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1.1. Introduction:

The term job satisfaction refers to an individual's general attitude toward his or her job. This definition is clearly a very broad one yet this is inherent in the concept. Remember, a person's job is more than just the obvious activities of shuffling papers, waiting on customers, or driving a truck. Jobs require interaction with co-workers and bosses, following organizational rules and policies, meeting performance standards, living with working conditions that are often less than ideal, and the like. This means that an employee's assessment of how satisfied or dissatisfied he or she with his or her job is a complex summation of a number of discrete job elements. So how then do we measure the concept?

The two most widely used approaches are a single global rating and a summation score made up of a number of job facts. The single global rating method is nothing more than asking individuals to respond to one question, such as "All things considered, how satisfied are you with your job?" Respondents then reply by circling a number between one and five that corresponds with answer from 'highly satisfied' to
'highly dissatisfied'. The other approach - a summation of job facts is more sophisticated. It identifies key elements in a job and asks for the employee's feeling about such. Topical factors that would be included are the nature of the work, supervision, present pay, promotion opportunities, and relations with co-workers. These factors are rated on a standardized scale and then added up to create an overall job satisfaction score.

Is one of the foregoing approaches superior to the other? Intuitively, it would seem that summing up responses to a number of job factors would achieve a more accurate evaluation of job satisfaction. The research, however, doesn't support such intuition. This is one of those rare instances in which simplicity wins out over complexity. Comparisons of one question global ratings with the more lengthy summation of job factors method indicate that the former is more valid. The best explanation for this outcome is that the concept of job satisfaction is inherently so broad that the single question actually becomes a more inclusive measure.

1.2. Job satisfaction as a Dependent Variable:

What work-related variables determine job satisfaction? An extensive review of the literature indicates that the more important factors conclusive to job satisfaction include mentally challenging work, equitable rewards,
supportive working conditions, and supportive colleagues.

**Mentally challenging work:**

Employees tend to prefer jobs that give them opportunities to use their skills and abilities and offer a variety of tasks, freedom and feedback on how well they are doing. These characteristics make work mentally challenging. Jobs that have too little challenge create boredom. But too much challenge creates frustration and feeling of failure. Under conditions of moderate challenge, most employees will experience pleasure and satisfaction.

**Equitable Rewards:**

Employees want pay system and promotion policies that they perceive as being just unambiguous, and in line with their expectations. When pay is seen as fair based on job demands, individual skill level, and community pay standards, satisfaction is likely to result. Of course not everyone seeks money. Many people willingly accept less money to work in a preferred location or in a less demanding job or to have greater discretion in the work they do and the hours they work. But the key in linking pay to satisfaction is not the absolute amount one is paid, rather, it is the perception of fairness. Similarly, employees seek fair promotion policies and practices. Promotions provide opportunities for personal growth, more responsibilities, and increased serial status.
Individuals who perceive the promotion decisions are made in a fair and just manner, therefore, are likely to experience satisfaction from their job.

**Supportive working conditions:**

Employees are concerned with their work environment for both personal comfort and facilitating doing a good job. Studies demonstrate that employees prefer physical surroundings that are not dangerous or uncomfortable. Temperature, light, noise and other environmental factors should not be at either extreme for example having too much heat or too little light. Additionally, most employees prefer working relatively, close to home, in clean and relatively modern facilities, and with adequate tools and equipment.

**Supportive Colleagues:**

People get more out of work than merely money or tangible achievements. For most employees work also fills the need for social interaction. Not surprisingly, therefore, having friendly and supportive co-workers leads to increased job satisfaction. The behaviour of one's boss also is a major determinants of satisfaction. Studies generally find that employee's satisfaction is increased when the immediate supervisor is understanding and friendly, offers praise for good performance, listens to the employees' opinions, and shows a personal interest in his or her employees.
Don't forget the personal job fit:

Holland's (1985) study shows that high agreement between an employee's personality and occupation results in a more satisfied individual. His logic was essentially this: People with personality types congruent with their chosen vocations should find that they have the right talents and abilities to meet the demands of their jobs; are thus more likely to be successful on those jobs, and because of this success, have a greater probability of achieving high satisfaction from their work. Several other studies also supported the Holland findings.

1.3. Job satisfaction as an Independent Variable:

Manager's interest in job satisfaction tends to centre on its effect on employee performance. Researchers have recognized this interest. So we find a large number of studies that have been designed to assess the impact of job satisfaction on employee productivity, absenteeism, and turnover. Let us look at the current state of our knowledge.

Satisfaction and Productivity:

A number of reviews were done in 1950s and 1960s, covering dozens of studies that sought to establish the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity.
These views could find no consistent relationship. In the late 1980s though the studies are far from unambiguous, one can make some sense out of the evidence.

The early views on the satisfaction-performance relationship can be essentially summarized in the statement "a happy worker is a productive worker". Much of the paternalism shown by managers in the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s - forming company bowling teams and credit unions, having company picnics, providing counselling services for employees, training supervisors to be sensitive to the concerns of subordinates was done to make worker happy. But belief in the happy worker thesis was based more on wishful thinking than hard evidence.

A careful review of the research indicates that if there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and productivity, the correlations are consistently low in the vicinity of 0.14. However, introduction of moderating variables has improved the relationship. The performance satisfaction correlations are stronger for higher level employees. Another point of concern in the satisfaction-productivity issue is the direction of the causal arrow. Most of the studies on the relationship used research designs that could not prove cause and affect. Studies that have controlled for this possibility indicate that the more valid conclusion is
that productivity leads to satisfaction rather than the other way around. If you do a good job, you intrinsically feel good about it. Additionally, assuming that the organization rewards productivity, your higher productivity should increase verbal recognition, your pay level, and probabilities for promotion. These rewards, in turn, increase your level of satisfaction with the job.

