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CHAPTER -I

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In recent years we have witnessed an unprecedented upsurge in studies on job motivation, job involvement and quality of work life (Hall & Lawler, 1970; Schwyhart & Smith, 1972; Walton, 1972; Dewhirst, 1973; Rao, 1981; Akhtar & Nizami, 1987; Hall & Mansfield, 1979; Elloy, Everett & Flynn, 1991). These terms though interrelated have been found to be factorially independent (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965; Weissenberg & Gruenfeld, 1968; Lawler & Hall, 1970; Akhtar & Kumar, 1978; Baba, 1979; Blau, 1985; Brooke, et al. 1988; Dolke & Srivastava, 1988).

The advent of scientific management (Taylor, 1911) focussed considerable research effort to find ways and means to simplify, standardize and specialize jobs. It was believed that simplification of the job would result in organizational benefits such as reduction in training costs, labour expenses, increased productivity and higher profits. Numerous scholars have studied the consequences of work simplification (Argyris, 1964; Blauner, 1964; Friedman, 1961; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959). Monotony, increased absenteeism and
loss of interest in the job were found to be factors that drastically undermine the benefits of job simplification. This led to exploring alternative sources to overcome the limitations.

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

Taking lead from the line of thinking of Herzberg, Turner & Lawrence (1965) gave the concept of Requisite Task Attributes (RTA). The six attributes delineated by them were: (a) variety, (b) autonomy, (c) required interaction (d) optional interaction,
They found RTA scores positively correlated with satisfaction and attendance of factory workers.

Hackman & Lawler (1971) identified four of the Turner & Lawrence (1965) attributes as core characteristics of jobs that would allow individuals to obtain meaningful personal satisfaction from the job itself. These four facets were: Autonomy, Task identity, Feedback and skill variety. Autonomy is the degree to which a job provides freedom, independence and discretion to the worker in scheduling his work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out. Task identity is the degree to which a job requires a completion of a 'whole' and 'identifiable' piece of work. Feedback is the degree to which carrying out the activities required by the job results in the employee obtaining direct and clear information about the effectiveness of his performance. Skill variety is the degree to which a job requires a number of different activities considered to be essential for carrying out the work. It also involves the use of different skills of a person to undertake different activities.

Hackman and Lawler (1971) also measured the strength of desire for the satisfaction of 'higher
order' needs (e.g., obtaining feeling of accomplishment, personal growth, etc.). They found that when jobs are high on the four core dimension, employees who were desirous of higher order need satisfaction tended to have high motivation and high job satisfaction, were infrequently absent from work and were rated by their supervisors as doing high quality work. Brief and Aldag (1975) replicated Hackman & Lawler study and endorsed that higher order need strength moderated job characteristics.

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

Several studies have been reported showing the impact of enriched job on job satisfaction, motivation and productivity in work setting (Stone & Porter, 1975; Orpen, 1979; Brass, 1985; Cellar, Kernan & Barrett, 1985; Head & Sorenson, 1985; Loscoco, 1989; Sekaran, 1989), Locus of control (Abdel and Ahmad, 1980), task complexity (Perrwe & Mizers, 1987), gender and personal responsibility (Bartunek, 1986), occupational group (Cherniss & Kane, 1987), supervisor accessibility (Dallinger & Hambple, 1988) and attention arousal (Fox & Feldman, 1988).

In a significant investigation of an insurance firm Medcof (1989) found that among clerks, extent of information technology use, was positively correlated with skill variety, feedback from agents and dealing with others and that there was no correlation between extent of use and task identity, task significance, feedback from the job. In the non-clerical job, use extent was negatively correlated with skill variety, feedback from agents and dealing with others.

One of the job characteristics, autonomy has been separately studied by many researchers with variables
such as role conflict and the outcome satisfaction, work role centrality and perceived control (Morris & Snyder, 1979; Saratha, 1984; Kreis & Brockopp, 1986; Spector, 1986). It could easily be inferred that increased level of autonomy results in higher job satisfaction and better outcome results.

Similarly feedback has been extensively researched. Fisher (1979) carried out a laboratory study and found that low performers liked their superiors less than high performers who have got feedback. Similar findings were obtained by Adler, Skov & Salvemini (1985) but Pearce & Porter (1986) obtained contradictory results and observed that the effects of feedback does not influence employee attitudes. Similar findings have been reported by Das (1986) and Das & Mittal (1989).

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

The relationship between job characteristics and perceived organisational effectiveness with respect to organisational typology were studied by Sayeed & Vishwanathan (1983). They pointed out that job extrinsic and job intrinsic factors differ in terms of importance in manufacturing and non-manufacturing organisations.
The significance of Hackman-Oldham job enrichment model (1976) in Indian context has been tested by various researchers. Padaki (1982 & 1984) found partial support for the model. In her factor analytical study macro and micro factors were found to be significant predictors of job satisfaction and motivational outcome. Padaki, however, did not find significant relationship between job characteristics and individual's performance effectiveness.

In a similar study towards finding out the profile of Indian manager's perception of job characteristics, the five core job dimensions can be used as a diagnostic aid in redesigning job (Maneriker & Patil, 1983). Gandhi (1992) observed that job characteristics, on the whole, have no significant predictor of organisational identification but job autonomy and skill variety emerged as predictors of identification, while task identity emerged as predictor of organisational involvement.

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

Critically reviewing the studies we come to the conclusion that the core job-characteristics (Autonomy, Task identity, Feedback and Skill variety) are, by and large, related to individual satisfaction, identification with the organisation, performance of the individual and such other facets of work life. It also comes to light that different job characteristics are perceived differently by the workers, supervisors and the managers. The differences in organisational policy and programme may differentially influence the job characteristics. In other words, it may be visualized that the perception of job characteristics may be specific to the sample of employees studied.

**JOB INVOLVEMENT**

As mentioned earlier, the other important variable under investigation is job-involvement. Historically speaking, Durkheim, an eminent sociologist, evinced interest in job involvement as early as 1893 but Lodahl & Kejner (1965) extensively studied job involvement and they were instrumental in bringing it to limelight. Although voluminous amount of research has
been conducted on its construct during the past two decades still a certain amount of confusion needs to be dispelled.

The term job involvement (JI) was used in varied contexts and often confused with ego involvement, need satisfaction, intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965; Weissenberg & Gruenfeld, 1968; Lawler & Hall, 1970; Schwyhart & Smith, 1972; Akhtar & Kumar, 1978; Blau, 1985; Brooke et al., 1988; Dolke & Srivastava, 1988).

Different interpretations of job involvement can be broadly categorized into two distinct ways. The first series of definitions seem to tie together the concept of self esteem. Individuals have been described as job involved if they view it as important to their life interest (Dubin, 1956) and perceive performance as central to their self-esteem (Gurin, Veroff & Feld, 1960). Vroom (1962) describes a person as ego-involved in a job by the level of his self-esteem which is affected by his perceived level of performance. In other words, for Vroom, involvement exists when a person's feeling of esteem is increased by good performance and decreased by the bad one. These definitions describe job involved person as one who is very much personally
affected by his whole job situation, the work itself, his co-workers, the company etc.

The second conceptual way of describing job involvement is 'the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work' or 'the importance of work in his total self-image' (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). Such a psychological identification with work may result partly from early socialization training during which the individual may internalize the value of goodness of work. Lodahl (1965) emphasized that during the process of socialization certain work values are injected into the self of the individual that remain even at the later stage in the form of attitude towards job. Siegel (1969) endorses that worker's sex, early socialization process and organisational variables affect the development of an individual's job involvement. From these definitions we can infer that repeated reinforcement of an individual's ideas about his job during his early socialization process is responsible for his developing the job involvement attitude. This suggests that fresh job holders are likely to be job involved if their socialization background is conducive to the development of such an attitude (Akhtar & Kumar, 1978).
Wollack, Goodale, Wijting & Smith (1971) consider job involvement as a partial operationalisation of the Protestant ethic. According to Katz & Kahn (1966) it is a moderator variable between satisfaction and performance. While Weissenberg & Gruenfeld (1968) think of it as a quasi indicator of motivation. 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. Lawler & Hall (1970) provided theoretical and empirical evidence to distinguish job involvement from need satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. They suggest that job involvement refers to the degree to which a person's total work situation is an important part of his life. Many investigators have confirmed that these terms are factorially independent (Cummings & Bigelow, 1976; Akhtar & Ahmad, 1978; Brooke, Russell & Price, 1988; Shore, Thornton & Shore, 1990).

