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INTRODUCTION:

In recent years psychologists have evinced much interest in investigating job factors leading to job motivation and job involvement which are considered to be vital indices of the quality of work life (Hall & Lawler, 1973; Walton, 1972; Dewhirst, 1973; Rao, 1981; Akhtar & Nizami, 1987; Elloy, Everett & Flynn, 1991; Orpen & Fisherdon, 1993).

Lodahl & Kejner (1965) were instrumental in bringing the term job involvement to limelight. Job involvement is the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work or the importance of work in his total self-image (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965).

In an extensive review of job involvement studies, Rabinowitz & Hall (1977) suggested that job involvement has been considered either in terms of individual differences or job situations or an interaction between the individual and his job or these are considered to be essential determiners of job involvement.

The other important variable under investigation is job characteristics. Herzberg (1959) propounded job enrichment theory and projected that ‘enriched’ job was a source of satisfaction to employees and leads them to better performance. Taking lead from the Herzberg’s monumental work, Turner & Lawrence (1965) developed measures of six
"requisite task attributes" (RTA). This summary index was used for ascertaining the relationship between nature of jobs and workers satisfaction and attendance. Hackman & Lawler (1971) identified four of the Turner & Lawrence (1965) attributes as core characteristics of job that would allow individuals to obtain meaningful personal satisfaction from the job itself. These four facets were - Autonomy, Task identity, Feedback and Skill variety. Hackman & Oldham (1975) combined these job characteristics into a single index called as motivating potential score (MPS). This is summary measure of work motivation. Few researches, in our country (Maneriker & Patil, 1983; Kumar, 1988; Gandhi, 1992), investigated these four core job characteristics as a composite model based on the assumptions that perceptions of these characteristics enhance employee motivation and performance. This formed the main objective of the present study. Moreover, absence of any measuring device to study job characteristics in Indian context, necessitated the development of a standardized tool. This is another salient feature of the present investigation.

Demographic variables such as salary and advancement and such other variables immensely influence behavior of employees in an organization. Many studies in our country have been conducted using correlational design to determine the relationship between demographic variables and job involvement. None of researchers using multivariate analysis attempted to probe the demographic and situational correlates of job involvement. Hence the purpose of this study is to
investigate the influence of core job characteristics (Autonomy, task identity, feedback & skill Variety) as well as demographic variables (advancement & salary) of various level of employees on job involvement.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

In pursuit of the above objectives, the present investigation was carried out in two public sector undertakings - a Textile mill and a Tannery located in industrial town of Kanpur. The sample comprises of 419 production line workers, 56 supervisors and 45 managers of the above mentioned organizations. Job characteristics scale (Naaz & Akhtar, 1993) was used for the measurement of job characteristics. Validity of the scale was gauged by computing item - total score correlation which range between .27 to .78. Product moment correlations computed among the four core job characteristics ranged between .18 to .81 (N=100). The values were found statistically significant at .05 level. The split-half reliability of the scale was .92.

Job involvement was measured by a scale developed by Lodahl & Kejner (1965). The split-half reliability, concurrent and construct validity of the 20 item scale has been reported by the authors. The adapted version of job involvement scale was used in this study. This adaptation was undertaken by Akhtar & Bacha (1984), having split-half reliability coefficient of .76 (N=100). Job characteristics (Autonomy, Task identity, Feedback & Skill variety) and demographic variables (Advancement & salary) were considered as independent
variables and job involvement as dependent variable. Standard multiple regression analysis was applied to find out which of the independent variables were significant predictors of the dependent variable. Stepwise regression analysis was used to find out the best prediction equation for the criterion.

**MAJOR FINDINGS:**

Among the three levels of employee we have studied, i.e., workers, supervisors and managers, it was found that task identity emerged as common predictor of job involvement for both the organization's employees. Salary emerged as an important predictor of job involvement for supervisors and autonomy for managers. Stepwise regression analysis revealed that job characteristics are much better predictor of job involvement than are the demographic variables. The findings lend support to the conclusions drawn by Saal (1978).

It may be recalled that both the organizations were government undertaking. It is an open secret that such organizations do not provide substantial freedom to the individuals in scheduling their job activities. Probably, this was one of the factors responsible for less involvement with the job.

**SUGGESTION:**

It is suggested that such studies should be carried out in various other public sectors as well as extended to private sector. The advent of multinational companies in the country, during the last couple of years, is both a
challenge as well as new experience for the employees. They have brought new organisational policy and programmes and are also offering various incentives to employees to boost productivity and sales. It would be interesting to undertake comparative study of job motivation and job involvement of employees serving in the public and private sectors as well as in multinational companies. Certain psychological factors such as early socialization process, locus of control, work ethics should also be taken into consideration to study job involvement.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

&

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Employees are one of the organizations most valued resource, the nature of work and characteristics of the jobs have direct impact on how effectively they perform. In other words, the way jobs and tasks are designed may be one of the most substantial influences on the work motivation, job satisfaction, job involvement and productivity of employees in work setting. In recent years there has been an unprecedented upsurge in researching the impact of the design of jobs in organizations on employees affective reactions such as, job motivation and job involvement which are considered to be vital indices of the quality of work life (Hall & Lawler, 1970; Schwyhart & Smith, 1972; Walton, 1972; Dewhirst, 1973; Rao, 1981; Akhtar & Nizami, 1987; Hall & Mansfield, 1975; Elloy, Everett & Flynn, 1991; Orpen & Fisherdon, 1993).

**JOB INVOLVEMENT:**

Historically speaking, Durkheim, an eminent sociologist evinced interest in job involvement as early as 1893 but Lodahl & Kejner (1965) were instrumental in bringing it to limelight. Although voluminous amount of research has been conducted on job involvement during the past two decades still a certain amount of confusion needs to be dispelled.

The term job involvement was used in varied contexts and often confused with ego involvement, need satisfaction, intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965; Weissenberg & Gruenfeld, 1968; Lawler
Different interpretations of job involvement can be broadly categorized into two distinct ways. The first series of definitions seem to tie together the concept of self esteem. Life interest is central to this concept (Dubin, 1956) and employees perceive their performance as significant aspect of their self esteem (Gurin, Veroff & Feld, 1960). Vroom (1962) describes a person as ego-involved in a job by the level of his self esteem which is affected by his perceived level of performance. In other words, for Vroom, involvement exists when a person's feeling of esteem is increased by good performance and decreased by the bad one. These definitions describe job involved person as one who is very much personally affected by his whole job situation, the work itself, his co-workers, the company, etc.

The second conceptual way of describing job involvement is the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work or the importance of work in his total self image (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). Such a psychological identification with work may result partly from early socialization process during which the individual may internalize the value of goodness of work. Lodahl & Kejner (1965) emphasized that during the process of socialization certain work values are injected into the self of the individual that remain even at the later stage in the form of attitude towards job. Siegel (1969) endorses that worker's
sex, early socialization process and organizational variables affect the development of an individual's ideas about his job. Early socialization process is deemed to be responsible for developing job involvement. This suggests that fresh job holders are likely to be job involved if their socialization background is conducive to the development of such an attitude (Akhtar & Kumar, 1978).

Katz & Kahn (1966) consider job involvement as a moderator variable between satisfaction and performance. Weissenberg & Gruenfeld (1968), think of it as a quasi indicator of motivation. Patchen (1970) considers job involvement as a convenient label summarising several characteristics that make the job more important and potentially more satisfying to the individual. Wollack, Goodale, Wijting & Smith (1971) consider job involvement as a partial operationalization of the protestant ethics. Lawler & Hall (1970) provided theoretical and empirical evidence to distinguish job involvement from need satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. They suggest that job involvement refers to the degree to which a person's total work situation is an important part of his life. Many investigators have confirmed that these terms are factorially independent (Cummings & Bigelow, 1976; Akhtar & Ahmed, 1978; Brooke, Russell & Price, 1988; Shore, Thornton & Shore, 1990).

These differences in interpretation clearly emphasize the historical lack of agreement concerning what job involvement represents. Kanungo (1979, 1982) has provided new
insight for understanding the term job involvement. He has proposed that one should make a clear distinction between job involvement and work involvement. Whether an individual is involved in a job is dependent upon the extent to which the job satisfies his salient needs and hence job involvement in this respect is more situationally determined. On the other hand work involvement is considered to be a more stable psychological characteristic (Kanungo, 1987b). Evidence of this conceptual distinction has been provided by Gorn & Kanungo (1980), Kanungo (1982), Misra, Kanungo, Von Rosenthal & Stuhler (1985), Elloy & Cornelius (1986) but Paully, Alliger & Stone (1994) found moderate support for this differentiation.

