

Why should Job Identification be distinguished from Job Involvement? : A Review of Literature

Stuti Saxena*

ABSTRACT

Research on organizational identification and job involvement abound in the literature. In fact, job involvement is defined in terms of job identification (Lodahl, & Kejner, 1965). The paper shall review the antecedents and consequences of job identification. The significance of job identification lies in the employee's propensity to stick with his/her job and increases job involvement which leads to enhanced organizational identification and commitment. It is also posited that job identification is prone to decline over time. Therefore, the underlying antecedents and consequences responsible for the diminishing job identification are also being discussed. The conceptual framework is significant for the further research on organizational identification, organizational commitment and employee turnover. Another major contribution of the paper lies in conceptualizing the concept of "job prestige" which is the resultant of job identification. The paper shall close with the organization's attempts at checking or preempting the decline in job identification with particular reference to employee turnover.

KEY WORDS: Job Identification, Job Prestige, Job Disidentification, Turnover.

JOB IDENTIFICATION

Job Identification refers to the extent to which individuals perceive themselves to be a part of the job they undertake (Kanungo, 1982; Luhtanen, & Crocker, 1992). However, this perception may not be equally "experienced". Secondly, in the literature on Job Involvement, researchers have defined job involvement in terms of Job Identification (Lodahl, & Kejner, 1965). But, there lies a difference between "involvement" and "identification". It is more of a chicken and egg type of causality, where Job Involvement may lead to Job Identification and vice-versa. Further, an individual is less likely to evince involvement in his/

her prospective job prior to organizational entry and on-the-job learning. Elsewhere, Job Involvement has been conceptualized as the degree to which an individual is involved in a particular job and actively participates in it (Gorn, & Kanungo, 1980). However, such participation may only be witnessed if a person understands likes and hence identifies himself/herself with the job. Also, Job Involvement appears to be more of a cognitive construct (Kanungo, 1982; Paullay, Alliger, & Stone-Romero, 1994) and hence narrow in scope. Contrarily, Job Identification may be a pre-organizational entry characteristic in an employee on account of several factors. And, therefore, Job Identification would encapsulate a

***Stuti Saxena**, Research Assistant, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, India.

Email: stuti.a.2@gmail.com

broader framework than Job Involvement. In this paper's framework, I posit that Job Identification would result in Job Involvement. The former is akin to an employee's induction and orientation to the job which would eventually culminate to his/her showing increased involvement in the job. Further, it would be more appropriate if job involvement is conceptualized in line with the framework of work engagement, a motivational-psychological state with three dimensions; viz., vigour, dedication and absorption (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). The paper would help delineate the distinction between the Job Involvement and Job Identification. Thus, the conceptual framework becomes pertinent to appreciate the nuances underlying Job Identification.

However, Job Identification is not liable to remain permanent. It is most apt to decline with time, should there be a flux in the job context factors. The paper shall deal with the antecedents and consequences of the deceleration in Job Identification as well.

● QUESTION OF IDENTIFICATION

Identity veers around the question of "Who am I?" whereas Identification deals with "How do I come to know who I am in relation to you?" (Pratt, 1998) Individual identity is concerned with how an individual defines himself/herself (Turner, 1982). In line with this conceptualization of individual identity, defining job involvement in terms of self-definition (Rotenberry, & Moberg, 2007: 203) or identification (Blau, & Boal, 1987; Lawler, & Hall, 1970) seems grossly misplaced. And, social identification is the process whereby individuals are identified in the context of a social group (Foote, 1951). It has been argued, in line with the

social identification theory (Tajfel, & Turner, 1979), identity veers around the extremes of personal and social identity. Whereas, personal identity refers to self-conceptions in terms of unique and individual characteristics (For instance, "I am good at playing a guitar"), social identification includes 'the value and emotional significance attached to that membership' (Tajfel, 1978). Implicitly, the conceptualization inheres an emotional component - 'I feel about... ' (Ashforth, Harrison & Coley, 2008). It has been indicated in the research that the emotional component has the most influential motivational force spurring action or the 'readiness to engage in or disengage from interaction' (Bergami, & Bagozzi, 2000).

Job Identification, in an individual employee's context, forms a part of individual identity.

However, in the context of the society to which he/she belongs, an employee's job identification gets reflected as a part of social identification. An individual perceives internalization of the job itself and puts in immense trust in his/her job. Since his/her work provides him/her an opportunity for self-expression (Kanungo et al., 1975), therefore, an employee expects his/her work to be intrinsically rewarding.

