



Uluslararası Sosyal Arařtırmalar Dergisi

The Journal of International Social Research

Cilt: 4 Sayı: 17

Volume: 4 Issue: 17

Bahar 2011

Spring 2011

INTRINSIC MOTIVATION, JOB SATISFACTION AND SELF-EFFICACY AS PREDICTORS OF JOB PERFORMANCE OF INDUSTRIAL WORKERS IN IJEBU ZONE OF OGUN STATE

Olayiwola OLUSOLA*

Abstract

This study investigated self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance of industrial workers with the aim of improving employees' productivity in Nigerian industrial settings.

Descriptive study of expo facto was adopted. The population for this study was made up of employees of both Frigoglas Nigeria Plc Ijebu-Ode (500 workers) and Ayokunle Industry Ltd Ijebu-Ode (600 workers). A total of 150 workers were selected through simple random sampling technique from each organization.

Four research instruments titled Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMT), Self-Efficacy Scale (SES) and Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) were used to collect data for the study. Job Performance was assessed using the Annual Performance Evaluation Reports (APER). The IMT was adapted from Ryan (1982). The test retest reliability of the instrument administered within two weeks interval yielded .80. The SES was self developed and has coefficient of .82. JSS was also self developed and have coefficient of .76. It measured job satisfaction. The response format used for the instruments was the Likert format with options ranging from Strongly Agree (SA) = 4, Agree (A) = 3, Disagree (D) =2 and Strongly Disagree (SD) =1. Higher score on the scale indicate high, intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and job satisfaction. All the instruments were divided into two parts. Part A solicited responses on personal information about respondents while part B collected data on the various variables under study. The workers completed the questionnaires while their APER forms were collected for each worker that completed the questionnaire. Multiple Regression Analysis was used to analyse data collected. 0.05 level of significance was applied in the analysis.

As a result of the finding, the analysis of the hypotheses are clear indication that (1) self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction will

* Department of Educational Foundations and Counselling, Faculty of Education, Obafemi Awolowo University

predict the job performance of industrial workers and (2) relatively, each of these variables will predict the job performance of workers.

Therefore, it is suggested that for organization to achieve their stated objectives and goals, managements of those organization must put in place policies that will encourage self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction among workers.

Key Words: Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Workers.

Introduction

Organizations seem to exist based on their goals and objectives. This perhaps made attainment of organization goals takes a paramount position in management thought. The attainment of these goals however is said to be depended largely on the resources at the disposal of such organization. Potent among the resources for the achievement of organization goals is the human resources which is dependent on their job performance. However as noted by Oloyede (1999), Ayodele (2002), Adikwu (2006), and Oba (2008), there is acute problem of low performance in many Nigerian Industries which has serious negative implication on the ability to achieve organization goals.

Katz (2005) defined performance as goal accomplishment. It is the process of reaching an end-that is, organizational goals. Performance is therefore, the qualitative and quantitative measure of activities, duties and operations which a job holder achieved efficiently and effectively within a defined time limit. Studies have found that the main objectives and purpose of personnel performance is achievement of target goals set by the organization which is fully dependent on the performance of its personnel and that personnel performance plays a significant role in the overall development of the organization. (Cole 1996, Dessler, 1994 and Ubeku 1975)..

The issue of job performance has been a great concern to many organizations especially in Nigeria. There have been many agitations on the part of the workers which had led to much industrial unrest. The workers of Nigerchin Nigeria Ltd and Kablemetal Nig. Plc were on strike for many months demanding for a better working condition (Adikwu 2006 & Democratic Socialist Movement 2008). Also, the Food and Beverages Workers Union had called her members for a boycott in recent years. This had led to many job cut and loss of profit on the part of their management. To pacify these workers, their management had tried to put some measures on ground by motivating them through financial inducements, provision of welfare services, many of them have also introduced casualisation of workers which has even worsen the situation.