Saleh (1981) argues that job involvement is a multi-dimensional concept of involving structural components of cognitive, evaluative and behavioral intentions. Rabinowitz, Hall & Goodale (1977) and Saal (1978) found that both individual (Personality) difference and situational (Job) variable contribute to the prediction of job involvement.

Review of job involvement definitions reveal that it has been considered either in term of individual differences or job situations or as an interaction between the individual and his job or these are considered to be essential determiners of job involvement.
Scholars, in the recent past, have tried to find the correlates of job involvement in a variety of organizational settings. The correlates have been classified in terms of personal data, situational characteristics and work outcomes. Job involvement was found to be positively related to performance by Bass (1965). Weissenberg & Gruenfeld (1968) found that job involvement was significantly related to satisfaction with motivator variables. Rabinowitz & Hall (1977) thoroughly reviewed job involvement studies and concluded that age and protestant work values were the strongest correlates of job involvement. Runyon (1973) and Reitz & Jewell (1979) advocate job involvement as a relatively personal characteristic and found that men are likely to value work more than women but Lennon (1987) obtained different results. In controlled work autonomy situation women were found to be more involved with their job than men.

A large number of studies have shown that job involvement is positively related to job satisfaction, recognition, fulfillment of intrinsic as well as extrinsic needs, participation in decision making, satisfaction with supervisors, etc. (Weissenberg & Gruenfeld, 1980; Gorn & Kanungo, 1980; Jans, 1985; Knoop, 1986; Lambert, 1991 and Riipinen, 1994).

Researchers have also attempted to explore the relationship of job involvement with demographic variables (Hall & Mansfield, 1971; Schwyhart & Smith, 1972; Mannheim,

Job involvement studies in our country surfaced relatively late on the horizon. The socio-cultural disparity between the industrially developed countries and the developing ones necessitate the significance of job involvement researches to be conducted on a wider spectrum in India. Indian researchers have attempted to explore the relationship of job involvement with demographic variables (Aichtar & Kumar, 1978; Sharma & Kapoor, 1978; Bajaj, 1978a & 1978b; Anantharaman, 1980; Jagdish, 1984; Khandelwal, 1986; Chaddha & Kaur, 1987; Pathak & Pathak, 1987; Kumari & Singh, 1988; Anantharaman & Deivasenapathy, 1980; Choudhry, 1988; Singh & Pestonjee, 1990). Personality variables and their relation to job involvement have also been explored such as locus of control (Reddy & Rahman, 1984; Reddy & Rajshekhar, 1988; Achmamba & Gopikumar, 1990). Personality pattern (Prabhakar, 1979; Verma 1985; Khandelwal & Mathur, 1987;
It has been repeatedly pointed by researchers that job involvement is influenced by organisational, situational and personal characteristics, but it has yielded consistently low correlations with almost every variable. The model of job involvement has been evolved on the assumption of linearity of relationship between job involvement and the variables mentioned above. Rabinowitz & Hall (1977), in their exclusive review of literature, concluded that "no one class of variables (personal characteristics, situational characteristics and work outcomes) show clearly stronger
relationships to job involvement than any other. The linearity of the relationship has been doubted by Indian researchers also (Anantharaman & Kaliappan, 1982; Akhtar & Bacha, 1984) who pointed out that the relationship may be curvilinear.

**JOB CHARACTERISTICS:**

As mentioned earlier the other important variable under investigation is Job characteristics. Characteristics of the job can be designed to match the individual needs, personality characteristics and expectations associated with the job. The issue of job design is of specific importance because the way in which jobs are structured, designed and controlled have a direct impact on employees performance, their job involvement and job satisfaction, (Sekaran, 1989).

Such factors as the number of employees required, diversity of activities performed, the needed skills, abilities and training and the authority and responsibility bestowed are all part of how a job is designed to enhance employees performance.

Taylor (1911) was the first person to scientifically examine the structuring of tasks and how they should be done by simplifying, standardizing and specializing the jobs. It was believed that simplification of the job would bring about organizational benefits such as reduction in training costs, labour expenses increased productivity and higher job profits. Numerous scholars have studied the consequences of
work simplification (Argyris, 1964; Blauner, 1964; Friedman, 1961; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959). Empirical studies began to appear in management literature which suggested that absenteeism and turnover as well as employee dissatisfaction and monotony often increased when the jobs were oversimplified and routinized. This led to exploring alternative sources to overcome the limitations.

One of the most important theme which inspired industrial psychologists to provide guidelines and framework for the motivation of workers is the notion of job enlargement. Programmes were initiated to give employees, within broad limits to set their own work pace, to include a greater variety of tasks, so as to make them more meaningful (Biganne & Stewart, 1963; Conant & Kilbridge, 1965; Davis & Valfer, 1965; Ford, 1969). But job enlargement studies, by and large, disregarded development of conceptual framework and failed to evolve theoretical foundations due to which the desired objectives were not achieved. Job enlargement experiments involved a number of simultaneous changes and it became difficult to ascertain which of these aspect of the redesigned jobs were, in fact, responsible for observed behavioral and attitudinal changes. Also, the generality of the job enlargement efforts were largely unknown and it was believed that horizontal as well as vertical expansion of jobs may overcome such shortcomings (Ford, 1969; Lawler, 1969; Sheppard & Herrick, 1972).
In view of the above mentioned considerations, concerted research efforts were made for enriching the job, by giving employees more responsibility and control over work and offering learning opportunities on the job, and to assess their influence on employees motivation. Inspiration for job enrichment theory may be traced to Herzberg's (1959) two-factor theory of job motivation. Herzberg assumed that in order to motivate personnel, the job must be designed to provide greater opportunities for intrinsic motivation such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement and growth. The technique entails enriching the job so that these factors are included in it. As opposed to job enlargement which horizontally loads the job, job enrichment vertically loads the job and makes it more challenging and involves ample opportunities for displaying one's skill and talents which, in turn, is considered as a source of satisfaction. Naturally, it may lead to better performance (Blood & Hulin, 1967; Hulin, 1971; Hackman & Oldham 1974; Hulin & Blood, 1968; Lawler, Hackman & Kaufman, 1973; Wanous, 1973).

Taking lead from the line of thinking of Herzberg, Turner & Lawrence (1965) gave the concept of Requisite Task Attribute" (RTA). The six attributes delineated by them were: (a) variety, (b) autonomy (c) required interaction, (d) optional interaction, (e) knowledge & skill required and (f) responsibility. On the basis of scores on each of the six dimension, a summary measure was derived, called the Requisite Task Attribute Index (RTA Index). This summary
index was used in ascertaining the relationship between the nature of jobs and workers satisfaction and attendance. The authors expectations that employees working on jobs which were high on the RTA index would have high job satisfaction and low absenteeism were not fully supported. They found that the expected relationships held only for workers from rural background, for workers in urban settings, they reported less satisfaction when jobs were high on the RTA index and was unrelated to absenteeism. The investigators attributed these differences to cultural background of employees.

The impact of community characteristics on jobs characteristics relations was further explored by (Blood & Hulin, 1967; Hulin & Blood, 1968). The researchers proposed that community alienation from the middle class work norm acted as a moderator of the job characteristics (Blood & Hulin, 1967).

From the above discussion it can be inferred that to enhance work motivation of employees, the conditions on the job can be arranged so that the employees believe that they will be most likely to obtain valued outcomes by working hard and effectively toward organizational goals. It may be possible to specify a set of "job characteristics" which will provide employees with higher order need satisfactions to the extent that they work hard and well toward organizational goals. Some researches (Lewin et. al, 1944; Argyris, 1964) suggest that individuals may experience higher order need satisfactions when they learn that they have, as a result of
their own efforts, accomplished something that they believe is personally worthwhile or meaningful. It appears that four of the requisite task attributes proposed by Turner & Lawrence (1965) may be useful in operationalizing the general job characteristics. These attributes are specified as core characteristics that would allow individual to obtain meaningful personal satisfaction from the job itself. These four facets are: Autonomy, Task Identity, Feedback & Skill Variety.

