

JOB ATTRIBUTES AND WORK ATTITUDES: A RESEARCH IN A MANUFACTURING COMPANY

Semra F. AŞCIGİL*

Abstract

This paper aims to explore the impact of teamwork participation on employee satisfaction and commitment in a manufacturing company. Along with teamwork, perceptions of job characteristics such as autonomy and complexity form the variables whose impact on attitudes has been studied. The findings of regression analysis reveal that the change in commitment level is significantly explained by complexity whereas the only significant independent variable explaining change in job satisfaction was job group. Teamwork participation does not make a difference in neither job satisfaction nor company commitment. The findings are interpreted combined with the findings of interviews to understand the social context in which teamwork is implemented.

Keywords: Teams, commitment, satisfaction, job related attitudes.

Öz

İşin Nitelikleri ve İş ile İlgili Tutumlar: Bir İmalat Firmasında Araştırma

Bu makale, takım çalışmalarına katılımın çalışanların işten duydukları memnuniyete ve işlerine duydukları bağlılığa olan etkisini, üretim sektöründe faaliyet gösteren bir firmada araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Takım çalışmasına katılımın yanısıra, özerklik ve karmaşıklık gibi iş ile ilgili nitelikler de çalışanların tutumlarına etki eden değişkenler olarak ele alınmıştır. Regresyon analizi sonucu elde edilen sonuçlar, işteki karmaşıklığın işe bağlılıkta meydana gelen değişimin istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir yüzdesini açıklarken, yalnız meslek grubu değişkeninin işten duyulan tatmini açıkladığını göstermiştir. Takım çalışmalarına katılımın ise işten duyulan memnuniyet ve işe karşı duyulan bağlılığı etkilemediği görülmüştür. Takım çalışmalarının yer aldığı sosyal ortamın da anlaşılabilmesi için, bulgular yapılan mülakatlarla birleştirilerek yorumlanmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Takımlar, işe bağlılık, memnuniyet, iş ile ilgili tutumlar.

* Doç. Dr., Middle East Technical University, Department of Business Administration, İnönü Bulvarı, 06531 Ankara/TURKEY, sascigil@metu.edu.tr

I. TEAMWORK AND WORK OUTCOMES

Considerable research has focused on the ways in which employees react to their jobs. The majority of these have examined the employee responses during organizational change. Organizational change based on restructuring work around teams has been a powerful change tool to improve performance of workplace. Most of the change programs initiated require involvement of organizational members more than before to achieve desired outcomes. In line with such efforts, considerable research exists in literature focusing on the attitudinal responses of employees to their jobs. Some of the research has provided evidence demonstrating that employee's affective responses to work maybe more directly related to the structural characteristics of the job, rather than individual characteristics of the employee (Griffin, 1988). Despite of this continuous interest in reasons of desired work attitudes such as satisfaction and commitment, teamwork remains to be an under-searched job attribute. The purpose of this paper is to expand the list of predictors of job attitudes to include *team membership* in understanding the attitudinal outcomes at workplace.

Teamwork is supposed to enable enhanced communication, coordination and integration of diverse information at the disposal of individual members (Rodwell *et. al.*, 1998; Tiernan *et. al.*, 2002). In this regard, teamwork opposes the traditional Taylorist intentions to isolate employees by means of assigning to standard tasks sequentially designed allowing less chances for communication. Teamwork is viewed to integrate individual with the organization (Morley and Heraty, 1995) whereas employees' consent for change is achieved by making them feel that their interests and company interests are aligned (Hare, 1976; Isabella and Waddock, 1994). To this end, team activities have been a common approach in reestablishing trust towards management who lose their trustworthiness mainly after downsizing experiences inherent in organizational change schemes. Taking a strategy deployment perspective, teamwork help in cascading down the new vision of doing business to operational levels and brings clarity about the future of both work and employees, offsetting ambiguities associated with change.

Numerous variables are found to influence the attitudinal outcomes of team based initiatives while the literature contains contradictory findings concerning the impact of teamwork on job attitudes (Batt, 2004). Significant relations have been found between teamwork and satisfaction and organizational commitment (Karia and Asaari, 2006) in a study of the effects of total quality management practices on employee's work related outcomes. Wright and Edwards (1988) have found out that teamwork leads to higher job satisfaction and labor productivity whereas no evidence was found about higher commitment. Harris (1992) and Nora, Rogers and Stramy (1985) found that

intrinsic job satisfaction increased after introducing team based work. Denis (1986), Larson and Gobeli (1987), Ford and Randolph (1992), Randolph and Posner (1992), and Doolen *et.al.* (2003) all cite increased satisfaction after structural changes that provide more challenging jobs and enhance responsibility and authority.

