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Abstract
Past empirical research has indicated that workplace factors affect the work attitudes of police officers. Police officers (N = 827) were surveyed in two districts (Sonipat and Rohtak) in the State of Haryana in the Republic of India. Ordinary least squares regression analysis was used to test the effects of job variables (i.e., job autonomy, job variety, training, and supervision) on job attitudes (i.e., job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment). Results indicate that variety, training, and supervision had positive associations with involvement, satisfaction, and commitment. Job autonomy had no association with job satisfaction or organizational commitment and had a negative association with job involvement.
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India, the world’s most populous democracy, is a dynamic developing nation taking a more prominent role on the world stage (Unnithan, 2009). Even though India is highly populated with a growing and vibrant economy, little has been published in Western journals concerning how workplace factors affect Indian police officers. Over the past several decades, research has shown that
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workplace factors help shape the work attitudes of job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among police officers (Johnson, 2012a, 2012b). These attitudes have significant outcomes for both officers and agencies, at least based on the research mainly conducted among police in developed nations, particularly the United States (Buker & Dolu, 2010; Tankebe, 2010). As a result, not as much is known about how job variables are related to work attitudes in developing nations. Bennett (1997) noted the importance of this type of research:

With democratization and human rights rapidly becoming international imperatives, knowledge about how to increase receptivity to change in traditional policies and operations, reduce costly turnover in personnel, and increase the incidence of cooperative behavior is necessary. Most police forces in the developing world operate with very limited financial and personnel resources, so they must understand how to use those resources most effectively and efficiently. At the same time, developing nations ... are experiencing dramatic increases in crime, and particularly crimes of violence, that challenge their established ways of operating. (p. 296)

The current study examined how the job variables of job autonomy, job variety, training, and supervision were associated with job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among Indian police officers from the Sonipat and Rohtak districts of the State of Haryana in the Republic of India (henceforth India). Police perform a critical government service. Understanding whether and how the job variables, which are often studied among Western officers in developed nations, are associated with the important work outcomes of job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment can provide information on whether the effects of the work environment are contextual and vary between police agencies.

Literature Review

The first uniformed police in India were created in 1792 during British rule. Police officers reported to the central government (Singh, 2002). After the first war for independence in 1857, the British passed the Indian Police Act of 1861 to introduce Western-style policing in India (Scott, Evans, & Verma, 2009). A year after independence in 1947, the Indian (Imperial) Police were renamed the Indian Police Services (Shah, 1999). While the federal government of India does maintain several specialized agencies, the main responsibility for policing is delegated to India’s 28 states, each of which has its own police force. Each state police agency is headed by a Director General of Police who is responsible for the operation and control of the police in his or her respective state. The state police agency is further divided into districts, with a police force under the direction of a Superintendent of Police. Districts are divided into subdistricts, subdistricts are broken down into police circles, and within police circles are police stations. Larger cities operate a metropolitan police force, answering to a Director General (Raghavan, 1999; Verma & Gavirneni, 2006). The seven union territories also have their own police forces, which are run by the Union government (Wu et al., 2012). The state governments have a good deal of control through the hiring and training of officers (Shah, 1999; Singh, 2002; Verma & Gavirneni, 2006). The Indian Police Services officers are appointed (and removed) by the federal government, and, to that extent, the central government has some control. The majority of Indian police officers occupy the position of Constable, which is the entry level for most officers and is a line position. The work can be long and demanding. Most Indian police officers work more than 10 hour on their scheduled days and can be called into work if the need arises. While top police administrators can make good pay relative to the Indian population as a whole, the official pay is not high for lower level officers. Officers are not unionized and the work structure is more paramilitary than democratic. Administrators have a great deal of latitude in supervising lower ranked officers. The challenges faced by a typical Indian police officer are many.
The police are an important part of the criminal justice system in India, but, in general, their image is not positive (Unnithan, 2010). In the past several decades, there has been a push to professionalize the police, increase their performance, and improve community relations (Wu et al., 2012). For instance, Mohalla committees (Maharashtra), neighborhood watch schemes (Delhi), and community policing (Trichy) have been very successful. Some of them, like the Mohalla committees of Mumbai and Bhiwandi in Maharashtra, have been able to diminish interreligious conflicts (Nilesh, 2011). Officers play a vital role in whether these changes are to become successful. Research in other nations suggest that improved work attitudes of job involvement, job satisfaction, and/or organizational commitment are associated with acceptance of change (e.g., community policing), improved community relations and communications, and reduced corruption (Bennett, 1997; Ford, Weissbein, & Plamondon, 2003; Haarr, 1997). In addition, research among police in the United States has found that low levels of these work attitudes are related with negative outcomes such as cynicism, burnout, and turnover (Gau, Terrill, & Paoline, 2013; James & Hendry, 1991; Manzoni & Eisner, 2006; Martinussen, Richardson, & Burke, 2007). Simply, positive work attitudes should benefit both the police agency and the officers.