The dimension autonomy refers to the degree to which a job provides freedom, independence and discretion to the worker in scheduling his work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out. Task identity is the degree to which a job requires completion of a 'whole' and 'identifiable' piece of work. In other words the job must provide outcomes which are intrinsically meaningful or otherwise experienced as worthwhile to the individual. Feedback is the degree to which carrying out the activities required by the job results in the employee obtaining direct and clear information about the effectiveness of his performance. Jobs high on the dimension of variety requires a number of different skills and abilities to be essential for carrying out the work and thus provide opportunities to workers to experience meaningfulness on the job.

In summary, it appears that employees perform effectively on jobs which are high on autonomy, task
identity, feedback and variety. The harder and better one performs on a job which is high on these dimensions, the more satisfaction one is likely to derive.

In a study designed to test the ideas set forth above, Hackman & Lawler (1971) found that when jobs are high on the four "core" dimensions (autonomy, task identity, variety and feedback), employees who were desirous of higher order need satisfaction, tended to have high motivation and high job satisfaction, were infrequently absent from work and were rated by their supervisors as doing high quality work. Brief and Aldag (1975) replicated Hackman and Lawler (1971) study and endorsed that higher order need strength moderated job characteristics.

Hackman & Oldham (1975) developed a comprehensive job characteristics model. This model recognizes that core job characteristics contribute to certain psychological states and that the strength of employees need for growth has important moderating effect. In essence the model advocates that certain job characteristics lead to certain critical psychological states such as skill variety, task identity and task significance may lead to experience meaningfulness, autonomy may lead to the feeling of responsibility and feedback may lead to knowledge of results. The more these psychological states are present, the more employees will feel good about themselves when they perform well. Hackman & Oldham (1975) combined these job characteristics into a single index called as motivating potential score (MPS). This
is a summary measure of work motivation.

Task characteristics moderated by growth need strength was studied by many other investigators also. However, it does not provide strong evidence for the positive role of growth need strength (GNS) as a moderator variable (Lawler, Hackman & Kaufman, 1973; Farr, 1976; Champoux, 1991; Tiegs et al., 1992).

Several studies have reported positive impact of enriched job on job satisfaction motivation and productivity in work setting (Stone & Porter, 1975; Orpen, 1979; Brass, 1985; Cellar, Kernan & Barrett, 1985; Head & Sorenson, 1985; Oldham, Hackman & Pearce, 1976; Loscoco, 1989; Sekaran, 1989, Kelly, 1992). Also self actualization, locus of control and job level (Sims & Szilagyi, 1976; Abdel & Ahmad, 1980), task complexity (Perrwe & Mizers, 1987), gender and personal responsibility (Dallinger & Hampble, 1988), attention arousal (Fox & Feldman, 1988) and organizaional commitment (Flynn & Tannenbamm, 1993) are the other aspects which influence job motivation and job involvement.

One of the job characteristics, autonomy has been separately studied by many researchers. Saratha (1984) contends that increasing autonomy and participation led to increased level of satisfaction. Kries & Brockopp (1986) also obtained similar results and found that autonomy was significantly related to job satisfaction. In a metaanalytic study, conducted by Spector (1986), autonomy and
participation were found to be associated with high level of involvement, performance and motivation.

Similarly feedback has been extensively researched. Fisher (1979) carried out a laboratory investigation and found that low performers liked their superiors less than high performers who get feedback. Adler, Skov & Salvemini (1985) have also obtained similar results. On the other hand, some researchers obtained contradictory results. They observed that the effects of feedback do not influence employee attitudes (Pearce & Porter, 1986; Das, 1986; Das & Mittal, 1989).

In a cross-cultural study Sekaran & Mowday (1981) obtained low correlations between job characteristics both for the USA and Indian samples. Their multiple regression analysis suggests that both individual characteristics and job characteristics are important predictors of job involvement.

The relationship between job characteristics and perceived organizational effectiveness with respect to organizational typology were studied by Sayeed & Vishwanathan (1983). They pointed out that extrinsic and intrinsic job factors differ in terms of importance in manufacturing and non-manufacturing organizations.

The significance of Hackman-Oldham job enrichment model (1976) in Indian context has been tested by many researchers.
Padaki, (1982 & 1984) found partial support for the model. In her factor analytical study, macro- and micro factors were found to be significant predictors of job satisfaction and motivational outcome. Padaki, however, did not find significant relation between job characteristics and individual performance effectiveness.

In a study aimed at finding out the profile of Indian managers perception of job characteristics, Maneriker & Patil (1983) found the Hackman model useful in arriving at a profile of manager. They suggested that the information on the five core job dimensions can be used as a diagnostic aid in redesigning jobs.

Kumar (1988) studied the relationship between job characteristics and need satisfaction of junior managers. He observed that there was a partial deficiency in all the need areas with regard to their fulfillment. Job characteristics were found to be related to need satisfaction whereas discretion was positively and variety was negatively related to need satisfaction.

Gandhi (1992) in her study found that job characteristics, on the whole, were not significant predictor of organizational identification but job autonomy and skill variety emerged as predictors of identification, while task identity emerged as predictor of organizational involvement.
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB INVOLVEMENT & DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

It is imperative that we must take into consideration the specific factors that may have motivational appeal for the people as well as the moderating effect of certain demographic variables on job motivation because a person comes to his job with his needs, aspirations and personality characteristics, etc (Herzberg et al, 1959; Ronan, 1970).

Review of studies also reveal that characteristics of workers must be considered along with characteristics of job in order to fully understand the workers effectiveness and attitudinal responses.

Many studies in our country have been conducted using correlational design to determine the relationship between demographic variables and job involvement. Certain demographic variables that have been selected for the present study are, chances of advancement, salary & job hierarchical level.

Chances of advancement or promotion is an important factor in motivation of employees. When an employee is promoted to the upper level of hierarchy he gets enhancement in salary, is assigned more challenging jobs, greater responsibilities and his worth is recognised. It may be assumed that the presence of these motivating conditions may enhance work effectiveness and job involvement. Review of literature in our country reveals that this variable has not been extensively researched. The present study may attempt to
Most important demographic variable for Indian sample is Salary (income). Salary appears to be able to satisfy not only existence needs but security and esteem needs as well. A number of research studies indicate positive relationship between salary and job involvement (Sharma & Kapoor, 1987; Aleem & Khandelwal, 1988; Orpen, 1988; Muktamath, Gaonkar & Pushpa, 1991). However, in their study (Pathak & Pathak, 1987; Chadha & Gill 1988) observed that income did not play any role in the job involvement of employee.

Job hierarchy influences job involvement of employees at work place. Many researchers have highlighted the significance of job level on job involvement (Sharma & Sharma, 1978; Das, 1983; Singh 1987; Aleem & Khandelwal, 1988; Choudhry 1988; Agarwala & Chadha, 1989; Singh Hussain & Pathak, 1994). Significant difference were found in the level of job involvement of managers, supervisors & workers.
AIMS & IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

During the last five years new fiscal policy has been initiated and vigorously pursued. Economic liberalisation, and new incentives to industrial organisation and emphasis on exports have injected the spirit of competition among industrial organization. The advent of multinationals in the country has started a process of organizational change. All these factors taken together demand that the organizations should achieve productive efficiency. It is needless to emphasise that job involvement is a crucial factor for enhancing performance of employees. Researches show that productive efficiency could not be achieved unless the various level of employees such as production line workers, supervisors and managers are sufficiently motivated to achieve organizational objectives and at the same time are motivated to fulfill their needs usually associated with the work life. In view of such broad considerations the present investigation was undertaken.

It has been pointed out earlier that job characteristics such as Autonomy, Task indentity, Feedback and Skill variety have not been extensively and intensively studied in our country. Also demographic variables have not been properly explored. An attempt has been made in the present investigation to take into consideration the core characteristics as well as demographic variables (Advancement & Salary) of workers, supervisors and managers of public sector undertakings. Probably, the present
investigation would throw light with the help of which better motivational strategy could be worked out to enhance job involvement of employees of various hierarchical levels.

The present investigation may help public sector organizations in formulating incentive programmes for their employees and achieve productive efficiency. Training managers could utilize the findings of the present investigation in reinforcing their orientation and refresher programmes.

The present investigation may be considered important from theoretical as well as applied point of view.
CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN
& METHODOLOGY
RESEARCH DESIGN:

Research design plays a significant role in inference making, using behavioural observations on a limited number of subjects and making decisions or predictions about the behaviour of the large group represented by these subjects. Edwards (1968) has specifically stated that "In research we do not haphazardly make observations of any and all kinds but rather our attention is directed towards those observations that we believe to be relevant to the questions we have previously formulated". His contention reflects the point that researches should be well planned and must be carried out using sound means and techniques for investigations. Research design enables the researcher to answer research questions as validly, objectively and accurately as possible.