On the other hand, Griffin (1988) based on a 3 year follow up of quality circles with matched pairs comparison group have found that attitudes and behaviors improved initially for the experimental group however dropped back to previous levels subsequently. Marks *et. al.* (1986) suggested that quality circles programs saved employees from negative contextual factors but contributed less to enhance quality of work life. Parker and Slaughter (1988) argued that peer pressure may become a disadvantage for teams which may become a means for stress management.

Macy and Izumi (1993) found that there was no relationship between the introduction of elements of the integrative structure (self-managing teams, job enrichment, other team mechanisms, hierarchical changes and multi-skilling) and attitudinal outcomes to the work environment. Another research demonstrated that the reaction may not only be to the new schemes, but how they are introduced (Carroll and Flood, 2000). Frequently, introduction of such forms of organization is accompanied by reduced prospects for promotion, increased job insecurity, and job cuts which are unlikely to lead to any significant increase in organizational commitment.

II. JOB ATTRIBUTES AND JOB ATTITUDES

The aim of this study is to explore the influence of individual and job characteristics on job attitudes focusing primarily on the outcomes of team membership. To this end, five job related and two outcome related constructs will be employed as the independent and dependent variables. The job characteristics investigated are team membership, job complexity, work autonomy, occupational category and promotion expectation. In their contributing work on job characteristics and job outcomes, Evans *et. al.* (2002) point to the importance of recognizing that perceptions of job characteristics such as autonomy and complexity, do not necessarily reflect reality. However, the authors claim, these perceptions can effect how employees respond to that reality. Therefore, in this study the focus will be on perceptions of job characteristics rather than job characteristics themselves.

Company commitment and job satisfaction are the two attitudinal outcomes studied in this paper. Employee's age, gender, education and tenure are the individual demographic characteristics employed. A brief discussion of job

related characteristics and the two outcome variables investigated in this study and their relevance follow.

Job satisfaction is defined as employees' statements of satisfaction with various aspects of his/her job. In general commitment is a measure of the employee's intention to stay with the same company. According to Mowday *et. al.* "commitment emphasizes attachment to the employing organization, including its goals and values, whereas satisfaction emphasizes the specific task environment where an employee performs his or her duties" (1982: 28). It is also operationalized as willingness to show effort and achieve organizational goals. The major aim of most of the job characteristics research has been to understand the manner in which employees respond to the present job characteristics. Lawler and Hall (1969) stated that the way job is designed has a substantial impact upon the attitudes and feelings of employees. The direct relationship of job characteristics to job satisfaction is theoretically supported by many researchers (Fried and Ferris, 1987; Brown and Peterson, 1993; Singh, 1998; Williams, 1998) whereas autonomy and skill variety are found to enhance intrinsic motivation by way of increasing self-accomplishment feeling at work. Locke (1976) and Kirkman and Shapiro (2001) have argued that subjective values play an important role in the relationship between job characteristics and attitudes. This view is also supported by social information processing theory which suggests that worker attitudes are constructed through social interaction with workers in the workplace rather than determined either by worker characteristics or by objective job characteristics (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978).

Job complexity is about enhanced learning value created through skill variety inherent in a job. It is determined by the degree of challenge and growth a job offers to its incumbent. In literature there are empirical studies suggesting that skill variety is one of the best predictors of job satisfaction (Becherer *et. al.*, 1982) and that job commitment is greater among those who possess a variety of skills (Hunt, *et. al.*, 1985). Contrary to the previous findings, Schlenker and Gutek (1987) have found that reduction in skill variety by way of role loss has significant negative impact on job satisfaction. Similarly, Van der Heijden and Brickman (2001: 173-198) study rejected a positive relationship between skill variety and satisfaction.

Autonomy is described by Hackman and Oldham (1975: 162) as "the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the employee in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out." There are several studies that have empirically found significant direct relationships between autonomy and commitment (Rabinowitz *et. al.*, 1977) as well as satisfaction (Katz and Kahn, 1978; Kulik *et. al.*, 1988).

