International Journal of Research in Engineering, Science and Management
Volume-1, Issue-8, August 2018
www.ijresm.com
ISSN (Online): 2581-5782

Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement among Employees - A Review

Manjot[1], Rahul Sharma[2]

[1]*Student, Department of School of Management Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, India*
[2]*Lecturer, Department of Electrical Engineering, SBSSTC, Ferozpur, India*

***Abstract*: With increased recognition of the fact that people can only be the long term competitive advantage in this post-globalized era, organizations are showing keen interest in ensuring higher levels of job satisfaction and job involvement among their employees. Here, one must understand the fact that job/work occupies an important place in the total life space of an employee; affecting him/her in variety of ways. Realizing this, since times immemorial, organizations have been concerned about what employees think about their working life, whether they are satisfied, and how much involved they are in their job. This may be because of expected interrelationships of employee feeling satisfied with the job, getting highly involved in the job, displaying greater work motivation, performing at a benchmark level and thereby augmenting organizational efforts in achieving the strategic goals. But, while trying to boost employee morale and motivation by focusing on their job satisfaction and job involvement; one faces the issue of whether job involvement and job satisfaction are similar in some ways or entirely different or one job attitude leads to the other; and if it is so, which one precedes the other. Considering this, present research report throws realistic light on the basis of careful review and analysis of earlier research studies.**

Keywords: job satisfaction, job involvement, job commitment.

I. Introduction

A. Job Involvement

Taking clue from the term 'Job Involvement' itself, we can say that 'Job Involvement' is an indicator of how much an employee is involved in the job. Conceptually, job involvement is an employee's work related attitude which is reflected in his/her enthusiasm, zeal and interest in job. In the opinion of Lodahl & Kenjer (1965), who developed the most celebrated and widely used measure of job involvement stated that job involvement affects people for whom job constitutes the most important portion of life. Thus, job involvement can be conceptualized as "the degree to which a person identifies psychologically with work or the importance of work in his total self-image." So, in a way, job involvement refers to the internalization of values about the goodness of work or the importance of work in the total worth of the person, and thereby it provides an insight about the ease with which the person can be further socialized by the organization, in the organization.

Supporting the same notion, Agarwala (1978), who has done pioneering research for developing the scale to measure job involvement in Indian context, refers to job involvement as an individual's willingness to invest himself/herself in pursuit of job activities perceived to be meaningful. In his opinion, a highly job-involved person is sure to demonstrate a strong desire to be at work, would be willing to exert himself/herself to cope with the demands of the job, consider the work activities as self-rewarding etc. So, job involvement can be considered as an indicator of an individual's commitment towards his/her own work/job.

Saleh & Hosek (1976) put forward four different interpretations of job involvement, as follows. In their opinion, an individual is job involved:

- When work to him/her is a central life interest;
- When he/she actively participates in the job;
- When he/she perceives performance as consistent with his/her self-concept;
- When he/she perceives performance as central to self-esteem.

Gorn & Kanungo (1980) have conceptualized the notion of job involvement as having two components:

- The degree to which an individual actively participates in a particular job, and
- A psychological state of identification relative to other activities (family, leisure), i.e., the importance of work in the person's self-image.

Thus, job involvement also reflects one's emotional attachment to one's job (Cheloha & Farr, 1980). Brooke, et al; (1988) considers job involvement as the degree to which an individual is absorbed in or preoccupied with his/her job.

All the above definitions have a common thread or are centered around a common theme that a job involved person is the one for whom work is a very important part of life and who is affected very much personally by his/her whole job situation; the work itself, his/her co-workers, the company and such others. Thus, employees with high level of job involvement strongly identify with and really care about the kind of work they do (Robbins & Sanghi, 2006).

Thus, the amount of job involvement an individual will have with his/her job will depend upon the affirmative strength with which he/she psychologically perceives the various facets of his/her job and job environment; while the non-involved employee does his/her living off-the-job. In other words, work is not as important a part of his/her psychological life, his/her interests are elsewhere, and the core of his/ her self-image, the essential part of his/her identity, is not greatly affected by the kind of work he/she does or how well he/she does it.

