

Employee Involvement – A Study Based on Selected Public Undertakings

Dr. Souvik Dutta,

Department of Business Administration,
B. B. College, Asansol,
West Bengal, India.

ABSTRACT

The success of an organization, largely, depends on its employees' commitment towards it. But in this present competitive labour market, organizations are, mostly, experiencing retention challenges. Sometimes, to shorten their employee cost, presently, organizations are hiring different contingent categories of employees, such as, contractual, temporary, part time, etc., along with permanent employees. In this advent, the present study has analyzed the impact of employees' type of employment on their overall job involvement using Mann-Whitney Mean Rankings.

Keywords: retention, employees' commitment, contingent, labour market.

INTRODUCTION:

Organizational functioning has undergone a dramatic change with the advent of liberalization, privation and globalization (LPG) concept of early 1990's. In India, too, the same has imposed several threats, in attaining, diverse organizational objective.

In this regard, employees, who work on it, can play a very important role. So, procurement of competent and dedicated workforce is becoming more critical. But how this workforce can be retained is appearing much more important, for overall, success and development of an organization. In such a positive environment, employees' commitment meets with the vision and mission of their organization.

Modern HRM concept has evolved, from the traditional approach of, health and happiness to welfare to personnel management to "a strategic partners, sharing comparable bedroom status. In this purpose in mid 1980's, it has taken assistance from diverse disciplines, such as, accounting, marketing and finance (Ferris, et.al .2000).

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE:

How does employee behave at work, often depends on, how he feels about being in organization. Employees have attitudes or viewpoints, about several aspects of their jobs, careers, and organizations, are normally considered as an important antecedent of turnover domestically. But surprisingly, the same has received a very little attention in global researches (Naumann, 1993; 62). More than half a century, peoples' attitudes, about different facets of job, were thought to be the major consideration of their work environment. However, the last few decades have witnessed an "affective revolution" in organizational psychology (Barsade, Brief, and Spataro, 2003). Lesabe and Nkosi (2007) have written that employee commitment has an impact on overall functioning of organizations in their literature. Jiang and Klein (2001) have mentioned that high employee commitment is a prominent feature of world class organizations. But, unfortunately, even the best – performing organizations do experience turnover, lack of job – satisfaction and commitment related problems. In a recent study by Kodikal and others (2016) have studied the influence of QWL on organizational commitment and identified a positive relationship between these two. Research exposure on job involvement is comparatively of recent phenomena in the field of organizational psychology. Alternatively, the term job involvement has been discussed by Mckelvey

and Sekaran (1977) as the merging of a person's ego identity with his or her job. In a study conducted by Pathak, R. D., in 1977, utilizing a sample of 150 bank officers from four major public sector banks in India was investigated the inter – relationship between job involvement and need satisfaction. Morrow in 1983 has written that there is a positive relationship between job involvement and organizational commitment. Kanungo in 1982 has identified the relationship between job involvement and other numerous variables like job characteristics, performance, turnover and absenteeism. Rahiman and Kodikal (2017) have investigated different facets of employee-attitude and its impact on their overall performance and another study was undertaken by Annink and others (2015) to identify the factors that create work-family conflicts. In a recent study by Kodikal and others (2016) have studied the influence of QWL on organizational commitment and identified a positive relationship between these two. Research exposure on job involvement is comparatively of recent phenomena in the field of organizational psychology. Walia (2015) has mentioned that job stress should be minimized for increasing an individual job involvement.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