**Job Involvement**

Job involvement is an individual’s psychological identification with a job and it reflects the level of importance the job plays in the person’s life (Kanungo, 1982). DeCarufel and Schann (1990) noted, “an individual with a high degree of job involvement would place the job at the center of his/her life’s interests. The well-known phrase ‘I live, eat, and breathe my job’ would describe someone whose job involvement is very high” (p. 86). In short, job involvement is the intensity of psychological bond a person forms to his or her job (Kanungo, 1982). Among police officers, job involvement has been theorized to lead to higher work performance (DeCarufel & Schaan, 1990), and in other fields, it has been linked to important outcomes, such as creativity, motivation, and performance (Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord, 2002; Pfeffer, 1994).

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is typically conceptualized as an affective (i.e., emotional) outcome consisting of “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences,” and job satisfaction generally occurs based on whether the job meets a person’s wants and needs (Locke, 1976, p. 1300). For example, White, Cooper, Saunders, and Raganella (2010) found among New York City police officers that when motivations for becoming a police officer were met, higher job satisfaction resulted. Job satisfaction has been linked to greater variety of task engagement and adoption and endorsement of innovative police styles among U.S. police officers and receptivity to community-oriented policing and change (Pelfrey, 2004, 2007; Wycoff & Skogan, 1994). Among South Korean officers, job satisfaction was associated with increased support for civilian oversight and reduced cynicism (Kang & Nalla, 2011; Lee & Moon, 2011). Canadian officers who reported higher levels of job satisfaction indicated greater levels of self-esteem (Kohan & O’Connor, 2002). Higher levels of job satisfaction have also been linked with reduced turnover intent among Canadian, U.S., British, and New Zealand officers (Allisey, Noblet, Lamontagne, & Houdmont, 2014; Brough & Frame, 2004; Gau et al., 2013; Kohan & O’Connor, 2002). Job satisfaction has also been reported to have a negative association with at-risk alcohol consumption among Australian law enforcement officers and burnout among Norwegian and Swiss police officers (Davey, Obst, & Sheehan, 2000; Manzioni & Eisner, 2006; Martinussen et al., 2007).
Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment refers to the bond between the worker and the employing organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). It is a bond with the entire employing organization and not with the job itself or a particular part of the organization (Ford et al., 2003). The two primary views of how the bond is formed are referred to as continuance and affective commitment. Continuance commitment is the bond between an individual and the organization that is based on various investments, such as pay, seniority, pension, social relationships, and nontransferable skills, and these investments compel a person to remain with an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Affective commitment is a bond that develops because of a psychological attachment that forms over time as a result of positive treatment within the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). This form of commitment has the core elements of loyalty to the organization, identification with the organization (i.e., pride in the organization, internalization of organizational goals, and acceptance of core organizational values), and involvement in the organization (i.e., personal effort made for the sake of the organization; Mowday et al., 1982). Affective commitment (henceforth, organizational commitment) is the most commonly measured form in the policing literature and was used for the current study (Meyer et al., 2012). Commitment is vitally important to police organizations, as it influences how police officers experience and carry out their job duties. For example, highly committed police officers are less likely to engage in corruption, ignore wrongdoing or avoidance of work by fellow officers, and tend to be more supportive of community-oriented policing practices (Ford et al., 2003; Haarr, 1997). Additionally, low commitment is associated with increased turnover intent, burnout, and cynicism among officers (James & Hendry, 1991; Manzoni & Eisinger, 2006; Martinussen et al., 2007).

Job Variables

The person–environment fit theory lays a foundation for the relationship between a person and the employing organization and helps explain the work attitudes and behaviors of employees (Edwards, Cable, Williamson, Lambert, & Shipp, 2006). The person–environment fit theory holds that workplace factors can either positively or negatively affect employees (Brown, 1996). If there is a good fit between the person and the work environment, then there generally will be positive work results, such as higher job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. If there is a poor fit between what the worker wants from the workplace and the actual workplace, negative outcomes are more likely (Edwards et al., 2006). Person–environment theory is based on an interactional perspective, holding that there is an interaction between an individual and his or her environment. Neither the individual nor the environment accounts alone for a particular outcome—but rather it is the interaction that shapes various outcomes (Sekiguchi, 2004b). In general, people want positive and rewarding workplace experiences and these needs and desires may or may not be met by workplace factors (Sekiguchi, 2004a). For example, in their study of New York City police officers, White et al. (2010) found that if the initial reasons for becoming an officer were met, then higher job satisfaction was found years later, but if the reasons for becoming a police officer were not met, low job satisfaction was likely, suggesting that a poor fit negatively affected job satisfaction. Under the person–environment fit theory, workplace factors play an important role.

There are multiple workplace factors that can affect the work attitudes of officers, including individual (e.g., gender and educational level), organizational (i.e., workplace factors), and environmental (e.g., community factors; Cooper, White, Ward, Raganella, & Saunders, 2014). The current study focuses on workplace factors in the form of job variables. The police work environment is not only limited to physical buildings, structures, or equipment but also includes intangible psychological and social components. While there are different workplace variables, most can be grouped in the
categories of organizational structure variables and job variables. Organizational structure is used to monitor, direct, and control employees (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990; Oldham & Hackman, 1981). Examples of major dimensions of organizational structure are centralization (i.e., degree of employee input allowed in organizational decision making), formalization (the degree of written rules, regulations, policies, and their enforcement), legitimacy (i.e., the issue of organizational fairness in employee outcomes and processes), integration (i.e., the degree to which work groups and departments cooperate rather than compete against one another), and instrumental communication (i.e., the degree the organization keeps employees apprised of important information; Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990). Job variables, on the other hand, generally are more limited in scope and tend to apply to a certain job or group of jobs within an organization (Griffin, Hogan, & Lambert, 2012). These variables may vary based on job roles and/or divisions within an organization. Job variables are important in helping to guide and control assignments within an organization. Examples of job variables are job autonomy, training, job variety, and supervision (Griffin et al., 2012; Johnson, 2012a, 2012b).

