

# Job Involvement of Polytechnic College Teachers in Tiruchirappalli District

OPEN ACCESS

Manuscript ID:  
MGT-2026-13039800

Volume: 13

Issue: 3

Month: January

Year: 2026

P-ISSN: 2321-4643

E-ISSN: 2581-9402

Received: 20.11.2025

Accepted: 27.12.2025

Published Online: 01.01.2026

Citation:  
Senthamil Selvamurugan.  
N. "Job Involvement of  
Polytechnic College Teachers  
in Tiruchirappalli District."  
*Shanlax International Journal  
of Management*, vol. 13,  
no. 3, 2026, pp. 66–75.

DOI:  
[https://doi.org/10.34293/  
management.v13i3.9800](https://doi.org/10.34293/management.v13i3.9800)



This work is licensed  
under a Creative Commons  
Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0  
International License.

**N. Senthamil Selvamurugan**

Assistant Professor, Department of Management  
Christhuraj College of Arts and Science, Panchapur, Trichy, Tamil Nadu, India  
 <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-1298-6139>

## Abstract

*This study examines the level of job involvement among polytechnic college teachers in the Tiruchirappalli District. The primary objective was to analyse whether job involvement differs with respect to age, gender, subject taught, and designation. A quantitative research design was adopted, and primary data were collected from 50 polytechnic college teachers using structured questionnaires. Percentage analysis, chi-square test, t-test, and one-way ANOVA were employed for data analysis. The results indicate that teachers exhibit moderate-to-high levels of job involvement. Although no statistically significant differences were observed across demographic variables, higher involvement was noted among mid-career teachers, science faculty, and Assistant Professors. This study contributes empirical evidence of teacher job involvement in technical education institutions. Future research should expand the sample size, adopt qualitative approaches, and examine the organizational and psychological determinants of job involvement.*

**Keywords:** Teacher Job Involvement, Polytechnic College Teachers, Technical Education Institutions, Gender, Subject Taught, Designation.

## Introduction

Education as an institution has been designed by society to encourage the social, cognitive, and behavioural development of students. Society has given teachers the responsibility to shape and provide direction to students. He is the one who plays a significant role in the lives of students in the initial years of development (Khan, 2017).

While several studies have examined job involvement among school and university teachers, limited empirical research has focused specifically on polytechnic college teachers, particularly in the context of technical education institutions in Tamil Nadu. Polytechnic colleges play a crucial role in skill development and employability; however, the work involvement of their teachers remains underexplored. This study addresses this gap by examining job involvement among polytechnic college teachers in the Tiruchirappalli District.

While extensive research has examined job involvement among school and university teachers, empirical studies focusing specifically on polytechnic college teachers remain limited, particularly in Tamil Nadu, India. Polytechnic institutions play a vital role in skill development and workforce preparation, making teacher involvement critical to educational effectiveness. This study addresses this gap by empirically analysing job involvement among polytechnic college teachers in the Tiruchirappalli District.

## Review of Literature

Involvement refers to an individual's engagement with their work. The construct of job involvement was proposed by Lodahl and Kejner in 1965.

It is the psychological identification of a worker with his work or the importance of work in the total self – image (Brown, 1996). Job involvement is defined as the extent to which an individual introduces himself to his job. Passionately took part in it and acknowledged that his job performance was valuable to his dignity (Pathak, 1983). Venkateswaran et al, (2015) revealed that less than 5 years, 5 years and above 5 years experienced teachers differs in job involvement. Teachers with less than 5 years of experience were more involved in their jobs than those with 5 years and above. Dehal and Kumar (2017) revealed that male and female, urban and rural college teachers differ in job involvement, and the mean values indicated that male and rural teachers were more involved in their job than their respective counterparts.

Recent studies have highlighted that organizational climate, professional autonomy, and institutional support significantly influence teacher job involvement (Fernet et al., 2019; Klassen & Chiu, 2021; Pan & Ghua, 2018). However, much of the existing literature focuses on school and general college teachers, with limited emphasis on the technical education faculty. This study extends earlier research by empirically examining job involvement in the polytechnic education context.

