

1995

## An Investigation Into Job Redesign Factors for the Creation of a Job Enrichment Plan

David Allen Whitmer  
*University of Northern Iowa*

*Let us know how access to this document benefits you*

Copyright ©1995 David Allen Whitmer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>

---

### Recommended Citation

Whitmer, David Allen, "An Investigation Into Job Redesign Factors for the Creation of a Job Enrichment Plan" (1995). *Graduate Research Papers*. 3849.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/3849>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@uni.edu](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

**Offensive Materials Statement:** Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

---

# An Investigation Into Job Redesign Factors for the Creation of a Job Enrichment Plan

## Abstract

Often, as organizations deal with issues affecting motivation, productivity and the challenges faced by the changing work force, focus is directed at the worker and not the job. Too many managers and supervisors believe that the technology or the task to be accomplished mandates the design of a job, thus making the job design fixed. Job enrichment is a process that can provide an opportunity to empower employees in their work by providing them the opportunity to perform complete tasks, rather than oversimplified tasks developed through specialization of labor. Job enrichment is a specific form of job redesign and is defined as the change in the content and level of responsibility of a job to provide greater challenge to the worker by providing a vertical expansion of responsibilities.

The problem of this study was to determine the steps necessary to implement a job enrichment process. Through a synthesis of the various resources, the following steps were compiled for implementing a job enrichment process: (1) Obtain management support and commitment, (2) Determine if managers want or will allow job enrichment, (3) Review employee job descriptions for terms or phrases that describe tasks being performed in pieces, (4) Conduct employee interviews to determine if workers want job enrichment, (5) Have employees respond to a job analysis questionnaire as a means for employees to describe their job, (6) Mutually explore tasks that are currently structured so employees cannot perform the complete job, (7) Identify training needed, (8) Provide feedback to employees, (9) Adjust any job description wording that contradicts job enrichment results, and (10) Monitor the process. A list of important aspects and issues about the process are also presented to help reduce problems that may arise in the implementation process.

The presented job enrichment plan provides guidelines for managers who want to empower employees in their work by providing them the opportunity to perform complete tasks. Job enrichment offers a sense of meaning to work because employees can identify how they contribute to and impact the whole system. Job enrichment is a motivational approach to improving productivity by promoting dignity as workers are given responsibility and authority to control their work.

AN INVESTIGATION INTO JOB REDESIGN FACTORS  
FOR THE CREATION OF A JOB ENRICHMENT PLAN

A Research Paper for Presentation  
to the Graduate Faculty  
of the Department of Industrial  
Technology  
University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Non-Thesis Master of Arts Degree

by  
David Allen Whitmer  
December 1995

Approved by:

Michael R. White, Ph.D. (Advisor)

11-9-95  
Date

Ahmed H. ElSawy, Ph.D. (Course Professor)

11-28-95  
Date

## ABSTRACT

Often, as organizations deal with issues affecting motivation, productivity and the challenges faced by the changing work force, focus is directed at the worker and not the job. Too many managers and supervisors believe that the technology or the task to be accomplished mandates the design of a job, thus making the job design fixed. Job enrichment is a process that can provide an opportunity to empower employees in their work by providing them the opportunity to perform complete tasks, rather than oversimplified tasks developed through specialization of labor. Job enrichment is a specific form of job redesign and is defined as the change in the content and level of responsibility of a job to provide greater challenge to the worker by providing a vertical expansion of responsibilities.

The problem of this study was to determine the steps necessary to implement a job enrichment process. Through a synthesis of the various resources, the following steps were compiled for implementing a job enrichment process: (1) Obtain management support and commitment, (2) Determine if managers want or will allow job enrichment, (3) Review employee job descriptions for terms or phrases that describe tasks being performed in pieces, (4) Conduct employee interviews to determine if workers want job enrichment, (5) Have employees respond to a job analysis questionnaire as a means for employees to describe their job, (6) Mutually explore tasks that are currently structured so employees cannot perform the complete job, (7) Identify training needed, (8) Provide

feedback to employees, (9) Adjust any job description wording that contradicts job enrichment results, and (10) Monitor the process. A list of important aspects and issues about the process are also presented to help reduce problems that may arise in the implementation process.

