CHAPTER SIX

ADMINISTRATORS AND THEIR JOB-SATISFACTION

One of the surest signs of deteriorating conditions in an organisation is low job-satisfaction. In its more sinister forms, it lurks behind slowdowns, absenteeism, strikes, turnover, etc. It also may be a part of grievances, low productivity, disciplinary problems, and other organisational difficulties. High Job-satisfaction, on the other hand, gladdens the hearts of administrators, because it tends to be connected with positive conditions that administrators want.

Job-satisfaction is the favourableness or unfavourableness with which employees view their work. It is based on job-attitudes but is somewhat broader in that job satisfaction relates to how the job fits into the total picture of the person's functioning. An attitude is a predisposition to respond, positively or negatively, to a certain set of facts. It is, therefore, a tendency to respond and can be considered a "leaning" in one direction or another. There are two main elements in an attitude, the predisposition and the direction of that predisposition. A Job-attitude would therefore, be, a tendency to aspects of job.

Development activities changed the nature of both the job and responsibilities of the administrators. As pointed out in the Introduction, the government in India is the prime social sector willingto assume the responsibility in the phenomena of social, economic and political change. As a corollary, administrators faced with the tasks for which they were not prepared properly to face. It is therefore, of interest to consider the attitudes of administrators to different aspects of the job.

ASPECTS OF JOB:

Responses to a structured questionnaire administered through interviews with respondents regarding the aspects of the job provide the data for analysis. Table 6.1 reveals the data on different aspects of job.

Table 6.1

Administrators' Responses to Various Items of Jobs

(N = 67)

Variables	Responses (Percent) 1	2	3
1. Committed to work	67.16 (45)	17.91 (12)	14.93 (10)
2. Assumption of job responsibility	38.81 (26)	55.73 (36)	7.46 (5)

Contd..

Table 6.1 (Contd..)

Variables	Responses (Percent)		
	1	2	3
2. Increase the work pace	68.66 (46)	19.40 (13)	11.94 (8)
4. Sense of achievement	28.36 (19)	49.25 (33)	22.39 (15)
5. Interest of job	76.12 (51)	14.93 (10)	8.96 (6)
6. Responsibility	65.67 (44)	23.89 (16)	11.94 (8)
7. Authority commensurate with responsibility	20.85 (20)	56.72 (38)	13.45 (9)
8. Need for relaxing procedure	76.12 (51)	16.42 (11)	7.46 (5)
9. Possibility of relaxing procedure	13.43 (9)	52.24 (35)	34.33 (23)
10. Scope of initiative	16.42 (11)	19.40 (13)	64.18 (43)
11. Importance of the job for the district	67.16 (45)	29.85 (20)	2.99 (2)
12. Worthiness of the job for the district	64.18 (43)	28.36 (19)	7.46 (5)
13. Qualifications and abilities whether in keeping with the job	65.67 (44)	29.85 (20)	4.48 (3)

Contd..

Table 6.1 (Contd..)

Variables	Responses (Percent)		
	1	2	3
14. Change of job within the department	67.16 (45)	25.37 (17)	7.46 (5)
15. Staying on your present job	50.75 (34)	14.93 (10)	34.33 (23)
16. Square deal from the department	32.84 (22)	46.27 (31)	20.90 (14)
17. Satisfaction from the job	52.24 (35)	34.33 (23)	13.43 (9)

Note:

(a) 1 stands for "very much" for variables 1 to 8, 14,15 and 17, "always" for 9 and 16, "sufficient scope" for 10, "most important" for 11, "most worthwhile" for 12, "most keeping with" 13.

2 stands for "somewhat" for variables 1 to 8, 14,15,17, "sometimes" for 9 and 16, "little scope" for 10, "important" for 11, "worthwhile" for 12, "somewhat keeping with" for 13.

3 stands for "not at all" for variables 1 to 9, 14-17, "no" for 10, "not important" for 11, not "worthwhile" for 12 and "not keeping with" for 13.

(b) Figures in parentheses indicate the number of administrators in each category.

(c) Totals may not add upto 100.00 because of rounding.

When asked the question, "To what extent are you committed to your work (like trying to do the job well and taking pride in your work)?" 67.8% of the administrators replied that they are committed very much, 17.9% to somewhat and 14.3% not at all. An overwhelming number of administrators, in other words, is committed to their work.

But when asked the question, "To what degree do you assume job responsibility", the picture was somewhat different. 58.9% of the administrators said very much, 33.7% somewhat and 7.5% not at all. It was natural for an administrator who was committed to the work to assume responsibility. One possible explanation for the incongruity between these two questions may be that as job responsibility is linked with attempts to improve methods and to solve work problems, district administration being the operational unit for bureaucratic process does not allow administrators at this level to improve methods. Administrators work in a world of rules and some frankly admitted during interview that if they follow the rule and take decision according to precedence, no one is going to block their career. On the other hand, if they take initiative and as a result, serious consequences follow, then they will be black-listed and hence, there will be no climbing up the ladder of career.

In order to assess "work-goal commitment", respondents were asked the following question, "To what extent do you automatically increase your work pace and shorten work breaks as work pressure increases". 66.7% of the administrators have replied very much, 19.4% as somewhat and 11.9% not at all.

Another question was asked to measure the sense of achievement. The question was "To what degree do you have a sense of achievement in performingyour job (such as getting a kick out of doing good work)? 28.4% of the respondents say very much, 49.3% as somewhat and 22.4% not at all. Perhaps, the cause of this perplexing result may be due to the fact that officers do not have the independent power they imagined to be theirs. They are submerged and almost faceless in the rules, manuals, procedures, acts etc. He feels himself as one of many cogs in a large machine. A district officer is not the absolute master of his department, so taking of decisions on the wake of changing demands of the people becomes very difficult for an administrator at the district level because of the stereotype nature of rules and procedures of work.

Data about the nature of work reveal that 76.1% of the administrators found their jobs interesting, 14.9% as somewhat and 9% not interesting. Administrators told that

they dealt with various subjects and diverse responsibilities and hence, found interest in the job.

