CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter comprises of information regarding the field of education, characteristics and personality of teachers, their own teaching efficacy, the job satisfaction and the summary of conceptual framework on each factor of big five personality that relates to self efficacy and job satisfaction had discussed.

I.1. INTRODUCTION

“Education is the passport to the future, for tomorrow belongs to those who prepare for it today” – MALCOM

Education is as old as the human race. It is a never-ending process of inner growth and development and its period stretches from the cradle to the grave. Education, in real sense, is to humanize humanity, and to make life progressive, cultured, and civilized. It is very important for the progress of individual and society. (Singh, 2013)¹.

Ukeje (1986)², summed it up when he opined that ‘Education is power’, it is a process of acquiring knowledge and ideas that shape and condition human attitude, actions and achievements; it is a process of developing the child’s moral, physical, emotional and intellectual power for his contribution in social reform; it is the process of mastering the laws of nature and utilizing them effectively for the welfare of the individual and for social reconstruction; it is the art of the utilization of knowledge for complete living. (Singh, 2008)³ enumerated “Education as a purposive, conscious or unconscious, psychological, sociological, scientific and philosophical process, which
brings about the development of the individual to the fullest extent and also the maximum development of society in such a way that both enjoy maximum happiness and prosperity”.

The main aim of education is to gain knowledge; the knowledge is lighted by a human being called “Teacher”. (Kalam and Rajan, 1998)⁴ in their observation “if you are a teacher in whatever capacity you have a very special role to play because more than anybody else you are shaping generations” teaching field is the only way to make students to get step up into the future generation. The keystone in the educational edifice is doubtless teacher. On him/her depends much more than any other, the progress and prosperity of children. Nobody can effectively take his/her place or influence children in the manner and to the degree; it is possible, for him alone to do. It is strongly beliefs that a teacher is to be the member of the holy order.⁵

The American Commission on Teacher Education (1944 – 46)⁶, described “The quality of a nation depends upon the quality of its citizen. The quality of its citizen depends not exclusively, but critical measure upon the quality of their education, the quality of their education depends more than upon any single factor, upon the quality of their teachers”.

Singh (2013)⁷, described Education makes the man develop his thinking and reasoning, problem solving and creativity, intelligence, aptitude, positive sentiments, skills, good values, and attitudes. It is through education that the individual is become a well – balanced personality, aesthetically rich, culturally sound, emotionally stable, mentally alert, morally upright, physically strong, healthy, social efficient, spiritually enlightened, vocationally self – sufficient and internationally liberal.

National Policy on Education (1986)⁸, rightly states that “The status of the teachers reflects the socio-cultural ethos of a society; it is said that no people can rise above the level of its teacher. The government and the community should endeavor to create conditions which will help motive and inspire teachers on constructive and creative lines”. 
The special features of an education are:
- It is both unilateral as well as bi-polar in nature.
- It is a continuous process.
- It is development of particular aspects of human personality or a harmonious integrated growth.
- It is stabilizer of social order, conservator of culture, an instrument of change and social reconstruction. 

**Secondary Education Commission (1952-53)**, says that “we are, however, convinced that most important factors in the contemplated educational reconstruction is the teacher, his personal qualities, and his educational qualification. His personal training and the place that he occupies in the school or college as well as in the community is upheld. The reputation of a school or a college and its influence on the life of the community, invariably depends on the kind of teachers working in it”. *(Education Commission, 1964 – 66)* rightly says that “of all the different factors, which influence the quality of education and its contribution to national development, the quality competence and character of teachers are undoubtedly the most significant”.

**Srihari (2007)**, stated that the teacher occupies a vital role of play in our effort to relate the education to national development and social change. It is the responsibility of the teacher to guide and inspire his/her students, to enrich discipline and to inculcate value, which are in consonance with our cultural heritage and our social objectives. Education is not merely the transfer of information but overall development of human personality. As it is mentioned in *(Indian Education Commission, 1966)* describes teacher as one of the most important factors contributing to the national development. Teacher is the pivot around which all the educational programmes, such as curriculum, syllabus, textbooks, evaluation, etc., rotate. The best system of education may fails to achieve the desire ends in the absence of sincere, competent and professionally aware teachers.
In the field of education measuring the job satisfaction of teachers has become a prime focus of attention for researchers to make it a dynamic and efficient one. The job satisfaction of teachers particularly at the high school level is much more important.

