METHODOLOGY

The major objective of the present study was to examine the impact of self-efficacy, work-commitment, and perceived organizational support on the work-outcomes. Work-outcomes were taken as job satisfaction, intent to stay and job performance. The method employed to meet this objective is delineated here under specific headings.

SAMPLE

The study was conducted on a sample of 300 skilled workers. The sample was drawn from eight production industries located in Sonepat, Delhi and Uttar Pradesh by employing the technique of cluster random sampling. Since the present study involve assessment of work commitment of skilled workers, the inclusion criterion was minimum tenure of three years in the same organization. Initially, a sample of 335 respondents was accomplished but due to absentees or incomplete questionnaires 35 respondents were dropped from the sample. Therefore, the final sample comes out to be 300 subjects. All the selected respondents were male and their age ranged between 30 to 52 years with a mean of 41.30 years. Minimum educational qualification of the respondents was matriculation. All the selected respondents had been serving the respective organization at least for the last three years. The unit-wise break-up/split of the sample is under:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. no.</th>
<th>Name of the Organization</th>
<th>No. of Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pepsi Co, Varun Beverages Pvt. Ltd., Noida</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Universal Spares (India) Pvt Ltd., Rai</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sabharwal Food Industries, G.T. Road, Nathupur</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eastern Bearings Pvt. Ltd., Kundli</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crystal Phosphatis Ltd., Nathupur</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unifab Industries, Nathupur</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Klick International Shoes Pvt. Ltd., Delhi</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Versatile Enterprises, Burari Garhi, Delhi</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | **300** |
MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

The data for the study were collected by administering seven measuring instruments on all the 300 participants. A brief description of each of the tests is as under:

1. Self-Efficacy Scale (SES)

General perceived self-efficacy pertains to one’s competence to deal with challenging encounters. It is measured with a parsimonious ten-item scale that was developed for use across cultures. According to Bandura (1995) self-efficacy makes a difference in how people feel, think and act. In terms of feeling, a low sense of self-efficacy is associated with depression, anxiety, and helplessness. People with high self-efficacy choose to perform more challenging tasks. They set themselves higher goals and stick to them. Self-efficacy is commonly understood as being domain-specific, that is, one can have more or less firm self-beliefs in different domains or particular situations of functioning. But some researchers have also conceptualized a generalized sense of self-efficacy. It refers to a global confidence in one’s coping ability across a wide range of demanding or novel situations. General self-efficacy aims at a broad and stable sense of personal competence to deal effectively with a variety of stressful situations (Schwarzer, 1994).

The Self-Efficacy Scale was developed by Jerusalem and Schwarzer (1981) in German, first as a 20-item version and later it was reduced to 10-item version (Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1992). Typical items are like “Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations,” “When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions” and “If I am in trouble, I usually think of something to do”. The scale items are
responded on 5 point scale with anchor labels, i.e. 5 indicating strongly agree to 1 indicating strongly disagree. The scale is scored by assigning a score of 5 to strongly agree, 4 to agree, 3 to undecided, 2 to disagree and 1 to strongly disagree. The scores on individual items are added to generate overall on each of the components of self-efficacy. Thus, the possible score for self-efficacy is from 10 to 50. High score indicates high level of self-efficacy and low score indicates low self-efficacy. It has been used in numerous research projects, where it typically yielded internal consistencies (coefficient alpha) between .75 and .91. The scale is not only parsimonious and reliable, it has also proven valid in terms of convergent and discriminant validity. For example, it correlates positively with self-esteem and optimism, and negatively with anxiety, depression and typical symptoms. The ten self-efficacy items were adapted to the 13 languages by bilingual native speakers based on the German and English versions of the instrument. The English version was used by the investigator to measure the self-efficacy among skilled workers in the selected organizations.

2. Work Commitment Scales

Work commitment was measured in terms of organizational commitment and occupational commitment. Both the commitments were measured through Allen and Meyer’s scales.

(a) Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS)

The revised scale of Organizational Commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990 a) was used to study work commitment of the respondents. The original scale comprises 8 items each on the three dimensions. The revised scale comprises 6 items on each of the three dimensions and hence, consists of 18 items. The English
version of the Mayer, Allen and Smith's (1993) scale was adapted to Indian setting by Khan and Mishra (2002) and same was used in the present study. Meyer and Allen (1993) applied different levels to what they described as three components of commitment: affective, continuance and normative. In order to control for a response bias, as suggested by Meyer and Allen (1993) some of the items were negatively worded. According to them the affective commitment (ACS) refers to employee’s emotional attachment to identification with and involvement in the organization. Continuance commitment (CCS) points to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization whereas normative commitment (NCS) reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment.

