

## **Job Involvement and Job Stress among Employees at Private Sectors of Tiruchirappalli District**

M. Daniel Solomon Phd<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor of Social Work, Bishop Heber College, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India.

---

**Abstract:** *Of late, the global work scene has witnessed feisty efforts by managerial protagonists to revamp the jobs with a view to have amplified job involvement. This is apparently based on the belief that job involvement is conducive not only to efficiency but also employees' self-fulfilment. Work and the workplace accentuates many issues related to organizational psychology including job satisfaction, job involvement, quality of work life, motivation and leadership and the physical and mental health of workers. Job involvement and job stress have, therefore, emerged as an important set for research. The finding reveals that more than half 51.6 percent of the respondent have low level of Job involvement and less than half 48.4 percent of the respondent have high level of Job Involvement and while analyzing the stress level more than half 50.8 percent of the respondent have low level of stress and less than half 49.2 have high level of stress.*

**Keywords:** *Job Involvement, Job Analysis, Job Interest, Job Autonomy, Job Motivation, Job Commitment, Individual Stress, Organizational Stress and Work Stress.*

---

### **I. Introduction**

Job involvement has been one of the most effective tools used for increasing employee productivity by enhancing employee participation and commitment. There are a number of approaches to conceptualize job involvement but few have received as much recognition as Lodahl and Kejner's, Kanungo's, and Ferrel and Rusbult's (Morrow, 1993). Lodahl and Kejner (1965) defined job involvement in terms of a job performance-self-esteem relationship and personal identification with work. Job involvement was defined by Kanungo (1982) as a cognitive or belief state of psychological identification with one's job in particular or work in general. Finally, Farrell and Rusbult (1981) defined job commitment "as the extent to which an employee perceives he/she is connected to a job" (p.80). What these approaches have in common is that job involvement viewed as a psychological identification with and attachment to one's job.

Stress is a feeling that one perceives when external demands exceed what one can handle within individual ability and resources. In reality, stress is inevitable. An appropriate level of work stress can stimulate our potentials and enhance efficiency. On the contrary, excessive stress at work would have negative impacts on us. Proper recognition and management of work stress is of paramount importance.

Of late, the organizations are facing inflationary pressures, dwindling budgets, and dearth of proficient work-force, it assumes greater importance to provide a positive work situation to ensure worker stability and better job involvement. Work and the workplace accentuates many issues related to organizational psychology including job satisfaction, job involvement, quality of work life, motivation and leadership and the physical and mental health of workers. Job involvement and job stress have, therefore, emerged as an important set for research.

### **II. Review of Earlier Studies**

Singh and Nath (1991) explored the effect of organizational role stress on job involvement on the bank employees. They found employees having high role stress, exhibited lower job involvement than those having low role stress. Study further revealed that organizational role stress was found to be the most powerful predictor of job involvement. According to Shafikhan & Puja (1992), the marital status, gender, and qualification had negative correlation between occupational stress and Job involvement of employees of hotel sector. Rai V. K. and Yadav V. C. (1995) found that there is positive co-relation between occupational stress and job involvement of industrial employees. Duftuar and Anjali (1997) explored the influence of occupational stress, organizational commitment and job involvement and personality of lower and middle level managers working in electrical manufacturing company in western India. Result revealed significant positive correlation between job involvement and several areas of occupational stress, organizational commitment and personality types. Biswas (1998) studied the influence of life style stressors- performance, frustration, threat and physical damage on organizational commitment and job involvement of managers, supervisors and workers of large and medium public and private sector organization. The subjects were asked to complete the discography

information schedule, life style stressors questionnaire, job involvement questionnaire and the perceived organizational questionnaire. The results revealed that the performance, threat and frustration emerged significant predictors of organizational commitment. Whereas none of the stressors emerged as predictor of job involvement the result also indicated that managers scored high on job involvement as compared to the supervisors and workers. The workers showed greater performance stress.

Dadania D A (1998) explored that the designation had an effect on occupational stress, while there was no significant difference of sector on job involvement. Srivastava (2001) Conducted a study to examine job involvement and mental health among 60 executive and 15 Supervisor with work experience ranging from 8 to 30 years result revealed that executives felt more involved in the job than the supervisor. There was a significant association between job involvement and mental health. Allam (2002) examined job involvement of bank employees in relation to job anxiety, Personality Characteristics, job burnout, age and tender. The result revealed that the job anxiety. Job burnout, age and tender were significant related to job involvement.

### III. Methodology

It seeks to explore the prevalent of job involvement level and work stress level in the private industrial sectors an attempt has been made to analyze and interpret the data collected through scale for job involvement and work stress. The scale contained specific items to assess the Job Analysis, Job Interest, Job Autonomy, Job Motivation and Job Commitment level of job involvement by the employees and special items to assess individual stress and organizational stress level of work stress. The researcher collected 500 respondents as sample by adopting simple random sampling using lottery method.