The presented job enrichment plan provides guidelines for managers who want to empower employees in their work by providing them the opportunity to perform complete tasks. Job enrichment offers a sense of meaning to work because employees can identify how they contribute to and impact the whole system. Job enrichment is a motivational approach to improving productivity by promoting dignity as workers are given responsibility and authority to control their work.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES.....	ii
CHAPTER	
I    INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Statement of Purpose.....	4
Statement of Need.....	5
Statement of Research Question.....	8
II   METHOD.....	9
Procedure.....	9
Review of Related Literature.....	9
III  RESULTS.....	14
Findings.....	14
Conclusion.....	23
REFERENCES.....	24

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	Page
1. Principles of Job Enrichment.....	10
2. Explanation of the Job Characteristics of Enriched Jobs....	11
3. Job Enrichment Implementation Steps.....	14
4. Issues To Consider To Reduce Problems in the Job Enrichment Process.....	19

## INTRODUCTION

Often, as organizations deal with issues affecting motivation, productivity and the challenges faced by the changing work force, focus is directed at the worker and not the job (Dowless, 1992). Too many managers and supervisors believe that the technology or the task to be accomplished mandates the design of a job, thus making the job design fixed (Campion & Thayer, 1989).

One major factor that has affected how managers view job design is specialization of labor or division of labor. The definition of specialization of labor is "the division of a complex job into simpler tasks so that one person or group may carry out only identical or related activities" (Mondy, Sharplin and Premeaux, 1991, p. 203). One of the first industrialized accounts of specialization of labor was cited in "An Inquiry into the Nature and Cause of the Wealth of Nations" by Adam Smith in 1776. Smith described the productivity increase of a pin manufacturer after the division of labor was utilized by separating the pin making into 18 different operations (Mondy, et al., 1991).

Frederick W. Taylor advanced the notion of specialization of labor at the beginning of the twentieth century. Although his main objectives were efficiency and employee performance reward, today his principles are often misinterpreted as dehumanizing considerations of work design (Weisbord, 1987). Regardless, Taylor's legacy of studying jobs is an emphasis on structuring jobs so they can be reduced to simple, easily learned, repetitive tasks so a job can be performed quickly and efficiently (Ivancevich, 1992).



Mondy, et al. (1991), gave advantages of specialization of labor which included: (1) increased productivity because employees can focus on a few tasks and achieve a high level of output, (2) lengthened span of management because specialization allows managers to supervise more workers, (3) decreased training time because with fewer details, a specialized job can be learned more quickly, and (4) consistently higher quality goods because if employees do one thing (specialize), they should become good at it. Also, Colclough and Tolbert (1992) assert that specialization of labor results in "a deskilled work force that can be paid low wages and is easily replaceable" (p. 29).

Although the advantages of specialization of labor would seem to warrant its implementation, research into this job design effort has found that employees, especially more educated workers, become dissatisfied with repetitive, highly specialized work (Bassett, 1994; Ivancevich, 1992). Specifically, this dissatisfaction of over-simplified work leads to boredom and fatigue resulting in "a high level of employee turnover and absenteeism and a deteriorating quality of output" (Mondy, et al., 1991, p. 204).

Another disadvantage to specialization of labor -- and a problem Taylor experienced as he applied his practices to the steel industry -- is that narrow jobs require a large number of employees in order to accomplish the complete task (Weisbord, 1987). Specialization of labor results in more employees to perform the total work because tasks are so specialized and so narrowly defined that one worker only accomplishes a small portion of the whole job. Although presented as a positive and desirable attribute of the division of labor because of its social rather than personal relevance, Karl Marx

(Wallimann, 1981) also noted that the division of labor would increase the number of workers in a shop.

Lastly, Colclough and Tolbert (1992) assert that specialization of labor hinders an employee's ability to change and adapt to new products and procedures. Colclough and Tolbert (1992) indicate research suggests high-tech industries such as plastics and chemicals employ continuous improvement efforts that raise employee skill levels rather than lowering them. In regards to how this job design practice affects productivity, Colclough and Tolbert (1992) state,

Productivity is largely conceived in terms of individual performance, and time and motion studies - a hallmark of Taylorism - are used to measure productivity. Hodson states, "This treatment of productivity suggests that labor was seen as an interchangeable component of production rather than as a uniquely human entity in need of being motivated to do quality work." (p. 35)

### Statement of the Problem

To motivate and retain good people, a manager must provide a challenging environment in which people can develop (Caudron, 1994). However, the design of a job can hinder employee productivity and growth. Work design, rooted in specialization of labor practices, focuses on tasks, not the worker, and causes jobs to be structured in such a way that employees are only given pieces of tasks instead of being allowed to perform complete projects (Parks, 1995). As a result, the employees do not experience meaning in their work and do not feel dignified in their positions (Weisbord, 1987). Moreover, when jobs are broken down into small units, feedback to the employee about the process is

usually nonexistent (Lavy, 1994). A job redesign process that can overcome narrow and unfulfilling jobs is job enrichment.

