CHAPTER V

JOB INVOLVEMENT

The term job involvement has been used frequently in different types of studies. In its wide range of use, different interpretations and measurements have been introduced. In fact the differences signify lack of clarity and the complexity of the concept. Kanungo attempted to clearly delineate the distinction between these two constructs. Till date in several studies attempts have been made to bring out the distinction between JI (Job Involvement) and WI (Work Involvement).

5.1 CONCEPT OF JOB INVOLVEMENT

The study conducted by S.D. Saleh and James Hosek (1976) reviews the different interpretations of JI and analyses the measurements used to clarify it.

Dubin (1956, 1968) conceptualised JI as the degree to which the total job situation is a central life interest i.e. the degree to which it is perceived to be a major source for satisfaction of important needs. Lawler & Hall (1970) defined it as the degree to which a person perceives his total work situation to be an important part of his life and to be central to him and his identity because of the opportunity it affords him to satisfy his important needs. Lodahl & Kejner (1965) defined job involvement as the degree of importance of one's work in one's total self image and Guion (1958) said it is characterised by the employee's perception of the job as being of extreme importance.
Different tools have been used to measure the central life interest type of involvement. In Dubin's (1956) questionnaire a respondent had to choose between a job oriented, a non-job oriented or an indifferent response. Davis (1966) instrument measured job involvement by asking an employee the time he devotes to his work and his perception of the importance of his job in his life. Finally Lodahl and Kejner's (1965) job involvement scale also measures the central life interest type of involvement.

A second interpretation of job involvement was proposed by Allport (1943) who conceptualised it as the degree to which an employee participates in his job and it helps meet such needs as prestige, self-respect, autonomy and self regard. Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960) indicated that personal involvement in the job depends on the extent to which an individual seeks self-expression and actualisation in his work. Wickert (1951) and Bass (1965) suggested the same type of job involvement. Bass suggested that the opportunity to make job decisions, the feeling that one is making an important contribution to company success, the chance to set one's own work pace and self determination leads to strengthening of job involvement.

Wickert suggested that the participation type of involvement could be measured by asking the employee the degree to which he feels he is actively participating in his job. Vroom (1959, 1962) indicated that it also could be measured by asking the employee how much he participates "Psychologically" in his job.
Another interpretation conceived of job involvement, was by French & Kahn (1962) as the degree to which the employee perceived that his job performance is central to his self concept i.e the degree to which it affects his self-esteem. Siegel (1969) stated that job involvement is the importance of work to a person's self esteem or sense of worth.

Iverson and Reuder (1956) reported job involvement in terms of the relationship of performance to valued characteristics. Hackman (1968) believed that this type of involvement operations in MBO programs gets the employee to commit himself to goals he sets for himself. Such commitment makes the goal important to the employee's self esteem and therefore becomes involved in achieving such goals. To measure self-esteem type of involvement the employee is asked how often he thinks about an unfinished problem after working hours (Vroom 1962; Slater 1959).

Again Vroom (1964) and Iverson and Reuder (1956) suggest to ask the individual whether a task requires the use of an ability or personality characteristics that he values. Lodahl & Kejner's job involvement scale also contains some items which measure this type of involvement.

The fourth and final conceptualisation of job involvement is mentioned by Vroom (1962, 1964). It refers to the degree to which the employee perceives that his job performance is consistent with characteristics that are central to his self concept. While Vroom considered consistency of performance with existing self-conception, French and Kahn emphasised the consistency with the valued self-conception.
In summary these are the four different conceptualisations of the construct of job involvement i.e. a person is involved (i) when work to him is a central life interest; (ii) when he actively participates in his job; (iii) when he perceives performance as central to his self esteem (iv) when he perceives performance as consistent with his self concept.

