

## Explaining Job Engagement & Job Satisfaction Dimensions related to Sport Facility Employees

\*Huseyin KOSE<sup>1</sup>, Alp POLAT<sup>2</sup>, Yucel TURKER<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>(Faculty of Sport Sciences / Anadolu University, Turkey)

<sup>2</sup>(Bozuyuk Vocational School / Bilecik Seyh Edebali University, Turkey)

<sup>3</sup>(Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences / Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Turkey)

Corresponding Author: Huseyin KOSE

---

**Abstract:** Organizations have always been focused on the level of job engagement and Job Satisfaction of their employees to understand the underlying factors of employee motivation and performance. There are many studies related to job satisfaction that are explaining the concept, its' dimensions, antecedents and consequences). However, there are not many studies on job engagement and satisfaction of sport facility employees in Turkey. Thus, the current study aimed to determine the dimensions related to job engagement and job satisfaction in sport management area. Results indicate that job engagement could be conceptualized in three dimensions like the other areas as "emotional engagement, cognitive engagement and physical engagement". However, in terms of job satisfaction it is different. Two factors revealed and termed as "psychological satisfaction and relational satisfaction" in sport facilities unlike the other organizations. Participants included 107 people, 49 men (45.8%) and 58 women (54.2%) employed by four sport facilities including managers, marketers, customer representatives, trainers, cleaning staff etc. The survey included measures of job engagement and job satisfaction by 27 items and adapted from previous empirical studies.. In order to evaluate and transform the data set in terms of meaningful factor analysis was applied. The scale used in the current study exhibits an ideal consistency and meet rigorous conceptual and empirical criteria for validity. In line with previous researches, there are similarities with the factors and items of job engagement, and differences with the factors of job satisfaction. The results of the study can be interests of sport managers and human resources management of sport organizations. Because identifying the items and factors of job engagement and satisfaction is important for managers of the sport organization. Thus useful strategies could be shaped to increase the employees' job engagement and satisfaction.

**Keywords:** Engagement, engaged employee, job engagement, job satisfaction, sport facility

---

Date of Submission: 16-09-2017

Date of acceptance: 12-10-2017

---

### I. Introduction

Job engagement and job satisfaction are very famous terms among Human Resource and Organizational Behavior researchers. For a long time, organizations focus on the level of engagement of their employees in an effort to understand the underlying factors of employee motivation and performance (Rich, 2006). There have been various definitions of job engagement, job satisfaction and their dimensions in the current literature. For example, Schafuli et al. (2002) defined engagement as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption. Engagement refers to a more persistent and pervasive affective- cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior (Storm and Rothmann, 2003). As well as job engagement, job satisfaction has been one of the most widely studied topics in organizational psychology. Storm and Rothmann (2003) expressed job satisfaction as the extent to which work is a source of need fulfillment and contentment, or a means of freeing employees from hassles or things causing dissatisfaction. While job engagement addresses feelings about the future, job satisfaction addresses past and present situations (MacDonald and McIntyre, 1997).

#### 1.1. Job Engagement

As a positive concept, job engagement is very common with companies and consulting firms (Wefald and Downey, 2009). It is defined as a person's enthusiasm and involvement in his or her job. Highly engaged people in their jobs tend to work harder and more productive than others. They are motivated by work itself and are likely to produce the results their organization want (Roberts and Davenport, 2002).

Job engagement is associated with the active participation and investment of an individual's whole person, not solely parts in to role performance (Rich, 2006). Job engagement consists of three dimensions. Those are: vigor, dedication and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Vigor is characterized by high levels of

energy and mental resilience while working, not being easily fatigued etc. Dedication is characterized by deriving a sense of significance from one's work, by feeling enthusiastic and proud about one's job. Absorption is characterized by being totally and happily immersed in one's work and having difficulties detaching oneself from it. Engaged employees are energetic and connected to their work activities effectively and they see themselves as able to deal completely with their job's demands (Schaufeli et al., 2002).

The extant literature focuses on the three dimensions of engagement: physical, cognitive and emotional dimensions.

-Physical Engagement; As Kahn stated (1990), when people engaged in a role, they express themselves physically and physical energies are directed at the accomplishment of role task.

-Cognitive Engagement; According to Kahn (1990), engagement was manifested by the investment of personal energies into cognitive labors.

-Emotional Engagement; People are engaged in their role when they exhibited behaviors that indicated the investment of personal energies and emotions (Kahn, 1990; Rich, 2006).