Job involvement refers to the psychological and emotional extent to which an individual participates in work, profession and company beyond simply punch. The word "job" in the phrase "job involvement" refers to more than a specific position. It can include the industry or profession in which an individual works, company, department, skills. Becoming involved in job means learning about the specific skills needed

to work, as well as trends in a field, how your position interacts with other company functions and employees and how your work affects the end result of your company's performance. Job involvement can be increased by joining trade or professional associations, giving speeches or delivering educational lectures, writing newsletter or magazine articles or serving on a committee. Job involvement often refers to your psychological or emotional involvement with your position, workplace or career. If you begin to worry about your work, department, co-workers or company performance, this is a sign that you might be overly involved in your job. It's one thing to be aware of what's going on in your company and want to help, but another to become critical of your co-workers' or supervisors' performance and decisions the company makes, especially if you take this home with you.

B. Job Satisfaction

Taking clue from the term 'Job Satisfaction' itself, we can say that 'Job Satisfaction' refers to an employee's feeling of satisfaction on the job. It is an indication of how content an individual is with his or her job. It refers to the total relationship between an employee and the employer in terms of employees' expectations and its fulfilment by the employer. Job Satisfaction is the most frequently researched primary work/job attitude in the domains of Organizational Behaviour and Human Resource Management. Many experts distinguish between 'Affective Job Satisfaction' and 'Cognitive Job Satisfaction'. 'Affective Job Satisfaction' is the extent of pleasurable emotional feelings one has about one's job in totality (Thompson & Phua, 2012); and is different from 'Cognitive Job Satisfaction', which is the extent of one's satisfaction with only some particular facets of the job like pay, working hours, superior-subordinate relationship and such other aspects of the job (Moorman, 1993).

According to Hoppock (1935), "Job Satisfaction refers to any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause an employee to say I am satisfied with my job."

Locke (1969) defined job satisfaction as the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values. Job satisfaction is also conceptualized as the general attitude of a person toward his or her job (Robbins &Sanghi, 2006).

Over the years, various theories of job satisfaction tend to assign various degrees of importance to sources of satisfaction, which can be classified into two categories namely Intrinsic and Extrinsic. Intrinsic sources depend on the individual characteristics of the person, such as attitudes. Extrinsic sources are situational, and depend on the environment, such as workplace climate.

Job satisfaction or employee satisfaction is defined as the extent to which an individual is contended with his or her job, in other words, whether or not they like the job or individual aspects or facets of jobs, such as nature of work or supervision. Job satisfaction includes multidimensional psychological responses to an individual's job, and that these personal responses have cognitive (evaluative), affective (or emotional), and behavioural components. (Hulin and Judge, 2003) Job satisfaction scales vary in the extent to which they assess the affective feelings about the job or the cognitive assessment of the job. Affective job satisfaction is a subjective construct representing an emotional feeling individuals have about their job. Hence, affective job satisfaction for individuals reflects the degree of pleasure or happiness their job in general induces.

Cognitive job satisfaction is a more objective and logical evaluation of various facets of a job. Cognitive job satisfaction can be one-dimensional if it comprises evaluation of just one facet of a job, such as pay or maternity leave, or multidimensional if two or more facets of a job are simultaneously evaluated. Cognitive job satisfaction does not assess the degree of pleasure or happiness that arises from specific job facets, but rather gauges the extent to which those job facets are judged by the job holder to be satisfactory in comparison with objectives they themselves set or with other jobs. While cognitive job satisfaction might help to bring about affective job satisfaction, the two constructs are distinct, not necessarily directly related, and have different antecedents and consequences.

C. Job Involvement vs. Job Satisfaction

The problem of semantic seems to be prevailing in case of the two widely researched work attitudes namely – job satisfaction and job involvement also. Prior empirical researches reveal varied and inconsistent results regarding the role and place occupied by job involvement in terms of its relationship with the other job attitude – job satisfaction. Many researchers (Kanungo, 1979; Gorn & Kanungo, 1980; Blau, 1985; Brooke, et al; 1988) opined that Job involvement is both conceptually and empirically distinct from job satisfaction. Even though, several studies (Lodahl & Kenjer, 1965; Weissenberg & Gruenfeld, 1968; Lawler (III) & Hall, 1970; Gechman & Wiener, 1975; Saal, 1978; Kanungo, 1979; Rabinowitz & Hall, 1981) have tried to identify job involvement as a distinct work attitude, the problem of delineating job involvement from other seemingly similar work attitude namely job satisfaction, has still remained.

