J

Japan

Koji Taira

Studies of Japanese business must begin with a basic question: "Who owns the firm?" (Abegglen and Stalk, 1985). The answer to this question in the US would be simple: shareholders. This implies the most important principle of firm governance: management is the agent of the shareholders. The basic problems of the firm arise from the principal–agent relationship with asymmetric information. In this type of firm, workers are resources that management buys, pays, and uses up for the maximization of profits.

The Japanese business law has just caught up with the American concept of the firm. The Commercial Code provides the basic legal framework for all types of private business in Japan. The latest amendments to the Code went into effect in April 2003, introducing, among others, "an American-style board with a chief executive officer (CEO) and more outside directors to help perform the oversight function" (JETRO, 2002). At present, a majority of Japanese firms have no plans to shift to this new system of corporate governance, but several high-profile firms, such as Sony, Hitachi, Toshiba, Mitsubishi Electric, and several others with a significant presence of foreign shareholders have adopted or are likely in the near future to adopt the American-style boards of directors (Japan Institute of Labor, 2003).

In Japan, the answer to the question "who owns the firm?" has never been as straightforward as in the US (Matsumoto, 1991; Aoki and Dore, 1994). Although the stakes of the individual shareholders have recently been gaining increasing attention and respect from management, shareholding has traditionally functioned as a means of strengthening inter-firm alliances. That is, a good proportion of the shares of the firm are held by friendly firms in the enterprise group of which the firm is a member. The firm itself also owns shares of other firms of the group. The member bank of the group is the main bank for the member firms.

Workers employed by the firm are much more than a factor of production. A good proportion of them, "regular employees," are considered "members of the firm" (*shain*) and participate in its management through "bottom-up" management, the employee union and consultative machinery (Koike, 1988). The firm, having slimmed down to its core activities, surrounds itself by a *keiretsu* of subsidiaries, affiliates, subcontractors, and distributors that supply it with parts, components, or services through forward and backward linkages. Managing the firm, then, means a coordination of diverse, sometimes conflicting, interests of various stakeholders while pursuing the firm's goals such as solvency, growth, and market share.

"Human resource," a popular concept in academic discourse, downgrades people to an equal status with other nonhuman resources. It is an especially misleading metaphor when applied to employee-members of the Japanese firm. Closer to the truth is that every employee is a manager in his or her own right, as much committed to the goals of the firm as those conventionally classified as "managers." Although the formal hierarchy of positions and functions within the Japanese firm is not much different from that of any firm in a market economy, practically all the positions and functions above the entry level all the way through top management are filled by internal promotions, owing to the well-developed INTERNAL LABOR MARKET.

The production concept of the Japanese firm is LEAN PRODUCTION, which emphasizes high product quality, *kaizen* (continuous improvements) in process and outcome, and "just-in-time" delivery in work relationships (*see* JUST-IN-TIME PRODUCTION SYSTEMS). This mode of production, unlike "mass production," devolves a maximum of judgment, initiative, and responsibilities to employees on the shop floor, eroding social distance and functional differences between managers and managed (Womack, Jones, and Roos, 1990). In the Japanese firm, those employees who would elsewhere be labeled "blue-collar" are "white-collarized" (Koike, 1988).

The tenure of the regular employees (employee-members of the firm) is indefinite, though subject to mandatory retirement at a stipulated age. The "standard regular" employees are hired at graduation from high school or college and remain in employment "for life," i.e., until mandatory retirement. These employee-members of the firm are immune to layoffs or discharges except under extreme circumstances, although they are free to quit of their own volition any time.

The Japanese firm, like its counterpart anywhere, is subject to output fluctuations due to changes in the conditions of the market, technology, and general business environment. A conventional capitalist firm adjusts workforce up or down as its output fluctuates. Barred from discharging its regular employees at will, the firm uses contingent workers as an adjustment factor (*see* CONTINGENCY EMPLOYMENT). These workers can be flexibly hired or fired according to changes in the firm's volume of business (Taira and Levine, 1985). The regular/contingent duality of employment is a major strategy of the Japanese firm. Contingent workers come in under a variety of contractual arrangements. Most common are temporary, seasonal, casual, or part-time workers hired for specified lengths or hours of service. The firm may also contract with other firms for sending in their employees for specified tasks in it. These firms, "subcontractors," belong to the *keiretsu*. Worker-dispatching firms have grown up in occupations related to data processing, office work, building maintenance, and security under a law passed in 1985.

For ordinary business cycles, the rules of employment adjustment built into the Japanese employment system are adequate for the security of tenure of the regular employees. When a recession is exceptionally long or deep, the terminations of contingency workers alone may not be enough. When this happens, as it did in the mid-1970s after the 1973 oil shock or in the post-bubble 1990s, additional adjustment measures are undertaken, such as a hiring freeze, reduction of working hours, transfers and reassignments, or moderation or suspension of salary increases. In the worst cases, after the exhaustion of all conceivable alternatives, some regular employees may be asked to take voluntary early retirement. Their terminations are costly, involving premiums and other incentives added to the contractual severance pay.

The recruitment and hiring of regular employees is a serious business (Taira and Levine, 1992). The firm begins planning for new hiring 12 months ahead of the actual induction of new employees. The procedure is also regulated by law and the Ministry of Health, Labor, and Welfare. During the spring of a given year, as soon as the new school year begins in April, the firm formulates its hiring plans targeted at college and high school seniors expected to graduate in the following year. In the summer, upon approval of the plans by the Employment Stabilization Office, the firm sends employee search notices to high schools and colleges.

To forestall undue influences on impressionable youth, the law prohibits recruiters from individually meeting high school students. They are only allowed to hold information meetings with groups of students. College students, supposed to be more mature and self-assured, are allowed individual JOB SEARCH activities. In the fall, the firm receives job applications, and holds written and oral examinations. Informal offers of employment (*naitei*) are then made to selected employees-to-be. During the remaining few months before April, the firm makes every effort to hold on to the *naitei* candidates. Depending on economic conditions, inter-firm competition may become so keen that each student receives several *naitei* offers and acquires considerable bargaining strength.

In April, new employees are inducted into the firm's employ at a solemn ceremony. Freshman employees are then put through a year of basic education and training combining classroom instructions and on-the-job practices. After this, each employee is formally assigned to a work unit to begin actual value-adding work. At this stage, a mentor is assigned to each new employee. From here on, the employee engages in lifelong competition for promotions in the firm's internal labor market as skills, knowledge, competence, and performance grow with more ON-THE-JOB TRAINING and experience.

Employee motivation for perpetual learning and effort is strengthened by a steeply rising salary schedule in association with the length of service and age known as the "seniority-based wage system." In principle, every freshman employee has the equal opportunity for rising to the top of the personnel hierarchy. Actual career paths depend upon efforts, merits, and luck that vary among individuals.

The Japanese firm exhibits two contradictory tendencies, one toward a "virtual corporation" and another toward diversification. They are interrelated, however. Like a virtual corporation, the Japanese firm concentrates on core competencies and procures parts, components, and services from other firms in the enterprise group and *keiretsu*. At the same time, the Japanese firm is innovative in generating growth through product differentiation and diversification as well as organizational restructuring and BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING. The firm, overgrown, then spins off activities that have reached a critical mass for viable independence and adds them to the group and *keiretsu*. By this process of cell division, the core firm remains slim, fit, and dynamic.