Hypothoses

The current study examined job autonomy, variety, training, and supervision as well as work-related attitudes (e.g., job involvement, satisfaction, and organizational commitment) among police officers in two districts in the State of Haryana in India. Job autonomy is the degree of control a person has over his or her job duties (Griffin et al., 2012) and it provides staff with a sense that they are in control and that their jobs allow them to have input and make decisions. This can translate into individuals feeling good about themselves, their jobs, and their employing organization (Ross & Reskin, 1992). In this study, job autonomy was hypothesized to have a positive relationship with job involvement, satisfaction, and organizational commitment among Indian officers because it was likely to lead to feeling of a positive work fit (Hypotheses 1–3). There is support for these hypotheses in past policing research, as several studies have demonstrated that job autonomy leads to increased job satisfaction and commitment among U.S., British, and Turkish officers (Allisey et al., 2014; Buker & Dolu, 2010; Johnson, 2012a, 2012b; Miller, Mire, & Kim, 2009).

Job variety is simply the degree of variation in the job (Price & Mueller, 1986). Some jobs involve highly repetitive tasks while other jobs require significant variation. Repetitive jobs provide little opportunity for mental stimulation and growth, while variety allows people to experience new things, try new skills, and grow. Job variety can allow people to view their jobs and organization in a positive light and, in the end, tend to result in a better fit for people at work (Price & Mueller, 1986). Job variety was, therefore, predicted to have a positive association with Indian police job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Hypotheses 4–6). While more limited than the case for job autonomy, there is some support for these hypotheses, at least among U.S. officers in terms of job satisfaction (Lawton, Hickman, Piquero, & Greene, 2000; Zhao, Thurman, & He, 1999).

Quality training provides employees with the confidence and skills to do their jobs successfully. Being successful in a job can result in a sense of pride and accomplishment, leading to a feeling that the workplace fits the needs of the person. Conversely, a lack of such training can result in people feeling uncertain and strained in carrying out their job duties, resulting in a feeling of a poor fit. If people feel that the training they have received has been useful and job related, they are more likely to connect with their jobs and their organization as well as feel satisfaction from their work because of a good fit with the agency (Lambert et al., 2009). Perceptions of training were hypothesized to be positively related to job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among Indian officers (Hypotheses 7–9).

Supervisors who provide proper control, direction, and guidance to assist employees are important in the field of policing (Fitch, 2008). Quality supervisors who care about their subordinates, look
out for them, and are considerate can create a positive work experience. On the other hand, a lack of quality supervision can result in strain and frustration for employees (Cooper et al., 2014). Positive experiences are likely to allow people to view their jobs and the organization in a positive light, while negative experiences are likely to result in employees viewing their jobs and the organization in an unfavorable light; hence, quality and supportive supervision was hypothesized to be positively related to Indian police officer job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Hypotheses 10–12). The policing literature provides support for the supervision hypotheses. Positive treatment by supervisors has been associated with higher levels of organizational commitment among police officers in Ghana (Tankebe, 2010) as well as three Caribbean nations (Bennett, 1997). In addition, supervisor support and consideration was found to be linked with higher organizational commitment among U.S. police officers (Brief, Aldag, & Wallden, 1976; Jaramillo, Nixon, & Sams, 2005).

Method

Participants

The present study was conducted in the northern Indian State of Haryana. The state has an area of 17,070 square miles and a population of 25.4 million. Haryana is adjacent to the national capital of New Delhi and is considered a relatively well-developed state with a literacy rate of 77% and life expectancy of 66 years; however, it suffers from an adverse sex ratio (877 women for every 1,000 men) and a widespread caste-based social administration system (Sutar, 2012). The Haryana Police is a force of about 56,750 officers and is divided into 21 districts. The present study was conducted in Sonipat and Rohtak districts, which have a force of about 3,000 total officers between the two districts. The two districts serve a total population of about 2.5 million. The Sonipat and Rohtak districts are each divided into 21 police stations (Haryana Police, 2014).

As most police organizations, the Haryana Police is a hierarchical organization. The department consists of highly structured rank hierarchy starting from the lowest rank of Constable (line officer), Head Constable (equivalent to sergeant), Assistant Sub-Inspector (assists with the operations of a police station), Sub-Inspector (usually oversees a smaller police station or unit such as a police outpost), Inspector (usually oversees a police station), Deputy Superintendent of Police (usually oversees several stations), Assistant Superintendent of Police (usually oversees a subdivision in a district), Superintendent of Police (usually oversees a district), Deputy Inspector General of Police (usually oversees several districts), Inspector General of Police (usually oversees several regions made up of districts), and the highest rank of the Director General of Police (oversees the entire state police).