Over the years, several research studies tried to unearth the distinctions between these two constructs; but the results are confusing. Surprisingly, little empirical evidence of their discriminant validity is reported (Blau, 1985; Morrow, 1983; Mathieu & Farr, 1991). Added to this, research also indicates similar sort of correlations between these two work attitudes and other important job related variables like absenteeism and turnover.

While some studies indicate that job involvement is an index of well-being along with job satisfaction (Morris & Koch, 1979; Dreher, 1980; Sekaran & Mowday, 1981), others suggest that job involvement may be a predictor of job satisfaction (Gechman & Wiener, 1975; Ben-Porat, 1980; Rabinowitz, 1985). A few studies also provide limited support for job involvement as a mediator of the relationship of individual and job situation variables with job satisfaction and other variables (Dailey & Morgon, 1978; Batlis, 1978; Saal, 1978). One study (Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977) even reported that job involvement is an outcome of job satisfaction. So, in the absence of rigorous empirical evidence of discriminant validity between job satisfaction and job involvement; coupled with similarities in their relations with other variables raise the possibility that they may not be distinct. (Brooke, et al; 1988). Even Lodahl & Kenjer (1965) found that in a sample of engineers, job

satisfaction and job involvement had roughly the same factorial content.

On conceptual ground, Locke (1976) distinguished job satisfaction as a positive emotional state reflecting an 'affective response' to the job situation, from job involvement, which is defined as a 'cognitive belief' state reflecting the degree of psychological identification with one's job (Lawler (III) & Hall, 1970; Locke, 1976; Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977; Kanungo, 1979). Although both these constructs refer to a specific job only, several researchers (Locke, 1976; Kanungo, 1979) tried to distinguish between the emotional state of liking one's job (job satisfaction) and the cognitive belief state of psychological identification with one's job (job involvement).

In the opinion of Kanungo (1979), satisfaction of needs on the job may be a sufficient but not a necessary condition for job involvement. So, in his opinion, satisfaction might increase the likelihood of job involvement, it is not the definition of job involvement itself. Further, several studies (Lawler (III) & Hall, 1970; Hackman & Lawler (III), 1971; Wanous, 1974; Brief & Aldag, 1975) found that person-job interactions occur in the prediction of job satisfaction; and therefore, job involvement and job satisfaction are distinct work attitudes.

Job satisfaction is an individual's general attitude toward his or her job. A person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive feelings about the job, while a person who is dissatisfied with his or her job holds negative feelings about the job. A closely related concept is job involvement. Job involvement is the degree to which a person identifies with his or her job, actively participates in it, and considers his or her performance important to self-worth. High levels of job involvement are positively related to organizational citizenship and job performance. Satisfaction refers to how employees feel their "happiness" about their job and conditions, such as compensation, benefits, work environment, and career development opportunities. Engagement, on the other hand, refers to employees' commitment and connection to work as measured by the amount of discretionary effort they are willing to expend on behalf of their employer. The higher the degree of job involvement, the greater the organizational commitment and effectiveness. An increase in the work related attitudes and wage satisfaction results in an increase in organizational commitment. Job satisfaction has important economic effects. Low job satisfaction is associated with higher rates of quitting (Freeman, 1978; Gordon and Denisi 1995; Clark, Georgellis and Sanfey, 1998) and higher rates of absenteeism. High job satisfaction correlates with improved job performance. Both employee job satisfaction and employee engagement are important for business sustainability. Top-performing organizations understand that measuring employees' contentment levels and emotional commitment to the organization on a regular basis can put them at a competitive advantage. Employee satisfaction and employee engagement are both critical to maintaining a happy and productive workforce, achieving satisfaction without engagement will have significantly less impact on business results. After all, engaged employees are emotionally committed to working hard, demonstrating initiative, and expending extra discretionary effort and doing so in alignment with strategic priorities to move the organization forward.