These differences in interpretation clearly emphasize the historical lack of agreement concerning what job involvement represents. Kanungo (1981) rightly contends that "distorted and ambiguous interpretations of the concept have created an aura of mysticism that must be dispelled before scientific understanding of the phenomena can be achieved." Although recently attempts
have been made to clarify the construct it is primarily the work of Kanungo (1979, 1982) that has provided us a new direction in our understanding of the term. He has proposed that one should make a clear distinction between job involvement and work involvement. Whether an individual is involved in a job is dependent upon the extent to which the job satisfies his salient needs and hence job involvement in this respect is more situationally determined. On the other hand, work involvement is considered to be a more stable psychological characteristic. Evidence of this conceptual distinction has been provided by Gorn & Kanungo (1980), Kanungo (1982), Misra, Kanungo, Von Rosenthal & Stuhler (1985), and Elloy & Cornelius (1986).

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

Review of job involvement definitions reveal that it has been considered either in terms of individual
differences or job situations or as an interaction between the individual and his job, or these are considered to be essential determiners of job involvement.

Examining the correlates of job involvement in a variety of organizational settings has attracted increased interest among scholars who have classified the correlates of job involvement in terms of personal characteristics, situational characteristics and work outcomes. Job involvement was found to be positively related to performance by Bass (1965). Rabinowitz & Hall (1977) thoroughly reviewed job involvement studies and concluded that age and Protestant work values were the strongest correlates of job involvement. Weissenberg & Gruenfeld (1968) found that job involvement is significantly related to satisfaction with motivator variables. Runyon (1973) and Reitz & Jewell (1979) advocate job involvement as a relatively personal characteristic and found that men are likely to value work more than women but Lennon (1987) obtained different result. In controlled work autonomy situation, women were found to be more involved with their job than men.
A large number of studies have shown that job involvement is positively related to job satisfaction, recognition, fulfillment of intrinsic as well as extrinsic needs, participation in decision making, satisfaction with supervisors (Weissenberg & Gruenfeld, 1980; Gorn & Kanungo, 1980; Jans, 1985; Knoop, 1986; Lambert, 1991).


Job involvement studies, in our country, surfaced relatively late on the horizon. The socio-cultural disparity between the industrially developed countries and the developing one's necessitate the significance of researches to be done in India. Indian
researchers have attempted to explore the relationship of job involvement with demographic variables (Akhtar & Kumar, 1978; Sharma & Kapoor, 1978; Bajaj, 1978; Anantharaman, 1980; Jagdish, 1984; Khandelwal, 1986; Chadha & Kaur, 1987; Pathak & Pathak, 1987; Kumari & Singh, 1988; Bajaj, 1978a; Anantharaman & Deivasenapathy, 1980; Choudhry, 1988; Singh & Pestonjee, 1990). Personality variables and their relation to job involvement have also been explored such as locus of control (Reddy & Rahman, 1984; Reddy & Rajshekhar, 1988; Achamamba & Gopikumar, 1990), stress (Strivastava & Sinha, 1983; Mishra, 1986; Vadra, 1991), personality pattern (Prabhakar, 1979; Verma, 1985; Khandelwal & Mathur, 1987; Ittey & Rani, 1990), role conflict and role ambiguity (Madhu & Harigopal, 1980; Singh, 1984; Srivastava & Singh, 1983; Singh & Mishra, 1983) and such other variables as self-esteem, childhood aspirations and expectations, adjustment, ego-strength, etc. Then organisation variables such as satisfaction, quality of work life, leadership style, role overload, work motivation, etc. have been investigated (Ghosh & Deb, 1983; Akhtar & Bacha, 1984; Singh, 1984; Reddy & Kumar, 1980; Singh & Mishra, 1984; Reddy & Rajshekhar, 1988; Dhillon & Donodona, 1988; Srinivasan & Kamalanabhan, 1986; Mishra, 1988; Sharma, Singh & Hussain, 1991). The
results of these studies are inconsistent as far as predicting the influence of various demographic and situational variables on job involvement because differing socio-cultural milieu, work values and working conditions bring about variations in cause and effect relationships.

The relationship between perceived importance and need satisfaction and job involvement were studied by various investigators (Kanungo, Mishra & Dayal, 1975; Pathak, 1983; Agarwala & Chadha, 1989). They advocate that subject who had a significantly higher order need tend to be highly involved. Contrary to the above findings, Akhtar & Kumar (1978) found that the satisfaction of higher order needs, satisfaction with organisational variables and job levels in no way influence job involvement.

It has been repeatedly pointed by researchers that job involvement is influenced by organisational, situational and personal characteristics, but it has yielded consistently low correlations with almost every variable. The model of job involvement has been evolved on the assumption of linearity of relationship between job involvement and the variables mentioned above. Rabinowitz & Hall (1977), in their exclusive review of
literature, concluded that "no one class of variables (personal characteristics, situational characteristics and work outcomes) show clearly stronger relationships to job involvement than any other." Linearity of the relationship has been doubted by Indian researchers also (Anantharaman & Kaliappan, 1982; Akhtar & Bacha, 1984) who pointed out that the relationship may be curvilinear.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The purpose of aims and objectives of any study is to highlight the main thrust of investigation. It is not possible to manipulate all the variables at the same time rather the spirit of the scientific enquiry is to select certain variables, increase or decrease them to ascertain their influence on selected variable/variables. It is evident from the title of the thesis that relationship between job involvement (JI) and job characteristics (JC) is to be investigated. Review of the studies on job characteristics reveal that autonomy, task identity, feedback and skill variety are considered as the core characteristics.

It has also been observed that job characteristics are influenced by childhood experiences, value orientation, organisational climate, job hierarchy, etc. Thus,
it emerges that different organisations have to be taken into consideration along with job involvement to study the job characteristics in proper prospectives.

Review of researches of job characteristics, in our country, leads us to infer that various investigators studied different job characteristics. Some characteristics were found to be significantly related to such variables as job attitudes. None of the researchers tried to investigate these four core job dimensions (Autonomy, Task identity, Feedback and Skill variety) as a composite model based on the assumptions that perception of these characteristics enhance employee motivation and performance. This formed the main aim of the present study. Moreover, absence of any measuring devise to study job characteristics in Indian context, necessitated the development of a standardized tool. This is another salient feature of the present investigation. The details of the scale development are reported in the next chapter.

We may be permitted to emphasize that present investigation has theoretical as well as practical implication. It was observed that the relationship between job involvement and job characteristics has not been extensively researched in our country and thus an attempt
has been made to find out the influence of job characteristics on job involvement. The finding may help the organisations whenever and wherever it is deemed to be advisable to initiate a programme of job enrichment. Since we would be conducting research in two different organisations, the scope of the present study broadened. Also we intend to include the production line workers, supervisors and managers of the two organisations, the findings will assume greater significance in terms of job hierarchical levels. The findings of the present investigation may be utilized by the management which intends to embark upon a programme of organisational change (OC) and organisational development (OD). Often people in management fail to differentiate between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, the present study may provide guidelines for improving intrinsic motivation of employees and it may be instrumental in framing incentive schemes.
As early as 1959, Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook emphasized that mode of collection of data, analyses, etc. should be guided by the objectives of the study on one hand and economy of procedure on the other. These considerations are important aspect of research design. Research design enables the researcher to answer research questions as validly, objectively and accurately as possible. Research design has assumed significance in social and behavioral sciences and it is considered to be the most important component of Research Methodology (Kerlinger, 1964).

