

AN ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTIVATION AND JOB INVOLVEMENT OF NURSING PERSONNEL

DEEPA PANDEY

Amity University, MP, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

Human being is a social animal. So human beings want many things like food, a place to sleep, money and the feeling that we belong as a member of a group. Such terms as "wants", "desire" and "needs" describe the motivations that distinguish between the positive forces which impel us to work toward certain ends. Such terms as "fears" and "aversions" refer to negative forces which repel a person away from certain objects or conditions yet the two types of forces are similar in one respect they both initiate and sustain behavior and this we call motivation. "Wishing" and "wanting" describe the positive driving forces in us which direct our behavior toward an approach object: such an object would be the food sought by a hungry person.

People have a variety of physical, social and physiological needs and satisfying these needs become their personal goal. Organization has a variety of incentives to use to induce people to work. These incentives include money, job security, status, and recognition and challenging jobs. Employees will be motivated to work if they find these incentives attractive. If these rewards are satisfactory, the worker will repeat his productive behavior. If they are not satisfying the worker will be discouraged.

KEYWORDS: Food, A Place to Sleep, Money, Social Animal, Motivation "Wishing" and "Wanting"

INTRODUCTION

The most important thing in understanding human behavior at work is to know the way motivation interacts with level of skill to affect performance / involvement. Human activities depend largely upon retained habits and skills, which have been acquired through the process of learning. Furthermore, as the number of occasions or the time devoted to learning increases, the level of skill which is stored in memory also increases, up to some ceiling imposed by the capacities of the nervous system. The performance of human activities is affected by the amount of motivation. This could be explained by the following relation:

$$\text{Performance} = \text{Skill} \times \text{Motivation}$$

Objectives of the Study

The employee's job involvement is influenced by the job environment as well as personality variables. The study entitled "An analysis of relationship between motivation and job involvement of Nursing personnel" has the following objectives:

- To determine the impact of motivation in different areas on the job involvement in nursing personnel.
- To determine the impact of motivation in overall groups on the job involvement in nursing personnel.

Hypothesis

- There is significant difference between the mean job involvement scores of high and low motivation in 7 different dimensions of motivation.
- There is significant difference between the mean job involvement scores of high and low motivation in overall groups.

Literature Review

The conception of the effect of motivation is quite consistent with our everyday experience, which tells us that complete lack of motivation (a zero motivation) means no performance at all. In addition we know that a person of mediocre skill can sometimes beat an 'expert', if he is inspired with high motivation.

The powerful effects of added motivation are used extensively in industrial situation. Changing motivation can make a remarkable effect on production or motivation can make a tremendous difference in performance, not because it adds to skill, but because it multiplies with it. We can express this effect as a formula:

$$\text{Performance} = \text{Skill level} \times \text{motivation}$$

This multiplying effect of motivation may be observed in the performance of tasks presenting all types of human functioning. Industrial psychologists have historically been interested in specific aspects of task-oriented behaviour such as these in the hope that a better understanding would result in a more "satisfied" worker and or in increased work productivity.

Hawthorne studies (Rothlisberger and Dickson, 1939) gave important inputs to the study of motivational influence in performance and gave emphasis on supportive organizations relationship and climate as means to boost employee performance. Later, the behavioural theories of management pioneered by Argyris (1957), McGregor (1960) and Likert (1961) focused on motivational implications of job performance. Maslow (1943), Vroom (1964) and Herzberg et al (1959) focused on different aspects of work motivation and job performance. The role of motivational processes in determining worker's job performance is widely recognized by other industrial psychologists as well.

Bose (1958) concluded that the productivity is definitely influenced by some psychological factors like, attitudes and job satisfaction.

Feather (1961), and Forehand and Gilmer (1964) discussed the interaction between personalities and job qualities leading to high efficiency of workers. Ganguly (1961) emphasized that employee productivity is a function of the number and strength of needs that must be satisfied through higher production, the degree of probability that high productivity will satisfy these needs and the amount of increase in productivity that will be required to satisfy these needs. Thus he stressed upon need fulfillment and expectancy as related to employee productivity.

