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Abstract

Although psychological literature abounds in studies of occupational stress, there is little reference in the Indian context on stressors outside the organization. The investigation undertaken presents a reorientation of emphasis in the sense that instead of exclusive concern with occupational stressors, an appreciation of extra-organizational stressors, namely social and family, has been kept in mind. More specifically, the thrust of the present investigation is to investigate and isolate the organizational and extra-organizational sources of stress which can predict job-involvement in a variety of different occupational settings. It also takes into account the influence of such demographic variable as age, sex, income and job-tenure on job-involvement. The study assumes added significance because occupational stress and social and family role stress together may have a more profound and crucial influence on the job-involvement of the individual than either type of stress alone.

The nature of the study presumed that social and family role stress, twelve dimensions of occupational stress, age, income and job tenure would be the independent variables
while job-involvement would be the criterion or dependent variable. The sample consisted of 340 employees from four organizations namely educational institutions, nationalised banks, medical college hospital, and telephone exchange. These four professional groups were chosen to find out whether the stressors were specific to the nature of the job or they had a common link across the professions.

Design of the Study

The focal aspect of the present investigation, as stated earlier, was to determine the extent to which job-involvement of an employee is influenced by occupational stress, social and family role stress, and a set of demographic variables namely age, sex, income and job tenure. In other words we were interested in ascertaining the predictors of job-involvement for various occupational groups and answer such questions so as to find out:

1) the prevalence of occupational stress and social and family role stress among teachers, telephone operators, nurses and bank cashiers/clerks and the extent to which they influence job involvement.

2) the influence of demographic variables on job-involvement of the above mentioned groups.

3) the extent of which men and women differ on job involvement.
Major Findings and Suggestions

Standard Multiple Regression Analysis was conducted to determine the predictors of job involvement. It was found that:

1. For the overall sample social and family role stress, role ambiguity, political and group pressures, poor-peer relations, intrinsic impoverishment, income and job tenure emerged as the predictors of job involvement.

2. For men teachers, social and family role stress, political and group pressures, under-participation, strenuous working conditions, unprofitability, age and income contributed to the prediction of job involvement.

3. For women teachers none of the IVs emerged as the predictor of job involvement.

4. For men operators four dimensions of occupational stress namely role ambiguity, responsibility for persons, powerlessness and unprofitability exerted significant influence on job-involvement.

5. For women operators, the F-value was found to be significant which indicates that the IVs as a whole exert significant impact on the D.V. But further analysis revealed insignificant t-values.

6. For the nursing staff, intrinsic impoverishment emerged as the predictor of job-involvement.
7. For the fourth professional group that of bank cashiers/clerks, poor-peer relations contributed to the prediction of job-involvement.

One of the objectives of the study was to determine the extent to which men and women differ on job-involvement. This was determined by making inter-group comparisons on job involvement by applying Duncan's Multiple Range Test. It was found that the group of nurses exhibit higher job involvement followed by women teachers and women operators.

It emerges from our investigation that occupational as well as social and family role stress both are predictive of job involvement. Therefore intervention strategies taking into account both these dimensions must be evolved. Family counselling, employee counselling, time management skills, removal of role ambiguity are some of the measures that can be undertaken. Investigations involving larger samples and more diversified groups should be conducted to present a more comprehensive and holistic picture.
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INTRODUCTION & REVIEW OF LITERATURE
INTRODUCTION

Historical Perspective:

Since the dawn of human civilization, mankind has ceaselessly been striving for the goal of happiness, peace and stress-free life. These have been considered as parameters of human well-being and prosperity. The quest has led to a dynamic technological whirl-pool which has spawned mega-bureaucracies, micro-task specialization and greater urbanization (Pestonjee, 1987). Consequently, unending competitions and ever present challenges both at the organisational and individual levels have crept into our lives. More explicitly stated, one has to compete with oneself and with significant others in the organisation. Even while competing with oneself, one cannot totally disregard the primary social institutions, such as the home and family which have been nurtured over the years by human civilization, and valued deeply by the individual. We may subscribe to this view to a lesser or greater degree or we may even totally disregard the prevailing dilemma, but we would be forced to agree on one basic point - modern life is pervaded with stress.
The term 'stress', emanating from Latin literature has been incorporated in natural sciences and engineering to represent 'force, pressure or strain' which an individual resists in an attempt to maintain its original state. Concern about the impact of stress on people has its roots in medicine and specifically in the pioneering work of Selye (1936) who used the concept of stress in a manner relevant for social sciences. He expounded his biological concept of stress as the "General Adaptation Syndrome" (GAS) a three phase response to stress that begins with an alarm, continues with resistance and may terminate with exhaustion. This three phase response to stress incorporates the orchestrated set of physical and chemical changes which prepare an individual to fight or flee. This fight or flight label grows out of an evolutionary analysis of the origins of the stress response when our cave dwelling ancestors had only two options for dealing with the stressor - "fight or flight response". The major concerns of our ancestors were finding food, protecting themselves from environmental hazards and wild animals especially the sabre-toothed tiger they could either fight it or attempt to flee from it. It is a centuries old, programmed response to threat that is a masterpiece of survival engineering, and yet it is tragically flawed in the sense that while the human nervous system is still responding the same way to environmental stressors, the stressors are not the same and the environment is radically different. The
present day world abounds with uncertainties, which include natural calamities as well as unpredictable events and incidents. Technological developments too, are accompanied by uncertainty, disruption and obsolescence. All these things cumulatively add to confusions that confound our lives. Ours is an era so impermanent that change and its effects have become the dominant features in many descriptors applied to recent times: the Age of Discontinuity (Drucker, 1968), the Age of Future Shock (Toffler, 1970), the Age of Uncertainty (Galbraith, 1977) and the Age of Anxiety (Albrecht, 1979). In a real sense change is the ultimate stressor.

The work of Selye (represented by the classic GAS model) stimulated a vast array of research which we find encompasses the concept from diverse perspectives physiological, psychological and sociological. These three emphases have influenced the variations imperspective in definitional and theoretical approach in stress research.

Stress Defined: Throughout history, 'stress' has been one of those things that everyone has experienced but few can define. At the inter-disciplinary level we find that the word stress connotes different meanings to different people and thus it is not precisely defined in various disciplines. Our contention is substantiated by Mason (1975), Ursin, Boade and Levin (1978) and Yuwiler (1976) who have observed that there exists a lack of general agreement over its definition.
The available scientific literature reveals that studies on stress can be placed into one of the three groups representing the main approaches to the problem of its definition and its nature. The first approach describes stress in terms of 'stimulus' characteristics of those disturbing or noxious environments that affect people adversely (Homes & Rahe, 1967; Anderson, 1978; Welford, 1973, Margetts, 1975). Such an approach usually treats stress as an independent variable for study and demands consideration of what stimuli are diagnostic of stress.

The second approach treats stress as a dependent variable for study, describing it in terms of the person's response to disturbing or noxious environment (Kahn, 1964, Beehr & Newman, 1978, Cofer and Appley, 1964, Hamner & Organ, 1978). This particular view of stress received its initial impetus from the writings of a physiologist Hans Selye (1956). He wrote 'stress is the non-specific (physiological) response of the body to any demand made upon it'. He believed that physiological stress response did not depend on the nature of the stressor and the pattern of defense reactions was essentially the same for all the animals. Selye's view of stress was later on developed by Levi & Kagan (1971) who emphasised the role of psychological factors in the mediation of physical disease. Levi & Kagan are of the view that the interaction of the psycho-social stimuli and the
psychological programme (Genetic factors & early life experiences) determine the occurrence of stress response. Pridham (1977) proposed a socio-psychological model of stress using a systems view. The 3 elements in the model are - stressor, stress state and state response. Similarly, Antonovsky (1979) and Justice (1985) view stress as evolving from exposure to stressor. Finemann (1979) suggests that stress is a psychological response state of negative effect characterised by persistent and high level of experienced anxiety or tension. Ivancevich & Matteson (1980) view stress as an adaptive response, moderated by individual differences, that is a consequence of any action, event or situation that places special demands upon a person.

The third approach views stress as an interactive process which encompasses the stimuli producing stress reactions, the reactions themselves and the various intervening processes (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). This interactional approach treats stress as an intervening variable between stimulus and response. Man-environment transaction model of Cox and Mackay (1976) suggests that stress arises when there is an imbalance between the perceived demand and perceived capability. A very similar working definition is proposed by McGrath (1976). He suggested that there is a potential for experiencing stress when a situation is perceived as presenting a demand which
threatens to exceed the person's capabilities and resources for meeting it. Demand and adjustment model of Lazarus (1966) suggests that 'stress occurs when there are demands on the person which tax or exceed his adjustive resources'. This interactional approach has been a major impetus to stress research because it highlights the role of cognitive appraisal and coping actions as critical features in defining stress.

Occupational Stress

The popularity of the stress concept has dwindled in the physiological field, where it first started and the use of the stress terminology continues to flourish in the psychological and social fields and since the early 1960's the term 'stress' has come into wide use in relation to work organisations (Agarwala, Malhan & Singh, 1979). The study of stress at work has attracted a considerable amount of interest in behavioural science research due to the realization that stress may hinder organisational effectiveness (McGrath, 1976; Steers, 1981); it is the major cause of employee turnover and absenteeism, thereby having indirect bearing in terms of financial impact and workers compensation (Schuler, 1980; Steers, 1981).

The terms occupational stress, job stress, and organisational stress have been used synonymously by various experts. The difference between these terms is sharp edged
and a clear-cut definition is often not possible. While job stress is specifically related to the physical working conditions, organisational stress on the other hand arises out of organisational structure and climate. Occupational stress is much broader term because it encompasses intrinsic aspects of job, organisational structure and climate, as well as role facets in the organisation. It is a more acceptable term as compared to job stress which implies a much narrower sense.

Determinants of Occupational Stress:

It is borne out by psychological literature that occupational stress is a condition wherein job related factors interact with worker's characteristics to disrupt psychological and physiological homeostasis such that the person is forced to deviate from normal functioning (Margolis & Kroes, 1974; McLean, 1974; Beehr & Newman, 1978; Brief, Schuler and Van Sell, 1981). More precisely, stress at work is a result of the interaction between the individual and his work environment. These considerations have probably led French, Rogers and Cobb (1974) to evolve the theory of person-environment fit. They reported two kinds of fit between the individual and the job environment. First kind of fit is the extent to which the person's skills and abilities match the demands and requirements of the job. Second kind of fit is the extent to which the job environment facilitates the satisfaction of needs of the person. It is quite apparent
that misfit of either kind may threaten the individual's well-being and generate strain in the person. This theory has been empirically tested by Harrison (1976). The findings of the study support the assumption that the primary link between job stress and health strain is person-environment misfit.

Researchers in the field of occupational stress (Cooper and Marshall, 1976; Eden, Kellerman & French, 1977; McGrath, 1976) have succeeded in highlighting the major sources of stress which can easily be placed into one of the following broad categories.

Intrinsic to the Job: Poor physical condition, work overload, time pressures and physical danger.

Role in the organisation: Role ambiguity, role conflict, responsibility for persons.

Career Development: Overpromotion, underpromotion, lack of security, lack of training, intrinsic impoverishment, low status.

Relationships at work: Poor relations at work, difficulties in delegating responsibility, lack of respect.