It is also important to note that not all officers start their careers at the rank of constable, the lowest rank, but most do. Most police organizations in India, including the Haryana Police, have four hiring ranks—Constable, Sub-Inspector, Deputy Superintendent of Police, and Assistant Superintendent of Police. Different qualifications are prescribed for entry at these four ranks. For instance, at this time, a person would need to have passed grade 12 or an equivalent examination for selection as a constable, while an undergraduate degree is required to apply for a Sub-Inspector rank or higher. Promotions are made according to merit and seniority; however, most officers hired at the rank of constable rarely rise above the rank of Sub-Inspector or Inspector. The leadership of the Indian police is provided by Indian Police Service officers. Indian Police Service officers are selected by holding annual competitive examination conducted by the federal government. Most ranks from Superintendent of Police to Deputy Inspector General of Police are occupied an Indian Police Service officer. The largest numbers of officers are at the rank of Constable, and there are fewer officers at each rank going up the Indian police hierarchy chart.
The basic administrative unit of policing in India, including the Haryana Police, is the district which is headed by an Indian Police Service officer with the rank of Superintendent of Police. The Superintendent of Police functions basically as the police chief for the district. The district unit is responsible for all policing activities including investigations, patrol, traffic, security of important government officials, and intelligence gathering. The current study surveyed officers from the districts of Rohtak and Sonipat, each headed by a Superintendent of Police. The actual number of officers posted in the study area was obtained from the office of the Director General of Police Haryana. The number of Constables, Head Constables, Assistant Sub-Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors, and Inspectors were 1,882 (59%), 680 (21%), 458 (14%), 134 (4%), and 38 (1%), respectively. The number of the Deputy Superintendent of Police and Superintendent of Police were 13 and 2, respectively, but these ranks were excluded from the survey sampling. Officers holding the ranks of Constable, Head Constable, Assistant Sub-Inspector, Sub-Inspector, and Inspector were surveyed.

The data for the present study were collected through a survey instrument that was distributed to 1,000 of the 3,000 police officers in the Sonipat and Rohtak districts of Haryana State of India, where every third officer was selected from a list of officers (i.e., systematic random sample). The officers were advised that the survey was voluntary and anonymous. The back method of translation was used, wherein survey materials (cover letter and questionnaire) were translated into Hindi, the national language of India, and then a second scholar translated the survey back into English to determine whether there were any translation problems. The cover letter and survey were enclosed in unmarked envelopes to ensure that no survey could be linked with a particular individual. The officers received the envelopes during their daily morning roll call. The officers were informed that the survey was voluntary and all responses would be confidential. Officers were informed that they were not to put their names or any other identifying marks on the surveys, that they could stop taking the survey at any time, that there were no rewards for taking the survey, and that there were no punishments for not taking the survey. The officers were instructed that they could take the survey at a time and location of their choosing. They returned the surveys in the unmarked envelope provided with the survey. A total of 827 surveys were returned, a response rate of 83%.

The univariate statistics for the variables are summarized in Table 1. Among the participants, the median age was 34 and ranged from 21 to 57 years of age. About 88% of surveyed officers were men. The participants represented all areas of the police agency except upper management. In terms of work position, 50% worked in police stations (where most executive functions of the police are carried out), while the remaining worked in areas, such as prisoner escort, reserve force, support, and administrative. Approximately 59% were line officers (i.e., held the rank of Constables). The median tenure in the current position was 11.50 years and ranged from 0 to 30 years. In terms of highest educational level, 23% had a matric degree (grade 10), 35% had a senior degree (grade 12), 35% had an undergraduate college degree, and 7% had a graduate or professional degree. Finally, 50% of the participants were from the Rohtak district, while the other half were from the Sonipat district.

Variables

Dependent variables. The three dependent variables used for the current study were job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. See the appendix for the specific wording of the items. Using 4 items from Kanungo (1982), an index measuring job involvement was created. The 4 items had an internal reliability Cronbach’s α of .63, which is on the low side but above the rule of thumb cutoff of .60. The factor loading scores were acceptable (see appendix for these scores). The factor analysis results suggested that the items had convergent validity and unidimensionality, and as such, the responses to the 4 items were summed together to form an additive index. The general rule of thumb is to use factor loading scores of at least .40 or higher and those above .50 are viewed as good, and the factor loading scores for the job involvement items were above .50 (Kim & Mueller,
It is important to note that Cronbach’s $\alpha$ measures internal reliability and factor analysis deals with convergent validity and unidimensionality, which are different concepts. Job satisfaction was measured using 3 items from Brayfield and Rothe (1951). The 3 items had a Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of .62. The 3 items loaded on a single factor and factor analysis results suggested that the items had convergent validity and unidimensionality. The responses to the 3 items were summed together to form an additive index. Organizational commitment was an additive index, consisting of 4 items from Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982). The 4 items had a Cronbach’s $\alpha$ value of .68. The factor loading scores were above .50 and all the items loaded on one factor. All three dependent variables were measured with a 5-point Likert-type response scale ranging from strongly disagree (coded 1) to strongly agree (coded 5).

