

A STUDY ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB INVOLVEMENT AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHING STAFF IN SELF FINANCING ENGINEERING COLLEGES IN ANNA UNIVERSITY-REGION III

*M. Valan Rajkumar**,

Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering,
United Institute of Technology, Coimbatore, India.

*Corresponding Author & Email: valanrajkumar@gmail.com

T. Meharajan,

Department of Management Studies
(DDE), Madurai Kamaraj University,
Madurai, India.

R. Ilangovan,

Department of Civil Engineering,
University College of Engineering,
Dindigul, India.

ABSTRACT

This paper focus on finding out the psychological test of job involvement among teachers in self-financing engineering colleges affiliated to Anna University, Region III – Madurai. The enhanced feeling of involvement in the job would make the teachers have a positive attitude towards the teaching profession. So the researcher has prepared a questionnaire to measure the psychological test among teachers. The descriptive research design is used to conduct the research which describing the characteristics of a particular individual or of a group. The samples are collected from the universe, stratified random sampling is used, and to conduct this study 620 samples are collected out of 3015 teachers. For collecting the data, the questionnaire method is used. The data collected has been analyzed through the application of percentage analysis, ANOVA (analysis of variance) and T-Test. Finally the researcher analyzed the data using SPSS (statistical package for the social science) 15.0 version and found that there is a considerable level of psychological test of job involvement on demographic variables among teachers. Hence the engineering colleges have to look forward to an improved sense job involvement with reduction of occupational stress among the teaching faculty to extract the best out of them. So the management should take necessary steps to reduce occupational stress among teachers because it will result in increased job involvement and quality of education.

Keywords: Job Involvement, Dedicated, Faculty Members, Engineering Colleges.

Introduction:

Teaching is an art and the quality of teaching depends on the love, dedication and devotion of the teacher towards the subject of the knowledge. The quality of any teaching programme cannot rise above the quality of its teachers. Teaching jobs are regarded as the noblest of all the professions in the world. The quality of education in any educational institute hinges on the availability of good

teachers. A good teacher not only shows the right path that the students should follow but also prepares the human resource for the further development of the nation. Therefore, teaching jobs not only offer an opportunity to earn one's living but also to engage in one of the oldest and noblest professions. Some people find teaching jobs appealing also because it entails engagement in various extracurricular and other activities of

the institute. With education becoming the need of the hour it is an essential fact that teachers work with high levels of satisfaction which would result in a positive attitude towards teaching.

Thomas Lodahl and Mathilde Kenjer (1965) contend that job involvement is the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work, or the importance of work in his total self-image. Job involvement may also be thought of as the internalization of values about the goodness of work or the importance of work in the worth of the person, and perhaps it thus measures the ease with which the person can further be socialized by the organization. Begley and Cazjka (1993) are suggested that committed employees, because of their positive attitudes, are less distressed by occupational stressors and therefore they perceive less stress.

Job involvement is the degree to which a person perceives his total work situation to be an important part of his life and to be central to him and his identity because of the opportunity it affords him to satisfy his important needs (Saleh and Rosek 1976). Guion (1958) proposed that it is characterized by the employee's perception of the job as being of extreme importance. Job factors can influence the involvement level of the individual in his job. The researchers found a negative relationship between job stressors and job involvement i.e. employees whose job involvement is high respond more negatively to job stressors (Frone et al 1995).

Job involvement is the psychological identification a person has with his or her job (DeCarufel and Schaan, 1990). It is the degree to which a person views the importance of a job in his or her life (Paullay et al 1994). 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" (DeCarufel and Schaan 1990). "Persons with low job involvement would place something other than their jobs (e.g., family, hobbies) at the center of their lives".

Job involvement refers to employees' attitudes toward their jobs and is one of the most specific factors relevant to work performance. The construct of job involvement has been defined as "the degree to which one is cognitively preoccupied with, engaged in, and concerned with one's present job" (Paullay et al 1994). Family responsibility and attitudes towards teaching are the most influential factors among female academics in job involvement and satisfaction (Mukthamath et al 1991). People with high levels of job involvement tend to be satisfied with their jobs and highly committed to their careers, professions, and employing organizations (Brown 1996).