Identification with the job would not rest, *prima facie*, on the individual employee's position, power, status, income, organizational or personal relations or the brand image of the organization with which is affiliated with. Thus, all these dimensions would be preceded by his/her first and foremost love for his/her job. It is his/her ability to align his/her mindset with his/her job and its tools and accoutrements which shall lend him/her the inner psychic satisfaction. Further, his/her daily

successes or failures at the job should not deter him/her from not being a pushover. S/he would fire on all cylinders until his/her daily targets or small achievements are fulfilled. Such identification is very much evident in individuals who are involved in research or complex problem-solving work, for instance. A scientist engaged in discovering a molecule for a process would evince a high degree of job identification. Mael and Ashforth (1992) discussed about Professional/occupational identification which refers to the definitive self in terms of the work being done by the person (For instance, I am a doctor; I am a teacher). This comes closest to the concept of Job Identification. However, the difference would lie in the verb being used (For instance, I treat patients; I teach). This implies that it is the job and all its concomitants which become the defining characteristic for an individual employee.

Thus, following the conceptualization of organizational identification proposed by Ashforth and Mael (1989), I propose that job identification reflects the degree to which an individual "experiences" oneness with his/her job. An employee would not perceive himself/herself as a "part" of the job or vice-versa. Such an employee would see himself/herself to be identified with the job as such. Such "experiences" are more on a psychological plane and hence internalized. And, such "experiences" may be perceived as well as experienced. It is only with such oneness that an employee would find his/her congruity with his/her job. However, Ashforth and Mael (1989) have distinguished between internalization and identification. In internalization, adoption of values and beliefs are motivated by a need to be right; embracing other's values and beliefs are more

deeper, and thus more permanent changes occur in individuals, whereas, in identification adoption is motivated by attraction, less strong and thus less permanent (Pratt, 1998). Identification refers to self in terms of social categories (for instance, I am), whereas internalization refers to the incorporation of values, attitudes, etc. within the self as guiding principles (for instance, I believe) (Ashforth, & Mael, 1989). Further, in terms of the job dimensions (namely, task autonomy, skill variety, task identity, task significance, feedback from the job itself, feedback from the agents and dealing with others) proposed by Hackman and Oldham (1980), an individual employee should be able to derive intrinsic satisfaction from all of them.

Job Identification should not be analyzed in terms of person-job fit. The latter is a more mechanical attachment with the job, wherein an employee may/may not be interested or feel the "oneness" with the job and still pursues the job. Thus, person-job fit is matching employees' skills, knowledge, and abilities to performing specific job-related tasks (Werbel & DeMarie, 2005). Such an employee may not share the intrinsic motivation needed to identify himself/herself with the job.

● ANTECEDENTS OF JOB IDENTIFICATION

The antecedents of Job Identification may be classified as intrinsic and extrinsic. Whereas the former would encapsulate factors like personal, psychological and economic factors, the latter would encompass dimensions like organizational, social and political. Intrinsic factors are, in fact, nothing but the factors which are associated with

the personality and inclination of the employee himself/herself. Extrinsic factors are linked to the environmental factors in which an employee is presently situated. Both the dimensions are broad-based and may have positive and negative connotations.

As far as the intrinsic factors are concerned, personal factors include the employee's interest and inclination in the job, which is a resultant of his/her career history and professional competence. Further, an employee's prior experience on the similar or related job may also serve as a precursor to his/her enhanced Job Identification, organizational identification notwithstanding. This is all the more fortified during an employee's socialization, induction and orientation in an organization with respect to his/her prospective job. Psychological factors would include an employee's innate desire to love the job which s/he is presently entrusted with. This would be visible in the degree of commitment expressed by the employee in the job. Economic factors are governed by the attractive of monetary and non-monetary incentives and rewards which are attached to the job. This would include his/her advancement, growth, achievement and recognition as well as the salary, perks and other benefits associated with the job (Ref. Herzberg et al., 1959). We are discounting the factors like age and experience of an employee here.

Among the extrinsic factors, organizational factors include aspects like the degree of autonomy which an employee has vis-à-vis some of the decisions related to his/her job (Blauner, 1964), working relationships with the supervisor, subordinates and peers and the overall work environment

(Rabinowitz, & Hall, 1977), which should be compatible with the employee's requirements. For instance, an R & D professional should have access to the latest scientific technologies to enable him/her to remain involved in his/her job. Among the social factors are included dimensions like his/her family support and other relationships, including friends. Finally, among the political factors are included the organizational and work politics which might goad or impinge an employee's efforts at his/her job.

Increased Job Identification would be evinced in an employee's on-the-work and off-the-work schedules. On-the-work schedules include an employee's love for his/her job which is evidenced in his/her propensity to remain committed to his/her job, enhanced intellectual curiosity and stimulation vis-à-vis his/her job, increased job passion (Ho, Wong, & Lee, 2011), working with absorbed attention in his/her job, attaching importance to his/her job (Rabinowitz, & Hall, 1977), taking up additional responsibilities related to the job and working for longer hours, if needed. In other words, such an employee would fall within the rubric of an "engaged employee". An "engaged employee" is defined as one who has enthusiasm for his/her job and exerts high levels of energy in his/her job while not being able to detach from it (Schaufeli, & Bakker, 2004). Off-the-work schedules include an employee's sense of pride in his/her job which gets reflected in his/her environmental interactions (family, peers, society).