1.2. JOB SATISFACTION

“Job satisfaction is a combination of two words ‘Job’ and ‘Satisfaction’. A ‘job’ is a “complex interrelationship of tasks, roles, responsibilities, interactions, incentives and rewards”, while satisfaction refers to fulfilment of a need or desire.”

Rani and Choudhary, (2012)\(^{14}\)

Lambert et al. (1999)\(^{15}\), stated job satisfaction is a favourableness or unfavourableness with which a teacher can view about their work. Job satisfaction is the fulfilment or gratification of certain needs that are associated with one’s work.

The term job satisfaction was brought to lime light by Hoppock he reviewed 32 studies on job satisfaction conducted prior to 1933. Even though the definition of (Hoppock’s, 1935)\(^{16}\) Job satisfaction was old, most of the people still cited this concept, he says job satisfaction as “any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person to truthfully say, ‘I am satisfied with my job’”.

Harpaz (1983)\(^{17}\), emphasized that job satisfaction has been defined in numerous ways. He reported that “authors use the term ‘job satisfaction’ ‘job attitudes’ ‘morale’ and ‘organizational climate’ interchangeably”.

Telman and Unsal (2004)\(^{18}\), recognized that the factors affecting job satisfaction into internal, external and personal. Internal factors include characteristics related to the basic nature of work. External factors are the conditions such as physical work, promotion conditions, relationships with superiors and co workers, creativity, job security, organizational structure and culture. Personal factors include factors such as demographic characteristics (gender, age, length of service, educational level etc.), personality traits and incentive, knowledge and skills.
Locke (1976)\textsuperscript{19}, stated, “job satisfaction may be defined as involving cognitive, affective and evaluative reactions or attitudes and states it is (for the present) as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience.” (Evans, 1997)\textsuperscript{20} defined job satisfaction from a more need-oriented perspective. According to her, job satisfaction is “a state of mind determined by the extent to which the individual perceives his/her job related needs to be met”.

Zembylas and Papanastasious (2004)\textsuperscript{21}, explained, job satisfaction as a teacher professional relation to their teaching role. This purpose of this relationship is to get involved in the process of teaching and get maximum from teaching. Job satisfaction is the level to which people like and satisfied from their jobs. If someone has no grievances about the job or is comfortable whatever one is receiving from job, one can say he/she is satisfied with his/her job. (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951)\textsuperscript{22} stated that job satisfaction refers to the individual’s attitude (feeling) towards his work. Ultimately every individual person has their own characteristics (Personality) that are changeable time and from one situation to another.

First of all, the concept of job satisfaction has been described in various ways by a number of researchers.

Lawler (1973)\textsuperscript{23}, states that “Overall job satisfaction is determined by the difference between all those things a person feels he should receive from his job and all those things he actually does receive”

I.3. DISSATISFACTION OF TEACHERS

Locke (1969)\textsuperscript{24}, described job dissatisfaction is the un-pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as frustrating or blocking the attainment of one’s job values or as entailing disvalues. Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one’s job and what one perceives it as offerings or entailing. (Jarsaniya, 2013)\textsuperscript{25} explained dissatisfaction with one’s job may have especially volatile spillover effects. For
instance, people feel bad about many other things such as family life, leisure activities, sometimes even life itself. Many unresolved personality problems and maladjustment arise out of a person’s inability to find satisfaction in his work. Both scientific study and casual observation provide ample evidence that job satisfaction is important for the psychological adjustment and happy living of an individual.

Dawes (2004)\(^{26}\), stated job satisfaction as a psychological construct by as having two constituents: A cognitive component (the perception that one’s needs are being fulfilled) and an affective component (the feeling that accompanies the cognition).

I.4. DIMENSIONS OF JOB SATISFACTION:

Luthans (1998)\(^{27}\), enumerated three important dimensions of job satisfaction which are as follows:

1. Job satisfaction is an emotional response to a job situation. As such, it cannot be seen, it can only be inferred.

2. Job satisfaction is often determined by how well outcomes meet or exceed expectations. For instance, if employees feel that they are working much harder than others in the department but are receiving fewer rewards they will probably have negative attitudes towards the work, the boss and/or co-workers. On the other hand, if they feel they are being treated very well and are being paid equitably, they are likely to have positive attitudes towards the job.

3. Job satisfaction represents several related attitudes which are: the work itself, pay, promotion opportunities, supervision and co-workers.

