

## **Relationship of Job Boredom Proneness with Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement in Employees of an Industrial Organization**

**Abdolzahra Naami, PhD**

Department of Psychology  
Shahid Chamran University

**Hossein Shokrkon, PhD**

Department of Psychology  
Shahid Chamran University

This study investigates the relationship between job boredom proneness as the predictor variable and job satisfaction and job involvement as the criterion variables. Job Boredom Proneness Scale, Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), and Job Involvement Questionnaire (JIQ) were administered to 275 employees, working in an industrial organization, selected according to a stratified random sampling method. The results indicated that job boredom proneness and its dimensions correlate negatively and significantly with job satisfaction and job involvement. The facets of perception of time and constraint had the most important role in explaining the variances of job satisfaction and job involvement.

**Keywords:** job boredom proneness, job satisfaction, Job involvement

Job boredom proneness, in Fisher's review (1993), is defined as an unpleasant trait in which the individual feels a pervasive lack of interest in and difficulty concentrating on the current activity and feels that it takes conscious effort to maintain or return attention to that activity. Several researchers have suggested that intentional difficulties are at the root of the experience of boredom (Hamilton, 1987). When people feel bored during task performance, they report not being able to keep their attention on the task, or having to exert considerable effort to keep their attention. Job boredom proneness is composed of five components. The first component is "external stimulations". In this area the person's boredom is so high that environmental stimulations can't stimulate him or her. In this case, the

person feels indifferent toward the environmental stimulations. It becomes really difficult to find job stimulations for these workers, and in general we can say that they need a lot more challenging stimulations. This group of workers cannot easily deal with their repetitive duties, and to keep their emotions high and feel happy they need lots of changes. The second component is called "internal stimulations" which deals with the problem of having difficulty in paying and keeping attention on one's duties. Workers high in this component have problems with finding their interesting activities, the lack of innovative ideas and disability in self-stimulating. The third component is "affective response". Among these reactions we can name anxiety, apathy, being bored from repeating actions, and resistance to stimulations and excitement. The fourth component is named "Time perception". This component deals with the use of time. For people with high scores on this component time passes too long. They can't use the time properly and also are unable to focus on their duties in due time. The fifth component is "constrain". People high in this component are mostly impatient, and in the situations that they need to be patient they become anxious.

Boredom feeling at work is a common complaint that most workers suffer for a short or long periods of time (Barabalet, 1999). Unfortunately, organizational researchers know very little about the phenomenon of boredom. However, there is evidence that boredom can have serious consequences. In the short run bored employees experience lapses in attention and even fall asleep, take longer to notice and correct errors, and have more accidents (Cox, 1980; Drory, 1982; Ohanlon, 1981). Other consequences of boredom can include emotional upset, stress, hostility, increased risk taking or thrill seeking, and drug and alcohol consumption (Hamilton, 1987, Orcutt, 1984; Wasson, 1981; Zuckerman, 1979).

Job satisfaction is simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of them. It is the extent to which people like or dislike their jobs (Spector, 1985). Antecedents of job satisfaction can be classified into two major categories. First, the job environment itself and factors associated

with the job are important influences on job satisfaction. This includes how people are treated, the nature of job tasks, relations with other people in the work place, and rewards. Second, there are individual factors that the person brings to the job. This includes both personality and internal variables. One of these internal variables is boredom proneness. Macdonald and MacIntrye (1997), using an employee sample from several different job categories, found a significant, negative correlation between scores on the job satisfaction scale and boredom. Lee (1986), using a sample of clerical employees, found that high scores on the Job Boredom Scale were significantly associated with lower job satisfaction. Gould and Seib (1997) assessed the effects of boredom proneness of restaurant workers and teachers. They found that restaurant employees categorized as boredom prone were significantly less satisfied with the work itself and the overall boredom prone teachers had significantly lower satisfaction scores regarding their job as a whole.

Job involvement has been defined as an individual's psychological identification to his or her job (Kanungo, 1982). It is the degree to which he/she is cognitively preoccupied with, engaged in, and concerned with ones present job. Job involvement involves the internalization of values about the goodness of work or the importance of work in the worth of the individual (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965).

### **Hypotheses**

1- There are negative relationships between job boredom proneness and its dimensions "external stimulation, internal stimulation, affective response, perception of time and constraint" with job satisfaction.