Pervin (1968) treated performance as a function of the interaction between the characteristics of the individual and those of the environment. Pestonjee and Akhtar (1969) studied the relative significance of ten intrinsic factors in motivating workers. Advancement participation and Recognition were rated more important than pay in their study.

Allen (1973) has proposed a theory 'M' for management. On the basis of a survey of the opinions of 289 managers, he concluded that behaviour is influenced by complex psychological, biological, social and economic factors.

Most people tend to be concerned with their own needs and objectives.

Sinha and Gupta (1974) indicated that higher the need satisfaction the more regular was the worker at the job. England, Dhinga and Agrawal (1974) studied the relationship between job success and job value. They have reported a correlation of .35 between these two variables. Kun, Parsons and Ruble (1974), Anderson and Butzin, and O' Reny and Roberts (1975) suggested that a person will be motivated to perform well when he perceives his job as requiring to use abilities that he values.

Bose (1978) studied the relationship between organizational stress and managerial performance. The sample consisted of 59 managers at three levels in a large business organization, The study reveals that the performance score of upper level managers correlated significantly with organizational stress scores. Mathur and Sharma (1978) reported that the job performance of skilled workers in industries seems to be related to the attitudes towards working climate, particularly those giving satisfaction to higher order needs in Maslow's need hierarchy theory.

Singh, Gupta and Data (1979) pointed out from their studies that prediction of performance from motivation and ability information obeys an averaging rule in India, and that the difference between Indians and Americans in this attribution task reflects true cultural differences.

This study on 62 employees from a printing press revealed that there was significant positive correlation between performance and attitude towards supervisor and pay.

Sharma and Mathur (1981) investigated the relationship between employee's values and their job performance. The analysis revealed that some values are positively related to job performance of Industrial workers.

Gupta, Pestonjee and Singh (1982) reported participation and job anxiety play an important role in determining the level of performance of blue-collar workers, this study was conducted in a textile firm, with a sample of 150 workers, in India. Sharma and Mathur (1982) reported that the correlates of job satisfaction are not the same. Therefore, a simplistic assumption that a satisfied employee is the better performer will not be very appropriate.

Lai (1984) in a study of library personnel reported that certain psychological variables like fulfillment of security, social and esteem needs, internally in loss of control, job satisfaction and job- involvement are significant contributors of job performance.

Chatterjee (1984) reported that Incentive Schemes i.e financial incentive schemes are under Indian conditions, a great motivation. Sharma's (1986) study indicated that internal factors, within the worker and within the job opportunity influence the job performance.

Singh (1988) found in his study, that motivation had a positive correlation with productivity. It is the human being who is responsible for the = productivity in organizations. If he has the necessary knowledge, motivation, skills and the right kind of attitude, he can improve the productivity in his area.

Lahiri and Srivastava (1967) contrast two job factors to illustrate that -individuals attributed dissatisfaction to environmental factors rather than to self.

Rao (1972), and Rao and Rao (1973) reported studies in which two factors theory could not receive unequivocal support. It was observed that motivators contributed to both, Satisfied and dissatisfied feelings. Motivators and hygiene factors were found not to be mutually exclusive in the factor analytic sense.

Dayal and Saiyadin (1970) reported that their findings are highly supportive of Herzberg's motivation hygiene theory. They concluded that the findings are all the more meaningful in view of the cross cultural differences pointing towards universality of human motivation.

Vroom (1964) looks at effective motivation not in terms of either a fixed set of human needs or as a uniform configuration of external motivations. He defines motivation as a process governing the choices, made by the persons among alternative forms of voluntary activity. Thus, motivation is a result of goals that a person wants to achieve. These goals may be different for different persons. These might be higher salary, promotion and job security for some and more interesting work for others.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Factorial design has been used to measure the impact of motivation on the job involvement of nursing personnel. The job involvement has been treated as dependent variable, while motivation has been treated as independent variables.

Measures

To study the variable in the study the variable in the present study the following two psychometric devices were utilized. The description of these tools is given below and the scales, items and instructions finally used are:

Employees Motivation Schedule (EMS): Developed and standardized by Sirivastava (1984) consists of 70 statements with four alternative responses, namely, always, mostly, seldom, and never, was used to assess nurses motivation in relation to seven dimensions.

