work incentive and the higher wage. However, for union members, the no merit incentive choice was preferred significantly as against the piece and higher pay rate systems.

• **Job Contents:** Job contents mean factors related to job enrichment. As per
Herzberg’s two factor theory of motivation if a job contains the factors: Work itself; Achievement; Possibility of growth and advancement; Responsibility and Recognition, each will contribute to job satisfaction and act as satisfier to attain pleasure.

- **Job Context:** Also known as Hygiene factors include the environmental factors of job. Presence of the factors does not resort to job satisfaction but absence of these factors, of course, cause pain. Such factors comprises: Company policies and Administrative supervision; Relations with supervisors; Working conditions; Salary; Person's personal life and relationship with subordinates; Status and Security (Horebiniak and Rateman, 1973).

**FACTORS RELATED WITH SUPERIOR**

- **Leadership Styles:** In an investigation carried out by Kalra (1988) it was found that individuals with authoritarian expectations from their leader are more satisfied with their jobs than those possessing democratic expectations.

- **Participation:** Participation in organizational decision making gives the feeling of belongingness. ‘BY US AND FOR US’ feeling develops only when employees participate in management. It facilitates job satisfaction and raise the levels of employees' productivity and morale.

- **Supervision and its Perceived Quality:** The attitude and behavior of supervisor is also said to be an important component in determining a feeling of job satisfaction among employees. Supervision is the process to check a person or employee, how efficiently, competently and intelligently he is doing his job. Supervisors are in a critical situation as on one hand they are under considerable pressure to achieve goal and the managers held them responsible for failures and on the other subordinates criticize them for their formal behavior on the job. In Some situations, supervisors become powerless authority in the organization. The social and behavioral scientists emphasized behavioral approach to management because to them a typical supervisory attitude may lead to different level of employee satisfaction. Supervisor should be adaptive to situations and a spirit of cooperation to achieve goal and better relationship should be developed to satisfy employees with their jobs. Then, as illustrated by managers who allow their people to participate in decisions that even affect their own jobs, there seems to be two dimensions of supervisory
style that affect job satisfaction- one employee centeredness and the other is participation or influence.

FACTORS RELATED WITH ORGANISATION

- **Employees Strength**: Study by Blum and Russ (1942) analyzed the attitudes of the two groups in relation to the total number of employees in the firms they work. Comparison of the attitudes of people working in a firm with less than 5 employees with those in companies with 100 or more, indicated higher level of job satisfaction in the firm with more number of employees.

- **Work Group**: Job satisfaction is also affected by the nature of the work groups. Friendly and cooperative co-workers constitute a modest source of job satisfaction to individual employees.

- **Employee's status in the Organization**: Status is the relative ranking that a person holds in a group, organization or society, a mark of recognition, honour and acceptance given to him. The modern fluent person is often pictured as a status seeker particularly of materialistic symbols such as infinite status and pride which have positive effect on the job satisfaction. An employee's position in the hierarchy of the organization is strongly related to his job satisfaction. To say higher the level of status, greater will be the satisfaction, e.g. managers tend to be more satisfied than non-managers; higher-level managers are more satisfied than lower level managers and line managers are more satisfied than staff managers. Similarly middle level managers are poorly satisfied with their jobs than top-level managers. Of course individual exceptions are always there.

- **Communication**: Several studies indicated employee's desire of seeking information from management. They were found eager not only to be communicated the various information's from the organization but also the ways to improve over what they are supposed to achieve.

- **Organizational Policies**: Organizational policies too have a great impact upon the thinking of an employee. Like working conditions, organizational policies affect one's life on and outside the job. Recruitment and selection policies provide opportunities for his family members or friends to get the job in the organization. If these policies suit an employee, it will develop his positive attitude towards the organization and he will feel satisfied. Similarly, if
promotion policies are giving him quick chances for promotion, he will feel more satisfied and develop a sense of belongingness towards organization. In the same way attractive remuneration policy may provide chances of stability to an employee. On the other side an illogical transfer policy may disturb the normal life of an employee and bringing a number of difficulties related to new job and place thus developing his negative attitude towards the organization. Frequent disciplinary actions may disturb mental balance of an employee who in turn start creating problems for people in management people. Moreover, immature separation policy may ruin the peaceful functioning of an organization resulting in numerous industrial disputes.

- **Geography**: People on the coastal regions and in big cities are the more satisfied with their jobs in comparison to those in the mountain areas or in small towns.