Job enrichment provides an opportunity to empower employees in their work by providing them the opportunity to perform complete tasks, rather than oversimplified tasks developed through specialization of labor. Job enrichment is cited in several works (Campion & Thayer, 1989; Cunningham & Eberle, 1990; Ivancevich, 1992; Kanin-Lovers, 1990; Mandell, 1989; Mondy et al., 1991; Thornhill, 1994) as a process that can be employed to promote employee growth and productivity to meet the business challenges of the next century. The problem of this study was to determine the steps necessary to implement a job enrichment process as a means to improve employee motivation and productivity.

### Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate and assemble the appropriate steps needed to implement job enrichment. Job enrichment is a specific form of job redesign and is recognized as a change in the content and level of responsibility of a job to provide greater challenge to the worker by providing a vertical expansion of responsibilities (Mondy et al., 1991). Frederick Herzberg's Two Factor Theory is cited in many works (Brackett, 1992; Cunningham & Eberle, 1990; Ivancevich, 1992; Mondy et al., 1991; Thornhill, 1994) as being the foundation upon which job enrichment is based. Herzberg's

Two Factor Theory identifies two classes of factors affecting job behavior: hygiene factors and motivators (Herzberg, 1968).

Herzberg's hygiene factors, sometimes called "dissatisfiers" or "non-motivators", are extrinsic factors that include things such as company policy, rules and procedures, salary, work conditions and interpersonal relations with supervisors (Brackett, 1992, p. 10). These factors can only dissatisfy employees, not motivate them. The motivators Herzberg suggests are intrinsic factors that include chances for responsibility, growth, the work itself, achievement and recognition (Brackett, 1992). As stated by Cunningham and Eberle (1990, p. 57), "According to Herzberg, motivating employees is entirely different from reducing job dissatisfaction. Reducing job dissatisfaction will not increase motivation but merely reduce the level of employee's dissatisfaction." Thus, the goal of job enrichment is to bring about an effective utilization of the personnel in an organization by motivating these employees through motivator factors used in enriching their jobs.

### Statement of Need

The job enrichment process provides meaning to the job by truly attempting to meet employees' needs for responsibility, growth and recognition. As a result, according to Mandell (1989, p. 49), "higher job satisfaction will lead to increased productivity." Job enrichment offers organizations that want to empower employees in their work an opportunity to increase productivity by providing the employees the opportunity to

perform complete tasks (Ivancevich, 1992). Job enrichment offers a sense of meaning to work because employees can identify how they contribute to and impact the whole system (Herzberg, 1968).

In support of the assumption that employees want responsibility, growth and recognition opportunities, Kovach (cited in Morris, 1995) found that surveyed employees ranked “interesting work” as the reward that most motivated them. Conversely, when Kovach surveyed supervisors as to what they thought motivated their workers, the number one response was “good wages,” while “interesting work” was ranked fifth. Also in another survey, Schwartz (cited in Morris, 1994) reported that people rated lack of career growth potential as the number one reason for a job change.

As corporations journey into the next century, some of the main issues affecting them are labor shortages, changing composition of the work force, skill shortages and corporate restructuring (McFarland, Senn, & Childress, 1994). To address these issues, companies are faced with a need to create flatter organizations and to empower and motivate employees and enrich their positions (McFarland et al., 1994; Moravec & Tucker, 1992; Wellins, Byham & Dixon, 1995). At the same time, businesses, to be successful and viable, must remain committed to controlling costs while being more productive.

Also, many companies are realizing that one of the critical factors in their organization is their technology base. Ownership and control of technology has become a dominating factor in today's marketplace. Leibowitz, Farren and Kaye (1986, p. 30) state,

"organizations are faced with the challenge to motivate, retain, and enhance the productivity of their technical employees." If these workers are not recognized as vital to the organization and provided with additional opportunities, the probability of high turnover and reduced output becomes great. Also, according to Sonnenfeld and Ingols (1988, p. 94), "Technically driven organizations, which depend on a fine division of labor and machine pacing, often create tedious, repetitive jobs with no future, although the pay rate for such jobs in the United States is far above the pay rate of foreign competitors."

In consideration of technical professionals, motivating and retaining these employees can directly enhance the company by securing its technology base. According to Shapero (1985), the management of professionals has become the most critical area faced by today's companies. In reference to this assertion, French (1987) provides four reasons why the topic of managing scientists, engineers and other technical professionals has become important. These are (1) intensified competition, (2) rapidly changing technology, (3) work force composition, and (4) unique nature of technical professional jobs. In relation to the unique nature of technical jobs, when compared to non-technical positions, French (1987, p. 401) states, "responsibilities and standards of performance relating to engineering and scientific positions are less readily established, performance is less readily measured, relative job worth is not so easily determined, and a rationale for promotion is not so easily developed." Thus, when considering the impact the technologist has on today's highly competitive organizations combined with the critical nature of managing these employees, it is essential that organizations and managements

best use these workers in order to maximize results and growth for these professionals and for the business.