III. MEASURES AND HYPOTHESES

The research combines both qualitative and quantitative data to bring an explanation to the impact of job attributes on work attitudes acknowledging at the same time the historical constraints imposed by past employment relationships. Autonomy (decision autonomy of employee concerning pace, methods, tools, etc. and discretion involved), job complexity (greater skill utilization and development opportunity), team membership (whether employee was a participant of a team) and promotion expectation (whether employee anticipates a promotion in the near future) are the specific job attributes that are considered as independent variables in this research along with team membership. A questionnaire used by Lincoln and Boothe (1993) in a survey examining the effect of unions on job attitudes is used in collecting data. Acknowledging the importance of rewards on creating positive attitudes towards work (Witt and Nye, 1992; Schwarzwald *et. al.*, 1992), a question related with earnings was added, however, employees refrained from declaring their earning level and preferred not to declare it.

Job satisfaction and company commitment are work attitudes measured in the research assuming to be the dimensions of employee attitudes (See Table 1). Job satisfaction scale has been used by Quinn, Staines, and McCullough (1974) and company commitment scale is a subset of Porter organizational commitment scale (Porter *et. al.*, 1974). The impact of employee attributes like age, tenure in the company, education, marital status and gender are also considered as demographics. The scale reliability for 16 items was .73. The coefficient alpha for the sub-scales job satisfaction (3 items), commitment (6 items), complexity (4 items) and autonomy (3 items) were .67, .70, .65 and .61 respectively (See Table 2).

The following hypotheses are tested in quantitative results in this research:

Hypothesis 1: Teamwork participation will be positively associated with both job satisfaction and commitment.

Hypothesis 2: Perceived autonomy will be positively associated with both job satisfaction and commitment.

Hypothesis 3: Perceived complexity will be positively associated with job satisfaction and commitment.

Hypothesis 4: Team members and non-members differ in their levels of company commitment and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5: Occupational difference (job type) will lead to a change in the levels of commitment and satisfaction.

Table-1: Scale Items and Descriptive Statistics

Items	Mean	S.D
<i>Company Commitment</i>		
I am willing to work harder than I have to in order to help this company Succeed (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree)	3.54	1.56
I would take any job in order to continue working for this company (same)	2.47	1.58
My values and the values of this company are quite similar (same)	3.11	1.44
I am proud to work for this company (same)	3.78	1.45
I would turn down another job for more pay in order to stay with this Company (same)	2.34	1.36
I feel very little loyalty to this company (1=str. agree, 5= str. disagree)	3.71	1.58
<i>Job satisfaction</i>		
If a good friend of yours told you that he or she was interested in working at a job like yours at this company, what would you say? (1=would advise against it, 2= would have second thoughts, 3= would recommend it)	2.23	.58
Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide? (1=would not take, 5= would take job again)	2.29	.73
How much does your job measure up to the kind of job you wanted when you first took it? (1=not what I wanted, 5= what I wanted)	1.95	.71
<i>Job Complexity</i>		
How long would it take to train someone to do your work? 1= few hours, 5= more than a year	4.67	.70
My job requires a high level of skill (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree)	3.76	1.46
My jobs keeps me learning new things (1=str. disagree, 5= str. agree)	4.09	1.35
There is a lot of variety in the kinds of things that I do in my job (1=str. Disagree, 5= str. agree)	4.10	1.39
<i>Work Autonomy</i>		
My job gives me freedom as to how I do my work (1= str. disagree, 5= str. agree)	3.08	1.70
My job lets me decide the speed that I work (same)	3.20	1.72
The degree to which “my judgement” was cited (1=least effect, 5= most effect) in response to : “What has the most effect on what you actually do on your job?”	3.34	1.53

Table-2: Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-Correlation for Variables

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Commit.	3.11	.94	(.70)							
2. Satisfact.	2.13	.54	.419*	(.67)						
3. Complex	4.07	.94	.271*	.054	(.65)					
4. Autonomy	3.15	1.24	.234*	.152	.187	(.61)				
5. Team membership	-	-	.145	.102	.179	.082	-			
6. Promotion	-	-	.016	-.065	-.113	.117	.041	-		
7. Education	-	-	-.002	.023	.217*	.180	.083	-.180	-	
8. Job category	-	-	.198*	.235*	.120	.160	.120	.009	.446*	-

Cronbach Alpha values for the subscales (in parentheses) are in the diagonal.

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

In addition to the circulation of the questionnaire, interviews are conducted with 39 employees in order to support findings of quantitative analyses as well as place them in the social context in which teamwork is implemented. Interview summaries are also sought to clarify employees' feelings about teamwork activities in general and the implementation process.