II. Review of Literature

Job involvement has emerged an important variable in organizational research. It has drawn the attention of management scientist and organizational psychologists. This variable is being studied with different prospective in the organization. It has great importance and significance in organizational development. Large numbers of studies have been conducted to see the job involvement among organizational job satisfaction.

Lodhal and Kejner (1965) defined job involvement as "the degree to which a person identified psychologically with his/her work or the importance of work in his/her total self-image". A person psychological identification with his work may be outcome of his early socialization process during which the individual may internalized the values about the goodness of work.

Guion (1958), Dubin (1956, 1968) and Siegel (1969) Saleh and Hosek (1976) proposed similar job involvement definition. These were "the job is of critical importance in personal life", "the individual will be actively involved in his/her own job", "the individual will be cognis, the influence of personal performance into self-esteem" and, "the congruence between work performance and self-concept". They further suggest that whenever these four definitions are satisfied, the individual will be involved in his/her own job.

Lawler and Hall (1970) and Blau (1985), stated job involvement involves only a single aspect, namely the three degree to which a person perceives the total work situation to be an important part of life, and to be central to their identity, because of the opportunity to satisfy important needs. Job involvement is the way a person looks at his job as a relationship with the working environment and the job itself. How job involvement generates feelings of alienation of purpose, alienation in the organization or feeling of separation between life and job as perceived by an employee. This creates co-relation between job involvement and work alienation (Rabinowitz and Hall, 1981).

Kanungo (1982) described job involvement as a cognitive state of uni-dimensional psychological identification from a motivational approach. Kanungo (1982) defined job involvement as individual's perception or belief that he is identified with his/her job. He further clears the difference between job and work. He stated "a job means an individual's present work, while work means work in genera".

Lewis and co-workers (1993) reported that physicians who are satisfied with their work are likely to report high satisfaction in their marriages and fewer psychiatric symptoms (Lewis et al., 1993). It has been reported that physicians' satisfaction is correlated with general life satisfaction. Rainet al., 1991). This correlation is reciprocal, as people who are satisfied with life tend to be satisfied with their job and those that are satisfied with their job tend to be satisfied with life.

Richard A. Murray (1999) indicates the correlation of job satisfaction with efficiency absenteeism, turnover and other aspects of performance. It is not necessary that the employees who are satisfied with their job always perform better. Since the type of work that employee does is an area of satisfaction for them, efforts should be made to find out what employees like about their jobs. If this is not done, the employees would

not be able to develop any sense of belongingness and interest in their jobs which would result in low job involvement of the employees.

Dormann and Zapf, (2001) stated that job satisfaction is one of the most researched concepts. It is regarded as central to work and organizational psychology. It serves as a mediator for creating relationship between working conditions, on the one hand, and individual/organizational outcome on the other.

Hellriegel and Slocum (2004) have argued that since satisfaction is a determinant of the work experience, it follows that high levels of job dissatisfaction are indicators of deeper organizational problems. Job dissatisfaction is strongly linked to absenteeism, turnover, and physical and mental health problems (Richardsen and Burke, 1991; Bhanankeret al., 2003; Rosta and Gerber, 2007).

Lise M. Saari and Timothy A. Judge (2004), This study states that even though organizations cannot directly affect employee personality, the use of sound selection methods and a goal match between employees and jobs will ensure people are selected and placed into jobs most appropriate for them which in turn will help enhance their job satisfaction. Dissatisfied employees are more likely to quit their jobs or be absent than satisfied employees.

HR council for the non-profit sector (2008) sheds light on retention challenges and strategies. Overall job satisfaction is reflected in three indicators of employee retention: whether employees expect to resign from their jobs in the coming year; whether or not they are currently looking for a new job; and their commitment to the organization they work for. The characteristics and circumstances of employees who are more likely to be less than satisfied can serve as a kind of early warning system for retention challenges that could be emerging in the organization, or that could be on the horizon.