In summary, in addition to the long-familiar "three treasures" of the Japanese employment system (lifetime employment, seniority-based wages, and enterprise union), recent research calls attention to the nature and strategy of the Japanese firm including characteristics such as enterprise groups, *keiretsu*, lean production, quality, *kaizen*, reengineering, virtual corporation, contingency workers, and many more. The basic point is that firms in a capitalist market economy must survive, make profits, and grow. Toward these goals, the Japanese firm has generated a complex of strategy, structure, organization, and process that appears distinct and fascinating when compared with firm types of other capitalist market economies. Through many stages of abstraction, generalization, and theorizing, the practices of the Japanese firm have been modeled as the "Japanese employment system." Since the last economic bubble burst in 1990, the macro economy of Japan has undergone considerable restructuring under a prolonged stagnation and frequent recessions. Since the Japanese employment system was a product of a growing economy, it has been losing fit with reality at the margins since 1990. An alternative model has not emerged yet, however.

Bibliography

Abegglen, J. and Stalk, G. (1985). *Kaisha: The Japanese Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Aoki, M. and Dore, R. (eds.) (1994). *The Japanese Firm: The Sources of Competitive Strength*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Japan Institute of Labor (2003). Revised commercial code introduces US-style corporate governance. *Japan Labor Bulletin*, **42** (5). Tokyo: Japan Institute of Labor.

JETRO (2002). Cover story: Corporate governance. *Focus Japan*, **29** (6). Tokyo: JETRO.

Koike, K. (1988). *Understanding Industrial Relations in Modern Japan*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Matsumoto, K. (1991). *The Rise of the Japanese Corporate System*. London: Kegan Paul International.

Taira, K. and Levine, S. B. (1985). Japan's industrial relations: A social compact emerges. In H. Juris, M. Thompson, and W. Daniels (eds.), *Industrial Relations in a Decade of Change*. Madison, WI: Industrial Relations Research Association.

Taira, K. and Levine, S. B. (1992). Education and labor skills in postwar Japan. In R. Leestma and H. J. Walberg (eds.), *Japanese Educational Productivity*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Japanese Studies.

Womack, J. P., Jones, D. T., and Roos, D. (1990). *The Machine that Changed the World*. New York: Rawson Associates.

job

Robert J. Harvey

A job is a collection of one or more positions that are similar enough in terms of their tasks and duties to allow them to be grouped together and treated interchangeably. Although some cross-position heterogeneity is typically present, as a practical matter the positions that are grouped together to form a job should be sufficiently similar in terms of their tasks and duties to allow them to be described adequately through the use of a single JOB ANALYSIS and job title.

See also *duty; task*

job analysis

Michael T. Brannick and Edward L. Levine

Job analysis is the systematic process of uncovering and describing the components of a job. The process may be all-encompassing or narrower, depending upon the needs of the job analyst. The analyst may explore the goals of the work, the work procedures and processes (duties, tasks, and so forth; Harvey, 1992), the kinds of personal attributes required of people to complete the work (*see* KSAOS), and the work context, broadly defined to include the physical environment as well as the business environment. For example, for the job of police officer, the goals of the work might include enforcing laws, promoting the safety of the public, and maintaining community relations. The work procedures and processes might include such activities as giving traffic citations, resolving domestic disputes, and testifying in court. The personal characteristics might include the ability to remember laws, physical strength, and skill in operating a patrol car. The work context might include such items as working outdoors. The police officer reports to a police sergeant within a particular civic and geographic context (consider, for example, how the job might differ from Miami, Florida, to Ann Arbor, Michigan).

Job analysis can be considered to be a managerial activity because it helps solve so many human resource problems (McCormick, 1979; Gael et al., 1988). However, it may also serve society at large. Among the vast uses of job analysis are producing a written description of the nature of the job (a JOB DESCRIPTION), providing information used to set salaries (JOB EVALUATION METHODS), and planning for the future of people at work in the company (HUMAN RESOURCE PLANNING). Job analysis also forms the basis for training programs (training and development; *see* TRAINING), hiring and promoting workers (STAFFING), defending the JOB-RELATEDNESS of employment practices, and defining the job in such a way that JOB PERFORMANCE can be evaluated (performance measurement). Societal purposes include vocational guidance for students.

Job analysis employs a variety of approaches to uncover and describe components of a job. Such approaches can be captured in four categories: (1) the kinds of job data collected; (2) the methods of gathering data; (3) the sources of job information; and (4) the methods of data analysis (Levine, 1983). The kinds of data collected include such items as responsibilities, products and services, machines, tools, work aids, and equipment, and work and worker activities. The sources of information include the job analyst (the person doing the job analysis), the job holder, the job holder's supervisor, training specialists, and technical experts such as chemists or college professors (*see* JOB ANALYSIS INFORMATION SOURCES). The data analytic approach can include units of work (TASK, DUTY, or job dimensions), worker TRAIT requirements, such as mental and physical capabilities, and quantitative scales applied to the work. For an example of a quantitative approach, job holders could be given a survey that asks them to rate each task in their job in terms of its difficulty to learn. The way we carry out a job analysis will depend on what we are trying to accomplish (Levine, Thomas, and Sistrunk, 1988). We might proceed differently, for example, if we are interested in staffing than if we are interested in job evaluation. In staffing, we would concentrate on what personal characteristics (e.g., skill in word processing) job applicants need in order to be successful on the job. In evaluating jobs to set salaries, we would concentrate on the aspects of jobs that differentiate them in terms of pay, such as degree of fiscal responsibility.

See also *strategic job analysis*

Bibliography

Gael, S., Cornelius, E. T., III, Levine, E. L., and Salvendy, G. (eds.) (1988). *The Job Analysis Handbook for Business, Industry and Government*. New York: John Wiley.

Harvey, R. J. (1992). Job analysis. In M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough (eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2nd edn, vol. 2. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Levine, E. L. (1983). *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Job Analysis*. Tampa, FL: Mariner.

Levine, E. L., Thomas, J. N., and Sistrunk, F. (1988). Selecting a job analysis approach. In S. Gael, E. T. Cornelius, III, E. L. Levine, and G. Salvendy (eds.), *The Job Analysis Handbook for Business, Industry and Government*, vol. 1. New York: John Wiley.

McCormick, E. J. (1979). *Job Analysis: Methods and Applications*. New York: AMACOM.

job analysis information sources

Michael T. Brannick and Edward L. Levine

The process of discovery of the nature of a job requires that the job analyst pursue one or more sources of job information, such as interviewing a job holder or observing the job holder perform the work.

Methods Emphasizing the Analyst

Observation. Probably the most common method is for the job analyst to watch the job holder actually doing the job (practical tips are given by Martinko, 1988). It is important to capture a representative sample of the entire job. It would not do, for example, to observe a surgeon only in his or her office counseling patients away from the operating room.

Doing the work. Although for practical reasons this method is seldom used, a great deal of insight about the difficulties of learning a job and the skills and abilities required to perform it can be learned by actually doing the work.

Methods Emphasizing Both Incumbent and Analyst

Individual interviews. In this method, the analyst asks questions of job holders and their supervisors. The questions need to be carefully structured prior to the interview for best results, but probing and following up on responses to questions allows this method some flexibility.

Group interviews. A knowledgeable group of workers and supervisors may be gathered to discuss a job. An advantage of such a procedure is that consensus can emerge about the nature of a job. Also, group members can say things that trigger responses from other group members resulting in a very complete picture of the job.