IV. RESEARCH SITE AND PARTICIPANTS

The study was conducted in a manufacturing company in Turkey (the information on sector has been changed in order to make company name anonymous). The company employed approximately 710 employees, which was reduced from a thousand two years ago. In addition to downsizing, de-layering occurred in the organizational structure. Quality related initiatives were launched 6 years ago that preceded significant steps towards developing a quality culture for employee involvement. Employee involvement schemes like suggestion system, 5S and teamwork have been initiated as part of quality movement. Since a significant time (over two years) has passed over launching the teamwork at the plant, the possibility of a halo effect has been reduced. On the other hand, practices like flexible time and gain sharing are not adopted in the company at the time the study was conducted. The company has got ISO 9000 certification three years ago.

The target population in the research is identified as employees below middle management. 86 employees working in a different location and 19 managers holding senior and middle level positions are excluded from the population being studied. Among the remaining, 103 employees selected by convenience sampling completed the questionnaire. Employees were told that the survey was a study of employee attitudes being conducted by a researcher

and confidentiality was assured. The completed questionnaires were collected by employees themselves in each unit and gathered afterwards.

Of the total sample responding to the questionnaire, 10% were women and 90% were men. Their ages ranged from 22 to 51 with an average age of 34.8 (SD=5.12). 25% were primary school, 51% high school and 22% university graduates. With respect to years worked in the firm, 31% worked less than 8 years, 33% worked between 9 and 12 years and 30% worked more than 12 years. 40% of the respondents stated that they had no teamwork experience.

The suggestion schemes had a history of about 10 years in the plant. Team activities were initiated as soon as the quality management was launched. Team activities concentrated on quality improvement and error reduction activities with some study on preventing waste and improving work environment. The company offered no financial benefits for participation in teamwork. Teams were either voluntarily formed or members were invited by management to work on problems due to their accumulated experience on the topic. The teams workers participate are formed by members working generally within the same unit whereas teams composed of engineers may engage in issues aiming at resolving interdepartmental issues.

V. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

To test the hypotheses 1 to 3, the responses obtained from 103 employees are analyzed through regression analysis. Standard regression coefficients and t-values were obtained by regressing commitment and job satisfaction scores on job attributes (team membership, job complexity, work autonomy, promotion expectation, job type) and employee attributes (age, gender, marital status, education, tenure). The independent variables explain 17% of the variance in job satisfaction and 17.8% of the variance in commitment (See Tables 4 and 5). The fourth hypotheses are tested through independent sample t-tests (See Table 3).

Table-3: t-test for Equality in Work Attitudes Between Subgroups

Variable	Subgroup	N	Means	SD	t
Commitment	1 team memb.	60	2.99	1.02	-1.46
	2 nonmember	41	3.28	.82	
Satisfaction	1 team member	60	2.08	.59	-1.02
	2 nonmember	41	2.19	.45	
Commitment	1 promotion	14	3.05	.94	-1.16
	2 no promotion	83	3.09	.95	
Satisfaction	1 promotion	14	2.21	.62	.63
	2 no promotion	83	2.11	.54	
Commitment	1 worker	75	3.02	.98	-1.36
	2 engineer	25	3.31	.79	
Satisfaction	1 worker	74	2.06	.54	-1.91*
	2 engineer	25	2.29	.49	
Commitment	1 female	9	3.46	.69	1.17
	2 male	93	3.08	.96	
Satisfaction	1 female	9	2.41	.32	1.64
	2 male	93	2.10	.55	

*p<.10

Table-4: Result of Regression Analysis for Company Commitment

Independent Variables	Standardized Beta	t
Job Attributes		
Team membership (1=Y)	.004	.033
Job Complexity	.273	2.497*
Work Autonomy	.153	1.396
Promotion expectation (1=Y)	.033	.307
Job type (1=worker, 2=engineer)	.195	.681
Employee Attributes		
Age (in years)	-.071	-.446
Gender (1=f, 2=m)	-.090	-.789
Education (1=primary school., 4=university)	-.262	-1.861**
Tenure (in years)	.121	.681
R Square	.178	
Adj. R Square	.073	
Durbin Watson	1.479	

Note: N=103 *p<.05 **p<.10

Table-5: Result of Regression Analysis for Job Satisfaction

Independent Variables	Standardized Beta	t
Job Attributes		
Team membership (1=Y)	.125	1.136
Job Complexity	-.047	-.427
Work Autonomy	.146	1.329
Promotion expectation (1=Y)	-.132	-1.216
Job type (1=worker, 2=engineer)	.260	1.763**
Employee Attributes		
Age (in years)	.086	.535
Gender (1=f, 2=m)	-.244	-2.123*
Education (1=primary school., 4=university)	-.082	-.581
Tenure (in years)	.102	.568
R Square	.170	
Adj. R Square	.063	
Durbin Watson	1.561	
Note: N=103	*p<.05	**p<.10

Hypothesis 1

To test this hypothesis, regression results are used. The standardized regression coefficient for regressing commitment on independent variables listed above indicate a positive but not significant relationships between team membership and job satisfaction

(B=.125, t (89)=1.136) and between team membership and commitment (B = .004, t (89) = .033).