Research design has assumed added significance in social and behavioural sciences and is considered to be the most important component of research methodology (Kerlinger, 1964).

Lindquist (1956) pointed out that "the researches are designed to proceed in a planned manner to control variance and answer pertinent research questions." Main functions of experimental designs are to maximize the effects of systematic variance, control of extraneous variance and minimize the error variance (Brooza, 1989). The design specifies the method to be employed for manipulating the independent variable and for measuring the dependent one. It helps in selection of appropriate statistical methods of
analysis. Ferguson (1981) asserts that several methodological approaches and designs have been developed but the choice of appropriate design depends upon the special characteristics of the sample, nature of measuring instruments and restraints regarding the manipulation of variables being studied. Thus, the choice of the method is governed by the aims of the study, the variables under investigation and the nature of the data. It is, thus, imperative that the objectives of the study should be spelt out clearly to facilitate the choice of the design. Research design can be classified into three broad categories: Exploratory, descriptive and hypothesis testing (Kothari, 1985). Exploratory research studies emphasise the discovery of ideas and insights. Such studies must be flexible enough to provide opportunity for considering different aspects of a problem under investigation. But it is usually difficult to postulate explicit hypothesis. Descriptive research studies are concerned with specific predictions, with narration of facts and characteristics concerning the individual, group or situation. The research design in case of hypothesis testing are those where the researcher tests the hypothesis of causal relationships between the variables.

The review of relevant literature in the preceding chapter has brought to light that certain job characteristics were found to be associated with many facets of jobs such as motivation, satisfaction and performance, job involvement, etc. It has been observed that changing or modifying certain
features of jobs resulted in the enhancement of quality of work life. But it has also been observed that in our country, various investigators (Kumar, 1978; Maneriker & Patil, 1983; Gandhi, 1992) studied different job characteristics. None of the researchers tried to investigate these four core job dimensions (Autonomy, Task identity, Feedback and Skill variety) as a composite model based on the assumptions that perception of these characteristics enhance employee motivation and improve their performance. Moreover, absence of any suitable measuring device to study job characteristics in Indian context, necessitated the development of a standardized tool. Such a void was narrowed by Naaz & Akhtar (1993) by developing a reliable and valid instrument for measuring job characteristics.

The main objectives of the present investigation as stated earlier are to determine the extent to which job involvement of an employee is influenced by these four job characteristics and a couple of demographic variables namely salary and opportunity for advancement. In other words, we are interested in ascertaining the predictors of job involvement for different categories of employees. The review of literature has also revealed that such variables as job characteristics and demographic variables have not been extensively investigated by Indian researchers.
METHODOLOGY

SAMPLE : A sample is that part of the universe which are selected for the purpose of investigation. A sample should exhibit the characteristics of the universe. According to Fisher (1950), a large sample is to be preferred than a smaller one. Actually the sample size is usually determined by the kind of problem to be investigated and the tools used by the researcher. A small random sample, however, is apt to be much superior to a larger but badly selected sample.

The present investigation was conducted in two Public Sector organisations—a Textile mill (Elgin mills Co. Ltd.) and a Tannery (Tannery & Footwear corporation of India Ltd., Tafco) located at Kanpur. Three levels of employees (Managers, Supervisors and Workers) were chosen for the present study. Since the total strength of both the organizations was very large only 25% of the workers were randomly selected for the study. The sample of managers and supervisors was 20% because the groups were much smaller in number as compared to the workers.

The total number of Elgin managers were 96, supervisors 124 and production line workers were 3,304. A complete list of managers, supervisors, and workers were obtained from the authorities of Elgin mills. A sample of 25% from each category of employees was randomly selected. Each subject was personally contacted and the purpose of the investigation was explained to them. They were administered Job Characteristics
and Job Involvement scales. As far as managers and supervisors were concerned, they submitted completed forms with much difficulty but for workers out of 850 forms distributed to them, after repeated visits only 405 forms were returned. Many workers expressed their inability to complete the form because they were illiterate. On scrutiny it was found that only 362 forms were complete. Thus, the sample of the managers was 24, the sample of the supervisors was 33 and the sample of the workers was 362 which were included in the study. It may also be pointed out that we distributed a few extra forms to the subjects on demand.

The same procedure was adopted for collecting data from Tafco employees. The total population of Tafco employees was 115 managers, 128 supervisors and 1431 production line workers. Although a sample of 25% from each level of employees were chosen for the study, the percentage of completed returns were very less as compared to Elgin employees. From the 360 forms distributed to workers, only 132 forms were found to be completed for further analysis. The complete returns from the supervisors and managers were 70 and 75 percent respectively.

Having obtained the returns, each and every respondents form was thoroughly scrutinized. The responses were tabulated on a mastersheet and tables were made separately for analysis in accordance with the requirements of statistical test.

The table given below presents the essential features
of the sample:

**TABLE 2.1: SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AVERAGE(S)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age(Years)</th>
<th>Tenure(Years)</th>
<th>Salary(Per month)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Mills</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>2800.83 Rs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannery</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43.80</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>3020.00 Rs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Mill</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.78</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>1836.36 Rs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannery</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.18</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>2045.65 Rs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Mill</td>
<td></td>
<td>362</td>
<td>41.62</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>1125.89 Rs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannery</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td>1546.10 Rs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOOLS USED:** The following scales were used for measuring the Job characteristics and Job involvement.

**JOB CHARACTERISTICS SCALE:** Job characteristics scale developed by Naaz & Akhtar (1993) was used to measure the job characteristics. It is a likert type 5-point self-rating scale. It consists of 28 items pertaining to four core job dimensions, ie., Autonomy; Task identity; Feedback & Skill variety. Validity of the scale was gauged by computing item total score correlation which range between .27 to .78. Product moment correlation coefficient computed between the four core job characteristics ranged between .18 to .81.
(N=100). The values were found statistically significant at .05 level.

Split-half reliability coefficient corrected by Spearman Brown formula for the four job characteristics were found as given below:

- Autonomy = .80
- Task identity = .60
- Feedback = .70
- Skill variety = .34

The overall reliability coefficient of the scale was .92 (Naaz, 1993). Both the reliability and validity values determine the efficacy of the scale (Appendix - A).

**JOB INVOLVEMENT:** The job involvement of the subjects was assessed with the help of Indian adaptation of Lodahl & Kejner's (1965) scale. This adaptation was undertaken by Akhtar & Bacha (1984). Its reliability coefficient (Split-half) has been reported to be .76. It is a 20 itemed 5-point rating scale. In the present investigation it was also used in Devanagri script adapted by Vadra (1991). To establish reliability of the Hindi version of the Job involvement scale, the scale was administered to a sample of 100 subjects both male and female teachers. The split-half reliability coefficient corrected by Spearman-Brown formula was .89. The obtained correlation value is significantly high for measuring the Job involvement in the Indian context (Appendix - B).
**STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**: The choice of a statistical method is linked to the type of data. Regression is considered to be the most suitable and useful technique because it ascertains the influence of several independent variables on the dependent one. (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). In the present study there are four job characteristics and two demographic variables considered as independent variables and one dependent variable, i.e., job involvement. Through this technique we intend to determine the significant predictors of the criterion or dependent variable.

The goal of research using regression is to illuminate the relationship between the dependent variable under consideration and a set of independent variables. As a preliminary step one can determine how strong the relationship is between dependent variable and the independent variables and then assess the importance of various independent variables to the relationship. Thus we can say that multiple regression is a statistical technique used to relate independent to dependent variables in a manner which takes interactive effects into account.

There are three major analytic strategies in multiple regression analysis namely: Standard, Hierarchical and Stepwise regression. Standard multiple regression is used when we have to simply assess relationships among variables and answer the basic question of multiple correlation. In hierarchical regression the researcher controls entry of variables into the regression equation on the basis of
logical or theoretical considerations. In the stepwise regression method the order of entry of variable is based on statistical criteria for using these methods might be theoretical or for development of hypothesis (Kerlinger, 1964).

In the present research we have made use of standard multiple regression and stepwise regression. Standard multiple regression strategy calls for entry of all independent variables into the regression equation at once. Each independent variable is assessed as it had entered the regression after all other independent variables had been entered. Each independent variable, then, can be evaluated in terms of what it adds to prediction of the dependent variable, over and above the predictability afforded by all the other independent variables. The next part of the analyses deals with stepwise multiple regression. It was applied to find out the best prediction equation for criterion variable. As exploratory technique, stepwise regression can be seen as model building procedure (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983).