The individual operating in context of industries and other employment's are motivated by a number of needs, individually or in different combinations. The present employees motivation schedule focuses following needs (being manifest at work [job]) which generate work motivations **Job involvement Scale:** -In the present investigation the Hindi adaptation (Kapoor and Singh, 1978) of Lodahl and Kenjner's. Job involvement scale consists of 20 statements with four alternative response.

Sample

The primary data collected from 200 nursing personnel who are selected from SGPGI, Lucknow. The nurses were selected from different departments of the institute. The age of respondents ranged between 35-50 years average of 40 years. The educational attainment of the respondent ranged from intermediate to B.Sc. the range of job experience was from 8 to 15 years with average experience for 12 years. The monthly income of respondent range from Rs. 10,000 -15,000 per month with average monthly income of Rs. 12,000/-.Prior to the administration of the test, nurses were told about utility of the study.

Research Instrument

Well-designed pretested questionnaire were used to collect the primary data for fulfilling the objectives of the study.

RESULTS

Table 1: Significance of Difference (C-R) between Mean Job Involvement Scores of Nurses in High and Low Motivation (Overall and Area-Wise) Groups

| Groups | N | Mean | S.D. | C-R | P |
|--|--------------|----------------|--------------|------|----|
| HM: Need for personal growth LM: Need for personal growth | 114 86 | 55.69 54.21 | 7.35 7.07 | 0.50 | NS |
| HM: Need for achievement LM: Need for achievement | 109 91 | 55.33 54.33 | 7.39 7.34 | 0.73 | NS |
| HM: Need for self control LM: Need for self-control | 105 95 | 55.76 54 76 | 7.30 7.11 | 1.45 | NS |
| HM: Need for Monetary gains LM: Need for monetary gains | 114 86 | 55.21 54.68 | 7.36 7.07 | 0.52 | NS |
| HM: need for non- financial LM: Need for non- financial | 104 88.98 | 55.60 54.32 | 7.32 7.09 | 1.26 | NS |
| HM: Need for social affiliation & conformity LM: Need for social affiliation & conformity | 112 88 | 55.60 55.47 | 7.84 6.70 | -084 | NS |
| LM: Need for autonomy & self actualization | 112 | 55.43 | 7.25 | 99 | NS |
| LM: Need for autonomy & self actualization | 88 | 54.42 | 7.19 | | |
| HM: Motivation (Overall) | 102 | 55.30 | 7.41 | .63 | NS |
| LM: Motivation (Overall) | 98 | 54.66 | 7.06 | | |

HM: High Motivation

LM: Low Motivation

Further we have tried to find out the significance of difference between the mean job involvement scores of nurses for the High and Low Motivation (overall and area wise) groups by computing mean, Standard Deviation and C-R (Critical-Ratio) which is recorded in Table-1

DISCUSSIONS

Table-1 indicates that mean job involvement score is higher in high motivation pertaining to need for personal growth group than the low motivation pertaining to need for personal growth group. To list whether any significant difference exists or not between the mean job involvement of both the groups the critical-ratio was computed and it was not found to be significant.

It means both the group enjoy same level of job involvement and they do not differ significantly with regard to their job involvement.

The concept of growth need strength is crucial, to the theory of work motivation underlying the job characteristics model Growth needs are defined as strong needs for personal challenge and accomplishment, for learning and for professional development. The job characteristics model (Hackman and Lawler, 1971; Hackman and Oldham 1976) assumes that not all employees appreciate job high in motivation potential. They employees having strong internal motivation when working on complex, challenging jobs. Others, with we strong need for growth, will be less likely to take advantage of opportunities for professional development provided by a job high in motivating potential.

It is also apparent from Table-1 that mean of job involvement is higher in high motivation pertaining to need for achievement group than low motivation pertaining to need for achievement group.

To find out the significant difference between two groups the C-R is a applied. But the C-R value fount not to be significant. It means both the groups don't differ significantly with regard to their job involvement. But on the basis of

means we can suggest that the high group of nurses has uses job. Involved than the low group of nurses.

Table-1 indicates that the mean job involvement is higher in high motivation pertaining to need for self-control group than low motivation pertaining to need for self control group. But the C-R value is not significant.