Organisational Structure & Climate: Underparticipation, restrictions on behaviour, red tape, office politics, unreasonable political and group pressures, powerlessness.
Thus stress can be caused by too much or too little to work, time pressures and deadlines, having to make too many decisions (Sofer, 1970), fatigue from the physical strains of the work environment, excessive travels, long hours, having to cope with changes at work, and the expenses (monetary and career) of making mistakes (Kearns, 1973).

Research evidences have demonstrated a large number of correlates of occupational stress. But a closer scrutiny reveals that most of the researchers have tried to trace the pathological concomitants of stress such as blood pressure, cholesterol level, and coronary heart disease. The primary concern should be on the efficiency of the normal individuals in organisational setting because in addition to the detrimental effects on the smooth functioning of an organization occupational stress has been found to be associated with absenteeism (Gupta & Beehr, 1979; Margolis, Kroes and Quinn, 1974), job dissatisfaction (Miles, 1985; Beehr, 1976; and Pestonjee & Singh, 1982) and voluntary turnover (Ivancevich, Matteson & Preston, 1982).

Role Stress:

Among other organisational variables employees job roles have been found to be the major occupational stressors. Within an organisational context, role can be understood in formal terms by the job description, job specification and by the organisational structure (Francis & Melbourn, 1980). The
Key to a successful assumption of a particular role in the organisation is the extent to which the individual expectations and organisational expectations match.

Several systems of classifications have been used to discuss role stress. Kahn & Quinn (1970) classify it under 3 main headings; expectation generated stress, which includes role ambiguity and role conflict; expectation resource discrepancies, which includes role overload, responsibility authority dilemma and inadequate technical information; and role and personality. French and Caplan (1973) have indicated role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload as general types of role stress.

Applied to the work place, role conflict implies "an incompatibility between job tasks, resources, rules or policies, and other people" (Nicholson & Goh, 1983) Kahn et al. (1964) assert that role conflict occurs when the "individual in a particular work role is torn by conflicting job demands or doing things he does not think are part of the job specification".

Role ambiguity results from inadequate information or knowledge to do a job. Unlike role conflict, the state of role ambiguity is one of uncertainty and lack of clarity regarding job duties and responsibilities (Kahn et. al. 1964; Marshall & Cooper, 1979).
Role overload has also been reported as a potential source of occupational stress in which a person is faced with a set of obligations requiring him to do more within a specified time limit (Sales, 1969). The focal person finds that he cannot complete all the task urged on him by various people within the stipulated time limits and requirements of quality.

In any event, the result of role conflict, ambiguity and overload, is stress for the individual and there is a substantial body of research indicating undesirable outcomes for the individual and the organisation. Studies have shown that role stress was negatively correlated with satisfaction with pay, supervision, advancement, job satisfaction, motivation, productivity and self-esteem, and positively correlated with expressed intention to leave the job, increased anxiety, depression and resentment, turnover and decision delays, increased absenteeism, deterioration of interpersonal relations and even increases in accident rates (Tannenbaum, 1966; Keller, 1975; Brief & Aldag, 1976, Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970; Caplan & Jones, 1975; Kahn et al. 1964; Margolis & Kroes, 1974; Johnson & Sarason, 1973; Singh Agarwal and Malhan, 1981; Jagdish and Srivastava, 1983).

Pareek (1981) differing from other experts, postulated role as a system; the system of various roles the individual carries and performs; and the system of various roles of
which his role is a part, and in which his role is defined by other significant roles. Pareek (1976) has called the first 'role space' and the second 'role set' and delineated ten different types of organisational role stress:

Inter-role Distance: is experienced when there is a conflict between organisational and non-organisational roles. For e.g. the role of an executive versus the role of a husband.

Role Stagnation: is the feeling of being stuck in the same role, having fewer opportunities for learning and growth.

Role Erosion: arises when a role has become less important than it used to be i.e. the challenge associated with the role has somehow been lessened.

Role Expectation: symbolizes conflicting demands made on the role by different persons (Superiors, Subordinates and peers) in the organisation.

Role Overload: is the feeling that too much is expected from the role than what the occupant can cope with.

Role Ambiguity: is experienced when there is lack of clarity about the demands of the role.

Role Isolation: is indicative of the absence of strong linkages of one’s roles with other roles in the organisation.

Self-role Distance: arises from a gap experienced between one’s concept of self and the demands of the role.

Personal Inadequacy: is depicted by the absence of adequate skills, competence and training to meet the demands of one’s
role.
Resource Inadequacy: arises when the human or material resources allocated are inadequate to meet the demands of the role.

The role stresses identified by Pareek (1981) encounters all the stressors one may have on his job.

SOCIAL AND FAMILY ROLE STRESS:

There are many potential sources of stress within the organisation. These stressors, in conjunction with events outside work (marital problems, family illness), interact to affect the total quality of one's life. This could be ascertained with the help of recent literature that has come to our light (Schein, 1978; Korman & Korman, 1980; Bhagat, 1983; Vadra & Akhtar, 1989; Akhtar & Vadra, 1990). Since the extra-organisational stressors range from changes in socio-technical system to the phenomena of social change, (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1980) endeavour has been made to highlight significant extra-organisational stressors.

Amongst the various extra-organisational sources of stress the social and family stressors have been examined more closely because of their great impact on personality development. Though the family may not itself be the source, it can be the unit within which stressors emerge, interact and exert a significant impact on people (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1987). A circular relationship exists between
family and work. The job and family are interacting factors with which a person must cope on a regular basis. Stressors in the family vary greatly in severity and in degree of continuity; there are brief crisis, such as illness of a family member, or long term strained relations with spouse or children. Often transfer and promotion impose a fresh demand on the employee for readjustment and in many cases the separation from the family may emerge as a poignant stressor. Relocation and change produce varied symptoms such as emotional disorientation, confusion and even physical ailments (Sinetar, 1986). Similarly to cope with economic and financial stressors many people have been forced to take a second job. This reduces time for relaxation and pleasant interaction with the family members. In such cases there is every likelihood that the accumulated stress would more adversely affect the employee. Our point of view gathers support from the work of Davidson and Cooper (1981) who emphasised that stress at work can also affect an individual in home and social environment and vice-versa. Marshall & Cooper (1979) delineated four intrusions of work into home life: carrying pending work to home, business travel, organisational social commitments and exclusive job pursuits such as advancement in the job and accepting new assignments.

Changed scenario as regards the employment of women is concerned is creating a diabolical situation which may lead to conflicting and overlapping responsibilities. In such
situations stress may loom large over to further reinforce stresses. This is vindicated by role theory which predicts that multiple roles can lead to inter-role conflict and in turn symptoms of strain (Kopelman et al. 1983). Inter-role conflict is likely to increase as the demands of either the work or family role increase (Beutell & Greenhaus, 1983). Similarly, inter-role conflict can increase as one's obligations to the family expand through marriage and the arrival of children. This is particularly the case for women, who tend to assume responsibility for household management and child care (Gorden & Strober, 1978; Gutek, et al. 1981). Role stress has been operationalised by Bhagat & Chassie (1981) to reflect the often demanding and conflicting time allocations that working women must contend with in order to manage their various responsibilities at work and at home. The burden of two full-time jobs: a career and a home makes them feel guilty about compromising both the quality of their work and relationship with their family (Etzion & Pines, 1986).

Role stress may occur not only during one's official professional job but may also result from the fact that professionals are often expected to continue to perform their role when they are outside the organisational setting (Vachon, 1987).
Perhaps the most universal cost of a successful professional career lies in the quality of family life. The executives frequently complain about their unsatisfactory home lives. The job exerts pressure on the man to spend more time at work, while the wife and children exert pressure for more time to be spent at home. The unfortunate executive is trapped right in the middle. If he leans towards the career his family life suffers, if he prefers to concentrate more attention towards his family, then he stands to lose professionally (Cooper and Marshall, 1979). Thus it is imperative that pressures of concern for family can spill over and affect work performance (Laube, 1973) while becoming emotionally involved with one's organisational roles can lead to taking one's stresses home with potentially detrimental consequences (Hadley, 1977). Googins & Burden (1987) in their study on managers found that workplace-family role strain was strongly associated with decreased physical and emotional well-being as measured by depression, life satisfaction, and days absent.

These considerations impress us with the fact that stress is truly complex and multiplicity of factors influence it. The complexity may be magnified by the interaction of social and family stress. Multiple roles, working husbands and wives, age of children, work and home responsibilities, migration, marriage delay, political
uncertainties, etc. create fathomless permutations and combinations of stress parameters (Larwood & Wood, 1979; Bhagat & Chassie, 1981; Pleck, 1977; Gutek et al., 1981; Gove & Tudor, 1973; Long & Porter, 1984). Hence a comprehensive view of stress can only be properly understood when we attach equal importance to extra-organisational factors, because what the person does outside work is both a determinant of his reaction to work, and at the same time affected by it.

JOB INVOLVEMENT:

The phenomenon of job involvement emerged from a factor analytic study of job satisfaction by Lodahl (1964). Initially, the researchers tried to determine its direct and indirect impact on productivity but later on emphasis was laid on exploring its relationship with situational and organisational variables (Akhtar & Kumar, 1978; Schwyhart & Smith, 1972; Hall & Mansfield, 1975; Bajaj, 1978; Bha, 1979). The term job involvement was used in various contexts and often confused with ego-involvement, need satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. Lawler and Hall (1970) provided theoretical and empirical evidence to distinguish these terms. Also Cummings & Bigelow (1976) and Akhtar & Ahmad (1978) have confirmed that these terms are factorially independent.

The concept of job involvement has gained much importance in recent years, because of its pivotal role in
providing a link between performance on the one hand and employee needs and quality of working life on the other. It is very central to work motivation and is an important component of organisational effectiveness (Hall & Lawler, 1970; Walton, 1972; Dewhrist, 1973).

Lodahl & Kejner (1965) defined job involvement as "the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work, or the importance of work in his total self-image". They further contended that job involvement is the internalization of values about the goodness of work and during the process of socialization these work values are injected into the self of the individual that remains even at the later stage in the form of attitudes towards job. The values which are internalised by the individual during the socialisation are the major outcome of religious and social philosophies. Moreover, socio-cultural aspects, also influence involvement, e.g. the environment where everyone is working and enterprising, then to be enterprising becomes a social norm which forces every one to get socialised through identification with this socio-cultural norm and subsequently, get committed and job involved. Similar definitions have been offered by Lawler & Hall (1970), Kunungo, Mishra & Dayal (1975) and Saleh and Hasek (1976) where job involvement represents the degree to which job
situation is central to one's life and self concept and the phenomenon of identification seems to be implicit.

Kanungo (1981) gave the motivational approach to job involvement and advocated that "the level of job involvement may be primarily a function of perceived need satisfying potentials of the job whereas the level of work involvement may be mainly determined by the individual's socialisation training in protestant ethic". This implies that job involvement refers to a specific belief regarding the present job. This belief operates at a descriptive level and describes workers identifications as they are. Work involvement on the other hand refers to a general belief about work. This belief operates at a normative level and is largely decided by the socialisation process. Warrenfeltz (1986) in a longitudinal examination of the work involvement construct found it to be a relatively stable construct that is related to early life experiences with work. Further he also experimentally demonstrated that different mechanisms were involved in the formation of job involvement in comparison to those for work involvement. While the level of job involvement could be altered by manipulating job parameters, work involvement was essentially unaffected by job parameters (reward, cost, investment size and alternative value).
Patchen (1970) considered job involvement as a convenient label summarising several characteristics that make the job more important and potentially more satisfying to the individual. Saleh (1981) argues that job involvement is a multidimensional concept involving structural components of cognitive, evaluative and behavioural intentions. Rabinowitz, Hall & Goodale (1977) and Saal (1978) found that both individual (personality) difference and situational (job) variables contribute to the prediction of job involvement.