Several factors are believed to influence a person's desire to perform work. The need based theories explained these desires; they explained the importance of motivation primarily as a phenomenon that occurs intrinsically, or within an individual and job satisfaction. Also the social cognitive theories believed that putting all other things in place, the personal disposition of an individual plays a very significant role. Therefore, the

focus of this study is to investigate whether intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and job satisfaction has a role to play in predicting job performance of industrial employees

Motivation seems to be a fundamental instrument for regulating work behaviour of staff. This may have made Olawoyin, (2000) to conclude that the optimization of work behaviour can best be achieved by motivating the workers. Ololube (2006) also asserted that motivation to work whether intrinsic or extrinsic are very essential in the lives of workers because they form the fundamental reason for working in life. As important as motivation is to workers performance, studies have supported the importance of intrinsic motivation over extrinsic motivation. For example, citing Maslow need hierarchy, Hersberg two factor, McClelland achievement motivation and Alderfer Existence Relatedness and Growth theories, Cole (1996), Drucker (2002) and Mercer (1998) claimed that financial rewards and incentives are important but they are not sufficient positive motivation. To them, intrinsic motivation- such as natural or personal drives, desires, impulse etc belonging to a person internally, has a role to play in job performance of workers.

With the same connecting string, Firestone & Pennel (1993); Johnson, (1990) and Rosenboltz, (1989), noted that commitment to the workplace have been found to be enhanced by psychotic rewards (acknowledgement of competence), meaningful and varied work, tasks autonomy and participatory decision-making, positive feedback, collaboration, administrative support, reasonable work load, adequate resources and pay, and learning opportunities providing challenge and accomplishment .

.Job satisfaction is link to performance (Dessler 1994). Job satisfaction is more of attitude, an internal state which may be associated with feeling of achievement either qualitatively or quantitatively. Furthermore, Mckenna (2000), Peretomode (1991), Whawo (1993) and Ololube (2006) were of the opinion that job satisfaction is necessary in order to achieve a high level of motivation and performance. Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman (1959) two factor theory is said to be heavily based on need fulfillment because of their interest in how best to satisfy workers (Dessler,1994; Ololube, 2006) Herzberg et al (1959) believed that the Hygienic or Maintenance factors will make workers to be dissatisfied and this will not improve performance. Motivation factors such as drive to excel, job enrichment, recognition etc will make workers work harder. They are sometimes called intrinsic factors (Yalokwu, 2000). However, War (1998) in Ololube (2006) cautioned that improved job satisfaction can sometimes decrease job performance.

The importance of self-efficacy in successful job performance must not be underestimated (Magar, 1992). Self-efficacy is the personal disposition of the job holder. It is the belief in ones capabilities in executing a course of action and it affects a person's choice of behaviour, motivation, perseverance and facilitative thought patterns (Bandura, 1977, 1986 & 1997). Researchers that supported the relationship between self-efficacy and job performance stated that, people who hold strong self-efficacy beliefs tend to - be more satisfied with their job and demonstrate more commitment (Trentham, Silvern & Brogdon. 1985) and have lower absenteeism (McDonald & Siegall, 1993).

Also, Hackett (1995) and Lent & Hackett (1987) confirmed that individuals who lack confidence in skills they possess are less likely to engage in tasks in which those skills

are required, and they will more quickly give up in the face of difficulty. Self-efficacy involves the judicious use of one's time to achieve set goals Drucker in Ola, and the effectiveness of leaders (Maxwell, 1995)

It cannot be disputed that self-efficacy has been a much more consistent predictor of behaviour and behaviour change than has any of the other closely related expectancy variables for example, self-concept (Graham and Weiner, 1995). Collins (1982) concluded after a research that ability was related to performance but regardless of ability level, workers with high self-efficacy tackled more problems correctly and reworked more of the ones they missed. In the same vein, Bouffard-Bouchard, Parent, and Larius & Egrare (1991) found that workers with high self-efficacy engaged in more effective self-regulatory strategies at each level of ability.