Hypothesis 2

The regression coefficients relevant for job satisfaction and perceived autonomy is positive but not significant (B=.146, t (89) =1.329). Similarly, results indicate a positive but not significant relationship for commitment and perceived autonomy (B=.153, t (89) =1.396).

Hypothesis 3

The beta coefficient for perceived complexity is in the expected direction in regressing commitment. The relationship between perceived complexity and commitment is positive and significant (B = .273, t (89) = 2.497, p< .05). The beta coefficient for perceived complexity and job satisfaction is negative but not significant (B = - .047, t (89) = - .427).

Hypothesis 4

The t-tests carried out indicate that team members and non-members do not differ significantly in terms of their commitment ($t(99) = -1.461$) and job satisfaction ($t(99) = -1.023$) levels.

Hypothesis 5

A significant difference is found between workers and engineers with regard to job satisfaction levels ($t(97) = -1.907$, $p < .10$). The workers' job satisfaction level (mean = 2.06, SD = .54) is lower than what engineers felt (mean = 2.29, SD = .49).

VI. QUALITATIVE RESULTS

The results of quantitative analyses mostly provide support for anticipated directions of the associations between independent and dependent variables. Autonomy and team membership induce positive changes in employee work attitudes as predicted through review of literature. While complexity contributes positively to commitment, its coefficient is negative for job satisfaction.

At this point of analysis, the data collected through interviews is used to understand how employees perceive teamwork activities. 39 employees were interviewed on a convenience basis. The interviews lasted between 15 minutes to 45 minutes. Of the interviewees, two are female. The average tenure of the respondents is 10.7 years. 19 of the interviewees stated active participation in a team activity at the time the interview was conducted. The questions asked during the interview are;

1. Considering your daily, weekly, monthly activities, what do you do to improve quality in your work?
2. What sort of things helps and supports you to improve your work?
3. What sort of things form obstacles for you in improving your work?
4. If things were ideal in your organization, what would they be like?

The interviews done with employees indicate that employees appreciate the training and learning opportunities provided, but still, they think that team related activities are not well organized leading to work overload. They state

that too many programs were launched leading to confusion and extra work load. Besides, increases in the workload that occurred both due to downsizing and assignment of new quality improvement related responsibilities increased work stress. Employees also feel uncomfortable about the inequalities of work share resulting from the developments in the way work is being done. However, they feel that compared to the past they are much more skilled and appreciate management's efforts to develop the human capital and investments in training. Despite of the well-established human resource development infrastructure, they complain about the way the process is implemented and the complaints are mainly on the late responses to proposals developed within involvement schemes. The delays in getting management's response to improvement suggestions or rejections of proposals without reasonable justifications were other reasons in decreased motivation and satisfaction levels. As one machine operator have said,

.....they rejected my suggestion and right after I left the unit, my suggestion was implemented. We are not allowed to trace and influence what will happen after we make a suggestion.

Similar views were voiced by another worker who said;

Our job ends once we make the suggestions. Afterwards, it is foreman's or engineer's decision whether to implement it or not. We are not given the chance to own, trace our ideas.

Effectiveness of team activities is misunderstood by middle management as 'increasing the number of teams'.

All middle managers do not have the same supportive attitude in facilitating team activities.

Based on the interview findings, it was observed that satisfaction with work varied depending on perceptions of employment security. The interviews also revealed that the relatively low satisfaction level is experienced among workers as compared to engineers. Workers have developed perceptions of insecure jobs and tended to be less satisfied. Engineers rarely conveyed doubts implying vulnerability during a possible future downsizing. They think that after developing new skills, they become more demanded and even more mobile. This may be considered as a sign of failure in teamwork ideals for integration with company goals, because engineers may prefer to choose alignment with their occupational standards and goals.