Review of the definitions with regard to job involvement reveals that it has been viewed either in terms of individual differences or job situations, or by an interaction between the individual and his job. In fact these three sets of factors - personal, situational and work outcome variables, are essential determiners of job involvement.

There has been an increasing interest among scholars in the empirical assessment of the correlates of job involvement in a variety of organisational settings. Psychological literature has classified the correlates of job involvement in terms of personal characteristics, situational characteristics and work outcomes. Bass (1965), in his study, found job involvement positively related to performance. Runyon (1973) perceived job involvement as a
relatively stable personal characteristic and opined that men are traditionally more likely to value work than women, aside from its importance to earn a living. Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) found that job involvement is significantly related to satisfaction with motivator variables. Rabinowitz & Hall (1977) thoroughly reviewed the studies in the field and concluded that age and protestant work values were the strongest correlates of job involvement. Weissenberg & Gruenfeld (1980) found job involvement related positively to satisfaction with recognition, with responsibility, with achievement and with interpersonal relations with superiors.

Research concerning job involvement started considerably late in India in comparison to the West. The socio-cultural disparity between the industrially developed countries and the developing ones, like our own, stresses the significance of researches to be done in Indian social conditions. Indian researchers have attempted to explore the relationship of job involvement with demographic variables (Akhtar & Kumar, 1978; Sharma & Kapoor, 1978; Bajaj, 1978; Anantharaman, 1980; Kumari & Singh, 1988), anxiety (Bajaj, 1978b), different occupational groups (Bajaj 1978a; Anantharaman & Deivasenapathy, 1980; Singh, 1984; Kumari & Singh, 1988), role conflict and role ambiguity (Madhu & Harigopal, 1980; Singh, 1984; Srivastava & Singh, 1983; Singh & Mishra, 1983) and on other variables like childhood
aspirations and expectations, participation, adjustment, satisfaction, locus of control, quality of work life, leadership styles, etc. (Akhtar & Bachcha, 1984; Singh, 1984; Reddy & Kumar, 1980; Reddy & Rajasekhar, 1988; Dhillon & Dondona, 1988; Srinivasan & Kamalanabhan, 1986; Dolke & Srivastava, 1988). The results of these studies are inconsistent while predicting the influence of various demographic and personality variables on job involvement because differing socio-cultural milieu, work values and working conditions bring about variations in cause and effect relationships.

Srivastava & Sinha (1983) found a negative relationship between JI & Occupational stress. Akhtar & Kumar (1978) found that the satisfaction of higher order needs, satisfaction with organisational variables and job levels in no way influence job involvement. Some Indian studies suggest that JI may be related to the total personality profile of workers (Singh, 1972; Prabhakar, 1979). Verma (1985) investigated the personality factors that affect JI in 68 employees of a Steel Plant and found the association of the following factors with job involved subjects: Outgoing, emotionally stable, assertive, conscientious, venture-some, placid, conservative, self-sufficient, controlled and relaxed.
Looking to the work done with respect to job involvement it is amply clear that not much concerted effort has been made to relate stressful aspects of work to job involvement.

AIMS & OBJECTIVES

In the light of the above discussions it is reasonable to infer that role stress and occupational stress are two separate constructs and we intend to explore the relative contributions of occupational stress and social and family role stress to the job involvement experienced by job incumbents. The problem assumes added significance due to the fact that there has been a reorientation in stress research from a nearly exclusive emphasis on organisational stress to an appreciation of extraorganisational stressors.

The present study focuses on the assumptions, gaps and biases in the literature. The home has been viewed as a stress-free sanctuary, whereas the workplace stress has been overemphasized. To better understand the costs and benefits of employment and of multiple roles and the stressfulness of family roles, more attention to the qualitative aspects of role is needed. In such a case the study assumes new
challenges because occupational stress and social and family role stress together may have a more profound influence on the individual than either type of stress alone. Hence more the stress, the more it would tend to disturb the interpersonal relationship both in the organisation as well as in the family. But whether a stress situation will elicit specified changes in behaviour that may effect job involvement requires an examination. In this respect, the present study takes a departure from other studies in that it seeks to identify how role stress and occupational stress are associated with job involvement. More specifically, the thrust of the present investigation is to investigate and isolate the organisational and extra-organisational sources of stress which can predict job involvement in a variety of different occupational settings. In this respect, the present study may fill a void which exists in this area.

When we look to our own country, we observe that most of the Indian researchers have tried to borrow and utilize factors and methodology used by psychologists in industrially developed countries. The socio-cultural differences are usually disregarded. It is apparent that social and family factors peculiar to Indian workers were not taken into
account while studying occupational stress. In fact the absence of any measuring device for social and family role stress obscured the real understanding of the phenomena. This lacunae has been overcome recently with the earnest attempt of Vadra and Akhtar (1990) to develop a social and family role stress (SFRS) Scale which incorporates stress factors that are specific to our own socio-cultural milieu.

The focus of this research was on exploring what set of factors tend to produce job-family role strain within and between components of the family-occupational role system - i.e. the individual, the family, and the workplace. Such study is expected to yield a wealth of data concerning the sources of stress and provide concrete suggestions regarding what can be done by families and employers to systematically alleviate it and reduce its negative effects on family functioning and work productivity. The present piece of research will be of wide interest to all concerned with the effects of stress and strain and with the quality of working life.

The present study would highlight the effect of organisational, extra-organisational and personal (demogra-
phic) variables on job involvement and would enable us to organise several training courses and to suggest ways and means how best stress could be controlled and work performance improved. The results are expected to throw new light on the dynamics of human performance and may necessitate changes in organisational policy of recruitment and training. Consultants working in the areas of recruitment, selection and placement, organisational design and development, productivity and improvement, will find much of value here.

The findings of the study may help us in determining the presence of occupational stress and role stress in Indian organisations and may help us in developing an intervention strategy to minimize the effect of stress on the job and in the family.

Summarising the objectives of the study it may be pointed out that empirical studies with regard to extra-organisational stressors have not been undertaken. Attempts have seldom been made to incorporate various facets of job involvement and to determine its predictors.
Studies on job involvement, occupational and extra-organisational stressors in Indian socio-cultural milieu are scarce.

The findings may have wide and varied implications for human resource management.
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RESEARCH DESIGN & METHODOLOGY

Researches are designed to proceed in a planned manner to control variance and to answer pertinent research questions (Lindquist, 1956). Such questions should be answered as far as possible, objectively and accurately. Research design has assumed significance in social and behavioural sciences and it is considered to be the most important component of research methodology.

The spirit of scientific enquiry is to objectively ascertain facts and analyse them in an unbiased manner to draw fruitful conclusions. Scientific methodology was evolved to achieve these objectives. The choice of a 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 to facilitate the choice of the design.

The review of research literature reported in preceding chapter impresses us with the fact that an individual's performance is influenced by stressors lying outside as well as within the organisation. But it has come to light that stressors pertaining to organization/occupation have been extensively researched and strategies have been evolved to minimize the sources of stress so as to enhance performance.
Stressors external to the organization have not been emphasized to the desired extent especially in our country. It was probably due to the fact that the tool for its measurement was not developed. In this regard Vadra & Akhtar (1990) have filled the void by developing Social and Family Role stress scale. The way has been paved for the measurement of extra-organizational stressors and the present researcher has considered the stressors residing within the organization as well as outside it.

The focal aspect of the present investigation as stated earlier is to determine the extent to which job-involvement of an employee is influenced by occupational stress, social and family role stress and a set of demographic variables namely age, sex, income and job-tenure. In other words we are interested in ascertaining the predictors of job-involvement for various occupational groups.

The review of literature has also revealed that such variables as age, sex, income and job-tenure together with occupational and social and family stressors have not been investigated in the context of job involvement by the Indian researchers. The present study was conceived to answer such questions as to find out:

1. the prevalence of occupational stress and social and family role stress among teachers, telephone operators,
nurses and bank cashiers/clerks, and the extent to which they influence their job-involvement.

2. the influence of demographic variables on job-involvement of the above mentioned groups.

3. the extent to which men and women differ on job-involvement.

The findings may have wide ranging implications for organizational change and organizational development. The natural outcome would be to evolve intervention strategies to counteract the adverse effect of the above mentioned variables on job-involvement.

Tools Used:

To pursue the above objectives the following scales were used:

Occupational Stress Index:

Occupational stress index developed by Srivastava and Singh (1981) has been used to measure occupational stress. It consists of twelve dimensions of job-life namely - Role overload, Role ambiguity, Role conflict, Unreasonable groups and political pressures, Responsibility for persons, Underparticipation, Powerlessness, Poor-peer relations, Intrinsic impoverishment, Low status, Strenuous working conditions, and Unprofitability. The occupational stress
index has a total of 46 items and apart from yielding scores on the twelve sub-scales a composite stress score could also be obtained.

The reliability indices ascertained by split-half method and by Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the scale as a whole are 0.94 and 0.90 respectively. The reliability indices of the 12 sub-scales are found to range from 0.45 to 0.84. The index of homogeneity and internal validity of the individual items has been determined by computing point-biserial coefficient of correlation (rpbi). The values of rpbi range from 0.36 to 0.59. The external criteria method has also been used for its validation.

Job-Involvement:

The job-involvement of the subjects was assessed with the help of Indian adaptation of Lodahl and Kejner’s (1965) job-involvement scale. This adaptation was undertaken by Akhtar and Bachcha (1984) and that scale was in Urdu script having the reliability value of 0.76, whereas in the present investigation it was in Devanagri script. For the purpose of determining the reliability of the Hindi version, the job-involvement scale was administered on a sample of 100 teachers (both men and women). The split-half reliability coefficient corrected by Spearman-Brown formula was 0.89. The obtained value of r is sufficiently high to signify that the Hindi version of the above scale is highly reliable.
instrument for assessing the job-involvement in the Indian context.

Social and Family Role Stress:

Social and family role stress (SFRS) scale developed by Vadra & Akhtar (1990) was used to measure the stress emanating from social and family situations. The SFRS is a Likert-type 5 point self rating scale. It consists of 25 items pertaining to social and family areas.

Validity of the scale was gauged by computing item-total score correlation which ranged from 0.27 to 0.58 and inter-item correlation which ranged between 0.20 to 0.62 for N=100. The split half reliability corrected by Spearman-Brown formula is 0.81. Both the reliability and validity values determine the efficacy of the scale (Vadra, 1989).

The format of all the three scales was Likert-type with 5 alternative response categories. Appendix A consists of job-involvement and occupational stress items which were randomly intermingled because both the scales were in Hindi language. Social and family role stress scale which is in English language has been put into Appendix B.