5.2 DISTINCTION BETWEEN JOB AND WORK INVOLVEMENT

The major source of conceptual ambiguity lies in the excess meaning given to job involvement. These are identified in four different ways.

i. Firstly the construct of JI has been confused with the issue of intrinsic motivation on the job. (Gorn & Kanungo 1980; Kanungo 1981) The most widely used measure of job involvement developed by Lodahl & Kejner (1965) combines items representing the two issues.

ii. Second, the issue of identifying the antecedent conditions of job involvement with the issue of identifying the state of job involvement and its subsequent effects has been confused.

iii. Thirdly the construct of job involvement has been defined and described as both a cognitive and a positive emotional state of the individual.

iv. Finally earlier conceptualisations of job involvement have failed to distinguish two different contexts in which an individual can show personal involvement (Kanungo 1981).
These are (i) specific job context and (2) generalised work context. Hence involvement in a specific job is a belief descriptive of the present job and tends to be a function of how much the job can satisfy one's present needs. Involvement with work in general or the centrality of work in one's life is a normative belief about the value of work in one's life and is more a function of one's past cultural conditioning or socialisation.

The previously developed scales by Lodahl & Kejner 1965; Saleh & Hosek 1976) and work values (Blood 1969) failed to make a conceptual distinction between job and work involvement. These scales have used the words job and work inter-changeably. The validity and usefulness of a conceptual distinction between involvement in a particular job and identification with work in general have been demonstrated by Gorn & Kanungo (1980). Kanungo has argued for a reformulation of the construct of involvement. According to such reformulation involvement either in the context of a particular job or with work in general can be viewed as a cognitive belief state of psychological identification.

An individual's psychological identification with a particular job or work in general depends on (1) the importance of his needs (extrinsic and intrinsic) (2) the perceptions he has about the need satisfying potentialities of the job or work. Viewed this way JI and WI cannot be measured with the existing instruments. This necessitates the development of valid and reliable new measures of job and work involvement for use.
5.3 MEASURES OF THE CONSTRUCT

Saleh & James Hosek (1976)² in their article conducted a study to find out if the four conceptualisations i.e. (i) CLI (ii) Active participation in job (iii) Importance of performance with valued self (iv) Consistency with self concept are different and whether such differences can be explained.

The job involvement scale included measures used in previous investigations. These are Davis 1966; Dubin 1955; French & Kahn 1962; Iverson & Reuder 1956, Lodahl & Kejner 1965, Vroom 1962, 1964, Wickert 1951. The most clear and most interpretable results were those of the three factor solution. The reliability of the new scale was established by including only those items which loaded more than .40 on one factor and less than .35 on the other two factors. The internal consistency of the total scales was .86.

Lawler & Hall (1970) found three factors similar in structure to the factors of the above mentioned study. First is labelled "Satisfaction" and corresponds closely to the study's factor of "active participation", their "job involvement" factor similar to central life interest factor. The third factor which they labelled "intrinsic motivation" is similar to the centrality of performance to self-esteem. It was implicitly assumed by them that job involvement was a simple concept that could be represented by one factor. This study suggested that while the three factors were factorially different, an important common element exists between them. It was assumed that the common element is the self or the self concept and the three factors express its different dimensions. Therefore, the three factor structure of job involvement may be perceived as engaging three components of the self. The structural definition of the self presented by Gergen (1971) was used for clarification.
In conclusion, job involvement may be defined as the degree to which the self with its three components, identity, connative and evaluative is reflected in the individual's job. It is the degree to which the person identifies with his job, actively participates in it and considers his performance important to his self worth.

Another interesting study by Gerald J. Gorn and Rabindra N. Kanungo (1980) contrasted with prevailing thought that, where job design provided greater responsibility and autonomy on the job, employees were likely to be more involved in them. He criticised this position on the ground that satisfaction of intrinsic needs on the jobs may be sufficient but not a necessary condition for job involvement. He proposed a motivational approach to the study of job involvement maintaining a conceptual distinction between intrinsic motivation and job involvement. Further JI being a cognitive state of psychological identification with the job, involvement depends on the degree to which job is perceived to meet one's salient needs-intrinsic or extrinsic. Thus it was hypothesised that individuals with salient extrinsic needs will be strongly involved in their jobs as individuals with salient intrinsic needs provided they perceive their jobs to have the potential for satisfying their salient needs.