### Statement of the Research Question

Herzberg's Two Factor Theory suggests that job enrichment is a motivational approach for attempting to improve productivity by giving workers responsibility and authority to control their work. The question of this research was “what are the steps necessary to implement a job enrichment process for creating a motivating climate for workers?” Also, a second and equally important question was “what are the issues the job enrichment implementor must be aware of in order to reduce problems in the process’ implementation and maintenance?”

## METHOD

### Procedure

An in-depth literature review was conducted on the topic of job enrichment with particular interest in this job redesign process. This literature search was delimited to literature available at the University of Northern Iowa library and its resources which included, but was not limited to, LEXUS/NEXUS and inter-library loan.

From a synthesis of the various theories, opinions and studies concerning job enrichment, the researcher has presented a job enrichment process outlining the steps necessary for implementation of the plan for enriching workers' positions. Also presented are important aspects and issues about the process that must be considered and addressed to avoid problems that could arise during the implementation of a job enrichment plan.

### Review of Related Literature

Herzberg (1966) suggested that motivators -- achievement, recognition, responsibility, the work itself, and growth -- are key components to job satisfaction. In his own article describing job enrichment, Herzberg (1968) exhibits seven "principles" of job enrichment (sometimes referred to by Herzberg as "vertical job loading") and the motivators involved with each principle, which are listed in Figure 1.



<u>PRINCIPLE</u>	<u>MOTIVATORS INVOLVED</u>
A. Remove some controls while retaining accountability.	Responsibility and personal achievement.
B. Increase the accountability of individuals for their own work.	Responsibility and recognition.
C. Give a person a complete and natural unit of work (module, division, area, etc.).	Responsibility, achievement, and recognition.
D. Granting additional authority to an employee in his activity; job freedom.	Responsibility, achievement, and recognition.
E. Making periodic reports directly available to the worker himself rather than to the supervisor.	Internal recognition.
F. Introducing new and more difficult tasks not previously handled.	Growth and learning.
G. Assigning individuals specific or specialized tasks, enabling them to become experts.	Responsibility, growth, and advancement.

Figure 1. Principles of Job Enrichment.

Source: Herzberg, 1968, p. 59

In addressing the psychological factors of job enrichment, Shafer, Tepper, Meredith and Marsh (1995) state that

According to the job enrichment model, internally motivating or enriched work is associated with the experience of three critical psychological states: *meaningfulness*: the individual sees his/her work as worthwhile or meaningful, *responsibility*: the individual believes that he/she is accountable for the outcomes of his/her work, and *knowledge of results*: the individual can determine whether or not the outcomes of his/her work are satisfactory. (p. 65)

Also, Shafer et al. suggest that the three psychological states of meaningfulness, responsibility and knowledge of results are a result of specific job characteristics which are (1) variety, (2) identity, (3) significance, (4) autonomy, and (5) feedback (see Figure 2). Thus, the goal of job enrichment is to bring about an effective utilization of the personnel in an organization by motivating these employees through motivator factors used in enriching their jobs. According to Cunningham and Eberle (1990, p. 58), "The assumption is that intrinsically rewarding jobs will make employees more satisfied and productive."

- |                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| 1. Variety:      | Accomplishing the work requires a variety of activities involving different kinds of skills and talents. |
| 2. Identity:     | The job involves completing a "whole" or identifiable piece of work.                                     |
| 3. Significance: | The job has an important impact on others.   |
| 4. Autonomy:     | Degree to which the job involves freedom and independence in determining how the work is to be done.     |
| 5. Feedback:     | Performance information provided either by the job itself or other people.                               |

Figure 2: Explanation of the Job Characteristics of Enriched Jobs.  
Source: Shafer et al., 1995, p. 65

Paul, Robertson, and Herzberg (1969) conducted a study in which laboratory technicians working under scientists in an industrial research department underwent job enrichment. The primary job of these technicians was to perform experiments developed by the scientists, set up the testing apparatus, and record data. The laboratory technicians were professionally qualified people, but did not hold doctorate degrees as did the scientists. These technicians expressed frustration to management that their technical ability was being wasted by scientists' refusal to delegate anything but routine work.

The job enrichment action plan in the Paul et al. (1969) study concentrated on three main areas: technical, financial and managerial. In the technical area, the technicians were more involved in planning projects and experiments and were encouraged to write the final report on any research project they had performed. Financially, the technicians were authorized to requisition materials and equipment without scientists' consultation and could request additional analysis if they felt it necessary. Managerially, senior technicians were given the responsibility for developing training programs for junior technicians. The result of this job enrichment design was more control and contribution by the technicians. As a means of measuring the success or failure of the job enrichment plan, a group of managers scored the research reports, concentrating on eight different criteria. Not only did the findings show that the scores of the experimental group continued to increase over the control group, but also reports written by the technicians were often "judged to be as good as the best of the scientists' (reports)," (Paul et al., 1969, p. 65).