Recent empirical studies have indicated that organizational climate, professional autonomy, and institutional support significantly influence teacher job involvement (Fernet et al., 2019; Klassen & Chiu, 2021; Pan & Ghua, 2018). However, most existing studies have focused on school and general college teachers, with limited emphasis on technical education faculty. This study extends prior research by empirically examining job involvement in the polytechnic education context.

## Significance of the Study

Teaching is a profession which is meaningful only when a teacher involves himself in the teaching – learning process (Pan and Ghua, 2018). Teachers play a significant role in the generation, transfer,

and application of knowledge, and college teachers shape the future of their students.

Thus, the present study aims to examine the job involvement level of polytechnic college teachers in the Tiruchirappalli District.

## Objectives of the Study

1. To study the job involvement of polytechnic college teachers with respect to age.
2. To study the job involvement of polytechnic college teachers with respect to the subjects taught.
3. To study the job involvement of polytechnic college teachers with respect to sex (gender).
4. To study the job involvement of polytechnic college teachers with respect to their designation.

## Hypothesis of the Study

1. There is no significant difference between male and female teachers in job involvement.
2. There is no significant association between age of the college teachers in job involvement
3. There is no significant association between subjects teaching of the college teachers in job involvement
4. There is no significant difference between designation of the college teachers in job involvement.

## Methodology

This study is empirical and based on the survey method.

The questionnaire was developed based on established job involvement constructs from previous studies to ensure content validity. A pilot assessment was conducted to improve the clarity and consistency of the items. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were assured of confidentiality and anonymity to minimize response bias

## Sample Design

Out of total 16 colleges, 15 colleges are self – financing; 1 Govt aided college, I have selected all of them, the total size of the respondents is 50 only.

## Tools of Data Collection

A well-designed questionnaire was used to collect data from the different colleges. The questionnaire consists of two parts:-

The first part of the questionnaire contained information about the respondents' age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, subjects taught, designation, and type of college (government, government-aided, and self-financed). Experience, salary earned, teaching hours per week, and college location were the independent variables. The second part of the questionnaire contained questions regarding the job involvement of college teachers.

In this section, five factors (seeking the opinion of college teachers) are proposed that may impact the level of job involvement of college teachers.

They are the preparation of lessons at home, new work environment, time-limited work, relaxed atmosphere with students.

## Statistical Techniques

Two types of analyses were used in the present study.

To determine the characteristic features of the sample, I used percentage analysis.

## Chi – Squire Analysis

To test the framed hypothesis, I used chi – square analysis, T – test, and one-way ANOVA.

## Area of the Study

The present study covered the college teachers of 14 private colleges of self-financing nature, one aided college, and one government college situated in Tiruchirappalli District.

**Table 1 Sample Respondents According to their Age**

| Particulars | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------|-------------------|------------|
| Below 30yrs | 15                | 30         |
| 30 to 40yrs | 20                | 40         |
| Above 40yrs | 15                | 30         |
| Total       | 50                | 100        |

**Source:** primary data

From the table, it is clear that 40 percent of the respondents belong to the age group of 30 to 40 years. Thirty percent of the respondents belonged to

the age group of below 30 years and above 40 years, respectively. It is concluded that the majority of the respondents were in the 30–40 years age group.

**Table 2 Sample Respondents According to their Sex**

| Particulars | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------|-------------------|------------|
| Male        | 24                | 48         |
| Female      | 26                | 52         |
| Total       | 50                | 100        |

**Source:** Primary data.

From the table, it is clear that more than half of the respondents (52%) are female, while the remaining 48 percent of the respondents are male.

**Table 3 Sample Respondents According to their Marital Status**

| Particulars | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------|-------------------|------------|
| Unmarried   | 15                | 30         |
| Married     | 8                 | 16         |
| Widow       | 15                | 30         |
| Divorced    | 12                | 24         |
| Total       | 50                | 100        |

**Source:** Primary data

From the table, it is clear that 30 percent of the respondents are unmarried and 30 percent of the respondents are widowed. A very low percentage of the respondents were married (8 %).

**Table 4 Sample Respondents According to their Educational Qualification**

| Particulars     | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------|
| P.G with M.phil | 15                | 30         |
| P.G. With Ph.D  | 16                | 32         |
| Only P.G.       | 19                | 38         |
| Total           | 50                | 100        |

**Source:** Primary data

From the table, it is clear that 38 percent of the respondents have a P.G. degree only. 30 percent of the respondents are having P.G with M.Phil degree and 32 percent of the respondents are having P.G with Ph.D degree. It is concluded that most of the respondents have a P. G. degree only.