The occupational difference in satisfaction levels can be explained through insecurity felt by primary school graduates that is due to a rumor concerning the possibility of termination of employment contract. There were rumors going around such as;

It is said that management is going to replace us (primary school graduates) with technical school graduates.

The number of workforce was reduced by almost 30% in the past. We are afraid that we will be confronted with such a situation again!

Our wage levels are fine. However, compared to other companies, they (union representatives) signed agreement for relatively lower wages last time. The union representatives are not strong enough to defend our interests.

Although related question was not answered in the questionnaire, discontent with the wage level was a factor surfaced recurrently during interviews as a reason for low level of satisfaction felt. Interviewees were apparently making a social comparison; what bothered them actually was the feeling that there was no comparative justice in the industry. For them, it was perceived injustice rather than the wage level itself which lead to dissatisfaction.

On the other hand, employee views about training provided was quite positive as reflected by changes in perceived complexity having a positive association with changes in commitment level. Training opportunities may be interpreted as a possibility of longer-term relationship with the company, which at the same time made employees feel secure. Increased confidence as to employment security has affected employee commitment positively. Identifying teamwork with quality management, a 13 year experienced worker stated that;

After quality management was launched, we took many hours of training. I can feel the skill growth I experienced in the last 5 years.

However, similar feelings are not reflected concerning work satisfaction. As evident in the responses of employees during interviews, the ambiguities and unfairness created in responsibilities and workload distribution have negatively affected the impact of complexity on satisfaction.

The two significant coefficients in regression equation for company commitment belong to complexity and educational level, whereas job status and gender initiate significant changes in dependent variable in the regression equation for job satisfaction. The findings suggest that teamwork participation,

the main focus of this study, does not alone lead to a significant difference in job attitudes between participants and non-participants as shown by the t-tests. The other independent variable - age is found to be positively associated with job satisfaction. The interpretation for this can be that increased satisfaction among elderly is stemming from complacency. On the other hand, the inverse relationship of age and commitment need to be explained further. The adverse relationship may be an indicator of a preference for retirement particularly in a change demanding work environment where aged people find it hard to adapt to the requirements of new schemes introduced. On the other hand, experience has a positive association with both of the dependent variables. This shows that number of years worked in the company but not age is the reliable source for enhancing both job satisfaction and commitment to the company.

VII. DISCUSSION AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Based on above findings, it can be concluded that the outcomes based on employees' participation in team-based initiatives are more complex than predicted and shaped by multiple factors. It is seen that more factors need to be considered in explaining work outcomes whenever combined interpretations of quantitative and qualitative findings are considered. In addition to the individual and work related attributes employed in the study, organizational factors like employment policy pursued in the past, perceptions as to fairness of wages or how change is managed emerge as critical. Team membership and its consequences are vulnerable to the influences of organizational context in which they are embedded. Socialization within teams that is expected to create positive work outcomes may not offset the anxieties arising from poor relations in the past. Similarly, positive outcomes of team activities may not eliminate the suspicions over justice in pay levels or work share. Moreover, the interviews suggest that, the absolute amount of economic incentives provided, whether employees are fairly paid in return to the responsibilities assigned, may not all the time constitute reliable reason for job satisfaction. Employee's sensitivity to social comparisons i.e. fairness in relation to earnings of referent others is equally important.

There is a possibility for improving work attitudes through teamwork as demonstrated by the direction of the association; however, this is conditional on providing a flawless employment relationship inherited from the past as well as justice in payment policies. It is difficult to reconcile suspicions about a possible downsizing decision with participation islands, i.e. teams demanding also the trust of employees. Employee involvement schemes most of the time can not remove the tension created by a high degree of uncertainty over the

future of employment contract. What is lacking is trust that is to be created by just policies and actions to enhance identification with team goals.

It appears that there is more potential for enhancing commitment through increasing opportunities for learning new skills. Investment in people, facilitating a work environment where they acquire new skills and update their knowledge base is more likely to create long-term engagement and commitment to company goals. The interviews point out that training provided may be perceived also as a means for higher potential for mobility for highly educated staff, just as it implies greater possibility for self-employment after retirement for workers. Managers need to acknowledge that trust in policies is essential to create alignment with company goals which can be established through making people feel that company is helping employees to upgrade their skill levels and create a learning environment. Commitment presupposes development of a long-term perspective which can be easily endangered with rumors of layoffs.

Overall, the findings support the literature distinguishing the predictors of satisfaction and commitment. Moreover, it is not team membership alone that makes a difference in work related attitudes. As the qualitative findings suggest, the unique effect of perceptions as to how teamwork is managed need to be considered.