We have identified the different factors, such as - (i) Communication, (ii) information, (iii) voice, (iv) welfare, (v) equality, (vi) recognition, (vii) pay, (viii) promotion, (ix) autonomy, (x) role stressors, (xi) job specific training, (xii) size of the organization, (xiii) responsibility, (xiv) feeling of achievement, (xv) relationship between subordinate and peers, (xvi) workload, (xvii) meaningfulness, (xviii) QWL, (xix) morale, (xx) accountability, (xxi) leadership, (xxii) CSR, (xxiii) paid training and tuition reimbursement, (xxiv) company policy and administration, (xxv) interesting job, (xxvi) treatment, (xxvii) employment alternatives, (xxviii) job scope, (xxix) job tenure, (xxx) job level, (xxxi) mutual trust, (xxxii) job involvement, (xxxiii) turnover, (xxxiv) job performance, (xxxv) respect attached with the job among others, (xxxvi) education, (xxxvii) organizational dependency, (xxxviii) job esteem, (xxxix) attitude of the family and friends, (xxxx) age, (xxxxi) supervisor's Support, (xxxxii) working hours, (xxxxiii) staffroom environment, (xxxxiv) leave and its sanctioning process, (xxxxv) academic achievements, (xxxxvi) library facility and (xxxxvii) self-control, to be relevant for this study through extensive literature review.

Further for the analysis I have used Mann – Whitney Mean Ranking for this purpose of analysis and comparison. As we have seen that, it can be appropriately used for analyzing data from an independent-measures design with two different conditions.

Primary data source has been the major source of our information. For this purpose, 764 sample questionnaires (ASQ) were distributed among the two categories of employees – permanent and temporary. On return, we received 590 filled-up questionnaires; of which, 294 were from permanent and 296 were from temporary employees respectively. After using Mann – Whitney Mean Rankings, the following implications of different elements, can be made:

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION:

Communication:

Communication plays an important role, towards enhancement of employee involvement, in an organization. But in our study, the feedback, relating to temporary employees, is showing a picture of dissatisfaction, in this context of communication. Most of the times, these employees get limited scope of proper communication from their management concerned. It may be for the reason of contractual employees' inability of holding, a permanent and responsible position, in their respective organization.

Fairness in the Matter of Receipt of Accurate Information:

Another clear picture of dissatisfaction, in terms of information participation of the temporary employees, can be seen from the outcome of Mann – Whitney Mean Rankings that we have applied in our present study. Inadequate information sharing, directly or indirectly related to their job and the organization, might be considered 'responsible' at this end.

Voice:

The temporary employees do not get any or gets limited scope for participation, in organizational decision making procedure, or their opinion, hardly, becomes the decision of their organization. This is the most significant reason, here, in bringing higher mean ranking in MW test.

Employee Welfare:

The permanent employees' mean ranking, in MW test, has appeared slightly higher, than that of, the temporary employees' mean ranking. The requirement and expectation of permanent employees are more from their

respective organization and the same has got an involvement, in their slightly higher mean outcome and unfavourable attitude, over this element.

Equitable Treatment:

The temporary employees are treated, individually, and for that reason, they face inequalities in their respective organization. This particular point can be highlighted as the most important reason behind their comparatively higher mean ranking in MW test.

Recognition:

The temporary employees' achievements get improper recognition and attention in their respective organization. As a result of that, it has brought higher mean ranking, for them, here, in this context.

Pay and Contingent Pay:

There is nothing specified and clearly defined, in terms of pay and contingent pay, temporary employees of different selected PSUs. It has put them in the hands of situation and management. These are the reasons that might be treated responsible in bringing higher mean ranking, for them, here.

Promotion:

The temporary employees don't get any scope for getting a promotion, from lower to higher order, in their respective organization. They leave the organization from the exactly same designation, that they joined, if, they want to continue their present assignment. These are the things that have got a reflection here, in this context of, promotion.

Autonomy:

The activities of temporary employees are minutely and strictly monitored by their respective supervisors. It leaves a narrow space, for independent decision making and self – control, for them. This should be treated as the most important reason, behind their higher mean ranking here.

Role Stressors:

Because of the nature and importance of their present assignment the permanent employees face more work – related stress than the temporary employees of different selected public undertakings. This is the reason that might be considered responsible, in this regard of higher mean ranking in MW test.

Job Specific Training:

The temporary employees get very little scope and consideration, from their respective organization, in this context of job specific training. They normally do some technical and stereo – typed activities that do not require, much, job specific training at the end. These are the things might be considered responsible, in this regard of higher mean ranking of contractual employees, in MW test, we have applied in our study.