**Table 5 Sample Respondents According to the Teaching of Subjects**

| Particulars            | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| English                | 10                | 20         |
| Maths                  | 8                 | 16         |
| Physics                | 19                | 38         |
| Chemistry              | 4                 | 8          |
| Computer Engineering   | 3                 | 6          |
| Electrical Engineering | 2                 | 4          |
| Civil Engineering      | 2                 | 4          |
| Mechanical engineering | 2                 | 4          |
| Total                  | 50                | 100        |

**Source:** Primary data

From the table, it is clear that 38 percent of the respondents are handling the physics subject. Twenty percent of the respondents were handling English subjects. 16percent of the respondents were handling the Maths subject, and eight percent of the respondents were handling the Chemistry subject. Six percent of the respondents were handling computer engineering subjects. Only 4 percent of the respondents were handling electrical engineering, Civil Engineering and Mechanical engineering subjects, respectively; thus, it was concluded that the majority of the respondents were handling the physics subject.

**Table 6 Sample Respondents According to their Designation**

| Particulars         | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Assistant Professor | 19                | 38         |
| Associate Professor | 13                | 26         |
| Professor           | 18                | 36         |
| Total               | 50                | 100        |

**Source:** Primary data

From the table, it is clear that 38 percent of the respondents are Assistant professors, 36 percent are Professors, and only 26 percent are Associate Professors. It is concluded that the majority of the respondents belong to the category of assistant professors.

**Table 7 Sample Respondents According to their Employment Status of the Respondents**

| Particulars  | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------------|-------------------|------------|
| Govt         | 23                | 46         |
| Govt aided   | 16                | 32         |
| Self-finance | 11                | 22         |
| Total        | 50                | 100        |

**Source:** Primary data

From the table, it is clear that 46 percent of the respondents are working in government colleges. 32 percents of the respondents work in government-aided colleges, and the remaining 22% work in self-financed colleges. It is concluded that the majority of the respondents are working in government colleges.

**Table 8 Sample Respondents According to the Total Teaching Experience**

| Particulars | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------|-------------------|------------|
| Below 2yrs  | 14                | 28         |
| 2 to 5 yrs  | 12                | 24         |
| 5 to 10yrs  | 12                | 24         |
| Above 10yrs | 12                | 24         |
| Total       | 50                | 100        |

**Source:** Primary data

From the table, it is clear that, 28percent of the respondents have teaching experience below two years. Among the respondents, 24% had teaching experience of 2 to 5 years, 5 to 10 years, and above 10 years. It is concluded that the majority of the teachers have teaching experience of below 2 years (28 percent).

**Table 9 Sample Respondents According to their Salary**

| Particulars        | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Less than Rs.20000 | 14                | 28         |
| Rs.20001 to 30000  | 13                | 26         |
| Rs.30001 to 40000  | 11                | 22         |
| Rs.40001 to 50000  | 12                | 24         |
| Total              | 50                | 100        |

**Source:** Primary data

From the table, it is clear that 28 percent of the respondents earn a salary of less than Rs.20000, 26percent of the respondents are earning a salary of Rs.20001 to Rs.30000. Only 22 percent of the respondents earn a salary of Rs.30001–40000. It is concluded that one-fourth of the respondents earn a salary of less than Rs.20000.

**Table 10 Sample Respondents According to the Lecture Hours Per Week**

| Particulars  | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------------|-------------------|------------|
| Below 12     | 16                | 32         |
| 13 to 18     | 15                | 30         |
| 19 and above | 19                | 38         |
| Total        | 50                | 100        |

**Source:** Primary data:

From the table, it is clear that 38 percent of the respondents have lecture hours of 19 and above. 30percent of the respondents have lecture hours of 13 to 18 percent per week, and 32 percent of the respondents have lecture hours of below 12 hours per week.