An individual employee who strongly identifies with his/her job would do all justice with his/her in-role performance. Thus, his/her psychological capital (Luthans, 2002) would be high.

Psychological capital emphasizes on people's strength and how they can grow and thrive in the workplace. It has been defined as an individual's positive psychological state that is characterized by four personal qualities, namely efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience. And, s/he would channel his/her creative faculties towards innovative attempts. S/he would take calculated risks in the job, and, given the desired autonomy, take on new novel challenges. S/he would employ new methods, tools and methodologies in his/her day-to-day tasks. And, to meet his/her daily targets, s/he would be willing to make small and big sacrifices on his/her personal front too.

● CONSEQUENCES

Hitherto, literature has dealt with "organizational prestige" (Ashforth, & Mael, 1989). The paper posits that job identification would lead to the feeling of enhanced "job prestige". Fundamentally, "job prestige" is a function of all those job dimensions which help establish a positive status about the job. An employee is more than satisfied with what his/her job is all about. This would help enhance his/her self-esteem (For instance, an individual's enhanced self-esteem with reference to his/her feeling of organizational identification (Ashforth, & Mael, 1989)). "Job prestige" may be defined in terms of the esteem and pride which an employee feels about his/her job. Such a feeling of prestige emanates from an employee's identification with the job. Since, "one of the most important tasks that organizations face today is that of bringing their employees to a high degree of emotional identification" (Carmeli, 2005: 461), therefore, Job Identification becomes a significant precursor to organizational identification,

especially where emotional identification with the job is involved.

The consequences of increased Job Identification are reflected in positive and negative behaviors. The positive behaviors include increased Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction (Locke, 1976), better performance (Lawler, & Hall, 1970), an employee's propensity to stay in the organization (Meyer, & Allen, 1997) and increased organizational identification. The negative behaviors include job alienation, conflicts at workplace, absenteeism (Blau, & Boal, 1987), stress and quitting (Blau, & Boal, 1987). Job identification necessarily includes sacrifices, as stated earlier. Such sacrifices may pertain to his/her health or relationships. And, both would deteriorate his/her work-life equilibrium. Thus, excessive Job Identification may have its negative repercussions on a person's psychological, social and mental health. Overly indulgence in Job Identification may lead to his/her obsessive behaviors with regard to his/her job so much so that s/he might be alienation from his/her family and near ones also thereby culminating in an overall declivity in a person's quality of life (Lambert, 2008). There might result work-life imbalance and family conflicts which would impair his/her efficiency sooner or later. However, it may be pertinent to note that workaholic employees are not necessarily passionate about their jobs (Schaufeli et al., 2008).

A similar concern has been expressed in literature on excessive Job Involvement which leads to imbalance in a person's life (Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker, & Baker, 2009). Apart from this, strong identification with the job should also

lead to career development and growth. This may be attributed to the fact that since an individual employee puts his/her best efforts in the job, therefore, it is likely that s/he would "expect" reward and recognition for his/her performance.

DECLINE IN JOB IDENTIFICATION

Defining and identifying oneself with the job as if it is defining oneself may not always be followed as a ritual. Both the extremes of job alienation as well as Job Identification are balanced on the fulcrum of work motivation. An employee's work motivation and hence his/her overall Job Identification is liable to decelerate with time. Yet again, there runs a sequential pattern of antecedents and consequences vis-à-vis a decline in job identification. This decline may eventually lead to job disidentification as well. Hence, the entire approach of perceiving his/her job would change. There would be decreased or total neglect on the part of the employee for his/her job. Job search and the consequent turnover intention may also be associated with some off-the-job factors, "shocks" or jarring events, such as receiving an unsolicited job offer or an addition or demise of a family member (Lee, & Mitchell, 1994; Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablinski, & Frez, 2001). Similarly, internal or on-the-job shocks include hiring of a new supervisor, being passed over for promotion or a change in the company's strategic mission (Lee, Mitchell, Wise, & Fireman, 1996). The following sub-sections shall delve further into this aspect now.