The design specifies the method to be employed for manipulating the independent one. It helps in selection of appropriate statistical methods of analysis. The choice of the method is governed by the aims of the study, the variables under investigation and the nature of the data. It is, thus, imperative that the objectives of the study should be spelt out to facilitate the choice of the design. Research design can be classified into three broad categories: Exploratory,
Descriptive and Hypothesis testing. Exploratory research studies emphasis the discovery of ideas and insights. Such studies must be flexible enough to provide opportunity for considering different aspects of a problem under investigation. But, it is usually difficult to postulate the explicit hypothesis. Descriptive research studies are concerned with specific predictions, with narration of facts and characteristics concerning the individual, group or situation. The research design in case of hypothesis testing are those where the researcher tests the hypothesis of causal relationships between the variables.

The review of relevant literature in the preceding chapter has brought to light that certain job characteristics were found to be associated with many facets of jobs such as motivation, satisfaction and performance, job involvement, role stress etc. It has been observed that changing or modifying certain features of job resulted in the enhancement of quality of work life.

When we analyzed the job characteristics studies in India, it becomes apparent that certain job characteristics were found to be of greater significance than others. Kumar (1978) found that discretion was
positively and variety was negatively related to need satisfaction of junior managers. Managers perceived need deficiency in all the areas. Similarly, Manerikar and Patil (1983) studied Indian managers perception of job characteristics using Hackman and Oldham (1975) model. None of the characteristics emerged as significant. In a recent study by Gandhi (1992) sheds some light on the impact of job enrichment characteristics on work and organizational identification. She used seven job characteristics out of which autonomy and skill variety emerged as significant predictors of organizational identification and task identity emerged as significant predictor of organizational involvement. But on the whole job characteristics have no significant predictor of overall organizational identification.

In view of the above inferences we intend to consider the following job characteristics: Autonomy, Task identity, Feedback and Skill variety. Thus we should determine the relationship between the above mentioned job characteristics. In this regard, one part of our research may be designated as exploratory. The next part of the investigation deals with determining the influence of job characteristics (Autonomy, Task identity, Feedback and Skill variety) and job level on job involvement. This pertains to the descriptive research design.
TOOLS USED

The following scales were used for measuring the job characteristics and job involvement.

JOB CHARACTERISTICS SCALE

For measuring job characteristics, a scale was developed by the investigator. A critical review of relevant literature helped us in delineating four dimensions of job characteristics, that is, Autonomy, Task identity, Feedback and Skill variety. Items for each dimension were framed in a statement form conforming to Likert's scaling technique and were sent to experts. They were requested to evaluate each item and to indicate the extent to which the items were appropriate for measurement of each job characteristic. On the basis of their comments/suggestions the items were reframed. The preliminary form of the scale consisted of 35 items: Autonomy (11), Task identity (11), Feedback (7), and Skill variety (6). The figure given within bracket indicates the number of items (Appendix-A).

For the purpose of item analysis, the scale was administered to a randomly selected sample of 100 workers of a Textile mill and a Tannery organisation of Central U.P. Item total score correlation were computed separately for each job characteristic. This
psychometric measure gives an indication of homogeneity of items. The results of each characteristic are reported in the following table:

### Table 2.1 ITEM–TOTAL SCORE CORRELATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.2747</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.3603</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.6768</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.6524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.5014</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.4608</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.6003</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.3518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>.1945*</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>.2139*</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>.7330</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>.4526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>.6148</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>.0738*</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>.1288*</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>.5574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>.4761</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>.5989</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>.5960</td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>.3506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>.5530</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>.3774</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>.6146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>.4714</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>.4345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>.3882</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>.1692*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>.1926*</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>.4504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>.6296</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>.2400*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not significant at .01 level
Only 7 items (12, 13, 17, 18, 26, 31, 33) yielded insignificant correlations with the total score. Thus we were left with 28 items: Autonomy (9), Task identity (7), Feedback (6), and skill variety (6) which yielded significant values of product moment coefficient of correlations.

Product moment correlations among the four job characteristics of workers of the two organisations were computed. The results are presented in Table 2.2a.

Table 2.2a

Correlation Among the Four Job Characteristics (WORKER RATINGS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Characteristics</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Task Identity</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Skill variety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.6563</td>
<td>.7193</td>
<td>.1803*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.8141</td>
<td>.3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.3563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill variety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 100
* Not significant at .01 level

Skill variety when correlated with Autonomy did not give statistically significant value at .01 level.

The relationship among the job characteristics rated by Supervisor (N = 55) are reported in the table given below:
Table 2.2b
Correlation Among the Four Job Characteristics
(SUPERVISOR RATINGS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Characteristics</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Task Identity</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Skill Variety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.1007*</td>
<td>.5955</td>
<td>.5019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.1296*</td>
<td>-.0263*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.4774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill variety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 55
* Not significant at .01 level

We find that the relationship between the Task identity and skill variety among supervisors negative as well as low.

Similarly trend is observed in case of the managers. The managers sample (N=45) yielded low correlation with task identity and skill variety.

Table 2.2c
Correlation Among the Four Job Characteristics
(MANAGER RATINGS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Characteristics</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Task Identity</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Skill Variety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.3585</td>
<td>.2877</td>
<td>.5857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.2689*</td>
<td>.0990*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.3949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill variety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 45
* Not significant at .01 level
It seems that the job characteristics differ in terms of job levels. The low values of correlation of skill variety may also be attributed to sample size. In view of these considerations, it was decided to include all the four job characteristics; Autonomy, Task identity, feedback and Skill variety in the present investigation which will be conducted on much larger sample.

Reliability refers to the internal consistency and stability of scores. The split-half reliability coefficients for the four job-characteristics were found as given below (N = 100).

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

The overall reliability coefficient of the scale is based on 28 selected items is .92.

The present job characteristics scale consists of 28 items (Appendix - B). The validation techniques used were internal consistency and construct validity. The
reliability coefficient reported exceeds the prescribed significance level. Thus the preliminary form of the scale is a reliable and valid instrument for measuring job characteristics.

**JOB INVOLVEMENT**

The job involvement of the subjects was assessed with the help of Indian adaptation of Lodahl and Kejner's (1965) scale. This adaptation was undertaken by Akhtar and Bacha (1984). Its reliability coefficient (split-half) has been reported to be .76. It is a 20 itemed 5-point rating scale. In the present investigation it was used in Devanagri script adapted by Vadra (1991). To establish reliability of the Hindi version of the job involvement scale, the scale was administered to a sample of 100 subjects both male and female teachers. The split half reliability coefficient corrected by Spearman-Brown formula was 0.89. The obtained correlation value is significantly high for measuring the job involvement in the Indian context (Appendix-C).

**SAMPLE**

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

The present investigation was conducted at two public sector organisations - a Textile mill (Elgin mills Co. Ltd) and a Tannery (Tannery and Footwear Corporation of India Ltd., TAFCO) located in a metropolitan city of northern India. Three levels of employees (Managers, Supervisors & Workers) were chosen for the present study. Since the total strength of both the organisations were very large, only 10% of the workers group were taken for study, while for the sample of managers and supervisors, the number goes up to 20% because both the groups were much smaller in number as compared to workers. Random sampling technique was used to select the subjects. Each and every subject was individually approached and they were assured their responses would be treated in strict confidence. Amongst the three groups, workers were more cooperative. The complete returns were 75% of the workers and 50% and 40% respectively of the supervisors and managers.
Having obtained the returns, each and every respondent's form was thoroughly scrutinized. The responses were tabulated as a mastersheet and tables were made separately for analysis in accordance with the requirements of statistical test.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Average(s)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Age(yrs)</td>
<td>Tenure (yrs)</td>
<td>Income (₹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile mill</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>2800.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannery</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43.80</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>3020.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile mill</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.78</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>1836.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannery</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.18</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>2045.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile mill</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>41.62</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>1125.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannery</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td>1546.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N, 595
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The choice of a statistical task method is linked to the type of data. Regression is considered to be the most suitable and useful technique because it ascertains the influence of several independent variables on the dependent one (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1983). In the present study there are four job characteristics and one dependent variable i.e. job-involvement. Through, this technique we intend to find out which of the independent variables are the significant predictors of the criterion or dependent variable.

