

# Relationship of Social Self-Efficacy and Worker's Job Satisfaction

Homa Khorasani Esmaeili\*, Mohd Taib Hashim

International business school (IBS), University Technology Malaysia (UTM), 54100 Malaysia

\*E-mail: Homa\_kh\_79@yahoo.com

## Abstract

Social Self-efficacy is as a significant contribution to an organization's long-term success which has emerged as significant antecedents of organization job satisfaction. Privatized organizations are obligated to social self-efficacy as the fundamental philosophy for their development and increase worker job satisfaction. Social Self-efficacy has to be coordinated with work satisfaction in order that accomplish the organization's mission. The following paper explains the relationship between social self-efficacy and work satisfaction through investigating relevant theories and past studies. The outcomes must lead managers to take into consideration the significant of emphasizing that training social self-efficacy can lead to improve job satisfaction and therefore organization's prosperity. The present study aims to deepen the role of social self-efficacy on worker's job satisfaction. Training in social self-efficacy can lead to higher job satisfaction and open the way to further research and have implications for training and talent management.

**Keywords:** Social self-efficacy, Workers' job satisfaction, Privatized organizations

## 1. Introduction

Worker's requirements in today's global marketplace, globalization, technological innovations, outsourcing and privatization, have made change the way in which businesses operate. Greater number of organizations strives in order to reducing worker's turnover, improvement productivity and also to assist organization's prosperity with spending greater time on worker's satisfaction (Atchison, 1998). On top of that, another investigating concerning to workers' satisfaction has remarked on absence from work and turnover intention, has taken out of organization's worker's job dissatisfaction (Mobley et al., 1979). Therefore, the research support this subject of the study that due to fact of the physical and mental well-being of workers, has become very popular and important in organizations (Hoole and Vermeulen, 2003). Hence, this phenomenon is pertinent to private organizations and public sector, whereas the greater number of the researches have been conducted for the public sector.

Employees with low level of work satisfaction are result undesirable behaviors (Camp, 1994). Dissatisfied workers may, would like either to employing during the work time, other personal duties and robbing the organization's resources or they go moonlighting. Workers may be withdrawing psychologically from the work, they demonstrate clearly unprofessional acts such as skipping meetings, wandering around pretending to be busy or drinking on the work. Eventually the workers that are dissatisfied from their work may either guide behaviors to change the work situation or work transfer as well (Mattila, 2006). Workers disposed to be not satisfied, and are probably not happy with the most aspects of their lives comprising their job (Ilies and Judge, 2003).

According to Locke (1976) a classic definition of job satisfaction is consistent as an emotional state. Scholars strived to capture the affective dispositions basic job satisfaction with enormous diversity of personality measures. Work attitudes are not only the product of situational factors, but also both literature and practitioners should more take into account through the variables which may contribute to the value with the purpose of enhancing satisfaction of work (Ilies and Judge, 2003). As pool (1997) asserted that job satisfaction of workers pertain to cognitive, expressing emotion and evaluative reactions in the direction of their work. From the cognitive of viewpoint, job satisfaction illustrates cognitive attitudes of employees concerning their works which it comes from perceptions of individuals of their works or workers job fit with organizations (O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986).

Moreover Robbins (2005) presumes that, the directors have as property of the moral of humanism and responsibility to dispose in advance, the workers with challenging, compensation and satisfying jobs. Obligation Knowing workers' requirements and improving their satisfaction of work is needed due to greater comprehension of employees' wants and in addition affect long term on profitability and prosperity of organizations. Understanding the factors which contribute and cause to achieving workers to job satisfaction, may be conducted to a suitable and correct planning of organization and also improve favorable and positive behavior among employees (Seta et al., 2000).