Robert D.Mohr, CindyZoghi (2008) Job satisfaction has important economic effects. Low job satisfaction is associated with higher rates of quitting (Freeman 1978; Gordon and Denisi 1995; Clark, Georgellis, and Sanfey 1998) and higher rates of absenteeism (Clegg 1983; Drago and Wooden 1992); high job satisfaction correlates with improved job performance (Judge et al. 2001b) and organizational citizenship behaviour (Organ and Ryan 1995). Dissatisfaction therefore may result in higher labour costs and lower productivity.

Chi-Shun Liao and Cheng-Wen Lee (2009), This study sheds light on the fact that Human behaviour plays a significant role in maximizing organizational effectiveness, regardless of technological development. In particular, any effort to maximize organizational effectiveness requires a higher degree of job involvement (JI) among members of an organization. For highly involved employees, their jobs seem inexorably connected to their diverse identities, interests, and life goals, as well as the satisfaction that they can derive from performing their job duties effectively. More involved persons also feel more competent and successful at work, believe that their personal and organizational goals are compatible, and tend to attribute positive work outcomes to their internal and personally controllable factors.

Judith et al., (2009), a study based on the national samples from Norway and Germany, compared the job satisfaction levels of doctors in these countries. The study found that the satisfaction level of the hospital doctors of Norway was higher than their counterparts in Germany. The major differences in the job satisfaction levels were attributed to the items “work hours” and “payment”.

S.K. Singh and Vivek Tiwari (2011), in this study, it has been found out that motivation increases with job satisfaction. Motivation is an independent variable and remains unaffected of both age as well as length of the service of the employees. The compensation package plays a significant role in motivating the employees and as a result increases job satisfaction. But it is not that only compensation package plays a role in motivation. Others aspects also play an important role.

Nazir Ahman Gilkar, Javid Ahmad Darzi (2013) stated that job involvement is highly influenced by job satisfaction. Job satisfaction increases productivity through bringing high quality motivation and through increasing working capabilities at the time of implementation. The concept of participative management is considered as a mechanism where workers have a say in decision-making process of an organization. Human resource policies that encourage worker involvement aim at providing employees with opportunities to have an input in decisions, incentives to expend discretionary effort and the means to acquire the appropriate skills.

B.M. Nwibere (2014) This study states that employees those who are more involved in their jobs consider their workplace to be an important part of their lives and are more engaged and involved in doing their work. They develop a sense of satisfaction by doing their work in the right manner. The motivation level of such employees is also high. An employee develops a favourable attitude toward one aspect of the job based on unique experiences (example: job involvement), such an employee is also likely to react favourably to other related aspects of the job (example: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, OCB and organizational commitment).

Timothy A. Judge and Ryan Klinger (2014), this study indicates that job satisfaction is strongly and consistently related to subjective wellbeing. There is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. The nature of job attitudes and subjective wellbeing highlights the fact that an understanding of one domain is incomplete without due consideration of the other. There are three possible forms:

1) Spill over, wherein job experiences spill over onto life experiences and vice versa.
2) Segmentation, wherein job and life experiences are Balkanized and have little to do with one another.
3) Compensation, wherein an individual seeks to compensate for a dissatisfying job by seeking fulfilment and happiness in his or her nonworking life, and vice versa.

III. Conclusion

We can conclude that even though job satisfaction and job involvement may appear to be the same construct or merely different labels for the same phenomenon of emotional attachment to the job; the fact remains that these two are separate and distinct constructs. People who treat these two constructs as synonymous usually ignore the fact that it is possible for some persons to be highly satisfied, but not involved, and for others to be highly involved, but not satisfied.

Thus, Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement, the two primary work related attitudes are different from each other; however they both share some commonalities with each other in terms of their positive impact on important work variables.