Methods Emphasizing the Incumbent

Diary. This method requires job holders to write down periodically the activities they have been doing at a particular time (see Freda and Senkewicz, 1988). Several different methods can be used for sampling times. For example, the job holder may have to write every half hour, each time he or she changes tasks, or whenever a beeper set by a job analyst goes off (*see* PERFORMANCE DIARIES).

Questionnaire. The questionnaire can be considered a structured interview that is self-administered. Often the items on a questionnaire are tasks or activities, and the incumbent is asked to evaluate each task on one or more scales. The US Air Force was instrumental in developing this approach. A good description of the Air Force technique is given in Christal and Weissmuller (1988). The POSITION ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE is another good example of this job analysis method.

Other Sources

Several other sources of information can be used in conducting a job analysis. These sources tend to be used as supplements to those already listed. They include equipment-based sources, in which the job analyst uses equipment such as a videotape recorder or audiotape recorder to gather information. The analyst may also review records, such as those found in company PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL files or accident reports. Often the job analyst will begin by reviewing literature about the job, such as books, research reports, or other materials produced inside the organization or outside of it. Training materials are especially useful in this regard. Finally, the analyst may resort to studying equipment design; i.e., examining blueprints or schematic drawings when the job is heavily dependent upon equipment or machinery and especially for new jobs when they do not yet have any incumbents.

Bibliography

Christal, R. E. and Weissmuller, J. J. (1988). Job-task inventory analysis. In S. Gael, E. T. Cornelius, III, E. L. Levine, and G. Salvendy (eds.), *The Job Analysis Handbook for Business, Industry and Government*, vol. 2. New York: John Wiley.

Freda, L. J. and Senkewicz, J. J. (1988). Work diaries. In S. Gael, E. T. Cornelius, III, E. L. Levine, and G. Salvendy (eds.), *The Job Analysis Handbook for Business, Industry and Government*, vol. 1. New York: John Wiley.

Martinko, M. J. (1988). Observing the work. In S. Gael, E. T. Cornelius, III, E. L. Levine, and G. Salvendy (eds.), *The Job Analysis Handbook for Business, Industry and Government*, vol. 1. New York: John Wiley.

job-based pay

Thomas H. Stone

Job-based pay refers to pay structures based on any form of JOB EVALUATION METHODS, focusing on job contents and/or job specifications. Job-based pay systems may be contrasted with knowledge-based or skill-based pay systems that use knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (*see* KSAOS) of each incumbent to determine pay (*see* SKILL-BASED PAY DESIGN). Thus, job evaluation methods of classification, factor comparison, Hay method, and point and ranking would all yield a job-based pay system whereby an incumbent's base pay is determined by the job he or she occupies rather than by KSAOs. Most employers use job-based pay, but knowledge- and skill-based systems are growing.

See also *classification job evaluation method; factor-comparison job evaluation method; Hay method and other hybrid job evaluation methods; point job evaluation method; ranking job evaluation method*

job burnout

Thomas A. Wright and James Campbell Quick

Job burnout is defined as the chronic and negative affective pattern of responses to stressful conditions at work (*see* JOB STRESS). It is related to reduced PRODUCTIVITY and increased ABSENTEEISM and EMPLOYEE TURNOVER. Understanding the causes of job burnout is important to early recognition, prevention of adverse consequences, and early recovery actions.

Causes

Freudenberger (1980), who coined the term "burnout," implied that it is caused by the continuous pursuit of success. Cordes and Dougherty (1993: 640) said job burnout results from a high level of chronic work demands, entailing very important obligations and responsibilities. Maslach (1982) suggested that job burnout is caused by constant exposure to emotionally charged interpersonal situations on the job. Hence, high achievement, responsibility, and/or emotionally demanding jobs may cause burnout.

Conceptualization

Maslach's (1982) three-component conceptualization is the most widely accepted. The first component, emotional exhaustion, describes an individual's affect, feelings of depleted emotional resources, and lack of energy. Individuals feel unable to give psychologically. A common symptom is dreading to go to work.

The second component, depersonalization, is characterized by negative, cynical attitudes and feelings about one's clients, who are seen to deserve their lot in life. Prominent symptoms include the use of derogatory, abstract language about one's clients, extensive use of jargon, and withdrawal from direct client contact.

The third component, diminished personal accomplishment, refers to the tendency for negative self-evaluation, resulting in increased dissatisfaction with one's job accomplishments and a heightened perception of minimal work-related progress.

Treatment

Job burnout is a potentially reversible condition. EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS and STRESS MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS can be helpful in identifying causes of job burnout and in establishing treatment interventions.

Bibliography

Cordes, C. L. and Dougherty, T. W. (1993). A review and integration of research on job burnout. *Academy of Management Review*, **18**, 621–56.

Freudenberger, H. J. (1980). *Burnout: The High Cost of High Achievement*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout: The Cost of Caring*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

job description

Michael T. Brannick and Edward L. Levine

The job description is a written summary of the nature of a job (see Ghorpade, 1988). The most common elements in a job description include:

1. a job identification that includes the job title;
2. a job overview that states the mission of the job and the products and services produced by the worker;
3. the primary tasks involved in the job;
4. a list of equipment, machines, and tools used;
5. raw materials, goods, data, or other materials used in the job;
6. the processes used to transform materials into products and services;
7. guidelines and controls that limit the discretion of the worker, such as supervision;
8. required knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (*see* KSAOS);
9. a description of the work context, such as working conditions; and
10. a statement of the qualifications required, such as a license or level of education.

Supervisors use job descriptions as a basis for assigning work and clarifying performance expectations. Job holders can use job descriptions to help understand their own jobs and jobs further up the job ladder that they may hold one day. Job descriptions are also a primary tool in PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL, in which supervisors evaluate the JOB PERFORMANCE of incumbents, and in JOB EVALUATION METHODS, with which the salaries of jobs within an organization are determined. Job descriptions may also play a role in RECRUITING and STAFFING functions, where they inform all parties of the nature of the work to be performed, thus helping to insure a good match between people and jobs.

The centrality of the job description to human resource practices is currently being questioned by some organizations because of rapid changes in jobs. Such changes are in response to the dynamic nature of today's business environment. In addition, many organizations have placed increased reliance on teams that require flexible assignment of duties (*see* SELF-MANAGING TEAMS).

Bibliography

Ghorpade, J. (1988). *Job Analysis: A Handbook for the Human Resource Director*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

job element method of job analysis

Ronald A. Ash

The job element method of JOB ANALYSIS focuses on the human attributes necessary for superior performance on the job. This approach can be contrasted with other job analysis procedures in that it bypasses the TASK information or descriptions of the work itself, and goes directly to job elements. Elements cover the entire range of job behaviors, intellectual behaviors, motor behaviors, and work habits, and may be called knowledge, skills, abilities, and other personal characteristics (KSAOS; Primoff and Eyde, 1988). The same element may cut across different tasks and different jobs. The significant elements in a job are identified, described, and evaluated by experienced and expert workers in an occupation and their supervisors, typically referred to as subject matter experts (SMEs).

The job element method was originally developed by Ernest Primoff of the US Civil Service Commission (now called the Office of Personnel Management), and since its development has been used in a variety of settings for developing job information used in RECRUITING, PERSONNEL SELECTION, PROMOTION, PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL, and TRAINING.

