

**A STUDY ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MEANINGFUL JOB ASSIGNMENTS AND  
EMPLOYEES PERFORMANCE & WELFARE**

**1. Dr. SUVARNA LAPALIKAR**

**2. Dr. MUKESH KESHARI**

1. Assistant Professor, St. Paul Institute of Professional Studies,  
Indore

2. Prof. & head, Commerce department, Christian Eminent College,  
Indore

**Abstract**

There is a famous saying “work is worship.” Although earning bread and butter is the basic necessity but this is not the eventual purpose of working life. Work is also a source of satisfaction and source of accomplishment. If employees perceive they are engaged in some significant job assignment, they tend to give more value to that job assignment (**Huta V. & Waterman, 2014**). Thus, significance of work in employees’ perception has the potential to determine their performance. In some cases (or in almost cases) Meaning of meaningful work may differ for employers and employees. An employee perceive a job meaningful when purpose of given task is matched with his/her own principles, standards and ideals.

This notion highlights the role of meaningful job assignment in overall success of the organization. Unfortunately, very little efforts have been made to explore this area so far. Therefore, this study is an attempt to study the relationship and effect of Meaningful Job Assignments on employees’ work effectiveness and overall wellbeing. In this study impact of meaningful job assignments have been measured on employees commitment, performance, job switching decisions and overall happiness of employees.

**1. Key Words**

Right goal, Dynamic organizations, Job priorities, Work life and personal life balance

**2. Introduction**

“Karma” the work has been given utmost importance in our culture. It gives the meaning, objective and fulfillment to the life. It is the evident truth that work should be directed towards

the right goal (**Steger & Duffy, 2012**). With the advent of Professional Management, work itself and approaches to accomplish it have significantly changed. Working environment is getting more technology driven than labor intensive. Skills and working methods are rapidly getting obsolete. Everyday organizations are facing new challenges. This scenario has presented new set of opportunities for the employees that were never available earlier. Along with experience; new ideas, dynamism and ability to learn, unlearn & relearn the new skills are giving employees competitive edge. It does not take a lifetime to climb the higher position in the organization. If people have ability, they can do so in very short period of time. On the contrary, this scenario has increased uncertainty of work itself, complications in work, spoiling the work experience and welfare of employees.

In a situation where people who work with you, organization culture, job priorities and employers expectations are changing very frequently; creating value for the organization employees work for is not self evident. It is really complicated, specifically to measure the difference particular employee make.

Considering this intricate state of affairs, it is essential to study, how meaningful job assignments can help both employers and employees in dynamic organizations. In particular, to find out can meaningful job assignments play their part to develop employees' commitment that can fulfill both, organizational objective and employees' personal objectives. Thus, maintaining the balance between Working life and personal life.

### **3. Review of Related Literature**

**Tetrick and Quick (2002)** noted, "The purpose of occupational health psychology is to develop, maintain, and promote the health of employees directly and the health of their families". As a field, occupational health psychology has made unique and important contributions to the study of worker well-being and has examined the impact of individual and contextual factors in the physical and psychological health of working people and their families. **Fassinger (2008), and Fouad and Bynner (2008)** provide an overview of the role of work in people's lives, with a particular emphasis on how psychologists can inform and shape public policy on work-related issues at both micro and macro levels.

**Meyer and Herscovitch (2001)** propose that commitment is “a force that binds an individual to a course of action of relevance to one or more targets”. Employees are theorized to experience this force in the form of three bases, or mindsets: affective, normative, and continuance, which reflect emotional ties, perceived obligation, and perceived sunk costs in relation to a target, respectively (**Allen and Meyer, 1990**). Thus, any scale that purports to measure organizational commitment should tap one of these mindsets and should reference the target, what the employee is committed to, be it the organization, a team, a change initiative, or a goal.

Wrzesniewski and colleagues (**Berg, Wrzesniewski, & Dutton, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001**) proposed meaningfulness as an important reason for job crafting, research has mainly focused on other (albeit important) job crafting outcomes such as employee work engagement, job performance, and organizational commitment (e.g., **Leana, Appelbaum, & Shevchuk, 2009; Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2013**). This means that the way job crafting affects meaningfulness remains untested while it is important to see whether employees who take the initiative to change their work characteristics are indeed increasing the meaningfulness of their work (**Kira & Balkin, 2014**). Therefore, we empirically test the assumption of **Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001)** job crafting model that job crafting is a proactive strategy to make work more meaningful.