Independent variables. The independent variables of focus were job autonomy, job variety, training, and supervision. See the appendix for the specific wording of the items. All of the job variables were answered using a 5-point Likert-type response scale ranging from strongly disagree (coded 1) to strongly agree (coded 5) and then summed to form additive indices. Two items from Curry, Wakefield, Price, and Mueller (1986) were used to measure job autonomy, and because there were only 2 items, Cronbach’s $\alpha$ was not calculated (Eisinga, Grotenhuis, & Pelzer, 2013). Based on factor analysis, the 2 items loaded on a single factor. Job variety was also measured using 2 items from Curry et al. (1986). The items loaded on one factor in a factor analysis. Perceptions of training were measured with 2 items from Lambert et al. (2009) and loaded on one factor in factor analysis. Quality, fair, and supportive supervision was comprised of 6 items adapted from Teas (1981). The items had a Cronbach’s $\alpha$ value of .70, and the items all loaded on one factor in a factor analysis. Finally, the personal characteristics of age, gender, position, post location, tenure, educational level, and district were included as control variables. See Table 1 for how these personal characteristics were coded.
Results

The univariate statistics for all the variables used in the study are reported in Table 1. There appeared to be significant variation in the dependent and independent variables (i.e., none were constants). The data conformed approximately to a normal distribution based on the skewness and kurtosis statistics. For the study variables, the skewness values ranged from $-0.16$ to $-0.87$. The kurtosis values ranged from 0.09 to 2.23.

A correlation matrix is shown in Table 2. Gender, educational level, job variety, training, and supervision all had statistically significant correlations with job involvement. In general, female officers tended to report higher involvement than their male counterparts. Educational level had a negative correlation with the job involvement variable. Job variety, training, and supervision were associated with higher levels of involvement. It is important to note that while these were statistically significant, the effect size was small to moderate for these variables with job involvement. The rule of thumb is that correlations higher than .50 are viewed as large, .30–.50 as moderate, and less than .30 as small (Cohen, 1988).

For job satisfaction, age, position, job autonomy, job variety, training, and supervision all had significant correlations. Older officers reported higher levels of job satisfaction. Line officers generally reported lower levels of satisfaction. Increases in autonomy, variety, training, and supervision were all associated with higher levels of job satisfaction. As with job involvement, the size of the significant correlations for job satisfaction ranged from small to moderate.

For organizational commitment, age, position, district, job autonomy, job variety, training, and supervision all had significant correlations. Older officers reported higher levels of commitment. Line officers (i.e., Constables) on average reported lower levels of commitment. In general, officers from the Rohtak district reported higher commitment as compared to officers from the Sonipat district. Increases in autonomy, variety, training, and supervision were associated with higher levels of commitment. It is important to point out that the significant correlations with commitment ranged between small and moderate, and none were strong.

Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression equations were estimated with job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as the dependent variables. The independent variables in each of the OLS models were the personal characteristics of the officers in addition to their job variables (e.g., autonomy, variety, training, and supervision). The results are reported in Table 3. Collinearity is seen as a problem when two independent variables have a correlation of .80 or higher and multicollinearity is seen as a problem when variance inflation factor scores (VIF) exceed 5 or tolerance values fall below .20 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Based on the correlation matrix, the VIF scores, and tolerance statistics, collinearity and multicollinearity were not a problem for any of the three regression equations. Specifically, for the job involvement regression equation, the tolerance and VIF values ranged from 0.48 to 0.95 and 1.05 to 2.11, respectively. For the job satisfaction regression equation, the tolerance and VIF values ranged from 0.48 to 0.96 and 1.05 to 2.11, respectively. For the commitment regression equation, the tolerance and VIF values ranged from 0.47 to 0.96 and 1.05 to 2.13, respectively.

For job involvement, the $F$ value of 10.50 was statistically significant at $p < .001$ and the standard error of the estimate being 2.71. Nevertheless, the predictive power of the model for this model was low. The $R^2$ value was .15 and the adjusted $R^2$ value was .13. This means that the personal and job variables explained approximately 13–15% of the observed variance of the job involvement variable. Gender, job autonomy, job variety, training, and supervision all had statistically significant relationships with involvement. Women, in general, reported higher levels of job involvement than men. Increases in job autonomy were associated with lower levels of bonding with the job. Conversely, increases in variety, training, and supervision were found to be linked with higher levels of involvement. Using the standardized regression slope coefficients (i.e., $\beta$ in Table 2), the size of the impact...
Table 2. Correlation Matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Post Loc</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Position</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tenure</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Educ</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. District</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Job Aut</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Job Var</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Train</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Super</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Job Inv</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Job Sat</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Org Com</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Post Loc = posting location; Educ = educational level; Job Aut = job autonomy; Job Var = job variety; Train = training; Super = supervision; Job Inv = job involvement; Job Sat = job satisfaction; Org Com = organizational commitment. The total number of participants was 827. With pairwise deletion, the number of participants ranged from 731 to 824 for the above correlations. For a description of the variables, how they were measured, and their univariate statistics, see Table 1.

*p ≤ .05. **p ≤ .01.
can be determined. Quality of training had the largest effect, followed closely by job variety, and then by supervision and gender. Job autonomy had the smallest magnitude effect.

For job satisfaction, the model fit was acceptable, with the $F$ value of 22.00 being significant at $p < .001$ and the standard error of the estimate being 1.88. The $R^2$ value and adjusted $R^2$ values of .26 and .25, while higher than those for job involvement, are somewhat low. Basically, the independent variables accounted for approximately a quarter of the variance observed in the satisfaction index. None of the personal characteristics had a significant association, and autonomy also had a nonsignificant relationship. Job variety, training, and supervision all had significant relationships; an increase in each was associated with higher reported satisfaction. Based on the standardized regression coefficients, training again had the largest impact, followed closely by job variety. Supervision had the smallest effect.