● ANTECEDENTS

More often than not, decline in Job Identification should be related to the temporal aspects. In other

words, the amount of time spent on the job, which once constituted an employee's significant self, would decline. Not being able to devote the requisite time for his/her job may be linked with certain controlled or uncontrolled dimensions. Thus, there may be a genuine decline in the job per se. The job may appear monotonous with time or there might be a lack of enthusiasm in the job owing to some alternative job which might appear more appealing. Alternatively, an individual's propensity to like his/her job may decline as a result of economic downturn. Personal factors like increased family responsibility, stress and health may impede job identification overtime. Prolonged sickness of the individual or a family member is liable to take a toll on an employee's interest in his/her job. Age may also be an impeding factor. It is also possible that for the sheer pursuit of some hobby or vocation, his/her interest in the job may be channelized to his/her lately developed inclination or pursuit. Family ties may make mandatory and significant demands on the time of the employee, which may not be denied. In the working couples' families, location and work preferences may consume a large chunk of an employee's time. Thus, the role of life's critical events (Lee, & Mitchell, 1994) may serve to dissociate an employee from his/her organization. For instance, a nurse's intention to nurture her baby may lead to her resignation (Russell, & Sell, 2012: 135). Further, dimensions associated with the organization like poor working conditions; bad relationships with the supervisor, subordinates and peers and low Job Satisfaction may lead to job identification. Non-congruence of the individual goals vis-à-vis the organizational goals may result in the decline of job identification as well.

However, it is not mandatory that organizational identification and Job Identification would operate in tandem. Occupational stress may be another reason for his/her job disidentification.

Decline in Job Identification may also be a subset of the lack of his/her "expected" career growth and advancement. Jealousy and rivalry in the organization owing to his/her expertise in the job may invite unwanted troubles from his/her peers. Thus, organizational politics may impede an employee's further chances of advancement and growth, thereby declining his/her overall morale and motivation to work.

Also, factors like decision of the company to cut down the employee strength for trimming and pruning the organization; contingent staffing; electronic monitoring and variable pay (Batt, Colvin, & Keefe, 2002); technological upgradation (with emphasis on head-content, instead of head-count); ongoing downsizing leading to uncertainty and demoralization (Batt, Colvin, & Keefe, 2002); organizational restructuring, including mergers and acquisitions; size of the organization (Balkin, & Gomez-Mejia, 1990); number of females in the organization and the number of employees with a college degree (Batt, Colvin, & Keefe, 2002); closing down of a particular unprofitable unit (Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers, & Mainous III, 1988); physically dangerous work (Viscusi, 1979); saving costs for establishing a new unit or for introducing a new process or technology or foreign expertise, may lead to increased employee turnover.

It may be pertinent to note that even the organizations engage in head-hunting practices. Thus, they too are engaged in the "search" for the

"right candidate", and, prefer to remove the underperformers. With stiff market competition, poaching and head-hunting (Capelli, 2000) ensures the induction of strategic employees (for instance, those who may have effected a turnaround in a rival organization, or, helped capture a significant market share) with assurances of handsome perks and compensation packages. Employee exit may also be initiated by the organization owing to serious illness of the employee or employee's demise. Thus, organization would look for the replacement.

Environmental conditions may push the individual employee to call it quits one day. Overall economic gloom may lead to his/her search for better options elsewhere. This becomes more conspicuous when the economic boom returns and the employee might be unwilling to make a comeback to his/her previous job on account of several factors (For instance, better pay and perks; his/her development of affiliation with the new job; changed work environment which is more appealing). Remuneration has always served as motivator for the employees to stay in the organization, and, in the event that the rival organization is willing to offer a better salary package, quitting appears a viable option before an employee. Also, better promotion avenues, perks and perceived brand image of the rival organization may impel the job switching.

Employee would evince less interest in his/her job. S/he would be spending more time with his/her family or his/her friends. The sense of identity and prestige associated with his/her job would decline. This might also be the result of his/her nearing his/her superannuation. S/he would be

devoting his/her time on aspects which are unlinked with his/her present job. For instance, s/he would be on the look-out for searching new jobs.

● CONSEQUENCES

Both individual as well as organizational outcomes may result owing to the decline in Job Identification. This is akin to "self-estrangement". "Self estrangement" results when the employee does not gain anything intrinsically meaningful, rewarding and satisfying from his/her job (Seeman, 1971). Absenteeism, job alienation behaviors, turnover, procrastination may be the immediate signs of an employee's job disidentification. Further, s/he would indulge in unproductive behaviors like quarrelling or squandering away the time at work. S/he might indulge in job search behaviors or look for alternative occupations.

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFORTS AT SUSTAINING AN EMPLOYEE'S JOB IDENTIFICATION

Decline in Job Identification would result in increased turnover and increase costs for an organization. Thus, an organization needs to be proactive in preempting the employee's dissociation with an organization. Perceived alternatives do not always predict turnover (Michaels, & Spector, 1982). And, if an employee perceives that there are significant costs of leaving the organization, then s/he would be motivated to stay on. In fact, employees continuously make investments in organizations (Farrell, & Rusbult, 1981), such as expending job effort, making friendships, developing skills, and, engaging in striking political deals which consume time before

fruition (Ref. Becker's (1960) side-bet theory; Shore, Tetrick, Shore, & Barksdale, 2000). Thus, an employee may not wish to sever ties with the co-workers, or, forego benefits associated with his/her long-term association with the organization. The "feel good" factor linked with an organization's association would make work enjoyable (Meyer, & Allen, 1991). Also, occupational commitment (Lee et al., 2004) with an engrossing work assignment may suppress organizational dissociation tendencies (Blau, 2009). Thus, the possibility of the realization of an employee's goals in the current organization would counter his/her quitting thoughts.