About responsibility it came out that 65.7% of the administrators spoke grudgingly about the responsibility being too much. 22.4% realised that they were assigned enough responsibility and 11.9% of them felt that that there was too little responsibility in their work.

As authority must be commensurate with responsibility, an attempt was made whether administrators have enough authority or not to decide the things. 23.9% of the administrators said that they possess enough authority, 58.7% some authority and 13.4% no authority. This incongruence between authority and responsibility may be an explanation of the low sense of achievement of the administrators.

When asked about the relaxation of administrative procedures, administrators were generally inclined to admit the necessity for relaxing procedures. 70.1% of the administrators saw the need for relaxing procedures always, 16.4% sometimes necessary and 7.5% not necessary. As regards the possibility of relaxing procedures, 13.4% of the respondents replied that relaxation was possible in most cases, 52.2% in some cases and 34.3% replied that relaxation is not possible.

As regards the scope of initiative, administrators in general thought that there was little scope of initiative for them. 16.4% of the administrators categorically said that there was sufficient scope for initiative, 19.4% said in favour of some scope, 50.7% replied that there was little scope and 13.4% as no scope at all. Originally, in the questionnaire, there were only three categories, but almost every respondents told of the utility of adding one more category, namely, little scope which was placed between some scope and no scope at all.

In reply to the question, "Do you consider your present job or duty in the department an important one in development programmes of your district?", 67.2% of the administrators have replied that they consider it as very important, 29.8% as somewhat important and 3% as no so important. It is clear from the data that majority of the administrators feel that what they are doing or are supposed to do is very crucial for the development of the district.

The picture remains almost same when the administrators were asked the question, "Do you find that what you are doing in the department is worthwhile or not for your district?" 64.2% of the administrators say that they

usually feel that they are mostly worthwhile, 26.4% as somewhat worthwhile and 7.6% as not worthwhile. This congruence between the perception of the importance of the job and its worthwhileness is natural, because a person who considers his job as being very important for development should treat it as worthwhile. This means that that seems to our respondents to be organisationally relevant also appears personally worthwhile. In answer to the question, "Do you think that your job is in keeping with your qualifications and abilities?" 65.7 percent of the administrators respond in the category of most keeping with, 29.8 percent as somewhat keeping with and 4.5 percent as not keeping with. When asked the question, "on the whole, how satisfied are you in your present job?", 52.2 percent of the respondents said that they are very satisfied, 34.3 percent as somewhat satisfied and 13.4 percent as not at all satisfied.

When asked the question, "would you change to some other job in the department, if you are given a chance?", 67.2 percent of the administrators replied in the affirmative as very much, 25.4 percent as somewhat, and 7.5 percent as not at all. A complementary question was asked, "To what extent do you think of staying on your present job?". In reply to this question, 80.7 percent say very much, 14.9

percent as somewhat and 34.3 percent as not at all.

In order to assess whether the organisation has taken care of the administrators, a question was asked, "In general, do you think that you have got a square deal from the department?", the response observed was: 38.8 percent always received square deal, 46.3% as sometimes and 20.9 percent as not received any square deal from the department.

In this connection, the respondents were asked another question, whether or not their department has tried its best to see that its employees got a square deal. It is of interest to note that 28.4 percent of the administrators say that it has tried its best while 22.4 percent say that it has hardly tried at all. As against this, 49.2 percent indicate that it has tried a little but not hard enough. This suggests that a large majority of respondents are dissatisfied with the organisation because it fails to take a good care of them.

The pattern of response in the last item clearly shows that what the department has done to the needs and requirements of the administrators is not enough. They fall short of the expectations of the administrators.

From the preceding analysis regarding the different aspects of the job, the evidence is very much baffling,

ambiguous and conflicting. Because, out of sixty-seven respondents, sixty one have said that their work is interesting. In terms of percentage, 91 percent of the administrators are interested in their work whereas 54.3 percent have said that they do not want to stay in the present job. Although 50.8 percent categorically replied that they wanted to stay on the present job very much, the proportion of those wanting to leave needs serious attention. Again, 86.5 percent of the administrators fall in the category of either very much satisfied or satisfied; yet, 67.2 percent want to change to some other job in the present department. Perhaps, the reason may be explained with the data regarding the receipt of square deal from the department. If we add up those who do not receive any square deal from the department with those who received it occasionally, we have the same percentage of 67.2 as those who want to change to some other job in the present department.

In the job-satisfaction scale that was used to measure the degree of job-satisfaction of the administrators, respondents were asked the following question, "All things considered, how do you feel about your present job?" There were ten structured statements in the answer-categories. It was assumed that the first three statements

(namely, "I love it", "I am enthusiastic about it" and "I like it very much") stood for strongly affirmative response and so respondents coming under these response categories were assumed to form the group of "very much" satisfied. The respondents coming under next three categories (for example, "I like it a good deal", I like it on the whole" and "I like it fairly well") which were neither strongly affirmative nor strongly negative were classified as "somewhat" satisfied. Respondents coming under the rest of the response categories (namely, "I like it a little", "I am indifferent to it", "on the whole I do not like it", "I dislike it") which were both mildly and strongly negative were classified under "not at all" satisfied. From Table 6.1, it is clear that 52.8 percent of the administrators are satisfied in their present job, whereas 34.8 percent of the respondents fall in the category of "somewhat" satisfied, whereas 13.4 percent are dissatisfied.

However, attempts have been made to find out what are the things that administrators like best and those which they like the least about their jobs. A content analysis of their responses is listed below in the tabular form (6.2 and 6.3).

Table 6.2

Responses to the question: "What are the things you like best about your job?"

(N = 67)

Responses	Frequency (in percentages)
1. Interest of work	76.12 (51)
2. Female rights	52.24 (35)
3. Scales of pay	31.34 (21)
4. Status	34.33 (23)
5. Power	14.93 (10)
6. Security of the job	94.03 (63)
7. Work on Development Programmes	92.54 (62)
8. Challenging scope of the job	11.94 (8)
9. The work of the Department	61.19 (41)
10. I do not like anything of the job	8.96 (6)

1) Percentages do not add upto 100.00 because multiple responses were permitted.

2) Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents.

On the basis of the indications of the administrators' choices of the best attractive features of the job, one could locate some of the sources and the degrees of their job satisfaction. Table 6.2 shows that the highest percentage of respondents regarded "Security of the Job" as the most attractive features of their job, "Work on Development Programmes", "Interest of Work" and "the Work of the Department" and "Pension Rights" came second, third, fourth and fifth in order of percentage of respondents who regarded this as the most attractive feature. Clearly in India, as elsewhere, maximum security of the job is provided by the government, services of the government employees have ample constitutional and legal safeguards. So many tales of corruption by the government employees are heard, even the names of those officers are identified, yet to take action against those corrupt officials has been a different task. Another explanation may be that in a society which does not provide material social security and where unemployment prevails on a vast scale, administrators may be attracted more by those service conditions which provide security rather than by "Status". 86.6% of the respondents regard "Status-Gap" is one feature of the job which they like the least (Table 6.3). Development is now the dominant perspective everywhere. All other activities including law and

order occupy a secondary position, so administrators try to associate themselves in development works.

Table 6.5

Response to the question: "What are the things you like least about your job?"
(N = 67)

Response	Frequency (in percentages)
1. The content of the job itself	2.99 (2)
2. Superiors interference	91.04 (61)
3. Politician's Interference	98.51 (66)
4. Too little responsibility	34.33 (23)
5. Ceremonial works like attending V.I.P's. meetings etc.	79.10 (53)
6. Too much paper work and little concrete work	95.52 (64)
7. Status gap	86.57 (58)
8. Dissatisfaction with subordinates	16.42 (11)
9. Scales of pay	25.37 (17)
10. Promotional opportunities	28.36 (19)

1) Percentages do not add upto 100.00 because multiple responses are permitted.

2) Figures in parentheses indicate number of respondents.

Table 6.3 reveals that the highest percentage of respondents regarded "Politician's interference" as the least attractive feature of the job followed by "Too much paper-work and little concrete work", "Superiors interference", "Status-gap", and "Ceremonial works like attending V.I.P's, meetings, desk work etc. In India, the democratization of the government at a dramatic pace, particularly after 1947 exposed administrators to share their authority with politicians. Politicians are becoming increasingly aware of their powers and they are taking interest in every detail of the proposals. According to administrators, three interests are in reality interference in administration. They get involved in petty matters and often work for parochial interests of caste, region, community and even for their self-interest. They argue that "until the unnecessary interference in administration is minimised, frustration or dissatisfaction is bound to lay their strong black hands on administration".

SELF -REGARD AND SELF-CONFIDENCE.

It is interesting to enquire about the perception of the environment by the administrators, because, it is assumed that if the administrators fail to manipulate their environment, they become frustrated, critical and apathetic of organisation. On the other hand, if the administrators

are capable of manipulating the environment, they will be more action-oriented and prepared to take initiative.

Table 6.4 presents the information regarding the rating of self-reliance by the administrators. Altogether four questions were asked to assess the self-reliance of the administrators.

Table 6.4

Administrators' Sense of Self-reliance

(N = 67)

Statement	Responses (Percent)		
	1	2	3
1. Within the rules and regulations of the department everyone has certain freedom to take decision, but problems are so complex and the ways of dealing with them so many that it is always safer to depend on the advice of those who you think know better than to act on your own.	76.12 (51)	9.06 (6)	14.93 (10)
2. What a person in my position thinks or does has hardly any influence on what is going on in the department.	65.67 (44)	11.94 (8)	22.39 (15)

Contd..

Table 6.4 (Contd..)

Statement	Responses (Percent)		
	1	2	3
3. If what one proposes is sound, one would have little difficulty in persuading one's colleagues and superiors in the department to accept it.	11.04 (8)	8.96 (6)	79.10 (53)
4. No matter how valid your arguments and reasonings for or against a decision are, the way decisions are made in the department there is little likelihood of these being considered.	64.18 (43)	10.48 (7)	25.37 (17)

Keys (a) 1 = Agree 2 = Undecided 3 = Disagree

(b) Figures in parenthesis indicate the number of respondents.

From Table 6.4, it is clear that administrators in the sample of the study are not sure of the appropriateness of their decision for tackling the problem. 76.1% of the respondents express their agreement to the proposition that it is safer to depend on the advice of those who know better. 66.7% of the administrators feel that they do not wield influence in the department. 79.1% of the administrators

express their disagreement with the proposition that "if what one proposes is sound, one would have little difficulty in persuading one's colleagues and superiors in the department to accept it". 66.2% feel that no matter how valid their arguments and reasonings for or against a decision are, the way decisions are made in the department there is little likelihood of their being considered.

Data reveal that the majority of the respondents have a low sense of self-reliance. They want to depend on other's advice to tackle a problem i.e. they are unwilling to treat their judgement as a decisive factor in coping with a problem. Data also support the finding of Roy's study (1975) that "not only they manifest a lack of self-reliance, but their perception of the environment as something intractable also reinforces their low self-image".

Table 6.5 analyses data on self-reliance according to the total score on the scale of self-reliance.

Table 6.5

Administrators' Sense of Self-Reliance (according to to Total score)

(N = 87)

Score	Positive number	Self-Reliance (Percent)	Negative Number	Self-Reliance (Percent)
3 to 4	10	14.93	42	62.69

Contd..

Table 6.5 (Contd..)

Score	Positive Number	Self-Reliance (Percent)	Negative Number	Self-Reliance (Percent)
1 to 2	2	2.99	13	19.40
Total	12	17.92	55	82.09

Positive Respondents mean = 3.42

Negative Respondents mean = -3.31

Overall Respondents mean = -2.28

From Table 6.5, it is clear that only 17.92 percent of respondents are positively inclined towards self-reliance. Out of this 14.93 percent of administrators have higher self-reliance, whereas 82.09 percent of administrators have very low self-reliance. 82.09 percent are negatively oriented towards self-reliance. Overall respondents mean is -2.28 indicating the trend that administrators' self-reliance is very low.

