



Understanding The Degree of Job Satisfaction and Work Engagement Among Employees in Corporate Environments

¹**Akanksha H S**, *Department of Psychology, School of Sciences, JAIN Deemed-to-be University*
akanksha.harihara@gmail.com

²**Dr. Shamala R**, *Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, School of Sciences, JAIN Deemed-to-be University*
shamala.r@jainuniversity.ac.in

Abstract: This study proposes to examine persons' experiences with engagement and job satisfaction in various work settings. With the increasing number of online job opportunities, it's important to understand how various working environments—online, offline, or hybrid—affect employees' dedication to their work and job satisfaction. The study focuses into how specific employment qualities, such workload or social interaction, may affect total involvement in addition to the conventional "satisfied" or "not satisfied" assessment. Since adults are usually the ones who adopt new work practices first, this study can provide valuable insights for creating safe and productive work conditions in the ever-evolving workplace of today. A sample of 100 participants—49 men and 51 women—who work in corporate environments were used by the researcher. The relationship between working modes (hybrid, offline, and online) and employee engagement and satisfaction was assessed in this study. While there were differences in work engagement levels among the groups, overall job satisfaction remained rather constant. The analysis suggests that working mode may affect qualities like dedication as well as enthusiasm. It's interesting to observe that all working methods consistently had high levels of work community satisfaction, despite changes in measurement methods.

Keywords: *Corporate Sector, Hybrid Working Mode, Job Satisfaction, Online Working Mode, Offline Working Mode, Work Engagement, Young Adults.*

1. Introduction

The degree to which a person is content with their current role is known as job satisfaction. Additionally, industrial psychology literature claims that "job satisfaction" refers to an individual's perception of the key components of their overall work environment. A variety of factors can be used to measure or influence the degree of satisfaction. Other factors that may be considered in addition to pay and benefits include the equality of the promotion system, working conditions, social interactions, leadership, the work itself, the scope of responsibilities, employment opportunities, issues related to the job, and job needs.

A job is a necessary component of life since most individuals spend their time working rather than engaging in other activities. These people are essential to the efficient functioning of our country. Therefore, what may employees expect from their workplace? And what exactly increases people's engagement and job satisfaction? Human motivation is driven by the satisfaction of basic human wants, including physical necessities, safety, love and belonging, social situations, and self-actualization.

When an employee prioritizes long-term goals and is emotionally or psychologically invested in their work, this is known as job engagement. What motivates employees to take part? Numerous employee engagement elements that impact workers' productivity and well-being at work have been found by researchers in the past. It is said that key elements influencing employee engagement are leadership, talent development, communication, and adaptability. Numerous research and analyses have examined the relationship between job satisfaction and a number of parameters, including job performance, job burnout, family life satisfaction, job stress, and other demographic factors. The subjects of job satisfaction and work engagement, however, have not gotten much scholarly attention.

Because of its beneficial impacts on performance outcomes, job involvement is a well-studied notion with a strong relationship to motivating behavior and work motivation (Christian et al., 2011). In light of this, businesses need it. The financial consequences of an unmotivated workforce have been demonstrated by academic and professional studies (Rayton et al., 2012; Gallup, 2013). Therefore, identifying organizational and job features that promote employee engagement is currently the main emphasis of the literature. Examining the effects of job satisfaction facets, or how employees feel about different aspects of their employment, on employee engagement at work is one way our study adds to the body of literature.

The degree to which a person is positive or negative with their job is known as job satisfaction (Spector, 1997). It requires assessing the "emotional state," which results from an individual's thoughts, feelings, and perceptions of their work (Weiss, 2002). Employees can possess various perspectives concerning numerous aspects of their work (Smith et al., 1969; Locke, 1976; Spector, 1997).

According to Rutherford et al. (2009), an overall or global job satisfaction score offers a similarly restricted way to gauge a person's degree of career happiness. Researchers Saks (2006), Avery McKay and Wilson (2007), Bakker et al. (2008), and others have investigated the connection between work engagement and overall or global job satisfaction.