Review of Literature:

The term of job involvement can be described as "the degree to which one is cognitively preoccupied with, engaged in, and concerned with one's present job" (Paullay et al., 1994). These kinds of employees can be recognized by the level they feel that the job is an important aspect of their self-definition. This statement and the construct is a popular term and widely used in the literature of employee performance (Robinson et al., 2004). However, a lot of work has been done by the practitioners and it can be found in the journals where it is recognized mostly as a theory rather than put it into practices and develops some empirical results. Robinson et al. (2004) argued that the most of the work is surprisingly attract low attention from the organization and becomes popular. This results in a way that the concept is going to be faddish or just present in the academic literature rather than in practice. The situation becomes worst as the term job involvement is described by different researcher in a diverse pattern and these descriptions are very different from each other.

Most of the times, these descriptions are similar to the term of organizational commitment or organizational citizenship behavior (Robinson et al., 2004). Some researchers also describes the term as intellectual and emotional commitment towards the organization (Baumruk, 2004; Richman, 2006; Shaw, 2005) or by the degree of discretionary efforts exercised by the employees in the organization (Frank et al., 2004). Different researcher explains the term by their own perception, Kahn (1990) define it as "the harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles; in involvement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances". Putting it simply, the term involvement refers to the physical and mental presence of the employee while doing the work in the organization.

Methodology:

To find out the psychological test of job involvement in selective engineering colleges affiliated to Anna University, Region III-Madurai. The researcher has used descriptive research design. Descriptive research studies are concerned with describing the characteristics of a particular individual, or a group, (C.R.Kothari, 2007). For conducting the study thirty six colleges having crossed four years are chosen from the population of 48 colleges. Out of which teachers who have served for two and more years in their present institution are taken as sample for data collection. 3015 teachers having crossed two and more years

were working during 2015-16. Out of which 620 samples are collected. Here the researcher has used stratified random sampling to collect the samples from the universe. For collecting the data researcher has used questionnaire where categorized the questions into four perspectives (demographic variables, occupational stress index, job involvement, job satisfaction) which will enable the researcher to understand and analyze the impact of job involvement among teachers. Finally the researcher has used SPSS software package 15.0 version for analyzing data.

Demographic Survey:

The questionnaire included a demographic profile based on the purpose of the demographic questions to identify the respondents' demographic characteristics. These parameters included; age, sex, marital status, educational qualification, department, designation, total teaching experience, salary, lecture hours per week, distance between the institution and residence and survey districts.

Job Involvement Scale:

The survey questionnaire consists of six items. The aim is to measure the job involvement of teachers. A five points likert type scale (1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-neutral, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree) is used to evaluate the impact on job involvement. The major three points are considered in this paper, (i) Most of the work schedule that I plan is effective, (ii) I involve myself to deal very effectively with the problems of my students and (iii) I regularly spend time to keep abreast of current developments in my field.

Data Analysis and Interpretations:

The analysis of the above the job involvement scale, which are compared with the respondent demographic characteristics. The demographic characteristics versus Most of the schedule that I plan are effective is shown in table. 1. The demographic characteristics versus I involve myself to deal very effectively with the problems of my students are shown in table. 2. The demographic characteristics versus I regularly spend time to keep abreast of current developments in my field are shown in table. 3.

Demographic Characteristics versus Most of the Schedule that I plan are Effective:

The demographic characteristics of teachers and their psychological test status on perceived level of job involvement of teacher aspects-Most of the schedule that I plan are effective are presented in

table 1. The results indicate a significantly positive influence of job involvement (Most of the schedule that I plan are effective) status of teachers belonging selective engineering colleges affiliated to Anna University, Region III-Madurai in psychological test of job involvement in all the demographic characteristics. The mean psychological test score of teachers on perceived level aspects significantly increased with the increase in each demographic characteristics teacher belonging selective engineering colleges affiliated to Anna University, Region III-Madurai. However, the mean value of the demographic characteristics of each respondent is not showing any significant differences in the perceived level of aspects-Most of the schedule that I plan are effective. In this perceived level of psychological test, the Most of the schedule that I plan are effective seems to have less significantly in educational qualification of the respondent, i.e., $p \leq 0.016$.