**Satisfaction and absenteeism:**

Locke (1964) reported that there is consistent negative relationship between satisfaction and absenteeism, but the correlation is not high - usually less than 0.44. While it certainly makes sense that dissatisfied employees are more likely to miss work, other factors have an impact on the relationship and reduce the correlation coefficient.

An excellent illustration of how satisfaction directly leads to attendance, where there is a minimum impact from other factors, is a study done at Sears, Roebuck (1977). Satisfaction data were available on employees at Sear's two headquarters in Chicago and New York. Additionally, it is important to note that Sear's policy was not to permit employees to be absent from work for avoidable reasons without penalty. The occurrence of a freak April 2 snowstorm in Chicago created the opportunity to compare employee attendance at the Chicago office with personnel in New York
where the weather was quite nice. The interesting dimension in this study is that the snowstorm gave the Chicago employees a built-in-excuse not to come to work. The storm crippled the city's transportation, and individuals knew they could miss work this day with no penalty. This natural experiment permitted the comparison of attendance records for satisfied and dissatisfied employees at two locations—one where you were expected to be at work (with normal pressures for attendance) and the other where you were free to choose with no penalty involved. If satisfaction leads to attendance, where there is an absence of outside factors, the more satisfied employees should have come to work in Chicago, while dissatisfied employees should have stayed home. The study found that on April 2 day, absenteeism rates in New York (the control group) were just as high for satisfied groups of workers as for dissatisfied groups. But in Chicago, the workers with high satisfaction scores had much higher attendance than did those with lower satisfaction levels. These findings are exactly what we would have expected if satisfaction is negatively correlated with absenteeism.

**Satisfaction and turnover:**

Satisfaction is also negatively related to turnover, but the correlation is stronger than what we found for absenteeism. Yet, again, other factors such as labour market conditions, expectations about alternative job opportunities,
and length of tenure with the organization are important constraints on the actual decision to leave one's current job.

Evidence indicates that an important moderating variable on the satisfaction turnover relationship is the employee's level of performance specifically, level of satisfaction is less important in predicting turnover for superior performers. Job satisfaction is more important in influencing poor performers to stay than for superior performers. Regardless of level of satisfaction the latter are more likely to remain with the organization because the receipt of recognition, praise, and other rewards gives them more reason for staying.

1.4. How employees can express Dissatisfaction?

One final point before we leave the issue of job satisfaction, employee dissatisfaction can be expressed in a number of ways. For example employees can choose to complain rather than quite. Below figure No. 1 offers four responses that differ from one another along two dimensions: Constructive/destructiveness and activity/passivity. They are defined as follows:

Exit: Behaviour directed toward leaving the organization, includes for a new position as well as resigning.

Voice: Actively and constructively attempting to improve conditions. Includes suggesting improvements, discussing problems with one's boss, and some forms of union activity.
Loyalty: Passively but optimistically waiting for conditions to improve. Includes speaking up for the organization in the face of external criticism and trusting the organization and its management to 'do the right thing'.

Neglect: Passively allowing conditions to worsen. Includes chronic absenteeism or lateness, reduced effort, and increased error rate.

Figure: 1
Responses to job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Constructive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exit and neglect behaviours encompass our performance variables - productivity, absenteeism, and turnover. But this model expands employees' expense to include voice and loyalty - constructive behaviours that allows individuals to tolerate unpleasant situations or to review satisfactory working conditions. It helps to understand situations, such
as those sometimes found among unionized workers, where low job satisfaction is coupled with low turnover union members often express dissatisfaction through the grievance procedure or through formal contract negotiations. This voice mechanism allows the union members to continue in their jobs while convincing themselves that they are acting to improve the situation.

1.5. Definition, philosophy and theories of Job satisfaction:

What is job satisfaction?

As this study being concerned with job satisfaction, it will be better to have full picture about the nature and significance of it. In the preceding pages the investigator has attempted to throw light on how job satisfaction can be studied as independent or dependent variables.

The word Job satisfaction is not easy to define in a one definition. There are so many definitions of Job satisfaction, but the one he will use is that Job satisfaction is the favourableness or unfavourableness with which employees view their work. A results when there is a fitness between job characteristics and the wants of employees, it expresses the amount of congruence between one's expectations of the job and the rewards that the job provides. It relates to equity theory and the psychological contract.
Job satisfaction or in its broader form work satisfaction is a difficult entity to define even in a simplistic terms, for the individual workers or in a group.

An administrator can say either "Department has high job satisfaction or Department has low job satisfaction." "In addition, job satisfaction can apply to the parts of an individual job. For example although Departments general job satisfaction may be high he may be dissatisfied with his vacation plan in the same may health is important because it represents general human condition. It requires attention, diagnosis and treatment just as health does. One school of thought in fact (Goldthorpe et.al, 1968) examines the problem in terms of its extrinsic or intrinsic orientation, that is whether the worker is primarily concerned with work as a means to provide fulfilment out side of job or finds fulfilment in the work itself, the former perhaps tending to be more of a working-class value and the latter more of a middle class one.