Size of the Organization:

This particular element has failed to add any significant and positive mileage in the work-life and general employee - attitude of temporary employees. Rather, we can further say that, they are dissatisfied with the practices of their so called large organization, they are currently, employed with. So, these are the things, we can consider, responsible here for bringing higher mean ranking, for them, in MW test.

Responsibility:

The temporary employees consider themselves 'less responsible' in their concerned organization. Their present service conditions and current assignment has made them, thinking, in that way and the same has got a reflection in their comparatively higher mean ranking here.

Feeling of Achievement:

The temporary employees' achievements are, hardly, counted by their management concerned. Besides that, their involvement, mostly with technical and stereo – typed activities, has also lessened their chances, of achieving, something new. These are the reasons that might be considered behind their higher mean ranking, in this context of, feeling of achievement.

Relationship with the Subordinate and Peers:

The comparatively higher mean ranking of temporary employees, in MW test, may be because of their viewpoint, that they are hired for certain purposes and the attainment of the same may curtail their work – life. Besides that, they are also more interested, in getting, a suitable alternative, so that, they can leave this assignment. These are things that always restrict them in creating a good relationship with subordinate and peers in their respective organization.

Work – load:

The comparative higher mean ranking of temporary employees, relating to work – load, can be explained as their unacceptability of the statement, we asked to them, in form of Attitude Sample Questionnaire (ASQ) . As they are bound to accept extra work – load, in form of overtime or something else for some extra earnings for

their family, they work beyond their specific work time, if, available. We have already mentioned that nothing is specific, for them, and it varies from organization to organization. These are things, might be taken, as influential in this regard.

Meaningfulness:

The temporary employees don't get or get very, little, scope of applying their existing knowledge, skills and abilities, at work. This has made their work 'negatively meaningful' to them. Besides that, their involvement, in doing stereo – typed activities, may also be considered, significant, in this context. So, these are things that may be considered behind their comparative much higher ranking, here, in this context.

Quality of Work – life:

The quality of work – life is a very important element that covers a broad spectrum of employee satisfaction at work. The term 'quality of work life' denotes all the components that an organization provides to its employees to bring satisfaction at work and, thereby, enhancement organizational efficiencies can be made (Walton, 1985). Various elements, such as, adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working condition, immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities, prospective scope for sustainable growth and security, social components inherited in work environment, establishing 'rule of law' at the work, balancing of work with life and social relevance of the work, etc., have been identified as helpful, in bringing, positive QWL at work (Walton, 1985). The temporary employees may also have some expectations, relating to QWL, from their present organization and assignment. But, unfortunately, most of the above mentioned elements are remain unavailable to them and this particular thinking, of them, is being reflected here in their unfavourable attitude and comparatively higher mean ranking here.

Morale:

Here also the mean ranking, of temporary employees, has appeared comparatively higher than that of the permanent employees. They don't consider, themselves, as the possessor of, exceptionally high morale. They are de-motivated with their existing autonomy, responsibility, scope of development, participation in organizational decision making, terms of employment, etc., in their concerned organization and that has made them unhappy in this regard

Accountability:

The present service condition or terms of employment, of permanent employees, can be treated as the most import reason behind their higher mean ranking here in this regard.

Leadership Style:

The temporary employees get insufficient scope to take part in organizational decision making procedures. Besides that, improper information sharing, faulty communication system towards them, etc, should be mentioned in this regard. So, whatever decision they are asked to implement appears to them as 'imposed on them'. We can consider these reasons might be behind their higher mean ranking in this regard.

Corporate Social Responsibility:

The temporary employees, of selected undertakings, don't possess the same viewpoint, like permanent employees, over this element. The most of CSR initiatives, of their organization, remain unknown to them and as a reason of that, it does not appear as an important matter to them. So, these are the influential things might be behind the slightly higher mean-ranking of tem, here, in this context.

