

# JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB INVOLVEMENT AMONG PRIVATE EMPLOYEES AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Shravan U. Kharani

Student ( M.A. Sem - II ), Shree & Smt. P. K. Kotawala Arts College, Patan.

Received: April 14, 2019

Accepted: May 19, 2019

**ABSTRACT:** Job satisfaction is an integral component of work climate, while working in organizations; people develop a set of attitudes about the work, supervision, coworkers, working conditions and so on. This set of attitudes is referred to as job satisfaction. Job involvement is the degree to which employees immerse themselves in their jobs, invest time and energy in team, and view work as a central part of their overall lives. An attempt has been made to measure the comparative study of Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement among Private Employees and Government Employees. The job satisfaction scale is developed by Dr. Amar Singh and Dr. T.R. Shama in 1999 and job involvement scale development by Santosh Dhar, Upinder Dhar and D.K. Srivastava in 2001. The sample consisted of 80 employees, 40 Government employees and 40 private employees with Government and private organizations. Job satisfaction measured the result indicates that there is no-significant difference between male and female private employees in job satisfaction or government male and female employees in job satisfaction. Job involvement measured the result indicates that there is no-significant difference between male and female private employees in job involvement or government male and female employees in job involvement. Job satisfaction measured the result indicates that there is significant difference between private and government employees. The correlation between job satisfaction and job involvement of private employees is reported low positive correlation. The correlation between job satisfaction and job involvement of government employees is reported very low negative correlation.

**Key Words:** Job satisfaction, Job involvement, Government employees and Private employees

## Introduction:

Job Satisfaction is a topic of wide interest to both people who work in organizations and people who study them. In fact, it is the most frequently studied variable in organizational behavior research. It is a central variable in both research and theory of organizational phenomena ranging from job design to supervision. Literally thousands of job satisfaction studies can be found in the journals of organizational behavior and related fields.

## What is job satisfaction?

Job satisfaction is simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs. As it is generally assessed, job satisfaction is an attitudinal variable. In the past, job satisfaction was approached by some researchers from the perspective of need fulfillment that is, whether or not the job met the employee's physical and psychological needs for the things provided by work, such as pay (e.g. Porter, 1962, Wolf, 1970).

**Hoppock (1935)** says job satisfaction is any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, "I am satisfied with my job".

**Statt (2004)** defines Job satisfaction can be defined also as the extent to which a worker is content with the rewards he or she gets out of his or her job, particularly in terms of intrinsic motivation.

## Importance of job satisfaction:

The importance of job satisfaction is obvious. Managers should be concerned with the level of job satisfaction in their organizations for at least 3 reasons:

- (1) There is clear evidence that dissatisfied employees skip work more often and are more likely to resign.
- (2) It has been demonstrated that satisfied employees have better health and live longer, and,
- (3) Satisfaction on the job carries over to the employee's life outside the job.

## Job Involvement

Job involvement is a more recent addition to the job literature. Closely related to motivation and job satisfaction is job involvement the intensity of a person's psychological identification with the job. Usually, the higher one's identification or job involvement with a job, the greater is the job satisfaction.

Job involvement is the degree to which employees immerse themselves in their jobs, invest time and energy in team, and view work as a central part of their overall lives. Holding meaningful jobs and performing them are important inputs to their own self-images, which helps explain the traumatic effects of job loss on their esteem needs. Job involved employees are likely to believe in the work ethic, to exhibit high growth needs, and to enjoy participation in decision making. As a result, they seldom will be tardy or absent, they are willing to work long hours, and they will attempt to be high performers.

In this portion, we clarify what we mean by employee involvement, describe some of the various forms that it takes, consider the motivational implications of these programs, and show some applications.

### **What is job involvement?**

**Lawler and Hall (1970)** imply that a job involved person sees her or his job “as an important part of his self-concept”.

**Blau and Boal (1987)** state that 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.

**Cotton (1993)** implies employee involvement as a participative process that uses the entire capacity of employees and is designed to encourage increased commitment to the organization’s success.

**Randolph (2000)** refers job involvement as a degree to which employees share information, knowledge, rewards, and power throughout the organization.

### **Review of the literature**

Job satisfaction has been a favorite topic of Western (popularity American) as well as Indian psychologists; **Locke (1976)** estimated that by 1972, 3,350 articles (or dissertations) had been written on this subject. In India also, **Daftuar (1969)**, **Ganguly (1971)**, **Sinha (1972)**, and **Sinha J. B. P. (1978)**, in their perspective reviews of Indian researchers in the areas, observed that the highest number of industrial psychological researches were done in the field of job satisfaction and its bearing on performance. For example, **Sinha (1972)** reported 144 researches on job satisfaction, out of a total 508 articles that he reviewed. **Sinha J. B. P. (1978)** reported 71 articles in the areas out of his coverage of 350 researches, many aspects of work- life and job satisfaction have been thoroughly studied And yet, “researchers have not been found satisfactory answer other question what makes put their best the job”? **Dixit (1971)**

Number of studies have been conducted to know working motivation force behind employee’s job satisfaction and job involvement in which very familiar study was done by **Lawler (1970)** in which he found that job involvement as an intrinsic drive motivates individuals to perform better and they perceive their job to be more centrally valued and satisfying. The job involved persons develop more sense of responsibility and identification with their jobs. They conceptualized themselves to a greater degree as persons primarily in terms of work role. Such inherent and strong characteristics improve the quality of work.