Following are the key guidelines (Mondy et al., 1991, p. 317) for developing a job enrichment process:

1. Increase the job vertically.

The job should be changed in such a way as to increase its level of difficulty and responsibility. Employees are given responsibilities that might have traditionally been part of a supervisor's job.

2. Increase the worker's accountability.

More individual control and authority over the work should be allowed.

3. Provide work scheduling freedom.

Within limits, the individual workers should be allowed to schedule their own work.

4. Provide feedback.

Timely periodic reports on performance should be made directly to the workers.

5. Provide new learning experiences.

Work situations should encourage opportunities for new experiences and personal growth.

## RESULTS

### Findings

Through a synthesis of the various resources, the steps in Figure 3 are proposed for introducing and implementing a job enrichment process.

1. Obtain management, especially top management, support and commitment.
2. Determine if the manager wants or will allow job enrichment.
3. Review employee job descriptions for terms or phrases that describe tasks being performed in pieces (i.e. "assists" or "helps").
4. Conduct employee interviews to determine if workers want job enrichment.
5. Have employees respond to a type of job analysis or job information questionnaire as a means for employees to describe their job.
6. Mutually explore tasks that are currently structured so employees cannot perform the complete job.
7. Identify training needed to accomplish complete task and set training schedules.
8. Provide feedback to employees.
9. Adjust any job description wording that contradicts job enrichment results.
10. Monitor the process.

### Figure 3: Job Enrichment Implementation Steps

Although no step-by-step approach is applicable in all situations, the following steps provide a guide for most any job enrichment process. However, it is important that the process be right for the organization (Walima, 1975).

Step 1: Obtain management, especially top management, support and commitment (Lawler, Mohrman, & Ledford, 1992; Walima, 1975). Changes within the organization must be supported or else detrimental problems will occur. A key approach in obtaining management support is by an expression of the organization's needs and then

a presentation of the benefits the job enrichment can bring to the organization. Ask upper management for their support or for an agreement that they will not interfere with the process (Walima, 1975).

Step 2: Determine if the manager wants or will allow job enrichment (Shelton, 1995). Although the design of a job can indeed limit the productivity of workers, it is often a symptom of a more serious problem - manager power and the need to exercise control over workers and their jobs. Proposing a job enrichment process to a manager that has not come to this realization will stop the improvement effort in its tracks.

Step 3: Review employee job descriptions for terms or phrases that describe tasks being performed in pieces. How a job description was written can itself limit a job. Whether conscious or unconscious, the manner in which a manager designs a position can pigeonhole employees in unfulfilling jobs. A powerful way to uncover this restrictive nature is examination of the job description for limiting terms and phrases such as "assists" or "helps".

Step 4: Conduct employee interviews to determine if workers want job enrichment (Cunningham & Eberle, 1990; Mandell, 1989). It cannot be assumed that all workers want job enrichment (Bassett, 1994). Not all employees in a work group will view their job in the same way. Even with only two workers, each may have his or her own set of needs and wants. It is important to assess if the employees possess the proper needs structure for the job enrichment process (Lawler, 1986). Hackman and Oldham (cited in Shafer et al., 1995) state

...that individuals with stronger growth needs (i.e., the need for intrinsically stimulating work) respond more favorably to enriched work. In contrast, workers with lower growth need strength “view their jobs as secondary sources of need satisfaction, and simply do not desire to work in jobs that feature high levels of challenge and responsibility.” (p. 65)

Fundamental questions to ask employees include: “What is your willingness to assume more challenging assignments in your position?”, “What interest do you have in learning new skills?”, and “What is your willingness to have more responsibility in your job?”.

Step 5: For those employees interested in enriching their job, have them respond to a type of job analysis or job information questionnaire as a means for the employees to describe their job. The use of questionnaires is a common method of data collection used in job analysis (Henderson, 1989) to obtain an outline and summary of how employees feel about their work. The questionnaire assists the workers in organizing their thoughts about the job and provides a reference guide for the manager later in the job enrichment process.

Step 6: Mutually explore tasks that are currently structured so employees cannot perform the complete job. The goal is an exploration to make the work interesting and meaningful for the employee (Pollock, 1995). A good place to start is with any elements of the job description identified in Step 3 that limits employees in their positions.

Through this mutual exploration, it is important to remember that the key element in job enrichment is to vertically increase the job. Tasks and responsibilities of the

supervisor need to be explored, especially those functions that would give employees more control over their own work.