Many experts (Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977; Herman & Hulin, 1972; Herman, Dunham & Hulin, 1975 and Newman, 1975) have used sophisticated multivariate analysis to identify the relative amount of common variance shared by a contribution of several independent variables and assess their influence on job involvement. Thus, our choice of stepwise multiple regression analysis was determined by the suggestion of above mention experts.
RESULTS:

Multiple regression analysis was applied for predicting job involvement which has been considered as the criterion variable. The predictor variables were certain job characteristics, such as, autonomy, task identity, feedback, skill variety and demographic variables (chances of advancement and salary).

First of all to find out the individual predictors and significance of relationship between independent variables and dependent variable, a standard multiple regression was computed.

Next part of the analyses deals with the relative contribution of each of the independent variable in explaining the variance for the dependent variable of job involvement. It was assessed by applying stepwise multiple regression analysis.

Table 3.1 STANDARD MULTIPLE REGRESSION (TOTAL SAMPLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Regression coefficient</th>
<th>Std. error of Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.0724</td>
<td>.0869</td>
<td>.0588</td>
<td>1.4782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>.1003</td>
<td>.1277</td>
<td>.0635</td>
<td>2.0096**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.0808</td>
<td>.0965</td>
<td>.0636</td>
<td>1.5166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill variety</td>
<td>-.0418</td>
<td>-.2136</td>
<td>.0864</td>
<td>2.4704**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.0144</td>
<td>-.0589</td>
<td>.5306</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.2224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= 68.5725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>.1593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. error of estimate</td>
<td>7.7899</td>
<td>Overall F = 2.5545**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** P<.05
Table 3.1 shows standard multiple regression analysis, done on the total sample of workers, supervisors and managers of the two organizations.

It is clear from the results that all the independent variables taken together influence job involvement of employees \( (F = 2.55, P < .05) \). Task identity and skill variety emerged as significant predictor of job involvement.

In the same manner the influence of job characteristics on job involvement of the workers of both the organizations were analyzed separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. error of Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.0067</td>
<td>.0076</td>
<td>.0699</td>
<td>.1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>.0925</td>
<td>.1211</td>
<td>.0763</td>
<td>1.5868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.0669</td>
<td>.1144</td>
<td>.0782</td>
<td>1.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>.0818</td>
<td>-.2208</td>
<td>.1019</td>
<td>2.165**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.0124</td>
<td>.2662</td>
<td>.6368</td>
<td>.4181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.0017</td>
<td>.0035</td>
<td>.4915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>= 71.6269</td>
<td>Multiple R = .1604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. error of estimate</td>
<td>= 7.9611</td>
<td>Overall F = 1.5642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result indicate that independent variables as a whole do not have any significant effect on the dependent variable \( (R = .1604, F = 1.5642) \). Only one variable
i.e., skill variety, emerged as a significant predictor of job involvement.

In case of Tannery workers independent variables as a whole failed to predict job involvement (F = 2.068). Task identity has a unique contribution to job involvement, the value of 2.695 being significant at .05 (Table 3.3).

**TABLE 3.3. STANDARD MULTIPLE REGRESSION (TANNERY WORKERS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variables</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. error of Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.1810</td>
<td>.1812</td>
<td>.1207</td>
<td>1.5004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>.2534</td>
<td>.3718</td>
<td>.1379</td>
<td>2.695**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.0775</td>
<td>-.0312</td>
<td>.1276</td>
<td>.2448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>.0554</td>
<td>-.0378</td>
<td>.1784</td>
<td>.2123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-.0162</td>
<td>.8744</td>
<td>1.0664</td>
<td>.8199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.0029</td>
<td>.0044</td>
<td>.6797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 58.7513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. error of estimate</td>
<td>= 7.3732</td>
<td>Multiple R = .3005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F = 2.068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** P< .05

Next part of the analysis deals with combined sample of Textile mill and Tannery employees.

Table 3.4 shows the result obtained by both the organizations workers.
TABLE 3.4 STANDARD MULTIPLE REGRESSION (WORKERS, COMBINED SAMPLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. error of Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.0777</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.0638</td>
<td>1.2541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>.1347</td>
<td>.1776</td>
<td>.0704</td>
<td>2.5198**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.0895</td>
<td>.0698</td>
<td>.7037</td>
<td>.9924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.0235</td>
<td>-.1855</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>1.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.0363</td>
<td>.1843</td>
<td>.5703</td>
<td>.3232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.0901</td>
<td>.0029</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>1.8449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intercept = 63.8742  Multiple R = .1908
Std. error of estimate = 7.6586  Overall F = 3.0683*

** P< .05
* P< .01

From the table 3.4 it is clear that independent variables as a whole emerge as predictors of job involvement with a significant F(F = 3.0683, P<.01). Again task identity was found as significant predictor of job involvement.

Further analyses were undertaken to gauge the influence of predictor variables on job involvement of supervisors and managers of both the organizations.
### Table 3.5 Standard Multiple Regression (Supervisors, Combined Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. error of Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-.0009</td>
<td>.1337</td>
<td>.1807</td>
<td>.7399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>.0232</td>
<td>-.0422</td>
<td>.2078</td>
<td>.2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.0398</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.2193</td>
<td>.8252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.1536</td>
<td>-.4597</td>
<td>.3013</td>
<td>1.5253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-.1398</td>
<td>-2.1486</td>
<td>1.9717</td>
<td>1.0897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.2203</td>
<td>.0077</td>
<td>.0052</td>
<td>1.471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intercept: $= 62.8829$, Multiple $R = .3367$

Std. error of estimate: $= 7.9336$, Overall $F = 1.0442$

In the supervisor sample, independent variables failed to predict job involvement (Table 3.5).

### Table 3.6 Standard Multiple Regression (Managers, Combined Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. error of Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.1589</td>
<td>.6665</td>
<td>.3216</td>
<td>2.0719**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>-.1067</td>
<td>-.3783</td>
<td>.2863</td>
<td>1.3212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.1285</td>
<td>.1529</td>
<td>.2619</td>
<td>.5837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.0746</td>
<td>-.8042</td>
<td>.4388</td>
<td>1.8325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-.0135</td>
<td>-1.8865</td>
<td>2.5005</td>
<td>.7544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.0325</td>
<td>.0021</td>
<td>.0027</td>
<td>.7937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intercept: $= 70.5452$, Multiple $R = .3798$

Std. error of estimate: $= 8.8337$, Overall $F = 1.0677$

** $P < .05$
Similar trend is discernible for managers of Textile mill & Tannery organizations. Table 3.6 reports that only one job characteristics, autonomy predicts job involvement of managers sample.

The last part of the analysis deals with combined sample (workers, supervisors & managers) of both the organizations separately.

**Table 3.7 Standard Multiple Regression (Textile Mill Employees)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. error of Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.0217</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.0702</td>
<td>1.0403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>.0666</td>
<td>.0931</td>
<td>.0773</td>
<td>1.2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.0301</td>
<td>.0872</td>
<td>.0787</td>
<td>1.1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.1058</td>
<td>-.3005</td>
<td>.1031</td>
<td>2.915*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-.0003</td>
<td>.2550</td>
<td>.6507</td>
<td>.3919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>-.0692</td>
<td>-.0014</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>1.6182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intercept = 71.8772

Std. error of estimate = 7.9611

**Multiple R = .1757**

**Overall F = 2.1873**

* P< .01
** P< .05

Table 3.7 shows that overall independent variable influence job involvement of Textile mill employees (F = 2.1873, P < .05). Skill variety emerged as single independent predictor of job involvement.
Table 3.8 shows results of Tannery employees. Neither multiple R nor independent variables emerged as predictor of job involvement of Tannery employees.

**TABLE 3.8. STANDARD MULTIPLE REGRESSION (TANNERY EMPLOYEES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. error of Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.1638</td>
<td>.1088</td>
<td>.1051</td>
<td>1.0351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>.1622</td>
<td>.2041</td>
<td>.1091</td>
<td>1.8711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.1381</td>
<td>.1134</td>
<td>.1047</td>
<td>1.0832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>.0653</td>
<td>-.0524</td>
<td>.1559</td>
<td>.3361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-.0349</td>
<td>-1.1275</td>
<td>.9077</td>
<td>1.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.0663</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.5758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.1442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. error of estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R = .2411
Overall F = 1.7388

In the previous analysis of multiple regression all the variables were found as predictors and they entered into the regression equation at once without any consideration of the degree and significance of their correlations with the criterion. Since this was an exploratory study, so there was need to know the relative contribution of independent variable that adds most to the prediction of the dependent variable in terms of increasing $R^2$.