Job satisfaction can be more accurately interpreted in terms of the general emotional tone of employees. Some employees, for example may be very much satisfied with their home and community life, but they think their jobs are average. In this instance their job satisfaction is relatively low, because it is below their other satisfaction, other employees may be loaded with home and community dissatisfactions but they also feel that their jobs are average. This means that
their job satisfaction is relatively high. In order to relate
general optional tone specifically to job satisfaction some
hance to organizations survey of job satisfaction and life
satisfaction so that the two conditions may be compared. Job
satisfaction and life satisfaction are often closely related.

Numerous authors have general lists of characteri-
stics considered to be desirable in the achievement of satis-
faction at work (e.g. Margolis, Kroes, Quinn 1974, Slawina
and Moykin, 1975, Taglor, 1924, Vamplen, 1973, Johnston and
Gherardi, 1970), but the original organization from which
many contemporary view have involved ones much to the work of
Maslow and Herzberg, despite the fact that their theories
were largely developed from study of limited levels of society.
Maslow's theoretical model postulates the existence in man
of primary and secondary divisions which serve to motive him
(Maslow, 1954). He argues that the primary drives are
inherited, although the means for satisfying them can be
learned.

The primary drives stem from physiological needs
and are oriented towards survival. The secondary drives are
not inherited but are learned and to some extent at least,
they may be culturally determined. They include such require-
ments as security, manifested in a need for protection and
freedom from fear, as well as requirement for organised stru-
cture and/or der. A need for low affection and a sense of
group identity, or belonging is also defined. A third group comprises the need for self-esteem, represented by a desire for self assurance, confidence and mastery along with feeling of achievement and the need for establishment of reputation and prestige. Maslow also defines a concept of self-actualisation or the need to become more fully developed and to reify one's ideas.

Herzberg (1966) from his work, has in fact stated that the main factors involved in job satisfaction are advancement, recognition, responsibility, growth and the job itself. These factors turned 'satisfiers' will correlate, if optimised, with improved performance, reduced labour turnover, more tolerant attitudes to managements and general 'Mental Health'.

Job satisfaction:

Job satisfaction has become the important and popular research topic in industrial and vocational psychology. At various times job satisfaction has been a dependent variable, and a moderating variable. Research has attempted to explore the relationship between an individual's feeling about his/her job and that individual's behaviour (Landy, 1978).

The term 'job satisfaction' gained currency through the publication of monograph of Hoppock (1935) on 'job satisfaction'. For the first time an intensive report on job satisfaction was published. The studies in the areas of job
satisfaction started decades ago in industrial psychology. The concepts of job satisfaction was, however, equated with industrial morale. Sometimes job satisfaction and morale were used interchangeably (Kahn and Morse, 1951; Harzberg, Mausner and Snyderman, 1959; and Gonguli, 1964), and sometimes it was proposed that job satisfaction constitutes an important factor or dimension of morale (Kahn, Katz, 1951; Schooler, 1952; Katz and Kahn, 1952). Strong (1959) has distinguished between the terms. Job satisfaction should be used with reference to individual whereas morale should be used to indicate the attitudes of the group, since the beginning of sixties, it was recognized that satisfaction and morale are not the same mental states and cannot be used interchangeably (Hull and Kolastad, 1942; Blum, 1956; Harrell, 1964; Siegel, 1962; Blum and Naylor 1968; Pestonjee, 1973).

Job satisfaction and morale differ from each other on at least two different dimensions: (i) individual vs group dimension and (ii) content dimension. Morale often has a group referent based on a sense of common purpose and the belief that group goals can be attained and are compatible with individual goals while satisfaction typically refers to the appraisal made by a single individual of his job situation. Secondly, morale is more future oriented while satisfaction is more present and past oriented, (Pestonjee, 1973, 1981). Crites (1969) has attempted to distinguish
between job satisfaction, vocational satisfaction and morale. Sinha (1972) holds that morale has been found to be closely related to job satisfaction that the employee derives from wages, nature of work, supervision, production handling of grievances and other factors that surround the work. Job satisfaction is an important ingredient of morale. He believes that job satisfaction is distributive and morale is collective phenomenon.

Job satisfaction is a Person's attitude towards the job. Positive attitudes toward the job are conceptually equivalent to job satisfaction and negative attitudes toward job are equivalent to job dissatisfaction (Vroom, 1964). Job satisfaction has been defined in various ways. Some definitions lay emphasis on the satisfaction of needs and some definitions try to focus attention on the factors (whether intrinsic or extrinsic) which contribute directly or indirectly to job satisfaction. Let us have a look at these definitions.

Hoppock (1935) was the first to provide a logical definition to the concept of job satisfaction. According to him, job satisfaction is 'any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, 'I am satisfied with my job'. (p.114).
Bullock (1952) has defined job satisfaction as "an attitude which results from a balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with job... These evaluations may rest largely upon one's own success or failure in the achievement of personal objectives and upon the perceived contribution of the job and company toward these ends."

Weitz (1952) opines that job satisfaction should be interpreted in the light of a general satisfaction index. Smith (1955) suggests that job satisfaction is "the employee's judgement of how well his job on the whole is satisfying his various needs."

According to Handyside and Speak (1964), job satisfaction is "a dynamic process of balancing one thing against another" and for Roberts (1966) "outward or inner manifestations which give individual a sense of enjoyment or punishment in the preference of his work."

Gilmer (1966) has defined that 'job satisfaction or dissatisfaction is result of various attitudes the person holds toward his job, toward related factors and toward life in general." (p. 255).

Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) have suggested that "job satisfaction are feelings or effective responses to facts
of the situation..... associated with a perceived differences between what is expected and what is experienced."

