

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 204 695

CS 015 315

AUTHOR Huszczo, Gregory E.  
TITLE Job Involvement, Satisfaction and Motivation: A Comparison of Predictors.  
PUB DATE Apr 81  
NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association (53rd, Detroit, Michigan, April 30- May 2, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Employee Attitudes; Employees; Employment Level; \*Job Satisfaction; \*Morale; \*Motivation; Predictive Validity; \*Psychological Needs; \*Work Attitudes  
IDENTIFIERS \*Intrinsic Motivation

ABSTRACT

Considerable research has examined the correlates of job involvement and its conceptual independence from the notions of satisfaction and motivation, with an indication of considerable overlap between the three concepts as well as the possibility that job involvement may be more aligned with motivation than with satisfaction. A job attitude survey administered to 414 laborers, clerical workers, and professionals indicated that job involvement only differed more significantly from motivation than from satisfaction on its correlates with performance, and with dissatisfaction with autonomy needs. Satisfaction with the higher order needs of esteem and self realization explained significant variance in general job satisfaction. Motivation appeared to be a more important predictor of job involvement than satisfaction measures. (Author/JAC)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made  
\* from the original document.  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED204695

JOB INVOLVEMENT, SATISFACTION AND MOTIVATION:  
A COMPARISON OF PREDICTORS

Gregory E. Huszczo  
Eastern Michigan University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE  
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Gregory E. Huszczo*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association meeting,  
Detroit, Michigan, April 30 - May 2, 1981.

CG 015315

### Title

Job Involvement, Satisfaction and Motivation: A Comparison of Predictors

### Author

Gregory E. Huszczo, Eastern Michigan University

### Area

Industrial/Organizational Psychology

### Problem

The concept of job involvement has received much empirical and theoretical attention in the last 15 years. A thorough review of over 70 such papers appeared in 1977 (Rabinowitz and Hall 1977). Several authors (Huszczo, 1978; Cummings and Bigelow, 1976; Lawler and Hall, 1970; and Weissenberg and Guenfeld, 1968) have specifically addressed the issue of the conceptual independence of job involvement, job satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. All have basically concluded that although these variables do correlate with each other, there is sufficient evidence of conceptual independence and this is generalizable to quite divergent samples. Surprisingly none of the research has systematically investigated what correlates these three concepts share. This study has two purposes: 1.) to establish which variables distinguish these concepts and which they have in common, and 2.) to establish that although job involvement, satisfaction and motivation may be conceptually independent, job involvement is more akin to the concept of motivation than that of satisfaction.

### Procedure

Fifty students in a class on research methods were trained in survey administration and asked to administer a job attitudes survey to 10 subjects each. Eliminating returns with any missing data, a 414 subject sample resulted. The sample contained 94 general and skilled laborers (Blue-Collar), 117 sales and/or clerical workers (Low White Collar), and 203 managers and/or professionals (High White Collar). The data on the demographic variables

ave evidence that the sample was reasonably representative of the community from which the data was gathered. The survey instrument was designed to include measures of the self-perception variables listed in the above mentioned studies. Thus, five demographic variables (Sex, Age, Seniority, Job Classification Level, and Educational Level), three general self estimates (of satisfaction motivation and performance levels), all five of Porter's (1962) Need Satisfaction measures (both the dissatisfaction levels and the importance levels were calculated) and four other commonly used scales (Job Involvement, amount of participative decision making allowed, intrinsic motivation and identification with the company (see Ruh, White and Wood, 1975) comprised the survey. Correlations were calculated between each of these variables and the measures of the three focus concepts of this paper (Satisfaction, Motivation and Job Involvement). In order to determine whether any significant differences existed between  $r_{12}$ 's and  $r_{13}$ 's when both  $r$ 's are based on the same sample of  $N$  cases, McNemar (1969) suggests using a  $t$ -test where:

$$t = \frac{(r_{12} - r_{13}) \sqrt{(N - 3) (1 + r_{23})}}{\sqrt{2(1 - r_{12}^2 - r_{13}^2 - r_{23}^2 + 2r_{12}r_{13}r_{23})}}$$

This was used to determine which bivariate correlations distinguished the three focus variables. Finally, three separate step-wise multiple regression equations were established with criterion variables of satisfaction, motivation and job involvement respectively. An  $F$ -test (see McNemar, 1969) was calculated to determine when an additional step failed to significantly improve ( $p < .01$ ) the equation.