Table 3.9 shows the results of stepwise regression analysis applied to total sample. It clearly reveals that all the independent variables put together
yielded a multiple $R$ of .15 and accounted for two percent of the total variance in job involvement out of which one percent was accounted by the task identity.

**TABLE 3.9 STEPWISE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (TOTAL SAMPLE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>.15319</td>
<td>.10031</td>
<td>.01006</td>
<td>.01006</td>
<td>6.0272*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.08472</td>
<td>.12036</td>
<td>.01449</td>
<td>.00442</td>
<td>2.6575**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.16606</td>
<td>.14739</td>
<td>.02172</td>
<td>.00724</td>
<td>4.3722*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.08648</td>
<td>.1591</td>
<td>.02531</td>
<td>.00359</td>
<td>2.1739**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.00012</td>
<td>.15932</td>
<td>.02538</td>
<td>.00007</td>
<td>.04216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-.05891</td>
<td>.15939</td>
<td>.0254</td>
<td>.00002</td>
<td>.01233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** P< .05
* P< .01

Next part of the analysis deals with workers sample of both the organizations. Table 3.10 shows the result of Textile mill workers.

**TABLE 3.10 STEPWISE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (TEXTILE MILL WORKERS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$Change</th>
<th>F change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>.1372</td>
<td>.0970</td>
<td>.0094</td>
<td>.0094</td>
<td>3.3636*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.1437</td>
<td>.1303</td>
<td>.0169</td>
<td>.0075</td>
<td>2.7228**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.0536</td>
<td>.1393</td>
<td>.0194</td>
<td>.0024</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.4166</td>
<td>.1436</td>
<td>.0206</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>.4329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>-.0015</td>
<td>.1454</td>
<td>.0211</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.0273</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.0216</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.1593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** P< .05
* P< .01
Two of the predictor variables, that is, Task identity and skill variety contributed significantly for the prediction of the criterion (job involvement) in Textile mill workers group. \( R^2 \) for task identity was .0094 \( (F = 3.36; P<.01) \). After the entry of skill variety, \( R^2 \) was .0169 \( (F = 2.72; P<.05) \). However altogether independent variables yielded multiple \( R \) of .14 and accounted for two percent of the total variance to job involvement.

Tannery workers results are reported in table 3.11.

**TABLE 3.11  STEPWISE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (TANNERY WORKERS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2 ) Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>.3958</td>
<td>.2534</td>
<td>.0642</td>
<td>.0642</td>
<td>8.9231*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.1507</td>
<td>.2853</td>
<td>.0814</td>
<td>.0172</td>
<td>2.4176**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-.8428</td>
<td>.2939</td>
<td>.0864</td>
<td>.0049</td>
<td>.6986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.0027</td>
<td>.2989</td>
<td>.0894</td>
<td>.0029</td>
<td>.4136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>-.0355</td>
<td>.2999</td>
<td>.0899</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.0799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.0378</td>
<td>.3005</td>
<td>.0903</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( P<.01 \)
** \( P<.05 \)

In this group multiple \( R \) of .30 accounts 9 percent of the total variance in job involvement. Task identity and Autonomy entered into the regression equation at the first and second step respectively and these two variables shared as much as 8% of the variance with the criterion.

Next phase of the study deals with different level of employees of both organization being analyzed.
separately.

Table 3.12 present the result of workers combined sample.

**TABLE 3.12  **STEPWISE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (WORKERS, COMBINED SAMPLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R²Change</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>.2081</td>
<td>.1347</td>
<td>.0181</td>
<td>.0181</td>
<td>9.0918*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.0029</td>
<td>.1586</td>
<td>.0251</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>3.5448*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed back</td>
<td>.0702</td>
<td>.1671</td>
<td>.0279</td>
<td>.0027</td>
<td>1.3848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.1386</td>
<td>.1823</td>
<td>.0332</td>
<td>.0053</td>
<td>2.6836**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.0815</td>
<td>.1909</td>
<td>.0364</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>1.6372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.1922</td>
<td>.1915</td>
<td>.0366</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.1135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P< .01  
**P< .05

Results indicates that all the predictor variable yielded multiple R of .19. Task identity entering the regression first accounts for one percent of the variance of Job involvement. Demographic variable; salary contributes significantly to the prediction of job involvement. Skill variety entering fourth in the regression adds 3% of predictable variance.

Table 3.13 presents the result of combined sample of supervisors group.
The results indicate that only one independent variable, salary, emerge as significant predictor of job involvement ($F = 2.75; P<.05$) of supervisor group. However, all independent variables accounts for 11% of predictable variance with a multiple $R$ of .33.

** TABLE 3.13 STEPWISE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (SUPERVISOR COMBINED SAMPLE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$Change</th>
<th>$F$ change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.0078</td>
<td>.2203</td>
<td>.0485</td>
<td>.0485</td>
<td>2.7564**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.2401</td>
<td>.2567</td>
<td>.0659</td>
<td>.0173</td>
<td>.9837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.1681</td>
<td>.2914</td>
<td>.0849</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1.0818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-1.7433</td>
<td>.3167</td>
<td>.1003</td>
<td>.0153</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.1809</td>
<td>.3355</td>
<td>.1126</td>
<td>.0123</td>
<td>.6939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>-.0421</td>
<td>.3367</td>
<td>.1133</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>.0412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $P< .05$**

** TABLE 3.14 STEPWISE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (MANAGERS COMBINED SAMPLE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$Change</th>
<th>$F$ change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.2427</td>
<td>.1589</td>
<td>.0252</td>
<td>.0252</td>
<td>1.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.5493</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.0681</td>
<td>.0428</td>
<td>1.5352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>-.3308</td>
<td>.3337</td>
<td>.1114</td>
<td>.0432</td>
<td>1.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.0021</td>
<td>.3545</td>
<td>.1257</td>
<td>.0142</td>
<td>.6537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-1.7292</td>
<td>.3695</td>
<td>.1365</td>
<td>.0109</td>
<td>.4922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.1529</td>
<td>.3798</td>
<td>.1442</td>
<td>.0076</td>
<td>.3406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In case of managers sample (Table 3.14), all the independent variables put together accounted for 14% of the total variance with a multiple $R$ of .37. But none of the variables contributed significantly to the prediction of criterion.

The next phase of analysis included workers, supervisors and managers of both the organizations collectively.

**TABLE 3.15 STEPWISE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (TEXTILE MILL EMPLOYEES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$F$ change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>.1065</td>
<td>.0113</td>
<td>.0113</td>
<td>4.7072*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.1166</td>
<td>.1383</td>
<td>.0191</td>
<td>.0077</td>
<td>3.2448*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>.1168</td>
<td>.1565</td>
<td>.0245</td>
<td>.0053</td>
<td>2.2517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.1665</td>
<td>.0277</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>1.3434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.0775</td>
<td>.1732</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.0022</td>
<td>.9553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.3073</td>
<td>.1747</td>
<td>.0305</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.2202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P < .01$

Table 3.15 shows results obtained by Textile mill employees. It indicates that 3% of the variance attributed to predictor variables with a significant multiple $R$ of .17. Skill variety and autonomy emerge as significant predictor and account for almost two percent of variance of job involvement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2 ) Change</th>
<th>F change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.1788</td>
<td>.1638</td>
<td>.0268</td>
<td>.0268</td>
<td>4.8018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>.1892</td>
<td>.2096</td>
<td>.0439</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>3.0912*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-.7899</td>
<td>.2205</td>
<td>.0486</td>
<td>.0047</td>
<td>.8517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>.1151</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.0557</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1.2839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.2398</td>
<td>.0575</td>
<td>.0017</td>
<td>.3196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>-.0524</td>
<td>.2411</td>
<td>.0581</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.1133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( P < .01 \)

Tannery employees results indicates (Table 3.16) that predictor variable significantly correlated with the criterion with a multiple \( R \) of .24 accounting for 5% of the variance. \( R \) for Autonomy was .1638 found to be significant ( \( F = 4.80; P < .01 \)). After the entry of Task identity \( R \) was .2096 (\( F = 3.09; P < .01 \)). These two predictor variables accounts for 4% of the variation.
DISCUSSION:

In the present study, we have explored the relationship between job involvement and selected demographic variables and certain job characteristics.