Sinha and Aggrawal (1971) have defined job satisfaction as 'a persistent affective state which has erosion in the individual as a function of the perceived characteristics of his job in relation to his frame of reference.' According to Wall (1973) job satisfaction is an affective rotation on the part of individual. Therefore, job satisfaction is an affective and evaluative concept.

Sinha (1974) suggests that "job satisfaction covers both the satisfaction derived from being engaged in piece of work, or in any persuit of a higher order. It is essentially related to human needs and their fulfilment through work. In fact job satisfaction is generated by individual's perception of how well his job on the whole is satisfying to his various needs."

Locke (1976) defines job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience" (p. 1300).

Wexley and Yukl (1977) suggest that job satisfaction is 'the way an employee feels about his job. It is a generalized attitude toward job based on evaluation of different aspects of the job.'
Landy (1978) opines that an individual occupies a point on a continuum that ranges from a strongly positive emotional state to a strongly negative one. The position that the individual occupies depends on both internal and external variables. The job related stimuli comprises a class of these variables. Thus, it is assumed that at least in part a person's emotional state is affected by interactions with the work environment. It is normally this portion of general hedonic or affective variance that is referred to as job satisfaction.

According to Pestonjee (1981), "like any other attitude, job satisfaction represents a complex assemblage of cognitions (beliefs or knowledge), emotions (feelings, sentiments or evaluations) and behavioural tendencies."

A large number of research studies have investigated that job satisfaction is derived from and caused by many inter-related factors. These factors cannot be completely isolated from one another for analysis, they can be separated by the use of statistical techniques to give an indication of their relative importance to job satisfaction (Harrell, 1964).

French, Kornhauser and Marrow (1946) had compiled a list of 'on the job' and 'off the job' factors of satisfaction and dis-satisfaction which were found underlying causes
Jurgenson (1947), 48) assessed the importance of job factors by using questionnaire, which was replied by approximately 4000 job applicants. Factors were ranked in the following order:

(i) job security,
(ii) opportunity for advancement,
(iii) type of work,
(iv) pride in company,
(v), (v) and (vi) pay and co-workers,
(vii) supervision,
(viii) hours,
(ix) working conditions, and
(x) benefits.

Evans and Lasseau (1950) reporting the 'My job contest' results, tabulated the following factors in order of preference: income, interesting and important job pride in company, fellow workers, immediate boss, management, working conditions, security, chance to get ahead, benefit plans, and safety and medical facilities.

Worthy (1950) has reported the following six factors which comprise job satisfaction: company in general, the local organization, local management, immediate supervision, co-workers and working conditions.
Grove and Kerr (1951) have concluded that 'wages' and 'liking for work associates' are major components of job satisfaction.

Morse (1953) includes job content, identification with the company, financial and job status and pride in a group performance as basic ingredients of job satisfaction.

Herzberg and his associates (1957) have reported ten major factors after reviewing job attitude studies which constitute job satisfaction. These are intrinsic aspects of job, supervision, working conditions, security, opportunity for advancement, wages and management, social aspects of job, communications and benefits.

Scott and others (1960) have found ten important job factors to be associated with job satisfaction: pay, co-workers, supervision, type of work (job demand or intrinsic job satisfaction), working conditions, identification with company, overall job satisfaction, security management, and opportunity for advancement.

Siegel (1962), after reviewing the studies of job satisfaction, comes to the conclusion that all the results may be grouped under two headings on the basis of their pertinence to factors (i) Intrinsic of (ii) Extrinsic to the job itself, factors intrinsic to job include: pay, job security
participation and personal recognition, hours and working conditions and occupational status. Among factors extrinsic to job are perceptions about supervisions, sex, age, level of intelligence, job experience or length of service, and personal adjustment.

Blum and Russ (1942), Blum (1956) and Naylor (1968) have reported that men state job factors in the following order of importance: (i) advancement, (ii) security, (iii) salary, (iv) supervision, (v) hours. But women considered 'supervision' more important than 'salary'. Large firm employees attach greater importance to advancement than small firm employees.

Pestonjee (1973) reviewed a number of studies and found the following factors important in job satisfaction: pay, co-workers, supervision, type of work (job demands or intrinsic job satisfaction), working conditions, identification with company, overall job satisfaction, security, management and opportunity for advancement.

"Under what conditions does a positive (satisfaction) or negative (dis-satisfaction) state arise?" This is one of the major questions people ask in job satisfaction researches. As the answer to the question a number of theories of job satisfaction have been proposed. Although, all the major theories have shown some promise in providing
explanations to nature and process of job satisfaction, they are specific in the sense that any one theory is not capable of explaining all the happenings. Some yield only to a particular methodological approach (e.g., Herzberg et al.'s 1959) some are conceptually unsatisfactory (e.g., Maslow's 1943, 1954, 1970, Need Hierarchy Theory) and some still need further explanations (e.g., Vroom's 1964 VIE Model). Some other attempts have also been made to explain the phenomenon of job satisfaction but with no apparent promise (e.g., Morse's 1953; Brophy 1959, etc.).

Maslow's (1943) theory of human motivation, which was further elaborated and extended in consecutive years (i.e., 1954, 1970) suggests that man has five basic needs:

(i) physiological needs,

(iii) safety needs,

(iii) belongingness and love needs,

(iv) esteem needs and

(v) self-actualization needs.

These needs are arranged in a hierarchical order based on their prepotency of dominance. A man who is unsatisfied in all his needs will be concerned with only the first physiological needs. When these are satisfied, he will go for higher and still higher needs.

Maslow did not develop a specific theory of work motivation, as such, but the implications of his theory for
the design of incentive systems by management is obvious. The optimal job involvement for a given employee would be the one which corresponded most closely to his position on the need hierarchy.

