Chapter-3

Method
Method is the back-bone of any scientific research. The term method refers to a systematic procedure, technique, and mode of inquiry. Method is also described as a way, technique or process of or for doing something. Our study is an empirical one which required certain process and steps. Since, the aim of the present investigation was to examine the predictive efficacy of self-concept and organizational identification on organizational commitment and job satisfaction, hence, the following steps were taken in carrying out the investigation.

Sample

There may not be any empirical study in behavioural sciences, especially in psychology, unless the population is defined and thereafter, sample size is determined by using appropriate sampling technique that should be the representative of the entire population of that specific category. Since, the present study was aimed to study on university teachers, so, a sample group of university teachers teaching in Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh were chosen. It seems necessarily relevant to mention that the teachers from the various departments of the numerous faculties—Arts, Social Sciences, Sciences, Theology, Commerce and from the Women’s College teaching non-professional courses were chosen as part of the sample population. The total sample consists of teachers, teaching as ‘Professor’, ‘Associate Professor’ and ‘Assistant Professor’. It is imperative to highlight that 323 teachers had consulted to fill the data but after scrutiny finally N = 287 teachers’ data were found appropriate for the purpose of tabulation and statistical analysis. The break-up of the sample and their characteristics have been given in Table-3.
Moreover, some more information from the sample were tapped through biographical information blank (Appendix-V) other than the afore-mentioned but because of the extreme homogeneity of the responses, it was decided not to mention these while mentioning sample characteristics. Such information was pertaining to general health, marital status, and rural/urban background of the respondents.

Tools Used

Psychologists are not magicians, hence, in quest of objective assessment entire psychological endeavours are based on the efficacy of psychological tools which must have gone through standardization process. Therefore, keeping these in mind, following psychological tools were used in this study.

Organizational Commitment Scale

Employees level of organizational commitment was measured by a scale developed by Shah and Ansari (2000). This scale was based on the three dimensions given by Meyer and Allen (1991) viz., ‘affective commitment’, ‘continuance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>N=287</td>
<td>47.37(8.046)</td>
<td>24-64</td>
<td>16.63(8.404)</td>
<td>1-40</td>
<td>3 (1.836)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>n₁=84</td>
<td>41.74(5.992)</td>
<td>24-62</td>
<td>10.05(5.236)</td>
<td>2-39</td>
<td>3 (2.138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>n₂=123</td>
<td>49.62(6.467)</td>
<td>38-64</td>
<td>18.41(6.180)</td>
<td>5-40</td>
<td>3 (1.678)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>n₃=80</td>
<td>55.36(5.868)</td>
<td>39-64</td>
<td>25.06(7.072)</td>
<td>1-40</td>
<td>4 (1.661)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
commitment’, and ‘normative commitment’. Hence, the scale consisted of three dimensions with five items in each, so the total numbers of items in this scale were 15, out of which 13 items were positively and 2 items were negatively framed. This scale had a seven point likert type response categories starting from 1 to 7 i.e., ‘1’ for “strongly disagree” and ‘7’ for “strongly agree” (see Appendix–I). The responses for positively worded items had to be counted on the pattern of likert type scale while responses had to be reversed for negatively worded items. This scale is reported to be highly standardized as split half reliability of the scale was found to be $r = 0.80$ and the congruent validity was $r = 0.76$. That confirms the scale reliability and validity.

**Job Satisfaction Scale**

Job satisfaction of the respondents was assessed by using a scale developed by Porter (1961). Porter had taken inspiration from Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (1954), hence, Porter’s hierarchy of needs patterned after Maslow’s approach that contain five hierarchy of needs, were security, social, esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization needs. Porter’s security and social needs are viewed as lower-order needs, while esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization as higher order needs. It is necessary to mention here that what Porter did was that he merged Maslow’s ‘physiological need’ with “security” and isolated “autonomy” from ‘self-actualization’ needs, hence, he also maintained five need hierarchies.

Porter’s scale which was used in the present investigation consisted of fifteen items based on five dimensions viz., satisfaction with ‘security’, ‘social’, ‘esteem’, ‘autonomy’ and ‘self actualization need’ (see Appendix -II) and each dimension has equal number of items. The scale has a five point response category ranging from “minimum degree” (score of 15) to “maximum degree” (score of 5). It is widely
accepted and commonly used scale which is reported to be highly standardized hence, the scale is considered to be reliable as well as valid.

The dimensions defined are being described below:

1. **Security Need:** The need for security is manifested in the common preference for a job with tenure and protection (job security), pension, and insurance plans.

2. **Social Need:** refers to the need for employee-centered supervision, team work, good supervisor-subordinate relation, and friendly behaviour.

3. **Esteem Need:** refers to need for recognition, respect, promotion, prestigious job titled, team leader, director.

4. **Need for Autonomy:** refers to need for being independent, free and self-directed, and have some control over their own affairs.

5. **Self Actualization Need:** refers to the desire for self-fulfillment, personal growth and self-development.