### IV. Results

The research analysis reveals less that majority 68.8 percent of the respondent got married and less than one third of the respondent were single. Less than one fourth of the respondent 72.4 percent of the respondent live in nuclear family and remaining 27.6 of the live in a joint family system. While we analysis the dependent majority 64.8 percent of the respondent have three to four dependent, less than one fourth 22.8 percent of the respondent have five dependent and remaining 11.4 percent have more than five dependent.

While analyzing the dimension more than half 53.2 percent of the respondent have low level of Job Analysis and less than half 46.8 2 percent of the respondent have high level of Job Analysis. More than half 56.8 percent of the respondent have low level of Job Interest and less than half 43 2 percent of the respondent have high level of Job Interest. More than half 55.2 percent of the respondent have low level of Job Autonomy and less than half 44 8 percent of the respondent have high level of Job Autonomy. More than half 50.8 percent of the respondent have low level of Job Motivation and less than half 49 2 percent of the respondent have high level of Job Motivation. More than half 53.2 percent of the respondent have low level of Job Commitment and less than half 46 8 percent of the respondent have high level of Job Commitment and the overall Job involvement reveals more than half 51.6 percent of the respondent have low level of Job involvement and less than half 48 4 percent of the respondent have high level of Job Involvement.

While analyzing the stress level more than half 55.6 percent of the respondent have low level of individual stress and remaining 44.4 percent of the respondent have high level of individual stress. Slightly more than half 50. 4 percent of the respondent have low level of organization stress and less than half 49.6 percent of the respondent have high level of organization stress. While analyzing the overall stress level it reveals that slightly more than half 50. 8 percent of the respondent have low level of stress and less than half 49.2 have high level of stress.

### Findings related to Key Variables

**Table 1:** Student T - Test Between The Respondent Marital Status And Various Dimension Of Job Involvement

Dimension	Marital status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Statistical Inference
Job Analysis	Married	334	21.0778	2.46536	t = 2.926 Df = 498 P > 0.05 Not Significant
	Unmarried	166	20.4096	2.27788	
Job Interest	Married	334	20.4910	2.70439	t = .710 Df = 498 P < 0.05 Significant
	Unmarried	166	20.3133	2.49571	
Job Autonomy	Married	334	16.8683	3.40209	t = 2.843 Df = 498 P > 0.05 Not Significant
	Unmarried	166	15.9398	3.51395	

Job Motivation	Married	334	19.2096	4.21186	t = 1.995 Df = 498 P < 0.05 Significant
	Unmarried	166	18.4217	4.05155	
Job Commitment	Married	334	19.1916	2.87671	t = 3.273 Df = 498 P < 0.05 High Significant
	Unmarried	166	18.2410	3.39551	
Job Involvement	Married	334	96.8383	12.06057	t = 3.091 Df = 498 P > 0.05 Not Significant
	Unmarried	166	93.3253	11.78094	

It is found from the above table that there is a highly significant difference between the marital status of the respondents and the Job commitment and there is a significant difference between the marital status of the respondents and Job Interest and Job motivation and there is no significant difference between the marital status of the respondents and the Job Analysis, Job Autonomy and overall job Involvement

**Table 2:** Student T - Test Between The Respondent Marital Status And Various Dimension Of Stress

Dimension	Marital status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Statistical Inference
Individual Stress	Married	334	41.9760	6.97309	t = .764 Df = 498 P > 0.05 Not Significant
	Unmarried	166	41.4699	6.97065	
Organization Stress	Married	334	58.5150	8.34169	t = 4.001 Df = 498 P < 0.05 Significant
	Unmarried	166	55.2048	9.41792	
Overall Stress	Married	334	100.4910	14.18279	t = 2.766 Df = 498 P > 0.05 Not Significant
	Unmarried	166	96.6747	15.19817	

It is evident from the above table there is significant difference between the marital status of the respondents and the organization stress. There is no significant difference between the marital status of the respondents and the individual stress and overall stress.

**Table 3:** Student T - Test Between The Respondent Type Of Family And Various Dimension Of Job Involvement

Dimension	Type of family	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Statistical Inference
Job Analysis	Nuclear	362	20.8840	2.50933	t = .418 Df = 498 P > 0.05 Not Significant
	Joint	138	20.7826	2.18735	
Job Interest	Nuclear	362	20.8066	2.41444	t = 5.285 Df = 498 P < 0.05 Significant
	Joint	138	19.4493	2.93251	
Job Autonomy	Nuclear	362	16.7569	3.44912	t = 2.065 Df = 498 P > 0.05 Not Significant
	Joint	138	16.0435	3.46172	
Job Motivation	Nuclear	362	19.5470	3.72968	t = 5.341 Df = 498 P < 0.05 High Significant
	Joint	138	17.3768	4.82724	
Job Commitment	Nuclear	362	18.8895	2.95843	t = .158 Df = 498 P < 0.05 Significant
	Joint	138	18.8406	3.41582	
Job Involvement	Nuclear	362	96.8840	11.07080	t = 3.682 Df = 498 P < 0.05 High Significant
	Joint	138	92.4928	13.91698	

With regard to the type of family there is High significant difference between family type and Job motivation dimension and the overall job involvement. There is significant difference between type of family and Job Interest and Job Commitment. There is no significant difference between type of family and Job Analysis and Job Autonomy dimension.