Luthans (1995)\(^{28}\), stated the workers of Smith, Kendall, and Hullin they suggested that there are five job dimensions that represents the most important characteristic of a job about which people have affective response. These are given below:
1. The work itself: the extent to which the job provides the individual with interesting tasks, opportunities for learning, and the chance to accept responsibility.
2. Pay: the amount of financial remuneration that is received and the degree to which this is viewed as equitable vis-à-vis that of others in the organization.
3. Promotion opportunities: the chance for advancement in the hierarchy.
4. Supervision: the abilities of the supervisor to provide technical assistance and behavioural support.
5. Co-workers: the degree to which fellow workers are technically proficient and socially supportive.

1.5. THEORIES OF JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction theories are fall into two categories:

1. Content theorists: Maslow’s (1954) need hierarchy theory and Herzberg’s motivator – hygiene theories (Herzberg, 1966) are examples of content theories and;

1.5.1. CONTENT THEORIES:

i. Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory: (Maslow, 1954) stated views of individual needs, job satisfaction is said to exist when an individual’s needs are met by the job and its environment. The hierarchy of needs focuses on five categories of needs arranged in ascending order of importance. Physiological, safety, belongingness and love are the lower-level needs in the hierarchy. The higher-level needs are esteem and self-actualization. When one need is satisfied, another higher-level need emerges and motivates the person to do something to satisfy it. A satisfied need is no longer a motivator. (Whaba and Bridwell, 1976) in his study viewed an extensive review of the research findings on the need hierarchy concept. The results of their review indicate that there was no clear evidence showing that human needs are classified into five categories, or that these categories are structured in a special hierarchy. Even
though hardly any research evidence was discovered in support of the theory, it enjoys wide acceptance.

ii. Herzberg’s Motivator-Hygiene Theory: To (Herzberg, 1966) the concept of job satisfaction has two dimensions, namely intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors are also known as motivators or satisfiers, and extrinsic factors as hygiene, dis-satisfier, or maintenance factors.

1. The motivators relate to job content (work itself) and include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement. Motivators are related to job satisfaction when present but not to dissatisfaction when absent.

2. The hygiene relates to job context(work environment) and involve, for example, company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions and are associated with job dissatisfaction when absent but not with satisfaction when present the emergence of the motivator-hygiene theory.

Iiacqua et al. (1995), Research based on the motivators or hygiene theory should apply different scales for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction because the opposite of job satisfaction is no job satisfaction and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction. Only single scales had been used to measure the job satisfaction. Scores on the high level reflects the high level of job satisfaction, whereas scores on the low end represented high dissatisfaction on the scale.

Intrinsic Factors

A) Achievement: is referred as the potential of the individual to tackle any sorts of problem related to work. Which means has the capacity to do the work effectively?

B) Recognition: means irrespective of the people around, be it the immediate boss or the colleagues, the individual is always praised for the assistance rendered at work effectively. The individual is appreciated by all and sundry at the work place.
C) **Responsibility**: means the responsible shouldered by the individual at work and the satisfaction derived through it in terms of decision making and supervision.

D) **The work itself**: means the satisfaction derived from the job through the intrinsic aspects. *Herzberg et al. (1959)* also identified work itself as a factor that can positively impact job satisfaction. He also defined work itself as “The actual doing of the job or the tasks of the job as a source of good or bad feelings about it”.

E) **Advancement**: means getting promoted to the next level of the job in the organization.

**Extrinsic Factors**

A) **Salary and advancement**: at the end of the day it’s the salary that matters to the worker, if the salary is not satisfactory, it can lead to dissatisfaction and the opportunity that the worker gets to climb the career ladder can also prove futile if the worker remains stagnant in one position.

B) **Supervision**: the leadership style of the manager is accountable to dissatisfaction too.

C) **Company policy and administration**: are the house of the management and the administration of the company. The climate of the organization and the communication style are accountable.

D) **Interpersonal relation**: the relationship among the workers and the tempo of the relationship between the colleagues.

E) **Job security**: it’s the permanence of the job and the company.

F) **Working conditions**: means the place physical attributes of the work place, including the materials available to make the work easier.

