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Abstract: Job involvement is one of the most successful HR practice used for enhancing employee efficiency and performance. This paper tried to investigate the relationship between job involvement and its outcomes including job satisfaction and employee job performance. Because both outcomes have direct effect on overall performance of organization. Data was gathered from 211 regular staff and results showed that job involvement has directly affect the satisfaction of employees; however no direct effect revealed with employee job performance.
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INTRODUCTION

There is a considerable amount of research done on job involvement. Most of this research has been done in Western cultures. Previous research did not found positive impact of job involvement on performance of individual employee. [1-5]. Diefendorff, et al. [6] argued past studies regarding relationship of job involvement and employee performance inconsistent and imperfect. Comparatively partial research finds regarding capability of job involvement and organizational commitment for prediction of job performance [7]. Hence, there is a need to further investigate the relationship between job involvement and job performance in non-western cultures.

The current study aimed at investigating the relationship between job involvement and other important outcomes. Specifically, the purpose of this study is to investigate the importance of employee job involvement and its effect on employee performance and job satisfaction.

Literature Review

Employee Job Satisfaction: Last two decades [8] employee satisfaction remains focused and critical area for researchers. Different researchers define job satisfaction with different angles but ultimate idea of satisfaction remained same. Comprehensive definition of Job Satisfaction described by Locke [9] and Wanous and Lawler [10] (p. 57) “A favorable attitude or pleasurable emotional state that result from a person’s job experience or a fit between a person and an organization”. It plays important role in development of employee and organization because satisfied employee is productive employee. It is necessary that job responsibilities should be clearly communicated to individual employee and employee should be involved decisions regarding his scope of work. New concept arise that giving individual responsibilities and authority to take decisions (which help employee to grow mentally) provide real satisfaction [9]. Researchers [11, 12] measured satisfaction as worldwide construct and an idea with multiples components. Job satisfaction is a function of characteristic in jobenvironment, an attitude and behavior produced by personality traits in the work environment [13]. As per Porter and Lawler [14] intrinsic job satisfaction is mostly depends on elements related to job design and individual’s on job performance. This mean that different aspects of job design have direct relation with job satisfaction and most of the time job enlargement produces high satisfaction among the employees [15]. As per JCM (Job Characteristics Model) of Hackman and Oldham [16] job satisfaction can be said...
that it is one of the utmost results of intrinsically enriched jobs and intrinsically enriched jobs have significantly positive relationship with job satisfaction and other similar constructs. Employees with positive self assessments evaluate themselves with high level of job satisfaction as compared to those employees who evaluate their self assessment as less positive or negative [17]. Job satisfaction play important role to overcome job anxiety as Parmar [18] demonstrated the negative relationship between job satisfaction and anxiety. If we study the mediation role of job satisfaction, we found it in relationship between role conflict and three types of commitments [19].

**Employee Job Performance:** Job performance is one of the major outcomes, which are studied by organizational behavior and industrial/occupational psychology research. In-role job performance is measure of activities that are included in formal duties of one’s job [20]. First inclusive and complete review of research between job satisfaction and employee performance was carried out by Brayfield and Crockett [21]. Organizations can enhance the job performance and potential of employees in place of work by making atmosphere of involvement and motivation which may play an important role for gaining competitive edge in business world [22, 23]. This clearly indicates that by initiating different types of activities, individual performance can be increased. For this purpose lot of concentration has been focused for identify the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. Productivity and job satisfaction have inconsistent relationship, most of the time it is positive but not significantly positive [24]. However, Job performance has positive relationship with job satisfaction and has significant affect on satisfaction of employee [25]. Furthermore Darden, *et al.* [26] (p.69) stated,”Job performance was a direct antecedent of job satisfaction”. A lot of research work was done on the relationship between job performance and role stress [27].

**Job Involvement and its Outcomes**

**Employee Job Satisfaction:** An analysis of 47 studies by Locke and Schweiger [28] showed that around 60 per cent studies discovered the employee involvement and job satisfaction significant relationship. Job involvement make workforce satisfied and productive.

Many researchers define job involvement as measure to which the job fulfills the individual’s desires that determine his degree of job satisfaction [29-33]. Research showed that both job involvement and employee job satisfaction are necessary and utmost elements for motivation and retention of employees, which ultimately leads to organizational and individual success.

“Job satisfaction is characterized as an attitude with a clear situational focus” Locke [9] (p. 1300) but job involvement is characterized as significance of work or job to individual’s self-esteem [34]. Soong [35] found the association between job involvement and job satisfaction but described that job involvement is a good forecaster of absenteeism and work behavior as compared to job satisfaction. If we further elaborate the literature regarding relationship between these two, one can found the reasonable correlation between job involvement and measures of job satisfaction [36]. Other studies Lawler and Hall [2] also reported the correlation between both job involvement and job satisfaction to other constructs related to work and job. This clearly shows the importance of job involvement to satisfy the employee for producing good results in other area of work and job, on the basis of literature it is also identified that employees whose level of involvement is high do not depend on inspiring perspective of behavior of immediate boss or job to increase and improve their level of job satisfaction [37, 38].

It was reported that employees with high level of job involvement have more recognition with their work and occupation, this recognition with work also increases their level of job satisfaction [39].

On the basis of above literature I developed the following hypothesis:

**Employee Job Involvement and Employee Job Satisfaction:** While explaining job performance Brown [39], citing Lawler III [40], Kahn [41] and Pfeffer [23], worked out that employee work behaviors are consequences of job involvement and job involvement have impact on employees’ motivation and effort, which ultimately showed the performance. Although Brown [39] meta-analysis showed non-significant relationship between performance and job involvement. Here we will try to find out the reasons of this non-significant relationship.