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

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

In the present piece of research we have made use of Standard multiple regression. This strategy calls for entry of all independent variables into the regression equation at once. Each independent variable is assessed as if it had entered the regression after all other independent variables have been entered. Each independent variable can be evaluated in terms of what it adds to prediction of dependent variable over the above predictability afforded by all the other independent variables.
CHAPTER - III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

RESULTS

In the preceding chapter it has been reported that the sample of the present study was drawn from workers and supervisory staff of Elgin Textile Mill and Tannery and Footwear Corporation of India (TAFCO) of Kanpur. As stated earlier certain Job characteristics (Autonomy, Task identity, Feedback and Skill variety) have been considered as independent variables and job involvement as the dependent one. Multiple Regression Analysis was used to analyze the data.

First of all we intend to present the overall influence of Job characteristics (Cumulative Scores) on Job involvement. This will be followed by separately ascertaining the influence of each Job characteristics on Job involvement. These analyses were done on the total sample of workers and supervisory staff of the two organisations. The first analysis is reported in Table 3.1.
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>4</td>
<td>1336.5380</td>
<td>334.1345</td>
<td>4.8765**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from regression</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>40494.3828</td>
<td>68.5184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>41830.9208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level

From table 3.1 we infer that the Job characteristics influence Job involvement. In order words, it may be visualized that the individuals high on Job characteristics would be having higher Job involvement.

The next analysis is reported in table 3.2. There we have determined the influence of each job characteristics on Job involvement.
### Table 3.2

Multiple Regression Analysis (TOTAL SAMPLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Value of ( r )</th>
<th>Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>STD error of Reg. Coeff</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>22.2315</td>
<td>6.9442</td>
<td>0.0905</td>
<td>0.2157</td>
<td>0.0621</td>
<td>2.0233*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>23.7718</td>
<td>5.0995</td>
<td>0.1262</td>
<td>0.1788</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>2.6355**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>15.5234</td>
<td>6.1661</td>
<td>0.0751</td>
<td>0.0756</td>
<td>0.0657</td>
<td>1.1505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Variety</td>
<td>13.1140</td>
<td>4.3852</td>
<td>-0.0373</td>
<td>-0.2333</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>-2.5423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>72.1879</td>
<td>8.3847</td>
<td>INTERCEPT</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CORRELATION</td>
<td>67.0259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MULTIPLE CORRELATION</td>
<td>0.1787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE</td>
<td>8.2775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level  
* Significant at .05 level

Out of the four Job characteristics only 'Autonomy' and 'Task identity' were found to be significant predictors of Job involvement whereas Feedback and Skill variety did not emerge as Predictors. We may conclude that the individuals desirous of 'Autonomy' and 'Task identity' would be Job involved.
In the same manner the influence of job characteristics on job involvement of the workers of both the organisations were analysed separately.

Table 3.3 reports the influence of predictor variable of TaFco workers on job involvement.

Table 3.3
Analysis of Variance for the Regression (TAFCO WORKERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributable regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1062.1289</td>
<td>265.5322</td>
<td>5.3404**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from regression</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6314.6201</td>
<td>49.7214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>7376.7490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level

When we observe table 3.3 it is amply clear that independent variables influence job involvement of TaFco workers. Multiple Regression Analysis was undertaken to find out the individual predictors and the results are reported in table 3.4.
Table 3.4

Multiple Regression Analysis (TAFCO WORKERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Value of r</th>
<th>Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>STD error estimate</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>22.9848</td>
<td>6.7144</td>
<td>0.2641</td>
<td>0.2711</td>
<td>0.1140</td>
<td>2.3769*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>23.8787</td>
<td>4.8347</td>
<td>0.3126</td>
<td>0.4125</td>
<td>0.1309</td>
<td>3.1504**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>16.2651</td>
<td>6.0844</td>
<td>0.1419</td>
<td>-0.0042</td>
<td>0.1218</td>
<td>-0.0347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Variety</td>
<td>13.9924</td>
<td>4.0502</td>
<td>0.0351</td>
<td>-0.1443</td>
<td>0.1709</td>
<td>-0.08442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Involvement</th>
<th>INTERCEPT</th>
<th>59.7538</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE CORRELATION</td>
<td>0.3794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE</td>
<td>7.0513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level
* Significant at .05 level

It is revealed that 'Autonomy' and 'Task identity' have again emerged as significant predictors of Job involvement.

The Analysis was further extended to find out whether or not the predictors exerts influence Job involvement of Elgin workers. The results obtained are reported in Table 3.5.
Table 3.5

Analysis of variance for the regression (ELGIN WORKERS)

<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>4</td>
<td>599.0825</td>
<td>149.1706</td>
<td>2.0242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from regression</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>26414.3945</td>
<td>73.9899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>27013.4770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed that the independent variables as a whole do not have any significant effect on the dependent variable. Multiple regression analysis was undertaken to find out the influence of individual predictors. The results are reported in Table 3.6.
Table 3.6

Multiple Regression Analysis (ELGIN WORKERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Value of r</th>
<th>Reg. Coeff</th>
<th>STD error</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>21.3646</td>
<td>6.8896</td>
<td>0.0338</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.0826</td>
<td>0.8534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>23.6298</td>
<td>5.0258</td>
<td>0.1167</td>
<td>0.1913</td>
<td>0.0922</td>
<td>2.0755*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>14.2569</td>
<td>5.7734</td>
<td>0.0419</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.0921</td>
<td>0.5062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Variety</td>
<td>12.5469</td>
<td>4.422</td>
<td>-0.0563</td>
<td>-2.2079</td>
<td>0.1207</td>
<td>-1.7232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th></th>
<th>INTERCEPT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>67.5068</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job- Involvement</td>
<td>71.5911</td>
<td>8.6504</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CORRELATION</td>
<td>.1489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE</td>
<td>8.6017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level.

When we examine regression coefficient of it, it emerges that only 'Task identity' emerged as significant predictor of Job involvement of Elgin workers.

Next part of the analysis deals with combined samples of Elgin and Tafco workers. This will provide a test of the extent to which Job characteristics influence Job involvement of workers of the both organisations. The results are given below in table 3.7.
Table 3.7

Analysis of variance for the regression (TAFCO AND ELGIN WORKERS)

<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>4</td>
<td>1358.8214</td>
<td>339.7053</td>
<td>4.9511**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from regression</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>33482.1718</td>
<td>68.611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>34840.9932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

'F' value was found to significant at .01 level which need further analysis for the purpose of individual predictors. The results are reported in Table 3.8.
Table 3.8

Multiple Regression Analysis (TAFCO AND ELGIN WORKERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Value of ( r )</th>
<th>Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>STD error of estimate</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>21.7971</td>
<td>6.881</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.1246</td>
<td>0.6827</td>
<td>1.8251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>23.7038</td>
<td>4.974</td>
<td>0.1636</td>
<td>0.2479</td>
<td>0.0768</td>
<td>3.2266*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>14.7971</td>
<td>5.9246</td>
<td>0.0825</td>
<td>0.0549</td>
<td>0.0749</td>
<td>0.7329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Variety</td>
<td>12.9350</td>
<td>4.3733</td>
<td>-0.0185</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
<td>0.0999</td>
<td>-1.8414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Job-Involvement

INTERCEPT 65.1419
MULTIPLE CORRELATION 0.1974
STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE 8.2831

** Significant at .01 level

The results indicate that only 'Task identity' emerged as predictor of Job involvement of the workers of both the organisations.

t-test was used to determine significant differences between the means of workers on Job involvement. Results are reported in table 3.9.
Table 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tafco</td>
<td>73.75</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>2.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>71.59</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level

It is observed that Tafco workers significantly differ with Elgin workers and the former, on an average, have higher Job involvement score than the later group. Co-efficient of variation of the Tafco group is 10 per cent whereas for the Elgin it is 12 per cent. The coefficient of variations are of the same order which signifies that there exists consistency in the responses of the two groups.