Specific procedures and rating scales used in the job element method of job analysis are described in Primoff (1975) and Primoff and Eyde (1988).

Bibliography

Primoff, E. S. (1975). *How to Prepare and Conduct Job Element Examinations: Technical Study 75-1, US Civil Service Commission*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Primoff, E. S. and Eyde, L. D. (1988). Job element analysis. In S. Gael, E. T. Cornelius, III, E. L. Levine, and G. Salvendy (eds.), *The Job Analysis Handbook for Business, Industry and Government*. New York: John Wiley.

job evaluation administrative issues

Timothy J. Keaveny

Job evaluation administration addresses implementation and utilization of a job evaluation plan. A primary issue is to decide who will participate in job evaluation. The typical choices are COMPENSATION specialists, managers, supervisors, and job incumbents. An effective job evaluation system requires managerial as well as employee acceptance of job evaluation results. In order to help to insure acceptance, participation by managers, supervisors, and employees is essential. Such participation can be through representation on task forces charged with designing a job evaluation system, as well as serving on committees that use the system to evaluate jobs.

Other administrative issues include training in the use of the system (*see* TRAINING), approval of completed job evaluations, communication of results to employees, and appeals procedures. Managers, supervisors, and job incumbents must be trained in the use of the job evaluation system. When the committee completes the evaluation of jobs, the results typically are reviewed by higher levels of management to insure that directions and guidelines were followed. The approved job evaluation results must be communicated to managers, supervisors, and job incumbents. Different methods can be used to explain the results to employees, such as brochures, videotapes, or meetings.

It is possible that some jobs will be incorrectly evaluated and it is quite likely that at least some will question the VALIDITY of some evaluations. As a consequence, it is essential to have procedures for appeal and review of job evaluation results.

After the initial round of evaluating jobs, communicating the results and addressing appeals, the system must provide for updating job descriptions (*see* JOB DESCRIPTION), analysis of newly created jobs, and evaluation of revised as well as new jobs.

Bibliography

Henderson, R. I. (1989). *Compensation Management: Rewarding Performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hills, F. S., Bergmann, T. J., and Scarpello, V. G. (1994). *Compensation Decision Making*. Fort Worth, TX: Dryden Press.

Milkovich, G. T. and Newman, J. M. (1993). *Compensation*, 4th edn. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

job evaluation methods

Matthew C. Bloom

Job evaluation is a systematic process designed to aid in establishing pay differentials across jobs within a single employer (Milkovich and Newman, 1996: 127). It is an alternative to person-based (e.g., competency-based pay) and market-pricing approaches (*see* PERSON-BASED PAY). Job evaluation is a judgmental process based on a systematic appraisal of job descriptions (*see* JOB DESCRIPTION). The culmination of this appraisal process is a hierarchy of jobs denoting their relative complexity and value to the organization. When matched with data about market pay rates, job evaluation provides the critical link between the organization's internal job structure and the external market and establishes the organization's pay structure (Schwab, 1980; Milkovich and Newman, 1996). Job evaluation is a crucial process for establishing a pay structure that is internally equitable, externally competitive, and consistent with the goals of the organization (*see* EXTERNAL EQUITY/EXTERNAL COMPETITIVENESS; INTERNAL EQUITY/INTERNAL CONSISTENCY).

Two essential components are usually assessed in job evaluation: job content and job value. Job content refers to the type of work performed, the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other personal characteristics (*see* KSAOS) required to perform that work, working conditions, degree of responsibility assumed, and so on. Job value refers to the relative contribution a job makes to organizational goals, its value in external markets, or its worth relative to some other agreed-upon standard. Job evaluation methods differ in terms of how they appraise job value and content, and how they position jobs based upon these values and content assessments. The most popular job evaluation method is the POINT JOB EVALUATION METHOD.

Bibliography

Milkovich, G. T. and Newman, J. M. (1996). *Compensation*, 5th edn. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Schwab, D. P. (1980). Job evaluation and pay setting: Concepts and practices. In E. R. Livernash (ed.), *Comparable Worth: Issues and Alternatives*. Washington, DC: Equal Employment Opportunity Council.

job family

Robert J. Harvey

A job family is a grouping of different jobs whose tasks and/or duties are deemed sufficiently similar to one another to allow them to be treated as interchangeable (e.g., to share a common employee selection battery). Because subsets of each job's tasks or duties (*see* DUTY; TASK) may be used when assessing similarity, it is quite possible for jobs that are grouped into different job families for one personnel purpose (e.g., employee selection using highly specific skill-based tests) to be grouped into the same job family for a different purpose (e.g., selection using a general cognitive ability test). Typically, job families are formed by clustering jobs within a single organization; in contrast, the term "occupation" is used to describe groupings of jobs that occur across industry and organizational boundaries. However, some authors use the term job family more generally to denote virtually any collection of similar jobs, regardless of the industry or organization in which they are found.

job involvement

Eugene F. Stone-Romero

Job involvement is an attitude toward the work role and its context. Conceptual definitions of job involvement have been of two basic types (see, e.g., Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977). One regards it as reflecting the degree to which a person's sense of esteem is affected by JOB PERFORMANCE. The other views it as the centrality of work and the job context to the individual's self-image. Unfortunately, however, there are many other views on the nature of the job involvement construct and there is currently no consensus on the most appropriate measure of this construct (Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977). Moreover, as is true of the conceptual definitions of many constructs, popular definitions of job involvement tend to confuse it with its antecedents (e.g., work values) and consequences (e.g., performance-based esteem changes; Stone-Romero, 1994).

Researchers and theorists have equated job involvement, directly or indirectly, with such constructs as work centrality, EMPLOYEE MORALE, intrinsic motivation, JOB SATISFACTION, and the Protestant work ethic (Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977). However, Paullay, Alliger, and Stone-Romero (1994) argued that job involvement differs from both the Protestant work ethic and work centrality. The Protestant work ethic is a value orientation that has several components, including the normative belief that individuals should be involved in their work (Weber, 1930; Wollack et al., 1971). Work centrality reflects the degree to which individuals view work (independent of a specific job) as being an important activity in life (Dubin, 1965). Job involvement reflects the degree to which individuals feel attracted or attached to the tasks that make up their jobs (i.e., job involvement role) and the setting in which such tasks are carried out (i.e., job involvement setting). Research by Paullay et al. showed that job involvement role, job involvement setting, work centrality, and Protestant work ethic are distinct, although related, constructs.

Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) attitude model can aid in the conceptualization of the job involvement construct. The model specifies that:

1 attitudes toward an attitude object are a function of individuals' values and beliefs;
2 attitudes, in conjunction with subjective norms, are precursors of behavioral intentions; and
3 these intentions determine actual behavior.

Applying this framework to the attitude of job involvement suggests that:

1 socialization consistent with such value orientations as the Protestant work ethic leads individuals to value the performance of job-related tasks and to view work as central to their lives;
2 this value orientation predisposes them to become involved with their jobs and their work settings;
3 when such work-related values are combined with beliefs about the nature-specific jobs and their settings, individuals manifest job involvement (i.e., an attitude of attraction to the job and its context); and
4 this attitude leads individuals to develop behavioral intentions that are reflective of it and, thereafter, to behave in attitude-consistent ways (e.g., perform at above-average levels).