Paid Training and Tuition Reimbursement:

The temporary employees, hardly, get a scope for skill up – gradation in their respective organization. To them, participation in paid training and tuition reimbursement appears nothing but a day – dream. Besides that, their involvement, in doing, mostly technical activities also curtail the same. All these matters have got a reflection in their comparative higher mean ranking here.

Company Policy and Administration:

Here also, the comparative higher mean ranking of temporary employees can be explained as their dissatisfaction, over this element, - company policy and administration. In our selected organizations, we have seen that most of the company policy and administration is permanent employee focused and oriented.

Job Challenge / Interesting Job:

Everyone likes that kind of job that is interesting and challenging, in nature. But the job, temporary employees are presently assigned to do, in their respective organization, is monotonous, in nature, and there is no challenge at all. Ultimately, it has made them dissatisfied in this context and the same has got a reflection in their respective comparative higher mean ranking, over this element, challenging / interesting job.

Employment Alternatives:

It has already been discussed that, the permanent employees hold a secure work – life that they can continue till

their superannuation. So, they are less interested to move further. This particular thinking, of them, has got a reflection in their higher mean output, in this regard of, employment alternatives than that of the temporary employees.

Job Scope:

Involvement, in doing routine technical activities, mostly, has made the job scope of temporary employees a narrow one. This particular consideration might be taken as the significant reason behind their comparative higher ranking, here, in this context.

Job Tenure:

This has already been discussed, in the previous parts of our study, that, the temporary employees are, normally, hired for attainment of certain purposes, and with this attainment, a temporary employment may come to an end. So, it is clear that, this type of employment is of shorter span and may come to end with the attainment of suitable alternative by them (temporary employees) as well. The above mentioned reasons might have got their involvement in bringing comparative higher mean ranking, over this element, job tenure.

Job Level:

The temporary employees' dissatisfaction over the organizational inputs, offered to them, such as, no scope of promotion, shorter span of control, etc. might be considered responsible in bringing comparative much higher mean ranking, for them, here, in this context of job level in their respective organization.

Mutual Trust:

The temporary employees get limited scope of building formal and informal association within themselves. As it is known to them that, their assignment is of temporary, in nature, and comparatively of shorter span. They are always more focused, on getting a suitable alternative, so that, they can leave their present assignment. All these things might be behind their comparative higher mean ranking in Mann Whitney test.

Job Involvement:

The comparative higher mean ranking of temporary employees can be treated as the manifestation of their non-involvement, in their job, once again. Insufficient organizational inputs, low QWL, improper scope of skill up-gradation, involvement in doing monotonous activities, low morale, etc., might be considered responsible, in this regard of, job involvement.

Turnover:

The turnover rate, of temporary employees, is, exceptionally, higher in these selected public undertakings and the same has got a reflection in their comparative higher ranking, here. Because of, insufficient organizational inputs offered to them, the approach of their respective management to them, shorter work-span, etc., they are more interested in searching suitable alternative outside. Ultimately, that increases their positive intention to leave the present assignment and join another organization, where they will be able to get, some positive atmosphere to work.

Job Performance:

We have already seen that the temporary employees, of selected undertakings, are suffering from insufficient organizational inputs, engaged in doing conventional type of work with lesser challenges, shorter span of activities, uncertain job tenure or rather job insecurity, etc. As a result of that, it has made them unhappy in this context.

Respect attached with the job among others:

The inability of temporary employees, to hold a responsible position, undefined scope of career progression, unavailability of other relevant organizational inputs, social status, etc., have forced them to rate, negatively, over this element. These are the things might be considered, responsible, here, in this context of comparatively higher mean ranking of them.

Education:

The temporary employees get little scope of learning because of their comparatively smaller span of activities. As a result of that, it restricts them, in facing, much work-related challenges. Apart from that, their limited scope of independent decision making, inadequate scope of skill up-gradation, ineligibility for getting a promotion, engage mostly in doing routine and monotonous work, etc., might be considered as some of the influencing factors, behind their comparative higher mean ranking, here.