The OCS consists of 18 items - 6 items for each dimension i.e. affective, continuance, and normative commitment, respectively. The statements included in the questionnaire are worded in accordance with the organizational commitment. Scale comprises both positively and negatively keyed items. The subject is asked to choose one of the responses on five point scale. The scale items are responded on 5 point scale with anchor labels, i.e., 5 indicating strongly agree to 1 indicating strongly disagree. The scale is scored by assigning a score of 5 to strongly agree, 4 to agree, 3 to undecided, 2 to disagree and 1 to strongly disagree. The scoring is reverse in the case of negative statements. The scores on individual items are added to generate overall on each of the components of organizational commitment. Thus, the possible score for commitment sub-scales is from 6 to 30. High score indicates high level of commitment and low score indicates low commitment on respective dimension of the organizational commitment. Reliability of the scale was assessed using split-half method and found to be 0.76, .75 and 0.70 respectively for
affective, continuance and normative organizational commitment. Construct validity of the scales was established through factor analysis (Meyer & Allen, 1993).

(b) Occupational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)

Occupational commitment of the employees was assessed by using Meyer and Allen’s (1993) Occupational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). The questionnaire, based on a three components model of commitment taps three dimensions of occupational commitment, viz. affective, continuance and normative. Meyer and Allen (1987) believed that these dimensions differ with regard to their relationship with certain organizational behaviors. According to Meyer & Allen (1993) affective occupational commitment refers to employees experiences with their basic needs, which tends to develop a stronger affective attachment to the organization than do those whose experiences are less satisfying. Continuance commitment presumably develops as employees recognize that they have accumulated investments or “side bets” (Becker, 1960) that would be lost if they were to leave the organization. They also recognize that the availability of comparable alternatives is limited. Finally, normative commitment develops as the result of socialization experiences that emphasize the appropriateness of remaining loyal to one’s employer (Winer, 1982) or through the receipt of benefits that create within the employee a sense of obligation to reciprocate (Scholl, 1981). Employees with a strong affective commitment remain with the organization because they want to, those with a strong continuance commitment remain because they need to, and those with a strong normative commitment remain because they feel they ought to do so.
The OCQ consists of 18 items - 6 items for each dimension i.e. affective, continuance, and normative commitment, respectively. The statements included in the questionnaire are worded in accordance with the occupational commitment. Scale comprises both positively and negatively keyed items. The subject is asked to choose one of the responses on five point scale. In the present study Hindi translation of English version of OCQ was used.

The scale items are responded on 5 point scale with anchor labels, i.e. 5 indicating strongly agree to 1 indicating strongly disagree. The scale is scored by assigning a score of 5 to strongly agree, 4 to agree, 3 to undecided, 2 to disagree and 1 to strongly disagree. The scoring is reverse in the case of negative statements. The scores on individual items are added to generate overall on each of the components of occupational commitment. Thus, the possible score for commitment sub-scales is from 6 to 30. High score indicates high level of commitment and low score indicates low commitment on respective dimension of the occupational commitment. The scale has been subjected to fairly extensive psychometric evaluation and has received considerable support. The authors of the scale have reported fairly high reliability estimates. The alpha coefficient estimates were .87 for AC, .75 for CC, and .79 for NC (Meyer et. al., 1993). The construct validity of the questionnaire was established through confirmatory factors analysis (CFA) of nurse's data. The analysis provided maximum likelihood of expected three factor solution for occupational commitment scale items. Further, the CFA distinguished between organizational and occupational commitments by extracting six factors. The authors tested the fit of the various models by computing relative no-centrality index and parsimonious normed – fit index. For these indices, higher values indicated that three factor solutions provided the best fit.
to the data. All the three components of occupational commitment contributed independently to the prediction of intention to continue in the occupation and correlated significantly with several of the organization-relevant outcome measures.

3. Perceived Organizational Support Questionnaire (POSQ)

Perceived Organization Support Questionnaire (POSQ) was developed by Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli and Lynch (1986) which measures the extent to which employees perceive that the organization values their career, contribution and concerned about their well-being. The POSQ comprises 36 items referring to evaluative judgments attributed to the organization, which include satisfaction with the employee as a member of the organization and with the employee’s performance, anticipation of the employee’s extra effort, consideration of the employee’s goals and opinions, the organization’s concerns about fair pay, job enrichment, full use of the employee’s talents, the employee’s satisfaction on the job, and the employee’s well-being. Statements referring to actions affecting the employee that the organization would be likely to take in hypothetical situation include willingness to help with job problems, replacing the employee’s with a lower paid new employee, responses to the employee’s possible complaints, mistakes, worsened performance improved performance, requested change of working conditions, requested special favor, decision to quit, and failure to complete a task on time, retention of the employee following job obsolescence, rehiring after lay off, and opportunities for promotion.