2- There are negative relationships between job boredom proneness and its dimensions "external stimulation, internal stimulation, affective response, perception of time and constraint" with job involvement.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Questionnaires, measuring the research variables, were distributed to 283 employees working in an industrial organization, being selected according to a stratified random sampling method. Questionnaires were sent to the participants to be filled out. They were informed about the research objectives and indicated that participation is voluntary and anonymous. Two hundred and seventy five completed questionnaires were returned. The sample consisted of 94% males with an average age of 35 years, 54% earned a high school diploma, 37% received some college education, and the remainder did not indicate their educational levels.

### **Measures**

**Job Boredom Proneness Scale:** The job boredom proneness scale (Vodanovich & Kass, 1990) consists of 28 items arranged on a 5-point-Likert scale. An internal consistency of .79 and test-retest (after one-week) of .83 were reported by the authors of the BPS. Coefficient alpha of the scale have been reported in numerous studies and have ranged from .19 to .84 (Vodanovich & Kass, 1990).

Preliminary evidence for the validity of the BPS was provided by significant and positive correlations between BPS and measures of depression, hopelessness, loneliness, a motivational orientation, and self-rating of boredom (Farmer & Sunderberg, 1986). The authors also reported significant negative correlations between BP scores and life satisfaction and autonomy scores. Subsequent research has found BPS scores to be significantly related to an array of negative effective states such as impulsivity, anger, aggression, anxiety, hostility, procrastination, and depression (Vodanovich, 2003). In the current study all internal subscales yielded an internal reliability alpha greater than .70 (external stimulation .91, internal stimulation .95, affective response .91, perception of time .85, and constraint .88.)

Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was developed by Spector (1985). The scale consists of 36 items. The format is a Likert rating scale with six response choices ranging from slightly agree to highly agree, with a possible score range from 36 to 216, where a high score indicates a high degree of job satisfaction. The internal consistency reliability (Coefficient alpha), computed on a sample of 2870, was .91. Test-retest reliability (over an 18-month interval) based on a sub-sample of the original group (N = 43) was, .71 (Spector, 1985).

Job Involvement Questionnaire (JIQ) was developed by Kanungo (1982). The JIQ consists of 10 items. Item response choices form a Likert type scale ranging from strongly agree (6) to strongly disagree (1). It has shown an internal consistency ranging from .14 to .90 (Blau, 1985; Kanungo, 1982) discriminant validity against related constructs, and convergent validity with the Lodahl and Kenjner (1965) scale and pictorial and semantic-differential measures (Kanungo, 1982).

## Results

**Table 1**  
**Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation of Job Boredom Proneness with Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement**

Variable	M	SD	7	8
Job boredom	14.25	4.36	.57**	-.42*
External stimulation	13.72	4.20	-.31*	-.27**
Internal stimulation	15.16	5.14	-.38**	-.30**
Affective response	15.7	6.17	-.48**	-.36**
perception of time	9.38	2.28	-.54**	-.36**
Constraint	8.70	1.92	-.42**	-.33**
Job satisfaction	9.78	2.18	-	.68**
Job involvement	10.12	3.02	.68**	-

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested by correlating job boredom proneness and its components with job satisfaction and job involvement and their correlation coefficients are shown in Table 1. It can be seen in Table 1 that there are significant and negative correlations between job satisfaction with job boredom proneness ( $r=-.57$ ,  $p<.05$ ), external stimulation ( $r=-.31$ ,  $p<.05$ ), internal stimulation ( $r=-.38$ ,  $p<.05$ ), affective response ( $r=-.48$ ,  $p<.05$ ), perception of time ( $r=-.54$ ,  $p<.05$ ), and constraint ( $r=-.42$ ,  $p<.05$ ), and job involvement with job boredom proneness ( $r=-.42$ ,  $p<.05$ ), external stimulation ( $r=-.27$ ,  $p<.05$ ), internal stimulation ( $r=-.30$ ,  $p<.05$ ), affective response ( $r=-.36$ ,  $p<.05$ ), perception of time ( $r=-.36$ ,  $p<.05$ ), and constraint ( $r=-.33$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Therefore, hypotheses 1 and 2 are supported.

