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INTRODUCTION

One of the major tasks Industrial and Organizational psychologists perform is assessing how employees feel about their jobs, or their satisfaction, and determining ways to improve it as a reasonable level of satisfaction. Industrial and Organizational psychologists and researchers have extensively studied the causes and consequences of job satisfaction since the beginning of growing interest in this field of research. Despite the seemingly greater importance of job performance to organizational functioning, job satisfaction is undoubtedly the most studied variable in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Much of this popularity derives from the relative ease with which job satisfaction can be assessed. Another reason for the popularity of the study of job satisfaction is that it is a central variable in many theories that deal with organizational phenomena, such as the nature of work, supervision, and the job environment. Job satisfaction has been posited as a cause of important employee and organizational outcomes ranging from job performance to health and longevity (Spector, 2003).

In fact job satisfaction refers to an individual's general attitude toward his or her job. A person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive attitudes about the job, while a person who is dissatisfied with his or her job holds negative attitudes about the job (Spector, 2003).

Job satisfaction has been defined in terms of attitude toward the job like any other attitude. It represents a complex assemblage of cognition (beliefs or knowledge) emotions (feelings, sentiments/evaluations) and behavioral tendencies. Reach (1958) found 12 factors of job satisfaction in addition to a general or a 'halo' factor, and as sub-general factor of general attitude towards supervision. As defined by Paul (1977) job satisfaction refers to favorableness or un-favorableness with which employee view their
work. It also expresses the amount of agreement between one’s expectations of the job and the rewards that job provides to the person. Since job satisfaction involves expectations; therefore it is also found related with the Adam’s (1963) ‘Equity theory of motivation’ besides other researchers also proposed the definition of job satisfaction emphasizing their views as related to various factors, (Sinha, 1974; Locke, 1976). Some investigators differentiated job satisfaction from job involvement and job climate (James & Jenes, 1974). Job satisfaction is attitudinal variable that reflects to show people how feel about their jobs overall as well as about various aspects of them. In simple terms, job satisfaction is the extent to which people like their jobs (Spector, 2003). A job is not entity but it is a combination of complex interrelationship of tasks, roles, responsibilities. interactions, incentives, rewards etc. A number of factors as related to an individual such as ability, health, temperament, age, expectations, conflicts. On the other hand the factors related to life away from the work such as home conditions, recreations, consumer problem, and labor union activities. The other factors which are related to employment or salary, type of work, supervisions, work culture/environment, facilities, working conditions, opportunities for career development/advancement, social relations at work and support from other members of the organization.

It is often heard that people working in the organization some of them express feeling that ‘I love my job’ “This type of work is difficult for me. It is a type of work that I hate.” Such types of feelings reflects a common dilemma, for instance a person who gets handsome/adequate salary and other benefits will love his job but on the other hand he may express his dissatisfaction with the working environment, peers, his immediate boss, organizational policies/decisions, non co-operation from superiors and subordinates, lack of promotional opportunities etc. The job satisfaction is no doubt a vastly
studied area at research in organizational behavior but it cannot be discarded on this ground because as long as the organizations exist and the human needs are concerned, the management is bound to take into consideration the satisfaction level of its workforce. A satisfied workforce will create a congenial and conducive atmosphere, good human relations, loyalty with the organization quality production and a strong feeling to be a member of a large family i.e. organizational where as a dissatisfied workforce can distort/ruin the growth and development of the organization in all respects. Many studies have been carried out on job satisfaction in relation to socio-biographical variables. The investigators found out relationship between job satisfactions and certain biographical factors (Birdi et al., 1995; Panda et al., 1996).

1-1- Purpose of the Study

Outcomes of different researches have showed complex effects of job satisfaction on organizational commitment, personality type and self-concept among employees. Age, Gender, Job Position, Education, Salary, and Job Tenure, are some of the determining variables that they make complex outcomes of researches and they made impossible exact prediction of job satisfaction outcomes.

These subjects groups are more complex in the cross-cultural environment of Iran and India, so the lack of review of literature on this subject in Iran and India, is the necessity of conducting this research is obvious in the traditional context of Iran and India which is one of the developing countries, furthermore this small piece research wants to show:

1. The study of the relationships between the dependent variable (Job satisfaction), and independent variables (organizational commitment, personality type and self-concept), and find the prediction equation, among bank employees.
2. The study of differences of dependent variable (Job satisfaction), and independent variables (organizational commitment, personality type and self-concept) with the consideration of demographic variables (age, gender, job position, education, salary, and job tenure) and also determine the degree of relationship with organizational commitment and self-concept of bank employees working in Iran and India.

Additionally, the assessment of the bank employees' organizational commitment, personality type and self-concept can be useful for enhancing the job satisfaction of bank employees.

1-2- Research Problem and Questions

This study investigates the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational commitment, personality type, and self-concept of bank employees with regard to age, gender, job position, education, salary, and job tenure in Iran and India. The present research is designed to search possible response to these questions as given below:

1. What is the equation of regression of job satisfaction from organizational commitment, personality type, and self-concept?

2. Is there any significant correlation between the scores of job satisfaction and organizational commitment?

3. Is there any significant correlation between the scores of job satisfaction and self-concept?

4. Is there significant difference between the scores of job satisfaction with consideration of country?

5. Is there significant difference between the scores of job satisfaction with consideration of personality type?
6. Is there significant difference between the scores of job satisfaction with consideration of age?
7. Is there significant difference between the scores of job satisfaction with consideration of gender?
8. Is there significant difference between the scores of job satisfaction with consideration of job position?
9. Is there significant difference between the scores of job satisfaction with consideration of education level?
10. Is there significant difference between the scores of job satisfaction with consideration of monthly salary?
11. Is there significant difference between the scores of job satisfaction with consideration of job tenure?
12. Is there significant difference between the scores of organizational commitment with consideration of country?
13. Is there significant difference between the scores of organizational commitment with consideration of personality type?
14. Is there significant difference between the scores of organizational commitment with consideration of age?
15. Is there significant difference between the scores of organizational commitment with consideration of gender?
16. Is there significant difference between the scores of organizational commitment with consideration of job position?
17. Is there significant difference between the scores of organizational commitment with consideration of education level?
18. Is there significant difference between the scores of organizational commitment with consideration of monthly salary?

19. Is there significant difference between the scores of organizational commitment with consideration job tenure?

20. Is there significant difference between the scores of self-concept with consideration of country?

21. Is there significant difference between the scores of self-concept with consideration of personality type?

22. Is there significant difference between the scores of self-concept with consideration of age?

23. Is there significant difference between the scores of self-concept with consideration of gender?

24. Is there significant difference between the scores of self-concept with consideration of job position?

25. Is there significant difference between the scores of self-concept with consideration of education level?

26. Is there significant difference between the scores of self-concept with consideration of monthly salary?

27. Is there significant difference between the scores of self-concept with consideration of job tenure?
1-3- Significance of the Study

This study is significant for the following reasons:

1. In the extensive literature on banking in both developed and developing countries, little has been written about the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational commitment, personality type, and self-concept of employees.

2. The present study will enhance the limited research about job satisfaction, organizational commitment, personality type, and self-concept.

3. It would seem to be an opportune time to undertake such a study in the light of the present global economic climate where there is demonstrated need for satisfaction and commitment of employees.

4. It is hoped that this study will contribute to the on-going research about bank employees' implementation of decisions.

5. A further significant aspect of this research topic relates to the country studied. Most of the studies of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, personality type, and self-concept have been carried out in the Europe and American countries. There is very little research conducted on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, personality type, and self-concept in regard to employees in an organizational context in Asian and developing countries, especially in Iran and India.

6. Finally, it is expected that this study may serve as the catalyst for further research in other Asian and developing countries to determine whether the results are context specific to Iran and India or whether the results may be common to other Asian and developing countries as well.
1-4- Definitions of the Key Terms

In this study the following operational definitions will apply:

1-4-1- Bank Employees- A person who serves customer in the Bank.

1-4-2- Job Satisfaction- "how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs" (Spector, 1997). This state is assumed to be realized in the form of job satisfaction score on the modified of the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire was developed by Singh (1989).

1-4-3- Organizational Commitment- Organizational commitment is defined in terms of member's identification and level of engagement with a particular organization. It reflects peoples' attitudes towards the organizations goals and values, a desire to stay with the organization, and a willingness to expend effort on its behalf (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979; Mowday, Porter & Steer, 1982). This state is assumed to be realized in the form of organizational commitment scores on the modified of Organizational Commitment Scale was constructed by Khan and Mishra (2002).

1-4-4- Personality Type- some categorizations sort individuals into discrete categories or types (Eysenck, 1991; Mathews, 1984). This state is assumed to be realized in the form of personality type scores on the modified of Behavior Activity Profile was developed by Matteson and Ivancevich (1982c).

1-4-5- Self-concept- Self-concepts or self-schemas include generalizations about the self such as "I am an independent person" or "I tend to lean on people. These cognitions arise from past experiences and, once formed, guide how we deal with information related to the self (Markus, 1977). This state is assumed to be realized in the form of self-concept scores on the modified of Self-concept Scale was constructed and standardized by Rastogi (1979).
1-5-Variables

Predictor Variables:

1. Organizational Commitment
2. Personality Type
3. Self-concept

Criterion Variable:

4. Job Satisfaction

Demographic Variables: Age, Gender, Job Position, Education level, Salary, and Job Tenure.

Dependent Variables: Job Satisfaction.

Independent Variables: Organizational Commitment, Personality Type, and Self-concept.
LITERATURE REVIEW

1-6-Job Satisfaction Historical Overview

The vast body of research done on job satisfaction reflects various factors that contribute to workers' satisfaction with their jobs. Locke (1976) categorized three different approaches that have been used to study job satisfaction. In the 1920s the focus on physical working conditions, physical arrangement of the work, and pay were emphasized. The human relations aspects of job satisfaction which explored the social role of the work group and the impact of good supervisory relationships were emphasized in the 1930s. The next trend emerged in the late 1950s and early 1960s and examined the features of the work itself that produce job satisfaction.

According to Spector (1997) most researchers today focus on workers' cognitive processes in the study of job satisfaction rather than on underlying needs.

Job satisfaction studies in the United States have their roots in the early explorations of industry's concern with ways to improve productivity (Gruneberg, 1976). One of the first studies to examine the relationship of the physical environment and worker productivity was carried out by Taylor (1911) at the Bethlehem Steelworks. In the late 1920s another important study was conducted at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company in Chicago. What was begun in 1927 as an attempt to identify the relationship between working conditions and physical conditions at the plant, ended with the realization that social factors and worker expectations had the greatest impact on job satisfaction (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). The Hawthorne studies gave way to extensive research on the multiplicity of factors involved in job satisfaction. Hoppock (1935) raised the notion that it may not be possible to disassociate job satisfaction with other satisfactions in life. In his famous monograph, Job Satisfaction, Hoppock (1935)
states that "family relationships, health, relative social status in the community, and a multitude of other factors may be just as important as the job itself in determining what we tentatively choose to call satisfaction" (p. 5).

Hoppock (1935) surmised that job satisfaction could be a function of general satisfaction with life. Gruneberg (1979) asserts that Hoppock's approach to job satisfaction is typical of many studies conducted since the 1935 monograph. Gruneberg (1979) states that this approach assumes that "if the presence of a variable in the work situation leads to satisfaction, then its absence will lead to job dissatisfaction" (p. 7). Commenting on the earliest studies of general life satisfaction and job satisfaction, Brayfield, Wells, and Strate (1957) noted that an investigation by Wesley of the University of Minnesota students in 1939 found that attitude towards the job was significantly and positively related to life in general. Wesley used the Hoppock Job Satisfaction Blank and the Rundquist-Sletto Morale Scale to survey 211 employed males 12 years after their enrolment at the university. His analysis revealed a 0.31 correlation between the two measures. Bamundo and Kopelman (1980) studied the moderating effects of several variables related to occupation, age and urbanization. The researchers used a global measure of general life satisfaction, a global measure of job satisfaction, and a facet-specific measure of job satisfaction in their study of 911 heads of households to examine the relationship between job and life satisfaction and specific variables. The moderating variables chosen for the study were based on the findings of their positive relationship to occupation, age, and urbanization in other research. They found evidence that the variables studied (which included occupational level, education, income, self-employment, age, job longevity, and residential city size) positively moderated the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. Although widely studied and
discussed in the literature, some researchers believe that the studies linking job satisfaction and life satisfaction are too simplistic. Rain, Lane, and Steiner's (1991) analysis of four literature reviews done in the 1980s on the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction found that the "spillover hypothesis" was substantially more supported in the studies. Rain et al. (1991) described the spillover hypothesis as job satisfaction and life satisfaction each influencing the other. The researchers maintain that in most of these studies a theoretical position is not taken and that job satisfaction is just assumed to affect life satisfaction.

The intrinsic features of the work, or how people feel about the nature of the job tasks, have been purported to be instrumental in producing job satisfaction (Bockman, 1971; Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; O'Driscoll & Randall, 1999; Thorpe & Campbell, 1965). Among the intrinsic factors frequently associated with job satisfaction are acquiring success and recognition, being able to apply or use skills, and feeling worthwhile and involved in the job (Gruneberg, 1979). In an extensive job satisfaction literature review, Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) found that the intrinsic nature of the job was cited most frequently as a contributing factor to job satisfaction. A study of 500 workers from a national longitudinal sample was conducted by Valentine, Valentine, and Dick (1998) to determine the association between job attitudes and various job motivators. Results from the study showed that intrinsic factors such as high involvement and enhanced self-esteem were a significant predictor of job attitudes among older workers. Other studies have found external factors, or features of the job that are external to the work, influence job satisfaction (Brayfield, Wells, & Strate, 1957; Carraher & Buckley, 1996; Ducharme & Martin, 2000; Graham, 1966;
Hulin & Smith, 1965; Pearson, 1991; Lee & Wilbur, 1985; Lobban, Husted, & Farewell, 1998; Martin & Schinke, 1998). A 1991 Gallup Poll of American workers found that while Americans were more satisfied with the interest level of their work and the amount of contact with other people, many more were dissatisfied with fringe benefits and opportunities for promotion (Hugick & Leonard, 1991).

Situational factors have been shown to affect job satisfaction. This approach argues that job satisfaction comes from the nature of the job or work environment (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997). One situational factor associated with job satisfaction is job level. Because higher level jobs generally are more complex and require greater skill diversity, they often have better working conditions and benefits. In a study Robie, Ryan, Schmieder, Parra, and Smith (1998) examined the effects of workers' job level on job satisfaction, their sample was 440 hospital employees. Job level was assessed through the use of four measures and job satisfaction was measured by the Job Descriptive Index. Robie et al. (1998) reported a consistently significant positive relationship between the measures of job level and job satisfaction.

In recent years the dispositional hypothesis has been proposed to explain job satisfaction and has received empirical support (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998; Steel & Rentsch, 1997). This approach is based on the premise that a person's character traits influence feelings about job satisfaction apart from the job or environment (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1977). According to Judge et al. (1997) value judgments or "core evaluations" represent the way individuals perceive themselves, other people, and the world. Judge, Locke, Durham and Kluger (1998) studied core self-evaluations (which included the concepts of self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control and non-neuroticism) to see their effects on job and life satisfaction. Judge et al. (1998) found that core
evaluations of the self had consistent effects on job satisfaction which were independent of the job attributes. Thus, Judge et al. (1998) argue that people with positive core self-evaluations view their lives and jobs in a better light because their internal make-up enables them to do so. In the next paragraphs we will discuss about the definition of job satisfaction.