**IMPACT OF JOB SATISFACTION**

Job satisfaction is significant as it affects actions and behavior of employees in a number of ways. The various ways in which job satisfaction affects employees' behavior are discussed as under:

**Performance**: Job satisfaction has a direct impact upon the performance of an employee. When an employee receives handsome salary, given better chances of development, provided with good working conditions and asked to work in a congenial environment, his attitude towards the job will be positive. This positive attitude will lead to better performance and higher productivity in terms of quality and quantity.

**Absenteeism**: Absenteeism and job satisfaction have a reverse relationship. When satisfaction level of an employee is high, absenteeism tends to be low and vice-versa. To mention here high job satisfaction will not necessarily result in low absenteeism but low job satisfaction no doubt is likely to bring about high level of absenteeism may be as a temporary withdrawal from work being it the easiest and least painful way for an employee to express his/her dissatisfaction.

**Turnover**: Like absenteeism turnover has also a reverse relationship with job satisfaction. Employees with low level of job satisfaction are more likely to be keen to leave their present job and therefore, such organizations, tend to have high turnover rates. Though, there can be other factors also affecting the rate of turnover in an
organization such as long illness of the employees, finding of job in other organizations, shifting of family from one place to another and so on.

**Mental Health:** Dissatisfaction with one's job may have especially volatile spillover effects. Many unresolved personality problems and maladjustments arise out of a person's inability to find satisfaction at work. Both scientific studies and simple observations provide ample evidences that job satisfaction is important for the psychological adjustment and happy living of an individual, as people may feel bad about so many other things such as family life, leisure activities and sometimes even life itself. A classical study by Arthur Kornhausen, provide empirical evidence for the relationship between job satisfaction and mental health. In fact, job satisfaction and the life satisfaction are inextricably bounded.

**Physical Health:** As had been revealed by Palmore in his study that physically healthy and are likely to live longer, the people who like their work and satisfied with their jobs. The logic behind the result is that people with sound health can work better and have more income, lead and enjoy quality life, which promote longevity. On the other hand the dissatisfaction with work leads to stress, which in turn, eventually can invite chronic physical problems like hypertension, coronary artery disease, digestive ailments and even some kinds of cancer. Therefore, job satisfaction is essential to maintain physical health not only of an employee but also of the organization as a whole.

**Goodwill of the Organization:** From the point of view of an organization people who feel positive about their work life are more apt to voice 'Favourable Sentiments' about the organization to the community at large. When the goodwill of the company goes up, new, qualified and dynamic entrants show their interest in joining organization. Organization will be in a position to enjoy the talents of people as job satisfaction fosters a pervasive residue of public goodwill and goodwill of the organization.

**Other Effects:** In addition to the above, many more other effects are also brought about through job satisfaction. Highly satisfied employees tend to be in a better mental and physical health. Their morale is high and have fewer dents on the job. They are in a better position to learn new things quickly. Being satisfied employees, they pose lesser problems with the job and take active part in various committees framed for smooth running of the organization. All this tends to create a good
atmosphere in the organization, which leads to the path of prosperity. Studies have also indicated that job satisfaction helps in: minimizing errors, accidents, stress of employees and bringing period of training down and thus leading them to greater job involvement.

CONCEPTUALISATION

The term job satisfaction was brought to limelight by Hoppock (1935) after reviewing 32 studies on job satisfaction conducted prior to 1933 and observed that job satisfaction is a combination of physiological, psychological and environmental circumstances that cause a person to say, 'I am satisfied with my job'. Thus, such a description indicates the variety of variables that influence the satisfaction of an individual but does not tell anything about the nature of job satisfaction.

Since job satisfaction depends upon a number of variables with varied dimensions, therefore, scholars defined the term in different ways depending on the situation and purpose for which it has been used. John Atkinson (1957) related the satisfaction with challenges in task or goal but while conducting the comprehensive review of job attitude and satisfaction with pessimistic observations by Herzberg, Mausher, Peterson and Campwell (1957) left the term satisfaction with inadequate definition.

Guion (1958) revealed morale and satisfaction as synonymous and believed that morale is the extent to which an individual's needs are satisfied and the extent to which the individual perceives that satisfaction as stemming from his total satisfaction from the job.

Job satisfaction has been referred by Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1960) as the persistent feeling towards discriminable aspects of the job situation. The term job satisfaction is employed in a variety of ways as it has feeling of satisfaction on the job and act as motivation to work in general and may be defined as function of person's interaction with environment. It covers both the satisfaction derived from being engaged in work or in any pursuit of higher order related to human needs and their fulfilment through work.