#### **4. Objectives**

4.1 To know the impact of Meaningful ful Job Assignments on employees’ commitment towards their organization.

4.2 To find out the impact of Meaningful Job Assignments on employees’ performance.

4.3 To know the relationship between Meaningful Job Assignments and employees’ layoff decisions.

4.4 To know the impact of Meaningful Job Assignments on employees’ overall welfare.

#### **5. Research Methodology**

##### **5.1 Research Design**

The research design for the study is explanatory research in nature. Data for the study has been collected from both the sources that is, primary and secondary sources. Secondary data has been collected from various newspapers, magazines, journals and various websites. Interviews have

also been taken as and when required. The methodology adopted for the completion of this study has been divided into various stages.

The first stage includes understanding the concept of meaningful job assignment and job Performance. During the process people, who are working in this field and have knowledge about this subject matter were also approached to share their views.

### **5.2 Sample size, sampling frame and data collection**

The second stage includes data collection from primary sources. Primary data has been collected through self administered questionnaire. The main objective of this questionnaire was to understand the impact of meaningful work on various facets of work life and personal life of employees in the studied region. Purposive random sampling approach has been used to collect the data through questionnaire. A pre testing of questionnaire has been conducted to ensure that the questions are not confusing, ambiguous or potentially offensive to the respondents, leading to biased responses. The questionnaire was finalized after reading the relevant reference materials and discussions on the subject matter. Sample size for this study is confined to 100 respondents only because of the time constraints and lack of financial resources. Sampling frame are the people of Indore and nearby area.

### **5.3 Reliability Test**

In the third stage all the collected data was sorted out, tabulated and stored in MS Excel sheets in a systematic way in order to make the information easy to understand and to make it ready to be fed in analysis process. Before analysis reliability of the data was checked at Alpha value  $0.861 > 0.7$ , which confirmed reliability of data.

#### **Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.861	24

### **5.4 Analysis of the data**

In fourth stage all the collected data was analyzed. Regression Model and One way Anova were used to test the hypothesis after checking normality, homogeneity and other necessary conditions.

## 6. Hypothesis Testing and Analysis

<b>Hypothesis</b>	<b>Test</b>	<b>Sig. value</b>	<b>Result</b>
H01 Meaningful Job Assignments do not have significant positive impact on employees' commitment.	Regression Model	.002	Rejected
H02 Meaningful Job Assignments do not have significant positive impact on employees' performance.	Regression Model	0.001	Rejected
H03 Meaningful Job Assignments do not have significant relationship with employees' layoff decisions.	One way ANOVA	0.042	Rejected
H04 Meaningful Job Assignments do not have significant positive impact on employees' overall welfare.	Regression Model	0.000	Rejected

**hypotheses 1** suggested that meaningful job assignment has a great bearing up on employees' commitment for organization they are working. Employees who were given meaningful job assignment were found to be more committed towards their organization compared to employees who did not get worthy work to do. Shapiro-wilk test was used to test the normality of data and with min sig. Value 0.089 ( $> 0.05$ ) data was found to be normally distributed. Homogeneity of Variances was checked through Levene Statistic test and with sig. Value 0.976 ( $> 0.05$ ) assumptions of Homogeneity sustained.

Multiple correlation coefficient which is a standard of quality of the forecasting of the dependent variable, was calculated as 0.725, indicated a good level of forecasting. The R square, coefficient of determination, which is the proportion of variation accounted for by the regression model above & beyond the mean model, measured as 0.563. Estimated model of coefficients calculated the constant value 964.472 and 125.012 (Meaningful job assignment) for dependent variable, investment avenue selection. At last P value 0.002 ( $< 0.05$ ) confirmed the rejection of null hypothesis.

Analysis of **hypothesis 2** discloses that Meaningful Job Assignments have significant positive impact on employees' performance. Thus, employees tend to perform well if they perceive the value of the work high and contributing to organizational goal.

The multiple correlation coefficients. R can be considered to be one measure of the quality of the prediction of the dependent variable; in this case, A value of 0.733, indicates a good level of prediction. The "R Square" column represents the  $R^2$  value (also called the coefficient of determination), which is the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that can be

explained by the independent variables (technically, it is the proportion of variation accounted for by the regression model above and beyond the mean model). We can observe from our value of 0.247 that our independent variables explain 24.7 % of the variability of our dependent variable.

The F-ratio in the ANOVA Table tests whether the overall regression model is a good fit for the data. The table shows that the independent variables statistically significantly predict the dependent variable,  $F(1, 98) = 12.576$ , (Table value 3.921, the regression model is a good fit of the data). P value 0.001 indicates that there is significant impact of the independent variable on dependent variable, thus our null hypothesis, Meaningful Job Assignments do not have significant positive impact on employees' performance, is rejected.