1.7-Definitions of Job Satisfaction

In reviewing the literature it becomes apparent that job satisfaction has been defined in a number of ways. Ivancevich and Donnelly (1968) defined job satisfaction as “the favorable viewpoint of the worker toward the work role he presently occupies” (p. 172). A succinct definition given by Spector (1997) states that “Job satisfaction is simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs” (p. 2). Also, job satisfaction is defined by Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist (1967, p.13) “as the actual satisfaction of the individual with intrinsic and extrinsic reinforcers” concerned with his/her job. Job satisfaction is also seen as the summation between what an individual expects/wants from a job on the one hand, and what is offered by the job on the other hand (Locke, 1969). It can be seen as an attitudinal (and affective) response to one’s job (McCormick & Ilgen, 1989). The job itself seldom serves as a unitary attitude object. The attitude, in this case satisfaction, that the individual associates with his or her job is really the degree of satisfaction with a number of different dimensions of a job (McCormick & Ilgen, 1989). These views relate to the Hackman and Oldham (1980) argument that job satisfaction refers to the individuals’ attitude towards specific facets of work. Schultz and Schultz (1994) however indicate that positive and negative feelings of job satisfaction develop from such a variety of work related factors that can range from a sense of fulfillment with daily activities to the availability of parking.
Nine different operational definitions of job satisfaction are identified by Wanous and Lawler (1972). Each of the operational definitions are described in terms of how different aspects or facets of job satisfaction are measured and how they combine to achieve an overall measure of satisfaction.

The definitions include: (1) overall job satisfaction as the sum of job facet satisfaction across all facets of a job. (2) job satisfaction as a weighted sum of job facet satisfaction. (3) job satisfaction as the sum of goal attainment or need fulfillment when summed across job facets, (4) job satisfaction as a correspondence to Vroom's "valence for a job", (5) job satisfaction as a discrepancy between how much there is now and how much there should be, (6) job satisfaction as a result of comparison between fulfillment and desires or ideals in the present (7) job satisfaction as a measure of desires or ideals of what one would like, (8) job satisfaction as the importance of a job facet that determines the degree of affect produced by an amount of discrepancy between fulfillment and desires, and (9) job satisfaction as the discrepancy between the importance of a job facet and the perception of fulfillment from a facet.

One of the difficulties in definition of job satisfaction is the different terminology used by researchers to describe it. The literature reveals that job satisfaction is used interchangeably with terms such as morale, attitude, and feelings. As early as the 1930s the term workers' feelings and attitudes were identified in studies (Kornhauser, 1930). Ivancevich and Donnelly (1968) suggest that the term satisfaction is similar to morale and attitude. Brayfield and Roethe (1951) noted that “…attempts to identify and estimate job satisfaction have preceded precise definition; employee satisfaction and morale are often equated but seldom defined” (p. 307). Another difficulty in clearly defining job satisfaction is the way in which satisfaction is measured. Ewen (1967)
notes that usually job satisfaction is measured by determining how satisfied employees are with various facets or aspect of their jobs. A concern raised by Ewen is how much weight each facet should be assigned in measuring it. Evans (1969) noted that the validity of job satisfaction measures is dependent upon the assumption that respondents assign equal importance to each facet. In a similar vein, Wanous and Lawler (1972) raised concern that the many conceptual definitions of job satisfaction has led to different ways of measuring the term satisfaction. Scarpello and Campbell (1983) observed that while the measurement of overall job satisfaction is the total of facet satisfaction, this assumption was appropriate only as long as the content of the satisfaction measure is valid.

Although there is no consensus on ways of defining job satisfaction or measuring it, job satisfaction generally is considered to be an affective state (Jayaratne, 1993). Spector (1997) states that “Job satisfaction can be considered as a global feeling about the job or as a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job” (p. 2). Although job satisfaction typically is expressed as an affective state, the cognitive component of workers’ satisfaction with their job increasingly is being recognized. Brief (1998) states that job satisfaction is defined as “an internal state that is expressed by affectively and/or cognitively evaluating an experienced job with some degree of favor or disfavor” (p. 86).

1-8-Theoretical Explanation of Job Satisfaction

Many theoretical explanations have been proposed to explain the concept of job satisfaction. Early attempts focused on understanding what contributed to workers’ job satisfaction in industrial organizations. These theories have been applied to the study of job satisfaction in human relations fields since the middle of the last century. More recent
theoretical attempts to explain job satisfaction have focused on workers' dispositional and cognitive traits.

1-8-1-Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction

The two-factor theory of job satisfaction has been used to explain what leads to worker satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory postulates that factors which produce job satisfaction are intrinsic and separate from factors which produce job dissatisfaction. Motivator factors consist of variables such as achievement, recognition, advancement, responsibility, and work itself. This higher order needs correspond to Maslow's level of self-actualization. Hygiene or extrinsic factors consist of variables such as pay, security, and physical working conditions. In Maslow's (1954) hierarchy, they correspond to lower order needs. Bockman (1971) notes that "motivators fulfill the individual's need for growth and hygiene factors help him to avoid discomfort and unpleasantness" (p. 158).

Herzberg's theory presumes that the presence of motivator factors produce job satisfaction, but the absence of them does not produce significant job dissatisfaction. In the same vein, the presence of hygiene factors does not produce feelings of satisfaction, but in their absence they do lead to job dissatisfaction.

1-8-2-Vroom's Expectancy Theory

Approaches to the nature and origin of job satisfaction have been explored at various points in the works of Vroom (1960, 1964). Vroom proposed that the study of job satisfaction can be approached from two perspectives: (a) the nature of the job, and (b) the nature of the individual. Expectancy theory posits that situational and personality variables combine to produce workers' satisfaction with their jobs. The expectancies are based on the individual's presumption that effort will lead to good performance and good
performance will lead to rewards. The difference between what workers actually experience and receive as rewards and what workers expect to receive leads to a discrepancy.

1-8-3-Work Adjustment Theory

Work adjustment theory proposes that worker adjustment outcomes can be explained by the interaction between an individual’s personality and work environment (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The theory was developed at the University of Minnesota as part of the Work Adjustment Project of the Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation in an endeavor to understand the problems of adjustment to work. Weiss et al. (1967) state that “work adjustment depends on how well an individual’s abilities correspond to the ability requirements in work, and how well his needs correspond to the reinforcers available in the work environment” (p. v). Furthermore, Weiss et al. maintain that “satisfaction and satisfactoriness are measurable indicators of work adjustment, and that they can be measured independently of each other” (p. v).

1-8-4-Role Theory

Although role theory (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964) does not seek directly to explain job satisfaction, it does have implications for workers’ satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their jobs. Role theory is defined as the occurrence of two or more inconsistent and unexpected behaviors for a task. Role ambiguity is defined as a lack of clearly identified information about responsibilities and duties and how they should be accomplished. Role conflict and role ambiguity have been associated with decreased job satisfaction, stress, and burnout (Bacharach, Bamberger, & Mitchell, 1990; Coll & Freeman, 1997; Dragan, 1981; Kahn, et al., 1964; Kottkamp & Mansfield, 1985;

1-8-5-Reference Group Theory

Reference group theory combines aspects of equity theory with the importance of understanding the group with whom the individual relates (Gruneberg, 1979). The theory speculates that since individuals compare themselves with others to determine if they are being treated equitably, then knowledge of the reference group will facilitate the understanding of workers' job satisfaction. How an individual chooses a reference group or what constitutes a reference group is not clear (Gruneberg, 1979).

1-8-6-The Situational Theory

The situational theory of job satisfaction has been advanced by Quarstein, McAfee, and Glassman (1992). This theory posits that job satisfaction is determined by two factors which are labeled situational characteristics and situational occurrences. Situational characteristics include those things workers evaluate before taking a job such as pay, promotion, working conditions, and supervision. Situational occurrences are those things workers do not previously evaluate and include factors that can be positive or negative. Positive factors might be tangible or intangible, while negative factors might include typical inconveniences or irritations associated with the work environment.

Quarstein et al. (1992) maintain that both situational characteristics and situational occurrences affect job satisfaction and understanding them can facilitate improved worker satisfaction.

1-8-7-The Theory of Individual Differences

The theory of individual differences in job satisfaction (Motowidlo, 1996) is a cognitive approach to understanding the causes of job satisfaction. This model posits that when workers view their jobs favorably, their evaluation is based on retrieving stored
memories from all positive and negative events associated with previous work environments.

1-8-8-Need Theories

The earliest application of the approach to understanding job satisfaction involved the concept of needs. Need theories were developed primarily to explain motivation (Furnham, 1992; Luthans, 1998). Murray’s (1938) manifest needs theory assumes that different people may be motivated by, or satisfied with, different conditions. The central thrust is that workers continually compare the current status of their needs to the level of need fulfillment that they desire from their jobs. Consequently those workers who are high in need achieved are likely to be more satisfied when they are solving problems and successfully accomplishing their job tasks. In contrast, those workers who are high in need for affiliation will probably be most satisfied by maintaining social relationship with their co-workers. When needs are unfulfilled, an unpleasant state of tension result and hence workers are not likely to experience job satisfaction. Fulfillment of the need eliminates the tension, thereby allowing people to feel satisfied.

McClelland (1962) has written extensively on the need for achievement. From the works of McClelland (1962) has emerged a clear profile of the high achiever. The specific characteristics of the high achiever can be summarized as follows:

1. **Risk-Taking:** Taking moderate risks are the single most descriptive characteristics of the person possessing a high need for achievement.

2. **Need for immediate feedback:** Closely linked to high achievers’ moderate risks is their desire for immediate feedback. People with a high need for achievement tend to prefer activities that provide immediate and precise feedback information on how they are progressing toward a goal (Luthans, 1998).
3. Satisfaction with accomplishments: High achievers find accomplishing a task intrinsically satisfying in and of itself. Luthans (1998) argues that these people do not expect or necessarily want the accompanying material rewards.

4. Preoccupation with the task: Once they have selected a goal, high achievers tend to be totally engrossed in the task until it has been completed.

Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959) distinguished between hygiene and motivator needs. Accordingly hygiene needs, are influenced by the physical and psychological conditions in which people work. Motivator needs are described as being very similar to the higher-order needs in Maslow’s (1954) need hierarchy theory. Herzberg et al. (1959) report factors found to be related to hygiene needs as: supervision, interpersonal relations, physical working conditions, salary, company policies and administrative practices, benefits, and job security. These factors are all concerned with the context or environment in which the job has to be done. When these factors are unfavorable, then job dissatisfaction is the result. Conversely, when hygiene factors are positive, such as when workers perceive that their pay is fair and that their working conditions are good, then barriers to job satisfaction are removed (Furnham, 1992). The fulfillment of hygiene needs, however, cannot by itself result in job satisfaction, but only in the reduction or elimination of dissatisfaction (Furnham, 1992; Ivancevich & Matteson, 1996; Luthans, 1998). Unlike hygiene needs, motivator needs are fulfillment by what Herzberg et al. (1957) called motivator factors, or satisfiers. They identified the following motivator factors: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. Whereas hygiene factors are related to the context of work, motivator factors are concerned with the nature of the work itself and the consequences of work. According to the theory, the factors that lead to job satisfaction are those that satisfy an
individual’s need for self-actualization (self-fulfillment) in one’s work, and it is only from the performance of the task that the individual can get the rewards that will reinforce his/her aspirations.

One of the oldest theories is Maslow’s (1954) five-stage needs hierarchy. The needs range from lowest to highest and include basic physiological needs, safety and security needs, social needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization (Maslow, 1954). As lower order needs are met, higher order needs can be fulfilled. The implication of this theory to job satisfaction supposes that when an individual’s lower order needs for things such as pay and security have been met, then higher order needs begin to be desired.

1-8-9-Cognitive Dissonance

Perceived inconsistencies in the workplace can also generate the cognitive dissonance. Leon Festinger (1957) proposed the cognitive dissonance theory, focusing on two principal sources of belief-behavior inconsistency, namely, the effects of making decisions, and the effects of engaging in counterattitudinal behavior. Such inconsistencies produce dissonance, which may be reduced in three major ways: (i) by diminishing the importance of the dissonant element; (ii) by adding consonant elements, (iii) or by changing one of the dissonant elements so that it is no longer inconsistent with the other.

1-8-10-Equity Theory and Cognitive Dissonance Theories

Equity theory has been used to describe job satisfaction. Gruneberg (1979) states that equity theory is based on the concept of receiving a “just reward” for efforts expended. Because individuals characteristically compare themselves to others, workers feel dissatisfied if they believe they are getting less than fellow workers. If the rewards and efforts are comparable to that of others, then people feel satisfied. When there is a
discrepancy between a person's perception of effort and rewards compared to others, employees will put less into their work and be less productive.

Social comparisons among employees regarding rewards are inevitable. It was Adams (1963) who propounded the equity theory that shed light upon the consequences of social injustice in the workplace. The essence of the theory is that employees compare their efforts and rewards with those of others in similar work situations. The theory argues that a major input into job performance and job satisfaction is the degree of equity or inequity that people perceives in the workplace. Creating a fair environment seems to be a key to successful job satisfaction. According to Adams (1963) inequity occurs when an individual perceives that the ratio of his or her outcomes to inputs and the ratio of a relevant other's outcomes to inputs are unequal. Equity exists when employees perceive that the ratios of their inputs to their outcomes are equivalent to the ratios of other employees. In order to restore equity, the person may alter the inputs or outcomes, cognitively distort the inputs or outcomes, or leave the field.

1-8-11-Locke's Value Theory

Locke (1969) in his seminal paper on a theory of goal-setting advocates for the purposefulness of human behavior and the importance of values or valence and consequences. Locke (1969) argues that goal-setting is a cognitive process that shapes human action. He argues that the individual's conscious goals and intentions are the determinants of behavior. One of the Characteristics of intentional behavior is that it persists until the goal is achieved. This is similar to McClelland's need for achievement. A goal is the object of action. People strive to attain their goals in order to satisfy their emotions and desires.

Locke (1976) describes the attributes of goal-setting as comprising goal specificity.
setting difficulty and intensity. According to Locke (1976) goal specificity leads to precision and clarity. Goal difficulty refers to the degree of proficiency or the level of performance that is sought. Goal intensity refers to the process of setting the goal or determining how to reach it. It is argued that job satisfaction may be more closely related to whether or not work provides people with what they want, desire or value. Workers examine what their jobs provide in terms of, for example, pay, working conditions and promotion opportunities, and then compare those perceptions to what they value or find important in a job. To the extent that the two match, job satisfaction results. Thus, value theory implies that the more important a job-related factor is to a worker, the greater its potential effect on his/her satisfaction (Furnham, 1992).