REFERENCES

[1] Alam GM, Hoque KE (2010) who gains from "Brain and Body Drain" Business -Developing/developed world or individuals: A comparative study between skilled and semi/unskilled emigrants. Afr. J. Bus. Manage., 4(4): 534-548
[2] Alam GM (2009). The role of science and technology education at network age population for sustainable development of Bangladesh through human resource advancement. Sci. Res. Essays, 4(11): 1260-1270
[3] Bhananker SM, Culler BF. Resident work hours (2003). Curr. Opin. Anaesthesiol., 16:603-619
[4] Boles JS, Howard WG, Donofrio HH (2001). An investigation into interrelationship of work-family conflict, family work conflict and work. J. Manage. Issu., 13: 376-390
[5] Cammann C, Fichman M, Jenkins D (1979). Overall Job Satisfaction.
[6] Clinebell S, Shadwick G (2005). The importance of organizational context on employees' attitude: an examination of working in main offices versus branch offices. J. Leadersh. Organ. Stud., 11(2): 89- 100.
[7] Freund A (2005). Commitment and job satisfaction as predictor of turnover intentions among welfare workers. Adm. Soc. Work, 29(2): 5-Khan and Nemati 2245 21.
[8] Daniel MC, Charles KP (2001). Socialization Tactics and Person. Organ. Fit Personnel Psychol., 54(1): 1- 23.
[9] Hafer JC, Martin TN (2006). Job Involvement or Affective Commitment: A Sensitivity Analysis Study of Apathetic Employee Mobility. Institute of Behavior and Applied Management.
[10] Hamermesh DS (2001). The Changing Distribution of Job Satisfaction'. J. Hum. Resour., 36(1): 1-30
[11] Hellriegel D, Slocum J (2007). Organizational Behavior', Tenth Edition. South Western, Canada Thomson
[12] Huselid M, Becker B (1996). Methodological issues in cross-sectional research and panel estimates of the human resource – performance link'. Ind. Relat. 35: 400–422.
[13] Janus K, Amelung VE, Gaitanides M, Schwartz FW (2007). German physicians "on-strike"- shedding light on roots of physician's dissatisfaction. Health Pol., 82: 357-365
[14] Judith R, Magne N, Olf GA (2009) Job satisfaction among hospital doctors in Norway and Germany .A comparative study on national sample. Scand J. Pub. Health, 37:503-508
[15] Judge TA, Thoresen CJ, Bono JE, Patten GK (2001). The job satisfaction, job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. Psychol. Bull., 127(3): 376-407
[16] White JK, Ruh R (1973) .Effects of Personal Values on the Relationship between Participation and Job Attitudes. Adm. Sci. Q., 18(4): 506- 514.
[17] Kanungo RN (1982) .Measurement of job and work involvement. J. Appl. Psychol., 67(3): 341(9).
[18] Kickbusch R, Price W, Theis J (2003). Turnover predictors: Causes of employee turnover in sheriff-operated jails. Crim. Justice Stud., 16: 67-76
[19] Landon BE, Reschovsky JD, Pham H, Blumental D (2006). Leaving Medicine: the consequences of physician dissatisfaction. Med. Care, 44(3): 234-242
[20] Lee HY, Park SE, Park EC, Hahm MI, Cho WH (2008). Job satisfaction and trust in Health Insurance Review Agency among Korean physicians. Elsevier J. Health Pol., 249-257.
[21] Leong L, Huang SY, Hsu J (2003). An empirical study on professional commitment, organizational commitment and job involvement in Canadian accounting firms. J. Am. Acad. Bus., 2(2): 360-370.
[22] Linzer M, Konrad TR, Douglas J 2000). Managed care, time pressure, and physician job satisfaction: results from the physician work life study. J. Gen. Int. Med. 14: 441-450
[23] Lodahl TM, Kejner M (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement'. J. Appl. Psychol., 44, 24-33.
[24] Murray A, Montgomery JE, Chang H, Rogers WH, Inui T, Safran DG (1986). Doctor Discontent A Comparison of Physician Satisfaction in Different Delivery System Settings, 1986 and 1997. J. Gen. Int. Med., 16(7): 452-459(8).
[25] Nadler E, Sims S, Tyrance P, Fairchild D, Bernnan T, Bates D (1999) Does a year make a difference? Changes in physician satisfaction and perception in an increasingly capacitated environment. Am. J. Med., 107:38-44.