For Drever (1964), satisfaction is related to fulfilment of needs. Need defined as a condition marked by feeling of some shortage followed by urge of getting it which drive the performance of action.
Roberts Dictionary of Industrial Relations defines job satisfaction as those outward of inner manifestation which gives to and the individual a sense of enjoyment or accomplishment in the performance of his work. Job satisfaction may come from the product or item produced or from the speed with which it is accomplished, or from other features relating to the job and its performance. Items like pay scale, the relationship of an individual with supervisor, working conditions including safety and many other factors may affect attitudes towards the job, which are not easily discernible on the surface.

Blum looked job satisfaction as a general attitude, which is the result of many specific attitudes in three areas, namely, specific job factors, individual characteristics, and group relationships outside the job. Thus, job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes which are related to the job and are concerned with such specific factors as wages, supervision, conditions of work, advancement opportunities, recognition of abilities, fare evaluation of work, social relations on the job, fare treatment of employer and other similar items. It also includes other factors as employee’s age, health, temperament, desires, level of aspiration, family relations, social status and recreational outlets etc.

Job satisfaction in view of Keith Davis is psychological factor as it can be more accurately interpreted in terms of general emotional tone of employees. Some employees for example, may be highly satisfied with their family and community life and they may think that their job provide only average satisfaction.

Hergberg in his paper puts forward the famous Two-Factor Theory of job satisfaction and observed that Hygiene Factors like organization policies, administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, allowances, status, security etc. ensure the satisfaction level only in the short term. However, motivators such as achievements, recognition, increased responsibilities, challenging work, growth and development will provide stable satisfaction to the employees in the long term.

As viewed by Adam and Homans in their equity theory, satisfaction of a person on the job is determined not only by his perceived input and reward he is getting but also the rewards others are getting for their inputs while performing similar jobs.
Alderfer in his ERG theory explains that the level of employees motivation and satisfaction in the organisation is related to how far their Existence Relatedness and Growth needs are satisfied while working in the organization.

According to Porter and Lawler satisfaction is an outcome of the complex relationship that exists between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards and perceived equitable rewards an individual is getting by accomplishment of the assigned job. However, the strength of the performance accomplished is dependent on the value of rewards, perceived effort-reward probability, ability and personal traits of an individual and his role perception.

According to Michael M. Grunberg (1972) job satisfaction is the favourableness with which employees view their work. It expresses the amount of agreement between one’s expectations from the job and the rewards that the job provides. Thus, job satisfaction involves expectations, it relates to equity theory, the psychological contract and motivation.

Locke defined job satisfaction as pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences. The concept generally refers to a variety of aspects of the job that influence a person’s levels of satisfaction with it. These usually include attitudes towards pay, working conditions, colleagues and superiors, career prospects and the intrinsic aspects of the job itself. An individual functioning in an organization is affected by the totality of his/her situation. Job satisfaction is, therefore, the ‘zest’ displayed by an employee contingent on his adjustments in personal, social and work life.

Hammer and Organ described job satisfaction as an intangible, unseen, unobserved variable and a complex assemblage of cognition (belief or knowledge) and emotional feelings (sentiments and evaluation) and such other behaviour tendencies.

Pleitner construes job satisfaction axiomatically as positive-in-tuneless in the job situation, the extent of which is dependent on the degree of harmony between a person’s expectancy and their fulfilment in reality.

Job satisfaction has been visualised by Durbin as a positive emotional state that occurs when a persons’ job seems to fulfil important job values provided these
values are compatible with one's needs. Whereas, for Muchinsky job satisfaction is the degree of pleasure an individual derives from his or her job.

As observed by Hakim job satisfaction is less absenteeism, to make positive contribution and to stay with the organization. In contrast, a dissatisfied employee may be absent more often, may experience stress that disrupts co-workers, and may be continually looking for another job. Contrary to what managers believe, however, high level of job satisfaction do not necessarily leads to higher level of productivity.

Rao and Narayana (1998) defined job satisfaction as a simple as well emotional reaction to job whereas according to them it is also referred to as overall feeling of satisfaction i.e. satisfaction with the situation as a whole (Global Satisfaction) and some other point of time it refers to a persons' feelings towards specific dimension of the work environment (facet or specific satisfaction).

Job satisfaction and life satisfaction are directly related as has been observed and defined by Newstrom and Davis (2002). In their opinion, Job satisfaction is a set of favourable and unfavourable feelings and emotions with which employees view their work. It is an effective attitude—a feeling of relative likes or dislikes towards something and focus on the attitude of an individual employee with multidimensional situation and resulting in spill over effect on job and life as well.

Steven and Mary (2005) viewed job satisfaction as an appraisal of the perceived job characteristics, work environment and emotional experiences at work by an employee.

As observed by Javier, Ana, Mercedes and Pilar (2005), job satisfaction is a summary and effective response of variable intensity, centered on specific aspects of the acquisition and the consumption which takes place at the exact moment an individual evaluate the object.