The model of organizational commitment was significant, with the $F$ value of 22.87 being significant at $p < .001$ and the standard error of the estimate being 2.79. The $R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$ values of .27 and .26, respectively. For a description of the variables, how they were measured, and their univariate statistics, see Table 1. $^{*}p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$.

Several conclusions can be reached when comparing the three regression models. First, based on the $F$ values and $R^2$ values, the personal characteristics and job variables had a smaller impact on job involvement than they had on satisfaction and commitment (i.e., more variance was explained by these variables for satisfaction and commitment than was the case for involvement). Second, based on $z$ score tests, job variety and training have similar effects across the three equations. This is an

### Table 3. Ordinary Least Squares Regression Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Job Involvement</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Org. Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>-1.3**</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post location</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job autonomy</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job variety</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ value (df)</td>
<td>10.50** (11,677)</td>
<td>22.00** (11,689)</td>
<td>22.87** (11,688)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2/Adj R^2$</td>
<td>.15/13</td>
<td>.26/25</td>
<td>.27/26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Org. = organizational; $b$ = unstandardized regression coefficient; $\beta$ = standardized regression coefficient; $df$ = degrees of freedom; Adj = adjusted. The total number of participants was 827. With listwise deletion, the number of participants in the job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment regression equations were 688, 700, and 699, respectively. For a description of the variables, how they were measured, and their univariate statistics, see Table 1. $^{*}p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$. 
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interesting finding. Third, while significant in all three equations, supervision, however, was a more salient predictor of commitment than it was for involvement or job satisfaction. Nevertheless, it is important to note that it was a significant, positive predictor in all three models. Fourth, while the difference between the effects of job autonomy on involvement and satisfaction were significant, the relationship between involvement and commitment was higher. Finally, while not reported in tabular format, regression equations were computed using only the personal characteristics as the independent variables. The personal characteristics accounted for approximately 1%, 4%, and 6% of the variance of involvement, satisfaction, and commitment, respectively. This suggested that the job variables were stronger predictors of the work attitudes than were the personal characteristics.

Discussion and Conclusion

Using framework of the person–environment fit theory, the current study assessed the value of the job variables in explaining job involvement, satisfaction, and organizational commitment among Indian police officers. The findings support the contention that job variables are important for Indian officers, as 9 of the 12 hypotheses were supported. Moreover, a broader interpretation suggests that certain job variables may be universally important to policing despite its cross-national contexts. That is, despite vastly different cultural contexts, some of our findings relating to Indian officers parallel findings relating to Western officers in developed nations. This suggests that these factors maybe important, possibly transcending cultural and national boundaries; however, additional research is needed to support this contention.

As hypothesized (Hypotheses 4–6), job variety had a significant positive association with job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. For the Indian officers in this study, variety in job tasks appears to be important in helping develop positive workplace outcomes. The ability to be creative and learn new things on the job may allow officers to experience positive psychological states, such as a sense of accomplishment and enjoyment, and could result in a better fit with the organization.

Similarly, positive perceptions of job training were linked with higher levels of involvement, satisfaction, and commitment (Hypotheses 7–9). Officers who felt that the training provided met their job needs and provided them with the skills to be successful, viewed their jobs in a more positive manner, ultimately leading to higher levels of involvement, satisfaction, and commitment. Training provides people with the skill, knowledge, and experiences to succeed at their jobs, generally resulting in a better fit for the person with the organization. In the end, this probably allows them to be more successful in their jobs and organization, resulting in greater commitment to the job and agency as well as gaining greater satisfaction from their job.

The results support the contention that perceptions of considerate and supportive supervision are linked with higher levels of involvement, satisfaction, and commitment (Hypotheses 10–12). The manner in which an Indian officer is treated by his or her supervisor appears to affect how that person views his or her job and the organization and appears to result in a positive person–environment fit. Unlike the other job variables tested, supervisors and/or supervision styles are easier to change in our view, which means Indian police administrators might be able to improve upon these three areas by making adjustments to management or supervision styles.

Contrary to our hypotheses, job autonomy did not have a significant positive relationship with any of the dependent variables and does not support our contention that it was a salient variable under the person–environment fit theory for Indian officers (Hypotheses 1–3). For both satisfaction and commitment (Hypotheses 2 and 3), job autonomy had a nonsignificant effect, suggesting that, perhaps, job autonomy might not be valued as highly by Indian officers compared to officers from more developed countries. For example, on a continuum from highly individualistic to highly collectivist cultures, the United States falls toward the individualist end, whereas India falls closer to...
the middle to the collectivist end; therefore, it is entirely plausible that job autonomy could be more highly valued among members of more individualistic cultures than among members of more collectivist cultures. This, of course, is untested here. Despite job autonomy's nonsignificance with satisfaction and organizational commitment, it may be linked with other work outcomes, such as job stress, burnout, turnover intent, or performance. This, of course, needs to be studied. The negative association between job autonomy and involvement (Hypothesis 1) in the multivariate analysis was opposite to our prediction and is not in line with the person–environment fit theory. The Haryana police could be a highly structured and hierarchical system for line personnel, and job autonomy may actually be a negative outcome for officers. It is also possible these findings are the result of what the respondents believed their superiors wanted them to say concerning job autonomy. Additionally, the results might be the result of random error. Clearly, more research is needed to determine what type of effects job autonomy has on Indian officers.