Eisenberger et al. (1986) observed a very strong evidence for general factor of perceived organizational support. The results indicated that the presumptive perceived support factor
accounted for 93.3% of the common variance and that a possible minor second factor accounted for only 6.1% variance. The variance perceived support factor accounted for 48.3% of the total variance and the possible second factor for 4.4%. The proportion of total variance accounted for by the perceived support factor is quite high considering the diverse content of the items. Factor loadings of perceived support factor were higher on every one of the 36 statements than did on possible second factor. Moreover, the lowest of the 36 perceived support loadings were greater than the highest of the 36 loadings for the minor second factor.

The 36 scale items are responded on 5 point scale with anchor labels, i.e., 5 indicating strongly agree to 1 indicating strongly disagree. The scale is scored by assigning a score of 5 to strongly agree, 4 to agree, 3 to undecided, 2 to disagree and 1 to strongly disagree. The scoring is reverse in the case of negative statements. The scores on individual items are added to generate overall on each of the components of perceived organization support. High score indicates high level of perceived organization support and low score indicates low perceived organization support. The POS questionnaire has provided for the high reliability and uni dimensional nature of survey of POS. The analysis resulted in reliability coefficient (Cronbach’s alpha) of .97, with item total correlations ranging from .42 to .83. The mean and median item total correlations were .67 and .66 respectively. As indicated earlier, there exists strong evidence for factorial validity of the POS questionnaire (Eisenberger et. al., 1986). Every one of the 36 scale items showed a strong loading on the main factor of POS, with minimal evidence for the existence of other factors. The substantial factor loading of each statement and the high proportion of relative variance and total variance accounted
for are notable since the items included a wide variety of ascribed organizational attitudes and possible actions relevant to employee's interests.

4. Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS)

The Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) was developed by Muthayya (1973). The scale is intended to measure the extent of job dissatisfaction among the administrative personnel engaged in the implementation of the developmental programmes at the block level. The preliminary form of the questionnaire was prepared on the basis of the style and content of the earlier questionnaires used for studying job satisfaction among the personnel in the field of industry by Robert Kahn and others in their studies on 'organizational stress'. While choosing the content area, care was taken to consult the job charts of the functionaries for getting an idea of the type of interaction they have on the job. The job satisfaction questionnaire consisted of 34 out of 48 preliminary items, after the item analysis.

Arbitrarily, the 34 items constituting the job-satisfaction questionnaire were classified into three aspects, viz., job aspect, the personal aspect and the interpersonal aspect. This classification was thought of as a guideline for understanding the extent of contribution of each of these aspects to one's job satisfaction. The job aspect covers information on pay, work opportunity, lack of technical know-how, promotional opportunities, facilities for work, work load, conflicting work-roles, under work, monotony of work, work expectation of superiors, and authority vested on the job. There were 17 items covering this aspect. The personal aspect includes ten items and covers information on feeling of inadequacy, security, non-acceptance in the department, under-employment, feeling to
change the job, lack of authority and belief in the programmes. The interpersonal aspect consists of seven items covering information on people’s apathy to the programs, political interference and pressure on one’s work, and attitude to superior officers. The items in the final scale were arranged at random. Typical items are like “Feeling that you could have worked better in a different organization”, “Feeling that you have security in your occupational positions”, and “Feeling that you have little opportunity to use your abilities in this organization”. The scale items are responded on 5 point scale with anchor labels, i.e., 5 indicating strongly agree to 1 indicating strongly disagree. The scale is scored by assigning a score of 5 to strongly agree, 4 to agree, 3 to undecided, 2 to disagree and 1 to strongly disagree. The scores on individual items are added to generate overall on each of the components of job satisfaction. The scoring is reverse in the case of negative statements. Higher score indicates higher job dissatisfaction.

The split - half of reliability (odd-even) for the 34 item job satisfaction scale was found to be .81, after applying the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, which may be regarded as quite satisfactory.

5. Intent to Stay Scale (ISS)

The Intent to Stay in the organization of the subjects was assessed through Shore and Martin (1989) scale. The areas covered are views/ feelings regarding stay in the organization, feelings regarding leaving organization, feelings regarding continuation to work in the organization and feelings regarding making your career in the present organization. It is a Likert type scale consisting of four items with five response alternatives. A score of 5 was assigned to response strongly agree; 4 to agree; 3
to undecided; 2 to disagree and 1 to strongly disagree. Total score for each scale was obtained by adding up individual item scores. The scoring was reversed in the case of negatively worded statements, i.e. a score of 5 was assigned to response strongly disagree; 4 to disagree; 3 to undecided; 2 to agree; and 1 to strongly agree. The coefficient alpha reliability of the scale is reported to be .92.