Clearly, the researchers have concentrated mainly as antecedents, on contextual and demographic factors rather than psychological features (Goldberg and Waldman, 2000, Steel et al., 2007). Moreover, Social self-efficacy, as a self-efficacy facet, depicts among psychological features as an important antecedent of job satisfaction (Borgogni et al., 2012), due to the fact that it is a process of key self-regulatory which affects directly on behavior and also through its effect on factors like for instance affective behaviors, comprehension of

relationships and barriers. Furthermore, studies have indicated that one of the important factors which positively have affected on job satisfaction is self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997, Judge and Bono, 2001, Borgogni et al., 2012). Moreover, it needs to perceive the time frame in which self-efficacious workers shape their social context, and how long it takes to develop high P-O (Person-Organization) fit and job satisfaction (Borgogni et al., 2012).

Social self-efficacy is a specific application of self-efficacy theory. Perceived self-efficacy is the belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments (Bandura, 1997, Wood and Olivier, 2006). Therefore, workers' job satisfaction by massive authors has been proved which its role has an underlying influence on productivity towards organization's profit and prosperity especially in private organizations.

In looking at affective attitudes toward job satisfaction, researchers have defined job satisfaction as an emotional response to one's job, or an employee's state of emotion and affective responses to specific aspects of their job (Kreitner and Kinicki, 1992). The social self-efficacy's role on workers' job satisfaction is therefore crucial to sustained and survival organization. Nevertheless, there is a lack of research investigating the role of social self-efficacy on job satisfaction in private sectors. Consistent with social cognitive theory, self-efficacy is likely to act as a factor that boosts job satisfaction. In fact, people high in self-efficacy proactively shape their work environment, managing problematic situations with colleagues and dealing effectively with the emotions elicited in the workplace (Judge and Bono, 2001).

This paper attempts to cover the lack of research investigating the role of social self-efficacy in its relation to employees' workplace satisfaction in privatized organizations. In this regard, the present study focuses on psychological characteristic which are supported by previous studies to propose the level of job satisfaction. Few researches have been done considering the relation of social self-efficacy and its influences on workers' job satisfaction. Hence, the contribution is to consider the role of individual and psychological characteristic which involve social self-efficacy on employees job satisfaction in private sectors. This paper encompasses parts including introduction, reviewing previous studies, discussion and finally conclusion.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Workers Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a positive feeling one gets and can personally identify with from a job, after appraising the job experiences (Locke, 1976). This disposition towards work is hence essentially within the work environment, including the job and organizational characteristics, and as well their interaction with worker characteristics (Rousseau, 1978). In conceptualizing job satisfaction, some consider certain aspects of the job to form a basis for it (Rice et al., 1989), and other based it on complete or whole satisfaction (Levin and Stokes, 1989), while some others have based conceptualizations on the intrinsic-extrinsic differences or distinctions (Naumann, 1993). Monetary compensation is a major explanatory variable among others for job satisfaction (Kalleberg, 1977). A study of managers in the public sector by Taylor and West (1992) revealed that the public employees, who compare their incomes with employees in the private sector, derived lower job satisfaction levels, thus making a conclusion of the effect pay levels have on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction level has also been noted to be consistently affected by the characteristics of job. Hackman and Lawler, (1971) identified that the levels of job satisfaction is higher in those workers with high skill variety, autonomous, feedback, and job significant tasks than in those who perform tasks that possess little of these characteristics (Hackman and Lawler, 1971). Self-expression in a job setting is found to have a positive relationship with job satisfaction (Voydanoff, 1980).

**Table1:** The reasons to focus on workers job satisfaction

There are reasons why managers must focus on the job satisfaction of its workers: (Alavi and Askaripur, 2003)	
1.	Evidence suggests that unsatisfied individuals leave organizations.
2.	Satisfied workers are in better health and have longer life expectancy. Further maintain that a lack of job satisfaction has been associated with symptoms like anxiety, depression and poor physical and psychological health, which have concomitant consequences for absenteeism and commitment (Connolly and Myers, 2003).
3.	Job satisfaction in the workplace also affects individuals' private lives which in turn has an effect on absenteeism and other important work-related attitudes and behavior.