### Results

Table 1 presents the correlations between each of the predictor variables and each of the three focus variables. The results confirm numerous findings of correlations between the variables used here. Sex and dissatisfaction with

social needs did not correlate significantly with any of the focus variables. Dissatisfaction with security needs did not correlate significantly with job involvement and educational level and importance of security needs did not correlate with job satisfaction. These findings are also consistent with previous literature (see Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977). The correlations with job involvement differed significantly from those with job satisfaction on 12 of the possible 19 comparison variables. It differed significantly from those with motivation on only 5 of these. This analysis indicates that the only times job involvement differs more significantly from motivation than from satisfaction was on its correlates with performance and with dissatisfaction with autonomy needs. Furthermore, job involvement has significantly higher correlation with motivation ( $r = .66$ ) than with job satisfaction ( $r = .55$ ). One should also note that all three concepts are clearly intercorrelated.

The results from the multiple regression analyses are presented in Table 2 in a manner to indicate the relative importance of the predictors of each of the focus variables. Again it is obvious - that satisfaction, motivation and job involvement are interrelated. Certain interesting differences also are evident. Satisfaction with the higher order needs of esteem and self realization explain significant variance in the general job satisfaction measure. The self-estimate of performance is an important predictor of satisfaction and motivation but not job involvement. Autonomy needs and amount of allowed participation in decision making add important explained variance in the equation for motivation but not for satisfaction or job involvement. Furthermore, the variables of job classification level, importance of self realization, identification with the company's goals, and age add to the explained variance of job involvement but not to the other two equations. Finally, it should be noted that motivation (both the general measure and the measure of intrinsic motivation) are relatively more important predictors of job involvement than that of the satisfaction measures.

### Conclusions and Implications

Although previous research has concluded that satisfaction, motivation and job involvement are three conceptually independent variables, this study indicates some important overlaps as well. Lodahl and Kejner (1965) found job satisfaction and job involvement to have roughly the same factorial content but point out that "It would not be justified to conclude that job involvement is the same as job satisfaction." (p. 32). Other studies have focussed on the differences between job satisfaction and job involvement (Weissenberg and Gruenfeld, 1968, Huszczo, 1978) while still others have used job involvement items as measures of job satisfaction. The present study provides evidence that job involvement is conceptually more akin to motivation than satisfaction but all three are clearly interrelated.

A common feature of all three focus variables is their lack of relationship with the satisfaction of lower order needs. This is convergent with a great deal of previous literature and conforms with Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. The differences between the three concepts are more a matter of degree than kind. Perhaps the most outstanding differences are the greater importance of intrinsic motivation, identification with the company and job classification level variables to our understanding of the job involvement concept. The job classification level relationship with job involvement calls into question some previous research findings (Cummings\* and Bigelow, 1976; Lawler and Hall, 1970). Finally, the pattern of results in this study clearly shows a trend that job involvement scores have more in common with motivation scores than satisfaction scores. Future research is needed to substantiate these conclusions. It is recommended that such studies involve a sample with several job levels represented and an instrument with a wider variety of measures especially scales of personality traits and values. Practically every study in this area has used only self-report measures. Future studies should attempt to include more objective measures.

Table 1  
 Simple r's with Criterion Variables  
 (N = 414)  
 (r<sub>.01, 400</sub> = .13)

	<u>Job Satisfaction</u>	<u>Motivation Level</u>	<u>Job Involvement</u>
Sex	.03	-.03	.05
Age	.28	.28	.33
Seniority	.19	.17	.22
Job Classification	.27 <sup>3</sup>	.31 <sup>3</sup>	.42 <sup>1,2</sup>
Educational Level	.10 <sup>3</sup>	.14	.23 <sup>1</sup>
Job Satisfaction	X	.69 <sup>3</sup>	.55 <sup>2</sup>
Motivation Level	.69	X	.66
Performance	.42	.48 <sup>3</sup>	.38 <sup>2</sup>
Job Involvement	.55 <sup>2</sup>	.66 <sup>1</sup>	X
Participation in Decisions	.34 <sup>2,3</sup>	.46 <sup>1</sup>	.45 <sup>1</sup>
Intrinsic Motivation	.36 <sup>2,3</sup>	.53 <sup>1,3</sup>	.62 <sup>1,2</sup>
Identification with Co.	.31 <sup>3</sup>	.33	.42 <sup>1</sup>
Security Needs (I)	.11	.14	.19
Social Needs (I)	.23 <sup>3</sup>	.30	.35 <sup>1</sup>
Esteem Needs (I)	.24 <sup>2,3</sup>	.34 <sup>1</sup>	.40 <sup>1</sup>
Autonomy Needs (I)	.27 <sup>2,3</sup>	.39 <sup>1</sup>	.42 <sup>1</sup>
Self-Realization Needs (I)	.29 <sup>2,3</sup>	.39 <sup>1</sup>	.46 <sup>1</sup>
(D) Security Needs	-.23 <sup>3</sup>	-.16	-.08 <sup>1</sup>
(D) Social Needs	-.09	-.12	-.10
(D) Esteem Needs	-.33 <sup>3</sup>	-.25	-.17 <sup>1</sup>
(D) Autonomy Needs	-.35	-.37 <sup>3</sup>	-.25 <sup>2</sup>
(D) Self-Realization Needs	-.40 <sup>3</sup>	-.36 <sup>3</sup>	-.26 <sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>This correlation differs significantly ( $p < .01$ ) from the correlation between this variable and job satisfaction.