SELF-CONFIDENCE

To be a leader in any situation, an individual must appear to make positive contribution to the group.

Self-confidence is an important variable as it indicates the extent of assurance one possesses about one's capacities and abilities in not only confronting problem situations but also in finding solutions to them. In the context of developmental activities, self-confidence involves various dimensions in the form of optimism on his part regarding his suggestions, stamina to face the resistance of the people in inculcating new ideas, methods, etc., and belief in their capacity to influence the behaviour of the people.

Table 6.6 presents evidences to show whether administrators possess self-confidence in its different dimensions. In order to assess the self-confidence five statements were made to the administrators for expressing their agreements or disagreements.

Table 6.6

Administrators' Sense of Self-Confidence

(N = 67)

Statement	Responses (Percent)		
	1	2	3
1. No matter how hard your intentions are, people always tend to misinterprete your suggestions.	64.18 (43)	1.49 (1)	33.33 (23)

Contd..

Table 6.6 (Contd..)

Statement	Response (Percent)		
	1	2	3
2. When I find myself confronted with so much resistance on the part of the people towards accepting better ways, I feel I should have chosen some other vocation.	22.50 (15)	3.00 (2)	74.63 (50)
3. When a programme arouses all sorts of unfavourable reactions, it is better to drop it.	29.85 (20)	3.00 (2)	67.16 (45)
4. If what you are doing is in the best interest of the people, it is always possible to convince them of its usefulness.	82.09 (55)	3.00 (2)	14.93 (10)
5. May be people today do not accept your proposal but you should not because they will come round to your view point.	88.00 (59)	3.00 (2)	9.96 (6)

Key: a) 1 = agree 2 = undecided 3 = disagree

b) Totals may not add to 100, because of rounding.

c) Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents.

64.2% of the respondents agree with the statement that "no matter how best intentions are, people always tend to misinterprete your suggestions". 74.6% of the administrators express that resistance on the part of the people towards accepting better ways will lead them towards other vocations. From this it follows that if choosing some other vocations is an indicator of job satisfaction scale, then it is not surely due to resistance on the part of people towards accepting better ways. Our data reveal that resistance on the part of the people does in no way create in their mind a sense of frustration.

67.2% of the respondents rejeot the view that "when a programme arouses all sorts of unfavourable reactions, it is better to drop it". This is indicative of the presence of confidence in their own ability to persuade people to try out the programme. This is also corroborated by fact that 82.1% of the administrators feel that if what is being done is in the best interest of the people, it is always possible to convince them of its usefulness. Similarly, 83.1% of the administrators also believe that even if people to-day do not accept their proposal, they should act because the people will come round to their view point.

It is clear from the data as revealed in Table 6.6 that a large majority of administrators feel confident in regard to their capacity to influence the behaviour of the people in spite of the possibility of being misinterpreted by the latter.

Table 6.7 analyses the sense of self confidence according to total score obtained by administrators.

Table 6.7

Administrators' Sense of Self-Confidence (According to total score)

(N = 67)

Score	Positive Number	Self-Confidence (Percentage)	Negative Number	Self-confidence (Percentage)
3 to 5	37	55.22	4	5.97
1 to 2	14	20.90	12	17.91
Total	51	76.12	16	23.03

Positive respondents mean = 3.03

Negative respondents mean = -2.00

Overall mean = 1.03

From the Table 6.7, it is evident that 76.12 percent of administrators have positive orientation towards self-confidence and 55.22 percent of them have higher self-confidence. Out of the 23.88 percent who have negative orientation towards self-confidence, only 5.97 percent have strong negative self-confidence. As the mean of those who have positive self-confidence (3.03) is higher than the mean of those who have negative self-confidence (-2.00) and as the overall mean is high (1.02), administrators perhaps have belief in their capacity to influence the behaviour of others.

Having analysed the data on self-reliance and self-confidence independently, it is proposed to correlate self-reliance and self-confidence. It is expected that those who score positive on self-reliance shall also score positive on self-confidence. The information is presented in Table 6.8.

Table 6.8

Administrators' Scores of Self-Reliance and Self-Confidence.

Self-Confidence	Self-Reliance: Negative Response	Self-Reliance: Positive Response	Total
Positive Response	58.21 (39)	17.91 (12)	76.12 (51)

Contd..

Table 6.4 (Contd..)

Self-Confidence	Negative Response	Positive Response	Total
Negative Response	23.88 (16)	0.00 (0)	23.88 (16)
Total	82.09 (55)	17.91 (12)	100.00 (67)

Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents.

Proportional difference is -16.42

It indicates that 16.42 percent of 67 cases in Table 6.8 are excessively in the negative direction. However, based on column totals, 70.91 percent with negative self-reliance scale values have positive self-confidence. Based on row total, 76.47 percent with positive self-confidence scale values have negative self-reliance. It suggests that those who score positive in the self-reliance also score positive in the self-confidence, but the reverse is not true. Data also reveal that only 17.91 percent of the respondents belong to the category of both positive self-reliance - positive self-confidence.

An attempt is also made to correlate different

Table 6.9 presents the data on administrators' commitment to work and job-satisfaction.

Table 6.9

Administrators' Commitment to work and Job-satisfaction

Job-satisfaction	Commitment to work: Not committed	Committed	Total
Satisfied	11.94 (8)	74.63 (50)	86.57 (58)
Not-satisfied	3.00 (2)	10.45 (7)	13.43 (9)
Total	14.93 (10)	85.07 (57)	100.00 (67)

* Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents.

Percentage difference is 55.22 which means that 55.22 percent of 67 cases are excessively in the positive direction. Based on column total, it is found 37.72 percent who are committed to work are also satisfied with their work, and 30 percent of the respondents who are non-committed are also satisfied. Analysing the data on the basis of row-totals, 86.21 percent of the respondents who are satisfied also fall within the committed group. "Q" value is 0.28 which indicates a low positive association between commitment to work and job-satisfaction "Q" is here not statistically significant ($P \geq .025$). χ^2 is 0.44 which also indicates that the deviation of the observed frequency from the expected is low and suggests that the relationship between the variables is low. "ϕ" is 0.08 which further indicates that the relationship between the commitment to work and job-satisfaction is low.