1-8-12-Lawler's Facet Satisfaction Model

Another comparison theory of satisfaction is Lawler's (1973) facet satisfaction model. This theory is an elaboration on portions of the Porter-Lawler motivation model. The facet satisfaction Model derives its name from the fact that it is intended to describe the processes by which satisfaction with any individual job component, or facet, is determined (Furnham, 1992). The comparison specified in Lawler's theory is between perception of what a worker believes he/she should receive in terms of job outcomes such as pay, recognition and promotions, and perception of the outcomes that are actually received.

Perceptions of actual outcomes depend, of course, on the outcomes themselves, as well as perceptions of the outcomes of referent others, or people holding similar jobs with whom workers compare themselves. Perceptions of what should be received depend on perceptions of the inputs the worker brings to the job such as skill, education and experience, as well as perceptions of job characteristics, such as responsibility and
difficulty, and perceptions of the inputs and outcomes of others (Judge, Locke & Durham, 1997). The facet model is highly cognitive in nature and reflects the view that people respond to their perceptions of reality more directly than to reality itself.

1-8-13-Social Learning Theory

According to the social learning theory of Bandura (1977), self-reinforcement develops whereby individuals improve and maintain their own behavior by giving themselves rewards over which they have control whenever they attain self-imposed standards of performance. Bandura (1982) coined the concept of "self-efficacy" to describe self-perceptions of how well individuals can cope with situations as they arise. According to Bandura (1982), self-efficacy originates from four sources, namely 1. performance accomplishment, 2. modelled exposure, 3. verbal persuasion and 4. physiological arousal.

Since both negative as well as positive self-reinforcement are possible, Bandura (1977) coined the terms "self-regulation" to include both the enhancing and reducing effects of self-evaluative influences. Self-regulated incentives increase performance mainly through their motivational function. In this sense, it can be argued that it could satisfy intrinsic job satisfaction. Bandura (1977) argues that people expend little or no effort in activities that have no personal relevance for them. Rather it is in those areas of life affecting one's well-being and self-esteem that self-evaluation activates persistent effort and commitment. Bandura (1977) avers that a wide spectrum of human behavior is regulated through self-evaluative consequences as expressed in the form of self-satisfaction, self-pride, self-dissatisfaction and self-criticism.

1-8-14-Theory X and Theory Y

McGregor (1960) identified two fundamentally different sets of assumption, held by
managers. The conventional view was labeled by McGregor as Theory X and the modern one as Theory Y. Theory Y presumes that an average employee inherently dislikes work and related physical and mental efforts and, whenever possible shall make attempts to avoid it. Therefore employees must be directed, coerced, controlled and/or threatened with punishment to achieve goals of the organization. Employees attempt to get out of responsibility and seek external direction whenever possible. Most workers consider security of job more important than other work related factors and will express little ambition. Method of motivation, based on Theory X can be called as 'carrot-and-stick'-method. In contrast, Theory Y keeps the viewpoint, that goals of an individual and of the organization can be integrated. Managers, supporting Theory Y believe that subordinates work hard, are cooperative, and have positive attitudes. The expenditures of physical and mental effort in work are as natural as play or rest. The manager should complement the employees' effort and creativity through gaining their commitment to the organization's goals, which entails allowing self-direction and discretion, reinforced through a system of feedback and rewards (McGregor, 1960).

1-8-15-Precipitating Factors of Job Satisfaction

Dodd-McCue and Wright (1996) indicate that the research literature reporting on the predictor variables of job satisfaction, seem to lack in the clarification of organizational and job characteristics as causal factors. The literature on job satisfaction divides causal factors of job satisfaction into three distinct groups (Furnham, 1992). These are: (1) organizational characteristics: these concern such things as the reward system, supervision, and decision-making practices, perceived quality of supervision (Wyatt & Marriott, 1956; Locke; 1976, Tosi, Rizzo & Carroll, 1990); (2) specific aspects of the job: these refer to aspects such overall workload, skill variety, autonomy, feedback
and the physical nature of the work environment (Locke, 1976; Hackman & Oldham, 1980); and (3) individual characteristics, these refer to personal characteristics such as self-esteem, ability to tolerate stress, as well as general life satisfaction (Murray, 1938; Maslow, 1954; Lawler, 1973; Locke, 1976). The job characteristic model proposes that the way workers perceive task attributes, such as having variety in their jobs or receiving recognition, is associated with job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). If workers perceive task attributes positively, they are more likely to find their work meaningful and be satisfied with their jobs. The intrinsic satisfaction received from the job motivates workers' performance.

1.9-Measurement of Job Satisfaction

Ways to measure job satisfaction have been attempted since Hoppock's monograph was presented in 1935 (Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1968). Since then thousands of studies have been conducted to try to determine the sources of workers' satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their jobs (Locke, 1969; Spector, 1985). Locke (1969) notes that despite the number of studies completed, advances in understanding the phenomenon of job satisfaction have not kept pace with the research. In reviewing the literature it becomes apparent that many different methods of collecting data and analyzing it are used. Because of the numerous methods used to investigate job satisfaction, different results are obtained (Locke, Smith, Kendall, Hulin, & Miller, 1964). The data collection techniques most often used in studies of job satisfaction include questionnaires, interviews, rank order studies, sentence completion tests, and critical incident inquiries (Fournet, Distefano, & Pryer, 1969).

The most commonly used technique to measure job satisfaction is the questionnaire (Ewen, 1967; Fournet, Distefano, & Pryer, 1969; Spector, 1997). Spector
(1997) states that using existing questionnaires is an easy way to assess job satisfaction. Since they have been used in previous studies, reliability, validity, and norms generally have been established (Spector, 1997). Other advantages of using questionnaires include increased likelihood of insured confidentiality, ease of administering, economical, and frankness in response if used anonymously (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Because it is less likely to deviate from the instructions and administration methods, Pedhazur and Schmelkin (1991) observe that questionnaires are less susceptible to bias.

Job satisfaction questionnaires can be divided into two types. One type measures overall job satisfaction and includes devices such as the Hoppock Job Satisfaction Scale or the Gallop Poll question, while the other type measures the various facets of the job and includes measures such as the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983). Scarpello and Campbell (1983) note that although both types of job satisfaction measures are useful depending upon the information sought global measures and sum of facet measures are not equivalent measures. Scarpello and Campbell (1983) examined the relationship between the sum of facets on the MSQ and a single-item global satisfaction scale and found only a 0.32 correlation between the two measures. The literature discusses some disadvantages of using preexisting job satisfaction scales. Wanous and Lawler (1972) state that important construct and validity questions are raised with job satisfaction measures because it is not clear if the term satisfaction is being measured in the same way. Ewen (1967) raises doubt that job satisfaction questionnaires do not take into consideration the importance of the single components to the worker. Costs can be a factor when a large number of people are going to be surveyed since many preexisting scales are copyrighted.
Interviews generally are used in combination with other methods to gather information about workers' job satisfaction (Fournet, Distefano, & Pryer, 1969). Spector (1997) states that more extensive information can be obtained in an interview since respondents are free to elaborate about the issues under discussion. Also, a less formal atmosphere encourages responses not preplanned by the interviewer (Spector, 1997).

In rank order studies, respondents are asked to rank the characteristics of the job they consider to be the most important determinant to overall job satisfaction. Fournet et al. (1969) point out that Likert (1961) considered the use of this method questionable since its importance can only be measured by its correlation to total job satisfaction.

Sentence completion techniques are projective in nature and provide an opportunity for the respondent to reveal information that otherwise may not have been disclosed (Fournet, Distefano, & Pryer, 1969). In this method individuals are asked to complete a sentence by using a phrase relative to their jobs.

The critical incident method utilizes an approach developed by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959). In this method workers are asked to describe times in which they were exceedingly happy or unhappy in their jobs. Workers are then asked to give reason for their feelings and how the feelings impact job performance and life satisfaction. The researcher then categorizes the factors that appear to be influencing job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

1-10-Factors Determining of Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

A number of variables have been found to relate positively to job satisfaction while others have been found to be more of an indicator of job dissatisfaction. Mortimer (1979) observes that there is no uniform agreement among investigators about the relative
importance or sources of job attributes and experiences. Murray (1995) notes that the variables are interrelated and difficult to determine their impact on each other and overall job satisfaction. Most studies have focused on individual differences, age, education, intelligence, salary, sex, and occupational level as determinants of job satisfaction (Fournet, Distefano, & Pryer, 1969). Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) believe that age, tenure, job level, and salary are linked with job satisfaction.

1-10-1-Age and Job Satisfaction

Of the characteristics most often cited, age consistently has been linked to job satisfaction (Anderson, Hohenshil, & Brown, 1984; Bernal, Snyder, & McDaniel, 1998; Clark, Oswald, & Warr, 1996; Glenn, Taylor, & Weaver, 1977; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957; Hoppock, 1960; Lee & Wilbur, 1985; McArthur & Stevens, 1955). Three views are associated with the relationship between age and job satisfaction (Lee & Wilbur, 1985). Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) described a U-shaped function to represent job satisfaction in the career span. In this model job satisfaction with younger workers is initially high and then drops after a few years, and finally rises as workers age. Using a large sample of British employees, Clark, Oswald, and Warr (1996) investigated the relationship between age and job satisfaction. They concluded that for overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with pay and work itself, strong evidence existed to support a U-shaped relationship between age and job satisfaction. The second view holds that job satisfaction increases as age increases. A number of studies have shown a positive linear relationship between age and job satisfaction (Bernal, Snyder, & McDaniel, 1998; Hulin & Smith, 1965; Rhodes, 1983; Ronen, 1978). Glenn, Taylor, and Weaver (1977) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and age for both males and females. Results of the study showed that job
satisfaction increases with age for both genders. Mei-Chih, I-Chuan, and Kuan-Chia (2007) examined the relationship between personal traits and job satisfaction among Taiwanese community health volunteers, the results showed that there is a correlation between job satisfaction and age. Lee and Wilbur (1985) surveyed 1,707 public employees of United States and state government. Respondents were categorized by three age groups which corresponded to the early, middle, and late stages of the career span. Findings revealed that job satisfaction increased for each of the three age categories, leading Lee and Wilbur to conclude that total job satisfaction increases as employees get older. The third view holds that job satisfaction and age are linear until a specific period and then declines (Saleh & Otis, 1964). Saleh and Otis (1964) studied 118 employees to see if job satisfaction increased with age until pre-retirement and then declined. Participants were administered a survey that was divided into five age periods with the last one being age 60 and over. Some researchers have noted that older workers tend to have a higher level of job satisfaction, although a number of studies have shown that the age variable might be more a proxy for experience (Janson and Martin, 1982; Brush, Moch et al. 1987). Kalleberg and Loscocco (1983) used data from a 1972-1973 U.S. national survey of 1,391 individuals ages 16 to more than 61 years and found that age was positively related to job satisfaction. Although conceding that differences between the samples may account for the differences found in the relationships, the authors argued that the more general processes of aging and development were at work. Weaver (1980) examined job satisfaction among 4,709 American workers from 1972-1978. Although job satisfaction remained the same over the years, it was associated with both age and occupation. Bedeian, Ferris, and Kacmar (1992) argued that increased employee age is likely to be associated with enhanced positions of organizational authority, prestige.
status, and confidence—all potential contributors to job satisfaction in and of themselves. Others believe that older employees are more likely than younger employees to have established a better person environment fit resulting in higher job satisfaction (Lewis, 1991). It has been shown, that older workers are more likely to be satisfied than younger workers (Miller, 1980; Siu, Lu, & Cooper, 1999; Souza-Poza, 2000). In a study Maghrabi (1999) showed that there was a significant difference in job satisfaction and age. Brush et al. (1987) calculated a mean correlation between age and job satisfaction of 0.22 in their meta-analysis of 21 studies. Two large sample surveys, one conducted in the United Kingdom (Clark, Oswald, & Warr, 1996) and the other in nine countries including the United States (Birdi, Warr, & Oswald, 1995), found a curvilinear relation between age and job satisfaction. For these countries, job satisfaction at first declines with age, reaching the lowest level at around ages 26 to 31, and then increase through the rest of the working career. Some of this difference might be attributable to better adjustment to work through experience. However, Birdi et al. (1995) found evidence that older workers have better conditions and greater rewards at work, and War (2001) suggested that as people become older, they tend to value different things at work, for example, older workers are less interested in having task variety, and so they might be happier with jobs that younger workers find dissatisfying. Ito et al. (2001) surveyed 1494 nurses in employed in 27 psychiatric hospitals in Japan and he found that younger age was significant predictors of intention to leave and they had low satisfaction. Previous researchers have found relationships between job satisfaction and age (Pugliesi, 1995; Cheung, and Scherling, 1999). Age is one of the best predictor of job satisfaction (Rodriguez et al. 1992; Finest, Gude, Hem, Tyssen, Ekeberg, Vaglum, 2005). Mottaz (1987) examined the relationship between age and overall work satisfaction and result suggest that age has an indirect
positive effect on work satisfaction through its relationship to work rewards and values. According to De Vaney and Chen (2003) age has an effect on job satisfaction. Results showed that job satisfaction levels increased with each age group until the pre-retirement period which declined. Some studies do not find any significant relationship between age and job satisfaction. Wiedmar (1998) found that age was not significant predictor of job satisfaction. Singh (1985), Belgen & Muller (1987) showed that age was found to be positive correlate of job satisfaction. Kirk (1988) in his study of elementary school counselors in Virginia did not find age and job satisfaction closely related. Murray's (1995) study of Virginia elementary school counselors also did not reveal a connection between age and job satisfaction. A study of a national sample of 1,095 workers was conducted by Bernal, Snyder, and McDaniel (1998) to investigate the relationship between age and job satisfaction. Respondents were divided into five age categories of 16-25 years, 26-35 years, 36-45 years, 46-55 years, and 56 years or older. Eleven major occupational categories were included in the study with individual analyses being completed on five occupational categories that had more than 100 cases. A positive but weak linear relationship between age and job satisfaction was found. Bernal et al. (1998) concluded that age is not a viable predictor of job satisfaction. Other studies by Natraj and Hiafeez (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. In continuation of it we will discuss about relationship between gender and job satisfaction.