Further analyses were undertaken to gauge the influence of Job characteristics on Job involvement of supervisors and managers of Tafco and Elgin organisations.
### Table 3.10

**Analysis of variance for the Regression (TAFCO AND ELGIN SUPERVISOR)**

<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>4</td>
<td>133.0972</td>
<td>33.2743</td>
<td>0.5072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from regression</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3345.4563</td>
<td>65.5971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3478.5535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.11

**Multiple Regression Analysis (TAFCO AND ELGIN SUPERVISOR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Value of r</th>
<th>Ref. Coeff.</th>
<th>STD error of estimate</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>23.8392</td>
<td>7.7454</td>
<td>-0.0009</td>
<td>0.0548</td>
<td>0.1831</td>
<td>0.2991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5.4539</td>
<td>0.0232</td>
<td>0.0286</td>
<td>0.2043</td>
<td>0.1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>17.8214</td>
<td>6.0154</td>
<td>0.0123</td>
<td>0.1375</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.5703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Variety</td>
<td>13.3392</td>
<td>4.3829</td>
<td>-0.1536</td>
<td>-0.4318</td>
<td>0.3062</td>
<td>-1.4101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Job-inv.</td>
<td>72.66</td>
<td>7.9527</td>
<td>MULTIPLE CORRELATION</td>
<td>STD ERROR PF ESTIMATE</td>
<td>73.961</td>
<td>0.1956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.10 and 3.11 clearly reveals that job characteristics did not influence job involvement of supervisors of
Tafco and Elgin organisations. Also, no predictor were obtained among the two groups of supervisors working in Tafco and Elgin.

Similar trend is discernable for managers of Tafco and Elgin organisations. The results are reported in table 3.12 and 3.13.

**Table 3.12**

Analysis of Variance for the Regression (TAFCO AND ELGIN MANAGERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of square</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attributable to regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>407.0152</td>
<td>101.7538</td>
<td>1.3308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from regression</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3058.2292</td>
<td>76.4557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3465.2444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3.13**

Multiple Regression Analysis (TAFCO AND ELGIN MANAGERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Value of r</th>
<th>Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>STD error</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>25.0666</td>
<td>5.8129</td>
<td>0.1589</td>
<td>0.5910</td>
<td>0.3098</td>
<td>1.9077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>23.6222</td>
<td>6.0426</td>
<td>-0.1067</td>
<td>0.2777</td>
<td>0.2571</td>
<td>-1.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>20.6222</td>
<td>6.0763</td>
<td>0.1285</td>
<td>0.1349</td>
<td>0.2577</td>
<td>0.5235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Variety</td>
<td>14.9777</td>
<td>4.1258</td>
<td>-0.0746</td>
<td>-0.6865</td>
<td>0.4122</td>
<td>-1.6652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Job- Involvement | INTERCEPT | MULTIPLE CORRELATION | STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.7111</td>
<td>8.8744</td>
<td>70.9568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last part of the analysis deals with combined sample (workers, supervisors and managers) of both organisations separately.

### TABLE 3.14

**Analysis of Variance for the Regression (TAFCO WORKERS, SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS)**

<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>4</td>
<td>846.1383</td>
<td>211.5345</td>
<td>4.4449**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from regression</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>8137.8999</td>
<td>47.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>8984.0382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level
Table 3.14 shows results of Tafco employees, 'F' value was found significant at .01 level when analysis was further extended to find out the individual predictor only 'Task identity' emerged as a significant predictor of 'Job involvement'.

Table 3.15 shows results of Tafco employees, 'F' value was found significant at .01 level when analysis was further extended to find out the individual predictor only 'Task identity' emerged as a significant predictor of 'Job involvement'.

**TABLE 3.15**

Multiple Regression Analysis (TAFCO WORKERS, SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Value of r</th>
<th>Reg. Coeff</th>
<th>STD error of Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>23.392</td>
<td>6.6073</td>
<td>0.2312</td>
<td>0.1948</td>
<td>0.1009</td>
<td>1.9298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>24.284</td>
<td>5.0977</td>
<td>0.2060</td>
<td>0.2371</td>
<td>0.1048</td>
<td>2.2028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>17.142</td>
<td>6.2461</td>
<td>0.1903</td>
<td>0.1427</td>
<td>0.0998</td>
<td>1.4293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Variety</td>
<td>14.1477</td>
<td>3.9425</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>-0.1782</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>-1.1495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>INTERCEPT</th>
<th>MULTIPLE CORRELATION</th>
<th>STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>73.8011</td>
<td>7.165</td>
<td>63.7076</td>
<td>0.3068</td>
<td>6.8985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level

Similarly, Multiple Regression Analysis was applied to the sample of Elgin employees.
Table 3.16

Analysis of Variance for the Regression
(ELGIN WORKERS, SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS)

<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>4</td>
<td>721.6095</td>
<td>180.4023</td>
<td>2.3751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from regression</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>31445.1328</td>
<td>75.9544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>32166.7424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 3.21 we can easily infer that overall job characteristics do not influence the job involvement.
Table 3.17

Multiple Regression Analysis (ELGIN WORKERS, SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Value of r</th>
<th>Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>STD error Reg. Coeff.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>21.7517</td>
<td>7.0385</td>
<td>0.0298</td>
<td>0.1035</td>
<td>0.0763</td>
<td>1.3557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>23.5489</td>
<td>5.0942</td>
<td>0.0894</td>
<td>0.1479</td>
<td>0.0853</td>
<td>1.7339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>14.8377</td>
<td>6.0165</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.0088</td>
<td>0.0840</td>
<td>0.1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Variety</td>
<td>12.6969</td>
<td>4.4856</td>
<td>-0.0878</td>
<td>-0.2720</td>
<td>0.1121</td>
<td>-2.4255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Job-Involvement</th>
<th>INTERCEPT</th>
<th>MULTIPLE CORRELATION</th>
<th>69.0865</th>
<th>0.1497</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>STD ERROR OF ESTIMATE</td>
<td>8.7151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.17 clearly reveals none of the independent variable emerged out as a significant predictor of Job involvement of Elgin employees.

The next part of the analyses deals with summary measures of four job characteristics. This is termed as Motivational Potential Score (MPS). Table 3.18 reports the effect of motivational potential score of various groups on Job involvement.
Table 3.18

Analysis of Regression of MPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.NO.</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Regression Coeff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>0.1705**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Tafco workers</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.4187**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Elgin workers</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>0.0751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Workers (combined sample)</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>0.2115**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Supervisors (combined</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-0.0375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>samples)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Managers (combined</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.0848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>samples)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Tafco (total sample)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.4236**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Elgin (total sample)</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>0.0253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at .01 level

Motivational Potential Score (MPS) of the total sample is predictor of Job involvement. The same is true of Tafco workers. Again MPS of combined samples of workers emerged as predictor of Job involvement. The same result was obtained for the combined sample of workers, supervisors and managers of Tafco.
DISCUSSION

Many investigators (Hackman & Lawer, 1971; Brief & Aldag, 1975; Saal, 1978; Cellar, Kerman & Barrett, 1985; Medcof, 1989; Elloy et al. 1991 and Gandhi, 1992) have shown that the core characteristics are instrumental in motivating employees, enhancing their job satisfaction, performance and job involvement. Our finding partially lends support to the above findings. In our study only 'Autonomy' and 'Task identity' emerged as significant predictors of job involvement. The same trend was discernable with respect to Tafco workers. However, in case of Elgin only 'Task identity' emerged as significant predictor for the criterion variable. We studied workers, supervisors and managers but we observed that for the three levels of employees in both the organisations, 'Task identity' emerged as the common predictor of Job involvement.