Demographic Characteristics versus I involve myself to deal very effectively with the Problems of my Students:

The demographic characteristics of teachers and their psychological test status on perceived level of job involvement of teacher aspects-I involve myself to deal very effectively with the problems of my students are presented in table 2. The results indicate a significantly positive influence of job involvement (I involve myself to deal very effectively with the problems of my students) status of teachers belonging selective engineering colleges affiliated to Anna University, Region III-Madurai in psychological test of job involvement aspects in all the demographic characteristics. The mean psychological test score of teachers on perceived level of aspects significantly increased with the increase in each demographic characteristics teacher belonging selective engineering colleges affiliated to Anna University, Region III-Madurai. However, the mean value of the demographic characteristics of each respondent is not showing any significant differences in the perceived level of aspects-I involve myself to deal very effectively with the problems of my students. In this perceived level of psychological test, the I involve myself to deal very effectively with the problems of my students seems to have less significantly in salary of the respondent, i.e., $p \leq 0.008$.

Demographic Characteristics Vs I regularly spend time to keep Abreast of Current Developments:

The demographic characteristics of teachers and their psychological test status on perceived level

of job involvement of teacher aspects-I regularly spend time to keep abreast of current developments are presented in table 3. The results indicate a significantly positive influence of job involvement (I regularly spend time to keep abreast of current developments) status of teachers belonging selective engineering colleges affiliated to Anna University, Region III-Madurai in psychological test of job involvement aspects in all the demographic characteristics. The mean psychological test score of teachers on perceived level of aspects significantly increased with the increase in each demographic characteristics teacher belonging selective engineering colleges affiliated to Anna University, Region III-Madurai. However, the mean value of the demographic characteristics of each respondent is not showing any significant differences in the perceived level of aspects-I regularly spend time to keep abreast of current developments. In this perceived level of psychological test, the I regularly spend time to keep abreast of current developments seems to have less significantly in distance between home to working institution of the respondent, ie., $p \leq 0.006$.

Findings:

The variables of job involvement namely, Most of the schedule that I plan are effective, I involve myself to deal very effectively with the problems of my students and I regularly spend time to keep abreast of current developments are the dominant variables. It is inferred that the majority of the teachers increase their job involvement compared with the demographic characteristics of the respondent at present as well as in future.

Conclusions:

From the above findings, researcher concludes that the variables on job involvement namely, Most of the schedule that I plan are effective, I involve myself to deal very effectively with the problems of my students, and I regularly spend time to keep abreast of current developments. The job involvement can be increased when the above variables are addressed. Here the researcher does not say that the demographic characteristics of the respondent can be measured only by variables of job involvement. Finally the researcher concludes that there is a socio-demographic variable have an impact on psychological test of job involvement of teachers.

References:

- [1] Baumruk, R. (2004). The missing link: the role of employee engagement in business success”, *Workspan*, Vol. 47, pp. 48-5
- [2] Begley, T. M. and Cazjka, J. M. Panel analysis of the moderating effects of commitment on job satisfaction, intent to quit, and health following organisational change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.78, pp.552-556, 1993.
- [3] Brown, S. P. A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol.120, pp.235. 255, 1996.
- [4] DeCarufel, A. and Schaan, J-L. The impact of compressed work weeks on police job involvement. *Canadian Police College*, Vol.14, pp.81-97, 1990.
- [5] Frone, M. R., Russell, C. J. and Cooper, M. L. Job stressors, job involvement and employee health: A test of identity theory. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol.68, pp.1 – 11, 1995.
- [6] Kahn W (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Acad. Manage. J.* 33: 692-724.
- [7] Kothari, C.R. (2007). *Research methodology methods and techniques*, 3rd Edition, New age international publishers.
- [8] Mukthamath, G. C., Gaonkar, V. and Khadi, P. B. Factors influencing job involvement and job satisfaction among women teachers. *Indian Journal of Behaviour* Vol.15 (3), pp.40-48, 1991.
- [9] Paullay, I., Alliger, G. and Stone-Romero, E. Construct validation of two instruments designed to measure job involvement and work centrality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 79, pp. 224-8 1994.
- [10] Paullay, I., Alliger, G., and Stone -Romero, E. (1994). Construct validation of two instruments designed to measure job involvement and work centrality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 224-8.
- [11] Richman, A. (2006). Everyone wants an engaged workforce how can you create it? *Workspan*, Vol 49, pp36-39.
- [12] Robinson, D., Perryman, S. and Hayday, S. (2004). *The Drivers of Employee Engagement*. Brighton, Institute for Employment Studies.
- [13] Saleh, S.D. and Rosek, J. Job involvement: concepts and Measurements, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.19, pp. 213-224, 1976.
- [14] Shaw, K. (2005). An engagement strategy process for communicators, *Strategic Communication Management*, Vol 9, No 3, pp26-29.
- [15] Thomas, N., Clarke, V. and Lavery, J. Self-reported work and family stress of female primary teachers. *Australian Journal of Education*, Vol.47 (1), pp.73 – 87, 2003.
- [16] Thompson, C.J. and Dey, E.L. Pushed to the margins: sources of stress for African American college and University faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol.69, pp.324-345, 1998.