It means both the groups do not differ significantly with regard to this job. Involvement but we can say that nurses having high need for self control have more job involvement than the low need of self control (motivation) group.

Glass and singer (1972) demonstrate that a lack of self-control can have long term deleterious effect upon performance.

Glass, singer and Freidman (1969) found that subject in their low self - control condition exhibited less persistence on tasks and made more errors that did subjects in the high self-control condition.

The obtained finding bring out the idea that when the level of need for for self control will be higher, will give high job involvement in nurses. In other words we can say that those nurse who have high need for self control show high level of job involvement.

It is obvious from Table-1 that the job involvement scores in terms of mean is comparatively higher in high need for monetary gains (motivation) group than the low need for monetarily gains group. While determining the significance of difference between mean job involvement of both the group the C-R value has been computed and the C-R value is not found to be significant. It means both the group are equally job involved either the belongs from high or low need for monetary gains.

It is obvious from table-1 that the mean job involvement is higher in high need for non-financial gains them low need for non-financial grains, while determining the significance of difference between means job involvement scores of high and low motivation (need for non- financial gains) groups C-R and applied the obtained critical-ratio was not found significant. It mean that there no deference in job involvement between high and low motivated (need for non-financial gains) of nurses.

It is obvious from Table-1 that the mean job involvement score is higher in high motivated (need for autonomy and self actualization) group than low motivated (need for autonomy and self actualization) group. While determining the significance of difference between mean job involvement scores of high and low motivated (need for autonomy and self actualization) groups. The C-R is computed but, the obtained critical-ratio is not found. To be significant. It mean both groups don't differ significantly with regard to job involvement. But on the basis of the means values, we can suggest that the nurses having high level of need for autonomy & self actualization shows high level of job involvement than the low group of nurses.

From the results presented in Table-1 we observe that high motivation (overall) group has higher job involvement scores as compared to low motivation (overall) group. While determining the significance of difference between mean job involvement scores of high and low motivation (overall) group the obtained critical ratio is not found to be significant.

It means nurses who are highly motivated show greater job involvement than those nurses who are low motivated.

According to Gagne and Fleishman (1959) human performance of almost any sort can be improved by increase in motivation. They view that job performance is a result of interaction between workers skill level multiplied by motivation. Voorm (1964) also emphasized that job performance is a result interaction worker skill ability and motivation.

According to Sutermeister (1963) if a person had no motivation, he could be the most capable individual in the world, but there would be no relationship between his ability and job performance. Thus, both ability and motivation are essential aspects of good employee performance.

Mehta (1978) discussed the problem of employee work motivation as an organization development strategy. According to his analysis there lies the clerical need for motivating and promoting greater human satisfaction in organization in order to achieve the desired organizational objectives and higher productivity.

Sharma's study (1986) has also high lighted the concept of motivating people in organization, as an important management strategy. In spite of many theories of work motivation available to us, this still remains a baffling issue and management should try to find out the best strategy for motivation people at work.

Tarkenton (1986) investigated that the secret to "getting people to perform" is motivation and to secret motivation is understanding the difference between what turns people on and what turns them off

CONCLUSIONS

The study shows that job involvement scores in terms of mean is comparatively higher in high need for monetary gains (motivation) group than the low need for monetarily gains group. It means both the group are equally job involved either the belongs from high or low need for monetary gains. The mean job involvement is higher in high need for non-financial gains than low need for non-financial gains, while determining the significance of difference between means job involvement scores of high and low motivation (need for non- financial gains) groups. The study found that there is no difference in job involvement between high and low motivated (need for non-financial gains) of nurses.

REFERENCES

1. Ali, S.N. and Akhtar, M., 1973. Motivational effect of level of aspiration on performance in adjusted and maladjusted individuals. *Manas 20 U*), 1-7.
2. Anderson, R., 1983. Health Promotion: An Overview Institute for Social studies, London.
3. Angle, H., and Perry, J., 1981. An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 1-14.
4. Argyris, C. 1957. *Personality and Organization*. New York: Haper and Row.
5. Agrawal U.N. (1978. Measuring job involvement in India. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 14,219-231.
6. Agrawal K.G. & Sharma, B.R. (1977). Gratification, meta motivation and Maslow. *Vikalpa*, 2 (A).
7. Arvey, R.D. & Neil, C.W. (1972). Testing Expectancy Theory Predictions Using Behaviorally Based Measures of Motivational Efforts for Engineers. Mimeograph, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
8. Bass, B.M. (1965). *Organizational Psychology*. Boston: Allyn Bacon.
9. Brief, A.P. and Idag, R.J. 1975. Employee reactions to job characteristics: A constructive replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60,182-186.
10. Blum, M. and Russ, J. (1942). A study of employee attitudes toward various incentive. *Personnel Psychology*, 19,438-444.