The concept of Involvement is conceptualised as having two components. (1) Involvement in a particular job (2) Psychological state of identification with work in general. With this distinction, the earlier mentioned study examined whether there were any differences between individuals whose most salient need is intrinsic and individuals whose most salient need is extrinsic with reference to their job and work involvement.
Another objective of the study was to explore whether individuals with salient intrinsic needs are more or less satisfied with their jobs than individuals with salient extrinsic needs.

Finally the study explored the question of whether satisfaction of salient intrinsic needs leads to more or less job and work involvement than satisfaction of salient extrinsic needs.

In view of the recent distinction between job and work involvement Rahindra N. Kanungo in his study (1982) developed separate measures of the two constructs using three different techniques (i) Semantic differential (2), questionnaire (3) and graphic methods. Data was collected from a heterogeneous sample of 703 employees and analysed to establish reliability, construct validity and criterion related validity of each measure. Relative effectiveness of the three techniques used to measure the constructs were examined. The results revealed that questionnaire and graphic measures pass the tests of reliability and validity. Semantic differential measures have questionable validity for measuring work involvement.

Despite the distinction in the concept of job involvement and work involvement, in general several studies have overlooked this distinction. In the article by R.N.Anantharaman and K. Shamshad Begam (1982) an attempt was made to find out if any difference existed in job involvement among bank employees (i.e. 10 managers, 50 officers and 100 clerks). Lodahl and Kejner's (1965) scale was used to measure job involvement. It was reported that no significant difference in job involvement was found among the banking employees.
In contrast to the above study a more recent one conducted by the authors Irina M.Paullay, George M. Alliger and Eugene F. Stone - Romero (1994) have attempted to examine and to clarify the relationship between the two concepts that have been confused and also used interchangeably in the literature. According to them, JI is defined as the degree to which one is cognitively preoccupied with, engaged in and concerned with one's present job. It is hypothesised that JI consists of two components JI - role or (JIR) i.e. the degree to which one is engaged in the specific tasks that make up one's job, and JI-setting or (JIS) the degree to which one finds carrying out the tasks of one's job in the present job environment to be engaging. JI is highest when an individual is engaged, or involved in both components.

In the above noted research WC is defined as the beliefs that individuals have regarding the degree of importance that work plays in their lives. WC is seen as being shaped by the socialisation of the individual. People learn to value work from their families, friends, religion or culture. Individuals come to believe through their own experience that work to them is a central component of their life.

The results of the study supported the notion that a meaningful distinction can be made between JI and WC. Support was also found for the hypothesised existence of the two types of JI : JIR and JIS.

Though Rabindra N.Kanungo initiated the distinction between the two concepts, research studies have not confirmed the distinction. The study of job involvement was measured as a single construct using the instrument developed by him with a lot of modification to suit Indian conditions.
5.4 FACTORS AFFECTING JOB INVOLVEMENT

Based on the earlier mentioned conceptualisation of the construct of Job Involvement 14 statements were selected wherein the first seven pertain to Job Involvement and the remaining seven to Work Involvement in Section II of the questionnaire.

These are involvement in job, monetary factor, personal interests, life goals, esteem need, emotional need, nature of the job, involvement in work, importance of work in one's life, value system, identity, value for work and life satisfaction.

5.5 IMPORTANCE OF STUDYING JI

Studies can aim at exploring the nature of job and work involvement within organisations eg. identify the antecedents and consequent conditions like turnover, organisational citizenship behaviours and productivity using the instruments. Attempts can be made to relate alienation and involvement in different spheres of life such as work, family and community.

More meaningful cross-cultural validity and generalisability of findings can be established relating to job and work involvement. Randall and Cole (1991) pointed to the pivotal role that job involvement plays in a unified theory of work commitment construct as they found that job involvement directly and strongly influenced organisational commitment. Similarly Huselid and Day (1991) also found the presence of a commitment - involvement interaction.
5.6 NATURE OF JOB INVOLVEMENT

The nature of job involvement in the five units can be ascertained by comparing the Mean Values that have been computed.