1-10-2-Gender and Job Satisfaction

Gender differences have been recognized as a factor in employees' job satisfaction level and it has been extensively researched and no conclusive evidence is found with
regard to the levels of satisfaction among men and women. However, results from several studies have indicated that there is a relationship between gender and job satisfaction (Bilgic, 1998; Lumpkin & Tudor, 1990; Goh & Koh, 1991; Oshagbemi, 2000b). For instance, in a study of the relationship between job satisfaction and personal characteristics of 249 Turkish workers in different occupations and job positions, Bilgic (1998) found that gender was a significant predictor of job satisfaction. Contributing to the literature on gender differences and job satisfaction, Goh & Koh (1991) examined the effects of gender on the job satisfaction of 608 Singaporean accountants and found that male respondents were more satisfied than their female counterparts. Some studies conducted by Lumpkin & Tudor (1990) and Stedham & Yamamura (2003) showed that female managers are paid less and are less satisfied with their pay; thus, it follows that they are not satisfied with their pay, promotions, and overall job satisfaction. On the whole, these studies have demonstrated that there is some association between gender and job satisfaction. Hulin and Smith (1964) surveyed 295 male workers and 163 female workers to determine how satisfied they were with their jobs. Results of the study indicated that female workers tended to be less satisfied with their jobs than male workers. Women tend to be more dissatisfied with their jobs than men (Lambert, 1991). Crossman and Abou-Zaki (2003) investigated job satisfaction and employee performance of Lebanese banking staff, the result showed that female employees were found to be less satisfied with all facets except pay. The researchers postulate that it is not sex per se that leads to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, but that it is a combination of things that co-vary with gender such as pay, job level, or advancement opportunities. According to Rodriguez et al. (1992) and Finest et al. (2005) sex is the predictor of job satisfaction. Hulin (1969) studied the effects of community characteristics on the job satisfaction of
470 male and female workers. One on Hulin's hypotheses was that workers' satisfaction with characteristics of their communities and their jobs was a predictor of both job and life satisfaction. Results from Hulin's study showed that there were differences between males and females for the variables related to job and life satisfaction. In Maynard's (1986) investigation of 338 employees' satisfaction level with work and related support networks, no significant differences were found in regards to gender. Ivancevich and Donnelly (1968) suggested that it is not gender differences that lead to job satisfaction but variations in societal treatment such as different compensation scales for males and females. Historically, it has generally been assumed that females express lower levels of job satisfaction than do males (Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969), but more recent research consistently reports no relationship of gender to overall job satisfaction (Murry and Atkinson, 1981; Summers and DeCotiis, 1988; Ting, 1997; Ganzach, 1998; Smith. Smits and Hoy, 1998). Despite the past researches, women have been found to report significantly higher job satisfaction than men (Hull, 1999; Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza. 2000; Okpara, 2004), although this gender gap appears to be narrowing (Rose, 2005). According to DeVaney and Chen (2003), demographic variables such as gender have an effect on job satisfaction. Wiedmar (1998) showed that gender was an important variable for job satisfaction.

1-10-3-Salary and Job Satisfaction

Studies linking salary and satisfaction with work have mixed results. Although the effects of salary on workers' job satisfaction are among the most frequently reported determinants of job satisfaction, accurately assessing its association with job satisfaction is complicated by factors such as age, occupational level, and education (Fournet, Distefano, & Pryer, 1969). Early studies by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell
(1957) reported that salary was not ranked high in importance by employees. Hoppock (1935) also did not find pay to be a significant factor in job satisfaction. Some studies have shown a positive relationship with age and pay satisfaction (Lee & Wilbur, 1985; Rhodes, 1983). Hulin and Smith (1965) state that "it is not a worker's salary per se that affects his satisfaction, but rather the discrepancy between what he is earning [his present salary] and his salary aspirations [desired salary]" (p. 211). A study conducted by Carraher and Buckley (1996) they explored another way of explaining satisfaction with pay based on the concept of cognitive complexity. The researchers defined cognitive complexity as the way in which individuals use their characteristics or traits to understand their world. In their study of 1,969 teachers, Carraher and Buckley (1996) concluded that cognitive complexities could account for different ways individuals conceptualize satisfaction with pay. Spector (1997) notes that workers tend to compare themselves to each other and are more concerned with equality in pay policies than in salary differences. Parmer and East (1993) showed that workers were strongly satisfied in the areas of supervision, coworkers, work, benefits, and pay. Voelck (1995) found that Michigan librarian were strongly dissatisfied with pay. Horenstein (1993) studied over 600 academic librarians in the United States to determine whether faculty status and rank were related to job satisfaction. She found that dissatisfaction was caused by opportunities for promotion, recognition of accomplishments, and salary. Wu and Norman (2006) showed that student nurses in China were dissatisfied with pay. Semmer, Zapf, and Dunckel (1998) indicated that pay has a significant effect on job satisfaction. In another study, Parikh and Savlani (1985) also found increasing satisfaction with increasing income for engineers in Gujarat. Visagam (1997) Suar and Sharan (1994) and Nazir (1998) surveyed samples from the employees of Neyreli Lignite Corporation, male
supervisors from South Eastern Railway worker shop and bank clerks, they found positive relationship between income and job satisfaction. Brasher and Chen (1999) surveyed recent college graduates and found that their level of starting pay related more strongly to pay satisfaction (correlation=.36) than to global satisfaction (correlation=.17). Spector (1985) found a mean correlation of only .17 between salary level and pay satisfaction in three samples of employees who held different jobs. Rice, Phillips, and McFarlin (1990) found a much larger .50 correlation between pay and job satisfaction in a sample of mental health professionals holding the same jobs. Okpara (2004) showed that there was a significant gap in salary between male and female bank managers in Nigeria and that female bank managers were less satisfied with their salary than their male counterparts.

1-10-4-Job Tenure and Job Satisfaction

Job tenure has been cited as a factor in job satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957; Lee & Wilbur, 1985; Schuh, 1967). Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) maintain that workers initially have high morale when starting a job but that it drops during the first few years of service and then increases as the number of years of service increases. In Hulin and Smith's (1965) study of 260 workers examining the effects of age, tenure on the job, tenure with the company, job level, salary, and salary desired minus salary received, the researchers did not find a U-shaped relation between age and tenure and job satisfaction. A study conducted by Duffy, Ganster, and Shaw (1998), the result showed that the relationship among individuals with positive affectivity and tenure found that affectivity does impact job tenure in an organization. Duffy et al. (1998) concluded that individuals with high affectivity and longer tenure were more likely to experience dissonance and leave the job if they became
dissatisfied. Duffy et al. (1998) surmised that workers with positive affectivity were more likely to seek ways to change their situation. Singh (1985) examined the correlates of job satisfaction among different professionals; he found that experience correlated positively and significantly in the case of advocates and doctors with job satisfaction, but on the case of teachers and engineers the relationship between experience and job satisfaction was not significant. Previous researchers have found relationship between job satisfaction and work experience (Steffy & Jones, 1990). People who are more experienced on their jobs are more highly satisfied that those who are less experienced (Bedian, Ferries, & Kacmar, 1992). Subjective factors such as perceived job match and job tenure effect on job satisfaction (Dawis, 2002). Sokoya (2000) found that there is a significant difference between job tenure and job satisfaction. Raymond and Elizabeth (1985) showed that job tenure has effect on job satisfaction. Interestingly, Clark and Oswald (1996) and Gardner and Oswald (2001) suggest that is U-shaped with respect to job tenure. Oshagbemi (2000) demonstrates that among university instructors in the UK employment tenure in higher education does not correlate with job satisfaction. This confirms more general findings that those with high job satisfaction are less likely to move (Akerlof, Rose, & Yellen, 1988). Chimankire, Mutandwa, Gadzirayi, Muzondo, and Mutandwa (2007) showed that there is not any significant difference between tenure and job satisfaction.

1-10-5-Education and Job Satisfaction

The findings regarding the relationship between education and job satisfaction are mixed. Some researchers argue that education has little significant effect on job satisfaction (Himle & Jayaratne, 1990; Poulin & Walter, 1992; Ross & Reskin, 1992; Gleason-Wynn & Mindel, 1999). Gleason-Wynn and Mindel (1999) state that education
Some studies show that people with higher education are more satisfied (Agho, Mueller, & Price, 1993; Martin & Shehan, 1989), whereas others suggest that people with higher education are less satisfied (Burris, 1983; Glenn & Weaver, 1982). The explanations that account for the contrary arguments are human capital theory (Fitzsimons & Peters, 1994) and expectation theory (Vroom, 1964). Therefore, people with higher education are likely to be more satisfied than those with lower education, whereas, the expectation theory argues that education increases expectations, which results in dissatisfaction. People with higher education are less satisfied because they have higher expectations and less tolerance for low pay, poor management, and limited benefits. (Christianson & Moscovice, 1993). Wu and Norman (2006) showed that degree level student nurses have relatively high job satisfaction. According to DeVaney and Chen (2003) education has an effect on job satisfaction. Wiedmar (1998) indicated that educational level was not significant predictor of job satisfaction. Many researchers have found positive relationships between education levels and job satisfaction (Rogers, 1991). Falcone (1991) found that educated managers expressed more job satisfaction in both public and private sectors than less educated managers. In a survey conducted in four municipalities in the Midwestern and Southwestern United States, Howard & Frink (1996) found that individuals with greater levels of education would experience more growth opportunities than those individuals who are less educated. In addition, Bilgic (1998) conducted a study of 249 full-time employees public and private sectors in Turkey and found that more educated employees were more satisfied than those of less educated. Mottaz (1984) examined the relationship between education and overall work satisfaction, the findings indicate that education has an indirect positive effect, but a direct negative effect on
overall work satisfaction. More specifically, the data suggests that education may increase work satisfaction by increasing work rewards. Moreover, it appears that most of the educational payoff is in terms of intrinsic rewards, e.g., task autonomy, task significance, and task involvement. On the other hand, the findings also indicate that education which does not lead to greater intrinsic rewards may significantly reduce work satisfaction. Crossman and Abou-Zaki (2003) investigated the relationships between job satisfaction, individual job facets, socio-demographic variables and job performance in the Lebanese commercial banking sector. The results indicate that employees with lower educational qualifications were least satisfied. Mel-Chin, I-chuan, and Kuan-chia (2007) found that there was a correlation between job satisfaction and education.

1-10-6-Job Position and Job Satisfaction

The antecedents of job satisfaction are not well reported in literature and research, consequently there are very few studies that enquire into the effects of position. In of the few studies linking position and job satisfaction, Howard & Frink (1996) reported that job satisfaction was positively affected by managerial position. That is, managerial employees were more satisfied with their jobs than their non-managerial counterparts. In fact, being a managerial employee indirectly increased satisfaction with co-workers, supervision, work motivation, and life satisfaction (Howard & Frink 1996).

1-11-Organizational Commitment

Given the long history of the investigation of commitment it is not surprising that it has been conceptualized and measured differently and remains a contested construct. One of the issues centers on the conceptualization of commitment in terms of the attitudinal-behavioral dichotomy, but it is measures based on the affective approach which have
most frequently been validated and used in previous research (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Price & Mueller, 1981; Steers, 1977; Meyer & Allen, 1997). An influential conceptualization is that of Mowday and colleagues (e.g., Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979; Mowday, Porter & Steer, 1982). Organizational commitment is defined in terms of member's identification and level of engagement with a particular organization. It reflects peoples' attitudes towards the organizations goals and values, a desire to stay with the organization, and a willingness to expend effort on its behalf. The latter has behavioral implications, but the conceptualization focuses more on how people think about their relationship to the employing organization and the formation of attitudes based on that. Although Meyer and Allen (1991) have sought to broaden the perspective on organizational commitment through the componential model, it has been shown that the three components are distinct and have different antecedents (Dunham, Grube, & Castanedal, 1994). Meyer and Allen (1997) still acknowledge, too, that commitment should be conceptualized as a psychological state concerned with how people feel about their organizational engagements. It has also been demonstrated that it is the affective characteristics which impact greatest on outcome variables such as absenteeism and turnover (Dunham et al., 1994; McFarlane-Shore & Wayne, 1993; Somers, 1995).

Organizational commitment has been variously and extensively defined, measured, and researched but it continues to draw criticism for lack of precision and concept redundancy (Meyer and Allen, 1997; Morrow, 1983; Reichers, 1985). For example, organizational commitment may be seen as part of a larger cluster of constructs describing the individual-organizational relationship that includes organizational identification, job loyalty, job attachment, and job involvement (Scott, Corman, and Cheney, 1998). The employment environment within industry and commerce has
changed dramatically over the past two decades. The concept of organizational commitment has enjoyed a great deal of research interest in the past two decades. For this reason, many organizations are turning from a control model to a commitment model in managing their workforce (Walton, 1985). This is because employees who are committed to their employing organization have been shown to enhance organizational effectiveness through their high levels of job performance and work quality and low levels of tardiness, absenteeism and turnover (Mathieu, Zojac, 1990; Randal, 1990). Organizational commitment conceptualized as an attitudinal variable is defined as the relative strengths of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. It is characterized by (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and virtues, (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and (c) a strong desire to maintain relationship and membership in the organization (Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982).

Reviewing the literature on organizational commitment (e.g., Buchman, 1974; Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982, Reichers, 1985) reveals that there are at least three different approaches to conceptualizing organizational commitment.

First, the side-bets (exchange) perspective sees commitment as an outcome of inducement/contribution transaction between the organization and member. In this conceptualization, the individual perceives associated benefits such as pension plans as positive elements in an exchange that produces willingness to remain attached to the organization. Thus, commitment is defined as a function of the rewards and costs associated with organizational membership (Alutto, Hrebiniaik, and Alonso, 1973; Farell and Rusbult, 1981).
Second is the *psychological perspective* which views organizational commitment as a three-component orientation. These components are: (a) identification with the goals and values of the organization, (b) a willingness to focus strong effort toward helping the organization achieve its goals, and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Buchanan, 1974; and Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian, 1974). Under this perspective commitment is defined as "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (Steers, 1977, p. 46).

Third is the *attributions perspective* which defines commitment as a binding of individuals to behavioral acts that results when individuals attribute an attitude of commitment to themselves after engaging in behaviors that are volitional, explicit, and irrevocable (Reichers, 1985). Most recently Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997) proposed a three-component model of organizational commitment that includes aspects of these three approaches. The multiple commitment framework provides a more complex view for understanding organizational commitment (Becker and Billings, 1993; Gordon & Ladd, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Reichers (1985) suggests that organizational commitment can be understood as a part of a collection of multiple commitments to the various groups that comprise an organization. From this perspective, organizations are viewed as coalitional entities, as reference groups and as role settings. These coalitional entities and their constituencies espouse unique sets of goals and values that may be in conflict with the goals and values of other organizational groups.

Most of the research interests in organizational commitment have been concerned with identifying the determinant of the concept in order to better manage. Four categories of antecedents of organizational commitment have been identified (Mowday et al., 1982).

1. Personal characteristics (eg. age, tenure, personality traits).
2. Job characteristics (eg. task, autonomy, task variety).

3. Work experience (eg. perceived pay equity, personnel importance to the organization).

4. Role related characteristics (role conflict and role ambiguity).

The four antecedent categories have been subsumed under two theoretical perspectives which explain the processes by which individuals become committed to their organization. The two theoretical perspectives are side bet and exchange theories. Side bet theory (Becker, 1960) considers commitment as an accrual phenomenon which occurs as a result of individual organizational transactions and alterations inside bets or investment over time. Side bet refers to anything of value the individual has invested (for example time, effort and money) that would be lost if he/she were to leave the organization (Cohen and Lowenberg, 1990). Exchange theory on the other hand posits that organizational members bring to the organizations their need or expectations. To the extent that the employing organization is able to provide a means for the satisfaction of the needs and or expectations, commitment would be developed. In fact, individual exchange their contributions or involvement in organizations for rewards on inducements that the organization can provide (Angle and Perry, 1983).

Organizational commitment is important to the changing world of work for the following reasons:

1. Organizations are not disappearing people still from the core of an organization even if the company becomes leaner. Organization tend to become smaller and more flexible (Meyer and Allen, 1997).

2. Commitment develops naturally through social exchange. If employees become less committed to organizations they will channel their commitment towards other
activities such as industry, occupation, profession, hobbies or volunteer activities. If not committed to the organization, they must therefore start evaluating their marketability outside the organization, rather than by their current or future job prospects in the organization.