**Table 4:** Student T - Test Between The Respondent Type Of Family And Various Dimension Of Stress

Dimension	Type of family	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Statistical Inference
Individual Stress	Nuclear	362	42.1050	7.12259	.37436	t = 1.545 Df = 498 P > 0.05 Not Significant
	Joint	138	41.0290	6.51101	.55425	
Organization Stress	Nuclear	362	57.8011	8.94205	.46998	t = 1.580 Df = 498 P > 0.05 Not Significant
	Joint	138	56.4058	8.52702	.72587	
Overall Stress	Nuclear	362	99.9061	14.83863	.77990	t = 1.692 Df = 498 P > 0.05 Not Significant
	Joint	138	97.4348	13.93780	1.18646	

There is no significant difference between the type of family and various type of dimension and the overall stress.

**Table 5:** Karl Pearson Coefficient Of Correlation between the Dependents of the Respondents with the Various Dimension of Job Involvement

DIMENSION	CORRELATION	CORRELATION VALUE	STATISTICAL INFERENCE
No. of family members and Job Analysis	-.359	Moderate relationship	P < 0.05 Significant
No. of family members and Job Interest	-.099	Low relationship	P < 0.05 Significant
No. of family members and Job Autonomy	-.237	Low relationship	P < 0.05 Significant
No. of family members and Job Motivation	-.232	Low relationship	P < 0.05 Significant
No. of family members and Job Commitment	-.241	Low relationship	P < 0.05 Significant
No. of family members and overall Job Involvement	-.304	Moderate relationship	P < 0.05 Significant

While analyzing the above table there is Moderate negative relationship between number of family members and in the Job Analysis dimension and overall Stress where as there is low negative relationship between number of family members and various dimension such as Job Interest, Job Autonomy, Job Motivation and Job Commitment.

**Table 6:** Karl Pearson Coefficient Of Correlation Between The Dependents Of The Respondents With The Various Dimension Of Stress

DIMENSION	CORRELATION	CORRELATION VALUE	STATISTICAL INFERENCE
No. of family members and Individual Stress	-.203	Low relationship	P < 0.05 Significant
No. of family members and Organization Stress	-.356	Moderate relationship	P < 0.05 Significant
No. of family members and overall stress	-.312	Moderate relationship	P < 0.05 Significant

It is very clear from the above table that there is a Moderate negative relationship between number of family members and in the organization stress dimension and overall stress. There is low negative relationship between number of family members and in the dimension of Individual stress.

## **V. Discussion**

While analyzing the data it is very clear that married people have high level of job involvement than the single people but at the same time the married people have more stress than the unmarried person and it may be they do not know how to balance the work load so the management can conduct work load motivational programme. It is very clear that the respondent from nuclear family have high job involvement and same time they have high level of stress whereas respondents from joint family system have low level of job involvement but they have low level of stress which reveal the Indian scenario there is a sharing of work responsibility and due to the reason the stress seem to be low. The management should ensure that employee involvement is recognized within the organization policy. It is found that there is a Moderate negative relationship between number of family members and Job involvement and stress. The management should understand the sources of stress and find out proper solutions and enhance the ability to cope with work stress by giving effective communication skill, good time management and good interpersonal relationship seminars in order to have good involvement in the Job.

## **VI. Conclusion**

Work and the workplace accentuates many issues related to organizational psychology including job satisfaction, job involvement, quality of work life, motivation and leadership and the physical and mental health of workers. Job involvement and job stress have, therefore, emerged as an important set for research. This

## **Acknowledgements**

The author would like to thank the University Grants Commission, SERO, Hyderabad, India for the financial assistance rendered to undertake the study as part of the Minor Research Project.

## **Reference**

- [1]. Allam,Z.(2002). A study of job involvement among Bank employees as related to job anxiety, personality characteristics and job burnout. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Department of Psychology, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh.
- [2]. Biswas,U.N.(1998). Life style stressors, organizational commitments, job involvement and perceived organizational effectiveness across job levels. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*. 34(1),pp.55-72.
- [3]. Daftuar, C.N. and Anjali(1997). Occupational stress, organizational commitment and job involvement in Sattva Rajas and Tamas personality types. *Journal of The Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*.15(1-2).pp.44-52.
- [4]. Dhdhania D A: A study of occupational stress organizational health, organizational commitment and job involvement of public and private sector of employees.
- [5]. Farrell, D. and Rusbult, C. 1981 "Exchanges variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. "*Organizational Behavior and Performance*, 27 (28) :78-95.
- [6]. Kanungo, R. 1982 "Measurement of job and work involvement." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 67:341-349.
- [7]. Lodahle, T. and Kejner, M. 1965 "The definition and measurement of job involvement." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 49, 24-33.
- [8]. Morrow, P., 1993 *The Theory and Measurement of Work Commitment*. Greenwich, CO: JAI Press Inc.
- [9]. Srivastava,S.K.(2001). Job involvement and mental health among executive and supervisors. *Journal of Community Guidance*.18(3),pp.365-372.