Seema Sanghi (2006) defined job satisfaction as the collection of individual hold towards one's job. A person with high level of job satisfaction holds positive feeling and dissatisfied person develops a negative feeling towards one's job. Whereas Robbins and Timothy (2007) defined job satisfaction as a positive feeling about one's job resulting from an evaluation of its characteristics.

Thus, job satisfaction can be explained by considering various important dimensions. First, job satisfaction is an emotional response to a job situation and as such it cannot be seen, it can only be inferred. Second, how well outcome meets or
exceeds expectations to determine job satisfaction. Third, job satisfaction represents several related attitudes such as attitude towards work itself, pay, promotional opportunities, supervisions and peers.

In view of the above conceptualization it could be stated that most organizational behavior researchers as well as practicing managers argued that sustaining of job satisfaction is important to an organization. Researches’ have also demonstrated that high job satisfaction results in greater performance, low turnover rates and absenteeism. In addition, highly satisfied employees tend to have better mental and physical health, learn job related task more quickly, met less accidents on the job and record less grievances. Some critics have also argued that this is purely a conjecture because there is so much we don’t know about the positive effects of satisfaction. On the other hand if satisfaction is low, there seem to be negative effect on the organization that have been documented. Therefore, it could be safely stated that higher level of satisfaction is a valuable instrument for organization’s overall health and effectiveness.

OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE CONCEPTS

JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction refers to a set of favourable and unfavourable feelings with which individuals view their work. It expresses the amount of agreement between one’s emerging expectations and the rewards that the job provides. It is a type of psychological contract and motivation for the job and attitudes of individuals. In other words, the job satisfaction typically refers to the self commitment of teachers towards their job. Blum (1949) stated that “job satisfaction is an attitude which results from a balancing and summations of many specific likes and dislikes experienced by an employee in the performance of his job.” Brooke, Russell and Price (1988) opined that “job satisfaction indicates an individual’s general attitudes towards the job”.

Here the term job satisfaction means satisfaction with work, work conditions, salary, security, promotion policy, plans and policies of institutions and satisfaction with management.

For the purpose of the present study job satisfaction may be conceptualized as the teachers’ perception of what is expected and what is actually received by them under different facets of the work situation. Thus, satisfaction is an outcome of the complex relationship that exist between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards and perceived
equitable rewards of an individual which he is getting by accomplishment of the assigned job. However, the strength of the performance accomplished is dependent on the value of rewards, perceived effort-reward probability, ability and personal traits of an individual and his role perception.

TEACHERS

Teachers in the present investigation refers to Professors/Principals/Directors, Associate Professors/Assistant Professors in selection grade and Assistant Professors working in institutes of education, engineering and management.

PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTIONS

In the present study the professional institutions refers to a category of institutions imparting specific professional education. Professional education refers to acquiring of specialized knowledge consisting of principles, concepts and techniques which are proven, systematic and capable of being applied to practical situations, that can be obtained and learned through the formals educational qualifications followed by a prolonged practical training. This requested knowledge one can further use in either instructing, guiding and advising others or impartially to serve various sections of the society. In order to improve the quality of service and level of efficiency the professional education also demands commitment to discover new ideas and upgradation of the existing knowledge through continuous research in the field.

FOCUS OF THE STUDY

With the above theoretical and conceptual background of job satisfaction and its importance in organizational performance, the present study intends to focus its attention on tracing out the determinants of job satisfaction for teaching faculty working in various private and self financing professional institutions of Haryana that too is particularly the institutions/colleges affiliated to M. D. University, Rohtak. Moreover, an attempt had also been made to assess the level of satisfaction prevalent amongst the teaching faculty of the sampled professional institutions and its impact on their performance.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

For the purpose of the present study we have set the following major objectives:
• To examine the prevalent level of job satisfaction amongst the teaching faculty of sampled self-financing professional institutes.

• To assess the significance of job satisfaction in view of its contribution in achieving personal, organizational and social objectives.

• To confirm the role of identified factors in determining the job satisfaction amongst the academics working in various categories of professional institutions.

SUBSIDIARY OBJECTIVES RELATED TO JOB SATISFACTION

To achieve the meaningful results pertaining to the above mentioned major objectives our subsidiary objectives are as follows:-

• To study the influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on job satisfaction of teachers.

• To study the influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on social factor of job satisfaction of teachers.

• To study influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on personal factor of job satisfaction of teachers.

• To study the influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on organizational factor of job satisfaction of teachers.

• To study the influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on research and teaching factor of job satisfaction of teachers.