Over the years, job satisfaction attitude has attracted a major concentration. (Atchison and Lefferts, 1972, Somers, 1999) noted that dissatisfied employees are more disposed to quitting an institution. Numerous studies have established that dissatisfied employees are more willing to quit their jobs (Carsten and Spector, 1987, Tett and Meyer, 1993, Griffith and Hom, 1995). For instance, Surveys in countries such as Malaysia, United States and Canada revealed the willingness of more than fifty percent workers to leave their current jobs if offered a similar position or job elsewhere, even though they claim to be satisfied with their positions and working conditions. (McShane and Von Glinow, 2009, McShane, 2011).

Job satisfaction as “a collection of feelings that an individual holds towards his or her job” defines (Robbins, 2005). It can be inferred from the definition that positive feelings is being held towards the job by a person with a high level of job satisfaction, and a negative feelings by a dissatisfied person. Locke (1976) as cited by (Cooper and Locke, 2000) gives an additional definition of job satisfaction as a “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences.”

Furthermore, Seta et al. (2000) stated that organization can make an appropriate plan to increase the level of positive behavior among workers with an understanding of the contributing factors to employees’ satisfaction. Job satisfaction is certainly one of the most extensively studied domains in the field of organizational behavior (Lee and Liu, 2007, Muse and Stamper, 2007, Pettijohn et al., 2008, Duraisingam et al., 2009, Pugno, 2009). Researchers have concluded that it is paramount for keep employees satisfied (George et al., 2002, Kreitner and Kinicki, 2008, Spector, 1997, Sang et al., 2009, Probst et al., 2010).

Pool (1997) attributed worker’s job satisfaction to their cognitive, affective, and evaluative reactions towards their tasks. O’Reills, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) explained, from the cognitive perspective, that explained job satisfaction demonstrates people’s cognitive attitudes towards their jobs—meaning, it emanates from how individuals’ view their jobs and how individuals fit into their organizations. With regards to affective attitudes toward job satisfaction, researchers described job satisfaction as a response based on emotions towards one’s job, or affective response to specific aspects of job by employee (Kreitner and Kinicki, 1992). Service profit chain has it that internal customers, referring to employees, should derive satisfaction first to enhance service performance, in as much better performance contributes more to increase in the satisfaction level of external customers (Heskett and Schlesinger, 1994). The advantages of having employees satisfied include longer stay with the organization, propagating positive image of the organization among other employees, increasing the commitment level in the organization (Jerome and Kleiner, 1995), and reducing the turnover intent (Yang, 2008), thus facilitating the achievement of the organization’s ultimate goal—profits (Kim and Back, 2012).

**Table 2:** Definitions of workers job satisfaction

Year	Author(s)	Definition
1990	(Odom)	Job's satisfaction is the scope to what worker feeling about her or his task. (p.157)
1997	Spector	Job satisfaction simply as “the degree to which workers like their jobs.”(p. 1)
2000	Cooper and Locke	Job satisfaction as a “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of worker’s job or job experiences.” (p. 166)
2001	(Price)	The affectional tendency that a worker has with respect to her or his job. (p.591)
2002	(Demir)	Job satisfaction to workers ‘is feeling of contentedness and discontentedness for a job. (p.402)
2005	(Robbins)	Job satisfaction, is explained as a person overall attitude concerning to her or his work. (p.24)
2010	(Spector and Fox)	Job satisfaction is a most importance vastly issues in the range of organizational behavior about a manner of a workers. (P. 132)