**1.5.2. PROCESS THEORIES**

(a) Equity theory Developed by J. Stacy *(Adams, 1965)*, equity theory stated that workers compared how hard they were working with the compensation they received for that work, and developed either satisfaction or dissatisfaction for their work. The important aspect of this theory was that if inequity was perceived, the worker became
dissatisfied which resulted in minimal productivity, tension in the workplace, and a decrease in morale (Beck, 1990). (b) Vroom’s Expectancy theory (Vroom’s, 1982). Equity theory was based upon three main assumptions. First, that people develop beliefs about what constitutes a fair and equitable return for their contributions for their jobs. Secondly, equity theory assumes that people tend to compare what they perceive co-workers have their employers. Thirdly, equity theory holds that when people believe that their own treatment is not equitable, relative to the exchange they perceive others to be making, and they will be motivated to do something about the inequity.

I.6. BIG FIVE FACTOR MODEL OF PERSONALITY

“Personality is the set of psychological traits and mechanisms within the individual that are organized and relatively enduring and that influence his or her interactions with, and adaptations to, the intrapsychic, physical and social environments”

(Larsen and Buss, 2005)

A comprehensive definition of personality is given by Luthans (2008), in his words “Personality means how a person affects others and how he understands and views himself as well as the pattern of inner and outer measurable traits, and the person situation interaction”. These definitions denote the following characteristics of personality:

1. Personality represents certain unique and distinctive traits of the person.
2. Personality is often seen as the habit of the person and it translates into action and behaviour in organizations in response to situations, to other people and to the policies and procedures.

Robbins et al. (2010), has described personality as “the sum total of the ways in which an individual reacts to and interacts with others. It is most often described in terms of measurable traits a person exhibits”.

Job Satisfaction and Big Five Factor Model of Personality
[A Study of Trained Graduate Teachers of Government and Private Schools in Puducherry and Karaikal Region]
Gupta and Joshi (2009)\textsuperscript{42}, emphasised Personality is one of the major psychological factors affecting the human behavior. The word personality is generally used whenever we talk about a person’s job prospects, achievements, marriage and other similar occasions. The study considers look at the concept of personality in a narrow sense as it implies a person’s smartness, charm, dress sense, popularity, physical attractiveness, body language etc. (Allport, 1961)\textsuperscript{43} described personality as “a dynamic organization within the individual of those psychological systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment”. According to (Eysenck, 1971)\textsuperscript{44}, “personality’ is the more or less stable and enduring organization of a person’s character, temperament, intellect and physique which determine his unique adjustment to the environment”.

Khurshid (2011)\textsuperscript{45}, described the concept of personality is a programmatic mechanism for describing, explaining and understanding of human behavior. Personality is a set of traits and behaviours that characterizes an individual. Every individual is unique, is the sense that no two people are exactly alike in terms of temperament, behavior and preferences. Even the same individual does not behave in an identical way in all situations. The same person behaves differently in different situations. Although every individual is unique and not completely consistent during different situations, still there are considerable commonalities in the human behavior, many people showing similar patterns of behavior in similar situations.

I.7. TRAITS THEORIES:

Trait theory is quantitative and refers to measurement of psychological characteristics called traits. According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association, says personality traits are “enduring patterns of perceiving, relating to, and thinking about the environment and oneself that are exhibited in a wide range of social and personal contexts.”\textsuperscript{46}

1.7.1. GORDON ALLPORT (1897 – 1967)\textsuperscript{47}

Allport (1936)\textsuperscript{48}, is known as a “trait” psychologist. One of his early projects was to go through the dictionary and locate every term that he thought could describe
a person. From this, he developed a list of 4500 traits like words. He organized these into three levels of traits.

1. Cardinal trait: this is the trait that dominates and shapes a person’s behavior. These are the ruling passions/obsessions, such as a need for money, fame etc.

2. Central trait: this is a general characteristic found in some degree in every person. These are the basic building blocks that shape most of our behavior although they are not as overwhelming as cardinal traits. An example of a central trait would be honest.

3. Secondary trait: these are characteristics seen only in certain circumstances (such as particular likes or dislikes that a very close friend may know). They must be included to provide a complete picture of human complexity.

I.7.2. RAYMOND CATTELL (1905 – 1988)

Trait theorist Raymond Cattell reduced the number of main personality traits from Allport’s initial list of over 4000 down to 171, mostly by eliminating uncommon traits and combining common characteristics.