It may be visualized that autonomy granted by the organisation may lead to self-fulfillment and may develop in the employee the feeling of freedom to schedule his work and to set up the pace of his work. These aspects are bound to develop job involvement among the employee. That is, autonomy may prompt employees to feel more responsible for the work outcomes. When
workers schedule their own work, they think that the outcome depends upon their own efforts, initiatives and decisions. Subsequently, they may feel more concerned with the organisation. This finding is in congruence with those of Morris & Snyder (1979), Mannheiem & Dubin (1986), Spector (1986) and Zikeye (1989) who have found job autonomy significantly related with job satisfaction, work role centrality, etc.

Task identity significantly predicts job involvement. This would mean that employees consider their job as their own or they have a sense of belongingness to their job. It offers employees the chance to do identifiable and whole piece of work in their job. In our study, the reason behind the significant relationship of task identity with job involvement might be that when a job is autonomous, workers are allowed to schedule their work activity and it led them to develop identification with their job. Fried & Ferris (1987) found 'Task identity' was highly related with work performance. More recently, in Indian context, Gandhi (1992) contended that task identity significantly predicts organisational involvement. Skill variety was not found to be predictor of job involvement but it is interesting that it was found to be negatively correlated with job involvement.
When we examine the data, we observe that low score on skill variety were associated with high values on job involvement. It could be inferred that the employees, by and large, do not aspire for skill variety. But experts from industrially developed countries have often argued that skill variety have motivational implications for job satisfaction (Glisson & Durick, 1988). We may be permitted to point out that skill variety may not have motivational appeal for the Indian sample (Kumar, 1988). Skill variety demands that one must have developed expertise to undertake multiple activity on the work. In this regard the performance at the job is bound to become more complex. Those who prefer simple and routine jobs may not like to undertake complex activities.

The combined analysis of workers of Tafco and Elgin organisation shows 'Task identity' emerged as a predictor of criterion variable. 't' test shows that Tafco organisation workers were slightly more job involved than their Elgin counterparts. It should be pointed out that during the course of the study workers of Elgin revealed that they work under unsatisfactory conditions. Also the Elgin organisation was large sized as compared to Tafco and there exists low interaction between the managers and supervisors as
well as between fellow workers. It is plausible that these two facets affected the job involvement of the Elgin workers. While discussing the factor of job involvement, the factor of absenteeism should also be taken into consideration. Hackman & Lawler (1971) and Brief & Aldag (1975) found that high absenteeism is indicative of low job involvement. The absenteeism record of Elgin and Tafco showed the extent of absenteeism. In the former organisation it was 16.11% in the later it was 9.63%. We may infer that due to greater extent of absenteeism in Elgin their employees had lower job involvement.

Analysis of the supervisory staff revealed insignificant 'F' value. It can be interpreted in the light of organisational structure. Being government undertaking (Public Sector) both the organisations have defined set of rules and procedures. It is an open secret that such organisations do not provide substantial freedom to the individuals in scheduling their job activities. Probably such aspects as initiative and personal enthusiasm are not permissible due to which it is not aspired for. This may lessen identification with the job. Supervisory practices are also influenced by the people holding top positions in the organization. Deviation from strict bureaucratic
practices are usually not tolerated. Our finding partially endorses the results obtained by Maneriker & Patil (1983). 275 managers of different organisations were asked to rate the job characteristics and their ratings were observed to be low on all the dimensions. Thus, our finding indicate that job involvement is lower due to bureaucratic climate of the organisations. It seems that bureaucratic climate influence more the supervisory staff than the workers.

Referring to Table 3.14 we observe that the employees (Workers, Supervisors and Managers) of Tafco significantly differ with regard to job involvement. Further analysis (Table 3.15) indicates that for the employees of the above organization 'task identity' emerged as predictor of job involvement. But no job characteristic emerged as predictor of job involvement for Elgin employees. The result could be interpreted in terms of prevailing discontent among Elgin employees regarding the low salary paid to them by their organization. Moreover, there was 20.95% to 30.10% decrement in production. In addition, Elgin is a very large organisation as compared to Tafco. In small organisation opportunities of greater interpersonal interaction exist where supervisor and worker generally work together. The present findings amply support this
aspect. Small group dynamics and possibilities of physical proximity leads to greater sharing which is found to influence 'Feedback'. In Elgin approximately eighty workers work under one supervisor whereas in Tafco this ratio is very low (1:15). It may be construed that greater impersonality prevails in Elgin due to which it is usually difficult for the supervisor to intimately know his subordinates. This may be a reflection on low job involvement among the workers in the Elgin.

The findings of the study show that the extent of job involvement is significantly determined by certain job characteristics. Job autonomy and task identity emerged as significant predictors of job involvement. The findings of this study imply that to enhance job involvement, management should make an attempt to enrich the jobs. Management should provide freedom, independence and discretion to employees in scheduling their work, in determining the procedures to be used in carrying out the work. This may facilitate the employees in developing identification with the job as well as with the organisation.

Another important finding (Table 3.18) pertains to motivational potential score which was found to be the predictor of job involvement. In this regard almost
all the workers seem to aspire for the fulfillment of the job characteristics which influences job involvement. It was more pronounced in case of Tafco employees than the Elgin employees. This finding is significant and it may be suggested that individual job characteristics such as task identity, autonomy, etc. are important but equally is the motivational potential score for investigating employees motivation as well as their job involvement. This aspect has not been investigated, to the best of our knowledge, in our country.

We may conclude that 'Autonomy' and 'Task identity' are crucial determinants of job involvement but it should also be pointed out that job involvement does not exclusively depend on job characteristics rather organisational climate and the size of the organisation are also important variables. The present finding has significant implications which may be utilize by the management for bringing out organisational change and embarking upon a programme of organisational development.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX-A
The present investigation aims at studying the aspirations of people pertaining to their job. Often disparity in perception leads to many organizational problems. We seek your co-operation in finding out the desired aspects in order to formulate programmes for better industrial relations.

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

Thanks,
APPENDIX -A

INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

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

1. Good workers are appreciated by the supervisors. ( )
2. Workers use the same method over and over again in doing their work. ( )
3. Workers generally feel satisfied when assigned a challenging task. ( )
4. Changes in the method of work is introduced without consulting the workers. ( )
5. Workers get sufficient authority to discharge their job related responsibilities. ( )
6. Usually workers get economic rewards for efficient performance. ( )
7. Most of the workers would work beyond working hours even if they are not paid for it. ( )
8. Generally the people are given repetitive tasks to perform. ( )
9. Most of the workers would like to shoulder greater responsibilities. ( )
10. The workers are given recognition for the good work done by them.

11. The performance target is decided by the worker himself.

12. Work related problems are solved by the worker themselves.

13. As compared to other organizations the workers get more opportunity to use their experience.

14. Workers are assigned different duties from time to time.

15. Display of skills by the worker is usually appreciated.

16. Workers have a reasonable say in deciding how their job is to be carried out.

17. In the absence of their immediate supervisor hardly any effort is made to finish the work.

18. Workers have no means to know about the progress made by them.

19. People have sense of accomplishment because they are given challenging work.

20. Workers are invited to participate in decision making.

21. Usually the workers do their work irrespective of any reward or recognition.

22. Workers are encouraged for suggesting new ideas about the work.

23. Most of the workers do not willingly do extra bit of work.

24. Workers are informed about their level of performance.
25. Workers views on organizational effectiveness are honoured by the management.