However, a 5 x 5 table can be made from the responses of the administrators regarding commitment to work and job-satisfaction. Table 6.10 presents the data.

Table 6.10

Administrators' Commitment to work and Job-Satisfaction

(N = 67)

Commitment to work (x_1)

Job-Satisfaction	Low	Middle	High	Total
High	7.46 (5)	2.99 (2)	41.79 (28)	52.24 (35)
Middle	4.42 (3)	8.96 (6)	20.90 (14)	34.33 (23)
Low	2.99 (2)	5.97 (4)	4.48 (3)	13.43 (9)
Total	14.93 (10)	17.91 (12)	67.16 (45)	100.00 (67)

*Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents.

γ = 0.45

τ_a = 0.14

τ_b = 0.26

d_{yx} = 0.29

d_{xy} = 0.24

All of the measures show that commitment to work and job satisfaction are positively related, meaning in this case an administrator who is committed to work will tend to be from the job-satisfaction group. A "γ" of 0.43 indicates that 43 percent of 734 paired directional comparisons in Table 6.10 are predominantly in the positive direction.

A "d_{yx}" of 0.29 means that 29 percent of paired comparisons not tied on commitment to work but tied on job-satisfaction are in the positive direction, whereas a "d_{xy}" of 0.24 shows that 24 percent of paired comparisons not tied on job-satisfaction but tied on commitment to work are predominantly in the positive direction. So, it is expected that an administrator who belongs to the group who are committed to work will tend to be from the group of administrators who drive satisfaction from the job.

Table 6.11 presents the data of association between assumption of job responsibility and job-satisfaction.

Table 6.11

Administrators' Assumption of Job-responsibility and Job-satisfaction (N = 67)

Job-Satisfaction	Assumption of Job-responsibility ( ) Not Assume	Assume	Total
Satisfied	5.97 (4)	80.60 (54)	86.57 (58)
Not Satisfied	1.49 (1)	11.94 (8)	13.43 (9)
Total	7.46 (5)	92.54 (62)	100.00 (67)

* Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents.

Based on column total, 87.10 percent of respondents in the sample studied with high score on job-assumption scale are also satisfied with their job. 93.10 percent of those who are satisfied with their job are also committed to work. Proportional difference is 64.18 which means that 64.18 percent of 67 cases in Table 6.11 are excessively in the positive direction. Moreover "q" value is 0.26 which indicates a low positive association which is not statistically significant ($P \geqslant .025$). χ^2 is 0.20 and "ϕ" is 0.05. A "χ^2" of 0.20 suggests that the deviation is small and hence the weaker is the relationship between the

assumption of job-responsibility and job-satisfaction. A "Ø" of 0.03 indicates also the low associations between the two variables.

Table 6.12 examines the data on assumption of job-responsibility and job satisfaction by a 3 x 3 table.

Table 6.12

Administrators' Assumption of Job-responsibility and Job-satisfaction (N = 67)

Job-satisfaction (y_1)	Assumption of Job-responsibility (x_1)			
	Low	Middle	High	Total
High	4.48 (3)	23.88 (16)	23.88 (16)	52.24 (35)
Middle	1.49 (1)	23.88 (16)	8.96 (6)	34.33 (23)
Low	1.49 (1)	5.97 (4)	5.97 (4)	13.43 (9)
Total	7.46 (5)	53.73 (36)	38.81 (26)	100.00 (67)

* Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents.

γ = 0.14
τ_a = 0.05
d_{yz} = 0.09
d_{xy} = 0.08
τ_l = 0.08

All of the above measures also show a low positive association between assumption of job-responsibility and job-satisfaction. A γ of 0.14 indicates that only 14 percent of 702 directional comparisons in Table 6.12 are in the positive direction. τ_a of 0.05 indicates that only 5 percent of all possible paired comparisons are predominantly in the positive direction. A "δ_{yx}" of 0.09 suggests that 9 percent of paired comparisons not tied on assumption of job-responsibility but which may be tied on job-satisfaction are predominantly in the positive direction. Similarly a "δ_{xy}" of 0.08 represents that 8 percent of paired comparisons not tied on job-satisfaction but tied on the assumption of job-responsibility are predominantly in the positive direction.

Table 6.13 furnishes the information regarding sense of achievement and satisfaction from the job.

Table 6.13

Administrators' sense of achievement and satisfaction from the job.

(N = 67)

Job-Satisfaction (y_1)	Sense of Achievement (x_1)		
	Negative	Positive	Total
Satisfied	16.42 (11)	70.15 (47)	86.57 (58)

Contd..

Table 6.13 (Contd..)

Job-Satisfaction (y_1)	Sense of Achievement (x_1)		
	Negative	Positive	Total
Not-Satisfied	5.97 (4)	7.46 (5)	13.43 (9)
Total	22.39 (15)	77.61 (52)	100.00 (67)

*Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

From Table 6.13, it is clear that proportional difference is 52.24 which means that 52.24 percent of cases are excessively in the positive direction. "Q" value is 0.55 which indicates a substantial positive association between sense of achievement and job-satisfaction. "Q" value is statistically significant ($\alpha \leq .025$) and "χ^2" value is 2.31 which is not statistically significant even at .005 level. "ϕ" is 0.21 which also suggests that the relationship is not very strong.

However, data are also analysed by a 3 x 3 table. Table 6.14 presents the information.

Table 6.14

Administrators' Sense of Achievement and Satisfaction from the Job.

(N = 67)

Job-satisfaction (y_1)	Sense of achievement (x_1)			
	Low	Middle	High	Total
High	7.46 (5)	25.37 (17)	19.40 (13)	52.23 (35)
Middle	8.96 (6)	17.91 (12)	7.46 (5)	34.33 (23)
Low	5.97 (4)	5.97 (4)	1.49 (1)	13.43 (9)
Total	22.39 (15)	49.25 (33)	28.36 (19)	100.00 (67)

*Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents.