Cattell (1965), believed it necessary to sample a wide range of variables to capture a full understanding of personality. The first type of data was life data, which involves collecting information from an individual’s natural everyday life behaviours. Experimental data involves measuring reactions to standardised experimental situations, and questionnaire data involves gathering responses based on introspection by an individual about his or her own behavior and feelings. Using a statistical technique known as factor analysis, he identified closely related terms and eventually reduced his list to just 16 traits are the source of all human personality traits abstractedness, warmth, apprehension, emotional stability, liveliness, openness to change, perfectionism, intelligence, rule consciousness, tension, sensitivity, social boldness, self – reliance, vigilance and dominance.
I.7.3. HANS EYSENCK (1961 – 1997)\textsuperscript{51}

British psychologist Eysenck (1992)\textsuperscript{52}, developed a model of personality based upon just three universal traits:

1. Introversion / Extraversion:
   Introversion involves directing attention on inner experiences, while extraversion relates to focusing attention outward on other people and the environment. So, a person high in introversion might be quiet and reserved, while an individual high in extraversion might be social and outgoing.

2. Neuroticism/Emotional stability:
   This dimension of Eysenck’s trait theory is related to moodiness versus even temperedness. Neuroticism refers to an individual’s tendency to become upset or emotional, while stability refers to the tendency to remain emotionally constant.

3. Psychoticism:
   Later, after studying individuals suffering from mental illness, Eysenck added a personality dimension he called psychoticism to his trait theory. Individuals who are high on this trait tend to have difficulty dealing with reality and may be antisocial, hostile, non-empathetic and manipulative.

Goldberg (1990)\textsuperscript{53}, started his own lexical project, independently found the five factor once again and gradually brought them back to the attention of psychologists. He coined the term “\textbf{Big Five}” for the factors. (Digman, 1990)\textsuperscript{54} gave names for these factors that were intended to indicate their meanings in a concise manner; these names, with single letter abbreviations for them, are as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item I. Extraversion/introversion, or Surgency…..E
  \item II. Friendliness/hostility, or Agreeableness…A
  \item III. Conscientiousness, or will………………..C
  \item IV. Neuroticism/Emotional Stability
  (or Emotional Stability…………………..N
  \item V. Intellect (or Openness)…………………..O
\end{itemize}
“N, E, O, A, and C are not inventions of Western Psychologists; they are part of human nature - dimensions of enduring dispositions that somehow find expression in every culture.” – ROBER R. McCRAE.

### Table 1: NEO PI R Facet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIG FIVE FACTOR</th>
<th>FACET (and correlated trait adjective)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion vs. Introversion</td>
<td>Gregariousness (sociable), assertiveness (forceful), activity (energetic), excitement-seeking (adventurous), positive emotions (enthusiastic) warmth (outgoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness vs. Antagonism</td>
<td>Trust (forgiving), straightforwardness (not demanding), altruism (warm), compliance (not stubborn), modesty (not how-off), tender-mindedness (sympathetic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness vs. Lack of direction</td>
<td>Competence (efficient), order (organized), dutifulness (not careless), achievement striving (thorough), self-discipline (not lazy), deliberation (not impulsive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism vs. Emotional Stability</td>
<td>Anxiety (tense), angry hostility (irritable), depression (not contented), self-consciousness (shy), impulsiveness (moody), vulnerability (not self-confident)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness vs. closedness to Experience</td>
<td>Ideas (curious), fantasy (imaginative), aesthetics (artistic), actions (wide interests), feelings (excitable), values (unconventional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Costa and McCrae’s (1992) NEO PI-R Facets

Wiggins (1996), examine the big five factor structure:

1. “The big five personality factors appear to provide a set of highly replicable dimensions that parsimoniously and comprehensively describe most phenotypic individual differences.

2. Given the variety of conceivable exclusion criteria for defining personality attributes, the big five are meaningful at all levels, but more comprehensive and parsimonious under narrower definitions of personality.
3. The big five factors are not necessarily of equal importance and reliability.

4. The big five do not form tight and discrete clusters of variables; rather, as a general rule, each factor represents a major concentration distribution of attributes in descriptive space.

5. A complete taxonomy of personality attributes must include both horizontal and vertical features of their meanings.

6. Rather than the final chapter of personality research, the big five is but an important beginning.

7. As a representation of phenotypes based on the natural language, the big five structure is indifferent and thus complementary to genotypic representations of causes, motivations and internal personality dynamic.