26. Often tasks are left incomplete.

27. Workers are seldom encouraged to perform different duties.

28. Supervisors generally consult their work whenever any problems crops up.

29. Most of the people consider that finishing the work within a given time is a challenge for them.

30. Opportunities are given to people to experiment with innovative methods of work.

31. Workers decision are seldom honoured by the management.

32. The management usually gives reward to good workers.

33. Most of the workers have a feeling of pride after successful task accomplishment.

34. Usually the workers work at a fixed location of time and place (Such as, Same place, table etc.) while completing the task.

35. The choice of the method of work is left to workers.
लस जान का उद्देश्य लोगो का काम है सम्बन्धित आधार का पता लगाना है। कब्र है निर्भर के अंतर होने के संग्रह में समय के उत्पन्न हो जाता है। काम के वातावरण को व्यवस्था प्राप्त के लिए हमें खाफी पद्धति की जरूरत है।

आफो हैमानदारी के दिया गया जवाब हमारे लिए पद्वाप साबित होगा। आफो अपनी पहचान देने की जरूरत नहीं है और आफो जवाबों को गुप्त रूप से जाएगा।

धार्याधार
कृपया निम्न लिखित वचन को ध्यान से पढ़िए और
यह कारण यह कहते हैं कि यह बातें, जिन में आप काम करते हैं,
उसमें हम अलग तक पानी जाती है। ऐसा करते हैं, जब आप काम
देने के लिए दोहरे कारणों को पूरा करता है।
कृपया यह ध्यान रखिए कि आप आपके वचन का जवाब देने का
प्रारंभ नहीं है।

आप जवाब क्षेत्र के पूरी तरह सही है तो दिए हुए
प्रश्नों में (४) केवल हैं और आप पूरी तरह से सही है
(१) केवल हैं। इसलिए आपको ४, ३ और २ केवल को अपनी
उत्तरानुसार वैधकोश करता है।

आप में सदीया दर्ज

1- कच्चे कर्मचारियों को निरोगस आसर
म रहते हैं।

2- कर्मचारी काम करने में स्वीकार की
विधि की बार-बार उपयोग करते हैं।

3- काम तार पर कर्मचारी जुनाहोतराण काम
मिलने पर स्थान अनुभव करते हैं।

4- काम करने के तरीकों में परिवर्तन कर्मचारियों
के स्कल-वाग्नि में किन्हा किया बताया है।

5- शीघ्र काम करने पर कर्मचारियों को आर्थिक
लाभ दिया जाता है।

6- कर्मचारियों को अपने काम पर सम्मानित
उत्तरायक मिला मुरा करने के लिए
काफी उपाय मिलते हैं।
7- अधिकतर कर्मचारी निघारित समय के बाद 
भी काम करने को तैयार रहते हैं, वाहे 
लेकि उनको वैल्यू मिलता नहीं।

8- एक ही जेन्ना काम लोगों को बार-बार 
करना पड़ता है।

8- अधिकतर कर्मचारी बार बार बाध्य 
निघारित करते हैं।

10- क्या काम करने पर कर्मचारियों का 
वादर किया जाता है।

11- काम करने का लच्छ कर्मचारी स्वयं ही 
निघारित करता है।

12- काम के बाद से सभी वातावरण कर्मचारी रहते ही 
सुलभता है।

13- दूरी में कर्मचारियों की 
लूहर में कर्मचारियों 
की वाने अनुत्पुर का उपयोग करने के बाद 
बाध्य बनाए मिलता है।

14- समय काम समय पर कर्मचारियों को अलग-अलग 
काम करने को दिखे जाते है।

15- काम काम पर कर्मचारियों की कार्य-शृंखला 
की प्रगति होती है।

16- कर्मचारियों की प्रमाणित अधिकार है कि 
उन अपना काम करे।

17- निरीक्षक की अनुपालन में नायक ही 
काम करते की कौशल जाती है।
१८ - कर्मचारियों को यह जानने का कोई साधन नहीं है कि उन्होंने कौन सा काम किया है।

१६ - लोगों में कामयाबी (प्राप्ति) का सहारा होता है, जब उन्हें कोई दुनियाँभूमियाँ काम दिया जाता है।

२० - निर्धारित करने में कर्मचारियों को भी हिस्सा लेने का अवसर दिया जाता है।

२१ - आमतौर पर कर्मचारी क्षमाया या प्रशंसा की प्रति कई बनता काम करते है।

२२ - कर्मचारियों के काम के मनमानित नामें मुकाबला देने के लिए प्रेषित किया जाता है।

२३ - अधिकतर कर्मचारी जों भली भयंकर खाम बननी सूक्ष्म से नहीं करते हैं।

२४ - कर्मचारियों की अपने काम के रूप के बारे में जानकारी की जाती है।

२५ - कर्मचारियों के स्थाना का कागर बनाने वाले किस्मों का प्रमाण-प्रमाण सम्पाद किया है।

२६ - अगर काम जूंधरे खोई दिये जाते है।

२७ - कर्मचारियों की विभिन्न प्रकार के काम करने के लिये कम ही प्रेषित किया जाता है।
२६ - अधिकतर लोग समझते हैं कि रचना के काम पूरा करना उनके लिए एक दुनाली है।

३० - लोगों को काम करने के अनेक तरीकों पर प्रयोग करने के लिए काम दिये जाते हैं।

३१ - कर्मचारियों के निर्णय को अवबंध-मण्डल शास्त्र ही कभी ग्रहण देता है।

३२ - बामताईं पर अवबंध कम्प्यूटर काम करने वालों को क्लास किया है।

३३ - अधिकतर कर्मचारी सफलतापूर्वक काम पूरा करने पर गंवा पत्ता करते हैं।

३४ - बामताईं पर कर्मचारी किसी निर्धारित रचना या रचना पर ही अपना काम पूरा करते हैं (जैसे : एक ही भेज, जगह द्वारा)।

३५ - काम कार्य के तरीकों का तुमारे कर्मचारियों पर छोड़ दिया जाता है।
JOB-CHARACTERISTICS SCALE

The present investigation aims at studying the aspirations of people pertaining to their job. Often disparity in perception leads to many organisational problems. We seek your co-operation in finding out the desired aspects in order to formulate programmes for better industrial relations.

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

Thanks,
INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

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

1. Good workers are appreciated by the supervisors. ( )
2. Workers use the same method over and over again in doing their work ( )
3. Workers generally feel satisfied when assigned a challenging task. ( )
4. Changes in the method of work is introduced without consulting the workers. ( )
5. Usually workers get economic rewards for efficient performance. ( )
6. Workers get sufficient authority to discharge their job related responsibilities. ( )
7. Most of the workers would work beyond working hours even if they are not paid for it. ( )
8. Generally the people are given respective task to perform. ( )
9. Most of the workers would like to shoulder greater responsibilities.