However, Maslow's need hierarchy theory has many weak points. The greatest weakness being that its assumptions are difficult to test empirically. In practice, it has been common for researchers to cite findings as being 'consistent' with Maslow's theory, but rare for them to make direct tests of it using the longitudinal method (Locks, 1975). Attempts made by Hall and Naugaim (1968) and Lawler and Suttle (1972) to test the theory directly, using longitudinal data have failed to support the theory. Blaker and Williams (1971) have rightly remarked 'it has proved easy to interpret situations by his (Maslow's) method, but rather more elusive to actually test it out'. (p. 2911).

While studying occupational satisfaction different psychologists have postulated different theories of job satisfaction. Brophy (1959) has classified theories of job satisfaction into four categories. The first category includes Morse's need theory. Morse (1953) proposed in his Need theory that the satisfaction, a worker derives from his job or occupation depends upon the function of two factors:

(i) how much his needs are fulfilled by being in a particular situation, and
(ii) how much his needs remain unfulfilled.

For knowing the amount of satisfaction of a worker, the following equation may be used:

\[ S = f(T_1 - T_2) - T_2 \]

where \( S \) = satisfaction

\( T_1 \) = Worker's initial tension level

\( T_2 \) = tension level after being exposed to the vocation.

Morse has introduced a correction factor \( T_2 \) into the satisfaction order, in order to account for individual differences in need level prior to occupational entry. Thus, it can be said that two individuals in the same work environment may differ in their satisfaction, despite equivalent reductions in tension levels because the needs of one were initially stronger than those of other.

The second category of theory of satisfaction, according to Brophy is based upon the hypothesis that "an individual's degree of satisfaction with an activity leading toward a goal is an inverse function of the level of his perceived probability of attaining the goal both in situation when the goal is attained and in situation when it is not attained," (p. 270). Katzell's (1964) theory is based on this model. According to Katzell (1964)

(i) The events or conditions experienced by a person in his job or occupation arouse, among other responses,
feelings or affection which he can verbalise on a continuum of 'like-dislike', 'pleasant-unpleasant' or 'satisfactory-unsatisfactory' and on similar evaluative or hedonic dimensions.

(ii) People differ markedly in degree of job satisfaction. In addition to errors of measurement, the variance in job satisfaction may be attributed to
(a) differences in stimuli, i.e., features of jobs (such as pay or supervision), and
(b) differences in the job incumbents.

(iii) The inter-individual sources of job satisfaction (ii)(b) above) may be accounted for largely in terms of the concept of adaptational level or the related concept of values. The feeling or affective responses evoked is, according to this view, directly proportional to the discrepancy between the stimulus and its corresponding adaptation level and inversely proportional to the adaption level (p. 342, Brophy).

Katzell's theory is similar to that of Morse. Both the theories are defined in terms of the differences between what the worker gets and what he wants. There is also a point of dis-similarity between the two. Matzell hypothesises that satisfaction is a multiplicative function of these variables whereas Morse concludes that it is a subtractive function.
Third category of theories includes 'role theories'. Brophy has distinguished between the sociological role theories and psychological role theories. Sociological role theories are explained through the concept of vocational satisfaction as a function of the organizational context within which the individual works. He has defined satisfaction in terms of discrepancies which exist between either (a) the worker's ideal role expectations and those of society, or (b) the worker's ideal role and his real role.

The last or fourth category includes Brophy's own theory of satisfaction - 'self theory'. This theory is based on ten hypotheses and a general hypothesis, that vocational satisfaction is a function of agreement among the workers' self concepts, both real and ideal and occupational roles he perceives or plays in the world of work (Crites, 1969).

Herzberg, Mausner and Snycerman (1959) have proposed Two factor Theory of job attitudes which provide a new approach to the study of job satisfaction. Herzberg et al. have proposed the motivation - hygiene concept which distinguishes two classes of factors affecting employee attitudes toward work.

(a) Motivating factors: Achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and possibility of growth - factors (Intrinsic) are generally job content factors which lead to job satisfaction (satisfiers).
(b) **Hygiene factors:** Supervision, company policy and administration, working conditions, inter-personal relations with peers, job security and status extrinsic factors are general job context factors which lead to _job dis-satisfaction_ (dis-satisfiers);

The principal hypothesis of the two factor theory is that motivators and hygiene factors differentially related to job satisfaction and dis-satisfaction. The most legitimate interpretation of this hypothesis is that 'motivators are more important than hygiene factors as determinants of job satisfaction; and hygiene factors are more important than motivators as determinants of job dis-satisfaction". (Weil and Stephenson, 1970).

The later elaborations of his theory (Herzberg, 1966) were tied to a specific view of nature of man. He proposed that there are two separate and unrelated categories of human needs; one category shares with animals - the physiological needs, and other category includes psychological needs which have roots in man's possession of a reasoning mind. He suggested that these two sets of needs operate in different manners. Physical needs work as a pain avoidance (tension reduction) system. When frustrated, they produce discomfort; when fulfilled they produce relief from dis-comfort but no positive pleasure. Contrary to this, the
need to use one's mind (psychological needs) is satisfied by such actions as increasing one's knowledge, making abstract interactions, creative activity, being affective in ambiguity, developing individuality and the like. These are growth oriented and act only in a positive sense, i.e., attaining growth brings pleasure, but failure to grow does not bring displeasure.