Thus, higher Perceived Organizational Support (POS) (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002), Perceived Supervisor Support (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Stinglhamber, & Vandenberghe, 2003), Organizational Affective Commitment (Meyer, Becker, & Vandenberghe, 2004) and Affective Commitment to the Supervisor (Stinglhamber, & Vandenberghe, 2003) would decrease employee turnover. Also, an employee is more likely to identify himself/herself with an organization which is itself a high-performing one, as this is reflective of the congruency with his/her self-concept (Ashforth, & Mael, 1989; Tajfel, & Turner, 1979). Thus, adequate social and psychological support (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablinski, & Erez, 2001) from family and reference groups (colleagues, friends, society, well-wishers) may serve to counter the turnover tendencies. Gouldner's (1957) work on cosmopolitan-local construct is a case in point. Thus, cosmopolitans are those employees who are, "... low on loyalty to the employing organization, high on commitment to

specialized role skills, and, likely to use an outer reference group orientation". Locals, on the other hand, are those employees, who are "... high on loyalty to the employing organization, low on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an inner reference group orientation."

Empirical research has predicted a diverse set of results vis-à-vis this construct in different settings, though.

Apart from this, the perceived failure of the past quitting decisions would goad an employee to stay in the present organization (Becker, 1960).

Further personality factors affect the intention to stay in the organization. Thus, highly self-motivated individuals ("internals") who are achievement-oriented and are good performers (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001), report greater Job Satisfaction and lower turnover intentions (Renn and Vandenberg, 1991).

Similarly, emotional adjustment was positively linked to Job Involvement (retention) (Hough, Eaton, Dunnette, Kamp, & McCloy, 1990). And, extroverts are more likely to have strong friendships at work (Tokar, & Fischer, 1998), and, hence attach significant values to their work relationships.

Apart from this, "non-work" factors (Cohen, 1995) may also ascertain employee's intention to stay. Thus, an employee may be "embedded" in his/her job owing to his/her affiliation to a religious/community association or a working spouse or children enrolled in a particular school (Mitchell et al., 2001). Attempts to comply with the moral/religious tenets (for example, "work is worship", "perseverance is the key to success") (Niles, 1999) would desist individuals from quitting. In a

similar vein, factors like higher age, marital status and having children to take care of are associated with an employee's likelihood to stay with the current organization, rather than to leave (Abelson, & Baysinger, 1984). Furthermore, educational and professional qualifications with relevant work experience would definitely propel job search behavior (Silvers, & Lara Valencia, 1990).

Thus, owing to the employee turnover, organizations encounter the loss of the experience, knowledge and the talent as well as the delays in their output delivery (Abelson, & Baysinger, 1984). Hence, retention of the employees takes primacy over everything else. "Workforces are increasingly uncommitted" (KPMG Report, 2012), and, retention is the biggest challenge before the HR wing. After all, this also impinges upon its brand value vis-à-vis the rivals. Thus, "firms are trying to improve their knowledge management capabilities by strengthening employee trust" (Adler, 2001). Organizations incur turnover costs (Bentein, Vandenberg, Vandenberghe, & Stinglhamber, 2005) owing to the erosion of employees' tacit or specialized knowledge, which makes them less easily replaceable (Guthrie, 2001). Organizations also realize the sunk costs incurred while training and socializing the employees. Attempts are, therefore, made to intercept the attempts of the employees showing inclination to move by providing them with more engaging work, a supportive work climate, and, other development and advancement opportunities (Guthrie, 2001; Huselid, 1995). In fact, the role of management is to take care of the workers and include them as a part of manager's "extended family" (Teagarden, Butler, & Glinow, 1992).

Linkage of perceived fairness of pay procedures and perceived fairness of pay amounts has been associated with employee satisfaction, thereby negatively predicting employee turnover (Hom, & Griffeth, 1995). Organizations should encourage individual incentives (Griffeth et al., 2000; Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid, & Sirola, 1998; Tekleab, Bartol, & Liu, 2005) as well as group incentives (Batt et al., 2002) and recognition of their high performing employees. Promotion, advancement, rewards and remuneration should be suitably designed by the organization. Employee development activities may be promoted including special assignments, job rotation, participation in task forces, projects or committees and other events in which something is learned or skills are developed (McCauley, 1986). Employees should be accorded sufficient autonomy in their work profile. Sharing information with the employees leads to greater participation of the employees in the decision-making process, especially the ones entailing strategic decisions (Rousseau, & Shperling, 2003).