VIII. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

As a qualitative and quantitative analysis of teams in a manufacturing firm, the findings are context specific. Sampling based on convenience is another limitation that needs to be underlined. Lacking earnings related data among job attributes is one shortcoming of this research. This also partly clarifies why explanatory power of regression model was less than expected. A longitudinal study might explain the changes in work attitudes in different phases of teamwork implementation better than a study conducted at a given time. Intra-team and inter-team relations which are not considered in this research may also help to enrich our understanding of work attitudes.

The findings also show that considering different occupational categories will be promising in enriching the research on work attitudes. The implication is that, it will be hard to bring a mutually exhaustive explanation about employee reactions towards involvement schemes without acknowledging social component of each type of work relationship. Engagement with different realities creates perceptual differences of job attributes, ending in changing

impact of predictors affecting each outcome variable. Thus, the future research needs to bring the broader organizational context to attention. Future research may also focus upon the impact of company policies and management on work attitudes for different job or task categories. Finally, it can be concluded that the under-researched social context can better be understood whenever the quantitative and qualitative data is combined in a research.

REFERENCES

- Batt, R. (2004) "Who Benefits from Teams? Comparing Workers, Supervisors, and Managers", **Industrial Relations**, 43(1), 183-212.
- Becherer, R.C., F.W. Morgan and L.M. Richard (1982) "The Job Characteristics of Industrial Salespersons: Relationship to Motivation and Satisfaction", **Journal of Marketing**, 46, 125-135.
- Brown, S.P. and R.A. Peterson (1993) "Antecedents and Consequences of Salesperson Job Satisfaction: Meta- Analysis and Assessment of Causal Effects", **Journal of Marketing Research**, 30 (February), 63-77.
- Carrol, S.J. and P. Flood (2000) Editors' Introduction, in P. Flood, T. Dramgoole, S.J. Carroll and L. Gorman (ed.) **Managing Strategy Implementation: An Organizational Behavior Perspective**, Oxford: UK, Blackwell.
- Dennis, H. (1986) "Matrix Structures, Quality of Working Life and Engineering Productivity", **IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management**, 33(3), 148-156.
- Doolen, D.L., M.E. Hacker and E.M. Van Aken (2003) "The Impact of Organizational Context on Work Team Effectiveness: A Study of Production Team", **IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management**, 50(3), 285-296.
- Evans, K. R., J.L. Schlacter, Schultz, R.J., Gremler, D.D., Pass M. and W.G. Wolfe (2002) "Salesperson and Sales Manager Perceptions of Salesperson Job Characteristics and Job Outcomes: A Perceptual Congruence Approach", **Journal of Marketing**, 30-44.
- Ford, G.R. and W. Randolph (1992) "Cross-functional Structures: A Review and Interpretation of Matrix and Project Management", **Journal of Management**, 18(2), 267-294.
- Fried, Y. and G.R. Ferris (1987) "The Validity of the Job Characteristics Model: A Review and Meta-Analysis", **Personnel Psychology**, 40 (Summer), 287-312.

- Griffin, R.W. (1988) "Consequences of quality circles in an industrial setting: A Longitudinal Assessment", **Academy of Management Journal**, 31(2), 338-358.
- Hackman, J.R. and G.R. Oldham (1975) "Development of Job Diagnostic Survey", **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 60(April), 159-170.
- Hare, A.P. (1976) **Handbook of Small Group Research** (2nd ed.) New York: Free Press.
- Harris, T. (1992) "Towards Effective Employee Involvement: An Analysis of Parallel and Self-Managing Teams", **Journal of Applied Business Research**, 9(1), 25-33.
- Hunt, S., L.B. Chanka and V.R. Wood (1985) "Organizational Commitment and Marketing", **Journal of Marketing**, 49, 112-126.
- Isabella, L.A. and S.A. Waddock (1994) "Top Management Team Certainty: Environmental Assessments, Teamwork, and Performance Implications", **Journal of Management**, 20(4), 835-859.
- Karia, N. and M. Asaari (2006) "The Effects of Total Quality Management Practices on Employees' Work Related Attitudes", **The TQM Magazine**, 18(1), 30-43.
- Katz, D. and R.L. Kahn (1978) **The Social Psychology of Organizations**, New York, Wiley.
- Katzenbach, J. R. and D. K. Smith (1993) **The Wisdom of Teams : Creating the High Performance Organization.**, Boston : Harvard Business School Press.
- Kirkman,B.L. and D.L. Shapiro (2001) "The Impact of Cultural Values on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Self-managing Work Teams:The Mediating Role of Employee Resistance", **Academy of Management Journal**, 44(3), 557-569.
- Kulik, C.T., G.R. Oldham and P.H. Langer (1988) "Measurement of Job Satisfaction, Comparison of the Original and the Revised Job Diagnostic Survey", **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 73(3), 462-466.
- Lawler, E.E. and D.T. Hall (1969) "Effects of Job Redesign: A Field Experiment," **Journal of Applied Social Psychology**, 73(3), 462-466.
- Larson, E. and D. Gobeli (1987) "Matrix Management: Contradictions and Insights", **California Management Review**, 24(4), 126-138.
- Lincoln, J. R., and J. N. Boothe (1993) "Unions and Work Attitudes in the United States and Japan", **Industrial Relations**, 32(2), 159-187.