Sample: The sample of the present study comprises of 340 employees drawn from Educational institution (men and women teachers), Nationalized Banks (Cashiers/Clerks), Medical
College Hospital (nurses), and Telephone Exchange (Operators both men and women). Thus the sample represents various organizations and professional groups. This was done to find out the stressors whether they were specific to the nature of the job or they had a common link across the professions. Incidentally, all the four professional groups chosen for investigation are related to the rendering of services.

For collecting the data a complete list of employees working in the organization was compiled and every second individual was randomly selected. Broadly, it works out to be 50% of the total number of employees. Each and every subject was personally approached and they were assured that their responses would be treated in strict confidence. Amongst the four groups, teachers and nurses were more cooperative. The completed returns were 25% of the teachers and 50% of the nurses.

The sample of the teachers was drawn from the Faculties of Art, Science and Social Sciences of Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh and the nurses were employed in the Jawahar Lal Nehru Medical College, A.M.U. Aligarh. The sample of Bank cashiers/clerks was drawn from the Nationalized Banks located in Aligarh. Incidentally, no women was employed as bank cashier/clerk and so the data was of men only. The data of men operators was taken from Aligarh Telephone Exchange whereas the data for women
operators was drawn from Kidwai Bhavan Telephone Exchange, New Delhi, because the women operators in Aligarh were part-time or casual employees.

Having obtained the returns, each and every respondent's form was thoroughly scrutinized. The incomplete returns were deleted and thus the sample is equal to 340 which covers about 25% of the total population.

The table given below presents the list of four occupational groups studied and their sample sizes, along with information on biographical variables.

**TABLE 2.1**

**SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational group studied</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age (Years)</th>
<th>Income (Rs.)</th>
<th>Job tenure (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38.46</td>
<td>3620</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40.20</td>
<td>3130</td>
<td>15.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39.03</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>2183</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.30</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Cashiers/Clerks</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.85</td>
<td>2628</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistical Analysis:

The choice of a statistical method is linked to the type of data and the design of the study. In the present study there are sixteen independent variables namely social and family role stress, twelve dimensions of occupational stress, age, income and job-tenure and one dependent variable i.e. job-involvement. Only a statistical test that could handle such a large information and so many variables successfully could be useful. For such purposes Multiple 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 and Fidell, 1983). Through this technique we are able to find out which IVs are the significant predictors of the criterion or D.V. Another advantage is that there exists no necessity of selecting uncorrelated IVs. Moreover, multiple regression technique relates independent to dependent variables in a manner which take interactive effects into account.

There are three major analytic strategies in multiple regression namely: Standard, Hierarchical and Stepwise Regression. To simply assess relationships among variables and answer the basic question of multiple correlation, the method of choice would be standard multiple regression. In hierarchical regression the researcher controls entry of
variables into the regression equation on the basis of logical or theoretical considerations. While in stepwise regression the order of entry of variables is based on statistical rather than theoretical criteria. Reasons for using these methods might be theoretical or for development of hypotheses.

In the present piece of research, we have made use of Standard Multiple Regression. This simultaneous or standard strategy calls for entry of all the IVs into the regression equation at once. Each IV is assessed as if it had entered the regression after all other IVs had been entered. Each IV, then can be evaluated in terms of what it adds to prediction of the DV, over and above the predictability afforded by all the other IVs.
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Results: In the preceding chapters we dwelt upon the conceptual and methodological issues and highlighted the objectives of the present study. We also discussed the design as well as the process of collecting and analyzing the data. In the present chapter the results obtained are presented and the results have been interpreted, thus projecting the implications of the research findings.

Since few researchers ventured to determine the predictors of job-involvement, we undertook this onerous task as a challenge. Naturally, standard multiple regression was considered to be the most appropriate method of analysis. Social and family role stress, twelve dimensions of occupational stress, age, income and job tenure constituted the independent variables (IVs). Together with analysis of the overall sample in terms of the extent to which the IVs were predicting the dependent variable (DV) - Job involvement, the sample of teachers, telephone operators, nursing staff and bank cashiers/clerks were analyzed separately.

The overall analysis for the total sample is reported in the following table.
TABLE 3.1
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE REGRESSION (TOTAL SAMPLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributable to Regression</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13944.20</td>
<td>871.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from Regression</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>25343.96</td>
<td>78.46</td>
<td>11.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>39288.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level

The above analysis is indicative of the influence of the independent variables on job-involvement (J.I.) but it cannot be inferred precisely the particular independent variable that could be considered as the predictor of J.I. To resolve this, Multiple Regression Analysis was undertaken and the results are reported in Table 3.2.

It could be immediately inferred from the results reported that the following IVs could be considered as predictors of J.I. - Social and family role stress, role ambiguity, political and group pressures, poor-peer relations, intrinsic impoverishment, income and experience for the total sample.

As mentioned earlier four professional groups - teachers, telephone operators, nursing staff and the bank
### Table 3.2
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (TOTAL SAMPLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Value of $r$</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error of t-value</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Family Role Stress</td>
<td>-.3502</td>
<td>-.0915</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>-2.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role overload</td>
<td>-.1076</td>
<td>-.1354</td>
<td>.1321</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>-.3429</td>
<td>-.7922</td>
<td>.1849</td>
<td>-4.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>-.0715</td>
<td>.1760</td>
<td>.1708</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Group pressures</td>
<td>-.0431</td>
<td>.2886</td>
<td>.1520</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for persons</td>
<td>.1662</td>
<td>.5534</td>
<td>.1721</td>
<td>3.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under participation</td>
<td>-.1764</td>
<td>-.2070</td>
<td>.1607</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>-.1261</td>
<td>.2147</td>
<td>.2105</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor-peer relations</td>
<td>-.3322</td>
<td>-.6611</td>
<td>.1724</td>
<td>-3.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic improvement</td>
<td>-.3743</td>
<td>-.5848</td>
<td>.1698</td>
<td>-3.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low status</td>
<td>-.3649</td>
<td>-.3806</td>
<td>.2134</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strenuous working conditions</td>
<td>-.1897</td>
<td>.1047</td>
<td>.1840</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprofitability</td>
<td>-.1587</td>
<td>.4099</td>
<td>.2255</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.0951</td>
<td>.0845</td>
<td>.1189</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.0086</td>
<td>-.0023</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>-3.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.1219</td>
<td>.2523</td>
<td>.1095</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Mean SD Intercept 92.10
Job-involvement 73.25 10.76 Multiple correlation .59
Std. Error of Estimate 8.85

Note: ** is indicative of significance at .01 level
* is indicative of significance at .05 level
cashiers/clerks comprised the sample of the study it was considered appropriate to determine the predictors separately of each group.

Table 3.3 shows the analysis of variance for men teachers.

**TABLE 3.3**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE REGRESSION (MEN TEACHERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributable to Regression</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4077.96</td>
<td>254.87</td>
<td>5.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from Regression</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2175.01</td>
<td>50.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6252.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level

Table 3.3 reveals that the F-value was found to be significant at .01 level which necessitated further analysis which is reported in Table 3.4.

The perusal of Table 3.4 indicates that social and family role stress, political & group pressures, under-participation, strenous working conditions, unprofitability, age and income have emerged as significant predictors of job-involvement for men teachers.
TABLE 3.4
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (MEN TEACHERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Value of r</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error of Reg. Coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Family Role Stress</td>
<td>-.3896</td>
<td>-.3780</td>
<td>-.1119</td>
<td>-3.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role overload</td>
<td>-.1473</td>
<td>-.0709</td>
<td>.3505</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>-.3373</td>
<td>-.4946</td>
<td>.4086</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>-.3615</td>
<td>-.5763</td>
<td>.4264</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Group pressures</td>
<td>-.0601</td>
<td>1.1485</td>
<td>.4433</td>
<td>2.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for persons</td>
<td>-.0524</td>
<td>-.3495</td>
<td>.5544</td>
<td>-.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under participation</td>
<td>-.3691</td>
<td>-1.0691</td>
<td>.4159</td>
<td>-2.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>.0816</td>
<td>.3905</td>
<td>.4632</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor-peer relations</td>
<td>-.3143</td>
<td>-.2944</td>
<td>.4010</td>
<td>-.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic impoverishment</td>
<td>-.3028</td>
<td>.1243</td>
<td>.3959</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low status</td>
<td>-.2601</td>
<td>.2123</td>
<td>.4147</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strenuous working conditions</td>
<td>-.4775</td>
<td>-1.2647</td>
<td>.4953</td>
<td>-2.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprofitability</td>
<td>-.0201</td>
<td>1.2761</td>
<td>-.6047</td>
<td>2.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.6716</td>
<td>.6716</td>
<td>.2360</td>
<td>2.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.0061</td>
<td>-.0061</td>
<td>.0020</td>
<td>-2.96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.1383</td>
<td>.1383</td>
<td>.1585</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Mean SD Intercept 108.01
Job-involveont 69.68 10.29 Multiple correlation .80
Std. Error of Estimate 7.11

Note: ** is indicative of significance at .01 level
* is indicative of significance at .05 level
Similar analysis was done for women teachers which is reported in Table 3.5.

### Table 3.5

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE REGRESSION (WOMEN TEACHERS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributable to Regression</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1806.38</td>
<td>112.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from Regression</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3105.79</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4912.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since F-value was found to be insignificant and further analysis yielded similar results hence it is not reported.

The second professional group was that of telephone operators. Table 3.6 shows the analysis of variance for the men operators.

### Table 3.6

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE REGRESSION (MEN OPERATORS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributable to Regression</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4108.36</td>
<td>256.77</td>
<td>4.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from Regression</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2644.36</td>
<td>61.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6752.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3.7
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (MEN OPERATORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Value of $r$</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error of t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Family Role Stress</td>
<td>.1648</td>
<td>-.0210</td>
<td>.1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role overload</td>
<td>.2214</td>
<td>.2467</td>
<td>.2621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>-.0067</td>
<td>-.1072</td>
<td>.4166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>.1232</td>
<td>.3471</td>
<td>.4713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Group pressures</td>
<td>.2063</td>
<td>-.1329</td>
<td>.3591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for persons</td>
<td>.4098</td>
<td>1.9646</td>
<td>.4542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under participation</td>
<td>.2463</td>
<td>.4934</td>
<td>.4671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>.2989</td>
<td>1.5496</td>
<td>.4769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor-peer relations</td>
<td>-.1222</td>
<td>-.5019</td>
<td>.4112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic impoverishment</td>
<td>-.1428</td>
<td>-.4532</td>
<td>.3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low status</td>
<td>.0184</td>
<td>-.2256</td>
<td>.4452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strenuous working conditions</td>
<td>.1582</td>
<td>.5100</td>
<td>.5427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprofitability</td>
<td>.4174</td>
<td>1.6927</td>
<td>.5681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.0114</td>
<td>-.1637</td>
<td>.3812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.0466</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.0265</td>
<td>.1655</td>
<td>.3524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Mean SD Intercept
Job-involvement 70.23 10.69 22.77
Multiple correlation .78
Std. Error of Estimate 7.64

Note: ** is indicative of significance at .01 level
* is indicative of significance at .05 level
To investigate the influence of IVs on job involvement the responses of the operators were further analyzed (table 3.7).

The above table depicts that four dimensions of occupational stress-role ambiguity, responsibility for persons, powerlessness, and unprofitability exert significant influence on job involvement for men operators.

Analysis of variance for women operators is reported in Table 3.8.