I.8. SELF-EFFICACY

“Teacher efficacy, ‘teacher’s self-efficacy’, or ‘teacher’s self efficacy’, is defined as ‘the teacher’s belief in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplishing a specific teaching task in a particular context”

- Moran and Hoy, (2001)\(^{57}\)

An eminent belief regarded as one of the most influential elements on teacher and student outcomes is ‘teachers’ self-efficacy’. The formation of theoretical foundation of self-efficacy is found in social cognitive theory, developed by a well-known Stanford professor Bandura, (1977)\(^ {58}\). His aspirations about self-efficacy were grand, as reflected in the article titled “self-efficacy: towards a unifying theory of behavioural change”. In this seminal work, bandura defined self-efficacy as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainment”. \(^ {59}\)

Bandura (1997)\(^ {60}\), claimed self-efficacy has a significant role in human functions. He stated “people’s perceptions of their efficacy influence the types of anticipatory scenarios that they construct and reiterate”. That is the reason why
individuals functioning can be estimated by the beliefs about their abilities rather than by what they are truly capable of doing, in fact these beliefs can help to decide what individuals can do with their knowledge and skills. (Pajares, 1992) postulated that “beliefs are formed early and tend to self-perpetuate; the earlier a belief is incorporated into the belief structure, the more difficult it is to alter”.

Bandura (1986), emphasised, social cognitive theory is rooted in a view of human agency in which individuals are agents proactively engaged in their own development and can make things happen by their actions. Key to this sense of agency is the fact that, among other personal factors, individuals possess self-beliefs that enable them to exercise a measure of control over their thoughts, feelings and actions that “what people think, believe, and feel affects how they behave”.

Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2007), stated, self-efficacy can also be described as the belief in the ability to “plan, organize, and carry out activities required to attain given educational goals”. (Bandura, 1997) observed the expectations of personal self-efficacy in teachers “will determine whether or not coping behavior will be initiated, how much effort will be expanded, and how long it will be sustained in the face of obstacles and adverse circumstances”.

I.9. TEACHERS WITH HIGH AND LOW SELF-EFFICACY

Bandura (2006), argued, individuals with high-efficacy are competent to heighten their fulfillment and are more self organizing, proactive, and self-regulating. (Coladarchi, 1992; Moran and Hoy, 2001) observed a teacher with self-efficacy tends to exhibit greater levels of enthusiasm, be more open to new ideas, more willing to try a variety of methods to better meet the needs of their students, and more devoted to teaching. And they would tend to be less judgmental of students and work longer with a student who is struggling.

Godard and Godard (2001), stated teachers’ high level of self-efficacy shows open-mindedness, having high communication skills, cooperative working desire, willingness to learn, plan and harmony, patient, tolerant, gentle and wise manner of teachers. (Fabio and Palazzeschi, 2008) argued teachers who have high
feelings of self-efficacy “emphasise the value of individual differences, enhance group competencies”

**Gibson and Dembo (1984)** 69 observed that teachers with a low sense of teaching efficacy believe that there is little they can do to teach unmotivated students since their success is due to the external environment. **(Bandura, 1986)** 70 state that “people who hold a low view of themselves will credit their achievements to external factors, rather than to their own capability. “Teacher with a lower sense of self efficacy are more “critical of students who make errors, work less with students who struggle, and are more likely to refer a difficult student for special education services.”(Corkett et al. 2011) 71

I.10. SELF EFFICACY BELIEFS

Self-efficacy beliefs are conceived as the most central and pervasive mechanism of human agency in social cognitive theory. In relation to this, **(Bandura, 2006)** 72 stated: “Among the mechanisms of human agency, none is more central or pervasive than belief of personal efficacy. This core belief is the foundation of human agency. Unless people believe they can produce desired effects by their actions, they have little incentive to act, or to preserve in the face of difficulties. Whatever other factors serve as guides and motivators, they are rooted in the core belief than one has the power to effect changes by one’s actions.” How people behave can often be better predicted by the beliefs that hold their capabilities than by what they are actually capable of accomplishing, for these self-efficacy perceptions help determine what individuals do with the knowledge and skills they have73.

**Bandura (1989)** 74, mentioned that “Persons are neither autonomous agents nor simply mechanical conveyors of animating environmental influences. Rather, they make casual contribution to their own motivation and action within a system of triadic reciprocal causation”. There are four sources of self-efficacy formation that can also be applied to a collective self-efficacies are given below.

(1) Master experience teachers thrive when they succeed and are limited and bothered when they fail.
(2) Vicarious teachers do not solely gather their feelings of self-efficacy from themselves, but from the stories of those around them.