γ = 0.40

τ_a = 0.15

d_{yx} = 0.24

d_{xy} = 0.20

τ_b = 0.25

All of the above measures show that sense of achievement and job-satisfaction are positively related to each other, meaning in this context, that an administrator who has sense of achievement will tend to be from the group of administrators who are satisfied with their job.

Expressed in terms of pairs, the positive association means that if we consider two administrators and find that an administrator has high sense of achievement we would expect that the administrator would have satisfaction from the job. A "γ" of 0.40 means that 40 percent of 650 paired directional comparisons in Table 6.14 are predominantly in the positive direction. A "τ_a" of 0.15 suggests that 15 percent represents the proportion of all paired comparisons that are predominantly in positive direction. However, a "d_{yx}" of 0.24 shows that 24 percent of paired comparisons not tied on sense of achievement but tied on job-satisfaction are in the positive direction and a "d_{xy}" of 0.26 shows that 26 percent of paired comparisons not tied on job-satisfaction but tied on sense of achievement are in the positive direction.

Table 6.15 illustrates the association between interest of the job and satisfaction from the job.

Table 6.15

Administrators' interest of the job and satisfaction from the job.

(N = 67)

Job-satisfaction	Interest of the job		
	Not Interesting	Interesting	Total
Satisfied	7.46 (5)	79.10 (53)	86.57 (58)
Not-satisfied	1.49 (1)	11.94 (8)	13.43 (9)
Total	8.95 (6)	91.04 (61)	100.00 (67)

Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

Table 6.15 reveals that the proportional difference is 61.19 which indicates that 61.19 percent of 67 cases are excessively in the positive direction. "Q" value 0.14 which implies a low positive association.

However, to have further assurance, a 3 x 3 table in Table 6.16 was constructed regarding administrators' interest of the job and satisfaction from the job.

Table 6.16

Administrators' Interest of the Job and Satisfaction from the Job.

(N = 67)

Job-Satisfaction (Y_1)	Interest of the Job (x_1)			
	Low	Middle	High	Total
High	4.40 (3)	2.99 (2)	44.78 (30)	52.25 (35)
Middle	2.99 (2)	7.46 (5)	23.88 (16)	34.33 (23)
Low	1.49 (1)	4.48 (3)	7.46 (5)	13.43 (9)
Total	8.96 (6)	14.93 (10)	76.12 (51)	100.00 (67)

Figures in parenthesis indicate the number of respondents in each category.

$\gamma = 0.42$

$\tau_a = 0.11$

$d_{yx} = 0.27$

$d_{xy} = 0.18$

$\tau_b = 0.32$

From the above measures it is clear that the variables interest of the job and satisfaction from the job are positively related to each other, meaning, in this case, that an administrator who has interest of the job will tend to be from the category of those who are satisfied with the job. A "γ" of 0.41 indicates that 41 percent of the 575 paired directional comparisons in Table 6.16 are predominantly in the positive direction. However, a of 0.11 represents 11 percent of all possible paired comparisons that are predominantly in the positive direction. A "d_{yx}" of 0.27 indicates that 27 percent of paired comparisons tied not on interest of the job but may be tied on satisfaction from the job, and a "d_{xy}" of 0.13 indicates that 13 percent of paired comparisons which are not tied on satisfaction from the job but tied on interest of the job are predominantly in the positive direction.

Table 6.17 presents the information on administrators' responses on the authority commensurate with responsibility and job-satisfaction.

Table 6.17

Administrators' responses on Authority commensurate with Responsibility and Job-satisfaction.

Job-Satisfaction (y_1)	Authority Commensurate with Responsibility (x_1) (N = 67) Not Commensurate	Commensurate	Total
Satisfied	2.99 (2)	83.58 (56)	86.57 (58)
Not Satisfied	10.45 (7)	2.99 (2)	13.43 (9)
Total	13.43 (9)	86.57 (58)	100.00 (67)

*Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

From Table 6.17, proportional difference is 0.83 which suggests that 83 percent of 67 cases are excessively in the positive direction. "Q" value is 0.90 which means a very strong positive association between authority commensurate with responsibility and job-satisfaction and is also statistically significant ($P \leq .025$). "χ^2" is 37.02 which is statistically significant at .005 level. "ϕ" is 0.74 which indicates that the relationship the

perception of whether authority is commensurate with responsibility and the job-satisfaction is very strong.

Table 8.13

Administrators' Responses on Authority commensurate with responsibility and Job-satisfaction.

(N = 67)

Job-satisfaction (Y_1)	Whether Authority Commensurate with Responsibility (x_1)			
	Not commensurate	Sometimes commensurate	Very much commensurate	Total
High	0.00 (0)	20.85 (35)	25.39 (15)	52.24 (35)
Middle	8.09 (5)	25.37 (17)	5.97 (4)	34.33 (23)
Low	10.45 (7)	1.49 (1)	1.49 (1)	13.43 (9)
Total	19.43 (9)	56.72 (38)	29.85 (20)	100.00 (67)

*Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

$\gamma = 0.72$

$\tau_a = 0.28$

$d_{yx} = 0.48$

$d_{xy} = 0.45$

$\tau_b = 0.46$

All the above measures suggest a strong positive correlation between the perception of the administrators authority for cope with responsibility and satisfaction from the job, meaning that, if we consider two administrators and find that one of them was from a group which thinks authority of the job is highly commensurate with responsibility we would also expect that the administrator would have higher-satisfaction from the job. Or in other words, an administrator belonging to the group which perceives higher authority with responsibility will tend be from the job-satisfaction group. A "γ" of 0.72 indicates that 72 percent of 357 paired directional comparisons in Table 6.18 are predominantly in the positive direction. However, a τ_a of 0.29 indicates that 29 percent of all possible paired comparisons that are predominantly in the positive direction. A "d_{yx}" of 0.43 suggests that 43 percent of paired comparisons that are not tied on the administrators' perception of authority with reference to responsibility but may be tied on job-satisfaction and "d_{xy}" of 0.45 that may be tied on authority in connection with responsibility but not tied on job-satisfaction are predominantly in the positive direction.

Table 6.19 presents the data on the association between the scope of initiative and job-satisfaction.