**TABLE 3.8**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE REGRESSION (WOMEN OPERATORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributable to Regression</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3346.85</td>
<td>209.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from Regression</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3345.32</td>
<td>77.79</td>
<td>2.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6692.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level

It is evident from the above table that the IVs as a whole exert significant effect on the dependent variable. But when further analysis was undertaken (Table 3.9) all the t-values were found to be insignificant.
TABLE 3.9
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (WOMEN OPERATORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Value of r</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error of Reg.Coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Family Role Stress</td>
<td>-.3709</td>
<td>-.0074</td>
<td>.0927</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role overload</td>
<td>-.2231</td>
<td>.1994</td>
<td>.3840</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>-.4224</td>
<td>-.7971</td>
<td>.4697</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>-.3811</td>
<td>-.0832</td>
<td>.5394</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Group pressures</td>
<td>-.2230</td>
<td>-.2371</td>
<td>.4208</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for persons</td>
<td>.1859</td>
<td>.7366</td>
<td>.4751</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under participation</td>
<td>-.4021</td>
<td>-.1724</td>
<td>.4384</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>-.3999</td>
<td>.2995</td>
<td>.6929</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor-peer relations</td>
<td>-.3073</td>
<td>-.1386</td>
<td>.5637</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic improvement</td>
<td>-.5583</td>
<td>-.5867</td>
<td>.4496</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low status</td>
<td>-.5572</td>
<td>-1.0488</td>
<td>.5813</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strenuous working conditions</td>
<td>-.4048</td>
<td>-.2360</td>
<td>.6939</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprofitability</td>
<td>-.0893</td>
<td>.2917</td>
<td>.6580</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.2092</td>
<td>.2990</td>
<td>.7286</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.2261</td>
<td>-.0038</td>
<td>.0049</td>
<td>-.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.1925</td>
<td>.0848</td>
<td>.7775</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Mean SD Intercept 89.26
Job-involvement 72.71 10.65 Multiple correlation .70
Std. Error of Estimate 8.82

Note: ** is indicative of significance at .01 level
* is indicative of significance at .05 level
The insignificant t-values indicate that individually variables have not emerged as predictors of J.I.

The third professional group was that of nurses. Table 3.10 shows the analysis of variance for this group.

**TABLE 3.10**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE REGRESSION (NURSES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributable to Regression</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2255.09</td>
<td>140.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from Regression</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1738.12</td>
<td>52.67</td>
<td>2.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3993.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level

F-ratio was found to be significant. Further analysis was undertaken to determine the individual predictors of job involvement for nurses as reported in table 3.11.

It can readily be seen from the above table that intrinsic impoverishment significantly contributes to the prediction of job involvement for the nursing staff.

Table 3.12 represents the analysis of variance for the fourth professional group-bank cashiers/clerks.
## TABLE 3.11
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (NURSES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Value of $r$</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error of Reg. Coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Family Role Stress</td>
<td>-.2825</td>
<td>-.0257</td>
<td>.0847</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role overload</td>
<td>-.3040</td>
<td>-.5718</td>
<td>.4048</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>-.2728</td>
<td>.0367</td>
<td>.4688</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>-.1371</td>
<td>.6192</td>
<td>.3494</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Group pressures for persons</td>
<td>-.4065</td>
<td>-.1864</td>
<td>.3705</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under participation</td>
<td>-.0818</td>
<td>.2469</td>
<td>.4144</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>-.4035</td>
<td>-.4732</td>
<td>.4892</td>
<td>-.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor-peer relations</td>
<td>-.4807</td>
<td>-.4520</td>
<td>.5030</td>
<td>-.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic improvement</td>
<td>-.4580</td>
<td>-1.1103</td>
<td>.4006</td>
<td>-2.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low status</td>
<td>-.4275</td>
<td>-.7119</td>
<td>.5561</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strenuous working conditions</td>
<td>-.0950</td>
<td>.1991</td>
<td>.3664</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprofitability</td>
<td>-.1300</td>
<td>.7120</td>
<td>.6601</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.1822</td>
<td>.1015</td>
<td>.2736</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.1146</td>
<td>-.0032</td>
<td>.0036</td>
<td>-.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.2118</td>
<td>.3986</td>
<td>.3318</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variables
- **Dependent Mean SD**: 81.66 9.02
- **Intercept**: 91.16
- **Multiple correlation**: .75
- **Std. Error of Estimate**: 7.25

### Note:
- **** is indicative of significance at .01 level
- * is indicative of significance at .05 level
TABLE 3.12
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE REGRESSION
(BANK CASHIERS/CLERKS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributable to Regression</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2501.36</td>
<td>156.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from Regression</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2475.51</td>
<td>75.01</td>
<td>2.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4976.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level

To specify the predictors of job involvement further analysis was undertaken as is reported in Table 3.13.

The Table 3.13 reveals that only one dimension of occupational stress namely poor-peer relations contributes to the prediction of job involvement.

Table 3.14 reports the differences among the means of various groups on job involvement obtained by using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

When several groups are to be compared and specially the differences among their means, Duncan's Multiple Range Test is the most appropriate one (McGuigan, 1969).
TABLE 3.13
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS (BANK CASHIERS/CLERKS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Value of r</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error of Reg.Coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Family Role Stress</td>
<td>-.3990</td>
<td>-.2684</td>
<td>.1530</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role overload</td>
<td>-.2164</td>
<td>.5996</td>
<td>.4415</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>-.4269</td>
<td>-.7471</td>
<td>.7211</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>-.1251</td>
<td>.1611</td>
<td>.5536</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Group pressures</td>
<td>.0267</td>
<td>.2671</td>
<td>.4716</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for persons</td>
<td>-.3268</td>
<td>-.8372</td>
<td>.5072</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under participation</td>
<td>-.2026</td>
<td>-.3980</td>
<td>.5435</td>
<td>-.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>-.0310</td>
<td>-.2651</td>
<td>.5972</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor-peer relations</td>
<td>-.4288</td>
<td>-1.1368</td>
<td>.4757</td>
<td>-2.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic improvement</td>
<td>-.2348</td>
<td>-.3595</td>
<td>.5128</td>
<td>-.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low status</td>
<td>-.4005</td>
<td>-.3717</td>
<td>.8635</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strenuous working conditions</td>
<td>-.1077</td>
<td>.0929</td>
<td>.7651</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprofitability</td>
<td>-.0316</td>
<td>.0460</td>
<td>.5703</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.2315</td>
<td>-.0321</td>
<td>.7234</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.2753</td>
<td>.0017</td>
<td>.0036</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.2599</td>
<td>.0312</td>
<td>.8421</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Mean SD Intercept 102.10
Job-involvement 70.32 10.07 Multiple correlation .70
Std. Error of Estimate 8.66

Note: ** is indicative of significance at .01 level
* is indicative of significance at .05 level
TABLE 3.14

INTER-GROUP COMPARISONS ON JOB-INVOLVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared on Job-involvement</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Compared Means</th>
<th>Difference between Means sig. at .01 level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurses Vs Men Teachers</td>
<td>81.66</td>
<td>69.68</td>
<td>11.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses Vs Men Operators</td>
<td>81.66</td>
<td>70.23</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses Vs Bank Cashiers</td>
<td>81.66</td>
<td>70.32</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses Vs Women Operators</td>
<td>81.66</td>
<td>72.71</td>
<td>8.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses Vs Women Teachers</td>
<td>81.66</td>
<td>75.88</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women teachers Vs Men Teachers</td>
<td>75.88</td>
<td>69.68</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women teachers Vs Men Operators</td>
<td>75.88</td>
<td>70.23</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women teachers Vs Bank Cashiers</td>
<td>75.88</td>
<td>70.32</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Seven comparisons are not reported because all yielded insignificant value.

The above table reveals that the group of nurses exhibit higher J.I. followed by women teachers and women operators.
DISCUSSION

After obtaining the results the researcher must evaluate these results in the context of the broader psychological theory, the social-cultural realities operating and present an integrated and comprehensive account of the work done and what it means. Undoubtedly, this aspect of research is most taxing but since it is this interpretation that brings out cogently and meaningfully the essence of the whole research endeavour, it constitutes a crucial and significant phase in the total research plan.

The present study mainly examined the issue of whether a set of antecedent factors - social and family role stress and occupational have relative influences on job-involvement. The effect of organizational differences was also investigated by extending the study to four different samples. The results obtained by multiple regression analysis allow conclusions regarding both the issues. Referring to table 3.1 and 3.2, the overall analysis showed that social and family role stress, role ambiguity, responsibility for persons, poor-peer relations, intrinsic impoverishment, income and experience emerged as the predictors of job-involvement. But this finding, does not allow us to draw any conclusions because the predictors of job-involvement may be organization-specific whereas these results refer to the
overall sample, which has been drawn from different organizations. More precisely, various occupational and social and family stressors may differentially affect job involvement. Sex-related difference, differences pertaining to job specifications and organizational priorities may influence job involvement. Attempt has been made to throw light on such issues.

Table 3.15 summarizes the list of predictors obtained for different professional groups.

TABLE 3.15
PREDICTORS OF JOB-INVOLVEMENT FOR DIFFERENT PROFESSIONAL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men teachers</td>
<td>Social and family role stress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unreasonable political and group pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underparticipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strenuous working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unprofitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men Operators</td>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility for persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unprofitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women operators</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>Intrinsic impoverishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank cashiers/clerks</td>
<td>Poor-peer relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings obtained for men teachers could be interpreted in terms of our socio-cultural milieu and the factors specific to the profession. In our society men are considered to be the chief bread-earners and heads of the family and the status accorded to the family is directly linked to their profession and designation. In such a situation it is but natural that the men teacher would be motivated by upward mobility in their profession. This leads to their exclusive commitment to the job and channelization of energies towards greater involvement. Such a striving impinges upon their family responsibilities with the ultimate result that their dependents develop a grouse for not having ample opportunities for interaction. Hence social and family role stress has emerged as a negative predictor of job involvement. Our contention is vindicated by the comments of Beattie, Darlington and Cripps (1974) who highlighted the difficult situation of the young executive who in order to build up his career, must devote a great deal of time and energy to his job just when his young house-bound wife, with small children is also making pressing demands. If he is more involved with his job, his family life suffers, if he prefers to enjoy the company of his family, then he stands to lose professionally (Cooper & Marshall, 1978). Since men teachers strive for upward mobility they are able to devote less time at home, their family resents when they do pending work in
home, travel or fulfill engagements related to their jobs. Our findings lend support to the diabolical situation where greater input in one area may be a source of distress in the other. Those who are more involved in the job may provide impetus to stressors in the home and family. But the vice versa may also be visualized.

Amongst the occupational stressors four dimensions namely political and group pressures, under-participation, strenuous working conditions and unprofitability predict job involvement. A careful examination of the multiple regression table (3.4) reveals that all the above mentioned dimensions of occupational stress are negatively correlated with job involvement. As far as unreasonable political and group pressures are concerned it is an open secret that the political heavy weights freely roam the corridors of university/college campus and cast dark shadows in cases of admission of students and promotion of teacher or appointment of Vice-chancellor. Academic or research achievements are often disregarded and prestigious assignments are give to persons wielding political clout. In such a climate job involvement is bound to suffer and our findings seem to be the real reflection of the climate pervading educational institutions.
By and large universities are autonomous with the freedom to frame syllabi, arrange efficient teaching and research activities. A democratic system is believed to exist in such institutions. But the reality is at variance with the cherished model. Power and authority remains the purview of a selected few which is amply reflected in case of men teachers for whom underparticipation has emerged as the predictor.