(3) Social persuasion talks, professional development, positive feedback, and a feeling of closeness with the staff can persuade people to feel more efficacious in teaching and

(4) Effective states efficacious faulty can react in a more positive way to very stressful situations. (Gooard et al. 2000)

Pajares (1997), explains that using social cognitive theory as a framework teachers can work to improve their students’ emotional states and to correct their faulty self-beliefs and habits of thinking (personal factors), improve their academic skills and self-regulatory practices (behaviour), and alter the school and classroom structures that may work to undermine student success (environmental factors).

Notion of triadic reciprocity posits that personal factors, behaviours and environmental events all operate as interacting determinants that influence one another bidirectionally (Bandura, 1986) as shown in figure 1.

Bandura’s representation of the triadic reciprocal relationship between behavioural, personal and environmental factors in human functioning

\[
\text{BEHAVIOUR} \\
\text{PERSONAL FACTORS} \quad \text{ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS}
\]

Bandura (1997) situates human beliefs within a context in which they are of equal importance environmental influences and behavioural outcomes. Behavior, therefore, becomes a result of the dynamics that occur between self-beliefs (personal factors such as cognitive, affective and biological events) and environmental events. Self-efficacy becomes an important component of social cognitive theory, specifically the notion of triadic reciprocity as beliefs about one’s capabilities are likely to inform
and impact the interplay between the elements of the triad. Bandura refers to the
control one has over influencing environmental and behavioural outcomes as human
agency.

Zimmerman and Cleary (2006)\(^79\), named four main features of self-efficacy:

1. It focuses on proposed abilities to perform a task rather than on behavior or
   psychological characters. In fact self-efficacy deals with “how well can I do
   something?” rather than “what am I like?”
2. Self-efficacy beliefs are domain-specific, and activity specific. In context-
specific, for example an individual may show a low self-efficacy for learning
   math in a competitive classroom context than in cooperative class. Though,
   self-efficacy is multidimensional and changes across particular activities
   within specific domain.
3. Self-efficacy depends on mastery norm performance rather than normative or
   other measures. That is students beliefs about their skillfulness in doing a
   specific task such as writing as essay is measured and this gives no idea about
   comparing them with their peers ability in essay writing.
4. As a final point, judgment about self-efficacy is done before really doing the
   task.

Bandura (1994)\(^80\), enumerates self efficacy as “people’s beliefs about their
capabilities to produce designed levels of performance that exercise influence over
events that affect their lives”. (Moran and Hoy, 2001)\(^81\) asserted that teacher efficacy
is “powerfully related to many meaningful educational outcomes such as teacher
persistence, enthusiasm, commitment and instructional behaviour, as well as student
outcomes such as achievement, motivation, and self-efficacy beliefs.”

Moran and Hoy (2001)\(^82\), changed the name of the Ohio state teacher efficacy
scale to the Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES). He stated that this instrument is
superior to previous measures of teacher efficacy in that it has a unified and stable
factor structure and assesses a broad range of capabilities that teachers consider
important to good teaching, without being so specific as to render it useless for
comparisons of teachers across contexts, levels and subjects.
I.11. TYPES OF SELF-EFFICACY

There are four types of teachers’ self efficacy, which play a key role in a teacher’s way of teaching and his/her willingness to persist even when things in class are not so easy. The types of teachers’ self efficacy are the following:

a) Behavioural self efficacy
b) Cognitive self-efficacy
c) Emotional self-efficacy
d) Cultural self-efficacy

(a) Behavioural self-efficacy explains the degree of a teacher’s beliefs in his/her efficacy to execute specific actions in order to handle specific teaching situations.

(b) Cognitive self-efficacy describes a teacher’s personal estimation of his/her capability to regulate over his/her thing during the teaching action.

(c) Emotional self-efficacy refers to a teachers’ belief in his/her ability to manage their own emotions in a particular teaching context. Last, but not least,

(d) Cultural self-efficacy is about a teacher’s personal expectations of being effective in specific situations in culturally appropriate teaching ways (Gibbs, 2003).

I.12. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Locke (1976), enumerated “personality is one among the many factors that act as a source of job satisfaction”. (Schneider and Dachler, 1978) noted that job satisfaction seemed very stable overtime, and they speculated that it might be the product of personality traits. (Furnham and Zacherl, 1986) described the relationship between personality and job satisfaction measured by a multi-dimensional scale, showed that psychoticism and neuroticism negatively correlated while extraversion positively correlated with job satisfaction. Employees with the high neuroticism scores tended to be less satisfied with the amount of work, their co-workers and their pay, while employees with high psychoticism (tough-minded) tend to be less satisfied with their supervisors, the nature of work and their co-workers than with low psychoticism (tender-minded) scores. People with high extraversion scores, on the other hand, positively correlated with all sub dimensions of satisfaction.
(McCrae and Costa, 1991)\(^87\) pointed-out that there is a positive relationship between extraversion and job satisfaction. Further, people with high extraversion scores correlated positively with all sub dimensions of job satisfaction.