Table 6.19

Administrators' Scope of Initiative and Job-satisfaction

(N = 67)

Job-Satisfaction (y_1)	Initiative (x_1)		
	No Scope	Scope	Total
Satisfied	52.24 (35)	34.33 (23)	86.57 (58)
Not-Satisfied	11.94 (8)	1.49 (1)	13.43 (9)
Total	64.18 (43)	35.82 (24)	100.00 (67)

Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

Proportional difference is -0.06 which means that 6 percent of 67 are excessively in the negative direction. "Q" value is 0.88 which suggests a substantial positive association between the scope of initiative and job-satisfaction. "Q" is also statistically significant ($P \leqslant .025$). "χ^2" is 5.76 which is not significant at .005 level.

Table 6.20 presents the information regarding the responses of administrators on scope of initiative and job-satisfaction in a 3 x 3 table. The purpose is to see their association in a precise manner.

Table 6.20

Administrators' Scope of Initiative and Job-Satisfaction.

(N = 67)

Job-satisfaction (y_1)	Scope of Initiative (x_1)			
	No Scope	Some Scope	Very Much Scope	Total
High	28.36 (19)	11.94 (8)	11.94 (8)	52.24 (35)
Middle	25.37 (17)	4.48 (3)	4.48 (3)	34.33 (23)
Low	10.46 (7)	2.99 (2)	0.00 (0)	13.45 (9)
Total	64.18 (43)	19.40 (13)	16.42 (11)	100.00 (67)

*Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

$\gamma = 0.38$

$\tau_a = 0.12$

$d_{yx} = 0.23$

$d_{xy} = 0.20$

$\tau_b = 0.21$

All of the above measures show a positive relationship between scope of initiative and job-satisfaction. A "γ" of 0.38 indicates that 38 percent of 682 paired directional comparisons in Table 6.20 are predominantly in the positive direction. But a τ_a of 0.12 suggests that 12 percent of all possible comparisons are in the positive direction. A "d_{yx}" of 0.22 shows that 22 percent of paired comparisons not tied on scope of initiative but which may be tied on job-satisfaction are in the positive direction. Likewise a "d_{xy}" of 0.20 indicates that 20 percent of paired comparisons not tied on job-satisfaction but which may be tied on scope of initiative are in the positive direction. All these mean that an administrator who has scope of initiative will tend to have satisfaction from the job.

Table 6.21 presents the information regarding whether qualifications and abilities of the administrators are in keeping with the job and job-satisfaction.

Table 6.21

Administrators' Responses regarding Qualifications and Abilities and Job-satisfaction. (N = 67)

Job-satisfaction (y_1)	Qualifications and abilities (x_1) Not keeping with	Keeping with	Total
Satisfied	2.99 (2)	83.58 (56)	86.57 (58)
Not-Satisfied	1.49 (1)	11.94 (8)	13.43 (9)
Total	4.48 (3)	95.52 (64)	100.00 (67)

* Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

Proportional difference is 0.70 which means that 70 cases out of 67 respondents are excessively in the positive direction. "Q" value is 0.56 which also indicates a substantial positive association between whether qualification and abilities of respondents are in keeping with their job and their sense of job-satisfaction. However, this is not statistically significant ($P \geq .025$).

Table 6.22 furnishes the information regarding the administrators' response on staying in the present job and job-satisfaction.

Table 6.22

Administrators' Response on Staying in the Present Job and Job-satisfaction. (N = 67)

Job-satisfaction	Staying in the Present job (x_1)		
	Not favour in staying in the present job	Favour in staying in the present job	Total
Satisfied	38.81 (26)	47.76 (32)	86.57 (58)
Not Satisfied	11.94 (8)	1.49 (1)	13.43 (9)
Total	50.75 (34)	49.25 (33)	100.00 (67)

* Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

Table 6.22 indicates that the proportion difference is 0.19 which means that 19 percent of 67 cases are excessively in the positive direction. "ϕ" value is 0.32 which suggests a very strong positive association. "χ^2" value is statistically significant ($P < .025$). D staying on in the job/job-satisfaction is 0.44 whereas D job-satisfaction/staying on in the job is 0.20. All these suggest that

consistent pairs - those with staying in the present job with satisfaction from the job - are much more common that inconsistent pairs. " χ^2 " is 6.05 which is statistically significant at .010 level. " ϕ " is 0.30 which indicates also strong positive relationship between the variables.

Table 6.23

Administrators' Response on Staying in the present job and job-satisfaction (N = 67)

Job-satisfaction	Staying in the present job (x_1) Not at all	Somewhat	Very Much	Total
High	8.99 (6)	14.93 (10)	34.33 (23)	52.24 (35)
Middle	34.33 (23)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	34.33 (23)
Low	13.43 (9)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	13.43 (9)
Total	50.75 (34)	14.93 (10)	34.33 (23)	100.00 (67)

*Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

From Table 6.23, it is clear that " γ " is 1.00 which means 100 percent of 1056 paired directional comparisons in the said table are predominantly in the positive

direction, i.e. a respondent who belongs to the group who wants to remain in the job or does not want to change his job will tend to be from the group of administrators who derive satisfaction from the job.

Table 6.24 presents the information on administrators' responses regarding whether respondents receive square deal and job satisfaction.

Table 6.24

Administrators' responses on Square deal and Job-Satisfaction (N = 67)

Job-Satisfaction (y_i)	Square deal (x_i) Not Received	Received	Total
Satisfied	10.45 (7)	76.12 (51)	86.57 (58)
Not Satisfied	10.45 (7)	2.99 (2)	13.43 (9)
Total	20.90 (14)	79.10 (53)	100.00 (67)

*Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

From Table 6.24, proportional difference is 0.73 which means that 73 percent of 67 respondents are excessively

in the positive direction. "Q" value is 0.93 which indicates a very strong association between administrators' perception of square deal which they receive from their department and job-satisfaction. This "Q" value of 0.93 is also statistically significant ($P \leq .025$). D square deal/job-satisfaction is 0.66 and D job-satisfaction/square deal is 0.46. All these indicate that consistent pairs - those who received square deal from the department and those who are satisfied with their job - are much more common than inconsistent pairs in the sample studied.