22 TABLE SHOWING THE MEAN VALUES OF JOB INVOLVEMENT FOR FIVE UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.9405</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.9457</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.7656</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.8508</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.9329</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean value of job involvement is highest in Unit II. It could probably be suggested that the Executives have identified themselves with their jobs. They are also aware of their ability to perform well on the job. Further their job helps in satisfying their needs. Amongst the five units Unit III has the least Mean Value. This shows that Executives of that Unit are relatively less involved in their job when compared to executives in other units.

A classification of the number of executives based on the total scores was found out to ascertain the levels of Job Involvement. Section II of the questionnaire contains 14 statements covering Job and Work Involvement.
The statements were valued on a 5 point Likert Scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The total score of each respondent for all the statements was ascertained. The score range that determined the three levels were 14 statements X 3 (value) = 42 and below, which comprised the first or the low level. The second comprised the score range of 43 to 55 being the second or moderate level and the third or the high level category had a score of 56 and above.

23 TABLE SHOWING THE LEVELS OF JOB INVOLVEMENT AMONGST EXECUTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Job Involvement</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>% to Total (approx.)</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>42 &amp; Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>43 to 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>56 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7 JOB INVOLVEMENT AND PERSONAL DATA

Using personal data, a profile of the Executives experiencing low, moderate and high levels of involvement in their job can be drawn up with the help of Chi-Square Test. Cross tabulation of Job Involvement and positions occupied by Executives was prepared. Results are given in the table below.
### Table Showing Association Between Job Involvement and Position of Executives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Involvement Level</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Row %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Table Value at 5% level of Significance</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.56104</td>
<td>.01363</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.65510</td>
<td>.01309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the table confirm that there is significant association between the levels of job involvement and the positions that Executives occupy. The reason attributable to the above relationship could be that, as the complexities of the job increases i.e. additional responsibilities, decision-making activities, risk factor involved etc, the extent of involvement in the job also increases. As an employee moves up in the hierarchy the job becomes more varied, less monotonous, complex and hence the increased involvement. Research work by Herzberg 1968, Lawler & Hall 1970 suggests that where greater responsibility and autonomy is provided on the job, employees were likely to be more involved in them.
Considering the second personal data, it was expected that an association of job involvement would be significant with experience of Executives. Those Executives with a higher tenure period would be more involved in their jobs than the Executives with less work experience. However, the results proved contrary. The table below would help examine this outcome.

### 25 TABLE SHOWING ASSOCIATION BETWEEN JOB INVOLVEMENT AND EXPERIENCE OF EXECUTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Job Involvement</th>
<th>Less than 5 yrs.</th>
<th>5-9 Yrs.</th>
<th>10-14 Yrs.</th>
<th>15-19 Yrs.</th>
<th>20 &amp; above Yrs.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Row %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Table Value at 5% level of Significance</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>1.71413</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>.98856</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>1.71874</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.98845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence Correspondence Analysis was used to highlight any latent or hidden association. From the map it is seen that executives with an experience record of 5-9 years and 10-14 years showed high involvement in their job.

To a certain extent executives with 15-19 years of experience also exhibit high involvement in their jobs. It is quite probable to find young, enthusiastic and energetic Executives to be equally involved in their jobs along with experienced and ‘seasoned’ Executives side by side.
MAP SHOWING ASSOCIATION BETWEEN JOB INVOLVEMENT LEVELS AND WORK EXPERIENCE OF EXECUTIVES

Low J1

< 5 Yrs
5-9 Yrs
10-14 Yrs
High J1
15-19 Yrs

Moderate J1

20 Yrs & above

Factor 1 (92%) Horizontal Work Experience < > Factor 2 (8½%) Vertical Job Involvement Levels
Anantharaman and Deivasenapathy (1980)\(^7\) reported that managers had higher job involvement than supervisors and workers. Hence it could be suggested in this study generally that, job involvement was found to be high with Executives who had put in a number of years of service being 5-9 years, 10-14 years and 15-19 years in their organisations. Cross tabulation between Job Involvement and age group of Executives has also been calculated.