- Locke, E.A. (1976) "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction", in M.D. Dunette (ed.), **Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology**, 1297-1349, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Macy, B. and H. Izumi (1993) "Organizational Change, Design and Work Innovation: A Meta Analysis of 131 North American Field Studies 1961-1991", **Research in Organizational Change and Development**, 7, 232-313.
- Marks, M. L., P. H. Mirvis, E. J. Hackett and J. F. Grady (1986) "Employee Participation in a Quality Circle Program: Impact on Quality of Work Life, Productivity, and Absenteeism", **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 71, 61-69.
- Morley, M. and N. Heraty (1995) "The High Performance Organization: Developing Teamwork Where It Counts", **Management Decision**, 33(2), 56-64.
- Mowday, R., L. Porter and R. Steers (1982) **Organizational Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover**, New York: Academic Press.
- Nora, J., R. Rogers and R. Stramy (1985) **Transforming the Workplace**, Princeton, NJ: Princeton Research Press.
- Parker, M. and J. Slaughter (1988) "Management by Stress", **Technology Review**, 37-42.
- Porter, L. W., R. M. Steers, R. T. Mowday and P.V. Boulian (1974) "Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians", **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 59, 603-609.
- Quinn, R. P., K. Staines and M. R. McCullough (1974) **Job satisfaction : Is there a trend?** Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Rabinowitz, S., D.T. Hall and J.G. Godale (1977) "Job Scope and Industrial Differences as Predictors of Job Involvement: Independent and Interactive?", **Academy of Management Journal**, 20(June), 273-281.
- Randolph, W. and B. Posner (1992) **Getting the Job Done: Managing Project Teams and Task Forces for Success**, Old Tappan, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rodwell, J.J., R. Kienzie and M. A. Shadur (1998) "The Relationship among Work-Related Perceptions, Employee Attitudes, and Employee Performance: The Integral Role of Communication", **Human Resource Management**, 59, 603-609.
- Salancik, G.R. and J. Pfeffer (1978) "A Social Information Processing Approach to Job Attitudes and Task Design", **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 23: 224-253.

- Schwarzwald, J., M. Koslowsky and B. Shalit (1992) "A Field Study of Employees' Attitudes and Behaviors After Promotion Decisions", **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 77, 511-514.
- Schlenker, J.A. and B.A. Gutek (1987) "Effects of Role Loss on Work-Related Attitudes", **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 72(May), 287-293.
- Singh, J. (1998) "Striking Balance in Boundary Spanning Positions: An Investigation of Some Unconventional Influences of Role Stressors and Job Characteristics on Job Outcomes of Salespeople", **Journal of Marketing**, 62 (July), 69-86.
- Tiernan, S.D., P.C. Flood and P.M. Eamann (2002) "Employee Reactions to Flattening Organizational Structures", **European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology**, 11(1), 47-67.
- Van der Heijden, B.I.J.M. and J.G.Brinkman (2001) "Stimulating Lifelong Professional Growth by Guiding Job Characteristics", **Human Resources Development International**, 4(2), 173-198.
- Williams, T. (1998) "Job Satisfaction in Teams", **The International Journal of Human Resource Management**, 9(5), 782-799.
- Witt, L. A., and L. G Nye, (1992) "Gender and the Relationship Between Perceived Fairness of Pay or Promotion and Job Satisfaction", **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 77, 910-917.
- Wright, M. and P. Edwards, (1998) "Does Team Working Work and If so, Why?", **Economic and Industrial Democracy**, 19(1), 59-90.