Organizational Dependency:

In this context, also, we can see a comparatively higher mean ranking in MW test that we have used for the purpose of our present study. In case of temporary employees, employed in different selected undertakings, the bonding between them and their organization is not at all strong. So, the organizational dependency, to them, has also appeared, negative, comparison to permanent employees.

Job Esteem:

The dissatisfaction of temporary employees is being manifested, here, in their comparatively higher mean ranking in MW test, over this element. The inability of their management concerned, in treating them, -‘people with potentialities for organizational development’ – has got a reflection here.

Attitude of the family and friends:

The temporary employees receive improper compensation, limited scope of development, no scope of promotion, with limited or no scope of say in organizational decision making and functioning, holding of less responsible position, etc., in their concerned organization. It has made them unhappy. As a result of that, the same has brought a comparatively higher mean ranking for them, here, in this context.

Age: The temporary employees don’t have any specific and defined career progression procedure, compare to permanent employees, in their respective organization. The same has, negatively, motivated them, in this context. As a result of that, young and talented employees, if they are not getting suitable job, then only join, in that type of assignment, or an experience employee, when he is not getting a proper and appropriate place to move further, remains with the organization. All these things are being reflected in the comparative higher mean ranking of temporary employees, in this context of, age.

Supervisor’s Support:

A nurturing behavior with proper technical competency, providing adequate help and assistance to his subordinates, lesser safety hazards, fair promotional opportunities, supervising not too closely, will allow some minimum autonomy and job with enriching demands, etc., are some of the pre-requisites for a supervisor, to promote, Quality of Work Life (popularly known as QWL) in an organization (Pattanayak, B., Human Resource Management, pp. 250 – 252). Here the temporary employees don’t get much assistance, in time of doing their work and the behaviour of respective supervisor does not appear nurturing at all to them. He (supervisor) does not allow them much autonomy, unfair promotional policy; close monitoring, etc., might be behind their higher mean ranking, than that of, the permanent employees.

Working Hours:

The temporary employees don’t enjoy that much flexibility in their allotted working hours, comparison to their permanent colleagues. This has made them dissatisfied and the same is being exhibited by them, in their comparatively higher mean ranking in MW test.

Staffroom Environment:

The temporary employees are ‘hardly’ provided a staff-room, where they can enjoy their pause time properly, increases some informal association within themselves, etc. These are things might be considered, responsible, here, for their comparatively much higher mean ranking, in this context, than the permanent employees (who are normally provided a well – equipped staff room, for spending, their leisure time) of different selected public undertakings.

Leave and its sanctioning process:

The temporary employees are entitled to get very limited number of paid leaves and beyond that everything is treated as ‘no work no pay’, for them, or they may be retrenched as well, if, they require a long leave. These are the things might be considered significant here, for them, in bringing comparative higher mean output, in this context of, leave and its sanctioning process.

Academic Achievements:

The temporary employees’ holding of a stagnant position, that means their ineligibility to get a promotion, and limited scope of development does not require much achievements ‘academically’. If so require, the rate is very low and negligible. Some time, their holding, of less responsible position, does not make their achievements eligible for counting by their respective higher authority, as well. The above mentioned reasons might be behind their comparatively higher mean ranking in MW test.

Library Facility:

We have already seen that the temporary employees are totally dissatisfied with their present job assignment. It has made them less interested in self-enrichment and development, of them, by doing library works. Some time, an odd difference with the permanent employees, in terms of book – lending, can easily be seen, here. So, these are things, we can consider, to be, behind their comparative much higher ranking over this element.

Lack of Control:

The temporary employees’ holding of less responsible position, minute and strict monitoring by their supervisors concerned, leaving lesser space for independent decision making, etc., have made the term ‘self - control’ to ‘externally – controlled’ to them. As a result of that, we have got a comparative higher mean ranking, for them, over this element - lack of control.