### Table Showing Association Between Job Involvement and Age Group of Executives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Involvement Level</th>
<th>Less than 30 yrs</th>
<th>31-45 yrs</th>
<th>46-55 yrs</th>
<th>56 yrs &amp; above</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
<th>Row %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHI-Square Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Table value at 5% Level of significance</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>5.42294</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>.49082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>5.77773</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another demographic factor which has a close association with tenure is age group of Executives. It was presumed that older executives would be more involved in their jobs than young executives.
B. MAP SHOWING ASSOCIATION BETWEEN JOB INVOLVEMENT LEVELS AND AGE GROUP OF EXECUTIVES
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Factor 1 (78%) Horizontal Age Group

< > Factor 2 (22%) Vertical Job Involvement Levels
Though no significant association resulted from the Chi-square test a careful examination of the map drawn using Correspondence Analysis technique showed that the executives in the age group of 31-45 years and 46-55 years are highly involved in their job.

The results of the association between age group and job involvement of executives falls in line with the experience of the executives and their significant relationship with job involvement.

Hence it could be concluded that tenure and age group of executives have a positive relationship with Executive’s involvement in the job.

Job involvement and educational qualification of executives were also associated to find any significant relationship between them. The chi-square test did not show any significant association between the two factors.

27 TABLE SHOWING ASSOCIATION BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION OF EXECUTIVES AND THEIR JOB INVOLVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Involvement Levels</th>
<th>UG &amp; PG</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
<th>Row %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi - Square Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35811</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.48248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAP SHOWING ASSOCIATION BETWEEN JOB INVOLVEMENT AND EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION OF EXECUTIVES

Low JI

High JI

Other

Factor 1 (80%) Horizontal Educational Qualification <-> Factor 2 (20%) Vertical Job Involvement Levels
On a close examination of the map drawn with the help of Correspondence Analysis, it is seen that executives with a Graduate or Post Graduate degree showed high level of involvement in their job, while Professional Executives showed moderate job involvement.

It is quite probable to expect professionals to have greater exposure to application orientation work and hence feel familiarity in handling situations, while executives with a basic or PG degree tend to learn from experience on the job.

Those with a diploma degree experienced low involvement in their jobs as they lack the necessary skills and understanding required on the job.

Job involvement and Income of Executives were also associated to find if any relationship existed between them. The table below shows the results.

### TABLE SHOWING AN ASSOCIATION BETWEEN JOB INVOLVEMENT AND GROSS MONTHLY INCOME OF EXECUTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Involvement Level</th>
<th>Less than Rs.7500</th>
<th>Rs.7501-Rs.15000</th>
<th>Rs.15001-Rs.22500</th>
<th>Rs.22501 &amp; above</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
<th>Row %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Table value at 5% Level of significance</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>2.61741</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>.85510</td>
<td>Not Signt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>2.62260</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. MAP SHOWING ASSOCIATION BETWEEN JOB INVOLVEMENT LEVELS AND GROSS MONTHLY INCOME OF EXECUTIVES
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The Chi-square test did not bring out any association between job involvement and gross monthly income of Executives. Previous research has suggested that an employee will be involved in his job only when it has the capacity or the potentiality to satisfy both the extrinsic and intrinsic needs of the individual.

On applying Correspondence Analysis technique the map showed only a proximity between executives earning Rs. 7501 - Rs.15000 and moderate job involvement of Executives.

Finally job involvement was not found to be associated with the Department or Division the Executives work in. This can be explained further with the help of the table below. The nature of work in the different departments to a certain extent has an impact on the level of involvement in the job though statistically the results do not support this view. Bass (1965) for instance suggests that opportunity to make decisions, chance to set one's own work pace and degree to which the job requires the use of an ability or characteristic (Vroom 1964 & Iverson & Reuder 1956) may be different in the departments.