**Table 2**  
**The Facets of Job Boredom Proneness Regressed on Job Satisfaction**

Enter Regression						
Variables	R	RS	B	$\beta$	t	P
External stimulation	.30	.09	.40	-.10	-1.41	.15
Internal stimulation	.39	.15	.43	-.33	-3.09	.003
Affective response	.49	.24	.25	-.47	-4.66	.001
Perception of time	.64	.41	.58	-.48	-8.21	.001
Constraint	.69	.48	.47	-.35	-4.95	.002
Stepwise Regression						
Variables	R	RS	B	$\beta$	t	P
Perception of time	.53	.28	.45	-.46	-8.08	.001
Constraint	.64	.42	.40	-.34	-4.78	.001
Affective response	.66	.44	.55	-.45	-4.49	.001
Internal stimulation	.69	.47	.27	-.36	-3.38	.001

F=33/16      P<.001

Through hierarchical multiple regression analysis (Table 1) it was found that the correlation coefficient of the combination of external stimulation, internal stimulation, affective response, perception of time,

and constraint with job satisfaction was significant ( $F=33.16$ ,  $P<.001$ ). The RS indicates that 48% of the variance of job satisfaction was explained by this regression model.

Next, attention was focused on determining which of the predictive variables is most closely related to job satisfaction. For this purpose, researchers employed the stepwise multiple regression technique.

The relevant statistics of the four variables entered in the stepwise multiple regression analysis in relation to job satisfaction is exhibited in Table 2. Perception of time was the first and the most salient of the variables that entered the regression model, and accounted for 28% of the variation in job satisfaction. At step 2, constraint entered the regression model and accounted for an additional 14% of the variation. At step 3, affective response entered the regression model and accounted for an additional 6% of the variation. Finally, at step 4, internal stimulation entered the regression model and accounted for an additional 3% of the variation in job satisfaction. Together, these four variables explained 47% of the variation in job satisfaction.

**Table 3**  
**The Facets of Job Boredom Proneness Regressed on Job Involvement**

<b>Enter Regression</b>						
<b>Variables</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>RS</b>	<b>B</b>	<b><math>\beta</math></b>	<b>t</b>	<b>P</b>
External stimulation	.29	.08	.16	-.04	-.47	.63
Internal stimulation	.33	.10	.15	-.21	-1.63	.10
Affective response	.37	.14	.23	-.28	-2.32	.001
Perception of time	.45	.20	.27	-.30	-4.21	.001
Constraint	.49	.24	.27	-.24	-2.78	.002
<b>Stepwise Regression</b>						
<b>Variables</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>RS</b>	<b>B</b>	<b><math>\beta</math></b>	<b>t</b>	<b>P</b>
Perception of time	.36	.13	.30	-.33	-4.49	.001
Constraint	.46	.21	.32	-.28	-4.27	.001

$F=11.21$       $P<.001$

Through hierarchical multiple regression analysis (Table 3) it was found that the correlation coefficient of the combination of external stimulation, internal stimulation, affective response, perception of time, and constraint with job involvement was significant ( $F=11.21$ ,  $P<.001$ ). The RS indicates that 24% of variance in job involvement was explained by this regression model.

Next, we focused on determining which of the predictive variables is most closely related to job involvement. For this purpose, researchers employed the stepwise multiple regression technique. The relevant statistics of the two variables that entered in the stepwise multiple regression analysis in relation to job involvement are presented in Table 3. Perception of time was the first and the most salient of the variables that entered in the regression model, and accounted for 13% of the variation in job involvement. At step 2, constraint entered in the regression model and accounted for an additional 8% of the variation in the criterion variable. Together, these two variables explained 21% of the variation in job involvement.

### **Discussion**

In the current study we investigated two hypotheses about the relationships between boredom proneness at work with job satisfaction and job involvement. Our findings supported the two hypotheses. The results showed that there was a significant relationship between job boredom proneness as well as between job satisfaction and job involvement. The findings of this investigation are in agreement with the findings of Gould & Seib (1997) and Kass, Vodanovich & Callender (2001).

The reason for the negative relationship between job boredom and job satisfaction is that both of these variables are somehow dealing with emotional feelings. Many of the investigators believe that job satisfaction is an attitude showing how people feel about their jobs. On the other hand, some investigators such as Farmer and Sunberg (1986), Geiwitz (1966),

Vodanovich (2003), Ohanlon (1981) have identified job boredom proneness as a state of negative emotional feeling. The similarity in the emotional dimension causes the relationship between these two variables. It is noticeable that job satisfaction is a type of positive feeling while job boredom is a sort of negative feeling, and this fact makes these two variables relate negatively.