Organ and Lingl (1995)\(^88\), investigated that there is a positive relationship between conscientiousness and job satisfaction. While the conscientiousness represents a general work involvement tendency and thus leads to a greater likelihood of obtaining satisfying work rewards, both formal (e.g., pay, promotions) and informal (e.g., recognition, respect, feelings of personal accomplishment) it should be related to job satisfaction.

Rhodes and Hammer (2000)\(^89\), argued that agreeableness is a reliable predictor of job satisfaction and people with personality similarities have better relationships. Furthermore, they measured the similarity of supervisors and subordinates using agreeableness. They compared these similarities to job satisfaction. They found that job satisfaction tends to increase when agreeableness similarity between supervisor and subordinate increase. (Lavanda, 2013)\(^90\) demonstrated that there is a positive impact from an individual personality on job satisfaction. (Lounsbury et al., 2007)\(^91\) examined personality traits in relation to job satisfaction. They found openness and extraversion to be significantly related to job satisfaction.

Judge and Ilis (2002)\(^92\), observed that self-efficacy relates negatively to neuroticism, and relates positively to extraversion, openness and conscientiousness and a non-systematic relation with agreeableness.

**Figure: 2**

![Diagram showing the relationship between job satisfaction and personality traits](image-url)
Larson and Borgn (2006), argued the relationship between Personality and Self-efficacy. They presume that “Personality is a driver of the acquisition of self-efficacy that it, that most personality development precedes the development of vocational self-efficacy.

Hartman and Betz (2007), has found that within the five factors, conscientiousness and extraversion were the two factors that were positively associated with many areas of occupational self-efficacy, while neuroticism had a negative association with these scales. Agreeableness had no significant relationship with self-efficacy. (Larson et al. 2007) further explain social career theory by stating personality, along with contextual affordances, influences learning experiences, which in turn influence self-efficacy and outcome expectations.

Self-efficacy and outcome expectations then impact the development of interests, which in turn influence choice goals and, subsequently, choice actions. In general, studies on self-efficacy have shown its impact on achievement and motivation (Gibson and Dembo, 1984) commitment to teaching (Coladarci, 1992) teachers’ adoption of innovation (Gusky, 1988) classroom management and control strategies (Woolfolk and Hoy, 1990) and personal characteristics such as gender grad level taught and experience (Ghaith and Shaaban, 1999).

Teachers’ job satisfaction and self-efficacy have a strong positive relationship. They supported that teacher’s autonomy, good interpersonal relations between teachers and parents and high time pressure were the most important factors that influence teachers’ job satisfaction (Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2010).

Soni (2003), noted that the employees who are more stable and introverted tend to be more satisfied with achievement, independence as well as human and technical supervision at the work place. It has also been established that extraverted and sociable individuals in the organization are less satisfied with human supervision. Apart from few results, most of the researchers noted significant positive relationship between extraversion and job satisfaction. (Senler and Sungur, 2010) have found that teachers using instruction strategies effectively could manage classroom at higher
levels and engage all students in learning. (Caprara et al., 2006) different studies have confirmed that teachers’ sense of efficacy plays a decisive role in protracting their job satisfaction.

Akomolafe and Ogunmakin (2014) in his study revealed that a significant relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. As the authors explain, self-efficacy ultimately determines how an individual behaves, thinks and becomes motivated to be involved in a particular task. For this reason, individuals with high self-efficacy tend to behave more positively, think more creatively which also interacts with motivation. Consequently, such teachers are relatively more satisfied with their jobs. Another possible reason for this finding is that individuals with high level of self-efficacy have the ability to effectively handle various tasks, obligations and challenges related to their professional role. Therefore, it is not surprising that a significant positive relationship was found between self-efficacy and job satisfaction among teachers.

Rahman et al. (2014), stated that self-efficacy is positively associated with job satisfaction it implies that self-efficacy is a virtue in carrying out the work successfully, influenced individual’s thought and behaviour in decision making.

The next chapter gives information regarding the review of literature.
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