<sup>2</sup>This correlation differs significantly ( $p < .01$ ) from the correlation between this variable and motivation.

<sup>3</sup>This correlation differs significantly ( $p < .01$ ) from the correlation between this variable and job involvement.

Table 2

## Step-wise Multiple Regression Equation Results

Step	Satis	F	Motiv	F	JINV	F
1	Motiv	374.85**	Satis	374.85**	Motiv.	322.16**
2	Dest	21.6**	JINV	117.08**	Int Motiv	89.29**
3	JINV	12.01**	Perf	23.95**	Job Class	34.18**
4	D Self Re	6.01*	PIM	13.07**	Satis	12.31**
5	Perf	4.64*	Int. Motiv.	7.85**	Self Re I	7.83**
6	Int. Motiv.	5.00*	D Aut	7.01**	Ident	5.62*
7			Att I	6.80**	Age	3.99*
8			Sex	4.26*		
	$R^2 = .53482$		$R^2 = .64974$		$R^2 = .60407$	

Critical  $F_{1, 400} = 3.86$  for  $p \leq .05$  (\*) and  $6.70$  for  $p \leq .01$  (\*\*)



## References

- Alluto, J. & Belasco, J. A Typology for Participation in Organizational Decision Making. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972, Vol. 17:1, 117-126.
- Cummings, T. & Bigelow, J. Satisfaction, Job Involvement, and Intrinsic Motivation: An Extension of Lawler and Hall's Factor Analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, Vol. 61, No. 4, 523-525.
- Gorn, G. & Kanungo, R. Job Involvement and Motivation: Are Intrinsically Motivated Managers More Job Involved? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 26, 1980, 265-277.
- Hays, W. Statistics for the Social Sciences. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., Chicago, IL., 1973, 662-667.
- Huszczko, G. Job Involvement vs. Job Satisfaction: A Comparison of Predictors, Southeastern Psychological Association Annual Convention, Atlanta, GA., 1978.
- Kanungo, R.N. The Concepts of Alienation and Involvement Revisited. Psychological Bulletin, 1979, 86, 119-137.
- Lawler, E. & Hall, D.T. Relationship of Job Characteristics to Job Involvement, Satisfaction, and Intrinsic Motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 49, 24-33.
- Lodahl, T. & Kejner, N. The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 54, 305-312.
- McNemar, Q. Psychological Statistics. New York, Wiley Press, 1962.
- Moch, M. Job Involvement, Internal Motivation, and Employees' Integration Into Networks of Work Relationship. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 25, 1980, 15-31.
- Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K, and Bent, D.H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Patchen, M. Some Questionnaire Measures of Employee Motivation and Morale. Institute for Social Research Monograph, 1965, 41, 1-70.
- Porter, L. Job Attitudes in Management: Perceived Deficiencies in Need Fulfillment as a Function of Job Level. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1962, 46, 375-384.
- Rebinowitz, S. & Hall, D. T. Organizational Research on Job Involvement. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84(2), 265-288.
- Ruh, R., White, J. K. & Wood, R. Job Involvement, Values, Personal Background, Participation in Decision Making, and Job Attitudes. Academy of Management Journal, Volume 18, No. 2, 1975, 300-312.

References Cont'd.

Vroom, V. Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation.  
Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Weissenberg, P. & Gruenfeld, L. Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and  
Job Involvement, Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 469-473.