The personal characteristics were generally not significant predictors of any of the dependent variables. For the job involvement equation, only gender had a significant association, with women reporting higher levels of involvement. Female Indian officers may place a greater importance to their jobs. Similar to the United States, female officers are a relatively new occurrence, and percentagewise, women still represent a small group in policing. In the current study, 12% of the respondents were women and approximately 11% of the police in the Indian State of Haryana are female. None of the personal characteristics were significant predictors of satisfaction. Only post location and district had significant associations with commitment. Post location was found to be significantly associated with organizational commitment. Specifically, officers who were posted in police stations were found to have a higher organizational commitment as compared to the officers who were posted in police lines or those assigned to do clerical work. The officers in police stations are mostly investigating officers (detectives). Detective work has been glorified through many television shows and also in books. The lure of detective work and the glamor associated with it might cause officers to have higher commitment. It could also be that officers more committed are more likely to be promoted. In addition, station officers tend to be involved in traditional law enforcement duties and responsibilities, and as such, they may identify with the work being done and may be more likely to bond with the police agency.

As indicated, the officers in Rohtak district reported lower commitment than did their counterparts in Sonipat district. Contact was made with the police chief office of the Indian State of Haryana for possible explanations on why the officers in the Sonipat district had higher levels of commitment than did the officers in the Rohtak district as found in the multivariate analysis. It was indicated that each district is headed by a Superintendent of Police who is the administrator for the officers in the district. It was indicated that the policing activities, priorities, and even the level of commitment of officers can be influenced to a degree by the Superintendent of Police because this position sets the agenda for the officer in the particular district. It could be that the Superintendent of Police has made a stronger connection with the officers in the Sonipat district than is the case in the Rohtak district. Another explanation is the issues faced in each district. The Rohtak district is the home town of the Chief Minister of the Haryana (i.e., position is similar to that of a U.S. state governor), and as such, the chief minister visits the Rohtak district more frequently, which results in additional security duties for officers, adding extra hours and work to the officers. In addition, the Rohtak district had experienced civil agitations and protests, which has added extra work for officers in this district. It is possible that because officers have to spend more time on these extra duties, resulting in longer hours, their level of commitment decreased. These are untested explanations, which need further study. Furthermore, as reported in the Results section, the personal characteristics explained little of the variance of involvement, satisfaction, or commitment. These findings are also extremely important to police administrators because personal characteristics are beyond their control. Thus, it suggests that involvement, satisfaction, and commitment are mostly influenced by intrinsic qualities of the job, which administrators can work to change, if necessary.
It is important to note that there were similarities and differences between the three regression models. Job variety, training, and supervision were all significant positive predictors of all three work attitudes, as expected under the person–environment fit theory. Variety and training were more consistent predictors across all three models than supervision, which was a stronger predictor for commitment than it was for involvement or satisfaction. For all three models, the job variables explained a far greater percent of the variance of the dependent variables than did the personal characteristics. One notable difference was that the job variables explained more variance for satisfaction and commitment than they did for involvement. The job variables could play a greater role in shaping satisfaction and commitment than bonding with the job. It could be that other factors outside of work result in a person psychologically identifying with being a police officer, such as motivations to become a police officer or personality (Brown, 1996, White, Cooper, Saunders, & Raganella, 2010). The low predictor power of the job variables for involvement found in this study need to be further explored to determine whether they will occur in other studies of Indian officers and officers in other nations or if they were an anomaly related to only the current study. Another difference between the models was the effects of job autonomy, as discussed earlier.

Even with the problems noted being an Indian police officer, the levels of job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment were high (see Table 1). This is an interesting finding that is difficult to explain without additional research. Other factors, such as helping deal with crime and helping citizens, could lead to high levels of the work attitudes. Job security and additional income through corruption may also result in these outcomes. The two surveyed districts in the Haryana police agency could be especially well run and this resulted in higher levels of these work attitudes or they may be present more widely throughout the Indian Police Service. There is also the possibility that the Indian officers did not fully understand the items dealing with involvement, satisfaction, and commitment. It is also possible that the officers were influenced in answering these items based on a concern to appear to be happy and committed officers to their superiors. The high levels of these work attitudes are an interesting finding and warrant additional study.

Although exploratory, our findings suggest Indian police administrators should be aware of the role that job variables appear to play in terms of involvement, satisfaction, and commitment of their officers. In order to improve these work attitudes, efforts need to focus on increasing job variety, more meaningful and relevant training, and supportive supervision. An important next step in this research agenda might be to conduct focus groups with officers to ask them how these dimensions can be improved. Similarly, scholars need to explore how different types of policing roles can be realistically expanded in India. Additionally, research is needed to determine what types of training are desired by Indian officers to allow them to do their jobs more effectively and efficiently. A focus group strategy could be used to ask Indian officers what training changes are needed and why. Supervisors need to be trained in the social aspects of their jobs in order to increase supportive and considerate supervision in policing. In addition, part of the evaluation of supervisors should include how they treat their subordinates. Indian officers need to be encouraged to provide constructive feedback of their supervisors. Finally, scholars need to study how supervision in the field of Indian policing can be enhanced. Making these and other changes will not be easy and will take time and guidance from scholars.