The analyses reported earlier are reasonably consistent with the findings of previous job involvement studies. Many investigator (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Brief & Aldag, 1975; Saal, 1978; Cellar, Kerman & Barrett, 1985; Elloy et al., 1991. Lambert, 1991 and Gandhi, 1992) have shown that the core characteristics are instrumental in motivating employees, enhancing their job satisfaction, performance and job involvement. In our study, 'task identity' emerged as the most significant predictor of job involvement to the sample of both the organisations workers. We studied three level of employees, i.e., worker, supervisor & managers. We observed that for supervisors, the salary was an important predictor variable and autonomy was valued by managers sample. The same trend was discernible with respect to Tannery employees. However, in case of Textile mill, 'skill variety' emerged as significant predictor for the criterion variable.

Task identity significantly predicts job involvement. This would mean that employees consider their job as their own or they have a sense of belongingness to their job. It offers employees the chance to do whole and identifiable piece of work in their job. In this study, the
reason behind the significant relationship of task identity with job involvement might be that when a job is autonomous, workers are allowed to schedule their work activity and it led them to develop identification with their job. Fried & Ferris (1987) found that 'task identity' was highly related with work performance. More recently, in Indian context, Gandhi (1992) contended that task identity significantly predicts organisational involvement.

Skill variety was found to be negatively correlated with job involvement. When we examine the data we observe that low score on skill variety were associated with high values on job involvement. It could be inferred that the employees, by and large, do not aspire for skill variety. But experts from industrially developed countries have often argued that skill variety has motivational implications for job satisfaction. On the other hand, we observed that skill variety may not have motivational appeal for the Indian sample (Kumar, 1988). Skill variety demands that one must have developed expertise to undertake multiple activity on the work. In this regard the performance at the job is bound to become more complex. Those who prefer simple and routine job may not like to undertake complex activities. Another job characteristics, 'autonomy' emerged as significant predictor for the sample of managers only. It may be visualized that autonomy granted by the organisation may develop in the employee the feeling of freedom to schedule his work and to set up the pace of his work. These aspects
are bound to develop job involvement among the employees. It means that, autonomy may prompt employees to feel more responsible for the work outcomes. When employees schedule their own work, they think that the outcome depends on their own efforts, initiatives and decisions. Subsequently, they may feel more concerned with the organization. Our finding lends support to the findings of Mannheim & Dubin (1986), Spector (1986) and Zikeye (1989) who found that job autonomy was significantly related with job satisfaction, work role centrality, etc. Beside 'autonomy', managers in particular do not show any significant relationship with other job characteristics and demographic variables. These finding are in line with the findings of Sinha (1973), Maneriker & Patil (1983). Sinha (1973) concluded that managers in public sector organisations believed that hard and sincere work was likely to bring "nothing in particular". The employees in such organisations generally lacked organizational identification. They felt that the organisation was "of the Govt." and they just performed their job roles to earn their bread (Srivastava & Krishna, 1992).

With respect to the relationship between job involvement and demographic variables, we find that only salary emerged as an important predictor for the sample of workers and supervisors. Our findings partially support the findings of Sharma & Kapoor (1978), Pathak and Pathak (1987), Aleem and Khandelwal (1988). Salary is not significantly perceived by the managers. Chadha & Gill (1988) also found
similar result. They contended that with the increased income the managers tend to take their task easily and involves themselves in many other side activities. As the very easy way of working also pays them well, they overlook their responsibility and seem to be less job involved.

The stepwise regression shown in Table 3.9 clearly suggest that job characteristics are much better predictors of job involvement than are the demographic variables. Our findings support previous research efforts that immediate job situation may exert influence on job involvement (Ruh & White, 1974). Saal (1978) contends that job characteristics explain a larger proportion of the variance in job involvement than personal demographic variables. Rabinowitz & Hall (1977) state that "no one class of variables shows clearly the stronger relationships to job involvement than any other".

The results of the present study should be interpreted in terms of organizational structure as well as job hierarchy. Being public sector undertakings both the organizations had a set of rules and procedures. It is an open secret that such organizations do not provide substantial freedom to the individuals in scheduling their job activities. Probably, such aspects as initiative and personal enthusiasm are not permissible due to which it is not aspired for. This may lessen involvement with the job. Moreover in such organizations, opportunities for advancement are limited. It takes many years to get promotion. So salary
becomes important factor of job involvement of the employees. Lack of opportunities of advancement combined with ever increasing cost of living is bound to lay emphasis on salary which is aspired by the employees. The government announces, at regular intervals, enhancement of dearness allowance but such enhancement hardly compensate the rising prices of various commodities.

**Suggestion for future research:**

It has been made amply clear that the present study was conducted on the two public sector organizations (ELGIN & TAFCO) of Kanpur. The sample of the present study (n = 595) was comprehensive but it is visualized that such study should be conducted in various other public sector undertakings. It is also suggested that the present study should be conducted in private sector as well.

With the liberalization of economic policies many multinational companies have established their organization in the country. The job conditions in such organizations are much different than the private organizations of the country. Thus, the study may be extended to multinational companies as well as private sector organizations. Also many Indian organizations have started joint ventures with foreign collaborators. Such organizations should also be explored to determine the influence of job characteristics on job involvement.
There are many other psychological factors such as early socialization process, locus of control, work values and ethics which may influence job characteristics as well as job involvement. These variables should also be researched. Unless it is done the present finding cannot be generalized.
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APPENDICES
The present investigation aims at studying the aspirations of people pertaining to their job. Often disparity in perception leads to many organisational problems. We seek your co-operation in finding out the desired aspects in order to formulate programmes for better industrial relations.

Your frank responses would be of great help to us. You need not to reveal your identity and your responses would be treated in strict confidence.

Thanks.
INSTRUCTIONS:

Please carefully read each statement and indicate the extent to which you observe the aspects mentioned below in your organisation. In this regard, you have to follow the procedure as indicated to give your response. Please note that you have to evaluate each statement.

Please put (5) within the bracket if you 'Fully Agree' with the statement. Put (1) within the bracket if you 'Fully Disagree' with the statement. In this manner, you have to put 4, 3, and 2 accordingly.

In this Organisation............

1. Good workers are appreciated by the supervisors. (   )
2. Workers use the same method over and over again in doing their work (   )
3. Workers generally feel satisfied when assigned a challenging task. (   )
4. Changes in the method of work is introduced without consulting the workers. (   )
5. Usually workers get economic rewards for efficient performance. (   )
6. Workers get sufficient authority to discharge their job related responsibilities. (   )
7. Most of the workers would work beyond working hours even if they are not paid for it. (   )
8. Generally the people are given respective task to perform. (   )
9. Most of the workers would like to shoulder greater responsibilities. ( )
10. The workers are given recognition for the good work done by them. ( )
11. The performance target is decided by the worker himself. ( )
12. Workers are assigned different duties from time to time. ( )
13. Display of skills by the worker is usually appreciated. ( )
14. Worker have a reasonable say in deciding how their job is to be carried out. ( )
15. People have sense of accomplishment because they are given challenging work. ( )
16. Workers are invited to participate in decision making. ( )
17. Usually the workers do their work irrespective of any reward of recognition. ( )
18. Workers are encouraged for suggesting new ideas about the work. ( )
19. Most of the workers do not willingly do extra bit of work. ( )
20. Workers are informed about their level of performance. ( )
21. Workers views on organizational effectiveness are honoured by the management. ( )
22. Workers are seldom encouraged to perform different duties. ( )
23. Supervisors generally consult their workers whenever any problems crop up. ( )
24. Most of the people consider that finishing the work within a given time is a challenge for them. ( )
25. Opportunities are given to people to experiment with innovative methods of work. ( )
26. The management usually gives reward to good workers. 

27. Usually the workers work at a fixed location of time and place (such as, same place, table etc.) while completing the task. 

28. The choice of the method of work is left to workers. 

Please furnish the following information:

How long you have been working in this Organization: ........................................

How long have you been in this profession: ......................................................

What are the chances of advancement in this organization (Good, Average, Poor): ........................................

Nature of Employment (Permanent or Temporary): ..................................................

Name of your Position: .................................................................

Income: .................................................................

Age: .................................................................

Educational level: .................................................................

Marital status: .................................................................