## 2.2 Social Self-Efficacy

Social self-efficacy is a definite application of self-efficacy theory. Perceived self- efficacy is the trust individual possess in his abilities to organize and execute the required courses of action to achieve set goals (Bandura, 1997, Wood and Olivier, 2006). Perceived social self-efficacy also mean such confidence individual has in his capability to initiate and engage in the necessary social interactional tasks needed to maintain interpersonal relationships (Smith and Betz, 2000). This covers attributes such as ability to negotiate interpersonal conflict, meet new people, display assertiveness in needed social situations, develop friendships, cultivate romantic relationships, and interact in a group setting. (Sherer et al., 1982) describes social self-efficacy as the ability to show personal efficacy in social situations. Social self-efficacy typifies individuals’ beliefs of being able to initiate social contact and develop new friendships (Gecas, 1989). Interpersonal competence is an important factor of personal success. Individuals perceive their ability to successfully interact with others in social situations differently. In respect to social interactions, Bandura (1986) postulated that individual’s behavior does not necessarily responsible for his or her ability to interact effectively. Instead, the self-belief in such individual’s ability to establish the necessary social interactions is responsible for whether the behavior is allowed or prevented. That is, their self-efficacy reflects their level of social confidence. In contrast, individuals with low social self-efficacy may possess more inclination towards avoiding specific types of interactions due to a perceived threat. Social self-efficacy has been applied severally in mental health and psychological adjustment, with considerations alongside with self-esteem, social anxiety, learned resourcefulness, loneliness, and depressive symptomatology (Smith and Betz, 2000).

Highly self-efficient personalities are more proficient in: (a) using cognitions to control their physiological and emotions responses; (b) using effective problem-solving strategies; (c) delaying the need for instant gratification;

and, are well (d) aware of their self-regulating abilities (i.e. perceived self-efficacy for coping includes one's belief in the effectiveness of being able to cope well in stressful situations) (Rosenbaum and Ben-Ari, 1985). Recent studies on employees indicated that high level of self was related to fewer depressive symptoms (Huang et al., 2005), ability to cope better with life stressors (Antonovsky, 1990), better engagement in work, good self-control abilities (Kenneth and Keefer, 2006), effectiveness in dealing with job related stress (Akgun and Ciarrochi, 2003). These studies generally suggest that employees with high self-efficacy, in contrast with others with low self-efficacy, have the ability to deal with threatening or challenging situations effectively, using a diverse range of coping skills.

### *2.3 The Relationship between Social Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction*

Social self-efficacy expectations refer to people's perceived abilities, which may be different from the actual ones they possess. Moreover, these expectancies are specified by domain and relate to particular tasks or situations, such that they can assume different consideration depending on the context. Social self-efficacy may perhaps be mostly significant for individual's satisfaction. Leary and Atherton (1986) studied a social anxiety-specific type of self-efficacy and how it relates with job satisfaction among bank staffs. The study indicated a moderate correlation social self-efficacy components and job satisfaction. Studies investigating self-efficacy and job satisfaction typically report correlations in the modest range (Schwarzer and Jerusalem, 1992). In a sample of employees prompted to imagine themselves within social situations, it was reported by Maddux, Norton and Leary (1988) that a correlation of  $-0.49$  exists between low social self-efficacy and a job satisfaction. However, recorded a correlation of  $.31$  between high self-efficacy and a job satisfaction (Mahone et al., 1993). Most researches carried out on self-efficacy in job satisfaction made use of simple, one-item Likert-scale ratings of social self-efficacy or unstandardized composites taken from other measures.

Some investigators have indicated the self-efficacy that is relevant to job satisfaction (Judge and Bono, 2001, Perdue et al., 2007, Borgogni et al., 2012, Miraglia, 2013). Self-efficacy influences job satisfaction through its link to practical achievement on the job (Judge and Bono, 2001). Thus, individuals with high confidence in their competences and capabilities to carry out a job will exhibit a higher level of satisfaction on the job, outside their length of service with the organization. (Pinquart et al., 2003) found that individuals who believe more in their self-efficacy and earn better results are likely to have a good job satisfaction.