Job engagement is a significant predictor of desirable organizational outcomes such as customer satisfaction, retention, productivity, and profitability (Buckingham and Coffman, 1999; Luthans and Peterson, 2002). It is associated with a sustainable workload, feelings of choice and control, appropriate recognition and reward, a supportive work community, fairness and justice, and meaningful and valued work (Saks, 2006).

Job engagement is distinct from job satisfaction. Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as an emotional reaction that results from the perception that one's job allows the fulfillment of one's important job values, providing and to the degree that those values are congruent with one's needs (Locke, 1976; Rich, 2006). It addresses past and present situations, while engagement addresses feelings about the future (Macdonald and McIntyre, 1997). More motivated workers may become more closely involved in the firm's operations and find more occasions for self-fulfillment. Hence, they may be more satisfied (Borzaga and Tortia, 2006). Unlike, engagement, the economic impact of disengagement is very high by the cost of psychological and medical consequences that result from workers' feelings. After reviewing the extant literature related to job engagement, the literature shows that engaged people to their job might lead to positive outcomes for themselves and organizations. So it is important for sport managers to understand the dimensions about job engagement of their employees.

## **1.2. Job Satisfaction**

As well as job engagement, job satisfaction has been one of the most widely studied topics in organizational psychology. It has been one of the widely studied topics in industrial-organizational psychology (Judge et al., 2001). In the academic literature, a number of definitions have been provided. Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from appraisal of one's job or job experience. For Locke, job satisfaction is an emotional reaction resulting from the perceptions that one's job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one's important job values and providing the needs (Locke, 1976; Rich, 2006). For Balzer et al. (1990), job satisfaction is "the feelings of a worker's job experiences in relation to previous experiences, current expectations or available alternatives" (Parks and Parra, 1994). All these and other definitions suggest that job satisfaction is an emotional reaction resulting from appraisal of one's job achieving of facilitating one's job values (Cranny et al., 1992; Weiss, 2002).

Job satisfaction is different from job involvement. They both refer to the specific job but job satisfaction is about employee's liking his or her job. Job involvement is about employees' degree of psychological identification with their job. Job satisfaction and job engagement are distinct from each other conceptually but job engagement is hypothesized to be positively related to job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is an assessment about employees' job's actual outcomes and comparison with their desired outcomes. So, as the literature states (Rich, 2006) job engagement and job satisfaction are empirically related to each other but they are different concepts.

Many people work to earn a living, that makes work an obligation rather than a choice. But individual experiences with work are ranging from work as a monotonous grind to work as an expression of one's identity (Hulin, 2002; Rich, 2006). So, the purpose of the current study was to investigate the dimensions of sport facility workers' perceptions of job engagement and job satisfaction. The current study first examines the theoretical understanding of job engagement and job satisfaction. Then an empirical investigation is made by using "Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)" (Schaufeli et al., 2002) and "Job Satisfaction Scale" (Borzaga and Tortia, 2006).

## **II. Method**

Participants included (107) employees working in a variety of jobs in four sport facilities in Eskisehir, Turkey. The employees were managers, marketers, customer representatives, trainers, cleaning staff etc. For the analysis of the data, the questionnaire was used as the data collection method; SPSS 21.0 was used in the analysis of the data. Frequency, percentage, averaging and standard deviation were used. In order to evaluate and transform the data set in terms of meaningful factors, factor analysis (Principal Component Factor) was applied.

**2.1.Procedure**

Three researchers collected the data for the study. Each researcher in the project was asked to distribute the survey to the employed individuals. The survey included a cover letter/consent form that informed participants about the purpose of the study. Participants were asked to complete the survey as a part of a study on job experiences and attitudes. Participation to the study was strictly voluntary and participants were informed that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. A total of (130) surveys were distributed and (107) of them were returned representing a response rate of (75) percent.

**2.2. Instrumentation**

Job engagement was measured by Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) used by Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma and Bakker (2002). The UWES is an 18-item scale measuring job engagement of employees of different organizations. Job satisfaction of sport facility employees was measured by a widely used measure of job satisfaction developed by Borzaga and Tortia (2006) including 9 items. The survey of the study included measures of job engagement and job satisfaction by 27 items. The 27 items scale was designed to assess participants’ psychological presence in their job and organization. Some sample items for “Job Engagement” are (“I work with high intensity on my job”, “I am excited about my job”, “At work I focus a great deal of attention on my job”). And a sample item for “Job Satisfaction” is (“I feel good about working at this company”). Participants indicated their response on a five-point Likert-type scale with anchors (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree.