Sex: .................................................................
Esta pàgina da a entender que el trabajo de los empleados es suministrar a dos empleados de la empresa. En contra de la confrontación en un ambiente donde se puedan generar conflictos, el trabajo de los empleados debe ser amigable. Los empleados deben ser comprensivos de las necesidades de la empresa y estar dispuestos a ayudar.

A su voluntad de hacerlo, ellos recibirán su ayuda en caso de que lo necesiten. Los empleados deben estar dispuestos a cuidar lo que está en la mano.

Vuestro apoyo.

Año del Laboratorio.
निदेश:— दुःख किस्मतिक बयान को ध्यान में पड़िये और यह बतायें कि यह बातें जिन तैयारी में आप काम करते हैं, उसमें कितने हद तक पापीत्व रहते हैं। इतने तरह से आपको अवां ठहरे लिए नीचे काटे जाये जो तरीकों का पालन करना होगा। दुःख कह ध्यान रखें कि ग्राम पुरुषों का जीवन कैसा है।

अगर ब्राह्मण के "पूरी तरह सहाय" है तो उसे हुए हैं। हां हैं लिखें और अगर-पूरीतित सूचक है, तो हैं। हैं लिखें। इन तरह आपको 4.3 और 2 ऊंची को इजाहार किया करना है।

इस तैयारी में —————

1. उपरी कर्मचारियों को निर्देश अक्षर सराहते हैं।
2. कर्मचारी काम करने में एक ही विधि का बार-बार अर्पण करते हैं।
3. आम्बूर पर कर्मचारी चुनौतिपूर्ण काम मिलने पर स्वाभाविक आश्वासन करते हैं।
4. काम करने के तरीकों में परिलक्षित कर्मचारियों के लाभ माहिती के विवरण किया जाता है।

5. उपरी काम करने पर कर्मचारियों को आशीर्वाद दिया जाता है।
6. कर्मचारियों को अपने काम से तपस्वी-आत्म उत्तरदायित्व की पूरा करने के लिए काफी जोखिम मिलते हैं।
7. अधिकार कर्मचारी नियामक समय के बाद भी काम करने के तैयार होते हैं। उसे इसके लिए उनके देन से न निले।
8. एक ही अवधारणा से लौटे जा सकता है।
9. अधिकार कर्मचारी और अन्य कंपनी के दायित्व निभाना पड़ते हैं।
10. उपरी काम करने पर कर्मचारियों का भारत दिया जाता है।
11. काम करने के लाभ कर्मचारी स्वयं को नियामक करता है।
12. तपस्वी-आत्म कर्मचारी का आलम-आलम काम करने का दिखा जाता है।
13. आम्बूर पर कर्मचारियों को कार्यक्षण की पूर्णता होती है।
14. कर्मचारियों की नियंत्रित अवधोत दिया। कितना का वह अन्य काम है।
15. लौटे में क्रमबद्ध प्रसारित का अवसान होता है, जब उन्हें नौकरी अर्पण करता है।
16. निष्पादन करने में कर्मचारियों को बेहतर हो दिशा लेने का अवसर दिया जाता है।
17. आम्बूर पर कर्मचारी इनाम या प्रशस्ति को परामर्श किये बिना अनन्त काम करते हैं।
18. कर्मचारियों को काम से अभ्यास नये लुभाव देने के लिए प्रेरित किया जाता है।
19. कर्मचारियों को अपने काम के स्तर के बारे में जानकारी प्रदान की जाती है।
20. कर्मचारियों के स्वाभाविक काम करने वाले कर्मी का प्रबल मूल्य उपलब्ध करता है।
21. कर्मचारियों की विविधता प्रकार का काम करने के लिए कम हो प्रेरित किया जाता है।
22. आम्बूर पर निरूपित कितना तस्कर के उमरने पर कर्मचारियों से तलाश लेते हैं।
23. अधिकार के लाभ समझते हैं कि समय के काम पुरा करना उनके लिए एक अनावश्यक है।
24. लौटे को काम करने के नये तरीकों पर प्रयोग करने भी देखा अवसर दिये जाते हैं।
25. कर्मचारियों के निवास का पुर्व-पीछा मूल्य उपयोग हो सकता है।
26. आम्बूर पर प्रबल काम करने वालों को प्राप्त करता है।
27. आम्बूर पर कर्मचारी को नियामक नियामक समय पर स्थान पर की अन्य काम पर करते हैं।
28. काम करने के तरीकों का प्राप्त निर्माण कर्मचारियों पर हो दिया जाता है।
JOB-INVOlVEMENT SCALE

APPENDIX-B

You are requested to read carefully each statement and rate them from 1 to 5, as you did earlier, in other words:

If you totally find yourself in agreement with the statement then you put (5) in the bracket,
If you agree put (4) in the bracket,
If undecided put (3) in the bracket,
If you disagree put (2) in the bracket,
If you find yourself total disagreement then put (1) in the bracket.

1. I will stay overtime to finish a job even if I am not paid for it. ( )
2. You can measure a person pretty well by how good a job he/she does. ( )
3. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job. ( )
4. For me, time at work really fly by. ( )
5. I usually show up for work a little early to get things ready. ( )
6. The most important things that happen to me involves my work. ( )
7. Sometimes I lie awake at night thinking ahead to the next day's work. ( )
8. I am really perfectionist about my work. ( )
9. I feel depressed when I fail at something connected with my job. ( )
10. I have other activities more important than my work. ( )
11. I live, eat and breathe my job.
12. I would probably keep working even if I did not need the money.
13. Quite often I feel like staying home from work instead of coming in.
14. To me, my work is only a small part of who I am.
15. I am very much involved personally in my work.
16. I avoid taking on extra duties and responsibilities in my work.
17. I used to be more ambitious about my work than I am now.
18. Most things in life are more important than work.
19. I used to care more about my work, but now other things are more important to me.
20. Sometimes I would like to kick myself for the mistakes I make in my work.
JOB INVOLVEMENT SCALE

APPENDIX-B2

नितौता- कृपया निम्नलिखित दर प्रश्न को ध्यानपूर्वक पढ़ें और अपने उत्तर, कैसे जिनके माने अपने पहले रिपोर्ट में पूरा नहीं किया होगा, हां या नहीं किया होगा।

1- मैं अपना काम नियमित समय से जैसे-समय नमने पर भी पूरा करूँगा /होने ( )

2- आदमी की असली पहचान इस बात से होती है कि यह किसी काम को जितनी उच्च तरह करता है।

3- जीवन में सच्चे-सच्चे अपने कार्य से ही कितना है।

4- काम करते हुए कठिन तरह सुबह बाता है, यहूदी पता ही नहीं किता।

5- अब मे अपने काम पर पहले ही पहुँच जाता /जा ती कौन सा मैं अपने काम की तैयारी कर सकूँ।

6- जीवन की अवस्था महत्वपूर्ण घटनाओं मैं काम तो समय-पता करती है।

7- कमी-2 मैं रात को लैटे-2 अपने दिन के काम के बारे में सोचका रहता /रहती हूँ।

8- मैं अपने काम के बारे में परिपक्वता के विद्यालय पर विचार करता /रहता हूँ।

9- जब मैं किसी काम में नामकरण होता /होती हूँ तो मुझे जादी का अनुभव होता है।

10- मेरे लिए और काम इससे ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण है।

11- काम की भूमि-बिखराई है।

12- अगर मुझे भी करता न भी होंगे तो शायद मैं काम करता नहीं।

13- अब मैं कार्य पर आने की अपेक्षा घर पर लक्षा पत्थर करता हूँ /करती हूँ।

14- मैं तद्दाह्य हूँ /समझता हूँ कि मेरे काम मैं मेरा बेचलर ग्राजुएट शोधा साहू परीक्षा करता है।

15- मैं अपने काम में हो मस्त रहता /रहती हूँ।

16- मैं अपने काम में अतिरिक्त काम और व्यापार की जिम्मेदारी /सोने करता /करती हूँ।

17- आप की अपेक्षा पहले अपने काम के प्रति अर्क महत्वपूर्ण रखता / रखती थी।

18- जीवन में अक्षरता चीजें कार्य से चयादमहत्वपूर्ण है।

19- ये पहले मैं अपने काम के बारे में चिन्तित रहता था /रहती थी लेकिन अब मेरे लिए काम की अपेक्षा दूसरी चीजें ज्यादा महत्व रखती है।

20- कभी-कभी मेरा दिल चाहता है कि अपने काम में की गई गलतियाँ के लिए मैं अपने आपको सजा।