This view of job involvement clarifies relationships between job involvement and its antecedents and consequences, helps to explain the results of prior research on relationships between job involvement and other variables (see Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977, for a review), and provides a basis for predicting how such interventions as employee involvement and job redesign programs will affect job involvement and its consequences.

Bibliography

Dubin, R. (1965). Industrial workers' worlds: A study of the "central life interests" of industrial workers. *Social Problems*, **3**, 131–42.

Fishbein, M. and Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Lodahl, T. M. and Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **49**, 24–33.

Paullay, I. M., Alliger, G. M., and Stone-Romero, E. F. (1994). Construct validation of two instruments designed to measure job involvement and work centrality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **79**, 224–8.

Rabinowitz, S. and Hall, D. T. (1977). Organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, **84**, 265–88.

Stone-Romero, E. F. (1994). Construct validity issues in organizational behavior research. In J. Greenberg (ed.), *Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Weber, M. (1930). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Winchester, MA: Allen and Unwin.

Wollack, S., Goodale, J. G., Wijting, J. P., and Smith, P. C. (1971). Development of the survey of work values. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **55**, 331–8.

job loss

Carrie R. Leana

Job loss is used interchangeably with layoffs and generally refers to loss of employment due to plant closings, work slowdowns, corporate DOWNSIZING, or organizational restructuring (Leana and Feldman, 1992).

Evidence exists that job loss has a negative impact on the unemployed, on his or her family, and on friends and coworkers. People who have lost their jobs have been found to be more anxious, depressed, unhappy, and dissatisfied with life in general. Job loss also has strong effects on psychosomatic illnesses such as sleeping disorders, eating disorders, overuse of sedatives, dermatitis, headaches, and listlessness. Spouses of the unemployed often suffer psychological problems similar to those of the job loser. There is also evidence that job loss may contribute to the rate of marital separation and divorce. The results of several laboratory and field studies on coworkers of laid-off employees suggest that these so-called survivors often lower their PRODUCTIVITY, develop poorer job attitudes, and voluntarily leave their employers in the wake of coworkers' layoffs (Brockner, 1988; Leana and Feldman, 1994).

Individuals cope with job loss in a variety of ways. These coping strategies have been categorized as problem-focused coping (i.e., JOB SEARCH, RETRAINING) or symptom-focused coping (i.e., seeking social support). Some level of both is necessary for successful adjustment and reemployment (Leana and Feldman, 1994).

Four corporate interventions have been most frequently used to soften the effects of layoffs. These include: advance notification, severance pay and extended benefits, retraining programs, and outplacement programs (Leana and Feldman, 1992).

Bibliography

Brockner, J. (1988). The effects of work layoffs on survivors: Research, theory, and practice. In B. Staw (ed.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, vol. 10. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Leana, C. R. and Feldman, D. C. (1992). *Coping with Job Loss: How Individuals, Organizations, and Communities Respond to Layoffs*. New York: Lexington Books.

Leana, C. R. and Feldman, D. C. (1994). The psychology of job loss. In G. R. Ferris and K. M. Rowland (eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, vol. 12. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

job performance

Peter Villanova, James T. Austin, and Walter C. Borman

Job performance is defined as that aspect of the work behavior domain that is of relevance to job and organizational success (Austin et al., 1991). As such, it represents a sample of the universe of behaviors an individual performs in the course of work that is relevant to judging success. Job performance is a key construct in human resource management, because criteria for PROMOTION, as well as for selection validation purposes, are frequently drawn from the job performance domain.

Representing and Understanding Job Performance

Job performance is a complex construct that is multidimensional, multiply determined, and potentially dynamic. Understanding job performance requires one to recognize that patterns of behavior in organizations can be prescribed through formal, bureaucratic means, such as job descriptions (*see* JOB DESCRIPTION), and through informal and more subjective means, such as role-sending, role-making, and role negotiation. Traditional definitions of job performance have concentrated on the former, more technical, objective and quasi-static job-based domain. More recent conceptualizations of job performance have been expanded to include less formally established activities, such as citizenship behavior and a willingness to assume responsibility and leadership beyond those detailed in a formal job description. No doubt this more inclusive conceptualization of job performance reflects the complexity of today's work organizations.

Job performance is multidimensional. There is abundant evidence that job performance, even for low-complexity jobs, is multidimensional (Campbell, McHenry, and Wise, 1990; Borman, 1991), and reflects both task and contextual aspects of the job (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993). Task proficiency is what has been traditionally studied as job performance and consists of the technical core (i.e., creating goods and services). Contextual performance reflects behaviors that enhance or detract from the environment surrounding the technical core.

Moreover, just as task performance is almost perfectly identified with established task elements of a job, contextual performance consists exclusively of emergent task elements that may be actively constructed or passively accepted by a worker. Because contextual performance more closely resembles "role performance," these activities and contributions may vary from worker to worker, even among those nominally assigned the same job classification. The implications are that performance dimensions may not only vary from one setting to another, as Bailey (1983) has argued, but also within a setting, where multiple roles are enacted by individuals performing the same "job."

Job performance is multiply determined. Just as no single dimension can successfully represent the complexity of performance, no single predictor sufficiently accounts for performance variability, or, more appropriately, for the patterns of behavior that define job success. Moreover, if one accepts that both tasks and contextual aspects of performance are important, the implications for selection include expansion of the predictor domain and acknowledgment that single predictor–single criterion combinations are inevitably deficient, both conceptually and practically. In particular, motivational and personality constructs would appear as logical candidates for providing incremental understanding of contextual performance, just as knowledge, skill, and ability constructs (*see* KSAOS) would seem to support task performance. Borman, White, and Dorsey (1995) have shown that contextual aspects of performance, such as "dependability," can account for as much, or more, of the variance in supervisor ratings of performance as do knowledge, ability, and proficiency.

Job performance is dynamic. The dynamic nature of performance on most jobs makes its representation by any measure at any one point in time somewhat deficient, contaminated, and less relevant than if measured at another time. Dynamic criteria reflect these shifts in the underlying structure of job success, and are reflected in changes in rank ordering of employees over time (Ghiselli, 1956). For example, the demands of the job, work aids, and worker proficiency may change over time as new technology or work methods are introduced, while performance standards are not calibrated to reflect these changes. The practical implications include timing of appraisals, appraisal accuracy, and the potential for inaccurate estimates of selection validity and utility. Models that reflect the interaction between persons and work systems seem well equipped to explain this dynamic variance.

Bibliography

Austin, J. T. et al. (1991). Construct validation of performance measures: Definitional issues, development, and evaluation of indicators. In G. R. Ferris and K. M. Rowland (eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bailey, C. T. (1983). *The Measurement of Job Performance*. Aldershot: Gower Press.

Blumberg, M. and Pringle, C. D. (1982). The missing opportunity in organizational research: Some implications for a theory of work performance. *Academy of Management Review*, **7**, 560–9.

Borman, W. C. (1991). Job behavior, performance, and effectiveness. In M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough (eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2nd edn, vol. 2. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Borman, W. C. and Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt and W. C. Borman (eds.), *Personnel Selection*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Borman, W. C., White, L. A., and Dorsey, D. W. (1995). Effects of ratee task performance and interpersonal factors on supervisor and peer performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **80**, 168–77.

Campbell, J. P., McHenry, J. J., and Wise, L. L. (1990). Modeling job performance in a population of jobs. *Personnel Psychology*, **43**, 313–33.

