

EMPLOYEE JOB INVOLVEMENT AND SENSE OF PARTICIPATION INFLUENCE ON JOB SATISFACTION: AN EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

Dr. Nazir Ahmad Gilkar
Principal Sri Pratap College,
Srinagar.

Javid Ahmad Darzi
Faculty (contractual) Amar Singh College,
Srinagar.

ABSTRACT

The present paper makes a humble academic effort to study the influence of job involvement and sense of participation on employees' job satisfaction. The unit of study for the present analysis is a select private sector bank. The objective for this study is to explore the possible influence of the aforesaid parameters on job satisfaction. Three hypotheses have been framed and with the help of f-test verified. The statistical techniques like mean, standard deviation have been applied and t-test used to assess the mean difference. On the basis of statistical data thus generated certain inferences have been drawn. The study finally arrives at several conclusions and offers suggestions for policy implications of the bank. The present paper is duly supported by updated references to the context.

KEYWORDS: job satisfaction, Job involvement, Job Participation and Decision-making.

INTRODUCTION

The involvement in job is the degree to which a person identifies himself with his job, actively participates in it and considers his or her perceived performance level important to self worth (Blau and Boal,1987).Employees with a high level of job involvement strongly identify with and care about the kind of work they do. Lodahl and Kejner (1965) define it as "the degree to which a person's work performance affects his self esteem". High levels of job involvement have been found to be related to fewer absences and lower resignation rates i.e., the job holder reacts to the work itself by attending regularly or being absent, or by quitting (Boal and Cidami,1984,Blau,1986). A job involved person appears to be one for whom work is very important part of life and who is affected personally by his whole job situation; the work itself, his co-workers, the organization etc. An involved employee expects his work to be intrinsically rewarding because he thinks work provides him the opportunity for self expression (Kanungo et al, 1975). While a non-involved employee does living off the job. It is believed that job involvement increases as a result of satisfying job experiences, more involved a person more effort he will exert on the job. Management style that encourages employee involvement can help to satisfy employee desire for empowerment. Brown (1996) and Rebinowitz and Hall (1977) on the basis of the results from several studies have concluded that job involvement and participation in decision making are positively and significantly correlated.

The study -Rationale

The participation of employees builds on the idea of reasonable autonomy. It is a mechanism for maximising flexibility and avoiding bureaucratic rigidity (Drucker: 1993). Employee participation has been emphasised in relation to job satisfaction as well (Cotton et al., 1988). When workers are given opportunities to participate in decision- making processes there are positive gains for organisational effectiveness and morale of employees'. It has its strong influence on job satisfaction. Monappa and Saiyadain (2005) view that almost all forms of participation can be considered as instruments for employee development, because, when workers' help is sought in solving work problems it tends to increase their job satisfaction. In a climate of participatory leadership morale is quite high and labour turnover, absenteeism and grievance rates are much lower. Participation increases workers sense of responsibility and employees adopt responsible attitude towards their work. They become ego involved and emotionally attached which have positive effect on job satisfaction that increases organisational effectiveness. Employee participative decision- making is also seen as a form of empowerment that allows employees to realise their full potential thereby helping organisations to secure competitive advantage (Jarrar and Zairi 2002). Job involvement, sense of participation and occupational level are found to contribute significantly to job satisfaction. Therefore, these constructs were selected for investigation in this study. Since no such study has been conducted in the state of J & K so far, this study is intended to fill up this research gap accordingly

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The objective of the present study is to explore the possible Influence of job involvement, sense of participation and occupational level on job satisfaction of the select bank employees.

HYPOTHESES

On the basis of the findings of the past researches and in the context of aforementioned objective, the following three testable hypotheses were formulated:

H₁: Job satisfaction is influenced by high and low levels of job involvement.

H₂: Job satisfaction is influenced by high and low levels of participation.

H₃: Job satisfaction is influenced by occupational level.

METHODOLOGY

The Primary data for the study was collected by administering pre-tested questionnaires to the respondents. 10-item, job involvement questionnaire (reliability = 0.71) developed for Indian organisations by Dhar et al. (2001) was adapted to index job involvement. 9-item questionnaire (reliability = 0.83) to index sense of participation was developed on the basis of literature review. 30-item Job satisfaction scale (reliability = 0.97) developed for Indian organisations by Singh and Sharma (1999) was used to explore the perceptions of respondents to measure their level of satisfaction with their jobs. This scale measures the level of job satisfaction in five broad areas (i) Job concrete area, (ii) job abstract area, (iii) psycho-social area, (iv) financial area and (v) community/ national growth aspects. Employee attitudes were recorded on a 5-point (1 - 5) continuum in these scales.