**Table 11 Sample Respondents According to the Location of the College**

| Particulars | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------|-------------------|------------|
| Urban       | 18                | 36         |
| Rural       | 12                | 24         |
| Semi urban  | 20                | 40         |
| Total       | 50                | 100        |

**Source:** Primary data

From the table, it is clear that 40 percent of the colleges are situated in semi – urban areas and 36 percent of the colleges are situated in urban areas. Only 24 percent of the colleges are situated in rural areas. It is concluded that the majority of colleges are situated in semi – urban areas.

## Finding

**Table 12 - Q12**

| Particulars       | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 10                | 20.0       |
| Disagree          | 5                 | 10.0       |

|                |    |       |
|----------------|----|-------|
| Neutral        | 8  | 16.0  |
| Agree          | 9  | 18.0  |
| Strongly Agree | 18 | 36.0  |
| Total          | 50 | 100.0 |

## Opinion

Table analyzed the impact of job involvement factors on individuals interested in participating in work-related activities outside regular working hours. Of the 50 respondents, 36% strongly agreed. Disagree 10%. The respondents easily create a relaxed atmosphere with their students, with 34% strongly agreeing. Agree 14%.

The respondents who regularly spend time to keep abreast of current developments in their field strongly agreed, while 32% disagreed and 14% were neutral. The respondents lost their appetite all the time when undertaking time-limited work, strongly agree 18%, disagree 4%.

The respondents took less time to adapt to the new work environment and situation, with 14% strongly agreeing and 7% agreeing.

**Table 13 - Q13**

| Particulars       | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 9                 | 18.0       |
| Disagree          | 8                 | 16.0       |
| Neutral           | 9                 | 18.0       |
| Agree             | 7                 | 14.0       |
| Strongly Agree    | 17                | 34.0       |
| Total             | 50                | 100.0      |

**Table 14 - Q14**

| Particulars       | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 11                | 22.0       |
| Disagree          | 7                 | 14.0       |
| Neutral           | 7                 | 14.0       |
| Agree             | 9                 | 18.0       |
| Strongly Agree    | 16                | 32.0       |
| Total             | 50                | 100.0      |

**Table 15 - Q15**

| Particulars       | No.of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 12                | 24.0       |
| Disagree          | 4                 | 8.0        |
| Neutral           | 8                 | 16.0       |
| Agree             | 8                 | 16.0       |
| Strongly Agree    | 18                | 36.0       |
| Total             | 50                | 100.0      |

**Table 16 - Q16**

| Particulars       | No.of re-spondents | Percentage |
|-------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 11                 | 22.0       |
| Disagree          | 8                  | 16.0       |
| Neutral           | 10                 | 20.0       |
| Agree             | 7                  | 14.0       |
| Strongly Agree    | 14                 | 28.0       |
| Total             | 50                 | 100.0      |

**Table 17 Chi-square test**

| Q17 Table - 17 |                   |        |          |        |         |        |       |        |                |        |       |        |                                                                |
|----------------|-------------------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|-------|--------|----------------|--------|-------|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Age            | Strongly Disagree |        | Disagree |        | Neutral |        | Agree |        | Strongly Agree |        | Total |        | Statistical Inference                                          |
|                | n                 | %      | n        | %      | n       | %      | n     | %      | n              | %      | n     | %      |                                                                |
| Below 30yrs    | 4                 | 36.4%  | 4        | 50.0%  | 2       | 33.3%  | 4     | 36.4%  | 1              | 7.1%   | 15    | 30.0%  | X <sup>2</sup> =7.161<br>Df=8<br>0.519>0.05<br>Not Significant |
| 30 to 40yrs    | 3                 | 27.3%  | 2        | 25.0%  | 2       | 33.3%  | 4     | 36.4%  | 9              | 64.3%  | 20    | 40.0%  |                                                                |
| Above 40yrs    | 4                 | 36.4%  | 2        | 25.0%  | 2       | 33.3%  | 3     | 27.3%  | 4              | 28.6%  | 15    | 30.0%  |                                                                |
| Total          | 11                | 100.0% | 8        | 100.0% | 6       | 100.0% | 11    | 100.0% | 14             | 100.0% | 50    | 100.0% |                                                                |

The chi-square test was used to determine the association between the age of the respondents and their job involvement.

The chi-square test was used to determine the association between the age of the respondents and their job involvement.

Ho:- There is no significant association between the age of the respondents and their job involvement.