Organizational commitment is an important issue from both the conceptual and organizational aspect since it may be used to predict employees’ absenteeism, performance, turnover, and other behaviors. Most researchers conceive of commitment as involving some form of psychological bond between people and organizations, although there is little consensus as to a useful operational index of the concept. Allen and Meyer (1990) conceptualized a multidimensional organizational commitment measure that drew on the early works of Porter et al. (1974); Becker (1960); and Weiner and Vardi (1980). McGee and Ford (1987), and Meyer et al. (1990) offered evidence for the presence of other sub-dimensions of commitment, namely personal sacrifice and lack of alternatives. The findings by Dunham et al. (1994) were consistent with the research of Steers (1997) and Mottaz (1988) that perceived participatory management to create rewarding situations intrinsically conducive to the development of affective commitment.

It is contended that the ideas put forward by Allen and Meyer (1990) tend to bring the definition of organizational commitment closer to the practical meaning of the concept. They maintain that organizational commitment is made up of three components or dimensions:

1. The affective component, referring to the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization.

2. The continuance component referring to commitment based on the costs that the employee associates with leaving the organization.
3. The normative component referring to the employee's feeling of obligation to remain with the organization.

It is contended that the organizational commitment of managers and other employees is essential for the survival and effectiveness of large work organizations because the fundamental responsibility of management is to maintain the organization in a state of health necessary to carry on its work. Effective management thus presupposes a proprietary concern, a sense of responsibility for and dedication to sustaining the well being of the organization. In the absence of ownership as a motive for such concern, modern organizations have of necessity turned to the deliberate creation and protection of committed elites (Selznick, 1957; Perrow, 1972).

Mowday et al (1982) distinguish between organizational commitment as an attitude and organizational commitment as a behavior. Attitudinal commitment reflects the individual's identification with organizational goals and the employee's willingness to work towards them. Thus, attitudinal commitment is synonymous with organizational commitment as measured by the organizational commitment questionnaire (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Behavioral commitment, on the other hand, is represented by what is termed attributional approaches to commitment, and its results from the binding of individuals to behavioral acts. Mowday et al (1982) maintain that there is a cyclical relationship between these two types of commitment whereby commitment attitudes lead to committing behaviors which, in turn, reinforce commitment attitudes. This distinction between commitment attitudes and commitment behaviors along with the increasing use of the organizational commitment questionnaire as the major instrument used to assess commitment may lead to more consistency and coherence to studies of organizational commitment.
It is important to note that, as we expand the concept of commitment to include desire, need, and obligation to remain, it no longer falls within the traditional social psychological definition of an attitude. To avoid confusion therefore, we will hereafter use the term “commitment” to refer to commitment as a psychological state (with an appropriate modifier, where necessary to identify the nature of the psychological state), and the term “behavioral commitment” to refer to commitment as behavioral persistence. Although there are many and varied definitions of commitment, they appear to reflect at least three general themes: affective attachment to the organization, perceived costs associated with leaving the organization, and obligation to remain with the organization.

Affective Attachment. For several authors, the term commitment is used to describe an affective orientation toward the organization. Kanter (1968), for example, defined what she called “cohesion commitment” as “the attachment of an individual’s fund of affectivity and emotion to the group” (p. 507). Finally, Porter and his associates (Mowday, Steers, and Porter, 1979; Porter, Crampon, and Smith, 1976; Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian, 1974) described commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Mowday et al. 1979, p.226).

Perceived Costs. Other authors view commitment as the continuation of an action (e.g., remaining with an organization) resulting from a recognition of the costs associated with its termination. Becker (1960), for example, described commitment as a disposition to engage in “consistent lines of activity” (p. 33). Kanter (1968) defined “cognitive-continuance commitment” as that which occurs when there is a “profit associated with continued participation and a ‘cost’ associated with leaving” (p. 504). For Stebbins (1970), continuance commitment was “the awareness of this possibility of choosing a
different social identity...because of the immense penalties involved in making the
switch" (p. 527). Others have used the term "calculative" to describe commitment based
on a consideration of the costs and benefits associated with organizational membership
that is unrelated to affect (Etzioni, 1975; Hrebinik and Alutto, 1972; Stevens, Beyer, and
Trice, 1978). Finally, Farrell and Rusbult (1981) suggested that commitment is "related to
the probability that an employee will leave his job and involves feelings of psychological
attachment, independent of affect" (p. 79).

Obligation. Finally, a less common, but equally viable approach has been to view
commitment as an obligation to remain with the organization. Marsh and Mannari (1977).
for example, described the employee with "lifetime commitment" as one who "considers
it morally right to stay in the company, regardless of how much status enhancement or
satisfaction the firm gives him over the years" (p. 59). In a similar vein, Wiener (1982, p.
421) defined commitment as "the totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a
way which meets organizational goals and interests", and suggested that individuals
exhibit these behaviors solely because "they believe it is the 'right' and moral thing to
do". Wiener and Vardi (1980) used a three-item scale to measure normative commitment.
Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they believe "a person who
should be loyal to his organization, should make sacrifices on its behalf, and should not
criticize it" (Wiener and Vardi, 1980, p.86).

1-12-Measurement of Organizational Commitment

The scale used to measure organizational commitment was developed by Allen &
Meyer, (1996). The authors divide the scale into two subdivisions, affective and
continuance commitment. Affective commitment has eight items, for example, "I enjoy
discussing my organization with people outside it". Continuance commitment has eight
items, for example, "right now, staying with the organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire". The items are measured on a Likert type anchored scale from *strongly disagree* (1), to *strongly agree* (7). In Riley’s (2006) sample Cronbach’s alpha for organizational commitment was affective commitment 0.78 and continuance commitment 0.81.

1-13-Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

A number of researchers suggest that job satisfaction has a special significance for an understanding of the effects of various antecedent constructs on commitment. Previous studies investigating causal models of organizational commitment and turnover (Price & Mueller, 1981; Taunton, Krampitz & Wood, 1989; Williams & Hazer, 1986) have suggested that the effects of various antecedents on commitment are mediated through job satisfaction. For example, William and Hazer (1986), using structural equation modeling, concluded that a variety of variables (namely, age, pre-employment expectations, perceived job characteristics, and the consideration dimension of leadership style) all influence commitment indirectly via their effects on job satisfaction. Similar results were obtained by Iverson and Roy (1994), Mathieu and Hamel (1989), and Michaels (1994). However, Price and Mueller (1981) disagree and conclude that only some, but not all, of the antecedents of commitment are mediated by job satisfaction: others, such as professionalism and kinship responsibility have a direct effect. Assumption that job satisfaction is a causal antecedent of commitment. However, given the uncertainty of whether satisfaction is a total or partial mediator of the effects of other antecedents on commitment, job satisfaction is examined as a potential mediator of the effects of organizational subcultures as well as examining the direct effects of subcultures on commitment. This view is consistent with previous research (e.g. Price & Mueller,
Brewer (1994) and Kratina (1990) concluded that bureaucratic practices often result in negative employee commitment while supportive work environments could result in greater commitment and involvement among employees. Health service organizations and hospitals have frequently been represented as 'traditional' and bureaucratic institutions (Clinton & Scheiwe, 1995) and nursing is subject to the significant rule-bound and bureaucratic forces. It is therefore specifically proposed that supportive and innovative ward subcultures have a direct and positive effect on commitment whilst bureaucratic ward subculture has a direct negative effect. In a similar vein, we expect positive relationships between supportive and innovative ward subcultures and job satisfaction and a negative relationship between bureaucratic ward subculture and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is predicted to have a positive effect on commitment as has been consistently shown in previous research on the determinants of commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Michaels, 1994; Mottaz, 1988; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Although a majority of writers have adopted job satisfaction as an antecedent of commitment (Williams & Hazer, 1986; Price & Mueller, 1981) there are others who have questioned this assumption (Vandenberg & Lance, 1992). In their review of the antecedents and consequences of commitment, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) concluded that the direction of causation was undecided, and opted for the neutral description of satisfaction as being a correlate of commitment. As noted, a number of writers (William & Hazer, 1986; Iverson & Roy, 1994; Mathieu & Hamel, 1989; Michaels, 1994) have suggested models in which the effects of various antecedents on commitment are totally mediated by their effect on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was found to be an important predictor of organizational commitment (Sonia, Pamela, & Marilyn, 1997). Sikorska (2005) found that job satisfaction was a strong predictor of commitment; also he
explained that higher levels of organizational commitment were associated with greater job satisfaction. Lalopa (1997) effectively used the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire to evaluate 300 non-supervisory resort employees' levels of commitment. Further, he developed a “Resort Job Satisfaction” scale by adopting items from previous studies. Findings provide further evidence that job satisfaction is a significant predictor of organizational commitment. Several researchers have found that job satisfaction is a predictor of organizational commitment (Proter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974; Price, 1977; Rose, 1991). Wu and Norman (2006) found a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Studies also consistently report a strong association between organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Blegen, 1993; Fang, 2001). Similarly, AL-Aameri (2000) found a strong positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment with a sample of registered nurses in Saudi Arabia. A positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment has been reported by studies which involve qualified professionals. Redfern, Hannan, & Norman (2002) reported a strong positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (r=0.60, P<0.001), in a study of the health care staff in a nursing home in the UK. This finding is consistent with a large survey of qualified nurses in the US (Ingersoll et al., 2002). Which revealed a closely positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (r=0.63, P<0.001). Knoop (1995) also reported organizational commitment was positively related to overall job satisfaction (r=0.64, P<0.001). Tinti (1995) found a strong positive correlation between the attitudinal variables (job satisfaction and organizational commitment). Satisfaction with the job as a significant contributor to organizational commitment has been well documented (Flynn & Solomon, 1985; Mottaz, 1987; Vanderberg & Lance, 1992; Steinhaus & Perry, 1996;
Morrison, 1997; Young et al., 1998; Eby & Freeman, 1999; Testa, 2001). These studies are not only consistent in reporting a positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, but also show the correlation is strong across studies. However, Draper et al.'s study (2004) found a negative relationship between job satisfaction and dimensions of commitment with a sample of NHS cadets.

1-14-Demographic Variables and Organizational Commitment

A number of variables have been found to relate to organizational commitment, in this section of research the demographic variables of age, gender, position, job experience, current monthly salary, and highest degree earned several studies are discussed. The studies in the review vary in setting but provide valuable insight into the relation between the demographic variables and organizational commitment.

Researchers (Mayer and Allen, 1997) have found that age was positively correlated with affective and normative commitment, but not to continuance commitment. Sneed and Herman (1990) examined the relationships among job characteristics, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and demographic variables were investigated. Age was the only demographic characteristic related to organizational commitment. Older workers had higher scores on the commitment scale.

Ellemer, Gilder, and Heuvel (1998) found that background variables as gender and level of education were not clearly related to three forms of commitment. Adeyemo (2000) reported a positive correlation between education and organizational commitment. Irving, Coleman, and Cooper (1997) found that age was not related to organizational commitment. Meyer and Allen (1984) earlier argued that age might be correlated with commitment by postulating that it serves as proxy for seniority that is associated with opportunity to better one's position in the work. On the issue of gender, Mathieu and
Zajac (1990) reported its relationship to organizational commitment. Similarly, it was found by Irving, et al. (1997) that the men in their sample had higher level of commitment than the women. Adeyinka, Ayeni, and Popoola (2007) reported that there is not any relationship exists in the organizational commitment of library personnel based on their years of experience. Iverson and Buttigieg (1999) found normative commitment to be significantly negatively correlated with years of education, raising the possibility that less educated workers harbor feelings of organizational loyalty reminiscent of a bygone era. Work experiences believed to contribute to the development of normative commitment include organizational support, organizational justice and role clarity, and normative commitment is positively associated with overall job satisfaction and job involvement (Meyer et al., 2002). Glisson and Durick (1988) found that education was found to be a significant predictor of commitment.

In a sample of human service workers, Morris and Sherman (1981) reported that older employees, less educated employees, and employees with a greater sense of competence had higher levels of organizational commitment.

Stevens, Beyer, and Trice (1978) found that several worker characteristics predict organizational commitment: the total number of years the worker had been in the organization was positively related to commitment, while the number of years the workers had been in the same position and the more the worker was favorably disposed to change were each negatively associated with commitment. In a large sample of hospital employees, Steers (1977) found a negative effect of education and positive effects for age. Age and tenure have generally been reported to be positively associated with commitment (Hall, Schneider, and Nygren, 1970; Lee, 1971; Sheldon, 1971; Hrebinjak.
1974), and education has been reported to be negatively related to commitment (Morris and Steers, 1980; Angle and Perry, 1981).

Tsui, Egan, and O'Reilly (1992) conducted a study on relational demography and organizational attachment. The demographic characteristics of sex, age, job tenure, and education were used in the study. Results of the study revealed that the larger the difference in age, and sex, the lower the individual's psychological commitment to stay with the organization. Results also concluded that being different in gender had more of an effect on organizational attachment than education and tenure. Finally, results revealed that being different have a more negative effect for men than for women. An interesting observation from the study was that men in homogenous units reported the highest level of organizational attachment.

Brady (1997) examined the organizational commitment of professional staff in health and human service organizations. The variables of age, gender, education, salary and years in the agency were examined in relation to organizational commitment. The results of the study revealed that affective commitment was significantly related to age (.097) and annual salary (0.19), but not related to years in position (0.08). Results revealed that continuance commitment was not significantly related to age (0.006), years in position (0.026), or annual salary (0.018). Normative commitment was not significantly related to age (0.06), years in position (0.03), or annual salary (0.19). The study also investigated the differences between organizational commitment (affective, continuance, normative) and level of education. Results revealed no significant difference between affective commitment and level of education (.82). Results also revealed no significant difference between continuance commitment and level of education (5.17). There were no significant differences found between normative commitment and level of education.
Valenti (2001) investigated the organizational commitment level of Generation X’ers between two different stages. Generation X’ers are individuals born between 1965-1978 and are assumed to be less committed to organizations than previous generations. To assess the differences, participants (n=315) completed the original Organizational Commitment Scale and a demographic survey to identify the variables of age, highest degree earned, and organizational tenure. In the study, Generation X’ers in stage 1 are beginning their entry into the adult world and are in the “Trial stage” of life, participants in this stage are under the age of 30 years. Stage 2 participants are in the “Stabilization or Establishment” stage and are between the ages of 30 and 44 years. Results from the study revealed that participants in stage 2 had more affective and normative commitment than participants in stage 1. This was interpreted to mean that older employees are more committed (affective, normative). When identified by stage, there was a significant difference between stage 1 and stage 2 Generation X’ers for affective commitment (1.98) but not normative commitment (1.18) or continuance commitment (3.22). When identified by age, there was no significant difference between stage 1 and stage 2 Generation X’ers for affective commitment (-0.70), normative commitment (-0.046) or continuance commitment (0.09).

Brookover (2002) examined the organizational commitment level of faculty at Clemson University in relation to the antecedents of age, gender, organizational tenure, and salary. The study assessed attitudinal and behavioral commitment. The results found no significant difference between age and attitudinal commitment (0.65), but a significant difference between age and behavioral commitment (0.02). No significant difference was found between salary and attitudinal commitment (0.12), but a significant difference was
found between salary and behavioral commitment (0.02). There was no significant
difference found between tenure and attitudinal commitment (0.44), but a significant
difference was found between tenure and behavioral commitment (0.01). Faculty that
graduated from Clemson University had a higher level of attitudinal commitment (0.005)
than faculty that did not graduate from Clemson University. There was no significant
difference found between graduates and non graduates of Clemson University for
behavioral commitment. A significant difference was found for behaviorally committed
faculty who were tenured versus non-tenured faculty.