The variables like job involvement, sense of participation and occupational level were treated as independent variables while as job satisfaction was treated as a dependent variable. Respondents (clerks and managerial groups) were categorised as high involved and low involved; high participating and low participating. Employees with job involvement scale scores of 36 and below were categorised as low involved group, while as employees with job involvement scale scores of 37 and above were regarded as high involved group.

Similarly, employees with participation scale scores 33 and below were categorised as low participating group while as employees with participation scale scores of 34 and above were regarded as high participating group. Based on stratified random sampling procedure total sample for the study consisted of 232 employees working in different branches of the bank. Mean, standard deviation, t-test, F tests, and multiple comparisons between the different groups of respondents were made to highlight mean differences on job satisfaction and correlation matrix was drawn to understand the nature of relationship between the constructs. The survey was conducted during the period March-April 2012.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Influence of job involvement, sense of participation and occupational level on job satisfaction

The correlation matrix attempted with regard to involvement, participation and satisfaction is tabulated hereunder:

Table1; Correlation Matrix of job Involvement, Participation and Job Satisfaction

	Job Involvement	Participation	Job Satisfaction
Job Involvement	1.0		
Participation	0.2472	1.0	
Job satisfaction	0.1686*	0.5683**	1.0

* $<.001$,** $<.05$

The table 1 reflects correlation coefficients of 0.16 and 0.56, respectively, between job involvement and job satisfaction and sense of participation and job satisfaction. This indicates that job involvement, sense of participation and job satisfaction are positively correlated.

The analysis of variance summary is given below:

Table 2: Analysis of Variance Summary

	Sum of Squares	DF	Sum of Squares	F	Sig.
Between Groups	241.548	5	48.310	2.636	.049
Within Groups	439.791	24	18.325		
Total	681.339	29			

The table 2 highlights the obtained value of F (=2.636) indicating the numerator of F-ratio is substantially bigger than its denominator. This clearly reveals that the mean differences between different groups of respondents do really exist.

The multiple comparisons signifying the least significant mean difference on job satisfaction is shown as under:

Table 3: Multiple Comparisons signifying the least significant mean difference on job satisfaction

Group	Mean Differences	Significance	P
High involvement and Low involvement	6.22	.013	<.05
High Participation and low Participation	7.24	.013	<.05
Clerks and Managers	1.09	.689	N.S

The table 3 exhibits significant mean difference of 6.22 between high involvement and low involvement subjects which supports the hypothesis, “Job satisfaction is influenced by high and low levels of involvement (H₁)”. Again, the significant mean difference of 7.24 between high participation and low participation subjects supports the hypothesis “Job satisfaction is influenced by high and low levels of participation (H₂). The only non-significant mean difference of 1.09 exists between managers and clerks rejecting the hypothesis “Job satisfaction is influenced by occupational level (H₃)”.

Job Involvement vis a vis Job Satisfaction

The job involved people appear to be the one for whom work is very important part of their life and who are affected personally by the whole job situation; the work itself, the co-workers, the organisation etc. An involved employee expects his work to be intrinsically rewarding because he thinks work provides him opportunity for self expression (Kanungo et al.1975). While as the non-involved employee does living off the job (Dhar et al.2001). An attempt in this regard has been made here to analyse the influence of high involved and low involved subjects on different dimensions of job satisfaction.

Table 4: Job Satisfaction Score of High and low Involvement Groups

Dimensions of J. S.	High Involvement			Low Involvement			Mean Difference	t	P
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.			
Job Concrete	174	21.72	3.07	58	12.80	3.51	8.92	31.99	<.05
Job Abstract	174	20.81	3.32	58	13.20	5.13	7.61	22.58	<.05
Psycho-social	174	26.21	4.10	58	20.40	5.12	5.81	15.17	<.05
Economic	174	15.34	2.41	58	10.73	2.69	4.61	21.21	<.05
Community	174	23.38	2.46	58	19.23	3.01	4.15	18.18	<.05

The table 4 reveals that job satisfaction of high involved subjects is significantly higher than low involved subjects on all dimensions of job satisfaction (p<.05). This finding corroborates with the earlier findings reported by Santhanmani (1983); Mishra (1986); Singh and Kumari (1988) in which high involved subjects were found more satisfied with their jobs than low involved subjects. This result again substantiates the hypothesis that “there is a significant difference in job satisfaction of high and low involved groups” (H₁). Maximum satisfaction was shown with psycho-social area followed by community, job abstract, job concrete and economic areas.