**III. Findings And Results**

Data were collected on 107 sport facility employers, 49 men (45.8%) and 58 (54.2%) women ranging in age from 18 to 45 years old. Also the respondents of the research comprised of fitness and other branches’ trainers (35.5%), facility managers (2.8%), salespeople (14%), cleaning staff (28%) etc. (See Table 1).

**Table 1.** Characteristics of the Participants

<b>Item</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<i>Gender</i>	Male	49	45.8
	Female	58	54.2
<i>Position</i>	Trainer	38	35.5
	Manager	3	2.8
	Salesman	15	14.0
	Customer representative	8	7.5
	Technician	3	2.8
	Cleaning staff	28	26.2
	Receptionist	7	6.5
	Accountant	5	4.7
<i>Educational Status</i>	Primary	17	15.9
	High School	22	20.6
	University	68	63.6
<i>Age</i>	18-25	30	28.0
	26-35	60	56.1
	36-45	17	15.9
<i>Average Household Income</i>	0 – 333 USD	41	38.3
	334 – 666 USD	48	44.9
	667 – 999 USD	16	15.0
	1000 < USD	2	1.9
<b>N= 107</b>			

After conducting factor analysis to explain sport facility employees job engagement and job satisfaction dimensions, the AFA indicated that job engagement was best represented as a higher-order factor with three lower-order dimensions of physical, emotional, and cognitive (See Table 2). Also, the results of the study showed that constructs about job satisfaction could be conceptualized and measured as a two-dimensional construct comprising psychological and relational satisfaction (See Table 4).

As suggested by Hair et al. (1995) three factors of job engagement and two factors of job satisfaction were identified for the factor analysis using the eigenvalue criteria that suggest extracting factors with an eigenvalue of greater than 1.0. After applying factor analysis to the data, the researchers followed the rotated factor matrix. The three factors of job engagement explained 67.03 percent of the total variance (emotional engagement: 25.35%, cognitive engagement: 23.61%, physical engagement: 18.07%). To apply factor analysis related to job engagement, it was necessary to test the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (Zhang et al., 2003). KMO was used to measure the sampling adequacy which should be greater than

0.5 for a satisfactory factor analysis to proceed, with KMO index  $\leq 0.5$  indicating that the correlation matrix is not suitable for factor analysis (Arthur et al., 2008). For the job engagement variables, KMO was 0.74, indicating that the sample was adequate for factor analysis (Kaiser, 1974). Bartlett's test is a measure of the multivariate normality of a set of distributions. A significant value indicates that a set of data do not produce an identity matrix and is thus approximately multivariate normal and acceptable for factor analysis (Arthur et al., 2008). In sample of the study, The Bartlett Test for Sphericity (BTS) was 863.896 ( $p < .001$ ), indicating that the hypothesis variance and covariance matrix of variables as an identity matrix were rejected; therefore, factor analysis was appropriate.

**Table 2** Constructs and Items of Job Engagement

Variables	1	2	3
<i>Emotional Engagement (6 items)</i>			
EEN1 I am proud of my job	,850		
EEN2 I am excited about my job	,762		
EEN3 I feel energetic at my job	,745		
EEN4 I am enthusiastic in my job	,745		
EEN5 I feel positive about my job	,706		
EEN6 I am interested in my job	,640		
<i>Cognitive Engagement (5 items)</i>			
CEN1 At work I pay a lot of attention to my job		,868	
CEN2 I devote a lot of attention to my job		,794	
CEN3 At work I am concentrated on my job		,766	
CEN4 At work my mind is focused on my job		,699	
CEN5 At work I am absorbed by my job		,666	
<i>Physical Engagement (3 items)</i>			
PEN1 I exert my full effort to my job			,929
PEN2 I devote a lot of energy to my job			,891
PEN3 I work with intensity on my job			,717
<i>(1= Strongly Disagree, 5= Strongly Agree)</i>			
<b>Internal consistency of the scale (14 items)</b>		<b>0.84</b>	

**Table 3** Reliability of the Constructs

Variables	Construct Reliability
<i>Emotional Engagement</i>	0.84
<i>Cognitive Engagement</i>	0.84
<i>Physical Engagement</i>	0.85
<b>Total Scale Reliability (Alpha)</b>	<b>0.84</b>

As can be seen on Table 1. the identified three factors were named 'emotional engagement', 'cognitive engagement' and 'physical engagement'. The coefficient alpha was measured to calculate the internal consistency of the data and assess the quality of the instruments (Hopkinson & Pujari, 1999). The total of scale reliability was 0.84 (see Table 3), thus the dimensions had high coefficient scores greater than the exhorted level of 0.70 (Kim et al., 2003; Nunnally, 1978).