According to Lawler III [40] first sets the performance measure and reward than introduce the employee involvement program. Organizations that identify and establish clear standards of measurement of performance
can get the benefits of employees’ job involvement. Keller [42] found the sound effects of job involvement on different variables of performance.

Main focus of job involvement technique is enriching work to encourage employees to get better job performance. This technique has been used by researchers since 1950s.

Pfeffer [23] and Hackman and Lawler [43] described job involvement as major determinant of organizational successfullness and employee motivation. Those employees who are fully involved in their job are good performer because job relate to their self-esteem [44]. Involvement of teachers in their work and job can affects the teaching competency of teachers, teaching excellence, teaching success, efficiency of students and efficiency of concerned organizations [45]. This indicates that job involvement may possibly provide the basic data for best utilization of workforce, because it gives meaning and guide them to seek out the real purpose of their job and work [46]. Chungtai [47] described in his study the positive correlation of job involvement with both in-role job performance and OCB in which he found $r = .30$, $p < .01$ with in-role job performance and $r = .43$, $p < .01$ with OCB. It is also essential and significant for highly involved people on job to perform efficiently because they consider it noteworthy for their self-esteem [44]. For this reason, Blau and Boal [48] propose in their study that high performing employees who also posses’ high level of job involvement and organizational commitment are most precious asset for organization. Bass and Ryterband [49] also argued that it is envy of ego involvement of employees in his job and relate this to performance. Its all about perception of employees, if they feel that job and work has potential to satisfy their psychological wants and requirements, they involve themselves completely and exert more effort and time to serve the organization [23, 41] researchers also concluded job involvement as predictor of performance and employee attitudes [23]. Parker [50] while comparing the relationship of job involvement with in-role job performance and OCB found that job involvement has significant relation with OCB than in-role job performance. Diefendorff, et al. [6] also examined the effect of job involvement with OCB. Employees with high level of job involvement perform their job according to responsibilities given by organization as well as according to their perception of own performance because involvement make them more self-regulating and confident [51]. So one can say that job involvement is a significant measure of effectiveness and efficiency of employees and organization [36].

While going through above literature following hypothesis was developed:

Employee job involvement is positively related to employee job performance.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

Data was collected from employees working in institution which are located in North Pakistan. Sample size for this study was 211 employees.

**Below Scales Were Used to Analyzed diverse Variables:**

**Job Involvement:** Ten-item scale of job involvement developed by Kanungo [34]. Example of items used was “The most important things that happen to me involve my present job”. Alpha reliability found ($\alpha = .80$).

**Job Satisfaction:** Job satisfaction was measured by using a six-item scale developed by Agho, et al. [52]. Alpha reliability found ($\alpha = .67$).

**Job Performance:** Williams and Anderson [53] 7-item scale was used in this study to measure supervisory rated job performance. To avoid the biasness these items were filled in by immediate supervisors of respondents. Alpha reliability were found ($\alpha = .77$).

**Data Analysis:** Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Mean of job involvement was found to be 3.36 (Standard Deviation = .66) and mean for job satisfaction is 3.62 (S.D = .62) and for job performance is 3.78 (S. D = .65).

Data in current study was normally distributed.

The relationship between job involvement and job satisfaction found positive ($r = .49, p < .01$). This result proved hypothesis true that job involvement is positively related to job satisfaction. However insignificant relationship found between job involvement and job performance ($r = .07, n.s$). This result does not support hypothesis that job involvement is positively related with job performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ten. Current</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.#</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tenure current</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 211. Only age, gender and tenure current controlled in analysis and used as control variables*

***Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

Reliabilities (α) given in bold along the diagonal

Research Model and Variables

Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>0.47***</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>0.08(ns)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01(ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression Analysis: I checked the effect of independent variable on dependent variables through regression analysis. Table 3 shows the result of regression between job involvement and job satisfaction. Job involvement is significant positive relationship with job satisfaction ($β=.47$, p <.001).

Table 4 shows the result of regression between job involvement and job performance. Job involvement is non-significant relationship with job performance. ($β=.08$, n.s).

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

On the basis of it was found that hypothesis developed in this research study got significant support. Out of three hypothesis two were supported excluding the hypothesis concerning job involvement and job performance.

Hypothesis that Employee job involvement is positively related to employee job performance was not proved. The probable reasons might be cultural and social, as performance measured by supervisory rating, in Pakistan supervisors usually do not share the employee’s performance with outsiders as well as its own employees. This can be said that respondents usually prefer to provide acceptable responses due to social pressure. As job involvement relationship job performance was not supported but these results are consistent with the study of [1-4, 6, 39, 54]. Fried [55] also found the week relationship between job characteristics and employee in-role job performance [54, 55].

Hypothesis that Employee job involvement is positively related to employee job satisfaction is supported by results and found that job involvement has significant positive relationship with job satisfaction. These results are consistent with the studies of Locke and Schweiger [28] and Brown [39] that job satisfaction is a result of job involvement.

It is suggested that in future research impact of job involvement on job performance may be measured by mediating the factors related to job constructs. Through this one can identify the mediating factors between job involvement and job performance.

In this study supervisory rating was used to predict the performance of employee, it will be interesting if we collect the performance data of same employees from concerned Human Resource department. It will provide good research area for future study.
The limitation might be the cultural constraints in which performance was measured through supervisor rating. In this supervisors tried to rate employee performance in keeping view that this information could be disclosed and their subordinates might consider it unjustifiable. This judgement might cause insignificant result with performance although to avoid biased responses data were collected through face to face.
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