Ghiselli, E. E. (1956). Dimensional problems of criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **40**, 1–4.

job posting

Robert D. Gatewood

Job posting is an internal RECRUITING source that transmits information about open positions to current employees of the organization. Commonly used methods are bulletin boards, organization newsletters, flyers, and computer systems. Job posting has both advantages and disadvantages. Filling a position with a current employee creates other job openings which, in turn, are filled by other employees. This series of moves can result in both career development opportunities and increased motivation to attain them. Job posting often results in an applicant pool for which the organization has detailed information regarding applicants' abilities and work performance, thereby providing relatively complete information for selection decisions. However, since job posting restricts the entrance of new employees into the organization, its use can also restrict the availability of new, innovative ideas about work activities. Also, depending on the demographic composition of the organization's workforce, it could hinder the development of a MULTICULTURAL WORKFORCE that is representative of the RELEVANT LABOR MARKET.

Breaugh (1992) has described guidelines for implementing a job-posting system. Specific suggestions include:

1 publicize openings in ways that employees will see them;

2 list postings for a reasonably long time period;
3 include a detailed JOB DESCRIPTION and JOB SPECIFICATION;
4 include a description of the steps required for applying for the job and how the organization will process applications; and
5 inform applicants about the results of their applications in a timely manner.

Empirical research concerning job posting is very limited. However, related to some of these recommendations, Barber and Roehling (1993) found that the amount of information presented and specifics about location and COMPENSATION were influential in decisions of whether or not to apply.

Bibliography

Barber, A. E. and Roehling, M. V. (1993). Job postings and the decision to interview: A verbal protocol analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **78**, 845–56.

Breaugh, J. A. (1992). *Recruitment: Science and Practice*. Boston: PWS-Kent.

job-relatedness

Barbara A. Lee

One method of proving that an employer practice is a BUSINESS NECESSITY is for the employer-defendant to show that it is job-related. For example, a job-related selection device is one that either measures the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (*see* KSAOS) needed for the job or is a valid predictor of an individual's ability to perform the job. The EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures require that validation studies be used to establish that the employer practice is job-related (29 CFR, section 1607.2(B)), but most courts have not required that selection devices other than tests be empirically validated (Schlei and Grossman, 1983: 1329).

Bibliography

Schlei, B. L. and Grossman, P. (1983). *Employment Discrimination Law*, 2nd edn. Washington, DC: Bureau of National Affairs.

job rotation

Gary P. Latham and Lucie Morin

This onsite training technique involves giving managerial and nonmanagerial trainees a series of lateral job assignments in various parts of the organization for a specific period of time varying in length from 3 to 12 months (Wexley and Latham, 1991). A primary objective is to improve trainees' decision-making and problem-solving skills by enabling them to gain an overall perspective of the organization, and to increase their understanding of the interrelations among its various units. Job rotation also helps trainees to crystalize their career plans and to increase their JOB SATISFACTION, motivation and organizational commitment (Campion, Cheraskin, and Stevens, 1994). Managers have reported that the most significant learning experiences that have contributed to their development are, in fact, on-the-job experiences (Latham and Seijts, 1995).

Although this training technique is receiving increasing recognition as a form of management development, it can prove to be costly because of the trainee's learning curve, the increase in workload, and a decrease in PRODUCTIVITY for the trainee and for peers. Thus, to maximize the effectiveness of job rotation, trainees should be assigned full functional responsibility with ample opportunity to use new skills and to make decisions (Wexley and Latham, 1991). This responsibility should be complemented by supportive coaching from one's supervisor or peers in each of the job assignments. Job rotation should be tailored to the needs and capabilities of all trainees as well as their career aspirations (Wexley and Latham, 1991).

See also *training; training evaluation*

Bibliography

Campion, M. A., Cheraskin, L., and Stevens, M. J. (1994). Career-related antecedents and outcomes of job rotation. *Academy of Management Journal*, **37**, 1518–42.

Latham, G. P. and Seijts, G. H. (1995). Management development. In P. Drenth, C. de Wolff, and H. Thierry (eds.), *European Handbook of Work and Organizational Psychology*. Houten: Bohn Stafleu Van Loghum.

Wexley, K. N. and Latham, G. P. (1991). *Developing and Training Human Resources in Organizations*, 2nd edn. New York: HarperCollins.

job satisfaction

Eugene F. Stone-Romero

Job satisfaction is an affective (i.e., emotional) response to a job or its facets that is based upon individuals' beliefs about differences between (1) the outcomes they perceive to be getting from a job and (2) the outcomes that they expect to get from it (see, e.g., Lofquist and Dawis, 1969; Cranny, Smith, and Stone, 1992). Although perceived outcomes are typically influenced by the *objective* levels of various variables (e.g., workload, pay), relationships between objective and perceived outcome levels are often far from perfect. Moreover, because values, interests, and needs differ considerably across individuals, there are corresponding differences in the outcomes that individuals want or expect from jobs.

Overall Satisfaction versus Satisfaction with Job Facets

Job satisfaction may be viewed in terms of individuals' (1) overall affective reactions to a job or (2) reactions to the specific facets of a job. Among the many facets that have been considered in previous job satisfaction research are the work itself, pay/COMPENSATION, achievement, PROMOTION/advancement, supervision–human relations, supervision–technical, coworkers, ability utilization, activity level, authority, company policies and practices, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, job security, social service, social status, task variety, career progress, personal growth, and working conditions (e.g., Lofquist and Dawis, 1969; Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969). Unfortunately, there is little consistency in the satisfaction facets considered by various job satisfaction theorists and researchers (see Cook et al., 1981: 37–74).

Research on Putative Causes and Effects of Satisfaction

The construct of job satisfaction has been of considerable interest to individuals in such fields as human resource management, industrial and organizational psychology, industrial sociology, occupational/vocational psychology, and organizational behavior. Not surprisingly, therefore, a tremendous number of empirical studies have had job satisfaction as their focus. As of about 1975, more than 3,300 studies had been conducted on job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). That number has probably more than doubled by now.

Research on job satisfaction has considered measures of both overall job satisfaction and facet satisfactions (Cook et al., 1981). Results of this research show considerable evidence of relationships between measures of job and/or facet satisfactions and (1) a host of hypothesized antecedents or causes (e.g., job design, pay, advancement/promotion, working conditions, career progress, coworkers, and supervision) and (2) a number of assumed consequences (e.g., ABSENTEEISM, EMPLOYEE TURNOVER, GRIEVANCES, physiological strain, psychological strain, general wellbeing, life satisfaction, job involvement, EMPLOYEE MORALE, and organizational commitment) (Locke, 1976; Cook et al., 1981; Cranny et al., 1992). The literature also shows that a number of INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES (e.g., work values) moderate relationships between job satisfaction and both its assumed causes and effects. Unfortunately, most of the research on job satisfaction has used nonexperimental designs. As a consequence, it is generally not possible to advance firm conclusions about the causes and effects of job satisfaction or the role that individual differences play in moderating relationships between job satisfaction and other variables.

Bibliography

Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., and Warr, P. B. (1981). *The Experience of Work: A Compendium of 249 Measures and Their Use*. London: Academic Press.

Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., and Stone, E. F. (1992). *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel About Their Jobs and How It Affects Their Performance*. New York: Lexington Books.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lofquist, L. H. and Dawis, R. V. (1969). *Adjustment to Work: A Psychological View of Man's Problems in a Work-Oriented Society*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., and Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

job search

Robert D. Bretz, Jr.

Job search is the process of gathering information about potential job opportunities. It is the individual corollary of RECRUITING and together they form the basis for successful person–job matching (*see* PERSON–JOB FIT). Job search frequently has been embedded within the construct of employee withdrawal under the assumption that it results from the same factors that lead to EMPLOYEE TURNOVER. However, the temporal relationship between intention to search and the intention to quit is ambiguous, suggesting that job search serves many purposes in addition to facilitating turnover. Some employed people search without any intention to leave a current position. For example, job search can be used to establish networks of influential contacts, to leverage improved employment conditions with the current employer, or to convince oneself that the current employment arrangements are attractive relative to alternatives (Bretz, Boudreau, and Judge, 1994).

Job search among the employed is thought to be motivated by a combination of "push" and "pull" factors. The push process reflects the degree to which current life or work situations cause enough dissatisfaction to justify the costs of finding and evaluating alternatives. The pull process reflects the market's reaction to one's human capital, or the degree to which an individual's accomplishments make one a target for external recruitment activity.

Critical aspects of the job search process include: (1) the amount of information sought; (2) the nature of the information sought; and (3) the source of the information (Schwab, Rynes, and Aldag, 1987). The amount of information sought encompasses both extensive and intensive search behaviors. Extensive search involves identifying potential job opportunities. Intensive search involves collecting detailed information about each alternative, and has been shown to relate to many positive outcomes, including shorter unemployment durations and higher probabilities of finding an acceptable job (Rynes, 1991).

The type of information sought changes over the course of the search. At first, people engage in extensive search to generate alternatives, followed at later stages by intensive search to learn more about the alternatives. However, the job choice literature is inconclusive regarding the evaluation process. One model suggests that job offers are evaluated simultaneously against one another, while competing models suggest that job seekers consider alternatives sequentially as they become known (Schwab et al., 1987). Under most circumstances it is reasonable to believe that job search is sequential, and that jobs are evaluated against preestablished standards on a few important criteria, such as (1) the nature of the work required, (2) the rewards the job offers, and (3) the degree of person–organization "fit" based on job requirements, values, personality, or needs (Bretz and Judge, 1994).

Job applicants typically assign greater credibility to informal than to formal sources of job information. Specifically, friends, relatives, and organizational representatives other than the recruiter are presumed more likely to give REALISTIC JOB PREVIEWS and are thus perceived as more credible. These sources generally yield better post-hire results as well. The effects of recruitment on applicant decisions have been debated, but research indicates that recruiting does significantly affect job search and choice behaviors (Rynes, Bretz, and Gerhart, 1991).

Bibliography

Bretz, R. D., Boudreau, J. W., and Judge, T. A. (1994). Job search behavior of employed managers. *Personnel Psychology*, **47**, 275–301.
Bretz, R. D. and Judge, T. A. (1994). The role of human resource systems in job applicant decision processes. *Journal of Management*, **20**, 531–51.
Rynes, S. L. (1991). Recruitment, job choice and post-hire consequences: A call for new research directions. In M. D. Dunnette and L. Hough (eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2nd edn. Palo

Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, pp. 399–444.

Rynes, S. L., Bretz, R. D., and Gerhart, B. (1991). The importance of recruitment in job choice: A different way of looking. *Personnel Psychology*, **44**, 487–521.

Schwab, D. P., Rynes, S. L., and Aldag, R. J. (1987). Theories and research on job search and choice. In G. R. Ferris and K. M. Rowland (eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, vol. 5. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 129–66.

job sharing

Stanley Nollen

Job sharing is a version of PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT whereby two part-time (usually half-time) employees share one regular full-time job (*see* PART-TIME WORK SCHEDULE). The two job sharers agree on the division of responsibilities and coverage of the job, such as by each working half-days or each working two and one-half days per week. Regular full-time pay and BENEFITS are prorated to each job sharer according to time worked. Job sharing usually occurs in organizations on a case-by-case basis and occurs among a wide range of occupations from production workers to professionals.

Bibliography

Olmsted, B. and Smith, S. (1994). *Creating a Flexible Workplace*, 2nd edn. New York: AMACOM.

job-skills training

Timothy T. Baldwin

Job-skills training initiatives are designed to identify and target improvement in the basic skills individuals need to be successful in the workplace. Job-skills training is of increasing interest to employers because new business realities (e.g., global competition, rapid technological change) have created demand for a higher level of skills for all workers. The domain of basic skills includes the traditional "three Rs" (reading, writing, and arithmetic) as well as problem solving, teamwork, and capacity to learn (Carnevale, Gainer, and Meltzer, 1990a). The most effective job-skills training has employed a job-specific methodology which links learning to JOB PERFORMANCE and encourages retention by requiring repeated use of trained skills (Carnevale, Gainer, and Meltzer, 1990b).

Bibliography

Carnevale, A. P., Gainer, L. J., and Meltzer, A. S. (1990a). *Workplace Basics: The Essential Skills Employers Want*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carnevale, A. P., Gainer, L. J., and Meltzer, A. S. (1990b). *Workplace Basics: Training Manual*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

job specification

Michael T. Brannick and Edward L. Levine

A job specification is a written description of the human characteristics necessary for the successful performance of a job. The typical sequence of events is to complete a JOB ANALYSIS to understand the nature of the work, to prepare a JOB DESCRIPTION, and then to prepare a more detailed job specification, which is used in RECRUITING and STAFFING. A summary of the job specification may be included in the job description.

The job specification communicates applicant characteristics that employers are looking for to job applicants as well as to recruiters and others in human resources responsible for staffing. In the psychological literature, the job specification usually refers to a list of knowledge, skills, abilities, and other personal characteristics (*see* KSAOS) required by the job, such as verbal comprehension, memorization, or integrity. A job specification is the result of one of several methods of job analysis specifically designed to yield estimates of KSAOs such as the JOB ELEMENT METHOD OF JOB ANALYSIS (Primoff and Eyde, 1988), the POSITION ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE (McCormick and Jeanneret, 1988), the threshold traits analysis system (Lopez, 1988), and the ability requirement scales (Fleishman and Mumford, 1988). In the management literature the job specification tends to be more broadly defined to include such attributes as educational requirements or other minimum qualifications (Wernimont, 1988). In practice, the job specification is sometimes far less than ideal, and often nothing more than a vague paragraph of personality traits written by a manager and given to a college recruiter. Ghorpade (1988) considered "job specification" to be something of a misnomer because it refers to human abilities as opposed to job attributes. He preferred the term "worker specification."

Bibliography

Fleishman, E. A. and Mumford, M. D. (1988). Ability requirements scales. In S. Gael, E. T. Cornelius, III, E. L. Levine, and G. Salvendy (eds.), *The Job Analysis Handbook for Business, Industry and Government*, vol. 2. New York: John Wiley.

Ghorpade J. (1988). *Job Analysis: A Handbook for the Human Resource Director*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lopez, F. M. (1988). Threshold traits analysis system. In S. Gael, E. T. Cornelius, III, E. L. Levine, and G. Salvendy (eds.), *The Job Analysis Handbook for Business, Industry and Government*, vol. 2. New York: John Wiley.