In order to develop factors that help explaining the sport facility employees' job satisfaction perceptions, factor analysis also conducted to job satisfaction items. The two revealed factors were termed 'psychological satisfaction' and 'relational satisfaction' and explained 59.68 percent of the total variance (psychological satisfaction: 29.97%, relational satisfaction: 29.70%). The extraction method used for principal factor analysis factoring with Varimax rotation. This method has been accepted widely as a reliable method for factor analysis and used in many studies (for example, Karjaluoto et al., 2002). In the current study KMO measure of sampling adequacy score was 0.71 and the Bartlett Test for Sphericity (BTS) was 269.220 ( $p < .001$ ).

**Table 4** Constructs and Items of Job Satisfaction

Variables	1	2
<i>Psychological Satisfaction (4 items)</i>		
PSS1 I feel secure about my job	,776	
PSS2 My wages are good	,771	
PSS3 I believe work is good for my physical health	,746	
PSS4 I feel good about working at this company	,622	
<i>Relational Satisfaction (4 items)</i>		
RES1 I feel close to at people at work		,797
RES2 I get along with my supervisors feel good about my job		,786
RES3 I receive recognition for a job well done		,640
RES4 I believe management is concerned about me		,555
<i>(1= Strongly Disagree, 5= Strongly Agree)</i>		
<b>Internal consistency of the scale (8 items)</b>		<b>0.77</b>

**Table 5** Reliability of the Constructs

Variables	Construct Reliability
<i>Psychological Satisfaction</i>	0.75
<i>Relational Satisfaction</i>	0.70
<b><i>Total Scale Reliability (Alpha)</i></b>	<b>0.77</b>

The two constructs met the criterion that a factor loading should be equal to or greater than 0.40. The Cronbach alpha's were greater than 0.70 and the total of scale reliability was 0.77. Both dimensions had high coefficient scores greater than the exhorted level of 0.70 (Kim et al., 2003; Nunnally, 1978) (Table 5).

#### **IV. Conclusion And Implications**

There has been a great deal of interest in job engagement and job satisfaction for a long time especially among practitioners and consultants. As the literature says job engagement and job satisfaction distinguish each other. While job engagement addresses feelings about the future, job satisfaction addresses past and present situations. On the one hand, job engagement is hypothesized to be positively related to job satisfaction and they are empirically related to each other, on the other hand they are different concepts (Rich, 2006). There have been many studies about those concepts. For example, according to Saks (2006) job satisfaction is a consequence of job engagement.

The purpose of the study was to identify the dimensions related to job engagement and job satisfaction of sport facility employees. First the study aimed to determine the dimensions of job engagement. The current literature focuses on three dimensions of job engagement in different areas. Rich (2006) administered the scale to a convenience sample of 117 working students enrolled in a senior level business class at a large southeastern university. Another sample used in the same study was comprised of 180 employees of an assisted-living health care facility. In the study there used to be three dimensions in line with the current research "physical, emotional and cognitive engagement". Schaufeli et al. (2001) hypothesized the relations with job engagement and job burnout in a sample of university students (N = 314). The factors were negatively related each other. Rich et al. (2010) stated that job engagement plays an important role on job performance. The sample of the study was 245 firefighters and their supervisors. The researchers stated before and many more evaluating job engagement in three dimensions in parallel with the current study. So it can be said that job engagement could be conceptualized in three dimensions including "physical, emotional and cognitive" in line with other organizations.

Finally, the researchers analyzed job satisfaction items to explain the dimensions related to sport facility employees and results of the statistical analysis indicate that job satisfaction could be identified by two factors "psychological and relational satisfaction". In the literature, since the job satisfaction scale was developed it is evaluated as a one-factor construct (Macdonald and MacIntyre, 1997; Borzaga and Tortia, 2006; Rich, 2006). The literature expresses engaged employees are also satisfied by their jobs (Saks, 2006; Rich, 2006). As stated, satisfied employees means satisfied customers. Satisfied customers means, new registrations, re-registrations, licensed merchandise consumption, free word of mouth promotions etc. for sport facilities. Thus, sport facility managers should care about their employees' engagement and satisfaction about their jobs and shape their management strategies in this manner.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The results of the study should be considered in the light of its limitations. The present study focused specifically on a limited number of employees and was limited to those who work in four sport facilities in a Turkish city. Furthermore, the focus on sport facility employees places the study in a particular context. Another limitation is the time. Because of the limited time the researchers could be able to include four sport facilities in to the study. Consequently, the results may not adequately represent the total population of sport facility employees in Turkey. The results may differ if other organizations or different regions are studied. Future researches could include a broader range about job engagement and job satisfaction.