Borgogni et al. (2012) investigated Self-efficacy and job satisfaction, using a sample of 1160 white-collars from the main Italian delivery company, a privatized organization for the measurement. The research findings indicate that training in self-efficacy can help to achieve a higher job satisfaction. (Borgogni et al., 2012) elaborated these results by showing not only are core self-evaluations linked to a perceptive view of intrinsic job characteristics. Thus, it appears that core self-evaluations have influence on job satisfaction, partly, because individuals that are positive individuals actually embrace more challenging jobs, and also because they have the perception that those jobs of equal complexity are as more inherently fulfilling (Bono and Judge, 2003).

Bandura (1986) postulated that an individual's sense of self-efficacy helps in reducing how one perceives or react to stress. The information submitted on the task activities, working conditions, rewards, achievement, and management practices can all influence individuals' perceptions of job satisfaction (Erdwins et al., 2001, Locke, 1976). These constructs are all indicated in a research model as antecedents to job satisfaction with Self-Efficacy Theory Explanation (Staples et al., 1998). Additionally, participants in the focus group research carried out by Staples (1996) suggested that job satisfaction in a virtual environment will be perceived differently depending on the support and the management's activities. Likewise, it depends on the remote individual's competence in working remotely. Overall, these results suggest that the satisfaction associated with tasks (job satisfaction) should be impacted positively by the positive judgments that an individual has received positive about his ability to carry them out (self-efficacy). Even though this prediction has no basis in existing self-efficacy theory, it only represent an extension of the theory (Staples et al., 1998).

### **3. Discussion**

The study was investigation relationship of social self-efficacy and workers job satisfaction in privatized organizations. Job satisfaction among employees in privatized organizations has a vital effect on other important factors of workplace such as withdrawal behaviors and productivity as well that at last dissatisfied workers lead to decrease profit. Social self-efficacy is one the key components of workers job satisfaction that rarely has investigated.

Social self-efficacy is one's beliefs in her/his abilities in associated with others, how workers can behave with others, for instance colleagues, and so forth. Once there is high social self-efficacy there will be obviously high job satisfaction among the workers, and without workers' social self-efficacy which lead to satisfaction, organizations will not have profitability and also keep continuously success.

The workers who are more confident they will be stronger to stay and solve the problematic conditions that may organizations encounter with. Therefore these two variables would not be distinct of another one.

#### 4. Conclusion

The present paper contributes to practice, that increasing social self-efficacy is a good strategy to enhance job satisfaction. Consistent with social cognitive theory, a training aimed at improving individual beliefs in one's own capabilities to exercise control over circumstances in the workplace can lead to a better fit and to higher job satisfaction. In particular, the intervention would be oriented to strengthen the self-regulation capabilities that underlie personal efficacy beliefs, and that allow employees to keep calm in stressful situations, solve interpersonal conflicts, cope with problematic situations, and recover quickly after a period of intense activity. Additionally, the training would aim to support job satisfaction on behalf of an employee in order to facilitate the fit between his/her characteristics, and the organizational opportunities.

This paper has implications for talent management. Employees high in social self-efficacy have stronger job satisfaction that, in turn, decreases withdrawal behaviors. Therefore, Human Resource development strategies may aim to identify self-efficacious employees, who can be considered the organization's key-people, and to find the factors underlying their satisfaction with the job, in order to enhancing organizations profit.

In fact, people high in social self-efficacy deal more effectively with difficulties, persisting in the face of failure, and they are more likely to attain valued outcomes according to their personal standards, from which they derive more satisfaction with the job. Moreover, the regulatory skills underlying social self-efficacy make employees confident to solve conflicts that may occur with colleagues, to overcome frustrations, to remain calm and in a good mood, deriving more satisfaction from their work. Thus, individuals who are confident in their abilities and competence to perform a job will be more satisfied with their jobs.

Dissatisfied employees more likely to declare their tendency to quitting in an institution, thus the employees with high social self-efficacy is likely to stay at work and try to improve in problematic situation. Several studies have linked dissatisfaction individuals more willingly to quit their works. Other investigators in the field of worker job satisfaction have noted that dissatisfied workers be derived from worker with low social self-efficacy.