As with most research, the current study had limitations. It was a single study of police officers in two districts in the State of Haryana, India. The effects of job variables could be situational and contextual and could vary across different types of police agencies, especially in terms of other Indian states and among police agencies in other nations. Furthermore, the use of cross-sectional data does not allow for causality to be demonstrated. While the relationships tested have theoretical support, in order to show empirically that the job variables lead to changes in involvement, satisfaction, and commitment, longitudinal data are needed. Additionally, several of the index measures had lower than expected values for internal reliability, although this could be a result of cultural differences.
with Indian police officers. Nevertheless, the low $\alpha$ values are an issue. While the factor analysis results indicated convergent validity and unidimensionality, the Cronbach $\alpha$ values need to be increased in future studies. Future research should explore adding new measures to the indices to improve our understanding of factors that influence involvement, satisfaction, and commitment among Indian police.

Similarly, future research should consider evaluating other job variables in an effort to understand more completely how workplace factors play a role in the involvement, satisfaction, and commitment of Indian officers. For example, job variables of job skill, task identity (i.e., the level that a person understands how his or her job contributes to the overall outcome of the organization), task significance (i.e., degree that an employee perceives that he or she affects the well-being of others, particularly coworkers), and job feedback could be explored in future research on how they affect Indian police officers. In a study of Turkish police officers, skill variety, task identity, task significance, and job feedback all had positive relationships with job satisfaction (Buker & Dolu, 2010). Additionally, as evidenced by the amount of variance explained in this and past studies, other variables appear to help shape involvement, satisfaction, and commitment of Indian police officers (i.e., 15% of the variance was explained for the involvement index and about a quarter for the satisfaction and commitment indices). This means that other variables, including other workplace factors, help shape these work attitudes. Researchers need to continue their efforts to identify additional variables that improve the understanding of factors that influence work attitudes among Indian officers. Future studies could examine how the motivations for becoming a police officer influence job satisfaction because there are different reasons to seek employment in this field (Raganella & White, 2004). For example, White et al. (2010) found that the reasons why a person became a New York City police officer or expected from the job were significant predictors of job satisfaction 6 years after starting the career. Research is needed to explore how community variables (e.g., such as public support) may influence the work attitudes of Indian officers (Cooper et al., 2014). Finally, the consequences of the work outcomes need to be studied. It is not known at this time if improving the involvement, satisfaction, and commitment of Indian officers would help increase their job performance and their professionalization, which might in the end improve the relationship with citizens and the community, a nagging problem in India. There is a need for far more research in this and other areas not only among Indian officers but also police in other nations.

In closing, the police provide critical public services in a myriad of nations, and therefore, investing in officers is important. One way to invest in them is to focus on improving their job involvement, job satisfaction, and commitment. The current study examined the association between the job variables of job autonomy, job variety, training, and supervision with involvement, satisfaction, and commitment among officers from Sonipat and Rohtak districts in Haryana, India. The findings provide support for notion that job variables appear to be relevant in explaining Indian officer involvement, satisfaction, and commitment. Specifically, job variety, training, and supervision were each found to have positive relationships with the three work attitudes. Indian officers appear to want a supportive and positive work environment, as has been found among Western police officers. In other words, the person–environment fit theory generally appears to apply to officers in India. In addition, our findings indicate that Indian police administrators should take note of the importance that job variables may play in shaping work attitudes of Indian officers. At the very least, the authors hope that this study will spur additional research among how work environment factors affect police officers not only in India but also in other nations, particularly developing nations. With this information, it should be possible to improve the work attitudes of Indian officers. In the end, too much is at stake to ignore how workplace factors influence the job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment not only among Indian officers but those across the globe. Additional research on officers in a myriad of nations will provide salient information of which workplace factors are contextual on their effects and which one are more universal in their effects.
Appendix - List of Index Items and Factor Loading Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lambda/Factor Loading Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td>I live, eat, and breathe my job</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The most important things that happen to me in my life usually occur at my job</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most of my interests are centered around my job</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>I like my job better than the average worker does</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most days I am enthusiastic about my job</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I find real enjoyment in my job</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>I am proud to tell people that I work for the Haryana Police</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment</td>
<td>I tell my friends that this is a great organization to work for</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I find that my values and the Haryana Police values are very similar</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Haryana Police really inspires the best in me in the way of job</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job autonomy</td>
<td>I have a great deal of freedom as to how I do my job</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My job does not allow me much opportunity to make my own decisions</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(reverse coded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job variety</td>
<td>My job requires that I be very creative</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My job requires that I must constantly learn new things</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>I do not have enough training to do my job well (reverse coded)</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have been provided enough training to do my job well</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>When decisions are made by my supervisor, persons affected are asked for their ideas</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor gives me advance notice of changes</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor is friendly and approachable</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors at this posting give full credit to ideas contributed by employees</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor looks out for my personal welfare</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor does little to make it pleasant to work here (reverse coded)</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Above items were measured using a Likert-type response scale ranging from strongly disagree (coded 1) to strongly agree (coded 5).
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