The general form of the equation to predict uses of Meaningful job Assignment and Employee performance from Perceived Usefulness is:

Employees' performance = 2.045 + (0.484 x Meaningful Job Assignments)

One way ANOVA was run to test **hypothesis 3**, which predicted that Meaningful Job Assignments have significant relationship with employees' layoff decisions. It shows that if employees are assigned meaningful job, they are more loyal to the present organization and do not look for other options. Normality of data was checked through Shapiro-wilk test and with sig. Value 0.523 data was found to be normally distributed. Homogeneity of Variances was checked through Levene's Statistic test and with sig. Value 0.555 assumptions of Homogeneity complied. Since Calculated F value 4.412 is higher than the F table value 4.0847 with Sig. value 0.042, our null hypothesis, is rejected.

Results of test conducted for **hypothesis 4** shows that Meaningful Job Assignments significantly contribute to overall welfare of employees. They think their work help them live out their life's purpose.

The multiple correlation coefficient can be considered to be one measure of the quality of the prediction of the dependent variable; in this case, A value of 0.748, indicates a good level of prediction. The "R Square" column represents the  $R^2$  value (also called the coefficient of determination), which is the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variables (technically, it is the proportion of variation accounted for by the regression model above and beyond the mean model). We can observe from our value

of 0.353 that our independent variables explain 35.3% of the variability of our dependent variable.

According to the F-ratio in the ANOVA Table tests whether the overall regression model is a good fit for the data. The table shows that the independent variables statistically significantly predict the dependent variable,  $F(1, 98) = 28.980$ , (Table value 3.920, the regression model is a good fit of the data). P value 0.000 indicates that there is significant impact of the independent variable on dependent variable, thus our null hypothesis, is rejected.

The general form of the equation to predict Overall welfare of employees from meaningful job assignments is: Overall welfare of employees =  $1.030 + (0.830 \times \text{meaningful job assignments})$

## **7. Conclusion and Implications**

In the present era, organizations and the way they function, are at the revolutionize phase. It requires higher expectations and commitment from both the sides viz. management and employees. This changing form of organizations, changing roles & responsibilities and working methods has generated some conflicting issues for employees along with many favorable outcomes (**Huta, V., 2007**). Findings of this research shows that meaningful job assignment has a great bearing up on employees' overall growth and welfare.

Thus meaningful job assignment becomes an indispensable tool for management that must be taken care of sensibly. If used properly it may help organization to achieve greater heights but if not, it may spoil the entire working spirit of the organization. Management and policy makers must make developing meaningful job assignment and monitoring it, a priority. Managers can start communicating within organization the key objectives and implication of task undertaken at broader level. It should be two way communication process because management should be well aware of their employees' perception about the given task. If managers get successful in cultivating meaningful job assignment in organization, they can be successful in changing employee's perception about how they look at their work.

## **8. REFERENCES**

- i. Allen N J and Meyer J P (1990), "The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization", Journal of Occupational Psychology, Vol. 63, pp. 1-18.

- ii. Berg, J.M., Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J.E. (2010). Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 158–186.
- iii. Fassinger, R. E. (2008). Workplace diversity and public policy: Challenges and opportunities for psychology. *American Psychologist*, 63, 252–268.
- iv. Fouad, N. A., & Byars-Winston, A. M. (2004). Work: Cultural perspectives on career choices and decision making. In R. T. Carter (Ed.), *Handbook of racial-cultural psychology and counseling, theory, research, and practice* (pp. 232–255). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.  
Huta, V. (2007). Pursuing pleasure versus growth and excellence: Links with different aspects of well-being. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 68(1-B), 649.
- v. Huta, V., & Waterman, A.S. (2014). Eudaimonia and its distinction from hedonia: Developing a classification and terminology for understanding conceptual and operational definitions. *Journal of Happiness Stud.*, 15, 1425-1456. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9485-0>
- vi. Kira, M., & Balkin, D.B. (2014). Interactions between work and identities: Thriving, withering, or redefining the self? *Human Resource Management Review*, 24, 131–143.
- vii. Leana, C., Appelbaum, E., & Shevchuk, I. (2009). Work process and quality of care in early childhood education: The role of job crafting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 1169–1192
- viii. Meyer J P and Herscovitch L (2001), “Commitment in the Workplace: Toward a General Model”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 11, pp. 299-326.
- ix. Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: The work and meaning inventory(WAMI). *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20, 322-337, . <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072711436160>
- x. Tetrick, L. E., & Quick, J. C. (2002). Prevention at work: Public health in occupational settings. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (pp. 3–18). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- xi. Tims, M., Bakker, A.B., & Derks, D. (2013). The impact of job crafting on job demands, job resources, and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18, 230–240.
- xii. Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J.E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 179–201.
- xiii. Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J.E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 179–201.