Table 1: Table showing the ANOVA test between demographic Characteristics and most of the schedule that I plan are effective

| Job involvement | N | Mean | SD | Value | Significance |
|----------------------------------|-----|------|-------|---------|--------------|
| All | 620 | 4.09 | .842 | | |
| Age of Respondent | | | | | |
| below 30yrs | 338 | 4.17 | .815 | F=2.598 | P<0.051 |
| 31-40yrs | 218 | 4.01 | .864 | | |
| 41- 50yrs | 50 | 3.90 | .931 | | |
| above 50yrs | 14 | 4.07 | .616 | | |
| Sex | | | | | |
| Male | 321 | 4.16 | .778 | T=2.203 | P<0.616 |
| Female | 299 | 4.01 | .901 | | |
| Marital Status | | | | | |
| unmarried | 292 | 4.20 | .801 | F=3.415 | P<0.017 |
| married | 314 | 3.99 | .868 | | |
| widow | 6 | 4.33 | 1.033 | | |
| divorced | 8 | 4.00 | .756 | | |
| Educational Qualification | | | | | |
| Under Graduate | 56 | 4.21 | .680 | F=3.469 | P<0.016 |
| Post Graduate | 351 | 4.16 | .790 | | |
| PG with M.Phil | 167 | 3.98 | .957 | | |
| Ph.D. | 46 | 3.85 | .894 | | |
| Department | | | | | |
| Engineering | 341 | 4.10 | .819 | F=2.781 | P<0.040 |
| MBA | 109 | 4.23 | .715 | | |
| MCA | 76 | 3.87 | 1.011 | | |
| Science and Humanities | 94 | 4.09 | .888 | | |
| Designation | | | | | |
| Lecturer | 114 | 4.16 | .782 | F=1.034 | P<0.389 |
| Senior lecturer | 34 | 4.12 | .844 | | |
| Asst. Professor | 386 | 4.09 | .816 | | |
| Associate professor | 50 | 4.08 | 1.122 | | |
| Professor | 36 | 3.83 | .845 | | |
| Teaching experience | | | | | |
| 2-5yrs | 343 | 4.09 | .815 | F=1.363 | P<0.245 |
| 6-10yrs | 154 | 4.15 | .815 | | |
| 11-15yrs | 79 | 4.09 | .950 | | |
| 16-20yrs | 27 | 3.74 | 1.095 | | |
| above 20yrs | 17 | 4.06 | .556 | | |
| Salary (in Rs.) | | | | | |
| less than 20000 | 297 | 4.11 | .806 | F=0.303 | P<0.911 |
| 20001-30000 | 216 | 4.09 | .858 | | |
| 30001-40000 | 64 | 4.06 | .990 | | |
| 40001-50000 | 16 | 3.94 | .772 | | |
| 50001-60000 | 15 | 4.00 | .655 | | |
| above 60000 | 12 | 3.92 | .996 | | |
| Lecture hour per week | | | | | |
| below 12 | 184 | 3.99 | .935 | F=2.934 | P<0.054 |
| 13-18 | 369 | 4.11 | .810 | | |
| 19 and above | 67 | 4.27 | .709 | | |
| Distance | | | | | |
| Less than 15km | 222 | 4.15 | .809 | F=1.742 | P<0.176 |
| 16-30km | 229 | 4.10 | .818 | | |
| 31km and above | 169 | 3.99 | .910 | | |
| District | | | | | |
| Dindigul | 156 | 4.10 | .841 | F=0.080 | P<0.988 |
| Madurai | 276 | 4.09 | .815 | | |
| Ramanathapuram | 62 | 4.05 | .931 | | |
| Sivagangai | 81 | 4.12 | .842 | | |
| Theni | 45 | 4.07 | .915 | | |