10. The workers are given recognition for the good work done by them.

11. The performance target is decided by the worker himself.

12. Workers are assigned different duties from time to time.

13. Display of skills by the worker is usually appreciated.

14. Worker have a reasonable say in deciding how their job is to be carried out.

15. People have sense of accomplishment because they are given challenging work.

16. Workers are invited to participate in decision making.

17. Usually the workers do their work irrespective of any reward of recognition.

18. Workers are are encouraged for suggesting new ideas about the work.

19. Most of the workers do not willingly do extra bit of work.

20. Workers are informed about their level of performance.

21. Workers views on organizational effectiveness are honoured by the management.

22. Workers are seldom encouraged to perform different duties.

23. Supervisors generally consult their workers whenever any problems crop up.

24. Most of the people consider that finishing the work within a given time is a challenge for them.

25. Opportunities are given to people to experiment with innovative methods of work.
26. The management usually gives reward to good workers. ( )

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

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

Please furnish the following information:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sex: ........................................
हम यहाँ का उद्देश्य लोगों का अपने काम से संबंधित आकृतियाँ का पता लगाना है। अक्सर इन्टरनॉशन में अन्तर होने से संस्था में समस्यायें उत्पन्न हो जाती हैं। काम के वातावरण की अच्छा वनाने के लिए हमें आपकी मदद की जरूरत है।

आपका ईमानदारी से दिया गया जानकारी हमारे लिए मददगार साबित होगा। आपको अपनी पहचान देने की जरूरत नहीं है। आपके जवाबों को गुप्त रूप से जानेगे होंगे।

धन्यवाद
निदेश:- यूप्या निरालिका ब्रह्म को स्वतंत्र गणना में पादायन और यह बताये कि यह 
बातें मतत्त्व में अपन काम करते हैं, तमम मतत्व हटक तपातियाँ है, इस तरह से 
उपकर व्यापक देखने से करीब भागी गये तए रर्की का पालन करा होगा। यूप्या यह 
ध्यान रखते हैं कि यूप्या पूर्वयुक्त ब्रह्म का ज्ञान कुछ है। 

उनके युक्त तरह तहता है तो दिये हुए दिशित में [51] अंक लिखें 
और अगर पूर्वयुक्त से असहमत है, तो [51] अंक लिखें। इस तरह अपके 4.3 और 
2 अंक की इच्छानुसार उल्लिखित करना है।

इस सत्त्व में ————

1. अद्धे कर्मचारियों की निरीक्षा अकसर सराहत है।  
2. कर्मचारी काम करते में एक ही माध्य का बार-बार ध्यान रखते है।  
3. अम्लाल पर कर्मचारी यूनालिका काम मिलने पर तत्काल अनुमोदन करते है।  
4. काम करने के तरीकों में प्रतिदिन कर्मचारियों के सलाह अनुसार करते हैं।  
5. अच्छा काम करने पर कर्मचारियों को शाषित इनाम दिया जाता है।  
6. कर्मचारियों को अपने काम के समय-काल उत्तरदायित्व की पूरा करने 
   के लिए काम की अनुमोदन मिलते हैं।  
7. अद्भुत कर्मचारी निर्धारित समय के बाद भी काम करने को तैयार 
   रहते है, जाँच इनके लिए उनकी काम भी के निर्देश।  
8. एक ही वैवाहिक लघुत्व का बार-बार करना पड़ता है।  
9. अद्भुत कर्मचारी और अद्भुत अनुसूचियों निमानी घटाते है।  
10. अद्भुत काम करने पर कर्मचारियों का अवलोकन जिया जाता है।  
11. काम करने का त्वत्तर कर्मचारी कृपया की निर्धारित करता है।  
12. समय-समय पर कर्मचारियों को आकर-अलग ताल करने को दिये जाते है।  
13. अद्भुत कर्मचारी पर कर्मचारी की कार्यकुशलता की प्रशंसा होती है।  
14. कर्मचारियों की यूनालिका अद्भुत है कि यदि उन्होंने काम कैसे करें।  
15. लघुत्व में कामयाबी (वापस) का अवलोकन होता है, जब उन्हें कोई 
   प्रशंसा काम दिया जाता है।  
16. निर्धारित करने में कर्मचारियों की बेहतर भी हिस्सा लेने का अवलोकन दिया 
   जाता है।  
17. अद्भुत पर कर्मचारी इनाम या प्रशंसा को प्राप्त किये बिना अपनाया( 
   काम करते है।  
18. कर्मचारियों को काम के समय-काल नये सुझाव देने के लिए प्रेरित किया 
   जाता है।  
19. कर्मचारियों को अपना काम के तरे में वाहक करी दी जाती है।  
20. कर्मचारियों के सत्त्व को कारगर नही करने वाले विभाग का पूर्वक मंडल 
   कर्म करता है।  
21. कर्मचारियों को चिंतित प्रशासन के काम करने के लिए काम को प्रेरित 
   किया जाता है।
22- आम्नेसिया पर निरीक्षण दिनी समस्ता के उमरने पर कर्मचारियों से सलाह दी है।
23- आम्नेसिया लौग समझते हैं कि समय से काम पूरा करना उनके लिए एक मुश्किल है।
24- शरीरो को काम करने के लिए तरीक़े पर प्रयोग करने के लिए अक्सर दिये जाते हैं।
25- कर्मचारियों के निर्णय को पूर्वाभास तथा शायद दी कभी समझनेदेता है।
26- आम्नेसिया पर प्रयोग अयोग काम करने वालों को इनाम देता है।
27-आम्नेसिया पर कर्मचारियों निर्धारित समय या स्थान पर ही अपना काम परामर्शित करते हैं।
28- काम करने के तरीकों का नूनाव कर्मचारियों पर छोड़ दिया जाता है।
APPENDIX-C
JOB-INVolVEMENT SCALE

APPENDIX-C

You are requested to read carefully each statement and rate them from 1 to 5, as you did earlier, in other words:
If you totally find yourself in agreement with the statement then you put (5) in the bracket,
If you agree put (4) in the bracket,
If undecided put (3) in the bracket,
If you disagree put (2) in the bracket,
If you find yourself total disagreement then put (1) in the bracket.

1. I will stay overtime to finish a job even if I am not paid for it. ( )
2. You can measure a person pretty well by how good a job he/she does. ( )
3. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job. ( )
4. For me, time at work really fly by. ( )
5. I usually show up for work a little early to get things ready. ( )
6. The most important things that happen to me involves my work. ( )
7. Sometimes I lie awake at night thinking ahead to the next day's work. ( )
8. I am really perfectionist about my work. ( )
9. I feel depressed when I fail at something connected with my job. ( )
10. I have other activities more important than my work. ( )
11. I live, eat and breathe my job. 

12. I would probably keep working even if I did not need the money. 

13. Quite often I feel like staying home from work instead of coming in. 

14. To me, my work is only a small part of who I am. 

15. I am very much involved personally in my work. 

16. I avoid taking on extra duties and responsibilities in my work. 

17. I used to be more ambitious about my work than I am now. 

18. Most things in life are more important than work. 

19. I used to care more about my work, but now other things are more important to me. 

20. Sometimes I would like to kick myself for the mistakes I make in my work.
Appendix-2

JOB INVOLVEMENT SCALE

निर्देश:- क्षया निम्नलिखित हर प्रश्न को ध्यानपूर्वक पढ़ें और अपने उत्तर, कैसे कि आपने पहले रिप्लाय उत्तर दिए हैं।

1. मैं अपने काम नियोजित होता है और अपने काम अथवा खुद के लिए किसी भी जोखिम लेता हूँ। ( )
2. आदर्श के अस्तित्व के बाद से होता है कि वह जिसी काम की स्थिति अटकी रहती है। ( )
3. मैं मीडिया से उत्सुक नहीं हूँ और मेरे काम के लिए किसी भी विवाद होता है। ( )
4. मैं अपने काम के बारे में विश्वास रखता हूँ। ( )
5. मैं अपने काम पर निर्भर हूँ। ( )
6. मैं स्वतंत्रता में उत्सुक नहीं हूँ। ( )
7. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
8. मैं अपने काम के बारे में उत्सुक नहीं हूँ। ( )
9. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
10. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
11. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
12. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
13. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
14. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
15. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
16. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
17. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
18. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
19. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
20. मैं अपने काम के बारे में प्रवर्तित हूँ। ( )
कृपया नीचे साली स्थानों की पूर्ति करें -

1- इस संस्था में आप कितने दिनों से काम कर रहे हैं -------

2- इस काम का कुलसंख्या कितने दिन का है -------

3- इस संस्था में उन्नति के कौन से क्रम कर है ( बहुत, कम, कुछ भी नहीं ) -------

4- वापसी संस्था में कितने लोग काम करते हैं -------

5- काम का रूपांतर ( रथायी या अरथायी ) -------

6- संस्था में आपका पद -------

7- वाय -------

8- वाय -------

9- शिक्षा का स्तर -------

10- विवाहित या अविवाहित -------