Future study can be research is also needed to understand the time frame in which self-efficacious employees shape their social context and how long it takes to develop high P-O fit and job satisfaction, as well as how long it takes to translate the positive effects of satisfaction into behavioral responses. Moreover, the next research can consider other facets of self-efficacy such as emotional self-efficacy on job satisfaction. In addition, the researcher can investigate the influence of self-efficacy facets on withdrawal behaviors.

#### References

- AKGUN, S. & CIARROCHI, J. 2003. Learned resourcefulness moderates the relationship between academic stress and academic performance. *Educational Psychology*, 23, 287-294.
- ALAVI, H. R. & ASKARIPUR, M. R. 2003. The relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction of personnel in government organizations. *Public personnel management*, 32, 591-600.
- ANTONOVSKY, A. 1990. Personality and health: Testing the sense of coherence model.
- ATCHISON, T. & LEFFERTS, E. 1972. The prediction of turnover using Herzberg's job satisfaction technique. *Personnel Psychology*, 25, 53-64.
- ATCHISON, T. A. 1998. The myths of employee satisfaction. *Healthcare Executive*, 14, 18-23.
- BANDURA, A. 1986. Social foundations of thought and action. *Englewood Cliffs, NJ*.
- BANDURA, A. 1997. Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.
- BONO, J. E. & JUDGE, T. A. 2003. Core self - evaluations: A review of the trait and its role in job satisfaction and job performance. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, S5-S18.
- BORGOGNI, L., DELLO RUSSO, S., MIRAGLIA, M. & VECCHIONE, M. 2012. The role of self-efficacy and job satisfaction on absences from work. *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée/European Review of Applied Psychology*.
- CAMP, S. D. 1994. Assessing the effects of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on turnover: An event history approach. *The Prison Journal*, 74, 279-305.
- CARSTEN, J. M. & SPECTOR, P. E. 1987. Unemployment, job satisfaction, and employee turnover: A meta-analytic test of the Muchinsky model. *Journal of applied psychology*, 72, 374.
- CONNOLLY, K. M. & MYERS, J. E. 2003. Wellness and mattering: The role of holistic factors in job satisfaction. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 40, 152-160.
- COOPER, C. L. & LOCKE, E. A. 2000. *Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice*, Wiley-Blackwell.
- CRANNY, C., SMITH, P. C. & STONE, E. 1992. Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs.
- DEMIR, C., ÖZALTIN, H. & CELIK, Y. 2002. Determining the level of job satisfaction of nurses working at Turkish military forces hospitals. *Military medicine*, 167, 402-405.
- DURASINGAM, V., PIDD, K. & ROCHE, A. M. 2009. The impact of work stress and job satisfaction on turnover intentions: A study of Australian specialist alcohol and other drug workers. *Drugs: Education, Prevention, and Policy*, 16, 217-231.