As a matter of fact, Herzberg has made a major contribution to our understanding to the nature and causes of job satisfaction. No emphasized importance of psychological growth as a pre-condition of job satisfaction and that such growth stams from work itself. This has generated further many fruitful suggestions and experimentations in the field of job redesign to allow the jobs for greater psychological growths.

On the other hand, Herzberg's insistence on the idea that dis-satisfaction is caused only by 'Hygiene' and satisfaction is caused by only 'Motivators', i.e., the existence of two unipolar continual is misleading both logically and empirically. The above assumptions, as a matter of fact, are not necessary in supposing that work facilitates psychological growth.

In the recent past Herzberg's theory has been consistently criticized on many grounds. e.g. Locko (1976). Among other difficulties with the Herzberg's theory, one is that
It has not been stated consistently. King (1970) has identified five different versions of it from Herzberg's writings. Locke (1976) has also noted many inconsistencies in his writings of 1966 itself. Herzberg's theory is also criticized on the ground that his theory is method bound i.e., when Herzberg's method is used (including his classification system) his original aggregate patterns of results is duplicated consistently (Herzberg, 1966) although not universally (House and Wigder, 1967) and not if the data are analysed on an individual basis (Schwab and Heremen, 1970). Schneider and Locke (1971) and Locke (1973) using the event/agent classification have shown that the classification of motivators as only satisfiers and hygiene factors as causing dis-satisfaction is misleading. Their results indicated that motivators were mentioned almost equally often as satisfiers and dis-satisfiers and accounted for more than 76% of the events in both the cases. They also found the same in the case of hygiene factors.

In recent years, the Interactional Theory proposed by Vroom (1964) has been widely accepted as a more plausible explanation of job satisfaction dynamics. According to this approach, explanation of satisfaction requires two sets of variables: The use of work role and personality variable both, because these two sets of variable interact with each other. Thus, any study of job satisfaction should
include information concerning these two sets of variables. The satisfaction that an individual derives from a work role or the valence of a work role to its occupant is assumed to be the function not only of the objective properties of that work role but also of the motives of the individual. This theory is based upon three important theoretical concepts — namely valence, expectancy and force.

Vroom has used the term 'valence' while referring to effective orientation towards particular outcomes. An outcome is positively valent when the person prefers attaining it to not attaining it. An outcome has a valence of zero when the person is indifferent to attaining or not attaining it. An outcome is negatively valent, when he prefers not attaining it to attaining it.

'Expectancy' is used as 'a monetary belief concerning the likelihood that a particular act will be followed by a particular outcome' (Vroom, 1964). Whenever an individual chooses between alternatives which involve certain outcomes, it seems clear that his behaviour is affected not only by his preference among these outcomes but also by the degree to which he believes these outcomes to be probable. For this condition Vroom has used the term expectancy.

According to Vroom, 'force' remains to be specified how valence and expectancies combine in determining choices.
"The force on a person to perform an act is a monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the valence of all outcomes and the strength of his expectancies that the act will be followed by the attainment of these outcomes." (p. 18).


Some investigators have provided a mathematical model of job satisfaction which is also known as substractive approach. These investigators believe that job satisfaction is a function of the difference between the amount of some outcome provided by a work role and a strength of a related desire or motive on the part of the person (Ross and Zander, 1957, Morse, 1953).

Locke (1969) has proposed a discrepancy theory of job satisfaction. This theory explains that a person will
be satisfied if there is no discrepancy between desired and actual conditions. A person will be dissatisfied if there is less than the desired amount of a job characteristic.

Landy (1978) has attempted to adapt a general theory of derived motivation (Soloman and Corbit, 1973) to a specific consideration of the phenomenon of job satisfaction. Opponent process theory predicts the affective reactions among experienced workers to intrinsic and extrinsic factors on the job; (intrinsic factors have the capacity to yield neutral hedonic status in their presence and positive hedonic after effects; extrinsic factors produce neutral hedonic status in their presence and negative hedonic after effects). Extrinsic factors can produce dissatisfaction after their termination and intrinsic factors can produce satisfaction after their termination. If an experienced worker were asked to recall pleasant work related situations, these situations would involve intrinsic factors (e.g. having overcome a difficult challenges); if these same workers were asked to recall unpleasant work-related situations, these situations would involve extrinsic factors (e.g. the withdrawal of environmental attributes normally seen as pleasurable). Thus, opponent process theory would lead one to deduce the principles that from the basic of Herzberg's inductive theory of job satisfaction (Landy, 1978).
1.6. **Determinants of job satisfaction:**

The varied research work done in various industrial and educational organization throws light on some variables of job satisfaction which may broadly be divided into three main categories:

(1) **Personal factors**
(2) **Factors related to job**
(3) **Factors controlled by the management**

(1) **Personal factors:**

(a) **Sex:** The findings of several studies reveal that women in general have more job satisfaction than men. Morse's (1953) study indicates that while the percentage of dissatisfaction is 55 in males it was 35 in the case of females. Such difference may be explained by the fact that females have relatively lower aspiration and expectations than males (Mohanty, 1973) and they have less economic burden. Hence, they become easily satisfied in their jobs compared to their counterparts. This study is not supported by Hyblin and Smith (1964) regarding the effect of sex difference in job satisfaction.

(b) **Age:** As evident from the findings of the study conducted by Morse (1953) workers of the higher age group have more job satisfaction than the younger
workers. But other studies do suggest that there is very little relationship between age and job satisfaction. (Sinha, 1973).