Sense of Participation vis a vis Job Satisfaction

The term Participation refers to an interaction in which communication occurs among participants whereby a particular set of outcomes occur. The manner of participation and the level at which it is exercised consequently brings forth outcomes such as job involvement, job satisfaction and organisational effectiveness (Pathak: 1983), Participation gives employees a sense of importance and consultation in joint decision making. In this backdrop, an attempt has been made to study the influence of high and low participation subjects on job satisfaction.

Table 5: Job Satisfaction Scores of High and Low Participation Groups

Dimensions of Job Satisfaction.	High participation			Low participation			Mean Difference	t	P
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.			
Job Concrete	142	20.47	2.93	90	11.01	3.04	9.46	29.66	<.05
Job Abstract	142	21.42	3.50	90	15.10	4.91	6.32	14.35	<.05
Pscho-social	142	27.13	3.86	90	19.00	4.87	8.13	17.71	<.05
Economic	142	13.71	2.41	90	9.12	2.41	4.59	17.75	<.05
Community	142	23.79	2.35	90	16.09	2.74	7.70	28.62	<.05

The table 5 reveals that job satisfaction of high participation subjects is significantly higher than low participation subjects with regard to all dimensions of job satisfaction (p<.05). Maximum satisfaction was shown with psycho-social area followed by community and least satisfaction was shown with economic area. Result obtained again supports the hypothesis that “there is a significant difference in job satisfaction of high and low participation subjects” (H₂).

Occupational level vis a vis Job satisfaction

Employees’ job satisfaction has been reported to vary with the occupational level. Jobs which are high in level are generally better paid, less repetitive, provide more freedom and require less physical effort than other jobs lower in level. Besides other factors, opportunity of self expression, self actualisation and salary are found to be the main aspects of occupational level. Vikas and Kishore (1986) have reported a significant influence of occupational level on job satisfaction. In this context it was hypothesized that “job satisfaction is influenced by occupational level (H₃)”.

Table 6: Job Satisfaction Scores of Managers and Clerks

Dimensions of Job Satisfaction	Managers			Clerks			Mean Difference	t	P
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.			
Job Concrete	132	17.32	2.98	100	17.65	3.61	.33	.87	N.S
Job Abstract	132	19.50	3.43	100	18.86	4.98	.64	1.33	N.S
Psycho-social	132	25.70	3.98	100	24.09	5.59	1.61	2.94	.000*
Economic	132	12.61	2.37	100	11.06	2.61	1.55	5.42	.000*
Community	132	21.44	2.66	100	20.12	2.77	1.32	4.22	.000*

*the mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

The table 6 highlights that the mean difference of 1.09 in respect of job satisfaction of the two levels of respondents, that is, managers and clerks is non-significant. This result fails to support H₃. Further, this finding does not corroborate with the finding of Vikas and Kishore (1986). Probing further, it was observed that occupational level does not have significant influence in Job concrete and job abstract areas, however, in psycho-social, economic and community areas the influence seems to be quite significant ($p < .05$). Clerks in comparison to managers were found less sanguine in occupational level as well.

CONCLUSIONS, SUGGESTIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The variables like job involvement, sense of participation and job satisfaction are positively correlated. Job satisfaction of high involved and high participating subjects is significantly higher than low involved and low participating subjects on all dimensions of job satisfaction. Respondents expressed maximum satisfaction with psycho-social area followed by community and so on. Least satisfaction was expressed with economic area. Again, Job satisfaction is believed to be influenced by the occupational level; however, in the bank under study this hypothesis is apparently non-tenable. Majority of employees in low participation group have expressed less liking for their jobs as they are neither motivating nor enjoying. Employees with low levels of work motivation have demonstrated enhanced level of involvement and motivation following involvement and participation activities (Locke and Schweigner: 1979).

The bank jobs are routine and repetitive in nature. Vroom and Deci (1960) suggest that the types of problems dealt with at various organisational levels influence the appropriateness of participation. It may be least appropriate at lower levels, where jobs are routine and more appropriate at higher levels where jobs involve addressing complex problems. Opposed to Vroom and Decis' (1960) view, Ritchie and Miles (1970) state that "managers who hold the Human Relations theory of participation believe simply in involvement for the sake of involvement", arguing that "as long as subordinates feel they are participating and are being consulted, their ego needs will be satisfied and they will be more cooperative". Employees are willing to get involved in goal setting, problem solving and decision making activities.

Human resource policies that encourage worker involvement aimed at providing employees with opportunities to have an input in decisions, incentives to expend discretionary effort and the means to acquire skills will undoubtedly enhance their job satisfaction. The present study accordingly suggests that the bank under study may look into the following recommendations for further improvement in the subject under discussion.