A study by Bahari et al. (2023) on the function of length as a mediator of work engagement and job satisfaction found that the link between working tenure and job satisfaction did not allow for work engagement difference. A sample of 160 volunteers, ages 21 to 60, was chosen by the researcher (72 males and 88 women). Using the Job Satisfaction Scale Work and Well-Being/Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), he found that employment tenure did not appear to alter the relationship between job satisfaction and work engagement.

Using a sample size of 893 banking employees (503 males and 390 females), the study by K H Simanjuntak et al. (2023) on the relationships between work environment and employee engagement, which are mediated by job satisfaction, discovered that both work environment and job satisfaction have a positive and significant impact on employee engagement. Further, these constructs might improve the connection between job happiness and the workplace.

Shabane et al. (2022) used job satisfaction and UWES with 618 respondents from a South African Army unit to investigate the effect of job satisfaction on employee relations and work engagement. The study contributes to the body of knowledge already available on human resource management, specifically regarding employee relations, job satisfaction, and work engagement. Job happiness, employee relations, and work engagement are frequently linked.

In order to investigate the relationship between work performance and organizational trust and job satisfaction, Nabila (2023) employed employee engagement as the mediator component. 75 respondents participated in the survey, which used the Employee Engagement, Job Performance, and Job Satisfaction Scales. According to the study, work performance is positively and significantly impacted by organizational trust. Employee engagement is positively impacted by organizational trust in a major way. The impact of job happiness on job performance is both

good and significant. Employee engagement is positively impacted by job satisfaction in a significant manner.

1.1 Rationale of the study

People's work habits have been rapidly evolving, especially with the development of technology and the internet. Employment possibilities are becoming available online. It is crucial for comprehending how these diverse job types affect work engagement and job satisfaction.

The majority of employees are adults, and they frequently adopt new work types early in life. Understanding this group's particular preferences and difficulties comes from studying them.

There is a significant relationship between work involvement and job satisfaction and mental health and well-being. It may be able to solve potential issues and promote better work environments by looking at how these factors are affected by online and offline work modes.

Working remotely has become more popular since the COVID-19 outbreak. As a result, a lot of businesses are taking into account totally or partially remote work arrangements. The results of this study may help us understand how helpful remote employment is for people.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Question

How do the levels of work engagement and job satisfaction among those working in corporate settings relate to the mode of operation (online, offline, or hybrid)?

2.2 Objectives

This study aims to evaluate corporate employees' job satisfaction regardless of whether they work in an offline, online, or hybrid setting.

To evaluate the level of work engagement among corporate workers who operate in offline, online, or hybrid environments.

2.3 Hypothesis

H1: There will be no significant difference in work engagement among adults working in online/ offline/hybrid modes.

H2: There will be significant difference in the work engagement among adults working in online/ offline/hybrid modes.

H3: There will be no significant difference in job satisfaction between adults working in online/ offline/hybrid modes.

H4: There will be significant difference in the job satisfaction among adults working in online/ offline/hybrid modes.

2.4 Research Design

This is a comparative quantitative research study done using online survey method. A One-way ANOVA tests the effect of two independent variables and is used to estimate how the differences change according to the levels of three categorical variables.

2.5 Variables

Job satisfaction and Work engagement.

2.6 Description of Tools

Demographic status is obtained along with standard questionnaires that assess the participants. Demographic status comprises Age, Gender, Working mode, Education, Occupation and other details according to JSS and UWES.

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES): Given by Schaufeli et al (2002). Reliability ranging from 0.80 to 0.90. UWES-17 has good construct validity. Dimensions– Dedication, Vigor, Absorption.

Job Satisfaction Scale: Likert scale given by Dr. Amar Singh and Dr. T. R Sharma. Reliability – 0.978. Validity and reliability - Over an 18 month time period, an internal consistency of 0.37 0.74 was calculated for a smaller sample of 43 workers. It consists of 30 items in different dimensions.

Such as - 1) Job intrinsic: job concrete, job abstract

2) Job extrinsic: Psycho social aspect, financial aspect, Community aspect.