Table 6.25 presents a 3 x 3 table for response on square deal which the administrators receive from their department and the satisfaction which they derive from their job.

Table 6.25

Administrators' Responses on Square deal which They Received from the Department and Job-satisfaction.

(N = 67)

Job-satisfaction (y_1)	Square deal (x_4) Not received	Sometimes Received	Always received	Total
High	1.49 (1)	23.88 (16)	26.87 (18)	52.24 (35)

Contdd.

Table 6.25 (Contd..)

Job-Satisfaction (y_1)	Square deal (x_1) Not received	Sometimes Received	Always received	Total
Middle	9.96 (6)	22.39 (15)	2.99 (2)	34.33 (23)
Low	10.45 (7)	2.99 (2)	0.00 (0)	13.43 (9)
Total	20.90 (14)	49.25 (33)	29.85 (20)	100.00 (67)

*Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

$$\gamma = 0.87$$

$$\tau_a = 0.37$$

$$d_{yx} = 0.58$$

$$d_{xy} = 0.61$$

$$\tau_t = 0.59$$

All the measures indicate that there is a positive relationship between the square deal which one receive

from his department and the satisfaction he receives from his job. A " γ " of 0.37 indicates that 37 percent of 924 paired directional comparisons in Table 6.25 are predominantly in the positive direction. A "d_{yx}" of 0.53 shows that 53 percent of paired comparisons not tied on square deal but which may be tied on job satisfaction are predominantly in the positive direction. Likewise A "d_{xy}" of 0.61 points out that 61 percent of paired comparisons not tied on job-satisfaction but tied on square deal are predominantly in the positive direction. A γ of 0.37 suggests that 37 percent of all possible paired comparisons are predominantly in the positive direction. However, as " γ " excludes all ties, and " τ_a " will be smaller than " τ_b ", then, it may be concluded that the variables involved are positively related to each other, meaning, in this case, that an administrator who receives square deal from his department will tend to have satisfaction from the job.

Table 6.26 presents the data on self-reliance and job-satisfaction. The purpose is to know whether self-reliance and job-satisfaction are associated or not.

Table 6.26

Administrators' Sense of Self-reliance and Job-satisfaction. (N = 67)

Job-Satisfaction (y_1)	Self Reliance (x_2) Negative Response	Positive Response	Total
Satisfied	68.66 (46)	17.91 (12)	86.57 (58)
Not Satisfied	13.43 (9)	0.00 (0)	13.43 (9)

*Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

Table 6.26 reveals a proportionate difference of .37 which means 37 percent of 67 cases are excessively in the negative direction. $D_{self\text{-}reliance/job\text{-}satisfaction}$ is 0.21 and $D_{job\text{-}satisfaction/self\text{-}reliance}$ is 0.16. Based on colum total, 35.05 percent of respondents belonging to the group who are negatively oriented towards self-reliance are satisfied with their job. Likewise based on row total, 79.31 present who are satisfied with their job belong to the category of negative self-reliance. 100 percent of those who are not satisfied in their job belong to the category of negative self-reliance. It may, perhaps be said that the concentration of cases in negative response-

satisfied group is an indicator of the fact that administrators may appraise their self-reliance to be low, but their sense of satisfaction from the job may not be low.

Table 6.27 presents the data on self-confidence and job-satisfaction, based on the assumption that an administrator who has favourable evaluation of his own capacities tends to have satisfaction from the job, because he can influence the behaviour of others positively.

Table 6.27

Administrators' sense of self-confidence and job-satisfaction. (N = 67)

Job-satisfaction (y_1)	Self-Confidence (x_4) Negative	Positive	Total
Satisfied	22.39 (15)	64.18 (43)	86.57 (58)
Not-satisfied	1.49 (1)	11.94 (8)	13.43 (9)
Total	23.88 (16)	76.12 (51)	100.00 (67)

* Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents in each category.

Proportional difference as analysed from Table 6.17 is 0.31 indicating that 31 percent of 67 cases are excessively in the positive direction. "Q" value is -0.47 indicating a moderate negative association between self-confidence and job-satisfaction. However, percentage difference between self-confidence and job-satisfaction is also calculated. $D_{\text{self-confidence/job satisfaction}}$ is -0.15 and $D_{\text{job-satisfaction/self-confidence}}$ is -0.03. Calculating percentage based on column total, 94 percent of those who have unfavourable (negative) self-confidence belong to the category of satisfied group in job-satisfaction level, whereas 94.31 percent of those who have positive self-confidence belong to the category of satisfied group in the job-satisfaction scale. Based on row total, 74.14 percent of those who are satisfied in their job also belong to the category of those who have positive self-confidence, while 80.39 percent of those who are not satisfied in their job belong to the category of those who have positive self-confidence. However, "Q" is not statistically significant ($P > .025$).

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

This chapter makes an attempt to identify the material and non-material constituent factors of job-

satisfaction and to find out the relationship between the factors of job-satisfaction and the scale of job-satisfaction. These two specific objectives were considered important, because, administrators now function in a changed environment which has reoriented the nature and responsibilities of their job.

A. It is revealed from the data collected from the sample studied that administrators are attracted towards their services because their job ensures security. Though administrators do not like their scales of pay, most of them like the security of their job. It may be due to the fact that in a society devoid of any social security and prevalence of large scale unemployment, security of the job is considered highest in the priority.

B. The strongest correlate of job-satisfaction is administrators' perception of authority to cope with responsibility. ("r" is 0.08 which is statistically significant at .025 level).

C. The second correlate of job-satisfaction is the square deal which a person receives from his department ("r" is 0.03 which is statistically significant at .020 level).

D. The third correlate is the administrators' attitude towards staying in the present job. ("r" is

0.68 which is also statistically significant at .025 level).

E. Scope of initiative is also a strong correlate of job-satisfaction. ["g" is 0.60 which is also significant statistically ($P \leqslant .025$)].

F. Another strong correlate of job satisfaction is administrator's sense of achievement. ["g" is 0.55 which is statistically significant ($P \leqslant .025$)].