"Enriched or enhanced" jobs (Hackman, & Oldham, 1980; Hom, & Griffeth, 1995) may result in "job embeddedness" (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008) when the employees are given the opportunity to develop and enhance their skills effectively. Direct linkage has been reported between retention and sound internal promotion/mobility policies (Batt et al., 2002). Organization-initiated encouragement should be accorded to self-managed teams (Cohen, & Bailey, 1997) and offline problem-solving groups (Batt et al., 2002). Employees should be coached and mentored (Payne, & Huffman, 2005) and socialized (Kreiner, & Ashforth, 2004; Saks, & Waldman,

1998) to ensure a congruency between employee preferences and organizational staffing practices (Holtom, Lee, & Tidd, 2002). Further, turnover decreases with more role clarity (Price, 1975). Thus, the HR policies may be designed keeping provision for flexible work policies and individual accommodations, as far as feasible.

All these measures would result in stronger attachment, identification, psychological ownership, empowerment and commitment to the organization (Meyer, & Allen, 1991, 1997; Rousseau, & Shperling, 2003). When the employee would be perceived as more pivotal or organizationally central (Staw, 1980), it would ensure development of a sense of belonging and a fortified social capital (Lee et al., 2004). Further, this would enhance "organizational embeddedness" (Ng, & Feldman, 2011) such that employees would align their individual interests and behaviors with the interests that benefit the organization (Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994) by internalizing their organization's attributes as their own (Mael, & Ashforth, 1995). Suitable stress-management interventions including coping mechanisms may also be introduced in the organization to relieve the worked-up employees.

Thus, flexible employment practices need to be followed by the organizations in order to facilitate employee stickiness. As far as the intervention on the part of the managers in checking their employees' propensity to leave is concerned, it has been suggested (Swider, Boswell, & Zimmerman, 2010) that the former need to adopt a more proactive approach by ensuring that the employees are prevented from searching in the first place. The managers should interact with the employees and

be aware of any requests for references. The managers should also liaison with the outside firms which call upon them for employment verification of their employees. However, the authors add a caveat here, stating that managers should not assume that "that employees who search for alternative employment are necessary "disloyal" but rather... recognize the potential for and importance of retaining these individuals, especially if they are high performers" (Swider, Boswell, & Zimmerman, 2010: 439).

Apart from this, organizations should introduce "integration and learning" diversity which would, in turn, facilitate improvement in organizational performance by facilitating the learning of new work methods and approaches (Thomas, & Ely, 1996). Such an approach would help in the incorporation of diverse perspectives and experiences of the employees, as well as their ways of working. Thus, the organization would be in a better position to integrate these varied experiences and views and re-align the tasks, strategies and culture (Cox, 1994). Occasional get-together and events' celebrations (birthdays, cultural creativity, feasts, sports and games) would ensure greater coherence and bonding among the employees.

Even the employer may help the employee to resolve their work-family dichotomous issues (Maertz et al., 1996). Thus, family obligations like child-rearing or elder care may be taken care of by the employers (Tiano, 1994).

CONCLUSION

Job Identification is an under-explored concept in the organizational literature. The conceptualization

needs to be studied in delineation with the Job Involvement and organizational commitment for better clarity. The present paper strove to underscore the antecedents and consequences of Job Identification and the decline in Job Identification, with particular reference to turnover. Research may underscore the significance of "job prestige" as a psycho-social conceptualization in strengthening Job Identification. Further, other identification concepts like "role identification" and "team identification" may be studied in the context of the organizational commitment and employee turnover across different professions/occupations. It is expected that the paper would serve as a reference frame for the researchers to appreciate the finer dimensions of job identification.

REFERENCES

1. Abelson, M. A. & Baysinger, B. D. 1984. Optimal and dysfunctional turnover: Toward an organizational level model. *The Academy of Management Review*, 9(2): 331-341.
2. Adler, P. S. 2001. Market, hierarchy, and trust: The knowledge economy and the future of capitalism. *Organization Science*, 12 (2): 215-234.
3. Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. 2008. Identification in Organizations: An Examination of Four Fundamental Questions. *Journal of Management*, 34(3): 325-374.
4. Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20-39.