6. Job Performance Scale (JPS)

The job performance of the subjects was assessed through Job Performance Scale prepared by Singh and Pestonjee (1988). This scale was used in two ways: first, respondent was required to rate himself on various areas included in the scale. Respondents have to give opinion regarding their work-efficiency on five given alternatives. Secondly, the immediate senior was required to rate how a particular sub-ordinate was doing on various job areas/work efficiency included in the scale. The areas of job performance covered by the scale are amount of effort expanded on the job, competence in completing work, speed of work accomplishment, quality of work, efficiency to edit the work, regularity and punctuality, capacity, care in handling company property, ability to work without supervision, ability to plan work, ability to handle different jobs, dependability, initiative on the job and overall performance etc. It is a Likert-type scale consisting of 14 items each having five alternate responses. The scoring was done on five point scale with score of one indicating the least and five the highest and three the average performance. Self rating of the performance of each of the respondent and immediate superior rating was obtained. A score of 1 was assigned to response to alternative (a); score of 2 was assigned to response to alternative (b); score of 3 was assigned to
response to alternative (c); score of 2 was assigned to response to alternative (d); score of 1 was assigned to response to alternative (e). Total score for each scale was obtained by adding up individual item scores. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability of the scale was estimated to be .89.

ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING

In order to collect data for the present study the respondents were approached through their unit in charge after seeking permission from their Director/Managing Director of the concerned unit of different organizations. Most of the subjects were willing to participate in the testing procedure. The selected respondents were contacted in their respective unit and their willingness to participate was sought. Since most of the respondents were willing to participate in the testing only during their free time, they were tested individually whenever they were able to spare time. The testing sessions were held during the months of August 2010 to December 2010. All the tests were administered on different hierarchical groups, i.e., workers and supervisors. The general testing conditions were satisfactory and up to the mark.

The testing atmosphere was uniform all through. While administering the tests, good rapport was established with the subjects to get their maximum cooperation and to have best out of them. They were told, at the very outset, that it is a part of scientific study and the collected data will be used for scientific purpose and it should not be taken as one’s evaluation. It was also made clear that their results would be kept confidential and they would be informed about their position on different behavioral measures, if they desire so after the completion of the study. Though there was no time limit to finish any of the tests, the
subjects were asked to complete the tests as early as possible. The subjects took, on an average approximately 50-55 minutes to finish all the tests. Instructions and administration procedures were same for all the respondents and well in accordance with that described by the test authors.

The tests were administered in the following sequence to all the respondents: self-efficacy, work commitment comprising organizational commitment and occupational commitment, perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, intent to stay, job performance (self) and job performance done by immediate supervisor.

For the self efficacy scale, perceived organizational support scale, and job satisfaction scale, respondents were asked to read the statements carefully and choose any one which was most appropriate according to them from five options given to them in the response sheet i.e., strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. Respondents were asked to indicate the degree of their agreement or disagreement with each statement by putting a cross in the relevant box in the response sheet.

Work commitment was measured in terms of organizational commitment and occupational commitment. The organizational commitment questionnaire and occupational commitment questionnaire contained three common dimensions of commitment i.e., affective, continuance and normative- each dimension further containing 6 items. They were mixed together to form a single 18 items series pertaining to affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment and normative organizational commitment. Another series of 18 items pertaining to affective occupational commitment, continuance occupational commitment and
normative occupational commitment was used to measure occupational commitment. Each item was presented with a five point response scale (strongly agree, agree undecided, disagree and strongly disagree). Respondents were asked to indicate the degree of their agreement or disagreement with each statement by putting a cross in the relevant box in the response sheet.

To measure intent to stay in the organization, respondents were asked to read the statements carefully and choose any one option which was most appropriate according to them from the five options given to them in the response sheet. The scoring was done on five point scale with score of one indicating the highest and five the least and three the average intention to stay in the organization.

For measuring job performance, testing was done in two ways. First, respondents were asked to read the statements carefully and choose any one option which was most appropriate according to them from the five options given to them in the response sheet. Secondly, immediate superior was asked to evaluate the performance of the respondent with regard to every statement. The scoring was done on five point scale with score of one indicating the least and five the highest and three the average performance. Self rating of the performance of each of the respondent was also obtained.

STATISTICAL ANALYSES

The obtained data were processed for descriptive statistics, product moment correlation, reliability analysis, multiple regression, and principal components analysis. Major aim of these analyses was to explore the impact of self-efficacy, work commitment, and perceived organizational support on work
outcomes, viz. job-satisfaction, intent to stay and job performance. The reliability of the measures was estimated through Cronback's coefficient alpha.