29 TABLE SHOWING AN ASSOCIATION BETWEEN JOB INVOLVEMENT AND THE DEPARTMENTS THAT EXECUTIVES WORK IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Involvement Levels</th>
<th>F-1</th>
<th>F-2</th>
<th>F-3</th>
<th>F-4</th>
<th>F-5</th>
<th>F-6</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Row %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Map showing association between job involvement levels and departments executives work in.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Table Value at 5% significance</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>6.87193</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>.73748</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>6.73815</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On applying Correspondence Analysis technique the map showed that Executives in the Production (F1) and the Systems Departments (F3) experienced high involvement in their jobs. Those in the Marketing Division (F6) also showed a moderate level of involvement in their jobs.

### 5.7.1 Profile of Executives Involved in their Jobs

The Chi-square tests and Correspondence Analysis help in drawing up a profile of executives involved in their jobs.

It can be comprehended that Middle Level executives having work experience of 10-14 years in the organisation and falling in the age group of 31-45 years with a varied educational background either working for the Marketing Production or Systems Departments show a range of moderate to high involvement in their job.

While Executives in the Senior level having a tenure of 15-19 years in the organisation, comprising largely the age group of 46-55 years either working in the Production and Systems Departments show a high level of involvement in their job.
5.8 PERSON-CULTURE FIT AND JOB INVOLVEMENT

Research has shown that just as similar backgrounds, attitudes and experience can increase liking between individuals (Tsiu & O'Reilly 1989) it may be that organisations that manifest and reward characteristic outcomes and behaviours will be more or less attractive to different types of people. Values provide the starting point with the joint processes of selection and socialisation acting as complementary means to insure person-organisation fit Chatman (1988).

Much of the previous research has also suggested that person-culture fit increases commitment, satisfaction and performance but very little empirical research on these relationships has been done. The general research question examined here is the following:

To what extent is person-culture fit associated with job involvement of Executives. It was expected to find that high levels of person-culture fit would be positively associated with job involvement of such executives and low levels of person-culture fit would be negatively associated with job involvement.

To examine the above stated hypothesis a Chi-square test was undertaken to determine the association between person-culture fit and Job Involvement of Executives. The results of the table below confirm the above statement.
### Table Showing the Association Between Clusters and Job Involvement of Executives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Job Involvement</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Row % (Approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cluster 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Cluster 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Cluster 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chi-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Table value of at 5% significance</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>16.43777</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>.00248</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>16.46264</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical results to a large extent help prove any relationship between the two concepts for the purpose of extensive examination. A careful observation of the table would reveal that 80/158 of the Executives in Cluster 1 who experience high person-culture fit also have high job involvement, the % being approximately 51%. Similarly 68/158 Executives i.e. approximately 43% with a high person-culture fit are moderately involved in their job and fall under Cluster 1. In Cluster 2 the Executives with moderate person-culture fit also experience moderate level of involvement in their jobs, % being 60% (12/20). Again Cluster 3 which comprises of low person-culture fit level of
Executives 1/53 i.e. 2% of them experience low job involvement, the cluster though largely comprises of Executives 37/53 (70%) with moderate level of job involvement. Hence it can be concluded that executives with high, moderate and low person-culture fit levels correspondingly show high, moderate and low involvement in their jobs.

The conclusion that can be drawn from the above is that there is a significant association between person-culture fit levels of executives and their involvement in the jobs.

5.9 CHAPTER SUMMARY

To sum up the outcomes of this chapter it has been observed that executives of Unit II show high involvement in their job. Those in Unit III show low involvement in their jobs.

To understand the difference in the levels of Job Involvement existing among executives three categories of low, moderate and high job involvement levels emerged.

A profile of the executives who showed high involvement in their job belonged to the senior level with a tenure of 15-19 years falling in the age group of 46-55 years and working either in the Production and Systems Departments.
To probe the objective of the association between person-culture fit clusters and levels of job involvement amongst executives the Chi-Square results confirmed this relationship.

Hence it can be concluded that executives with high person-culture fit (Cluster 1) showed high level of job involvement while those with low person-culture fit (Cluster 3) experienced low level of job involvement. Those moderately fit executives of Cluster 2 showed moderate level of involvement in their jobs.
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