### **Objectives:**

1. To study and compare the score of male and female of private employees in job satisfaction.
2. To study and compare the score of male and female of government employees in job satisfaction.
3. To study and compare the score of male and female of private employees in job involvement.
4. To study and compare the score of male and female of government employees in job involvement.
5. To study and compare the score of government and private employees in job satisfaction.
6. To study and compare the score of government and private employees in job involvement.
7. To study and compare the correlation of job satisfaction and job involvement of government employees.
8. To study and compare the correlation of job satisfaction and job involvement of private employees.

### **Hypothesis :**

1. There is no significant difference between male and female private employees in job satisfaction.
2. There is no significant difference between male and female of government employees in job satisfaction.
3. There is no significant difference between male and female of private employees in job involvement.
4. There is no significant difference between male and female of government employees in job involvement.
5. There is no significant difference between government and private employees in job satisfaction.
6. There is no significant difference between government and private employees in job involvement.

7. There is no significant correlation between the scores of job satisfaction and job involvement of government employees.
8. There is no significant correlation between the scores of job satisfaction and job involvement of private employees.

**Sample :**

The sample consisted of 80 employees was taken randomly. 40 Government employees and 40 private employees selected with the equal number of male and female drawn from the various Government and private organizations.

**Tools :**

Following tools were used to collect the Data.

**( 1 ) Singh and Sharma's Job Satisfaction Scale (1999)**

This scale was developed by **Dr. Amar Singh** and **Dr. T.R. Shama** in 1999. The level of job-satisfaction was measured in two types of areas-job intrinsic (factors lying in the job itself) and job-extrinsic (factors lying outside the job). It consisted at 30 statements. The subject has to give his/her answer in just fully satisfied, satisfied, average satisfied, dissatisfied, fully dissatisfied.

**Reliability and validity of job satisfaction scale:**

The test-retest reliability works out to be 0.978 with N = 52 and a gap of 25 days. The scale compares favorably with **Muthyya's** job satisfaction questionnaire giving a validity coefficient of 0.743. Moreover the satisfaction measures obtained from this scale have a close resemblance to the ratings given to the employees on a 3-point scale: fully satisfied, average satisfied, dissatisfied by the employers. The coefficient of correlation was 0.812 (n=52).

**( 2 ) Dhar, S., Dhar. U and Srivastava's Job Involvement Scale (2001)**

This scale was developed by **Santosh Dhar, Upinder Dhar and D.K Srivastava** in 2001. After consulting relevant literature on the subject several statements were framed to from the scale. It consisted at 10 statements. The subject has to give his/her answer in just strongly agrees, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree.

**Reliability:**

The reliability was determined by split-half method corrected for full length by applying Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula on the data collected from the sample of 371 subjects. The reliability coefficient was found to be 0.71.

**Validity:**

Besides face validity as all items of the scale are related to the concept of job involvement, the scale has high content validity. In order to determine validity from the coefficient of reliability (Garrett, 1981), the reliability index was calculated. The index of reliability measures the dependability of test scores by showing how well obtained scores agree with their theoretically true values. The index of reliability gives the maximum correlation which the given test is capable of yielding in its present form. His is true because the highest correlation can be obtained between a test and second measure is between the test scores and their corresponding true scores. The later has indicated high validity on account of being 0.83. The correlation between individual items scores and total scores of the scales was also determined. All the ten items have significant correlation; therefore, all of them were retained.

**Procedure :**

This study is about job satisfaction and job involvement of the government and non-government male employees. First of all the permission, data and time were received from the different heads of the department of Government, semi-government and non-government organizations to collect the data from the employees. Then the general information was received from the employees, the necessary instructions were also given and then the tests were given to the employees. The employees were free to meet at home instead of at the industries. It was sincerely checked whether the employee has given the whole answers or not so that they do not remain unanswered.

**Result and Discussions :****Table-1**

Table indicating Mean, Standard Deviation and T-Value of male and female of private employees in Job Satisfaction.

Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	't' value	Level of sign.
--------	---	------	------	-----------	----------------

Private Male	20	76.10	14.30	0.12	N.S
Private Female	20	70.60	11.80		

Table shows the mean for 20 private male employees and 20 private female employees are 76.10 and 70.60. The S.D value for 20 private male employees and 20 private female employees are 14.30 and 11.80. the 't' value for private male employees and private female employees which is 0.12 has been found no significant at 0.05 level. This result support hypothesis (1)

**Table-2 :**

Table indicating Mean, Standard Deviation and T-Value of male and female of government employees in Job Satisfaction.

Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	't' value	Level of sign.
Government Male	20	98.15	5.88	0.05	N.S
Government Female	20	93.60	9.18		

Table shows the mean for 20 government male employees and 20 government female employees are 98.15 and 93.60. The S.D value for 20 government male employees and 20 government female employees are 5.88 and 9.18. the 't' value for government male employees and government female employees which is 0.05 has been found no significant at 0.05 level. This result support hypothesis (2)

**Table-3 :**

Table indicating Mean, Standard Deviation and T-Value of male and female of private employees in Job Involvement.

Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	't' value	Level of sign.
Private Male	20	32.90	5.31	0.38	N.S
Private Female	20	32.00	4.90		

Table shows the mean for 20 private male employees and 20 private female employees are 32.90 and 32.00. The S.D value for 20 private male employees and 20 private female employees are 5.31 and 4.90. the 't' value for private male employees and private female employees which is 0.38 has been found no significant at 0.05 level. This result support hypothesis (3)

**Table-4 :**

Table indicating Mean, Standard Deviation and T-Value of male and female of government employees in Job Involvement.

Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	't' value	Level of sign.
Government Male	20	39.20	4.92	0.42	N.S
government Female	20	40.00	5.30		

Table shows the mean for 20 government male employees and 20 government female employees are 39.20 and 40.00. The S.D value for 20 government male employees and 20 government female employees are 4.92 and 5.30. the 't' value for government male employees and government female employees which is 0.42 has been found no significant at 0.05 level. This result support hypothesis (4)

**Table-5 :**

Table indicating Mean, Standard Deviation and T-Value of government and private employees in Job Satisfaction.

Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	't' value	Level of sign.
Government	40	95.88	7.95	9.39	S
Private	40	73.33	13.24		

Table shows the mean for 40 government employees and 40 private employees are 95.88 and 73.33. The S.D value for 40 government employees and 40 private employees are 7.95 and 13.24. the 't' value for government employees and private employees which is 9.39 has been found significant at 0.05 level. The result didn't supports hypothesis (5)

**Table-6 :**

Table indicating Mean, Standard Deviation and T-Value of government and private employees in Job Involvement.

Groups	N	Mean	S.D.	't' value	Level of sign.
Government	40	39.33	5.05	1.65	N.S
Private	40	32.60	5.04		

Table shows the mean for 40 government employees and 40 private employees are 39.33 and 32.60. The S.D value for 40 government employees and 40 private employees are 5.05 and 5.04. the 't' value for government employees and private employees which is 1.65 has been found no significant at 0.05 level. This result support hypothesis (6)

**Table-7 :**

Table indicating Mean, Standard Deviation and correlation between job satisfaction and job involvement of private employees.

Scale	N	Mean	S.D.	r correlation
Job satisfaction	40	73.33	13.24	0.25
Job involvement	40	32.60	5.04	

As seen from the table : 7 that the correlation between job satisfaction and job involvement of private employees is reported 0.25 which is low positive correlation.

**Table-8 :**

Table indicating Mean, Standard Deviation and correlation between job satisfaction and job involvement of government employees.

Scale	N	Mean	S.D.	r correlation
Job satisfaction	40	95.88	7.95	- 0.07
Job involvement	40	39.33	5.05	

As seen from the table : 8 that the correlation between job satisfaction and job involvement of government employees is reported - 0.07 which is very low negative correlation.

**Conclusion:**

- There is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of male and female employees of private sectors.
- There is no significant difference between the job satisfaction of male and female employees of government sectors.
- There is no significant difference between the job involvement of male and female employees of private sectors.
- There is no significant difference between the job involvement of male and female employees of government sectors.
- There is significant difference between job satisfaction of government employees and private employees.

- There is no significant difference between job involvement of government employees and private employees.
- There is a low positive correlation between job satisfaction and job involvement of private employees in some private sectors, employees may have more work load but less salary. So it may be the cause of low positive correlation for private sectors.
- There is a very low positive correlation between job satisfaction and job involvement of government employees.
- Government employees get the more benefits compare to private employees, so they score more on the scale of job satisfaction.

**References:**

1. **Hoppock, R. (1935)**. Job Satisfaction. In Singh, A., and Sharma, T. R. (1999) Manual for job Satisfaction Scale. Agra, National Psychological Corporation, P. 5
2. **Schultz, D.P. and Schultz, E. S. (1994)**. Psychology and Work Today: An Introduction to Industrial and Organizational Psychology. 6<sup>th</sup> Edi, N.J. Prentice Hall (Upper Saddle River) P.189, 271,283.
3. **Lawler, E. E. and Hall, D. T. (1970)**. Relationship of Job Characteristics to Job Involvement, Satisfaction, and Intrinsic Motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, P. 311, from: [http://World.Com/site\\_net/49142](http://World.Com/site_net/49142)
4. **Cotton, J. L. (1993)**. Employee Involvement. In Robbins, S. P. (2001). Organizational Behavior. 10<sup>th</sup> Edi, New Delhi, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, P.195.
5. **Blau, G.J. and Boal, K.R. (1987)**. Conceptualizing, How Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment Affect Turnover and Absenteeism. In **Robbins, S.P. (2003)**. Organizational Behavior 10<sup>th</sup> Edi, New Delhi Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, P. 195