Table 2: Table showing the ANOVA test between demographic characteristics and I involve myself to deal very effectively with the problems of my students

| Job involvement | N | Mean | SD | Value | Significance |
|----------------------------------|-----|------|-------|----------|--------------|
| All | 620 | 3.20 | 1.099 | | |
| Age of Respondent | | | | | |
| below 30yrs | 338 | 3.24 | 1.109 | F=0.781 | P<0.505 |
| 31-40yrs | 218 | 3.20 | 1.080 | | |
| 41- 50yrs | 50 | 3.00 | 1.125 | | |
| above 50yrs | 14 | 3.07 | 1.072 | | |
| Sex | | | | | |
| Male | 321 | 3.20 | 1.089 | T=-0.055 | P<0.719 |
| Female | 299 | 3.21 | 1.110 | | |
| Marital Status | | | | | |
| unmarried | 292 | 3.19 | 1.096 | F=0.618 | P<0.603 |
| married | 314 | 3.22 | 1.095 | | |
| widow | 6 | 3.67 | 1.211 | | |
| divorsed | 8 | 2.88 | 1.356 | | |
| Educational Qualification | | | | | |
| Under Graduate | 56 | 3.45 | 1.111 | F=2.003 | P<0.112 |
| Post Graduate | 351 | 3.20 | 1.061 | | |
| PG with M.Phil | 167 | 3.22 | 1.152 | | |
| Ph.D. | 46 | 2.91 | 1.132 | | |
| Department | | | | | |
| Engineering | 341 | 3.22 | 1.103 | F=1.592 | P<0.190 |
| MBA | 109 | 3.13 | 1.001 | | |
| MCA | 76 | 3.04 | 1.171 | | |
| Science and Humanities | 94 | 3.38 | 1.118 | | |
| Designation | | | | | |
| Lecturer | 114 | 3.34 | 1.096 | F=1.855 | P<0.117 |
| Senior lecturer | 34 | 3.15 | 1.158 | | |
| Asst. Professor | 386 | 3.22 | 1.075 | | |
| Associate professor | 50 | 3.08 | 1.209 | | |
| Professor | 36 | 2.81 | 1.091 | | |
| Teaching experience | | | | | |
| 2-5yrs | 343 | 3.30 | 1.048 | F=2.491 | P<0.042 |
| 6-10yrs | 154 | 3.15 | 1.095 | | |
| 11-15yrs | 79 | 3.06 | 1.244 | | |
| 16-20yrs | 27 | 2.70 | 1.068 | | |
| above 20yrs | 17 | 3.29 | 1.263 | | |
| Salary (in Rs.) | | | | | |
| less than 20000 | 297 | 3.31 | 1.055 | F=3.165 | P<0.008 |
| 20001-30000 | 216 | 3.17 | 1.093 | | |
| 30001-40000 | 64 | 3.11 | 1.249 | | |
| 40001-50000 | 16 | 2.88 | 1.025 | | |
| 50001-60000 | 15 | 3.20 | 1.082 | | |
| above 60000 | 12 | 2.17 | 1.030 | | |
| Lecture hour per week | | | | | |
| below 12 | 184 | 3.01 | 1.150 | F=4.144 | P<0.016 |
| 13-18 | 369 | 3.28 | 1.059 | | |
| 19 and above | 67 | 3.31 | 1.117 | | |
| Distance | | | | | |
| Less than 15km | 222 | 3.21 | 1.139 | F=1.147 | P<0.318 |
| 16-30km | 229 | 3.28 | 1.071 | | |
| 31km and above | 169 | 3.11 | 1.080 | | |
| District | | | | | |
| Dindigul | 156 | 3.31 | 1.118 | F=0.853 | P<0.492 |
| Madurai | 276 | 3.19 | 1.038 | | |
| Ramanathapuram | 62 | 3.08 | 1.258 | | |
| Sivagangai | 81 | 3.23 | 1.099 | | |
| Theni | 45 | 3.04 | 1.167 | | |