• To study the influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on financial factor of job satisfaction of teachers.

SUBSIDIARY OBJECTIVES RELATED TO SIGNIFICANCE OF JOB SATISFACTION

• To study the influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on significance of job satisfaction of teachers.

• To study the influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on significance of job satisfaction for social development of teachers.
• To study the influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on significance of job satisfaction for personal development of teachers.

• To study the influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on significance of job satisfaction for organizational development.

SUBSIDIARY OBJECTIVES RELATED TO FACTORS INFLUENCING JOB SATISFACTION

• To study the influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on social factors influencing job satisfaction of teachers.

• To study the influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on personal factors influencing job satisfaction of teachers.

• To study the influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on organizational factors influencing job-satisfaction of teachers.

HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses were framed for verification in the present study.

HYPOTHESES RELATED TO JOB SATISFACTION

H₁ There is no significant influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on job satisfaction of teachers on account of social personal, organizational, research & training and financial factors.

H₂ There is no significant influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on social factor of job satisfaction of teachers.

H₃ There is no significant influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on personal factor of job satisfaction of teachers.

H₄ There is no significant influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on organizational factor of job satisfaction of teachers.

H₅ There is no significant influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on research and teaching factor of job satisfaction of teachers.
H6 There is no significant influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on financial factor of job satisfaction of teachers.

HYPOTHESES RELATED TO SIGNIFICANCE OF JOB SATISFACTION

H1 There is no significant influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on significance of job satisfaction of teachers pertaining to personal, organizational and social issues.

H2 There is no significant influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on significance of job satisfaction for social development of teachers.

H3 There is no significant effect of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on significance of job satisfaction for personal development of teachers.

H4 There is no significant impact of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on significance of job satisfaction for organizational development.

HYPOTHESES RELATED TO FACTORS INFLUENCING JOB SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS

H1 There is no significant influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on personal, organizational and social factors influencing job satisfaction of teachers.

H2 There is no significant influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on personal factors influencing job satisfaction of teachers.

H3 There is no significant influence of type of institutes, level of position of faculty and their interaction on organizational factors influencing job satisfaction of teachers.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The present research endeavour deals with the study of job satisfaction among teachers of professional institutions.

It is very difficult, rather impossible, to cover whole of it in a single study, therefore, like other studies in social sciences the present study has also been conducted under the limitation explained below:-
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• The measuring tools and instruments are partially reliable and valid.
• If the scope of the study is made too wide, the depth is reduced.
• More accurate results can be obtained from whole of the population rather than from sample drawn from a population unless the sample is a true representative of the population which is quite difficult to achieve. Due to the limitations of time and resources on the part of investigator, an attempt has been made to delimit the study in terms of sample, method of study and measuring instruments.

**Delimitation in Sampling**

• The study was delimited to 410 respondents of 70 professional colleges (40 Colleges of Education, 16 Colleges of Engineering and 14 colleges of management).

• The study was confined to professional colleges located in the jurisdiction of M.D. University, Rohtak.

**Method**

The study adopted the psychological and sociological technique of research and, therefore, suffers from all those short comings, which are inherent in such techniques.

**Instruments**

The instruments used to assess job satisfaction, significance of job satisfaction and factors influencing job satisfaction have been standardized by the investigator herself. These may not be described as perfect tools because of the various limitations involved in construction and standardization of tools.

**CHAPTERIZATION SCHEME**

The present work has been divided into six chapters. The first chapter introduces the brief review of approaches and theories of employees satisfaction and motivation, determinants of job satisfaction, impact of job satisfaction, conceptualization, oprationalisation of the concept, focus of the study, objectives and hypothesis of the study and limitations of the study.

A close scrutiny of available foreign and Indian literature on the subject and its correlates have been conducted in chapter two of the research report. In chapter three,
we have included the design of the research, survey universe, its population and sample, development and description of research instruments for data collection, variables and statistical techniques applied for analysis of collected data.

The objective-wise analysis pertaining to prevalent level of job satisfaction of the teaching faculty on account of personal, organizational, social, research and teaching and financial dimensions, significance of job satisfaction for organizational personal and social development and the factors influencing job satisfaction, have been computed and measured in chapter four of the study.

The major inferences of analysis of chapter four, deficiencies responsible for level of satisfaction and their interpretations have been incorporate in chapter five of the report. Apart this, in view of noted deficiencies the last part of the chapter also highlights some meaningful suggestions to improve the level of satisfaction of the faculty working in sampled self-financing engineering, management and education colleges. The major findings, recommendations, utility of research and guide lines for future researchers have been summarized in the concluding chapter six of the report.
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