Foosiri (2002) examined the relationship between organizational commitment
(affective, continuance, normative) and the antecedents of age, education, and salary of
Thai employees within the American Chamber of Commerce in Thailand. Results
revealed a significant relationship between affective commitment and education and
salary, a significant relationship between continuance commitment and education, and a
significant relationship between normative commitment and age and education. Results
also revealed a positive correlation between age and affective, normative, and
continuance commitment, a positive correlation between salary and affective
commitment, and a negative correlation between education and continuance and
normative commitment.

King (2002) conducted a meta-analysis to summarize the relations between the
three-component Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS) and the organizational
commitment questionnaire (OCQ) in their antecedents, correlates, and consequences. The
results from the study revealed that affective commitment had a correlation of 0.05 to
education, 0.16 to age, and 0.19 to tenure. There was a positive and significant correlation
with OCQ and education (0.04), but there was no significant correlation between OCQ
and age (0.18) and tenure (0.10). There were no significant correlations found between continuance commitment and education (-0.11), age (0.16), and tenure (0.22). There were no significant correlations between normative commitment and education (-0.08), age (0.17), and tenure (0.18).

Schneider (2003) investigated the relationship of selected demographics to organizational commitment. The results revealed a significant relationship between affective commitment and age and income, and normative commitment and income. To further investigate if the variables would account for variance of affective and normative commitment, a stepwise multiple regression was conducted. Results revealed that income and education were predictors of affective and normative commitment. Regression analysis indicated that roughly 6 percent of variance in commitment (affective and normative) was accounted for by income alone and 3 percent when education was added to the equation (affective and normative).

Labatmediene, Endriulaitiene, and Gustainiene (2007) found that there was no significant relationship between personality traits and organizational commitment. It was also found that there was a significant relationship among organizational commitment, age, and the level of education. Lim (2003) examined the variables of age, education, gender, and years of service in current organization in relation to organizational commitment. The results revealed no significant differences for age and affective organizational commitment (0.56), continuance organizational commitment (1.33), and normative organizational commitment (0.94). Results also revealed no significant differences between educational level and affective organizational commitment (2.11), continuance organizational commitment (1.72), and continuance organizational commitment (0.69). Results revealed no significant difference between years of service in
current organization for affective organizational commitment (2.35), continuance organizational commitment (1.05), and normative organizational commitment (2.42). There was a significant difference found for gender and affective commitment and continuance, males had higher affective and continuance mean scores than females.

Heinzman (2004) examined the relationship between the variables of age, tenure, and job satisfaction to organizational commitment. The results revealed that affective organizational commitment has a significant relationship to tenure (0.22) but not age (0.13), continuance organizational commitment has a significant relationship to tenure (0.25) but not age (0.14) and normative organizational commitment has a significant relationship to tenure (0.17) but not age (0.08).

Huang (2004) investigated the level of organizational commitment among faculty at Taiwan’s higher educational institutions. The results revealed no significant relationship between age and affective organizational commitment (0.48), continuance organizational commitment (0.09), and normative organizational commitment (0.11). Results also revealed no significant relationship between length of employment and affective organizational commitment (0.81) and normative organizational commitment. There was a significant relationship found between length of employment and continuance organizational commitment (p<0.005).

Al-Kahanti (2004) investigated the organizational commitment of faculty at the Institute of Public Administration in relation to the demographic variables of age, gender, education, occupational level, and salary. Results revealed that age, gender, annual salary and organizational tenure significantly correlated with organizational commitment (affective, continuance, normative, overall). Results also revealed that education significantly related to continuance commitment. In a study by Wahn (1998), results
revealed that women in human resource positions reported higher levels of continuance commitment than male human resource professionals. The study also revealed a positive relationship between tenure and continuance commitment and a negative relationship between educational level, level in hierarchy and continuance commitment. In conclusion, women appear to have the same or greater organizational commitment to their workplace than men. Another study conducted within this subsection was by Lawthom, Patterson, West, and Staniforth (1996). They examined the perception of the work environment of 156 female and 898 male managers in a manufacturing industry in Britain. The researchers concluded that women had higher levels of organizational commitment than men. In another study Blackhurst, Brandt, and Kalinowski (1998) examined the relationship between career development and the organizational commitment of female student affairs administrators. The sample consisted of 140 women student affairs administrators of various levels. The major findings were that organizational commitment was higher for women with five or more years on the job than for women with fewer than five years on the job. They concluded that the lowest levels of organizational commitment were observed by women in assistant or associate director positions. Winterstein (1998) examined the commitment of head athletic trainers in their intercollegiate work environment, and techniques to describe head athletic trainers' commitment to their organizations. A proportional random sample (n=330) of head athletic trainers of NCAA Division I, II, and III member institutions was the sample for the study. Results indicated that continuance commitment scores were significantly lower than the affective and normative scores. Results also showed that Division I and Division II head athletic trainers demonstrated higher levels of normative commitment to their athletic departments and affective and normative commitment to their co-workers than
their Division III head athletic trainers. In conclusion, the findings reinforce the primary focus of the head athletic trainers who were student-athletes and student athletic trainers.

One of the latest studies has been conducted by Chelladurai and Oswagawara (2003) who assessed the differences in organizational commitment among American NCAA Division I and Division III coaches and Japanese coaches. The sample for the study included 432 Division I coaches, 468 Division III coaches, and 274 Japanese coaches. Results from the study revealed that Japanese coaches were significantly higher in their commitment to their organizations than Division I and Division III coaches. In conclusion, administrators of intercollegiate athletics have to focus on cultivating the commitment of their high-performing coaches.

A variety of worker characteristics that describe the worker's personality has been reported to be associated with commitment (Hulin and Blood, 1968; Hall and Schneider, 1972; Goodale, 1973; Buchanan, 1974; Dubin, Champoux, and Porter, 1975; Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977; Steers and Spencer, 1977; Kidron, 1978). Gelade, Debson, and Gilbert (2006) examined organizational commitment in a sample of 49 countries. Affective commitment varies significantly by country and is strongly related to dimensions of personality. Affective commitment is high in countries where the population is extravert and low in countries where the population is neurotic. Chusmir and Hood (1988) conducted a study of predictive characteristics of Type-A behavior among men and women. The result showed that for both Type-A women and men, the most significant factors were high levels of need of power, job commitment, and hierarchical position. Begley and Lee (1999) found that career commitment showed a limited buffering role for those high in Type-A behavior.
Personality Type is a term most commonly associated with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, a model of personality development created by Isabel Myers and her mother Katharine Cook Briggs. This model was developed around the ideas and theories of Carl Jung (Keirsey & Bates, 1984), a Swiss physician-psychiatrist. Jung was a contemporary of Sigmund Freud and a leading exponent of Gestalt personality theory. As early as 1923 he theorized that what seems to be a random variation in human behavior is actually quite orderly, logical and consistent and is the result of a few basic differences in mental functioning and attitude. These differences affect what people perceive, as well as how they draw conclusions about these perceptions (Stevens, 1994). In Jung’s personality theory, he classified all conscious mental activity into four mental processes, each involving an individual’s orientation towards self and the environment. The first two processes identify the way in which a person perceives a stimulus or becomes aware of things, people, events or ideas. These are the Sensing (S) process, which refers to observing information by way of the senses, and the Intuition (N) process, which refers to perceiving meanings, relationships and possibilities by using insight. The next two mental processes refer to the way in which people make judgments or decisions. These are the Thinking (T) process, which refers to logical, objective decision-making and the Feeling (F) process in making judgments based on a system of subjective and personal values. Judgers (J) prefer a planned organized approach to life while Preceptors (P) enjoy a flexible and spontaneous approach to life (Stevens, 1994). Jung also identified individuals with two attitude types, Extraversion (E) and Introversion (I) that describe how an individual prefers to engage the environment and use the four basic mental functions. These two attitude types are seen as complementary orientations towards life.
Extraversion defines the actions of individuals who prefer an orientation to the outer world of people, places and things. On the other hand, Introversion, describes a preferred orientation towards the inner world of thoughts, concepts and ideas (Stevens, 1994). Using Jung’s theories, Myers and Briggs developed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The MBTI instrument consists of 126 questions representing four preferences, drawing a similarity to hand preferences: although we all use both our hands, we have a preference for one hand over the other. The preferred hand leads many activities in which we use both hands (Geyer, 2005). The same apply for the mental processes. The Personality Preference will lead the mental process. According to Van Rensburg et al. (2001) Personality Preferences can be defined as reflections of habitual choices between the rival alternatives in the way information is received and decisions are made. In the MBTI instrument the four preferences, Extraversion (E)/ Introversion (I), Sensing (S)/ Intuition (N), Thinking (T)/ Feeling (F) and Judging (J)/ Perceiving (P), are combined into a profile or Personality Temperament Type of which 16 possibilities exist, each with its own unique pattern of preferences. The MBTI is used to determine how people consciously prefer to attend to the world, how they choose to perceive that to which they attend, and how judgments are made about these Perceptions. Later the MBTI became a registered trademark of Consulting Psychologist Press, Inc., which also publishes and distributes the Inventory (Geyer, 2005).

Keirsey and Bates described one of the most popular methods of applying the MBTI. While the MBTI uses 16 psychological preferences or Temperament Types, Keirsey and Bates have categorized observed behavior into four broad Personality Temperament groups, namely Sensing-Judging (SJ), Sensing-Perceiving (SP), Intuitive-
Thinking (NT) and Intuitive-Feeling (NF). They also designed a 70-item forced choice questionnaire to elicit an individual's preferences, similar to those originally designed for MBTI (Keirsey & Bates, 1984). Keirsey and Bates (1984) described people who have the combination of Sensing-Perceiving (SP) as disliking routine, enjoying risk-taking and having a strong play ethic. These people usually do not fit well into a traditional classroom setting and are usually less successful in school. People with a Sensing-Judging (SJ) combination are almost total opposites of the SP's. They love rules, regulations, duty and honour. They have a strong work ethic and a parental outlook and they usually do very well in traditional school settings. The Intuitive-Thinking combination people (NT) are described as natural born scientists. They desire to have power over nature and to be able to predict and control reality. They highly value logic and reason. These people tend to do very well in formal education. The last temperament Type is Intuitive-Feeling (NF). These people are on a never-ending search for self. They usually speak and write fluently and for that reason tend to do well in school. They prefer subjects that deal with people such as social sciences (Keirsey & Bates, 1984). The Keirsey Bates Temperament Sorter has a lesser view of the importance of Introversion and Extraversion than the MBTI (Turnbull, 2003). When the Personality Preferences were combined into a profile of which 16 possibilities exist, this profile was called Personality Temperament Types (Keirsey & Bates, 1984). Each of these 16 Personality Temperament Types has unique and specific preferences and personality characteristics (see Table 1-1).
Table 1.1 Descriptions of the Sixteen Personality Temperament Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>Innovative organizer, aggressive, analytic, systematic, more tuned to new ideas and possibilities than to people's feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>Fact minded, practical organizer, aggressive, analytic, systematic, and more interested in getting the job done than people's feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>Observant loyal helper, reflective, realistic, empathetic, patient with details, gentle and retiring, shuns disagreement, enjoys the moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>Imaginative helper reflective, inquisitive, empathetic, loyal to ideas, more interested in possibilities than practically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>Inquisitive analyzer, reflective, independent, curious, more interested in organizing ideas than situations or people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>Practical harmonizer and people's-people, sociable orderly opinionated, conscientious, realistic and well tuned to the here and now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>Practical analyzer, values exactness, more interested in organizing data than situation or people, reflective, a cool and curious observer of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>Imaginative harmonizer and worker-with-people, sociable, expressive, orderly, opinionated, conscientious, curious about new ideas and possibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>Realistic adapter into the world of material things, good-natured, tolerant, easy going, orientated to practical, first hand experience, highly observant of details and things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>People's-orientated innovator of ideas, serious, quietly forceful and preserving, concerned, with the common good with helping others develop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>Logical, critical, decisive innovator of ideas, serious intent highly independent concerned with the organization determined and often stubborn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>Analytical manager of facts and details, dependable, decisive, painstaking and systematic, interested in systems and organizations, stable and conservative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>Warmly, enthusiastic planner of change, imaginative, individualistic, pursues inspiration with impulsive energy seeks to understand and inspire others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>Systematic manager of facts and details. Concerned with people's welfare dependable painstaking and systematic stable and conservative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>Inventive analytical, planner of change, enthusiastic and independent, pursues inspiration with impulsive energy seeks to understand and inspire others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Later research confirmed that the Keirsey Bates Temperament Sorter (KBTS), as a measure of Jungian personality, correlates significantly with the MBTI. Quinn et al.
(1992) conducted an experiment with 191 students who completed both of these tests in one class meeting. He found that the correlation between the Myers-Briggs and the Keirsey instruments was significant at the 0.001 level. These results support the use of either instrument to determine an individual's Personality Type.

1-15-1-Type-A Behavior Pattern

The eminent Scottish surgeon, John Hunter (1728–1793), suffered from angina pectoris. He also suffered from a short fuse. One day, immediately after an intensely heated board meeting, Hunter stormed out of the room, collapsed, and died in the arms of a colleague (Acierno, 1994). His case brought to light the powerful influence of emotions on the heart. Hunter very likely had what modern physicians would call a Type-A personality, which is characterized by intense ambition, strong competitiveness, and a constant preoccupation with deadlines. Persons lacking these traits are said to have a Type-B personality. From the cardiac standpoint, the difference between the 2 types may be important—or it may not. The Type-A behavior pattern (TABP) is defined as an action-emotion complex stimulated by certain environmental events. It is believed to be influenced by Western cultural values that reward those who can produce in any capacity with great amounts of speed, efficiency and aggressiveness (Lachar and Barbara, 1993). The TABP is characterized by traits such as impatience, aggressiveness, a sense of time urgency, and the desire to achieve recognition and advancement. People exhibiting Type-A behavior have a hyper awareness of time and thus walk, eat and perform most activities rapidly and perfunctorily. Successive tests based on interviews of TABP subjects also suggest that people with Type-A behavior tend to present physical manifestations; i.e.,
facial tension, rapid speech, prolepsis (interruption of others' speech), tongue and teeth clicking, and the audible forced inspiration of air (Denollet, 1993).