It is difficult to properly explain the strenuous working conditions as predictor of job involvement for men teachers. But if we analyze it in terms of political pressures and underparticipation then it may be argued that day to day unjustified interference of students demand, the appeasement policy adopted by the higher-ups, peer-group rivalry and lack of clear-cut policy for higher education has a confounding effect especially when the 'guru' and 'shishya' relationship has been eroded. We may be permitted to point out that disruption of class-room activities, threats given for enhancing marks and such other activities have made teaching an arduous task. Apart from the prevailing climate the economic crunch has led to feeling of deprivation. In almost every educational institutions there is a 13 to 20% budgetry cut due to which it is difficult to augment the labs and the libraries. When the escalating prices are taken into account the picture becomes more bleak. Consequently the labs
are starved and the libraries are unable to provide facilities of books and journals.

Unprofitability refers to the lack of recognition for the good work done or absence of punishment to be meted out to the erring employee. Both these factors are sadly non-existent in our work-culture. Again, it is a predictor (negatively) for the men sample only. Neither in the overall sample, nor in the female teachers and operators has it emerged as significant. Perhaps the same explanation that has been forwarded with regard to social and family role stress as a predictor for the male sample but not a predictor for the female sample can be put forward in this case also. Undoubtedly, societal expectations, social and family roles are different for men and women and therefore result in a difference in predictive value of the above variables.

Age has emerged as a predictor where senior teachers seem to be more job-involved as compared to their junior counterparts. It seems that most of the senior teachers have either succeeded in achieving their stipulated targets or have been working with missionary zeal. A decade back advancement in the job for a teacher was non-existent. But in recent years personal promotion scheme has opened avenues for advancement. In many universities a time frame has been set for this purpose and at many places mass promotions have been
granted due to which young teachers obtained greater benefit. Recently Akhtar (1991) commented that "the present climate is research-oriented and publication-oriented" but we find a wide disparity in the quality of the researches that are published. The publication fever has gripped more the younger teachers than the senior ones. The general observation shows that younger teachers more actively participate in activities peripheral to the job and want to derive political gains more than the older teachers. Their involvement is therefore not so much within the job as it is in the outside. It would not be wrong to infer that our younger colleagues are more ambitious than the senior teachers and our results are a pointer in this direction.

It can also be observed from Table 3.4 that income bears a negative relationship with job involvement. The grades of the university teachers have been recently revised and to some people it would look that the high income group of teachers is found to be yielding negative correlation with the job involvement. But the substantial increase in salary has been negated because the income tax slab has not been enhanced and even additional Dearness Allowance (DA) and House Rent Allowance (HRA) are taxable with the result that take pay home salary has shrunk. Added to this is the rising cost of prices which is reflected in our findings. Some of the findings mentioned above could not be supported or
negated because similar studies were not undertaken to the best of our knowledge.

When we analyzed the results for women teachers, we found that none of the variables emerged as the predictor of job-involvement which makes it very clear that there are sex-related stress differences within the same profession. Our finding endorses the earlier findings of Vadra & Akhtar (1989) where it has been explained by the authors that although a greater number of women have entered the labour force, even then we see a greater affinity of women towards traditional sex roles. By and large, women in India have jobs and not a career. They evade tension and potential conflict by having very little career mobility. While getting a job is important for them growing into the job is not as important as it is for men. This explains why occupational stress did not emerge as the predictor of job involvement. Social and family role stress also did not contributed to the prediction of job involvement because the finances accruing from the job and availability of time for the family may not give rise to such stressors. This finding is specially characteristic of the Indian society which lays more emphasis on family welfare than on individual growth, where the main role of women is still that of a home maker and where marriage and family are regarded as the ultimate goals for women. While a great deal
of stress among men is job-centric or work-oriented, stress among women is still largely home-centric or family-oriented.

Our finding lends support to the results obtained by Kumar (1986) who reported that while Indian women find it difficult to succeed in career in the male world, they do not report interpersonal conflict as a stressor as American women do. Probably women in the west challenge the stereotyped sex norms, Indian women show more willingness to accept stereotyping rather than entering into conflict with other colleagues. Despite accepting stereotyped sex norms, Indian women do not report conflict between work and home, and overload as major stressors. This may be because of the better social support networks e.g. availability of domestic servant and elderly family members that Indian families provide. Besides, university teaching provides flexible working hours, vacations and appropriate grades of salary.

The second professional group was that of telephone operators. Table 3.8 depicts four dimensions of occupational stress as predictors of job involvement for men operators namely -- role ambiguity, responsibility for persons, powerlessness and unprofitability. Telephone operators perform repetitive jobs using a few skills and might be suffering from monotony. They simply dial number after number or book long distance calls. In such a situation job-
enrichment and autonomy seem to be non-existent. The results obtained by us may be considered as realistic reflection of their job hazards due to which role ambiguity, responsibility for persons, powerlessness etc. emerged as overriding stressors. Such stressors are probably so dominant that demographic variables, might have been overshadowed.

Role ambiguity has been found to negatively predict job-involvement. Though role ambiguity has yielded negative and low correlation with job-involvement, this factor is difficult to interpret because since the operators are performing simple routine activities, job role ambiguity may actually be non-prevalent. It appears that operators have misinterpreted role ambiguity because of the monotony from which they suffer. It may also be interpreted in terms of defence mechanism to justify disinterest in monotonous job.

Responsibility for persons refers to the level of responsibility that a worker feels for the welfare and future of others. Occupational stress caused by responsibility for welfare of other persons, emanating from the work performed, has been found to be positively related to job-involvement. Thus, no matter if the job is monotonous, an appreciation of its implication for others and a consequent sense of responsibility for persons, probably results in high job-involvement. This is in keeping with the many classic studies
of organizational behaviour that have revealed that perceptions and attitudes of the worker can often override many of the disadvantages that emanate from other conditions. Thus, responsibility for persons is understandably associated with job-involvement.

Powerlessness has emerged to be a positive predictor of job-involvement. This implies that men operators have scored high on powerlessness as well as high on job-involvement. To be more precise it means that the telephone operators are not required to play the roles from which power and authority emanate. They are involved in simple routine activities and the opportunities of work scheduling, building team organizational development, dealing with policy matters, rewarding or punishing subordinates, etc. lies beyond the purview of their job-specification. A deeper analytical approach may bring to surface the feeling of the operators that they experience powerlessness due to the routine nature of the job. People doing similar job and getting compensation for such job may be obliging others and having a sense of influence on others but such type of influences are non-existent especially in electronic exchanges. The present finding seems to be a reflection of such aspects.

The fourth predictor of job-involvement for men operators is unprofitability. As discussed in the case of men
teachers, the same explanation is perhaps broadly true about the telephone operators also.

Analysis of variance for women operators yields a significant F-value (Table 3.9) which shows that the IVs as a whole exert significant effect on the dependent variable (J1). But when analyzed separately none of the IVs bear significant relationship with the DV as indicated by insignificant t-value (Table 3.10). This may be due to high extent of variance. The plausible explanation is that an individual IV may not be affecting the DV but the cumulative effect has been revealed by F-value. Again the same interpretation that has been offered for women teachers holds true for women operators also though the former group belongs to high socio-economic group whereas the latter belongs to lower middle-income group. But the psycho-dynamics of the two groups are the same. Traditionally, the husband in our society has been the non-accommodating partner with respect to domestic responsibilities, and the wife has accommodated, placing her primary emphasis on the family and not on job or career. Wives are found to perform a greater percentage of household labour and parenting responsibilities and husbands are found to work a greater number of hours weekly.

Hall and Hall (1980) advocate that although many husbands of working women intellectually accept and encourage their wives in their careers, few either psychologically or
practically (e.g. by taking traditional housewife chores) support them. When one considers that most men come from homes where their role model was a 'mother at home', the fact that they still expect their working wives to carry out the traditional house-hold duties is not surprising. Broadly speaking, in most cultures, men are expected to be aggressive, assertive and achievement-oriented, while women in each society are socialized to behave in less assertive, less active, more demanding and more conforming manner than boys. In addition, most work organizations have not adequately planned for the increasing desire of women both to work and have a family. Our findings are in conformity with the findings of many researchers who have investigated dual-career roles (Larwood and Wood, 1977; Cooper, 1982; Finn, et al., 1969).

Nurses comprised the third professional group in our sample. Analysis of variance yields significant F-value indicating the cumulative effect of I.V.s on the dependent variable. But when further analysis was undertaken to specify the predictors only intrinsic impoverishment emerged as a negative predictor of job-involvement for nurses. This finding could be accounted by the routine job that nurses have to perform. The picture build up of the nurses working life is strikingly multifaceted. A central requirement of her role is that she should show no signs of stress - maintaining
a detached concern and remaining calm even during emergencies. At the same time she is called upon to play a major part in relieving the emotional anxieties of others. Patients and their relatives demand her support. The nurse's role is therefore implicitly and chiefly one of handling stress.

Nurses experience intrinsic impoverishment which adversely affects job involvement. Although they serve the humanity, they don't get social recognition, doctors scold them and do not treat them as their co-workers, patients insult them and people in our society have misplaced notions about them. Nurses typically work shifts and unsocial hours which can be both physically and socially unsettling. This can both devalue the status of their work and cut nurses off from adequate leisure hours during which to recover from stress.

This implies that the ability to have flexibility within one's position and to have atleast some possibility of upward mobility is considered important by the nurses. Promotional ladders for staff nurses should be developed so as to allow them to have a reasonable amount of job enrichment. Thus, amongst the nurses, one dimension of occupational stress was a predictor variable for job-
involvement, but social and family stress was not predictive of job involvement.

When viewing the results obtained for the female sample in the three professional groups we are struck with the fact that in all these groups social and family role stress is not predicting job involvement. For the male sample, however, it is a significant predictor variable (negative). That is, the greater the family and role stress, the lesser would be the job involvement. For the female sample, job involvement remains unaffected by family and role stress. Thus, a high role stress would not lower job involvement nor a low role stress enhance it. The dynamics operating in the two gender groups are distinct. While the male's role of the primary bread-earner makes his commitment and concern with upward-mobility, pay enhancement so all-pervading that it affects his job-involvement, the same not being true of women - another important dimension must not be lost sight of. This lies in a factor unique to our socio-cultural milieu and the position of women in that framework. It is an undeniable truth that women have lived a life of bonded labour, if not worse, in our culture. Over and above, society and religion sanctified this role of the suppressed martyr, so women learnt to accept their destiny of suffering and humiliation. There was also no way out - they were economically dependent upon others. Education and employment have opened new vistas
of dignity and autonomous existence. Therefore, a job for a woman is a symbol of emancipation and it has a meaning different from what job implies for men. It can also be safely presumed that the dual role which a working women has to play must be enhancing the quantum of stress being experienced by her. With modern facilities to minimize housework labour not available to her as they are to her Western counterpart, and place of work not geared towards providing facilities to the women, as well as attitude of male co-workers, undoubtedly there are more stresses and tensions for her. But the job has a significance which even these stresses cannot effect. Therefore her job-involvement remains independent of stresses experienced by her in coping with dual roles. The traditional training of coping and tolerating over the years seems to have stood her in good stead. Our contention receives further support from the observation that for women in the western countries the role of stress is the same as it is for men. Perhaps after a few decades when the woman's new role is absorbed and integrated into the Indian psyche, some different dynamics may emerge.