**Mohsin Self-Concept Inventory**

Self-concept of the respondents was measured by using Mohsin self-concept inventory (1976) that contained 48 items consisting of positively and negatively phrased statements about abilities and strengths pertaining to the cognitive, affective, and conative areas (see Appendix-III). The positively and negatively phrased statements were equally balanced in numbers. All positively phrased statements affirm positive quality and all negative phrased statements deny negative quality. The acceptance of a statement as characterizing oneself signifies, in either case, positive evaluation of the self. The entire inventory is, thus, intended to measure variation in self-regards. Two halves reliability of the MSCI was reported as $r= 0.57$ whereas, $r=0.73$ for the full inventory that confirm the reliability of the scale. The validity of
MSCI was hypothesized to correlate negatively with a short version of Maslow’s SI test, adopted by the author, and positively with MPCI (Mohsin Parent Child Inventory). The correlation of MSCI with Maslow SI test was -0.351, and with MPCI it was 0.396, for a sample of under-graduate students (Mohsin, 1976), hence, both values are reported to be significant at less than 1 percent level of confidence. It was also reported that the obtained correlations may be taken as indices of construct validity of the MSCI.

Organizational Identification Scale

The last test used in this study was pertaining to the measurement of organizational identification that was developed by the researcher for the purpose of the present investigation. It contains seven dimensions i.e., ‘organizational prestige’, ‘organizational belongingness’, ‘autonomy in organization’, ‘employee-centered management’, ‘promotional opportunities’, ‘supervisory behaviour’ and ‘transparency’ (see Appendix-IV).

Before the development of the scale for measuring organizational identification, it was defined that organizational identification is “one’s perception towards the organization as a whole that will reflect one’s belongingness with the organization”. Organizational identification was viewed to be the function of its seven dimensions which were identified out of judges’ agreement and even judges agreements were followed for retaining each item under each dimension of the scale. Since, there was a purpose of the scale, hence, each dimension were properly defined to provide direction to the respondents while responding each statements. The dimensions defined are being described below:

1. **Organizational Prestige:** It refers to organizational reputation in terms of its product and services.
2. **Organizational Belongingness:** It refers to employees feeling to have high matching with the organization.

3. **Autonomy in Organization:** It refers to organizational freedom given to employees in case of the work/assignment given to them, e.g., the way the work is accomplished.

4. **Employees-Centered Management:** It refers to enhancement of employees’ effectiveness by improving employees’ quality of life.

5. **Promotional Opportunity:** It refers to organizational avenues for upward mobility in terms of salary and hierarchy progression.

6. **Supervisory Behaviour:** It refers to supervisory style of interacting with the subordinate. It may also reflect to superiors-subordinate relationships.

7. **Transparency:** It refers to openness as well as, clarity in all organizational processes and functions.

For developing the scale, initially under each dimension seven items were very cautiously prepared. Thereafter, the whole list of items (statements) was given to the experts who worked as judges and had interest in the same discipline to rate each item (statement) on a five point scale in a manner whether these items (statements) are relevant in measuring organizational identification as well as, the items appropriately serve the purpose under each seven facets of the scale. Having obtained the ratings from 20 experts, the averages of the judges’ ratings were calculated and only those items were retained which had high agreement. This whole procedure clearly confirms the relevance and the face validity of the scale. Moreover, the item analysis was also done by calculating coefficient of correlation for each item with total scores of the scale on a sample of 100 university teachers. The coefficients of each item is found significant at .01 level of confidence, hence, all items were retained (see
Appendix-IVA). But in spite of this fact both reliability and validity were calculated for further confirmation. Split-half reliability of the scale yielded the value $r = 0.834$ that confirmed the reliability, whereas, congruent validity of organizational identification scale was also calculated by comparing the scale with the scores of Porter's (1961) job satisfaction scale. The obtained value $r = 0.736$ also confirmed the validity of the scale.

Finally, there were 21 items in the scale, i.e., three items under each seven dimensions. The scale has seven point likert type response categories ranging from “Strongly Agree” (a score of 7) to “Strongly Disagree” (a score of 1), hence the total score of the scale ranges from 21-147, higher the score on scale indicate high identification and lower to low identification with the organization.

Having collected the data, scoring of each scale was done and thereafter, scoring sheet was prepared for feeding the scores in computer for final analyses with the help of SPSS (statistical package for social sciences).

**Statistical Analysis**

Above mentioned scales were used to collect the data for determining the predictive proficiency of the predictor variables related to self-concept and organizational identification to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Once the data collected and the tabulations of the scores of the data were completed, thereafter, it was necessarily warranted to apply appropriate statistical test to analyze the data for obtaining the results of the study. Hence, keeping in view the nature of the problem, its objectives and hypotheses, multiple regression analysis (MRA) was applied to the data. Multiple regression analysis studied the influences of several predictor variables simultaneously on the criterion variables. The function of MRA is
to make prediction about criterion variables on the basis of various predictor variables. Although, there are various methods to assess relative contribution of each predictor variable but we used stepwise multiple regression analysis (SMRA). SMRA entered each variable in sequence and then its value assessed. The analysis was done undertaking total sample for organizational commitment as a whole and its various components, and the same was done for the other criterion variable i.e., job satisfaction and for its various facets. Thereafter, the same analysis was run following the same pattern undertaking sub-sample group of teachers’ (‘Assistant Professors’, ‘Associate Professor’, and ‘Professor’) separately.