The chi-square test results show that, out of 50 respondents, 15 were below 30 years of age.

1 strongly agree, 4 strongly disagree in the age group of 30 to 40 years, out of 20 respondents, 9 strongly agreed and 3 strongly disagree. In the age group of above 40 years, out of 15 respondents, 4 strongly agreed and 4 strongly disagreed.

**Table 18 Chi-Square test**

| Q18 Table -18    |                   |       |          |       |         |       |       |       |                |       |       |       |                                                                  |
|------------------|-------------------|-------|----------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject          | Strongly Disagree |       | Disagree |       | Neutral |       | Agree |       | Strongly Agree |       | Total |       | Statistical Inference                                            |
|                  | n                 | %     | n        | %     | n       | %     | n     | %     | n              | %     | n     | %     |                                                                  |
| English          | 4                 | 36.4% | 2        | 25.0% | 0       | .0%   | 3     | 27.3% | 1              | 7.1%  | 10    | 20.0% | X <sup>2</sup> =27.383<br>Df=28<br>0.497>0.05<br>Not Significant |
| Maths            | 0                 | .0%   | 3        | 37.5% | 1       | 16.7% | 2     | 18.2% | 2              | 14.3% | 8     | 16.0% |                                                                  |
| Physics          | 4                 | 36.4% | 1        | 12.5% | 2       | 33.3% | 5     | 45.5% | 7              | 50.0% | 19    | 38.0% |                                                                  |
| Chemistry        | 1                 | 9.1%  | 0        | .0%   | 2       | 33.3% | 0     | .0%   | 1              | 7.1%  | 4     | 8.0%  |                                                                  |
| Computer Engg.   | 0                 | .0%   | 1        | 12.5% | 1       | 16.7% | 0     | .0%   | 1              | 7.1%  | 3     | 6.0%  |                                                                  |
| Electrical Engg. | 1                 | 9.1%  | 0        | .0%   | 0       | .0%   | 0     | .0%   | 1              | 7.1%  | 2     | 4.0%  |                                                                  |
| Civil Engg.      | 0                 | .0%   | 1        | 12.5% | 0       | .0%   | 0     | .0%   | 1              | 7.1%  | 2     | 4.0%  |                                                                  |

|                  |    |        |   |        |   |        |    |        |    |        |    |        |  |
|------------------|----|--------|---|--------|---|--------|----|--------|----|--------|----|--------|--|
| Mechanical Engg. | 1  | 9.1%   | 0 | .0%    | 0 | .0%    | 1  | 9.1%   | 0  | .0%    | 2  | 4.0%   |  |
| Total            | 11 | 100.0% | 8 | 100.0% | 6 | 100.0% | 11 | 100.0% | 14 | 100.0% | 50 | 100.0% |  |

Chi-square test to find out the association between the subject teaching of the respondents and their job involvement

A chi-square test was conducted to determine the association between the subject teaching of the respondents and their job involvement.

Ho: There is no significant association between the teaching of subjects by the respondents and their job involvement. The chi-square test results show that, out of 50 respondents, 15 taught physics. 50 % of them strongly agree, 12.5% of them disagree this.

Of them, 10 taught English, 36.4% strongly disagreed, and 7.1% strongly agreed.

Equal percentage (ie) 4 of the respondents are teaching the subject of Electrical engineering, Civil Engineering and Mechanical Engineering respectively. 20% of the respondents are teaching English, 16% of them are teaching Maths, 38

percentage of them are teaching physics subjects.

**Table -19 t-test**

| Q15    | n  | Mean | S.D   | Statistical inference                          |
|--------|----|------|-------|------------------------------------------------|
| Male   | 24 | 3.29 | 1.367 | t=0.118 Df=48<br>0.906>0.05<br>Not Significant |
| Female | 26 | 3.35 | 1.832 |                                                |

A t-test was conducted to determine the difference between the gender of the respondents and their job involvement.

Ho:- There is no significant difference between the gender of the respondents and their job involvement; the mean value of males is 3.29. The mean value for females was 3.35.

The mean value for females was higher than that for males.

Therefore, females have higher job involvement than males.