Many jobs are to a great extent repetitive and their variety range is limited and not compatible with the workers' job boredom proneness. This will result in low levels of job satisfaction.

The other factor which is able to cause job dissatisfaction is low internal stimulation. Workers with high levels of job boredom proneness are not completely capable of concentrating on their ideas or developing new ones. They can't easily find what makes them interested. These characteristics decrease their level of job satisfaction. In addition, other factors that cause reduction in the level of job satisfaction are stress, depression, and not getting excitement out of the job events.

Furthermore, since work conditions often cannot motivate the workers with high levels of job boredom proneness, time passes too slowly for them and they don't know how to manage their time appropriately, causing a reduction in their job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is to some extent dependant on the workers job performance. It means that workers with high levels of job performance get more job rewards that enhance their job satisfaction. Just the contrary, since the workers with higher levels of job boredom proneness cannot manage their time well, they won't get job rewards which leads to a reduction in their job satisfaction.

In the case of the relationship between job boredom and job involvement, our findings show that there is a negative and significant relationship between these two variables. Job boredom proneness mainly affects job attitudes. As mentioned earlier, some investigators such as Gould and Seib (1997), Lee (1986), Mac Donald and Mac Intyre (1997) indicate that there are negative relations between job boredom and job involvement. The findings of this investigation show that job boredom

proneness reduces job involvement. Interest in a job is affected by the person-job fit. When a job satisfies the workers needs, job involvement will increase. Usually, workers with high levels of job boredom proneness need more job motivation, and there are few jobs that can satisfy adequately the workers need of stimulation. This fact makes the workers have a lesser degree of job involvement.

### ***References***

- Barabalet, J. M. (1999). Boredom and social meaning. *British Journal of sociology*, 50, 631-616.
- Blau, G. (1985). Further exploring the relationship between job involvement and voluntary individual turnover, *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 313- 330.
- Cox, T. (1980). Repetitive work. In C. L. Cooper and R. Payne (Eds.), *Current concerns in occupational stress*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Drory, A. (1982). Individual differences in boredom proneness and task effectiveness at work. *Personnel Psychology*, 35, 141-151.
- Farmer, R. F., & Sundberg, N. D. (1986). Boredom proneness-the development and correlates of a new scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 50, 4-17.
- Fisher, C. (1993). *Boredom at work: A neglected concept*. Human Relations, 46, 395-417.
- Geiwitz, P. (1966). Structure of boredom, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 592-600.
- Gould, C., & Seib, H. M. (April 1997). *Job satisfaction as a function of boredom proneness and central life interests*. Paper presented at the 43rd annual Southeastern Psychological Association meeting, Atlanta.
- Hamilton, J. A. (1987). Attention, personality, and the self-regulation of mood. *Progress in Experimental Personality Research*, 10, 281-315.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982), Measurement of job and work involvement, *Journal of Applied psychology*, 67, 341-349.

- Kass, S. J., Vodanovich, S. J., & Callender, A. (2001). State-trait boredom: Relationship to absenteeism, tenure, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16, 317-327.
- Lee, T. W. (1986). Toward the development and validation of a measure of job boredom. *Manhattan College Journal of Business*. 15(1), 22-28.
- Lodahl, T. M., & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 49, 24-33.
- MacDonald, S., & MacIntyre, P. (1997). The generic job satisfaction scale: Scale development and its correlates. *Employee Assistance Quarterly*, 13, 1-16.
- Mikulas, W. L., & Vodanovich, S. J. (1993). The essence of boredom, *The Psychological Record*, 43, 3-12.
- O'Hanlon, J. F. (1981). Boredom: Practical consequences and a theory. *Acta Psychologica*. 49, 53-82.
- Orcutt, J. (1984). Contrasting effects of two kinds of boredom on alcohol use. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 14, 161-173.
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of community psychology*, 13, 693-713.
- Vodanovich, S. J. (2003). Psychometric measures of bored: A review of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology*, 137, 569- 595.
- Vodanovich, S. J., & Kass, S. J. (1990). A Factor analytic study of the boredom proneness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55, 115-123.
- Wasson, A. S. (1981). Susceptibility to boredom and deviant behavior at school, *Psychological Reports*, 48, 901-902.
- Zuuckerman, M. (1979). *Sensation seeking: Beyond the optimal level of arousal*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Received: 20 / 9/ 2011

Revised : 8 / 4/ 2012

Accepted: 27 / 4/ 2012