2.7 Sampling Technique

Snowball sampling technique is used.

2.8 Sample Size

100 adults between the age range of 22 to 40 years old (both males and females)

Inclusion Criteria: Participants should fall between 22 to 40 years of age. Participants should be working in corporate settings to take part in this research.

Exclusion Criteria: Individuals below 22 years of age and above 40 years of age are not considered. Even if they fall in this category, those who do not work in a corporate sector are not considered. Individuals with any mental disabilities are not considered.

2.9 Procedure

Employees who work in corporate environments were the subjects of the study, which used a Google form with two questions that included socio demographic information. Each person's information was gathered to determine how engaged and satisfied they were with their jobs, whether they worked offline, online, or in a hybrid environment.

2.10 Data Analysis

SPSS will be used for the data analysis. Data will be analyzed by using Normal distribution (normality curve). Based on this further analysis such as descriptive statistics and One- way ANOVA will be done. For the socio-demographic details such as name, age, gender, Working mode (online/ offline/ hybrid) - descriptive statistics will be used.

2.11 Ethical Considerations

Participants' confidentiality and anonymity was protected. Every participant has given their informed consent. At any moment, the participant may choose not to participate. There will be no dishonesty to the participants during the study.

3. Results

The section completes the data analysis and the findings. The results are being examined using SPSS 26. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) and the Standardized Job Satisfaction Scale were used to collect the data. The most common significant levels of 0.001 and 0.05 according to APA were then applied to the results. The researcher tested the different hypotheses in this study using this significant level.

Table 1: Showing the socio-demographic details of participants.

Sample characteristics	N	%	M	SD
Gender				
Male	49	48		
Female	51	50		
Working mode				
Offline	53	52		
Online	30	29.4		
Hybrid	17	16.7		
Age			27.91	5.761

Note N=100

According to Table 01, there were 49 males (48%) and 51 females (50%) in the sample. 52% of the participants worked mostly offline, with hybrid mode coming in second at 16.7% and online mode at 29.4%.

Table 2: Tests of Normality

Tests of Normality							
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk			
Statistic		df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.	
WORK_ENGAGEMENT		.295	100	.000	.830	100	.000
TOTAL_JOB_SATISFACTION		.201	100	.000	.863	100	.000
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction							

The results of the normality tests, which are displayed in Table 02, suggest that the distributions of total job satisfaction and work engagement were not normal. At a value of .295 (df = 100, $p < .05$), the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic for work engagement was significant. Similarly, work involvement had a significant Shapiro-Wilk value ($W = .830$, $df = 100$, $p < .05$). With a significant Shapiro-Wilk statistic ($W = .863$, $df = 100$, $p < .05$) and a significant Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic (.201, $df = 100$, $p < .05$), the similar pattern was seen for overall work satisfaction.

These findings suggest that non-parametric tests should be employed for further analyses, as they are more suitable for data that do not follow a normal distribution. In this study, more importance is given to Shapiro-Wilk test as the sample size is very less ($N=100$).

Table 3: Analysis of Variance for Work Engagement and Job Satisfaction

Variable	Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Job Satisfaction	Between Groups	5.355	2	2.677	1.750	.179
	Within Groups	148.405	97	1.530	--	--
	Total	153.760	99	--	--	--
Work Engagement	Between Groups	8.986	2	4.493	6.729	.002**

Within Groups	64.774	97	.668	--	--
Total	73.760	99	--	--	--

Table 03 provides an examination of variance. An ANOVA was performed to ascertain whether participation in groups impacted work engagement and job satisfaction. The results for job satisfaction are shown in the aforementioned table. There was no statistically significant effect of group membership on job satisfaction ($F(2, 97) = 1.750, p = .179$). To put it another way, the groups' average work satisfaction scores varied very little. However, the results demonstrated a statistically significant impact of group membership on work engagement ($F(2, 97) = 6.729, p = 0.002$). As a result, there is a statistically significant difference in the groups' average work engagement scores.