11. A. Bose, S.K. (1958). A psychological approach to productivity movement. *Indian Journal of Psychology* 33.
12. Broedling, L.A. (1975) Relationship of internal- external control to work motivation and performance in an expectancy model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60 (1), 65-70.
13. Cherrington, D.J., Reitz, H.J. & Scott, W.E. (1971). Effect of contingent and non contingent reward on the relationship between satisfaction and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 55,531-536.
14. Campbell, J.P. & Pritchard, R.D. (1976). Motivation theory in industrial and organizational psychology. In M.D. Dunnette (ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicao: Rand McNally.
15. Chatterjee, N.N. (1984). *Industrial Relations in India's Developing Economy*. Allied Book Agency, Calcutta
16. Christopher, O. (1976). Effect of perceived instrumentality on the relationship between the valence of pay and job performance. *Journal of social Psychology*, 68 (1), 131-132.
17. Dayal, I & Saiyadin, M.S. (1970). Cross Cultural validation of Motivation Hygiene Theory. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, October.
18. Dwivedi, N. and Pestonjee, DM., 1975. Socio- personal correlates of job satisfaction. *Psychological Studies*, 20, 30-39.
19. Dwivedi, R.S. (1980). Some correlated of job performance. *Indian Journal of Indsutrial Relations*. 15.
20. Ewen, R.B., 1973. Pressure for production, task difficulty and correlation between job satisfaction and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 58 (3), 378-380.
21. Fleishman, E.A., 1973. Twenty year of consideration and structure. In E.A. Fleishman and J.G. Hunt Eds.), *current Development in the Study of Leadership*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
22. French, J.R.P. and Caplan, R.D., 1970. Psychological factors in coronary heart diseases. *Industrial Medicine*, 39, 383-397.
23. Feather, M.T (1961). The relationship of persistence at a task expectations of success and achievement related motives. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology* 63, 552-561.
24. Feldman, J.M. (1974). Note on the utility of certainty weights in expectancy theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59,727-730.
25. Fischer, C.S. (1976). Alienation: Trying to bridge the chasm *British Journal of Sociology*. 27,35-39.
26. Fleishman, E.A. (1958). A relationship between incentive motivation and ability level in psychomotor performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 56, 78-81.
27. French, E.G. (1957). Effects of interaction of achievement, motivation and intelligence and problem solving success. *American Psychologist*, 12, 399-400 (Abstract).
28. Fromm. E. 1955. *The Same Society*. New York: Holt, Renehart and Winston
29. Ganguli, H.C., 1964. *Structure and Process of Organization*, Bombay Asia Publishing House.
30. Gupta, J., 1993. Employee Motivation, Alienation and job involvement as the determinants of work performance.

Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Deptt. of Psychology, Lucknow University, Lucknow. (U.P.) India.