The last professional group was that of Bank Cashiers/Clerks. Referring to table 3.12 it can be seen that the F-value is significant at .05 level which implies that the IVs as a whole influence the DV. When further analysis was undertaken poor-peer relations emerged as the predictor
of job-involvement. The findings reflect the conditions under which the cashiers/clerks work. In performing their duties they are seated at a place which is set aside to avoid interaction with other colleagues working in the banks. They are entrusted with the task of dispersing the cheques and crediting the money collected. This activity continues in most of the banks between 10 to 2 PM. Then they are required to tally the accounts and submit the reports by the time banks are closed. The overriding fear that the accounts may not go wrong keeps them involved in their work. Thus it is quite clear that interaction with the peers is not only restricted but non-existent. Our finding lends support to the results obtained by Shaffer (1982) who observed that "when people are happy and enjoy working together the positive emotional climate generated by their interaction makes work pleasurable and satisfying on the other hand, if there is an air of tension on the job, people sense it and begin to reflect that tension in their work or in their relationship with co-workers". When the employees do not have pleasant interactions with their co-workers, little support system within the work setting, it will influence their stress level.

One of the objectives of the study was to find out the extent to which men and women differ on the variable of job-involvement. Duncan's Multiple Range Test was applied to test
the significance of difference among the means of several groups (table 3.14) and it was found that the group of nurses exhibit highest job-involvement followed by women teachers and women operators. These are followed by men telephone operators, bank cashiers/clerks and men teachers. Thus all the three groups comprised of women show a higher job-involvement than all the three groups comprised of men. This is an extremely interesting finding. As far as nurses are concerned, one can argue that there were no male nurses counterpart in the sample so the high amount of job-involvement may not be connected with their being women but with the very nature of work performed by them. The nursing profession involves tending to the sick and suffering humanity and bringing comfort to them. The feedback received in the form of gratitude and appreciation from the patients is definitely a unique factor for the nurses and must be creating a sense of identification and involvement with the job. This probably accounts for their being the highest scorers on job-involvement. But even the other female sample groups are higher on job-involvement than their male counterparts. Thus factors other than the nature of the work must be playing a role. The investigator feels inclined to refer to the explanation offered in some preceding paragraphs where the role of stress vis-a-vis job-involvement is discussed for the female sample. It had been pointed out that the job for
the Indian women is a symbol of economic independence and a consequential freedom from oppression and humiliation suffered through the centuries. Therefore, it is viewed in a more psychologically positive light than by men. Further, the woman is not usually the primary bread-earner so she has a more hassle-free, non-ambitious approach to her job which allows her to work for work's sake only rather than confound the work situation with promotional and other considerations. Furthermore, since women have to strike a balance between job and family life, they do not like to keep work pending and therefore exhibit greater diligence and involvement in their work.

In the end, we may conclude that by and large the job-involvement model which views both the situational variables as well as demographic variables as predictors of job-involvement has been endorsed by our findings. Earlier work done in the area (Rabinowitz, Hall and Goodale, 1977; Saal, 1978; Akhtar & Kumar, 1978; Kumari & Singh, 1988; Madhu & Harigopal, 1980; Srivastava & Sinha, 1983) is on the same lines although in some studies demographic variables have been given greater prominence than situational variables. The work done by the present author is more holistic in nature since it has tried to incorporate dimensions of stress namely social and family which were usually ignored earlier. Furthermore both individual-related as well as job-related factors have been investigated in an in-depth manner by
selecting for study different types of professional groups and the sex variable within these professional groups.

Implications of the Study and Suggestions

The study conducted has brought out with cogence and clarity the role of extra-organizational stressors in job-involvement. Whereas occupational stressors have invariably been emphasized by investigators, the significance of social and family role stressors have by and large been given little weightage.

First and foremost it may be suggested in the light of the present findings that extra-organizational stressors should be considered as important as the occupational stressors. If any intervention strategy is to be designed then both the facets have to be highlighted equally. One intervention strategy could be family counselling so that the home and family stressors may not go unbridled and a better understanding of the job-involvement may dawn upon the members of the family. On entering the organization, a person inevitably loses a fair degree of his freedom. He has certain commitments towards the organization which his family ought to know.

Counselling the employees may prove equally beneficial. If employees are trained to adopt proper time scheduling,
then activities in the organization may not interfere with family interactions. By proper time scheduling they can avoid bringing job situations such as pending work, home with them. Further, they should open their work life to their family and let them understand and feel what the job means to them, the efforts they have to put in, the pains they undertake, the obstacles they come across and quite likely the family will be able to have a sense of identification with the work and its demands, thus becoming a source of support rather than stress. By reserving week-ends and vacations for the family (except in some unavoidable emergencies) for outing, celebrations, and other family activities, an important source of family grudge can be avoided. In family emergencies and crisis, the employees should investigate all the options available at their workplace - shared job options, flexible time arrangements, day-care facilities, sick leave if the child is ill.

Organizations can also take concrete steps in stress management of employees. In case of senior executives, workshops should be organized for acquainting them with new and better methods of doing their work, brushing up abilities involved in their work, thus ensuring greater efficiency. Another intervention strategy could be to train the executives to speed up the system of decision making. Added to this should be the delegation of powers and authority and
sharing of responsibilities. In most organizations there is no clear-cut demarcation of work roles, a large degree of overlapping and confusion coming up very often. By reducing ambiguity we can encourage a higher degree of job-involvement amongst employees. Thus family counselling, better time management skills, ability to set priorities, reducing role ambiguity by defining job roles and delegation of work can go a long way to reduce stress in the work situation and thus ensure greater job-involvement. Thus, benefits may accrue from re-design programmes which facilitate the control of stressful demands by changing the work environment.

The implications of this study for managing the job stress are immense. Effective management would involve cognizance of occupational factors as well as social and family role stressors. Had we been able to conduct a study with wider representative sample it would have served as a basis to plan support services catering to special needs of specific groups. Not only this, it would have done yeomen service by contributing empirically to the development of sociological theory in this area. Nevertheless, some important issues of practical importance have been indicated and further work will help to complete the picture.

It is suggested that organizations of the future will have to pay attention to their effects on people other than employed persons (i.e. spouses and children) and allow for
the needs of families to influence organizational policies and actions. Questions about day-care, part-time work, maternity and paternity leaves, transfers, spousal involvement in career planning and flexible working hours may become primary considerations for employees in the future.

Limitations

While the investigator acknowledges her limitations both temporal and material, it has been tried to cover as large a sample and be as precise as it was possible within these limits. Because various groups had to be compared extensive study could not be done, more professional groups could not be covered. Moreover the sample investigated is small, particularly with reference to the number of independent variables that form part of the regression analysis. Therefore the results obtained by us cannot be generalized rather they can only serve as indicators.

The fact that the same set of predictors have not emerged for men and women should ideally be subjected to a further series of in-depth probing. We must leave that for the future, since this information is the outcome of the present research and follow-up can be undertaken only in the future. But the fact that the sex variable could not be investigated further remains a shortcoming of our work. Shortcomings of this type cannot be overcome in individual
research because practical considerations override the desire of the investigator to encompass all possible variables on an ideally large sample. Collective research schemes and organizationally sponsored research should be done to overcome this obstacle.

Unless similar studies are conducted on diverse samples and we have a data bank we would not be in a position to draw conclusions. Nor would we be in a position to design coping strategies because these strategies can be evolved only by taking into consideration the nature of the job, family and the organization. That is why we have not been able to spell out any specific intervention strategies and this remains a limitation of our work. If we had been able to incorporate the study of pertinent personality factors it would have enhanced the comprehensiveness of our work. We were also not able to take into consideration factors like family size, presence of pre-school aged children, nature of work like it being part-time or full-time. These would have given us greater insight into the dynamics operating.

Another limitation pertains to the package used in our research for computing Multiple Regression Analysis. The package was IBM-SSP on Mainframe VAX-11/780. As semipartial correlations for assessing the unique contribution of I.Vs is not given in this programme, therefore precise information
regarding what percentage of variance is contributed by each I.V. is not known. It is suggested that future studies should use more advanced packages.

We realize that our findings may not be applicable to various levels of employees and different organizations because of the smallness of the sample studied. But the present work provides us a lead to future researchers who may extend the present work on other but larger professional groups so that the authenticity of the present findings may be established.

The investigator has made it a special point to bring out the limitations of the investigation not only in the interest of objective scientific enquiry but also because the journey of knowledge goes on. The torch is passed on from one to the other and an appreciation of limitations is helpful to future investigators in planning their work. The secret of scientific growth lies in vicarious experience and it is our earnest desire that shortcomings perceived by our own selves may prove useful to others in generating knowledge in the area.
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APPENDICES
इस प्रश्नावली का उद्देश्य यह है कि आपके कार्य-जीवन में सम्बन्धित विभिन्न पहलुओं की जानकारी हासिल की जाय। इस जानकारी की सफलता केवल आपके सहयोग और ईमानदारी से नवाउने पर निर्भर करती है। आपको कभी-भी अपना नाम और पता नहीं लिखना है। आपके द्वारा दिए गए उत्तर पूरी तरह से गोपनीय रखे जायें। आपके उत्तर केवल वैज्ञानिक उद्देश्य के लिये श्रांग नियम लें। आप जाने कि इम जान-रज्जताल (जानकारी) की सहायता से लोगों के जीवन भर का अच्छा बनाने में मदद भी देंगे।

धन्यवाद
यह प्रश्न निम्नलिखित है। अपने उत्तर जैसे कि नीचे बताया गया है
उसके प्रकार से हो। इस प्रश्नावली को पूरा करने के लिये सब कोई वक्तव्य नहीं है पर सुझाव
आप जितनी जटिल हो सके उत्तर दे। प्रश्न प्रकार उत्तर देना जरूरी है।

हर प्रश्न के सामने एक कोष्ट ( ) दिया गया है। अगर आप किसी प्रश्न से पूरी तरह सहमत हैं
तो (१) लिखिये, अगर सहमत नहीं है तो (२) लिखिये, अगर अनिहित हैं तो (३) लिखिये, अगर असहमत हैं
tो (४) लिखिये, और अगर पूरी तरह अग्रगत नहीं हैं तो (५) लिखिये।