5. Balkin, D. B., & Gomez-Mejia, L. R. 1990. Matching compensation and organizational strategies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(2): 153-169.
6. Batt, R., Colvin, A.J.S., & Keefe, J. 2002. Employee voice, human resource practices, and quit rates: Evidence from the telecommunications industry. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 55(4): 573-594.
7. Becker, H. S. 1960. Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66: 32-42.
8. Bentein, K., Vandenberg, R., Vandenberghe, C., & Stinglhamber, F. 2005. The role of change in the relationship between commitment and turnover: A latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3): 468-482.
9. Bergami, M., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2000). Self-categorization, affective commitment and group self-esteem as distinct aspects of social identity in the organization. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 555-577.
10. Blau, G. 2009. Can a four-dimensional model of occupational commitment help to explain intent to leave one's occupation? *Career Development International*, 14(2): 116-132.
11. Blau, G., & Boal, K. (1987). Conceptualizing how job involvement and organizational commitment affect turnover and absenteeism. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(2), 288-300.
12. Blauner, R. (1964). *Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
13. Capelli, P. 2000. A market-driven approach to retaining talent. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(1): 103-113.
14. Carmeli, A. (2005). Exploring determinants of Job Involvement: An empirical test among senior executives. *International Journal of Manpower*, 26: 457-472.
15. Cohen, S., & Bailey, D. 1997. What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of Management*, 23 (3): 239-90.
16. Cox, T. 1994. *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
17. Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. 1994. Organizational image and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(2): 239-263.
18. Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I.L., & Rhoades, L. 2002. Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3): 565-573.
19. Farrell, D., & Rusbult, C. E. 1981. Exchange variables as predictors of Job Satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 28: 78-95.
20. Foote, N. N. (1951). *Identification as the*

- basis for a theory of motivation. *American Sociological Review*, 16: 14-21.
21. Gorn, G. J. & Kanungo, R. N. (1980). Job involvement and motivation: Are intrinsically motivated managers more jobs involved? *Organisational Behavior and Human Performance*, 26: 265-277.
 22. Gouldner, A. W. 1957. Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2: 281-306.
 23. Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. 2000. A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, 26: 463-488.
 24. Griffin, M. L., Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., Tucker-Gail, K. A., & Baker, D. N. (2010). Job involvement, job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and the burnout of correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(2): 239-255.
 25. Guthrie, J. P. 2001. High-involvement work practices, turnover, and productivity: Evidence from New Zealand. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1): 180-190.
 26. Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. 1980. *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
 27. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley.
 28. Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., & Tidd, S. T. 2002. The relationship between work status congruence and work-related attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5): 903-915.
 29. Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Eberly, M. 2008. Turnover and retention research: A glance at the past, a closer review of the present, and a venture into the future. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2: 231-274.
 30. Hom, P. W., & Griffeth, R. W. 1995. *Employee turnover*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.
 31. Hough, L. M., Eaton, N. K., Dunnette, M. D., Kamp, J. D., & McCloy, R. A. 1990. Criterion-related validities of personality constructs and the effects of response distortion on those validities. *Journal of Applied Psychology [Monograph]*, 75: 581-595.
 32. Huselid, M. A. 1995. The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3): 635-672.
 33. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. 2001. The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127: 376-407.
 34. KPMG. 2012. *Rethinking human resources in a changing world*.

35. Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 341-349.
36. 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: 49-59.
37. Kreiner, G. E., & Ashforth, B. E. 2004. Evidence toward an expanded model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(1): 1-27.
38. Lambert, E., & Paoline, E. (2008). The influence of demographic characteristics, job characteristics, and organizational structure on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Criminal Justice Review*, 33: 541-564.
39. Lawler, E., & Hall, D. (1970) Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54: 305-312.
40. Lee, T. W., & Mitchell, T. R. 1994. An alternative approach: The unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *Academy of Management Review*, 19: 51-89.
41. Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Sablinski, C. J., Burton, J. P. & Holtom, B. C. 2004. The effects of job embeddedness on organizational citizenship, job performance, volitional absences, and voluntary turnover. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5): 711-722.
42. Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Wise, L., & Fireman, S. 1996. An unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(1): 5-36.
43. Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
44. Lodahl, T., and Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49: 24-33.
45. Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18: 302-318.
46. Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reid, F., & Sirola, W. 1998. Explaining nursing turnover intent: Job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, or organizational commitment? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(3): 305-320.
47. Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 6: 695-706.
48. Mael, F. & Ashforth, B. (1992) Alumni and their alma maters: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13: 103-123.
49. Mael, F. A., & Ashforth, B. E. 1995. Loyal from day one: Biodata, organizational identification, and turnover among newcomers. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(2): 309-334.