From the above discussion, it is prevalent that, the mean of Type – 2 (temporary) employees has come out with comparatively higher mean rankings than the Type - 1 (permanent) employees, except, in the areas of welfare, role – stressors and accountability. The reason of that comparatively higher mean of Type – 2, i.e. – temporary employees, may be due to the reason of their negative attitude, dissatisfaction or unacceptability of the statement, we asked to them, in form of ASQ. Alternatively, in case of welfare, stressors and accountability the same thing has happened to the Type – 1 i.e. - permanent employees.

CONCLUSION:

In conclusion it can be said that the factors, mentioned above, are influential in temporary work life. But, despite the several negative implications, practice of engaging temporary employees, from contractors and indirect sources, are still largely practiced. But considering them in diverse activities, providing them some sort of information about the organization, involving them in organizational decision making process, recognition for the good work done by them, employee friendly company policy and administration, democratic leadership style, proper working environment, consideration for training, equal treatment, enlarging their area of functioning, creating a sense of organizational dependency, flexible work – time, paid annual leaves and medical leave, an equipped staffroom, encouraging for further education, performance based pay, etc. might be considered, for them, and can be provided, to them, with a very little problems. Later on, that may appear helpful, in increasing, their morale, positive involvement and commitment with less turnover intentions.

Table: Mann-Whitney Mean Rankings

Name of the Elements	Type of Employment	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Communication	1	294	234.8	69031
	2	296	355.79	105314
	Total	590		
Information	1	294	257.42	75680.5
	2	296	333.33	98664.5
	Total	590		
Voice	1	294	217.13	63837.5
	2	296	373.34	110507.5
	Total	590		
Welfare	1	294	300.34	88300
	2	296	290.69	86045
	Total	590		
Equality	1	294	241.65	71044.5
	2	296	348.99	103300.5
	Total	590		
Recognition	1	294	242.41	71269
	2	296	348.23	103076
	Total	590		
Pay	1	294	251.36	73899.5
	2	296	339.34	100445.5
	Total	590		
Promotion	1	294	164.67	48412
	2	296	425.45	125933
	Total	590		
Autonomy	1	294	229.09	67353.5
	2	296	361.46	106991.5
	Total	590		
Stressors	1	294	352.72	103700.5
	2	296	238.66	70644.5
	Total	590		
Training	1	294	219.15	64430
	2	296	371.33	109915

Name of the Elements	Type of Employment	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
	Total	590		
Size	1	294	277.04	81450.5
	2	296	313.83	92894.5
	Total	590		
Responsibility	1	294	288.34	84771
	2	296	302.61	89574
	Total	590		
Achievement	1	294	262.66	77223.5
	2	296	328.11	97121.5
	Total	590		
Relationship	1	294	279.92	82296
	2	296	310.98	92049
	Total	590		
Workload	1	294	287.66	84573
	2	296	302.31	89182
	Total	590		
Meaningfulness	1	294	189.4	56684.5
	2	296	400.88	118660.5
	Total	590		
QWL	1	294	250.13	73539
	2	296	340.56	100806
	Total	590		
Morale	1	294	256.73	75477.5
	2	296	334.01	98867.5
	Total	590		
Accountability	1	294	320.18	93813
	2	296	270.07	79942
	Total	590		
Leadership	1	294	288.45	84804.5
	2	296	302.5	89540.5
	Total	590		
CSR	1	294	292.98	86135
	2	296	298.01	88210
	Total	590		
Reimbursement	1	294	206.43	60691.5
	2	296	383.27	113063.5
	Total	590		
Policy	1	294	285.87	84044.5
	2	296	305.07	90300.5
	Total	590		
Challenge	1	294	238.27	70050.5
	2	296	352.35	104294.5
	Total	590		
Treatment	1	294	242.53	71305
	2	296	348.11	103040
	Total	590		
Alternatives	1	294	280.49	82465
	2	296	310.41	91880
	Total	590		
Scope	1	294	241.52	71007
	2	296	349.11	103338
	Total	590		