Table 3: Table showing the ANOVA test between demographic characteristics and I regularly spend time to keep abreast of current developments in my field

| Job involvement | N | Mean | SD | Value | Significance |
|----------------------------------|-----|------|-------|---------|--------------|
| All | 620 | 3.73 | 1.535 | | |
| Age of Respondent | | | | | |
| below 30yrs | 338 | 3.63 | 1.561 | F=1.902 | P<0.128 |
| 31-40yrs | 218 | 3.88 | 1.508 | | |
| 41- 50yrs | 50 | 3.60 | 1.539 | | |
| above 50yrs | 14 | 4.29 | 1.069 | | |
| Sex | | | | | |
| Male | 321 | 3.79 | 1.529 | T=1.126 | P<0.748 |
| Female | 299 | 3.66 | 1.541 | | |
| Marital Status | | | | | |
| unmarried | 292 | 3.64 | 1.550 | F=0.674 | P<0.568 |
| married | 314 | 3.81 | 1.517 | | |
| widow | 6 | 3.50 | 1.643 | | |
| divorced | 8 | 3.75 | 1.753 | | |
| Educational Qualification | | | | | |
| Under Graduate | 56 | 3.66 | 1.552 | F=0.337 | P<0.799 |
| Post Graduate | 351 | 3.77 | 1.531 | | |
| PG with M.Phil | 167 | 3.64 | 1.576 | | |
| Ph.D. | 46 | 3.80 | 1.424 | | |
| Department | | | | | |
| Engineering | 341 | 3.78 | 1.543 | F=0.507 | P<0.678 |
| MBA | 109 | 3.72 | 1.497 | | |
| MCA | 76 | 3.55 | 1.578 | | |
| Science and Humanities | 94 | 3.68 | 1.526 | | |
| Designation | | | | | |
| Lecturer | 114 | 3.69 | 1.529 | F=0.217 | P<0.929 |
| Senior lecturer | 34 | 3.62 | 1.498 | | |
| Asst. Professor | 386 | 3.72 | 1.577 | | |
| Associate professor | 50 | 3.90 | 1.329 | | |
| Professor | 36 | 3.75 | 1.461 | | |
| Teaching experience | | | | | |
| 2-5yrs | 343 | 3.74 | 1.510 | F=0.339 | P<0.852 |
| 6-10yrs | 154 | 3.72 | 1.619 | | |
| 11-15yrs | 79 | 3.58 | 1.549 | | |
| 16-20yrs | 27 | 3.89 | 1.476 | | |
| above 20yrs | 17 | 3.94 | 1.391 | | |
| Salary (in Rs.) | | | | | |
| less than 20000 | 297 | 3.71 | 1.517 | F=0.386 | P<0.858 |
| 20001-30000 | 216 | 3.77 | 1.573 | | |
| 30001-40000 | 64 | 3.66 | 1.586 | | |
| 40001-50000 | 16 | 4.06 | 1.237 | | |
| 50001-60000 | 15 | 3.67 | 1.345 | | |
| above 60000 | 12 | 3.33 | 1.775 | | |
| Lecture hour per week | | | | | |
| below 12 | 184 | 3.59 | 1.569 | F=1.218 | P<0.297 |
| 13-18 | 369 | 3.80 | 1.522 | | |
| 19 and above | 67 | 3.70 | 1.508 | | |
| Distance | | | | | |
| Less than 15km | 222 | 3.88 | 1.501 | F=5.180 | P<0.006 |
| 16-30km | 229 | 3.82 | 1.475 | | |
| 31km and above | 169 | 3.41 | 1.620 | | |
| District | | | | | |
| Dindigul | 156 | 3.56 | 1.611 | F=1.524 | P<0.194 |
| Madurai | 276 | 3.80 | 1.502 | | |
| Ramanathapuram | 62 | 3.48 | 1.576 | | |
| Sivagangai | 81 | 3.81 | 1.509 | | |
| Theni | 45 | 4.04 | 1.413 | | |