McCormick, E. J. and Jeanneret, P. R. (1988). Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ). In S. Gael, E. T. Cornelius, III, E. L. Levine, and G. Salvendy (eds.), *The Job Analysis Handbook for Business, Industry and Government*, vol. 2. New York: John Wiley.

Primoff, E. S. and Eyde, L. D. (1988). Job element analysis. In S. Gael, E. T. Cornelius, III, E. L. Levine, and G. Salvendy (eds.), *The Job Analysis Handbook for Business, Industry and Government*, vol. 2. New York: John Wiley.

Wernimont, P. F. (1988). Recruitment, selection, and placement. In S. Gael, E. T. Cornelius, III, E. L. Levine, and G. Salvendy (eds.), *The Job Analysis Handbook for Business, Industry and Government*, vol. 1. New York: John Wiley.

job stress

James Campbell Quick, Debra L. Nelson, and Marilyn Macik-Frey

Job stress is defined as the psychophysiological arousal resulting from demands associated with a job. Although more often having negative connotations, job stress is a neutral concept that can also result in positive outcomes. The response to stress is dependent upon individual, interpersonal, and contextual factors associated with the perception and response to the job demands. The goal of individuals and organizations is to increase the functional, healthy consequences, or eustress, and decrease the dysfunctional, unhealthy consequences, or distress (or strain). Eustress may lead to enhanced JOB PERFORMANCE up to an optimal level of stress; conversely, distress may place an employee at risk of physical and psychological illness and occurs when the job stress is too intense, frequent, or chronic (Selye, 1976), or when prevention and coping are suboptimal. Understanding job stress is important to maximize the positive outcomes, minimize the detrimental effects on the person and organization, and provide systematic prevention management programs.

Sources of Job Stress

Job stress is triggered by a wide variety of job demands. These include task-specific demands, role demands, interpersonal demands, and physical demands (Quick et al., 1997). These demands are not inherently or necessarily harmful, and the degree of stress they elicit in a person depends in part on the individual's cognitive appraisal of that demand. Lack of control over and uncertainty about aspects of the psychosocial and physical work environments are a major source of job distress. The complex contemporary organization with growing diversity, WORK–FAMILY CONFLICT, globalization, and increasing technology add to the loss of control and predictability (Cooper, 1996). Extreme working environments, such as those of military fighter pilots or oilfield service personnel in arctic climates, create unique physical and/or peak demands. Whether the job-stress level is healthy or unhealthy is determined in part by the prevalence of job strain within a given work population as well as the INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES in their response to stress.

Costs of Job Strain

Job strain may be costly to organizations and may take one of three individual forms: psychological, medical, or behavioral. Common forms of psychological distress are depression, JOB BURNOUT, anger, and sleep disturbances. Common forms of medical distress are backaches and headaches, ulcer disease, and cardiovascular problems. Common forms of behavioral distress are substance abuse, violence, and accident proneness. High-strain jobs, characterized by high job demands and low employee control, have significantly higher incidence rates of distress, such as myocardial infarction (Karasek et al., 1988).

Organizational costs may accrue from employees' psychological, medical, and behavioral distress. The direct organizational costs of job strain take the form of EMPLOYEE TURNOVER, ABSENTEEISM, performance problems on the job, and workers' compensation. In addition, there are indirect organizational costs of job strain which may be reflected in low EMPLOYEE MORALE, low JOB SATISFACTION, faulty decision-making, and distrust in working relationships.

Individual Difference in the Stress–Strain Relationship

The stress response is universal; the intensity, frequency, and consequences of the stress response are not. Individual differences influence the degree to which job stress may become job strain or eustress. Gender, personality, EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, cognitive complexity, and interpersonal communication competency play a role in the response to stress (Macik-Frey, Quick, and Quick, 2004). Although many of these individual difference variables are inherent traits, there is evidence that focused training in stress management and prevention may improve the stress response outcomes for those people who are predisposed to experience strain in particular situations.

STRESS MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS may help prevent job stress from becoming one or another form of job strain (job distress) and may potentially assist with positive focus of energy (eustress). EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS can help employees who experience identifiable job strain, distress, and/or job burnout. HEALTH PROMOTION programs may also help employees to manage job stress.

Bibliography

Cooper, C. L. (ed.) (1996). *Handbook of Stress, Medicine and Health*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Karasek, R. A., Theorell, T., Schwartz, J. E., Schnall, P. L., Pieper, C. F., and Michela, J. L. (1988). Job characteristics in relation to the prevalence of myocardial infarction in the US health examination survey (HES) and the health and nutrition examination survey (HANES). *American Journal of Public Health*, **78**, 910–18.

Macik-Frey, M., Quick, J. C., and Quick, J. D. (2004). Interpersonal communication: The key to unlocking social support for preventive stress management. In C. L. Cooper (ed.), *Handbook of Stress, Medicine and Health*, rev. edn. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Quick, J. C., Quick, J. D., Nelson, D. L., and Hurrell, J. J., Jr. (1997). *Preventive Stress Management in Organizations*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Selye, H. (1976). *Stress in Health and Disease*. Boston: Butterworth.

Johnson v. *Transportation Agency, Santa Clara County* (1987)

Leonard Bierman

In *Johnson* the court considered whether a voluntary AFFIRMATIVE ACTION plan, developed by the county transportation agency, was justified by the existence of a *manifest imbalance* that reflected underrepresentation of women in *traditionally segregated job categories* rather than purported past *discriminatory* practices. The Supreme Court ruled by six to three that the Santa Clara Transportation Agency was justified in giving a road dispatcher's job to Diane Joyce, who scored two points *less* than a man on a test, but was found to be otherwise qualified by a panel of supervisors. The county's plan passed a three-pronged test set by the justices: it was flexible, temporary, and designed to gradually correct a manifest imbalance in the overwhelmingly white, male workforce. The plan did *not* require the discharge of white workers and their replacement by minority hires, nor did it absolutely bar the advancement of nonminority employees.

just-in-time production systems

James P. Womack

A just-in-time production system (JIT) is a term for the production management system pioneered by Taiichi Ohno and his colleagues at the Toyota Motor Company in the years immediately after World War II. Ohno believed that inventory was the root of most problems in physical production and set out to devise a universally applicable system in which the creation of significant amounts of inventory was impossible. In logic, the best way to do this was the introduction of a "pull" system in which no part or finished unit was made until the ultimate customer or the next stage in the production process specifically requested it. Ohno's mechanism for signaling the previous production stage to make more parts was the *kanban*, an order card returned from the next stage when more parts were needed.

Ohno's system could only work if previous stages were able to quickly switch production to the type of part just requested. Therefore, rapid tool changes were essential. (Methods for rapidly changing tools are often termed "single minute exchange of dies," after the usage of Shigeo Shingo, Ohno's colleague who perfected quick tool changes.)

Ohno's system also required high quality and a high degree of machine availability because, by design, there were no reserve inventories of parts on hand. *Jidoka* (or self-monitoring machines), *poka-yoke* (or mistake-proofing of processes), and total productive maintenance (a set of techniques to assure that all tools are available for work all the time) were accompanying techniques for JIT production, perfected in Japan in the 1950s.

See also *lean production*

Bibliography

Monden, Y. (1983). *The Toyota Production System*. Atlanta, GA: Institute of Industrial Engineers.

Ohno, T. (1988). *Just-in-Time for Today and Tomorrow*. Cambridge, MA: Productivity Press.