Another important consideration in the job redesign is to eliminate nonessential and unnecessary work so that more time and energy can be used for the enriching job activities (Denton, 1994; Dowless, 1992; Orpen, 1979; Noer, 1993). Many tasks are wasteful and consume precious organizational resources, while other work practices create productivity bottlenecks. As organizations are faced with doing more with fewer people, the elimination of unnecessary and trivial work is paramount.

Yet another way to set up the job enrichment design is to consider how the employee's job can be like a small business within the large business (Pollock, 1995). Autonomy and independence are effective job motivators for enriching the job. As jobs are redesigned to allow employees to perform complete tasks, these motivators are achieved.

Step 7: Identify training needed to accomplish complete task and set training schedules. Enriched job situations should encourage opportunities for new learning and personal growth (Kaye & Leibowitz, 1994; Pollock, 1995). The true goal of worker education is to obtain organizational development (Sonnenfeld & Ingols, 1988).

Step 8: Provide feedback to employees. Employees want to know how they are doing in a job and managers must share that information with them (Blanchard, 1994). Although one principle of the job enrichment process is to design work that allows workers to perform whole and complete tasks, employees must not be abandoned in their



work -- which is neither enriching nor empowering (Muglia, 1992). As job enrichment is a motivational approach for attempting to increase productivity, feedback will motivate employees through understanding and knowing how they are doing in their new responsibilities. As stated by Paul, Robertson and Herzberg (1969, p. 77), "The main consequence (of job enrichment) is that management becomes a service, its purpose to enable, encourage, assist, and reinforce achievement by employees."

Step 9: Adjust any job description wording that contradicts job enrichment results (Cunningham & Eberle, 1990). As jobs become enriched, some areas of the job description, especially those areas that in the past had limited employees in their positions, must be changed to reflect the new and greater responsibilities of these employees.

Step 10: Monitor the process (Walima, 1975). Job enrichment is not an event but a process. Constant evaluation of the job and duties must take place to ensure the tasks are still enriching or else the job will become stale. Continuous improvement is necessary for the job enrichment process to be successful.

When implementing the job enrichment plan, important aspects and issues about the process must be considered and addressed to reduce problems that may arise (see Figure 4).

1. Expect resentment from supervisors.
2. Job enrichment intentions must be communicated.
3. Prepare for employee opposition and skepticism.
4. Avoid over-enriching the job.
5. Consider the job classification system.
6. Very little application in a union environment.
7. Recognize the organization will need to change.
8. Stay committed to the job enrichment process.

**Figure 4:** Issues To Consider To Reduce Problems in the Job Enrichment Process.

1. Expect supervisors, especially first-line supervisors, to experience resentment, anxiety and even hostility concerning job enrichment changes (Herzberg, 1968; Lawler, 1986). As employees are given duties that had traditionally been the supervisor's, the supervisors may express negative feelings about the power they must relinquish and experience fear concerning their role in the organization and their job security. Education and information must be provided to these supervisors to reduce their anxiety and to identify their roles and responsibilities after the job enrichment process has taken place.

Also, it is important to stress that shared leadership is critical to organizational growth. As stated by Beatty and Ulrich (1991, p. 324), "Individuals become leaders by having influence and control over the factors that affect their work performance."

2. The job enrichment implementer's intentions must be communicated to employees when initiating the process. Communication is the key to successful implementation and employee concerns and questions must be addressed and answered.

Employee awareness is a must so anxiety and fear are removed before problems arise that will hamper or even kill the implementation (not to mention the participation) process.

3. Prepare for employee opposition and skepticism. It is the implementer's plan, not the employees'. A risk of even a well designed plan is its vulnerability to employee fear and anxiety of change (Bassett, 1994). Human nature is to react to changes in the environment. Again, effective communication is the key to successful implementation.

Also, if employees have experienced many short lived programs, skepticism will be high. Assurance needs to be given to the employees that the job enrichment process is not a flavor-of-the-month program.

4. Over-enriching a job can increase the mental demands of the worker and cause stress and even burnout (Campion & Thayer, 1989; Parks, 1995). An over-enriched job occurs when an employee has been given too many tasks to perform or the mental demands of the redesigned job are too great for the worker.

In some regards, over-enriching a job can have the same negative outcomes as job enlargement. Job enlargement is adding more tasks to a job to make it structurally larger by increasing the job horizontally (Herzberg, 1968). However, if the tasks being performed were already meaningless, then the job enlargement approach enlarges the meaninglessness of the job (Herzberg, 1968). Job enlargement or task enlargement also increases the chance of workers making more errors due to mental overload (Campion & McClelland, 1993).