- ERDWINS, C. J., BUFFARDI, L. C., CASPER, W. J. & O'BRIEN, A. S. 2001. The Relationship of Women's Role Strain to Social Support, Role Satisfaction, and Self - Efficacy\*. *Family Relations*, 50, 230-238.
- GECAS, V. 1989. The social psychology of self-efficacy. *Annual review of sociology*, 291-316.
- GEORGE, J. M., JONES, G. R. & SHARBROUGH, W. C. 2002. *Understanding and managing organizational behavior*, Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- GOLDBERG, C. B. & WALDMAN, D. A. 2000. Modeling employee absenteeism: Testing alternative measures and mediated effects based on job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 665-676.
- GRIFFETH, R. W. & HOM, P. W. 1995. The employee turnover process. *Research in personnel and human resources management*, 13, 245-93.
- HACKMAN, J. R. & LAWLER, E. E. 1971. Employee reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of applied psychology*, 55, 259.
- HESKETT, J. L. & SCHLESINGER, L. 1994. Putting the service-profit chain to work. *Harvard business review*, 72, 164-174.
- HOOLE, C. & VERMEULEN, L. P. 2003. Job satisfaction among South African aircraft pilots. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29.
- HUANG, C.-Y., SOUSA, V. D., TU, S.-Y. & HWANG, M.-Y. 2005. Depressive symptoms and learned resourcefulness among Taiwanese female adolescents. *Archives of psychiatric nursing*, 19, 133-140.
- ILIES, R. & JUDGE, T. A. 2003. On the heritability of job satisfaction: The mediating role of personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 750.
- JEROME, L. & KLEINER, B. H. 1995. Employee morale and its impact on service: what companies do to create a positive service experience. *Managing Service Quality*, 5, 21-25.
- JUDGE, T. A. & BONO, J. E. 2001. Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 86, 80.
- KALLEBERG, A. L. 1977. Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 124-143.
- KENNETH, D. & KEEFER, K. 2006. Impact of learned resourcefulness and theories of intelligence on achievement of university students: An integrated approach. *Educational Psychology*, 26, 441-457.
- KIM, Y. & BACK, K.-J. 2012. Antecedents and consequences of flight attendants' job satisfaction. *The Service Industries Journal*, 32, 2565-2584.
- KREITNER, R. 2005. *Foundations of management. Basics and best practices*, Boston MA.
- KREITNER, R. & KINICKI, A. 1992. *Organizational Behavior* Boston: Richard, D. Irwin. Inc.
- KREITNER, R. & KINICKI, A. 2008. *Organizational behaviour*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- LEE, H.-W. & LIU, C.-H. 2007. An examination of factors affecting repatriates' turnover intentions. *International Journal of manpower*, 28, 122-134.
- LEVIN, I. & STOKES, J. P. 1989. Dispositional approach to job satisfaction: Role of negative affectivity. *Journal of applied psychology*, 74, 752.
- LOCKE, E. A. 1976. *The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction*1.
- MAHONE, E. M., BRUCH, M. A. & HEIMBERG, R. G. 1993. Focus of attention and social anxiety: The role of negative self-thoughts and perceived positive attributes of the other. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 17, 209-224.
- MATTILA, A. S. 2006. The power of explanations in mitigating the ill-effects of service failures. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 20, 422-428.
- MCSHANE, S. & VON GLINOW, M. 2009. *Organizational behaviour: Emerging knowledge and practice for the real world*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill.
- MCSHANE, S. L. 2011. *Organizational behavior*, Tata McGraw-Hill Education.
- MIRAGLIA, M. 2013. Should I stay (at home) or should I go (to work): individual and contextual antecedents of absenteeism and presenteeism. Evidence from a privatized Italian organization.
- MOBLEY, W. H., GRIFFETH, R. W., HAND, H. H. & MEGLINO, B. M. 1979. Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological bulletin*, 86, 493.
- MULLINS, L. J. 2007. *Management and organisational behaviour*, Pearson Education.
- MUSE, L. A. & STAMPER, C. L. 2007. Perceived organizational support: evidence for a mediated association with work performance. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 517-535.
- NAUMANN, E. 1993. Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment among expatriate managers. *Group & Organization Management*, 18, 153-187.
- O'REILLY, C. A. & CHATMAN, J. 1986. Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of applied psychology*, 71, 492.
- ODOM, R. Y., BOXX, W. R. & DUNN, M. G. 1990. Organizational cultures, commitment, satisfaction, and