**Table 20 Oneway ANOVA**

| Q12                 | N  | Mean | S.D   | SS      | Df | MS    | Statistical Inference                    |
|---------------------|----|------|-------|---------|----|-------|------------------------------------------|
| Between Groups      |    |      |       | 4.808   | 2  | 2.404 | F=0.998<br>0.376>0.05<br>Not Significant |
| Assistant Professor | 19 | 3.79 | 1.357 |         |    |       |                                          |
| Associate Professor | 13 | 3.08 | 1.706 |         |    |       |                                          |
| Professor           | 18 | 3.22 | 1.629 |         |    |       |                                          |
| Within Groups       |    |      |       | 113.192 | 47 | 2.408 |                                          |

Of the respondents, 38% were assistant professors, 36 percent were professors, and the remaining 26% were associate professors.

### One way anova

Analysis of variance results for designating and teacher job involvement.

To determine the relationship between the independent variable, designation, and the dimension of the dependent variable, teacher job involvement, a one-way ANOVA was conducted while considering the mean value. The teachers working in the designation of Assistant Professor had a mean value of 3.79.

The teachers with the designation of associate professors have a mean value of 3.08. The teachers working in the designation of professor had a mean value of 3.22.

Of these three designations. Teachers working in the designation of assistant professor have the highest job involvement, while those working in the designation of associate professor have the lowest job involvement.

1. The survey showed that 40 percent of the respondents were in the age group of 30–40 years. The remaining 30 percent of the respondents were below 30 years and above 40 years of age.

2. It was know from the table that, 52 percent of the respondents are female, 48 percent of the respondents are males
3. It is known from the table that an equal percentage of 30 are unmarried and widowed, respectively. Very low percent of the respondents are married
4. 38 percent of the respondents had only a P. G. degree. 30 percentage of the respondents are having P.G. with M.Phil degree. 32 percent of the respondents had a P. G. with a Ph.D. degree.
2. Workload management and academic autonomy should be improved, especially among early career faculty.
3. Continuous training and skill-upgradation programs should be encouraged for technical subject teachers.
4. Supportive institutional policies can help sustain high levels of teacher engagement.

46 percent of the respondents worked in the government. Colleges. Of the respondents, 32 percent were from government-aided colleges and 22 percent were from self-financed colleges. 40percent of the colleges are in semi – urban areas and 24 percent are in rural areas. Of these, 36% are in urban areas.

### Findings

The findings indicate that most polytechnic college teachers demonstrate moderate to high levels of job involvement, particularly in participating in work-related activities beyond regular working hours and maintaining a positive learning environment. This reflects the strong professional commitment of teachers.

Age-wise analysis using the chi-square test revealed no statistically significant association between age and job involvement. However, teachers in the 30–40 age group showed relatively higher involvement, suggesting greater engagement during the mid-career stage.

Subject-wise analysis also showed no significant association, although teachers handling physics and other technical subjects reported higher involvement, possibly due to increased academic demands. Gender-based analysis indicated no significant difference, although female teachers recorded slightly higher mean job involvement scores. Designation-wise analysis revealed that Assistant Professors had higher involvement, likely due to career advancement motivations.

### Suggestions

1. Polytechnic institutions should strengthen professional development and recognition programs to enhance teacher job involvement.

### Future Research Directions

Future studies should include larger samples across different districts or states to improve generalisability. Comparative studies between government-aided and self-financing institutions may offer deeper insights. Qualitative approaches, such as interviews, could further explore the psychological and organizational factors influencing job involvement.

### Conclusions

The present study examined job involvement among polytechnic college teachers in the Tiruchirappalli District and found that teachers generally exhibited satisfactory levels of professional engagement. Although demographic variables did not show statistically significant differences, meaningful patterns were observed across age, subjects taught, and designations.

This study contributes to the limited empirical literature on job involvement in technical education institutions. Enhancing teacher job involvement is essential for improving instructional quality, institutional effectiveness and student outcomes.

### References

- Ahluwalia, S. P. "Job Involvement of Teacher Educators in Relation to Certain Demographic Variables." *Journal of Human Values*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2010, pp. 75–84.
- Argyris, C. *Integrating the Individual and the Organization*. John Wiley & Sons, 1964.
- Bandura, A. *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. W.H. Freeman, 1997.
- Blau, G. J. "A Multiple Study Investigation..." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 27, no. 1, 1985, pp. 19–36.