- ✓ To arrange periodical meetings, effective training to the employees working in the bank.
- ✓ To make all the employees updated by providing current information for any aspect of banking services and products to develop knowledge management concept.
- ✓ To widen the areas of responsibility, larger delegation of authority, adequate feedback and incentive for good work and training.
- ✓ To create a work environment in which bank officers, who are themselves playing a key role as managers in motivating others, would voluntarily put forth their maximum contribution.
- ✓ To strive for the shared goals of employees (managers and clerks).
- ✓ To engage employees in developing mission statement, establishing policies and procedures, determining perks etc.,
- ✓ To improve employees' communication to boost their morale and satisfaction levels.
- ✓ To create a sense of ownership in the company, participative management to instil a sense of pride and motivate employees to increase productivity in order to achieve the organizational goals set by the bank.
- ✓ To recognize employees as an important resources rather than hired labourers in the process of decision-making

REFERENCES

- Blau, G.J and Boal, K. R. (1987). Conceptualizing How Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment Affect Turnover and Absenteeism. *Academy of Management Review* (April) 290
- Blau ,G.J. (1986) Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment as Interactive Predictors of Tardiness and Absenteeism. *Journal of Management* ,Winter, 577-84
- Brown, S.P. (1996), "A meta-analysis and review of organisational research on job involvement" *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 120 pp 235 – 255.
- Cotton, J. L., Vollrath, D. A. and Jennings, K.R. (1988), "Employee participation: Diverse forms and different outcomes", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 13(1), pp.8-22.
- Dhar S., Dhar U. and Srivastava, D. K. (2001), "Manual for Job Involvement Scale", Ankur Psychological Agency, Indore.
- Drucker, P. (1993), *Post-Capitalistic Society*, New York: Harper Collins.
- Gilkar N.A. and Darzi J.A. (2011) "Job Involvement Impact on Job Satisfaction: Study of a Select Commercial Bank" *JM International Journal of HR Review* 1(4): 259-265
- Gilkar N.A and Darzi J.A. (2012) "Relationship between participation and job satisfaction: Analysis of a bank organization" *International Journal of Commerce and Business Management* 5(1):53-57
- Gilkar N.A. and Darzi J.A. (2012) "Modern Management Practices for Business" 152-158
- Jarrar, Y.F. and Zairi, M. (2002), "Employee Empowerment – A UK survey of trends and best practices", *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Vol. 17(5), pp.266-271.
- Kanungo, R.N., Sasi, B. M., and Dayal, I. (1975), "Relationship of Job Involvement to Perceived Importance and Satisfaction of Employees needs", *Internal Review of Applied Psychology*, 24, Pp.49 – 59.

- Locke, E. A. and Schweigner, D. M. (1979), "Participation in decision making: One more look", *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, Vol. 1, pp. 265-339.
- Lodahl ,T.M. and Kejner,M (1965) Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement,*Journal of Applied Psychology* 49,24-33
- Mishra, P.C. (1986), "Strenuous working conditions Stressors as a moderator Variable of job satisfaction – Job involvement relationship", *Indian Psychological Review*, Vol. 31, pp. 4-9.
- Monappa, A. and Saiyadain, M. (2005), *Personnel Management*, Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing Co. Ltd, New Delhi.
- Pathak, R. D. (1983), "Workers' Participation in management – A conceptual framework", *Indian labour Journal*, Vol. 24(6), pp.815-823.
- Rabinowitz, S. Hall, D.T. (1977), "Organisational Research on Job Involvement" *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 84, Pp. 265 – 288.
- Ritchie, J. B. and Miles, R. E. (1970), " An analysis of quantity and quality of participation as mediating variables in the participative decision making process", *Personnel Psychology*, 23, pp. 347 – 359.
- Santhanmani, V.S. (1983), "Job involvement of R & D personnel", *Journal of Psychological Research*, Vol. 27(2), pp. 107 – 114.
- Singh, A.P. and Kumari, P. (1988), "A study of individual need strength, motivation and involvement in relation to job satisfaction, productivity and absenteeism", *Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 182, pp. 24 – 42.
- Singh, A., and Sharma, T. (1999), "Job Satisfaction Scale", *National Psychological Corporation*, Agra.
- Vikas, Rajan and Mukesh Kishore (1986),"Job satisfaction and occupational status of police personnel", *Asian journal of Psychology and Education*, Vol. 17(2), pp 18 – 21
- Vroom, A. H. and Deci, E.L. (Eds) (1960), *Some personality determinants of the effects of participation*, Englewood Cliffs, N J.:Prentice –Hall.