- cohesion. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 157-169.
- PERDUE, S. V., REARDON, R. C. & PETERSON, G. W. 2007. Person—environment congruence, self - efficacy, and environmental identity in relation to job satisfaction: a career decision theory perspective. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 44, 29-39.
- PETTIJOHN, C., PETTIJOHN, L. & TAYLOR, A. J. 2008. Salesperson perceptions of ethical behaviors: Their influence on job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78, 547-557.
- PINQUART, M., JUANG, L. P. & SILBEREISEN, R. K. 2003. Self-efficacy and successful school-to-work transition: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 329-346.
- POOL, S. W. 1997. The relationship of job satisfaction with substitutes of leadership, leadership behavior, and work motivation. *The Journal of Psychology*, 131, 271-283.
- PRICE, J. L. 2001. Reflections on the determinants of voluntary turnover. *International Journal of Manpower*, 22, 600-624.
- PROBST, J. C., BAEK, J.-D. & LADITKA, S. B. 2010. The relationship between workplace environment and job satisfaction among nursing assistants: findings from a national survey. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, 11, 246-252.
- PUGNO, M. 2009. Job performance and job satisfaction: an integrated survey. *University of Trento, Dept. of Economics Discussion Paper*.
- RICE, R. W., MCFARLIN, D. B. & BENNETT, D. E. 1989. Standards of comparison and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 591.
- ROBBINS, S. P. 2003. *Organisational behaviour: global and Southern African perspectives*, Pearson South Africa.
- ROBBINS, S. P. 2005. *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*, Издательский дом Вильямс.
- ROSENBAUM, M. & BEN-ARI, K. 1985. Learned helplessness and learned resourcefulness: Effects of noncontingent success and failure on individuals differing in self-control skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 198.
- ROUSSEAU, D. M. 1978. Characteristics of departments, positions, and individuals: Contexts for attitudes and behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 521-540.
- SANG, K. J., ISON, S. G. & DAINTY, A. R. 2009. The job satisfaction of UK architects and relationships with work-life balance and turnover intentions. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 16, 288-300.
- SCHWARZER, R. & JERUSALEM, M. 1992. Advances in anxiety theory: A cognitive process approach. *Advances in test anxiety research*, 7, 2-31.
- SETA, C., PAULUS, P. & BARON, R. 2000. *Effective human relations*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon Publications.
- SHERER, M., MADDUX, J. E., MERCANDANTE, B., PRENTICE-DUNN, S., JACOBS, B. & ROGERS, R. W. 1982. The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological reports*, 51, 663-671.
- SMITH, H. M. & BETZ, N. E. 2000. Development and validation of a scale of perceived social self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 8, 283-301.
- SOMERS, M. J. 1999. Application of two neural network paradigms to the study of voluntary employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 177.
- SPECTOR, P. E. 1997. *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*, Sage.
- SPECTOR, P. E. & FOX, S. 2010. Theorizing about the deviant citizen: An attributional explanation of the interplay of organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 132-143.
- STAPLES, D. S., HULLAND, J. S. & HIGGINS, C. A. 1998. A self - efficacy theory explanation for the management of remote workers in virtual organizations. *Journal of Computer - Mediated Communication*, 3, 0-0.
- STEEL, R. P., RENTSCH, J. R. & VAN SCOTTER, J. R. 2007. Timeframes and absence frameworks: A test of Steers and Rhodes'(1978) model of attendance. *Journal of Management*, 33, 180-195.
- TAYLOR, G. S. & VEST, M. J. 1992. Pay comparisons and pay satisfaction among public sector employees. *Public Personnel Management*.
- TETT, R. P. & MEYER, J. P. 1993. Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: path analyses based on meta - analytic findings. *Personnel psychology*, 46, 259-293.
- VOYDANOFF, P. 1980. Perceived job characteristics and job satisfaction among men and women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5, 177-185.
- WOOD, L. A. & OLIVIER, M. 2006. A self-efficacy approach to holistic student development. *South African journal of education*, 24.
- YANG, J.-T. 2008. Effect of newcomer socialisation on organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention in the hotel industry. *The Service Industries Journal*, 28, 429-443.

---

**Homa.Khorasani Esmacili** received her Master in 2009 from Pune, India and Bachelor degrees in 2002 from Kerman, Iran. She is currently pursuing her PhD in the field of business management at Faculty of International Business School, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. She worked as a lecturer at Islamic Azad University Bam, Iran 2011.