- Brown, S. P. "A Meta-Analysis and Review of Organizational Research on Job Involvement." *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 120, no. 2, 1996, pp. 235–255.
- Dehal, P., and S. Kumar. "Job Involvement of College Teachers in Relation to Gender and Locale." *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2017, pp. 45–50.
- Diefendorff, J. M., et al. "Examining the Roles of Job Involvement..." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2002, pp. 93–108.
- Dubin, R. "Industrial Workers' Worlds..." *Social Problems*, vol. 3, no. 3, 1956, pp. 131–142.
- Fernet, C., et al. "Committed, Inspiring, and Healthy Teachers: How Do School Environments and Motivational Factors Facilitate Optimal Functioning?" *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 59, 2019, pp. 481–491.
- Hackman, J. R., and G. R. Oldham. "Motivation through the Design of Work..." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, vol. 16, no. 2, 1976, pp. 250–279.
- Kanungo, R. N. "Measurement of Job and Work Involvement." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 67, no. 3, 1982, pp. 341–349.
- Khan, A. "Role of Teachers in the Moral Development of Students." *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2017, pp. 150–165.
- Klassen, R. M., and M. M. Chiu. "The Occupational Commitment and Intention to Quit of Practicing and Pre-Service Teachers." *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2021, pp. 114–129.
- Liu, L., et al. "The Influence of Social Support on the Job Involvement..." *Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2025, p. 271.
- Locke, E. A. "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction." *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, edited by M. D. Dunnette, Rand McNally, 1976, pp. 1297–1349.
- Lodahl, T. M., and M. Kejner. "The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 49, no. 1, 1965, pp. 24–33.
- Mathieu, J. E., and J. L. Farr. "Further Evidence for the Discriminant Validity..." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 76, no. 1, 1991, pp. 127–133.
- Meyer, J. P., and N. J. Allen. "A Three-Component Conceptualization..." *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1991, pp. 61–89.
- Mowday, R. T., et al. "The Measurement of Organizational Commitment." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 14, no. 2, 1979, pp. 224–247.
- Moynihan, D. P., and S. K. Pandey. "Finding Workable Levers..." *Administration and Society*, vol. 39, no. 7, 2007, pp. 803–832.
- Pan, B., and R. Ghua. "Teacher Involvement, Professional Commitment and Teaching Effectiveness in Higher Education." *Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 111, no. 4, 2018, pp. 412–421.
- Pathak, R. D. "Job Involvement: Its Conceptual Clarification and Empirical Exploration." *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1983, pp. 64–75.
- Paulhus, D., and D. R. Shaffer. "Sex Differences in the Impact..." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, vol. 44, no. 4, 1981, pp. 363–368.
- Rabinowitz, S., and D. T. Hall. "Organizational Research on Job Involvement." *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 84, no. 2, 1977, pp. 265–288.
- Reeve, C. L., and C. S. Smith. "Refining Lodahl and Kejner's Job Involvement Scale." *Organizational Research Methods*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2001, pp. 91–111.
- Rich, B. L., et al. "Job Engagement..." *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 53, no. 3, 2010, pp. 617–635.
- Richter, A., et al. "The Effectiveness of Teams in Organizations." *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 22, no. 13, 2011, pp. 2749–2769.
- Saleh, S. D., and J. Hosek. "Job Involvement: Concepts and Measurements." *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1976, pp. 213–224.
- Schaufeli, W. B., and A. B. Bakker. "Job Demands, Job Resources..." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 25, no. 3, 2004, pp. 293–315.

- Singh, A. P. *Job Involvement Questionnaire*. Department of Psychology, Banaras Hindu University, 1989.
- Su, Q. "Beyond the Walls of the Classroom..." *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 15, 2024, p. 1465880.
- Venkateswaran, S., et al. "Job Involvement of College Teachers in Relation to Their Experience." *Journal of Education and Practice*, vol. 6, no. 15, 2015, pp. 99–104.

#### Author Details

**N. Senthamil Selvamurugan**, Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Christhuraj College of Arts and Science, Panchapur, Trichy, Tamil Nadu, India, **Email Id:** Senthamilmurugan6@gmail.com.