Number of dependents in the Family:

It has been proved from the findings of Morse's investigation that there is a negative relationship between the number of dependents and job satisfaction. Thus as the number of dependents in a family increases job satisfaction decreases and vice-versa. Most probably, financial difficulty is the major cause of job dissatisfaction in such cases. Sinha (1973) however, did not find the effect of family and dependents on job satisfaction. Hence without further research on this problem no definite view can be given on the relationship between job satisfaction and the number of dependents in the family.

(c) Length of Service:

The findings of some investigators suggest that in the preliminary stage of service more job satisfaction is experienced. But when the employee reaches the age 50-60 years job satisfaction decreases gradually. After this age again the tendency of rise in job satisfaction is observed. Sinha (1965) did not find significant difference in job satisfaction between the shorter and longer years of service makers. According to Hull and Kolstand (1942) the level of
morale usually reaches the maximum after 20 years of service in an organisation.

(d) **Intelligence:**

There is a general assumption that to perform a job satisfaction, intelligence is necessary. Therefore, many have hypothesised that there exists a positive relationship between intelligence and job satisfaction. But several investigators have brought quite confusing findings. According to Ahbroke workers having high intelligence have demonstrated dissatisfaction in job. From the findings of Wyatt and Langdon it has been proved that most intelligent women workers in a chocolate factory experienced monotony and boredom very quickly which is an indicator of dissatisfaction in job. However, from the study of Kornhouser and Sharp (1932) no significant relationship is observed between attitude and intelligence. Thus, further research is necessary for a generalised conclusion on the relationship between job satisfaction and intelligence.

(e) **Level of aspiration:**

According to Morse (1953) when the aspiration and performance of the employees do not run parallel there is frustration which leads to dissatisfaction in job. Morse opines that the level of aspiration of the employees determines the degree of satisfaction experienced by them.
According to him the level of the satisfaction is a combination of both level of aspiration and the amount of return from the environment. He has advanced the hypotheses that satisfaction basically depends upon what an individual wants from the work and what he gets in return. Satisfaction is reached when these two are in line and job satisfaction exists when the return from the environment is much less than the need level of the individual.

(f) Personality:

It is a major factor in influencing job satisfaction. But since it is difficult to measure the traits of personality scientifically not much research could be done on the problem. From the study conducted by Kornhouser and Sharp on women employees, it is noticed that out of 25 highly neurotic workers, 16 were always dissatisfied in job while only 3 out of 25 normal workers expressed job satisfaction.

It has been previously mentioned that satisfaction or dissatisfaction is a generalised tendency of the personality. There are some who normally satisfied in their personal social and professional life while there are others who are dissatisfied in every sphere of life. Thus, it becomes a generalised nature of the individual to show satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Sinha (1965) found significant positive relationship between a workers' total adjustment and job satisfaction.
(g) **Education:**

A number of contradictory findings have been obtained regarding the relationship between educational levels and job satisfaction. The findings of Morse's study indicates that employees who could not pass middle school examinations had greater job satisfaction than more educated employees. But the findings of other studies have not supported this view. Hence further research is necessary to throw light on this determinant of job satisfaction.

(h) **Fulfilment of Personal needs:**

Morse's and Schaffer's research (1953) leads one to conclude that job satisfaction depends upon the fulfilment of personal needs. Schaffer found that a high correlation existed between the person's strongest needs and overall satisfaction. Among the strongest needs, creativity and challenge mastery and achievement are important ones.

1.7 **Self-awareness: its meaning and explanations:**

Our concern with self-awareness has a long and respectable ancestry. It is kin to the age old concern of man to know what he is and why he behaves the way he does. Modern thinkers believed that some hidden energy within himself which guided his behaviour. Behaviour or activities of any individual will be governed by himself and his
environment. This is the concern of self-awareness too: to find the causes of why we behave the way we do and what are the forces within us and in the environment that influence our behaviour.

What is self-awareness? 'Self-awareness is the understanding of, and developing an insight into, what we are. What are the characteristic ways in which we perceive the reality into us? What are those inborn factors, the developmental factors and the results of learning that determine our responses to situational and people? How did we learn what we learn - under what environmental pressure and what inner factors determine the direction taken by our learning? In what ways does our past learning influence our current attitudes? behaviour? In short, what makes us tick?

Is the concern with self-awareness, they only an academic one? If so, why not leave it to the academicians? Obviously cannot be scientists, why not leave scientific questions to the scientists and let the rest of us follow our own various pursuits. Or, is there something all of us can gain from the pursuit of self-awareness? The answer is: Yes, indeed. There is a great deal each one of us can gain from self-awareness. With increased self-awareness, all of us will be able to follow our pursuits with much greater efficacy and energy we can become happier and more productive.
In this assertion, there is not a finest suggestion that there is something wrong with us now. Most of us are relatively healthy. That is why we are able to lead fairly satisfying and socially useful lives. That is why we are able to carry out our numerous social roles with a fair degree of success. Self-awareness is advocated not because we are sick with any deliberating malady. We are not neurotic or psychotic. If we were, we would not be able to function in society the way we do.