4. Discussion

The study intends to investigate the level of work engagement and job satisfaction among persons aged 22 to 40. There were 51 women and 49 males among the sample's 100 participants. The socio-demographic information section examined the age, gender, and mode of employment of the participants. The data was analyzed using SPSS 26. The Job Satisfaction Standardized Scales and the UWES have been employed.

$F(2, 97) = 1.750, p = 0.179$, the results for job satisfaction did not show a statistically significant effect of working mode. This suggests that there was little variation in the average job satisfaction scores across the offline, online, and hybrid work mode groups. This non-significant result could be explained by a number of factors. Such as -

1) *Small sample size*: The statistical test's ability to identify real group differences may be affected by a smaller sample size. To fully capture possible differences in job satisfaction between working styles, a larger sample size could be required.

2) *Factors related to a job*: Beyond working style, a number of factors can affect job satisfaction, including workload, supervisor support, and the nature of the job. It's possible that these job-specific characteristics overwhelmed the working mode's possible impact in this investigation.

3) *Unique options*: The personalities and tastes of employees differ. While some people might do better in online settings, others might prefer working offline. Because certain employees

from each working mode group may be somewhat happy regardless of the mode, these individual differences may account for the non-significant results.

4) *Work Engagement*: The ANOVA results for work engagement revealed a statistically significant effect of working mode, $F(2, 97) = 6.729$, $p = 0.002$. This indicates that there are statistically significant differences in average work engagement scores between the offline, online, and hybrid work mode groups. Post-hoc tests would be necessary to determine which specific working mode groups differ in work engagement. Several potential factors could explain these findings such as;

i) *Social interaction and isolation*: Offline work environment typically offers more opportunities for social interaction with colleagues, which can contribute to increased feelings of belonging and engagement. Online and hybrid work arrangements might offer fewer opportunities for such interaction, potentially leading to lower work engagement.

ii) *Work-life balance*: Working remotely can make it more difficult to draw boundaries between work and personal life, making it more difficult to disconnect after work. Job engagement may be affected by this failure to disconnect from work, which can lead to job overload and burnout.

iii) *Distractions and interruptions*: Online work environments can be more susceptible to distractions, such as notifications and emails, which can disrupt focus and hinder work engagement. Offline environments may offer fewer distractions, allowing for greater concentration on work tasks.

This research sheds light on other important aspects of job satisfaction and work engagement. Such as – What brings people joy in their jobs? Job satisfaction is influenced by a number of variables, including competitive pay, a sense of accomplishment, a healthy work-life balance, a favorable working relationship, and opportunities for advancement. What does being involved really entail? Vigor (high energy), devotion (persistent work), and absorption (complete immersion in job) are traits of engaged employees. Positive outcomes such as decreased turnover intentions and stronger organizational commitment can result from high job satisfaction and work engagement. This is known as the “domino effect.”

Other individuals in the study: High job satisfaction and engagement seem to be linked with favorable work environments, strong employee interactions, and organizational trust.

The results mentioned above confirm H3 (null hypothesis) by showing that there are no significant variations in job satisfaction among people who work in online, offline, or hybrid modes. Also, H2 is supported by the key differences in work engagement across people who work in online, offline, or hybrid modes.

Limitations

- a) Sample size was small.
- b) Ratio between online and offline working mode is not same.
- c) There are also various factors that might help to increase the job satisfaction level other than just working mode or the kind and level of work engagement.
- d) Leadership style, Management style, job role, workplace politics etc. are the factors that have not been measured or discussed in this research study.

Implications of the Study

1. Future studies should examine how working mode affects engagement at work and looks at underlying mechanisms like autonomy, social interaction, and job expectations.
2. Research could look at how social interaction and job changes affect various working arrangements and how they influence employees' work engagement.
3. It is recommended that researchers take into account different criteria for measuring work community happiness in order to account for limit effects and capture small differences within this theoretical framework.