31. Galbraith, J.R. & Cummings, L.L. (1967). An empirical investigation of the motivational determinates of task performance: Interaction effects between instrumentality- valence.
32. Ganguly, H.C. (1961). *Industrial Productivity and Motivation*. Bombay, New Delhi: Asia Publishing House.
33. Ganguly, T. (1953) The workers attitude towards the management. *Indian Journal of Psychology*, 28,29-37
34. Gavin, J.E. (1970). Ability, effort and role perception as antecedents of job performance. *Experimental Publication System*, 5, Ms.No.190A,1-26.
35. Gechman A.S. & Weiner, Y. (1975). Job involvement and satisfaction as related to mental health and personal time devoted to work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60,521 -52 3. Ghiselli, E.E. (1968). Some motivational factors in the success of managers *Personnel Psychology*, 21 431-440
36. Gupta, M. (1977). A study of job satisfaction among women workers. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 14 (3).
37. Harrel, T.W., 1964. *Industrial Psychology Oxford Book Company, Calcutta*.
38. Hackman. J.r. & Lawler, E.E. (1971). Employees reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55, 259-286, (Monograph).
39. Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and nature of man*, Cleveland, O.H.: World publishing.
40. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B., 1959. *The Motivation to work*. New York: Wiley.
41. Hulin, C.L. and Blood, Mr., 1968. Job enlargement individual differences and worker responses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 69,41-55.
42. Hulin. C.L. & Smith, P.A. (1967). An empirical investigation of implications of the two factor theory of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 51, 396-402.
43. Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory.
44. Herzberg.F. (1968)One more time: How do you motivate employee? *Harvard Business Review*, (January-February), 53-62.
45. House, R.J. Wigdor, L.A. (1967). herzberg dual- factors theory of job satisfaction and motivation: A review of the evidence and a criticism. *Personnel psychology*, 20,369-389.
46. Hunt, J.G. & Hill, J.W. (1969). The new look in motivational theory for organizational research. *Human organization*, summer, 100-109.
47. Inkson,J.H.K., 1978. Self- esteem as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job- satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(2), 243-247.
48. Jans, N A (1982). The nature and measurement of work involvement. *Journal of occupational Psychology*, 55, 57-67.
49. Kahn, R.L, (1961). Review of F. Herzberg. et.al. The motivation to work. *Contemporary Psychology*, 6,9.

50. Kanungo, R.N., Mishra, S.B. & Dayal, I. (1975). Relationship of job involvement to perceived importance satisfaction of employee needs. *International Review of Applied Psychology*.
51. Kanungo, R.N. (1979). The concepts of alienation and involvement revisited. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 119-137.
52. Kanungo R.N. (1981). Work alienation and involvement: problems and prospects. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 30,1-15. R.N. Kanungo, (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 67 (3), 341-349.
53. Kapoor, R. & Singh, A.P. (1978). Job involvement scales: A pilot study (unpublished). Department of psychology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.
54. Kulkarni, A.V. (1976). Job involvement and perceived importance of job factors. *Indian Psychological Review*, 13 (2), 36-40.
55. Lawler, E.E. III, 1966. Ability as a moderator of the relationship between job attitudes and job performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 19,153-164.
56. Lahiri, D.K. & Srivastava, S. (1967). Determinants of Satisfaction in middle management personnel. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 51 (3), 254-265.
57. Lawler, E.E. III & Porter, L.W. (1967). The effect of performance on job satisfaction. *Industrial Relations*, 7, 20-29.
58. Lal, M & Bhardwaj, G. (1981). Motivation across three job levels. *Vikalpa*, 6 (2), April.
59. Lawler, E.E. III (1969). Job design and employee motivation. *Personnel Psychology*, 22, 426-435.
60. Lawler, E.E. III. & Hall, D.T. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54, 305-312.
61. Lawler, E.E. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Monterey Calif: Brooks/ Cali.
62. Lodahl, T.M. Lodahl, T.M. & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 49,24-33.
63. McClelland, D.C. (1985). *the Human side of Interprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
64. Mehta, P. (1978). Motivational approach to organization development. *National Labour Institute Bulletin*, April.
65. Maslow, A.H. 1943. " A theory of Human motivation". *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
66. Maurer, P.C.(1969). Work role involvement of industrial supervisors East Lansing: MSU Business Studies.
67. Mishra, S. Kanungo, R.N. & Stuhler, E.A. (1985). The Motivational formulation of job and work involvement: A cross national study. *Human Relations*, 38 (6), 501-518.
68. Nagpal, R. and H. Sell., 1985. Subjective well being Regional Health Papers, SEARO, WHO.
69. Narain, L. (1973). *Managerial Compensation and Motivation in public Enterprises*. New Delhi: Oxford IBH publishing company