Although increasing the difficulty of the job is one approach to enriching a job, the increased difficulty needs to be positive and not a source for the creation of harmful stress or fatigue. An over-enriched job can become a source of employee dissatisfaction, and thus stifle the motivational gain job enrichment attempts to provide (Bassett, 1994). Also, if jobs are over-enriched, it will be more difficult to staff these positions and training time will increase. Careful attention must take place when enriching jobs to create a balance between making the job more meaningful while keeping the enriched jobs attainable for employees. Mutual exploration and agreement between the supervisor and the employee about the enriched position is one key method of keeping the job attainable and realistic.

5. Realize that some techniques cannot be implemented without changing the job classification system (Cunningham & Eberle, 1990; Lawler, 1986). The design of job enrichment is to promote growth in the current position, not what can be done to get promoted. However, if not properly communicated to employees, job enrichment can cause employees to feel their new responsibilities justify higher wages (Bassett, 1994; Orpen, 1979). Although one can argue that all good works could lead to a promotion, job enrichment is for empowering workers in their present jobs.

6. Realize that job enrichment may not have a role for union employees (Bollmeier & Suojanen, 1975; Lawler et al., 1992). Typically, the contract between the company and the union employees specifies and defines the types of jobs and the duties and responsibilities of the workers. Unions may oppose the job redesign effort because

they perceive it as an attempt by management to squeeze more work out of the worker without increasing wages. Also, unions may view job enrichment as a threat to their power and position with workers.

7. Recognize the organization will need to change (Lawler, 1986; Lawler et al., 1992). Job enrichment is not a process that occurs in a vacuum. Other organizational systems may need to change or the job enrichment process will not be able to take root and flourish because it is being choked by the old structures of the organization. To help achieve this awareness, a discussion of how the job enrichment process will affect the organization needs to take place with top management as their support is being sought in Step 1 of the job enrichment implementation process.

8. Stay committed to the job enrichment process. If the organization is not willing to follow through and maintain the enriching process, then the leaders in the organization should never start (Burns, 1994). Otherwise, employee expectations are raised, only to be let down later.

Also realize that in the short term, satisfaction and productivity may decline as adjustments are made in the organization. Job enrichment is a long term, continuous improvement process for the employees and the organization and is not a quick fix gimmick (Lawler, et al., 1992; Walima, 1975). Stay committed by continuing to enrich and re-enrich jobs (Lawler, 1986).

## Conclusion

Often if a manager feels productivity in a workplace is low, the focus is usually directed at the worker and not the job. Too many managers and supervisors believe the technology or tasks to be accomplished mandates the design of a job, thus making the job design fixed (Campion & Thayer, 1989). However, jobs do not need to remain fixed. The presented job enrichment plan provides guidelines for managers who want to empower employees in their work by providing them the opportunity to perform complete tasks. As indicated by Muglia (1992, p.5), “successful businesses have leveraged their people power in addition to their technology and processes.” The job enrichment process provides this leverage through a vertical expansion of job responsibilities. Job enrichment offers a sense of meaning to work because employees can identify how they contribute to and impact the whole system. Job enrichment is a motivational approach to improving productivity by promoting dignity as workers are given responsibility and authority to control their work. As asserted by Lawler (1986, p. 100), “(job enrichment) can yield long-term improvements in productivity that result from having a more motivated, knowledgeable, and empowered work force.”

## REFERENCES

- Bassett, G. (1994, May). The case against job satisfaction; a satisfied worker is not necessarily a productive worker. Business Horizons, p. 61.
- Beatty, R. W., & Ulrich, D. O. (1994). Re-energizing the mature organization. In C. E. Schneier, C. J. Russel, R. W. Beatty, & L. S. Baird, (Eds.), The training and development sourcebook (2cd ed.) (pp. 319-330). Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.
- Blanchard, K. (1994, January). The changing role of managers. Quality Digest, p. 17.
- Bollmeier, W. S., Jr., & Suojanen, W. W. (1975). Job enrichment and organizational change. In Waino W. Suojanen, G. L. Swallow, M. J. McDonald, & W. William Suojanen (Eds.). Perspectives on job enrichment and productivity (pp. 31-47). Atlanta, GA: Georgia State University.
- Brackett, G. R. (1992, September). Classroom management: Application to human resources. Supervision, pp. 9-11.
- Burns, G. (1994, February). The trouble with empowerment. Quality Digest, p. 47-49.
- Campion, M. A., & McClelland, C. L. (1993). Follow-up and extension of the interdisciplinary costs and benefits of enlarged jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78(3), 339-351.
- Campion, M. A., & Thayer, P. W. (1989, January). How do you design a job? Personnel Journal, pp. 43-46.
- Caudron, S. (1994, April). HR revamps career itineraries. Personnel Journal, pp. 64B-64P.
- Cunningham, J. B., & Eberle, T. (1990, February). A guide to job enrichment and redesign. Personnel, pp. 56-61.
- Colclough, G., & Tolbert II, C. M. (1992). Work in the fast lane: Flexibility, divisions of labor, and inequality in high-tech industries. State University of New York.
- Denton, D. K. (1994, January-February). “!\*##@#! I hate this job!” Business Horizons, pp. 46-52.