More than 40 years ago, Friedman and Rosenman (1959) reported that people with a Type-A personality had a 7-fold greater incidence of clinical coronary artery disease than did those with a Type-B personality. Since then, many conflicting reports have appeared concerning the relationship between Type-A personality and the development and progression of coronary artery disease (Friedman et al. 1982; Kawachi et al., 1998). A panel sponsored by the National Institutes of Health in 1981 concluded that Type-A behavior constituted an independent risk factor for coronary artery disease (Coronary-prone behavior and coronary heart disease, 1981). The risk was similar in magnitude to that created by smoking, hypercholesterolemia, or elevated blood pressure. Four years later, however, members of the Multi-center Post-Infarction Research Group (Case et al., and the Multi-centre Post-Infarction Research Group, 1985) argued that there was "no uniform evidence to substantiate either a close relation between the characteristic behavior of the Type-A personality and coronary disease or the protective effects of the Type-B personality." The controversy escalated in 1993, when Lachar (1993) suggested that coronary-prone behavior and Type-A behavior are not synonymous, and that the coronary-prone patient should not be envisaged as the "achievement-oriented, overburdened workaholic. Instead, coronary-prone behavior appears to include physiological and emotional reactivity to challenging situations," especially those triggering anger, cynicism, mistrust, and hostility (Lachar, 1993). Subsequent investigations further complicated this issue. A case-control study of 340 patients by O'Connor and coworkers (O'Connor et al., 1995) in 1995 raised the possibility that
decreased levels of HDL cholesterol account for the increased risk of nonfatal myocardial infarction in persons with the Type-A personality. Unfortunately, most other studies on psychosocial risk factors for myocardial infarction have not included data on HDL cholesterol. Consequently, the nature of the association between the Type-A personality and serum HDL concentration remains problematic. Friedman and colleagues, for example, helped alter Type-A behavior in patients who had sustained a myocardial infarction, contending that such alteration substantially reduces the recurrence of myocardial infarction as well as episodes of silent ischemia. (Friedman et al., 1982; 1984; 1996). But is that approach necessarily good? According to a 1981 editorial in The Lancet, (1981) making a substantial change in Type-A behavior could result in a “demotion in status, in job function, in the regard of colleagues and possibly in personal income.” Despite myriad studies during the past 5 decades, the precise role of personality types in producing or preventing coronary artery disease awaits clarification. Meanwhile, current evidence suggests that Type-D personality has displaced Type-A as the dominant personality risk factor for coronary artery disease.

The Characteristics of Type-A Personality:

1. are always moving, walking, and eating rapidly.
2. feel important with the rate at which most events take place;
3. strive to think or do two or more things at once;
4. cannot cope with leisure time;
5. are obsessed with numbers, measuring their success in terms of how many or how much of every thing they acquire, (Robbins and Sanghi, 2006).
1-15-2-Type-A Behavior and Job Stress

These traits are considered the stable and consistent characteristics derived from observation of subjects with TABP. However, emotional and behavioral reaction patterns do not occur outside of contexts. As the above characteristics represent the traits of TABP, it is necessary to recognize that these subjects often find themselves in states or conditions that elicit this kind of behavior. People with TABP seem to find themselves in various high-pressured scenarios, which is regarded often as a result or state of this construct rather than a trait. One example might be that subjects with Type-A behavior find themselves in high-demand/low-achievement work settings, which tends to increase their impatient and agitated behavior.

Occupational stress researchers are particularly interested in the concept of Type-A behavior and hostility because of:

-The possibility that these personality characteristics may moderate the effects of job stressors.

-Research indicating that Type-A is rewarded and reinforced in organizations by income and prestige (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1988; Chesney and Rosenman, 1980). For example, differing effects of a job stressor was found in a study (Hurrell, 1985) of machine-paced letter sorting machine workers compared to self-paced workers. Machine pacing was associated with higher anxiety, anger and depression, but only for non-Type-A workers.

Type-A behavior may also contribute to increased job performance, which is rewarded in organizations (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1988; Chesney and Rosenman,
1980), although the evidence linking Type-A to productivity is mixed (Matheson and Ivancevich, 1987). Type-A is viewed not as a fixed personality trait but "as the outcome of a set of predispositions interacting with specific types of eliciting situations" (Matthews and Haynes, 1986). As Singer et al. (1986) pointed out, employees "would learn more relaxed styles if demands and deadlines, job loss threats and speedups, were diminished to a more acceptable level."

It is also possible to describe organizations in terms similar to those used to describe Type-A individuals: hard driving/competitive, time-urgent, hostile, aggressive, job centered (Matheson and Ivancevich, 1987). A survey has been developed (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1983) which provides a total organization's Type A/B score and three subcomponent scores: hard driving/aggressive, time-urgent and job centered, along with an individual's Type A/B score, and a score indicating Type A/B person-environment fit (Matheson and Ivancevich, 1987).

1-15-3-Measurement of Type-A Behavior Pattern

Several different tests have been utilized in studying Type-A behavior, such as the Bortner Rating Scale Type (Bortner and Rosenman, 1967), the Framingham Type-A Scale (Haynes, Feinleib, and Kannel, 1980), the Jenkins Activity Survey (JAS) (Jenkins, Zysanski, and Rosenman, 1979). The JAS is a questionnaire, filled out by the patient, performing a self-evaluation of his/her own behavior. It makes queries about speed and impulsivity, job involvement, and aggressive behavior. This self report is considered less conclusive in relating TABP to CHD than the SI because of incidental bias and/or distortion. Since Type-A behavior pattern marks a reaction to a certain situation; the Structured Interview is preferred over the others as it evaluates behavior
directly and has the strongest association with CHD (Example of SI). This method, however, requires intensive interviewer training and recognize a margin of error due to the interviewer's behavior while interviewing subjects (Rosenman et al., 1964).

1-15-4-Type-B Personality

Type-B Personality is a form of behavior associated with people who appear free of hostility and aggression and who lack a compulsion to meet deadlines, are not highly competitive at work or play, and have a lower risk of heart attack (Dental Dictionary, 2004). The opposite of Type-A personality, the Type-B personality is relaxed, uncompetitive, and inclined to self-analysis (Science Dictionary, 2002). B Behavior Pattern characterized by a relaxed manner, patience, and friendliness that possibly decreases one's risk of heart disease, also called Type-B personality (Medical Dictionary, 2002). Type-B’s are said to be more comfortable, more easygoing, less competitive and less aggressive, Lazarus (1994), stated that Type-B’s also experience stress, however, they are less panicky when they are faced with challenges and threats. Moreover, they differ from the Type-A’s in terms of their blood pressure and other biochemical reactions (Howard et al. 1986).

Type of B’s is “rarely hurried by the desire to obtain a wildly increasing number of things or participate in an endless growing series of events in an ever-decreasing amount of time.

Type-B’s Characteristics:

1. never suffer from a sense of time urgency with its accompanying importance
2. fell no need to display or discuss either achievements or accomplishments unless such exposure is demanded by the situation.
3. play for fun and relation, rather than to exhibit their superiority at any cost;
4. can relax without guilt (Robbins and Sanghi, 2006).

The Type-A persons are more persistent, more work addict and always in the over produce more work in short span of time this tendency seems to give some sort of job satisfaction than the Type-B persons. Because enjoy the work more than the B type persons.

1-15-5-Type-D Personality

In 1990 Cary Cooper formulated a Type-D personality, which he claims is a sub-set of Type-A and is "typified by chronically angry, suspicious, mistrustful behaviors and more prone to cardiovascular conditions". He also described Type-Ds as "humorless hurried and aggressive" (Cooper, 1990; cited by Robbins et al., 1994). In the 1999 edition of a popular undergraduate text on stress and health, the author, Rice, does not mention Type-D but he does designate two pages to the so-called toxic core of TABP in a chapter entitled Personality and Stress (Rice, 1999). It is therefore understandable that Cary Cooper did not totally debunk the link between Type-A, occupational stress and cardiovascular disease; that he presented Type-D as a subset of Type-A. To use another construct from psychology, the community of organizational psychologists would not suffer as much 'cognitive dissonance' (lack of alignment between their beliefs and their behavior) if they only 'got it half wrong'. Today the experts have extended their knowledge and also their power base, as they classify and caste the Type-Ds as the new deviants. The good advice given to those workers previously classified as Type-A may now be proffered to the innately humorless, hurried and hostile, if these unfortunate characters assessed as Type-D can elicit any sympathy. In 1996, Denollet's group (Denollet, Sys, Stroobant, Rombouts, Gillbert, Brutsaert, 1996) introduced the Type-D personality as a strong coronary risk factor. (Type-C relates to coping with cancer),
(Temoshok and Dreher, 1992; Temoshok, 2000). The 'D' stands for a “distressed” personality type—one that has a tendency to experience negative emotions and to inhibit self-expression (Denollet, 2000; Denollet and Van Heck, 2001). Patients with coronary artery disease and a Type-D personality have a 4-fold risk of death compared with non-Type-D patients (Denollet, 1998). Recently, Rozanski and associates (Rozanski, Blumenthal, Kaplan, 1999) extensively reviewed the impact of psychological factors on the pathogenesis of cardiovascular disease. They concluded that psychosocial stressors mediate cardiovascular disease through sympathetic hyper-reactivity, increased arrhythmogenesis, pro-coagulant activity, and accelerated atherosclerosis.

1-15-6-Type-E Personality

A term used to describe professional women who fit neither Type-A nor Type-B personality categories but who have a marked sense of insecurity and strive to convince themselves that they are worthwhile (Dental Dictionary, 2004).

1-15-7-Type-T Personality

The Type-T personality, as described by Farley (1986), characterizes individuals along a continuum ranging from those motivated by risk-taking and thrill-seeking (Big-T) to those who are risk and thrill avoiders (Little-T). Big-T individuals are hypothesized to prefer high levels of stimulation, complexity, and are distinguished by flexibility in thinking styles. Little T individuals, in contrast, appear overwhelmed by high levels of stimulation, desiring routine, simplicity, certainty, and predictability (Farley, 1986).

1-16-Personality Type and Job Satisfaction

As for the relationships between personality type and job satisfaction researchers conducted several studies and found out different results. The issue of job satisfaction has

Omundson et al. (1996) assessed the potential differences in Type-A personality, job satisfaction and turnover intention by ethnicity, occupational setting, and level of decision-making authority among two samples of Euro-American and Hispanic certified public accountants. Results showed that ‘A’ personality was found to be significantly associated with occupational setting and level of decision-making authority. Job satisfaction and Type-A personality was found correlated significantly but negatively with turnover intention. Finally, Type-A personality correlated significantly positively with job satisfaction. Judge, Heller, and Mount (2002) found that extraversion had a positive effect and neuroticism a negative effect on job satisfaction. Furnham, Petrides, Jackson, and Cotter (2002) concluded that personality does not have a strong or consistent influence either on what individuals perceive as important in their work environment or on their levels of job satisfaction. Lounsbury, Moffitt, Gibson, Drost, & Stevens (2007) examined personality traits in relation to job satisfaction and career satisfaction for 1059 information technology (IT) professionals. As hypothesized, eight traits were significantly related to both job and career satisfaction: Assertiveness, Emotional Resilience, Extraversion, Openness, Teamwork Disposition, Customer Service
Orientation, Optimism, and Work Drive. In a meta-analysis of the relation of affectivity to job satisfaction, Connolly and Viswesvaran (2000) reported true score correlations of positive affectivity (PA)-negative affectivity (NA) with job satisfaction of 0.49 and 0.33 respectively. Dole and Schroeder (2001) examined the impact of various factors on the personality, job satisfaction and turnover intentions of professional accountants, the analysis did not detect an overall significant relationship between personality and job satisfaction or turnover intentions. In a study Mynatt, Omundson, Schroeder, and Stevens (1997) showed that Personality was not found to directly affect turnover intentions, but the expected relationship between Type-A personality and high job satisfaction was detected. Al-Mashaan (2001) found significant and positive correlations of job stress with neuroticism and locus of control of both men and women. Job satisfaction scores correlated significantly but negatively with external locus of control for both sexes, while job satisfaction had a positive correlation with Type-A behavior for women only. Results from a study showed that in a sample of 332 German managers a Type-A personality and an External locus of control are associated with greater perceived levels of stress (particularly in terms of inter-personal relationships), lower job satisfaction and a poorer physical and mental health than that of managers with a Type-B personality and an Internal locus of control (Kirkcaldy, Shephard, and Furnham, 2002). Chusmir and Hood (1988) reported that job satisfaction was a significant predictor of Type-B behavior pattern for both sexes. A very strong negative relationship was found between stress and job satisfaction, however, no relationship was observed between stress and Type-A or Type-B behaviors (Köse, 1984). The analysis did not detect an overall significant relationship between personality and job satisfaction. A study conducted by Li, Lin, and Chen (2007) the correlation between personality traits and job satisfaction was 33.6%.
Giora and Miri (2002) showed that both Type-As and Bs were generally more satisfied when teamed up with same type members. Matteson and et al. (1984) investigated the relationship between Type-A behavior, sales performance, and job satisfaction among 355 life insurance agents. Result did not show significant differences between Type-A and B agents on sales performance and job satisfaction. Mudgil, Muhar, and Bhatia (1992) indicated that low job satisfied teachers exhibited Type-A behavior, which could make a person highly susceptible to chronic heart diseases.

1-17-The Conceptions of the Self

Rosenberg (1979) asserts that the concept of “self” stands foremost in the ranks of confusion. The inconsistent usage of terms such as ego, identity, existential self, authentic self, phenomenal self, self-image, and self-worth have amplified the terminological confusion in this area (Rosenberg, 1979). However, over the years, one fundamental distinction has been recognized the self as object vs. the self as agent (Rosenberg, 1979; Wylie, 1974). The self can be conceived as an active agent or as an object of one's own knowledge and evaluation (Rosenberg, 1979; Wylie, 1974). As an active agent, the self plays an instrumental role in interpreting external events and guiding behavior (Carver & Scheier, 1989; Harter & Marold, 1989; Loevinger & Blasi, 1989). According to Rosenberg (1979), the essence of the self as object can be defined as the “totality of the individual’s thoughts and feelings with reference to himself as an object” (p. 8). As will be discussed later, both conceptions of the self are of relevance with this thesis.

1-18-Distinctive Features of Self-Concept and Self-esteem

Researchers generally agree that self-concept represents a broader construct comprised of cognitive, affective, and behavioral components, and that self-esteem is a more limited evaluative aspect of one's self-concept (e.g., Campbell, 1990; Fleming &
Courtney, 1984; Greenwald et al., 1988; McGuire & McGuire, 1982). In this context, many investigators assert that self-concept can be considered descriptive, whereas self-esteem is evaluative (e.g., Campbell, 1990; Fleming & Courtney, 1984; Harter, 1983).

Despite conceptual claims supporting the distinction between self-concept and self-esteem, construct validity research has not supported the discriminability of these constructs (e.g., Shepard, 1979). Some researchers have attributed this lack of distinction to the use of self-report scales comprised of items eliciting both descriptive and evaluative components (e.g., Watkins & Dhawan, 1989). In spite of the use of open-ended questions, Greenwald et al. (1988) found that self-esteem was an important aspect of self-concept scores, even when the measure of self-concept had no superficial evaluative content. Similarly, Watkins and Dhawan (1989) found that making distinction between self-concept and self-esteem is more apparent in non-Western than in Western samples. (For a more thorough review of these issues, readers are referred to Byrne, 1996). Recognizing that the theoretical distinction between self-concept and self-esteem has not yet been empirically substantiated and consistent with the literature wherein the two terms are typically used interchangeably, the terms self-concept and self-esteem will be considered here as synonymous constructs.