50. Maertz, C. P., Stevens, M. J., Campion, M. A., & Fernandez, A. 1996. Worker turnover in Mexican factories: A qualitative investigation and model development. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Academy of Management, Cincinnati, OH.
51. McCauley, C. 1986. Developmental experiences in managerial work: A literature review. Technical report No. 26. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
52. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. 1991. A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1: 61-89.
53. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. 1997. *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
54. Michaels, C. E., & Spector, P. E. 1982. Causes of employee turnover: A test of the Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(1): 53-59.
55. Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablynski, C. J., & Erez, M. 2001. Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6): 1102-1121.
56. Ng, T.W.G., & Feldman, D.C. 2011. Locus of control and organizational embeddedness. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84:173-190.
57. Niles, F.S. 1999. Toward a cross-cultural understanding of work-related beliefs. *Human Relations*, 52: 855-867.
58. Paullay, I., Alliger, G., and Stone-Romero, E. (1994). Construct validation of two instruments designed to measure job involvement and work centrality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(2): 224-228.
59. Payne, S. C., & Huffman, A.H. 2005. A longitudinal examination of the influence of mentoring on organizational commitment and turnover. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 48(1):158-168.
60. Pratt, M. G. (1998). To be or not to be: Central questions in organizational identification. In D. A. Whetten & P. C. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in organizations* (pp. 171-207). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
61. Price, J. H. 1975. A theory of turnover. In B.O. Pettman (Ed.), *Labor turnover and retention*. Epping: Gower Press.
62. Rabinowitz, S. and Hall, D. T. (1977), "Organizational research on job involvement", *Psychological Bulletin*, 84(2): 265-88.
63. Renn, R. W., & Vandenberg, R. J. 1991. Differences in employee attitudes and behaviors based on Rotter's (1966) internal-external locus of control: Are they all valid? *Human Relations*, 44: 1161-1178.
64. Rotenberry, P. F., & Moberg, P.J. (2007). Assessing the impact of job involvement on performance. *Management Research News*, 30(3): 203-215.
65. Rousseau, D. M., & Shperling Z. 2003. Pieces of the action: Ownership and the changing employment relationship. *The*

- Academy of Management Review, 28(4): 553-570.
66. Rusbult, C. E., Farrell, D, Rogers, G., & Mainous III, A. G. 1988. Impact of exchange variables on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: An integrative model of responses to declining job satisfaction. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 31(3): 599-627.
 67. Russell, C. J., & Sell, M. V. 2012. A closer look at decisions to quit. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117: 125-137.
 68. Saks, A. M. & Waldman, D. A. 1998. The relationship between age and job performance evaluations for entry-level professionals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(4): 409-419.
 69. Schaufeli, W. B. & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25: 293-315.
 70. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B. & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a brief questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66: 701-716.
 71. Seeman, M. (1971). The urban alienations: Some dubious theses from Marx to Marcuse. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63: 213-218.
 72. Shore, L. M., Tetrick, L. E., Shore, T. H., & Barksdale, K. 2000. Construct validity of measures of Becker's side bet theory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57: 428-444.
 73. Slivers, A., & Lara Valencia, F. 1990. Labor absorption and turnover in the maquila industry. *Arizona Review*, 38: 17-23.
 74. Staw, B. M. 1980. The consequences of turnover. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 1(4): 253-273.
 75. Stinglhamber, F., & Vandenberghe, C. 2003. Organizations and supervisors as sources of support and targets of commitment: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(3): 251-270.
 76. Swider, B. W., Boswell, W. R., & Zimmerman, R. D. 2010. Examining the job search-turnover relationship: The role of embeddedness, job satisfaction, and available alternatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(2): 432-441.
 77. Tajfel, H. (1978). "Interindividual and intergroup behaviour." In Tajfel, H. *Differentiation between groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations* (London: Academic Press): 27-60.
 78. Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
 79. Teagarden, M. B., Butler, M. C., & Von Glinow, M. A. 1992. Mexico's maquiladora industry: Where strategic human resource management makes a difference. *Organizational Dynamics*, 20(3): 34-47.
 80. Tekleab, A. G., Bartol, K. M., & Liu, W. 2005. Is it pay levels or pay raises that matter

- to fairness and turnover? Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26(8): 899-921.
81. Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. 1996. Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity. Harvard Business Review, September-October: 79-90.
82. Tiano, S. 1994. Patriarchy on the line: Labor gender and ideology in the Mexican maquila industry. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
83. Tokar, D. M., & Fischer, A. R. 1998. More on RIASEC and the five-factor model of personality: Direct assessment of Prediger's (1982) and Hogan's (1983) dimensions. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 52: 246-259.
84. Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (ed.), Social Identity and Intergroup Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
85. Violet T. Ho, Sze-Sze Wong, Chay Hoon Lee (2011). A Tale of Passion: Linking Job Passion and Cognitive Engagement to Employee Work Performance. Journal of Management Studies, 48(1), 26-47.
86. Viscusi, W. K. 1979. Employment hazards. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
87. Werbel, J., & DeMarie, S. M. (2005). Aligning strategic human resource management and person-environment fit. Human Resource Management Review, 15, 247-262.



QUOTES

Yesterday is gone. Tomorrow has not yet come. We have only today. Let us begin
Mother Teresa

Kind words can be short and easy to speak, but their echoes are truly endless
Mother Teresa

Not all of us can do great things. But we can do small things with great love
Mother Teresa

Pleasure should be pursued just for supporting the body and not for gratifying it
Mahabharata