- Dowless, R. (1992, February). Motivating salespeople: One order of empowerment, hold the carrots. Training, pp. 16, 73-74.
- French, W. L. (1987). The personnel management process: Human resources administration and development (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Henderson, R. I. (1989). Compensation management: Rewarding performance. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. New York: World.
- Herzberg, F. (1968, January-February). One more time: How do you motivate employees? Harvard Business Review, pp. 52-62.
- Ivancevich, J. M. (1992). Human Resources Management: Foundations of Personnel. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Kanin-Lovers, J. (1990, January/February). Meeting the challenge of workforce 2000. Journal of Compensation and Benefits, 5, 233-236.
- Kaye, B., & Leibowitz, Z. (1994, September). Career development: Don't let it fizzle. HRMagazine, p. 78.
- Lavy, N. (1994, April). Integrated manufacturing self-control. TQM Magazine, pp. 18-21.
- Lawler, E. E., III, (1986). High-involvement management: Participative strategies for improving organizational performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E., III, Mohrman, S. A., & Ledford, G. E., Jr. (1992). Employee involvement and total quality management: Practices and results in fortune 1000 companies. San Francisco: Jossey - Bass.
- Leibowitz, Z. B., Farren, C., & Kaye, B. L. (1986). Designing career development systems. San Francisco: Jossey - Bass.
- Muglia, V. O. (Ed.). (1992). 1992 best people practices. Dearborn, MI: Society of Manufacturing Engineers.
- Mandell, B. (1989, October). Does a better worklife boost productivity? Personnel, pp. 48-52.



- McFarland, L. J., Senn, L. E., & Childress, J. R. (1994). 21st century leadership. New York: Leadership Press.
- Mondy, R. W., Sharplin, A., & Premeaux, S. R. (1991). Management: Concepts, practices, and skills. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Moravec, M., & Tucker, R. (1992, June). Job descriptions for the 21st century. Personnel Journal, pp. 37-44.
- Morris, L. (1994, January). Career changes driven by growth opportunities. Training and Development, pp. 63-64.
- Morris, L. (1995, July). Crossed wires on employee motivation. Training and Development, pp. 58.
- Noer, D. (1993, November). Four new realities. Executive Excellence, pp. 16-17.
- Orpen, C. (1979, March). The effects of job enrichment on employee satisfaction, motivation, involvement, and performance: A field experiment. Human Relations, pp. 189-217.
- Parks, S. (1995, May). Improving workplace performance: Historical and theoretical contexts. Monthly Labor Review, p. 18.
- Paul, W. J., Robertson, K. B., & Herzberg, F. (1969, March-April). Job enrichment pays off. Harvard Business Review, pp. 61-78.
- Pollock, T. (1995, May). A personal file of stimulating ideas, little-known facts and daily problem solvers. Supervision, p. 21.
- Shafer, S. M., Tepper, B. J., Meredith, J. R., & Marsh, R. (1995). Comparing the effects of cellular and functional manufacturing on employees' perceptions and attitudes. Journal of Operations Management, 12, 63-74.
- Shapero, A. (1985). Managing professional people: Understanding creative performance. New York: Free Press.
- Shelton, C. (1995, June). Team mania. Executive Excellence, pp. 9-10.

- Sonnenfeld, J. A., & Ingols, C. A. (1994). Working knowledge: Charting a new course for training. In C. E. Schneier, C. J. Russel, R. W. Beatty, & L. S. Baird, (Eds.), The training and development sourcebook (2cd ed.) (pp. 87-98). Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.
- Thornhill, S. K. A. (1994, September). Hospital clinical career advancements programs: Comparing perceptions of nurse participants and nonparticipants. Health Care Supervisor, pp. 16-25.
- Wallimann, I. (1981). Estrangement: Marx's conception of human nature and the division of labor. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Weisbord, M. R. (1987). Productive workplaces: Organizing and managing for dignity, meaning, and community. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wellins, R. S., Byham, W. C., & Dixon, G. R. (1995, June). Texas instruments gets from here to there; Texas instruments inc. defense systems and electronics groups. Training and Development, p. 10.
- Walima, S. E. (1975). Kaiser aluminum's action guide to job enrichment. In Waino W. Suojanen, G. L. Swallow, M. J. McDonald, & W. William Suojanen (Eds.). Perspectives on job enrichment and productivity (pp. 257-279). Atlanta, GA: Georgia State University.