1-19-Historical Overview of Self-Concept Theory

The origins of self-concept theory, and consequent research, are reputed to have been formalized by James in 1890 (Bracken, 1996; Hattie, 2000). James is noted in history for his development of the idea or philosophy of the 'self' and the development of the 'self' into a cohesive theory (Bracken, 1996). James theorized that there is a hierarchical order to the 'self' starting at the lowest tier with the 'material self', followed by the 'social self' with the 'spiritual self' being the last tier (Bracken, 1996). Current research
testing James' theorized hierarchical ordering of the dimensions for self-concept has not necessarily borne out these claims (Shavelson et al., 1976). Of probably more important, especially in current research, is James' idea that self-concept is multidimensional, meaning that multiple domains form the self-concept. Hattie (2000) reminds us that much of James' theorizing on self-concept has been selectively ignored during the past 100 years. This is especially evident during the behaviorist era of the 1950s to 1970s when James' key point of multidimensionality was ignored in favor of an all-encompassing global assessment for self-concept (Hattie, 2000; Marsh, 1990a). Hence, despite James' historical notion that our self-concept is dynamic, multidimensional and possibly hierarchically differentiated, this area of investigation attracted few researchers while the attempt to measure self-concept as a single global entity gained favor. DeSteno and Salovey (1997), claim that during this period investigators such as Burns (1979) struggled to apply their models that were based within the framework of unidimensionality and global self-concept. Hattie (as cited in Marsh & Craven, 1997, p. 133) aptly refers to this period of self-concept research as the “dustbowl of empiricism”. The hallmarks of the period of self-concept research prior to the mid 1970s were a lack of theoretical bases, poorly designed measurements, small sample sizes and incongruous results (Marsh & Craven, 1997). In spite of these methodological weaknesses, researchers relied heavily on unidimensional measures consequently producing paradoxical results. The aim appeared to be one of throwing everything into self-concept measurement in the hope that something significant would arise (Marsh & Craven, 1997). These problems were further complicated by the injudicious use of these measures for between-construct studies whereby self-concept was related to other variables prior to addressing within-construct issues. For example, self-concept measures were commonly utilized for between-
construct studies with other psychological and behavioral factors resulting in a compounding risk of error for interpretation. Consequently the history of self-concept research has been plagued with theoretical and methodological flaws and these issues are currently mirrored in nursing self-concept research.

1-20-The Multidimensional Model of Shavelson, Hubner and Stanton

Although originally conceptualized in his chapter on "The Consciousness of Self" (James, 1890) the multidimensional features of self-concept did not attract the attention of researchers for over half a century (cited in Bracken, 1996; Hattie, 2000). Prior to the major advances of Shavelson et al. (1976) and Marsh (1988) self-concept was often regarded as "a slippery concept whose adequate definition is irritatingly elusive" (Epstein, 1973, p. 404). Until recently, a unidimensional model of self-concept was an acceptable framework in which to measure the construct. Self-concept research continued with the theme of unidimensionality or non-differentiation within the psychological structure. In fact, prior to Shavelson et al. (1976) and their landmark developments in revisiting and mapping out the constructs that underlie self-concept, most "a priori" Models presented self-concept as a global and unidimensional concept. The danger inherent in those previous models was that significant pieces of the self-concept puzzle were either ignored or remained unidentified (Marsh & Shavelson, 1985). The impact of these pieces could not be interpreted or even recognized in the earlier global and unidimensional models proposed by researchers (Marsh, 1987; Marsh & Shavelson, 1985). It is highly probable that by conceiving self-concept as a unidimensional (one factor) construct, researchers have misrepresented many projects aimed at identifying and accurately measuring self-concept. For example, the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) and the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967, 79
1984) are examples of self-concept instruments that are based on a unidimensional theoretical model of self-concept. A host of difficulties have been encountered from the usage of such measures. These include methodological weaknesses, poor quality measures and weakened construct validity (Marsh, 1987; Shavelson et al., 1976). After reviewing the dubious quality of previous work on the theory and measurement of self-concept, Shavelson and his colleagues developed a theoretical model that addressed some of the previous problems inherent in self-concept research. The researchers began by developing a theoretical model based in part upon the themes raised by James (Marsh, 1990a). The new model for self-concept incorporated a review of theoretical and empirical research, in particular the strengths of James' theories and specifically addressed the weaknesses such as the global or unidimensional aspect (Shavelson et al., 1976). The major features of the Shavelson, Hubner and Stanton (1976) model are as follows:

1. Self-concept is a hierarchical structure with an apex of general esteem at the pinnacle,
2. Self-concept is a multidimensional structure containing multiple dimensions or facets,
3. The multiple dimensions become more context specific lower down the structure.
4. The context specific facets become increasingly stable with age,
5. Facets contain both the elements of evaluation (affective) and description (cognitive), (Adapted from Shavelson et al., 1976).

The Shavelson et al. model is regarded as a multifaceted (multidimensional) hierarchical model (Marsh, 1990a). In this model a general self-concept factor is at the pinnacle or apex and the next level down is represented by higher order factors such as
academic and non-academic self-concept. As the hierarchical model unfolds each higher order factor becomes differentiated into more specific lower order factors (Marsh, 1990a). For example, the higher order factor of social self-concept is further divided into peer self-concept and significant others self-concept. The subdivisions of each factor end with specific indicators or items that aim to capture the various aspects of the 'self'.

Shavelson et al. emphasized that their model of self-concept was a hypothetical one and that self-concept was not an end in itself. Shavelson et al. (1976) and Marsh and Shavelson (1985) raised the critical point that self-concept is a 'potential' rather than an 'outcome'. The researchers included in their self-concept framework the notion that facet or dimension development occurs through experience and interpretation of the external world (Shavelson, et al., 1976). Unfortunately, Shavelson et al. were unable to locate self-concept instruments that could adequately measure the multiple dimensions of their proposed model and the multidimensional feature was not well accepted by other self-concept researchers (Marsh, 1990a). In more recent years however, multidimensional instrumentation has been developed whereby the hierarchical and multidimensional structure of the Shavelson et al. model could be fully tested and explored. What did eventuate from the Shavelson et al. (1976) model was a blueprint for the next generation of self-concept measurement instruments and a new and enlightened era in self-concept theory and research (Marsh & Craven, 1997).

1-21-The Re-birth of Multidimensional

Innovative investigations unraveling the structure of self-concept have led to an exciting and rapidly expanding field of research. The history of self-concept research is a fascinating journey that has contributed substantially to our understandings of psychological development. However, most recent advances in self-concept research
have developed through comprehending the multiple dimensions of the self-concept structure (Bracken, 1996; Byrne, 1996).

1-22-Current Models of Self-Concept and the Marsh/Shavelson Model

As opposed to earlier investigations that concluded self-concept was a global or all encompassing aspect of the "self" (Hattie, 1992), it is now universally accepted that self-concept is indeed a multi-factorial and multidimensional entity (Bracken, 1996; Byrne, 1996; Hattie, 1992; Marsh, Byrne & Shavelson, 1988; Shavelson et al., 1976). The recent evidence supporting multidimensionality has come from a wealth of “factor analytic studies” (Bracken, 1996, p. 8). The complexity of self-concept continues to be clarified through the development of measures that can capture such dimensionalities (Bracken, 1992; Byrne, 1996; Marsh, Byrne & Shavelson, 1988).

The Shavelson et al. model (1976) revolutionized self-concept theory. However, there remained inherent difficulties with the hierarchical multidimensional model. Marsh and Shavelson (1985) attempted to redress the weaknesses that centered on why one apex factor or hierarchically organized theoretical model did not satisfy the data in statistical analysis. The Marsh Shavelson revision occurred primarily because the correlations between higher order factors such as general self-concept and esteem were found to be much lower than anticipated. So low in fact, that it led the researchers to reassess the initial hierarchical structure at the second order level (Byrne, 1996). More importantly perhaps was the evidence from Marsh that dimensions such as verbal and maths self-concept were nearly uncorrelated (Marsh & Craven, 1997).

In the revised model, Marsh and Shavelson (1985) were able to demonstrate the "internal/external frame of reference model" which helped to explain why one factor combinations were unable to satisfy the data evidence. For example, verbal and math
self-concept were combined as one factor in the Shavelson et al. model, but in the new re-conceptualized model they are actually representative of two higher order factors.

Ultimately, the Marsh/Shavelson model, with its multiple higher order factors, proved to be the superior model. The ordering and number of factors provided theoretical and statistical support for the revised model (Marsh, 1987). The new multidimensional interpretation of self-concept by Shavelson and Marsh (1985) gave rise to a series of new instruments that were able to capture this understanding and test it across a variety of life situations.

1-23-The Self-Description Questionnaires

The Self-Description questionnaires (SDQI, SDQII, SDQIII; Marsh, 1992a, 1992b, 1992c) are developed from the Shavelson model and thus represent an improvement over most earlier instruments which were not theoretically derived. The SDQI was designed for use with preadolescents, whereas the SDQII and SDQIII were designed for adolescents and late adolescents/young adults, respectively.

1-24-Self-Concept and Job Satisfaction

The antecedents of job satisfaction are not well reported in literature and research, consequently there are very few studies that enquire into the effects of self-concept. In of the few studies linking self-concept and job satisfaction, Sharma (1999) reported a positive correlation in a study of relations between personality types, self-concept and job satisfaction for young Indian adult workers. Although good self-concept is in itself considered a significant outcome in a variety of areas, it is also highly valued as an important mediating factor that influences other important psychological and behavioral outcomes such as job satisfaction and workplace retention (Cowin, 2002). Choi, and Kim (2000) found a significant positive correlation between professional self-concept and job
satisfaction \( r = -0.486, p < 0.01 \). Cowin, Johnson, Craven, & Marsh (2008) showed that nurses' self-concept had a stronger association with nurses' retention plans \( B = 0.45 \) than job satisfaction \( B = 0.28 \).

### 1-25-Demographic Variables and Self-Concept

Based on a review of studies of self-concept, Marsh (1990a) found that males have significantly higher physical ability, physical appearance, and math self-concepts for all age groups ranging from preadolescence through early adulthood, whereas females have higher verbal self-concept scores. For scales specific to the Self-concept Domains Questionnaire II, Marsh (1990a) reported that males have higher emotional stability and general self-concept scores, whereas females have higher honesty/trustworthiness scores. Gender differences on the social scales are inconsistent but tend to indicate a trend favoring girls (e.g., girls have higher same sex peer relations scores than do boys on the Self-concept Domains Questionnaire II). An examination of age effects suggests that self-concept scores generally decline for both genders during preadolescence and early adolescence (i.e., grades 8/9), level out, and then increase through late adolescence and early adulthood. The only age by gender interaction reported by Marsh (1990a) was for the physical appearance scale. Gender differences favored girls at the younger ages (primary grades) but favored boys at all other ages, particularly during adolescence (Marsh, 1990a). Similarly, other studies have found that, children's general self-concept declines immediately after the transition to junior high school (Simmons, Rosenberg, & Rosenberg, 1973; Wigfield, Eccles, Mac Iver, Reuman, & Midgley, 1991) and gradually increases again during the adolescent period (Bachman, O'Malley, and Johnston, 1978; McCarthy & Hoge, 1982; O'Malley & Bachman, 1983; Silbereisen & Zank, 1984). Harter (1993) has additionally found that, beginning in junior high school and continuing into
high school, females consistently obtain lower general self-esteem scores than do males. In corroboration of Marsh's (1990a) findings, other investigators have found that boys showed higher self-concepts ability in the areas of sports, math, and physical appearance, whereas girls were found to show higher self-concepts ability in English (Hagborg, 1994; Harter, 1993; Meece, Parsons, Kaczala, Goff & Futterman, 1982; Wigfield et al., 1991). These gender differences appear to emerge prior to early adolescence (Wigfield et al., 1991). Rotenberg and Cranwell (1989) reported that developmental changes in the organization of self-concept were found in White as well as in American Indian children: external orientation decreased with age, whereas internal orientation increased with age on the transformational measure only. In comparison to White children, however, American Indian children showed (a) greater external orientation on both measures, and (b) greater and lesser internal orientation on the open self-description and transformational measures, respectively. This latter discrepancy was interpreted as reflecting American Indian children's competent reference to psychological characteristics but their limited ability to use those in judging change. Kimberly and Barton (2003) obtained insignificant relationship between age and global self-concept. Weinland, Gable, and Varming (1976) examined the self-concept differences between 190 American and 98 Danish 5th and 6th grade suburban students in light of known societal and educational differences. Danish males and American females were found to show significantly higher self-confidence in personal attributes; American students reported higher achieving in school scores than Danish students. Kimberly and Barton (2003) reported that girls have lower physical ability and mathematics self-concept than boys.
A study conducted by Liu and Wang (2005) and obtained result showed that there was a significant main effect for gender, with female students having significantly higher perceived academic effort (academic self-concept subscale) than their male counterparts.

In reference to gender, research indicates that boys and girls usually differ in both global and specific self-concept dimensions (Eklund, Whitehead, and Welk, 1997). In general, investigators have noted less favorable physical self-perceptions for females in comparison to males (Boyd and Hrycaiko, 1997; Gofli and Zulaika, 2000; Hagger, Biddle, and Wang, 2005; Harter, 1978; Hattie, 1992; Jackson and Marsh, 1986; Marsh, 1998; Weiss and Bredemeier, 1983). These less favorable self-perceptions for girls have been found with regard to specific physical self-concept dimensions, including perceived sport competence, physical condition and strength (Asçi et al., 2005; Maiano et al., 2004; Marsh, 1998; Welk and Eklund, 2005), physical attractiveness (Hagborg, 1994; Maiano et al., 2004; Marsh, 1998), and overall physical self-appraisals (Asçi et al., 2005; Gutiérrez, Moreno, and Sicilia, 1999a; Maiano et al., 2004; Marsh, 1998; Whitehead and Corbin, 1997).

The antecedents of self-concept are not well reported in literature and research, consequently there are very few studies that enquire into the effects of personality type. In the light of few studies linking self-concept and personality type, Sharma (1999) reported a positive correlation between personality types, self-concept and job satisfaction for young Indian adult workers. Lobel (1988) found that Type-As scored lower on all the dimensions of self-concept except the physical. Wolf, Hunter, Webber, and Berenson, (1981) examined the relationship between self-concept and personality type and the result showed a negative relationship between self-concept and Type-A behavior.
Researchers showed that low self-concept clarity was independently associated with high neuroticism, low self-esteem, low conscientiousness, low agreeableness, chronic self-analysis, low internal state awareness, and a ruminative form of self-focused attention. Consistent with theory on Eastern and Western self-construal, Japanese participants exhibited lower levels of self-concept clarity and lower correlations between self-concept clarity and self-esteem than did Canadian participants (Campbell, Trapnell, Heine, Katz, Lavallee, and Lehman, 1996).

There are a few studies about self-concept and position, job tenure, salary, and education level. Cowin (2002) examined the self-concept of nurses and its relationship to job satisfaction and retention. The results suggested that a strong relation existed between the nurse general self-concept and professional status scales (0.86 for the experienced nurse group and 0.79 for the student nurse group).

A study conducted by NSW Nursing Workforce Research Project (2000), and the findings suggest that there is a close relationship between nurses self-concept and the professional and workplace issues.

There is rare research existed between salary and self-concept, in a study Cowin (2002) showed that pay was not found significantly correlated to nurses’ self-concept.