Name of the Elements	Type of Employment	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Tenure	1	294	230.69	67824
	2	296	359.87	106521
	Total	590		
Level	1	294	175.46	51584
	2	296	414.73	122761
	Total	590		
Trust	1	294	251.17	73845
	2	296	339.53	100500
	Total	590		
Involvement	1	294	224.34	65955.5
	2	296	366.18	198389.5
	Total	590		
Turnover	1	294	204.38	60088
	2	296	386	114257
	Total	590		
Performance	1	294	248.04	72923.5
	2	296	342.64	101421.4
	Total	590		
Respect	1	294	207.02	60916.5
	2	296	383.02	113428.5
	Total	590		
Education	1	294	251.67	73991.5
	2	296	339.03	100353.5
	Total	590		
Dependency	1	294	209.39	61559.5
	2	296	381.03	112785.5
	Total	590		
Esteem	1	294	198.15	58255
	2	296	392.2	116090
	Total	590		
Attitude	1	294	198	58213
	2	296	392.34	116132
	Total	590		
Age	1	294	262.61	77208.5
	2	296	328.16	97136.5
	Total	590		
Supervisor	1	294	282.08	82932
	2	296	308.83	91413
	Total	590		
Worktime	1	294	266.08	78227
	2	296	324.72	96118
	Total	590		
Environment	1	294	239.24	70338
	2	296	351.38	104007
	Total	590		
Leave	1	294	195.06	57347
	2	296	395.26	116998
	Total	590		
Academic	1	294	226.15	66489
	2	296	364.38	107856
	Total	590		
Library	1	294	241.89	7114.5

Name of the Elements	Type of Employment	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
	2	296	348.75	103230.5
	Total	590		
Self-control	1	294	242.16	71196
	2	296	348.48	103149
	Total	590		

‘1’ - Permanent Employees and ‘2’ - Temporary Employees.

REFERENCES:

- Annink, A., et. al., (July, 2015). Work-family State Support.
- Barsade, S. G., Brief, A. P., and Spataro, S. E., (2003). The affective revolution in organizational behavior: The emergence of a paradigm, In Greenberg, J., (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science*, 2nd ed., pp. 3–51, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Farris, G.F., (2000). Rewards and retention of technical staff, IEEE, *International Engineering Management Conference*, pp.617-619.
- Kanungo, R.N., Mishra, S.B., and Dayal, I., (1975). Relationship of Job Involvement to Perceived Importance Satisfaction of Employee Needs, *International Review of Applied Psychology*, Vol.-24, pp.49-59.
- Kodikal, R., and Rahiman, Habeeb Ur, (2016). Influence of Quality of Work life on Organizational Commitment Amongst Employees in Manufacturing Sector, *International Journal in multidisciplinary and Academic Research*, 5(5), 2-30.
- Lesabe, Rankgoang Andrew-Face, and Nkosi, James, (2007). A Qualitative Exploration of Employees’ Views on Organizational Commitment, *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. - 5 (1), pp.35-44.
- Mckelvey, B., and Sekaran, U., (1977). Toward a career-based theory of job involvement: A study of scientists and engineers, *Administrative Science Quarter*, Vol.-22, pp.281-305.
- Morrow, P.C., (1993). The Theory and Measurement of Work Commitment, Jai Press, Greenwich.
- Naumann, E., (1993). Organizational predictors of expatriate job satisfaction, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24(1):61-81.
- Pathak, R. D., (Oct.-Dec., 1983). Job Involvement and Need Satisfaction of Bank Officers in India, Research Note, Dept. of Business Management, MDU, Rohtak, Vol.-8, No.-4, 297-301.
- Rahiman, Habeeb Ur., and Kodikal, R., (2017). Impact of Employee Work Related Attitude on Job Performance, British journal of Economics, *Finance and Management Sciences*, Vol. - 13(2), 93-105.
- Sharma, J., and Dhar, R. L., (2016). Factors Influencing Job Performance of Nursin Staff: Mediating Role of Affective Commitment, *Personnel Review*, 45(1), 161-182.
- Walia, K., (2015). Job Stress and Job Involvement: A Study of It Professionals from North India, *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, Vol.8(4).
- Walton, (1985). Cited in Pattanayak, B., *Human Resource Management*, pp. 250 – 252.