#### **Acknowledgements**

The present study was submitted as an oral presentation at 2016 International Business Research Conference, Tokyo, Japan, December 15-16, 2016.

#### **References**

- [1] Rich, B. L. (2006). *Job Engagement: Construct validation and relationships with job satisfaction, job involvement, and intrinsic motivation*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida.
- [2] Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach, *Journal of Happiness Studies*, (3), 71-92.

- [3] Storm, K. and Rothmann, S. (2003). A psychometric analysis of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale in the South African Police Service, *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29 (4), 62-70.
- [4] Macdonald, S. and MacIntyre, P. (1997). The generic job satisfaction scale: Scale development and Its Correlates, *Employee Assistance Quarterly*, 13(2), 1-16.
- [5] Wefald, A. J. and Downey, R. G. (2009). Job engagement in organizations: fad, fashion, or folderol?, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 141-145.
- [6] Roberts, D. R. and Davenport, T. O. (2002). Job engagement: Why it's important and how to improve it, *Published online at Wiley Interscience*, 21-29
- [7] Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-624.
- [8] Buckingham, M. and Coffman, C. (1999). *First, Break All the Rules*, Simon and Schuster, New York.
- [9] Luthans, F. and Peterson, S. J. (2002). Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy, Implications for managerial effectiveness and development, *Journal of Management and Development*, 21(5).
- [10] Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- [11] Borzaga, C., Tortia, E. (2006). Worker motivations, job satisfaction, and loyalty in public and nonprofit social services, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, (35), 225-248.
- [12] Locke, E. A. (1976). *The nature and causes of job satisfaction*, In M.D. Donnette (ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 60, 159-170.
- [13] Balzer, W. K., Smith, P. C., Kravitz, D. A., Lovell, S. E., Paul, K. B., Reilly, B. A., & Reilly, C. E. (1990). *User's manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) scales*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University, Department of Psychology.
- [14] Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E. and Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 376-407.
- [15] Parks, J. B. and Parra, L. F. (1994). Job Satisfaction of Sport Management Alumnae, *Journal of Sport Management*, (8), 49-56.
- [16] Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. J., Stone, E. F. (1992) *Job satisfaction: how people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*, Lexington Press, NY
- [17] Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences, *Human Resource Management Review*, (12), 173-194.
- [18] Hulin, C. L. (2002). *Lessons from Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, The Psychology of Work, Theoretically Based Empirical Research, Lea's Organization Management Series, NJ.
- [19] Zhang, J.J., Pennington, G.L., Connaughton, D.P., Braunstein, J.R., Ellis, M. H., Lam, E. T. C., and Williamson, D. (2003). Understanding women's professional football game spectators: sociodemographics, game consumption, and entertainment options. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 12 (4), 228-243.
- [20] Kaiser, H. F. (1974). Index of factorial simplicity, *Psychometrika*, 23, 31-36.
- [21] Arthur, D., Tong, W.L., Chen, C.P., Hing, A.Y., Sagara-Rosemeyer, M., Kua, E.H., &
- [22] Ignacio, J. (2008). The validity and reliability of four measures of gambling behaviour in a sample of Singapore university students. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 24, 451-462.
- [23] Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E. and Tatham, R. L. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis (4th ed.)*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- [24] Hopkinson, G.C., & Pujari, D. (1999). A factor analytic study of the sources of meaning in hedonic consumption. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33, 273-290.
- [25] Kim, S. S., Lee, C.K., & Klenosky, D. B. (2003). The influences push and pull factors at Korean national parks. *Tourism Management*, 24, 169-180.
- [26] Nunnally, J. C. (1978) *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd ed. McGraw-Hall, New York..
- [27] Karjaluo, H., Mattila, M. and Pentto, T. (2002). Factors underlying attitude formation towards online banking in Finland, *The International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 20(6), 261

Huseyin KOSE. "Explaining Job Engagement & Job Satisfaction Dimensions related to Sport Facility Employees ." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, vol. 19, no. 10, 2017, pp. 35-40.