5. Conclusion

In this study of 100 corporate employees, overall job satisfaction wasn't significantly impacted by working mode (online, offline, hybrid). However, work engagement levels differed. Working remotely or in a hybrid model appeared to decrease passion and commitment compared to traditional office environments. Interestingly, feeling connected to the work community remained high regardless of physical work location. This suggests physical presence might not be essential for building positive work relationships, but it could be for deeper engagement with the work itself.

References

- Ab Hamid, M. R., Sami, W., & Sidek, M. M. (2017). Discriminant validity assessment: Use of Fornell and Larcker criterion versus HTMT criterion. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 890(1), 012163.
- Abraham, R. (2000). The role of job control as a moderator of emotional dissonance and emotional intelligence–outcome relationships. *The Journal of Psychology*, 134, 169–184.
- Ali, M., Lei, S., & Wei, X.-Y. (2018). The mediating role of the employee relations climate in the relationship between strategic HRM and organizational performance in Chinese banks. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, 3(3), 115–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2016.12.003>
- Ang, S. H. (2014). Research design for business and management. London: Sage.
- Armstrong, M. (2012). Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice (12th ed.). London: Kogan Page.
- Bell, E., & Bryman, A. (2007). The ethics of management research: An exploratory content analysis. *British Journal of Management*, 18*(1), 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00487>
- Bless, C., Higson-Smith, C., & Sithole, S. L. (2014). Fundamentals of social research methods: An African perspective (5th ed.). Juta.
- Boermans, S. M., Kamphuis, W., Delahaij, R., Van den Berg, C., & Euwema, M. C. (2014). Team spirit makes the difference: The interactive effects of team work engagement and organizational constraints during a military operation on psychological outcomes afterwards. *Stress and Health*, 30(5), 386–396. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2621>
- Bratton, J., & Gold, J. (2017). *Human resource management: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). London: Palgrave
- Brynard, P. A., & Hanekom, S. X. (2011). *Introduction to research in management related fields* (2nd ed.). Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Budd, J. W., & Bhawe, D. P. (2019). The employment relationship: Key elements, alternative frames of reference, and implications for HRM. In J. Storey, D. M. Gould, & I. C. Bjorkman (Eds.), *Sage handbook of human resource management* (pp. 41–64). Sage Publications Ltd.

- Caraway, C. L. (2020). A looming pilot shortage: It is time to revisit regulations. *International Journal of Aviation, Aeronautics, and Aerospace*, 7(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.15394/IJAAA.2020.1470>
- Carmeli, A., & Freund, A. (2004). Work commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Organisation Theory and Behaviour*, 7(3), 289–303. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-07-03-2004-B001>
- Cherian, S., Alkhatib, A. J., & Aggarwal, M. (2018). Relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction of nurses in Dubai Hospital. *Journal of Advances in Social Science and Humanities*, 4(1), 36373–36400.
- Du Plessis, J. V., & Fouche, M. A. (2015). *A practical guide to labor law*. Pretoria: LexisNexis.
- Ehlers, L. (2007). *Labour relations practice in South Africa* (3rd ed.). Pretoria: EAMS.
- Faragher, E. M., Cass, M., & Cooper, C. L. (2005). The relationship between job satisfaction and health: A meta-analysis. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 62, 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.2002.006734>
- Ghafoor, A., Qureshi, T. M., Khan, M. A., & Hijazi, S. T. (2011). Transformational leadership, employee engagement, and performance: Mediating effect of psychological ownership. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(17), 7391–7403. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM11.126>
- Grant, A. M., Christianson, M. K., & Price, R. H. (2007). Happiness, health, or relationships? Managerial practices and employee well-being trade-offs. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(3), 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2007.26421238>.
- Hassan, S., Hassan, M., & Shoaib, M. (2014). Measuring the impact of perceived organizational support, psychological empowerment, and rewards on employee's satisfaction: Testing the mediating impact of employee engagement. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 30(5), 625–660.
- Krishnan, R., *et al.* (2015). Employee work engagement: Understanding the role of job characteristics and employee characteristics. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences*, 4(10), 58–67.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701–716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>

Singh, A., et al. (n.d.). Job Satisfaction Scale. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.