But is that the whole story? Is that all we want? Just not to be sick! Are sickness and health poles opposite? Does it mean that if we are not sick, we are healthy? Quite the contrary. Both terms are relative. They mark the two ends of a continuum. The difference is only a matter of degree. When sickness increases, health decreases and vice-versa. The relationship is such that we can talk legitimately only of relative sickness and relative health. Are we so totally satisfied with the degree of health that we possess that we see no scope for improvement at all? If the answer is that there is scope for improvement and we strongly believe that there is the correct answer - then how do we go about realising this improvement? What are the things that currently prevent us from achieving a better quality of life?
There is a famous saying that modern man lives with 'half a heart and one lung'. The statement means simply that we realise only half our potentialities. Only as part of us is involved in anything we do. Some profiles of healthy persons are developed by psychologists. Maslow refers to a healthy person as a 'self-actualiser'. Carl Rogers calls a healthy person a 'full functioning person'. Frich Form call him a productive person. These states of being and becoming a rarely found in modern society. According to Maslow, only one out of a million achieves the state of self-actualisation in the ordinary circumstances. When we compare ourselves with the picture of the healthy person painted by psychologists, we know where we stand. We also know, then, what is there for us to achieve. But before we go on to describe the 'healthy' state of being and becoming, let us examine some of the common problems that contribute to our partial immobilisation.

Psychologists have suggested that our cognitive life—perceiving, thinking are remembering—are far from what we think it is. While we believe that we are perceiving reality for what it is, in point of fact, we are not perceiving it objectively. Our thinking, which we consider to be rational as often not so. What we recall from memory often represents only a very small proportion of what our sense organs have registered in the first place.
Murphy declares that our cognitive processes are not 'free'. There are numerous factors shackling our cognitive processes. The stronger among these factors are:

(1) Socially shared autisms and (2) wishful thinking. Socially accepted ideas of good and bad, right and wrong of 'ought and ought not' are deeply ingrained in us through socialisation. These ideas interfere with our perception of reality and our objectivity in thinking. The second factor - wishful thinking - also affects the cognitive processes in the same way. We never receive impressions from the outer world without getting impressions as the same time from the world inside us our biological and social needs are the other inner source of our impressions. What we see is normally contaminated by what we wish to see and are prepared to see.

One's perception of other people, it is said, is influenced by the perceiver's own beliefs, and it resulted in incorrect judgements about people, thereby adversely affecting our inter-personal relationships. Unless we are aware of our own implicit personality theory, how it arose in the first place and why it persists, and in what ways it influences our perception of other people, our judgements of other people will be subjected to serious error.
Psychologically healthy person:

Freud has said that most of us use some kind of security measures called the defence mechanisms. Defense mechanisms represent more or less permanent escape techniques which people adopt in the face of anxiety. Producing situations, operating unconsciously, these defence mechanisms tie up a lot of person's energy. This tie-up energy is then not available for constructive purposes. Self-awareness helps a person to get over his need for defence mechanisms, and releases considerable energy which now becomes available for constructive use.

Psychological health is desirable not only from the point of view of the person himself, but also from the point of view of those who come in contact with him. In our lives all of us are involved in various social relationships. In order that the other people involved with us in social relationships may be healthy, we must become healthy ourselves. When we have discarded our facets and self-deceptions and have developed a flexible and open perceptual framework, our relationships with others become such as would help them grow up into healthy individuals.

Lombard has advanced one other interesting reason why self-awareness is important. He argues that self-awareness helps reinforce the scientific attitude. Maslow
a behavioural scientist, once undertook a study of the healthy person whom he called the 'self-actualising person'. He defined the self-actualising persons as one in whom the highest need in man, the need for self-actualisation, is most prominent. For Maslow the self-actualising person is the epitome of psychological health. There are several characteristics of healthy personality. It includes distinguishing character traits, perceptual accuracy and ever newness of experiences, impulse life and emotional tendencies, intellectual attributes, social interests and attitudes to self.

The key to psychological health lies in 'self-acceptance'. It is basically acceptance of oneself and the resultant trust in oneself which make the healthy person what he is. The various characteristics of the healthy person described in above paragraph boil down to this basic key concept of acceptance and trust in oneself. Acceptance and trust will come with self-awareness. It is only when a person understands the forces working within himself with a sense of tolerance and acceptance that he is able to transcend the limitations set by these forces. When he understands his perceptual framework and tendencies as well as the forces making for those perceptual tendencies, he is able to transcend the limitation set by them. It is only then that he is able to perceive and understand others and the world as
it is, and accepts them for what they are. As a result, his response to people and situations becomes more realistic. Realistic experiencing of the world makes for a life that is marked by greater happiness, enhanced productivity and continuous growth.

1.8. **Significance of the Present Study:**

It was mentioned earlier that self-awareness means developing an insight into what we are. Self-awareness of men is to find out the causes of why they behave the way they do and what are the forces within them and the environment that influences the behaviour of the people.

Many researches have been published in Journals and books regarding the organizational effectiveness. One of the important determinant was job satisfaction of the employees. Job satisfaction is multivariate or multidimensional phenomena and also its relationship with psychosocial-cultural factors. Job satisfaction is a major concept in organizational psychology as well as in management study. It was earlier mentioned that job satisfaction has been a dependent variable and some time it considered moderator and independent variable by researchers.

Though job satisfaction has been area of active concern of the psychologists for many decades, yet little
attention is given towards the job satisfaction of engineers in relation to some psycho social variables. Individuals' level of self-awareness will lead to better/higher job satisfaction. One can expect that there might be some level of self-awareness and other variables like type of organization, cadre and number of dependent in the family which lead to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction in this profession. In the present context the main aim here is to see the effect/impact of self-awareness on job satisfaction.

In the Indian context little dependable information has been available about the self-awareness and job satisfaction. The present investigation is one more attempt to study the factors of job satisfaction, particularly in context of self-awareness of the respondents. The aim of the study was to explain the problem along psychological as well as socio-cultural lines. The complexity of the problem, however, defines such expectations.

Before describing the present investigation, it would be more appropriate to get acquainted with the studies that have already been made to examine the factors of job satisfaction. This would provide good background to the present problem.