(१) इस नोकरी में मुझे बहुत अधिक काम करना पड़ता है।
(२) मुझे अपने काम तथा कार्य परिणामों के सम्बन्ध में उपलब्ध निर्देश तथा सूचनाओं अस्पष्ट हैं।
(३) मैं अपने काम निर्धारित समय से अधिक समय लगने पर भी पूरा करता/करती वाले इसके
      लिये बुझे बताने न भी मिले।
(४) मेरे कामों के सम्बन्ध में विभिन्न अधिकारियों के निर्देश परस्पर विरोधी (Contradictory)
      होते हैं।
(५) राजनीति, सामयिक, दबाव और बोलचालिक (Formal) नियमों के निर्देशों के बीच सामंजस्य
      (Harmony) स्थापित करना भी निये जवित समय बन जाता है।
(६) आदमी की असली पद्धति इस व्यक्ति में होती है कि वो किसी काम को कितनी अच्छी तरह
      करता है।
(७) बहुत सारे अंबारियों की कार्य कुशलता तथा उल्लास को जिम्मेदारी भरे उधार भांग दी
      जाती है।
(८) यहाँ मेरे सलाहकर पर विषय ध्यान दिया जाता है तथा उन्हें कार्यान्वित भी किया जाता है।
(९) जीवन में सच्चा सतीश मुझे अपने कार्य से ही मिलता है।
(1०) अंबारियों के काम के विवाद (Distribution of assignment) के सम्बन्ध में मेरे नियम
      तथा निर्देशों का अपना किया जाता है।
(1१) मुझे अपने पद्धति के लोगों के साथ काम करना पड़ता है।
(1२) काम करते हुए वक्त फिर तरह गुजर जाता है मुझे पता ही नहीं चलता।
(1३) मेरे काम नीति तथा उपाय किम्प के है।
(1४) इस समग्र के उल्लेख अधिकारों में आधा ममता का ध्यान रखते है।
(1५) बुधगाँव में अपने काम पर चलते ही पड़ता जाता,जितने ही तालिका में अपने काम की तैयारी
      कर सकूँ।
(1६) मुझे अपने महत्त्व और काम की मात्रा की तुलना में कम मुख्य वैज्ञानिक मिलती है।
(1७) मैं अपना काम तनावूण्ड स्थिति में करता/करती हूँ।
(१२) जोवन को अधिकतर महत्वपूर्ण दर्शाने अथवा काम से सम्बन्धित होते हैं।
(१३) काम की अधिकता के कारण मुझे ज्ञान में कभी कर्मचारियों तथा सामान्यों से ही काम ज्ञानप्रद होता है।
(१४) मेरे कायम के तत्काल तथा विशेष गुरु तर्क सप्तद तथा मिल्या है।
(१५) कभी,कभी मैं रात को नेट पर अपने दिन के काम के बारे में सोचना रहता/सोचने रहती है।
(१६) विभिन्न अधिकारी अथवा काम की तरीके में बदलना नहीं दे रहे हैं।
(१७) सामान्य लिबनोविक दर्शन के कारण मुझे कुछ काम करना बाहर हृदय भी करने पड़ जाते है।
(१८) अपने काम के बारे में मैं परिपूर्णता के निदान में विश्वास रखता/रखती हूँ।
(२१) अनेक लोगों के निर्देश को विचारधारा मेरे ही ऊपर है।
(२२) उच्चवर्गीय प्रशासनिक (Administrative) समस्याओं को निलाम के मेरा सहयोग लिया जाता है।
(२३) जब मैं किसी वाणी में सामान होता/होती है तो मुझे उदासी का अनुभव होता है।
(२४) कर्मचारियों के द्वारा उप्रश्रम के बारे में मेरी सलाहों को सम्मिलित महत्व दिया जाता है।
(२५) मेरे कुछ साधी और अनोखा कर्मचारी (Subordinate) मुझे नाकामयात और बदलने का संकेत करते है।
(२६) मेरे लिये और काम इस काम से उपयोग महत्वपूर्ण है।
(२७) अपने काम के श्रम और अनुमान का घरे घरे से उपयोग करने का अवसर मिलता है।
(२८) इस चोरों के कारण जूते समझ में काफी समान मिलता है।
(२९) काम के मेरे अंदर आस्वर नहीं है।
(३०) मेरे कहीं मेहमन और काम-नुकसान के लिये शायद ही कभी मुझे सम्मिलित उपाय करता है।
(३१) मेरे कुछ काम (Assignment) बहुत ही जोखिमपूर्ण (Risky) तथा जलपाई है।
(३२) अगर मुझे पानी की जहाँ नहीं हो तो शायद मैं काम करता ही रहूँगा/करता ही रहूँगी।
(३३) काम की अधिकता के कारण मुझे अपने काम बहुत जल्दी-जल्दी निपटाने में काफी परेशानी होती है।
(३४) मेरा काम कायम तथा अधिकार नियंत्रण पर अंतर रहते हैं के कारण मैं अपना काम सुधार (Smoothly) से नहीं कर पाता/पाती है।
(३५) अंतर हो मेरे काम करने में अपनी चाह के स्वयं उपयोग करते/करती है।
(३६) मूल जो नये काम दिये जाते हैं उन्हें करने के लिये न लंबा सप्तद निर्देश दिये जाते हैं और न पयासप साधन हो उपलब्ध है।
(३७) सामान्य प्रशिक्षण (Group Conformity) किसी उपयोग रखने के लिये मुझे कभी-कभी सामान्य से अधिक काम करना पड़ जाता है।
(३८) मैं, सामान्य, समान्यतः के विश्वास के मेरे काम अधिक (धांड़ा सा) परिवर्तन होता है।
(३९) इस संगठन नियम के बिना काम और तबहों की एक बड़ी विचारधारा अपने ऊपर है।
(४०) संगठन नियम की महत्वपूर्ण नीतियों के बारे में मुझे मुझाल हो सकते है।
(४१) मेरे काम ही में मस्त रहता/रहती है।
(४२) महत्वपूर्ण (Appointments) में मेरी शुरु तथा मत का ध्यान रखा जाता है।
(47) प्रशासनिक तथा उद्यान सम्बन्धों समस्याओं को मुलाकात में मेरे महाराजी (Colleagues) अपनी हरी पहुँच में सहयोग देते हैं।

(48) मेरे अपने कार्य में अपनी बड़ी काम और दायित्व (जिम्मेदारी) लेने से कामा करती है।

(49) इसका मुख्य अपनी अभिलिपिका (Aptitude) तथा कोशिष्ट करने के लिए कार्यकर्ता मोर्फिंग देते हैं।

(50) मेरे उत्कृष्ट अधिकारियों द्वारा नव नव कामों को विशेष महत्व नहीं देते हैं।

(51) आज की अवधारणा में मेरे काम के प्रति अधिक महत्ताकांक्षा रखता था/रखती थी।

(52) मेरे अनुभव करते-करते बड़े-बड़े मेरा प्रोफेसर एक बोझ था वह गया है।

(53) इन तीनों में अधिक अस्तित्व रहने को बदल में मेरे पारिवारिक तथा व्यक्तिगत (Personal) कामों व समस्याओं के लिए पर्याप्त समय नहीं दे पाता/पाती है।

(54) जीवन में अनिवार्य नीति जाने में उद्यान महत्वपूर्ण है।

(55) में उच्च अधिकारियों तथा महाराज मुझसे किस तरह के काम व व्यवहार की उम्मीद रखते है उन्हें पता नहीं होता है।

(56) यहां कार्यचर्या अधिकारिक निर्माणों तथा व्यवस्थापन कार्यक्रमों (Formal work Systems) को समृद्धित महत्व देते है।

(57) मेरे मेरे मेरे मेरे काम के बारे में बहुत विविधता रहता था/रहती थी लेकिन अब मेरे लिये कार्य को अपेक्षा करने नींद उद्यान महत्व प्राप्त है।

(58) राजनीतिक सामूहिक दबाव के बजह से मुझे अनुभव बीमार तथा प्रयासों में काम-प्रणाली व नीतियों का उल्लंघन करने को मजबूर होना पड़ता है।

(59) कार्य-प्रणाली, उपकरण (Implements) तथा कार्य-दृष्टि में किसी तरह के मुंहारा या बलदाब के समर्थ में मेरे सहयोग मात्री जाती है।

(60) कभी-कभी मेरा आत्म-विवेक है कि अपने काम में कोई गलतियों के लिये मैं अपने आप को सजा हूँ।

(61) यहां कार्यचर्या में अपनी गलती का चिंताजनक और मुफ्त मामला (Team Spirit) परिरूप मात्र में है।

(62) समतल शक्ति के काम कार्यों और समकालिकी को मुलाकात में मेरे सहयोग या सलाह नहीं जा करने नियमों में सम्बन्ध है।

(63) यहां का काम करने का मानव हमारी शक्तियों और मनोरंजन का नजर से सत्यमथनक है।

(64) मैं का काम भी करने पहुँचे है जो दूसरे करने चाहिए।

(65) बस्ती तथान (Present) कामों निर्देशों और प्रायोजनक नीतियों की जगह अचानक नई प्रणाली और नीतियों का लागू करने के काफी परेशान होती है।

(66) कार्यों की अधिकता और मदर की कमी की बजह से मेरे व्यवस्था काम (Assignment) उत्तरी स्तरों तरंग नहीं कर पाता/पाती जितना मैं करना चाहता/चाहती हूँ।

[4]
The purpose of the present investigation is to study the various aspects related to job life. The success of the present investigation would entirely depend upon your cooperation and frank responses. You need not give your name and address and your responses will be treated in strict confidence. The questionnaire is untimed but you are requested to complete it as quickly as possible.

The data would be exclusively used for scientific purposes. It may help in preparing a viable program to improve the quality of life of people working in different fields.

We are confident that we will receive your full cooperation.
Please read carefully each statement and rate them from 1 to 5 as suggested below:

If you find yourself in total agreement with the statement put 5 in the parentheses, if you agree put 4, if undecided put 3, if you disagree put 2, and if you find yourself in total disagreement then put 1 in the parentheses.

1. The members of my family think that I should have opted for some other job. ( )

2. My spouse/family reminds me that my job does not carry much social prestige. ( )

3. It is distressing to know that people consider my job to be inadequate for the expression of my talents. ( )

4. My family members often remind me that this job is not fit for me. ( )

5. The members of my family often complain that I am underpaid. ( )

6. My family members complain that the job activities do not allow me sufficient time for recreation. ( )

7. My family members try to impress upon me that I cannot achieve the objectives of my life through the present job. ( )

8. Often I undergo mental tension at home due to my job. ( )
9. The members of my family get irritated when I do pending work in home.

10. Hard working people frequently appreciate the role that I play.

11. I often realize that my job-related responsibilities lead to the negligence of the studies of my children.

12. I am often accused that I do not share the home responsibilities as I should do.

13. I feel distressed to hear that I could have earned more if I would have selected some other job.

14. The family members complain that my health is deteriorating due to work overload.

15. I feel embarrassed by the comments of my family that I do not have the courage to get ahead.

16. I do not talk about my professional colleagues at home because my family members consider them to be untrustworthy.

17. I cannot invite my office colleagues at home because my family does not like them.

18. The tension associated with my work role may be reduced if the members of my family happen to know my organizational duties and functions.

19. Differences between me and my family members pertaining to my work often lead to a difficult situation.

20. I do not entertain the recommendations of my near and dear ones for certain favours pertaining to my job and for that I have to suffer mental agony.
21. The challenging nature of my job is not appreciated by my family members.

22. My family members have an aversion towards my acceptance of more work-related responsibilities.

23. My family contributes immensely to my progress.

24. My desire to complete the pending work at home often creates a conflicting situation.

25. In order to give due importance to my family I have to forego career development opportunities.

Please furnish the following informations:

Age..............................................

Designation..............................................

Employer (organization)..............................................

Education..............................................

Monthly income/salary..............................................

Experience..............................................

Marital status (Married/Unmarried)..............................................

No. of Promotions earned..............................................

No. of Dependents..............................................

Education of spouse..............................................

Income/salary of spouse..............................................