70. Pestonjee, D.M., Singh, A.P. and Singh, S.P., 1980. Attitudes towards union as related to job involvement and morale- Personal communication
71. Porter, L.W. (1966). *Managerial Thinking: An International study*: New York: Wiley
72. Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T. and Boulian, P.V., 1974. Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59 603-609.
73. Poulton, EC, 1970. *Environment and Human Efficiency*. Springfield, IL: Charles, C. Thomas.
74. Quinn, R.P., Seashore, S. and Mangione, I., 1971. *Survey of working conditions*, U.S. Government Printing Press.
75. Reddy, N.Y. & Ravi Kumar, R. (1980). Job attitudes in lower management. Involvement, Motivation and compnay satisfaction. *managerial Psychology*, 1,77-80.
76. Reynold, M. (1973-74). Perceptual defence and Herzberg's methodology: A basis for understanding commitment to work. *Interpersonal Development*, 4, 170-176.
77. Rabinowitz, S. (1981). Towards a development model of job involvement *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 30, 31-50.
78. Rao, G.V.S. & Rao, V. Ganapathy. (1973). A study of factors contributing to satisfaction and importance of industrial personnel: A test of the two factor theory. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*. 9(2), 233-262.
79. Sofer, C,1970. *Men in Mid career*. Cambridge University Press.
80. Shepard, J.M. (1971). *Automation and alienation: A study of office and factory workers*. Combridge, MA: MIT. Press.
81. Shrode, A.W.& Voich, D. [Jr.] (1974). *Organization and Management- Basic System Concepts*.
82. Srivastava, A. k. (1978). Life satisfaction of executives: A case study: *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 14(1).
83. Saal. F.E. (1978). Job involvement: A multivariate approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63 (1), 53-61.
84. Sall. F.E. (1981). Empirical & Theoretical implications of a purely cognitive definitions of job involvement. *International Review of Applied psychology*, 30,103-120.
85. Satesh, S.D. and Hosek, J. (1976). Job involvement Concepts and measurement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 19,213-224.
86. Satesh, S.D. (1981). A structural view of job involvement and its differentiation from satisfaction and motivation. *International review of Applied Psychology*, 30,17-29.
87. Schwab, D.B. (1973). Impact of alternative compensation systems of pay valence and instrumentality perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 58, 308-312.
88. Sharma, S. & Sharma, R.K. (1978). A study of job involvement in relationship to certain demographic variables among Engineers. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 15 (1)m 141-148.
89. Sharma, K.N. (1981). A study of intrinsic value structures and creativity among higher secondary school girls.

- Journal of Psychological Researches*, 25 (1), 1-24.
90. Siegel, A.L. & Ruh, R.A. (1973). Job involvement, participation in decision making, personal background and job behavior. *Organizational behavior and Human performance*, 9,318-327
 91. Singh, R. Gupta, M. & Dalai, A.K. (1979). Cultural difference in attribution of performance: An integration theoretical analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 37, 1342-1351.
 92. Singh, P. Gupta W. & Rastogi, M. (1981). Job involvement in relation to marital status and sex. *Psychological studies*, 26, (2), 82-83
 93. Srivastava, A.K. (1984). Construction and Standardization of Employees Motivation Schedule. Department of Psychology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.
 94. Stagner, R. (1950. Psychological aspects of industrial conflict: II Motivation. *Personnel Psychology*, 3, 1-6.
 95. Sutermeister, R.A. (1963). *People and Productivity*. McGraw-Hill Company Inc. U.S.A.
 96. Tarkenton, F. (1986). *How to motivate people*. New York: Harper and Row.
 97. Turner, A. and Lawrence, P., 1965. *Industrial jobs and the workers* Cambridge, Mass: harwar University Press
 98. Viteless, M.S. (1953). *Motivation and Morale in Industry*. New York: Norton. Vroom, V.H., 1964. *Work and Motivation*, New York: Wiley.
 99. Vroom, V.H (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.
 100. Wolfe, J.B. (1936). Effectiveness of token reward for chimpanzees. *Comparative Psychology Monographs*, 12, 1-72.
 101. Wolman, B. (ed). 1973) *Dictionary of Work and Organizational Psychology* Nijmegen: Catholic University.
 - Weissen berg P & Gruenfield, L.W. (1968). *Relationship between job satisfaction and job involvement*.
 102. Yukl, G.a., Wexley, K.N. & Seymore, J.D. (1972). Effectiveness of pay incentives under variables ratio and continuous reinforcement schedules.