Self-efficacy regulates the way in which an individual perceives his or her competence. This perception influences an individual's ability to complete a task and a set, attainable goal (Pajares & Schunk, 2001). According to Pajares (2007), and Schunk & Pajares (2001), research studies have demonstrated that self-efficacy affects the level of motivation, learning, and achievement. Covey (1994), after conducting a research on the importance of self-efficacy to job performance, proposed seven habits of highly effective people, which allow individuals to fully experience themselves and their sense of self-worth, and this enables them to deal effectively with others from a position of quiet inner strength.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis below was tested at 0.05 level of significance:

1. There is no significant contribution of intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and job satisfaction to the prediction of job performance of industrial workers.
2. There is no significant contribution of intrinsic motivation to the prediction of industrial workers job performance
3. There is no significant contribution of self-efficacy to the prediction of industrial workers job performance
4. There is no significant contribution of job satisfaction to the prediction of industrial workers job performance

Research methods

The population for this study was made up of employees of both Frigoglas Nigeria Plc Ijebu-Ode (500 workers) and Ayokunle Industry Ltd Ijebu-Ode (600 workers). A total of 150 workers were selected through simple random sampling technique from each organization. The total sample from the two organizations was 300.

Research Instruments

Descriptive study of expo facto was adopted. Three research instruments titled Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMT), Self-Efficacy Scale (SES) and Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) were employed. Job Performance was assessed using the Annual Performance Evaluation Reports (APER). The IMT adapted from Ryan (1982) has 35 items. The scale has been used in previous studies (Koestner and Deci 1991, Deci Egharari, Patrick and Leone

(1994) and yielded internal consistencies between .75 and .85. The test retest reliability of the instrument administered within two weeks interval yielded .80. The response format used for the scale was the Likert format with options ranging from Exactly True = 4, Moderately True =3, Rarely True = 2 and Not at all True =1. Higher score on the scale indicate high intrinsic motivation. The SES was self developed. It has 22 items and has coefficient of .82. The response format used for the scale was the Likert format with options ranging from Strongly Agree (SA) = 4, Agree (A) = 3, Disagree (D) =2 and Strongly Disagree (SD) =1. Higher score on the scale indicate high self-efficacy. JSS was also self developed. It has 24 items and has coefficient of .76. The response format used for the scale was the Likert format with options ranging from Strongly Agree (SA) = 4, Agree (A) = 3, Disagree (D) =2 and Strongly Disagree (SD) =1. Higher score on the scale indicate high job satisfaction. All the instruments were divided into two parts. Part A solicited responses on personal information about respondents while part B collected data on the various variables under study. The workers completed the questionnaires while their APER forms were collected for each worker that completed the questionnaire.

Multiple Regression Analysis was used to analyse data collected.0.05 level of significance was applied in the analysis.

RESULTS

Hypothesis One

There is no significant contribution of intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and job satisfaction to the prediction of job performance of industrial workers. Data were subjected to multiple regression analysis with all the variables entered into the model at the same time. Results of the multiple regression analysis that have been tested for significance are presented on Table 1 that indicates the regression coefficients and the analysis of variance.

Table. 1: Multiple Regression Analysis of the Prediction of Job Performance of Industrial workers from intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and job satisfaction.

REGRESSION	ANOVA					
	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
R - .986	Regression	21770	3	7257.777	3211.818	< .05
R ² - .971	Residual	641.660	284	2.259		
R ² (adj) - .971	Total	22412.000	287			

The results in Table 1 above indicated that intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and job satisfaction together significantly predicted job performance of industrial workers [R = .986; R² = .971; R² (adj) =.971; F_(3,284) = 3211.818; p < .05]. This revealed that 97.1 % of the variations in industrial worker' job performance was accounted for by intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and job satisfaction. The null hypothesis of no significant contribution of intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and job satisfaction to the prediction of workers job performance was rejected by the findings of this study. The findings imply that intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and job satisfaction would combine to predict performance of industrial workers.

Hypothesis Two:

There is no significant contribution of intrinsic motivation to the prediction of industrial workers job performance

Data were subjected to multiple regression analysis with all the variables entered into the model at the same time. Results of the multiple regression analysis that have been tested for significance are presented on Table 2 that indicates the regression coefficients and the analysis of variance.

Table. 2: Multiple Regression Analysis of the Prediction of Job Performance of Industrial workers from intrinsic motivation.

REGRESSION	ANOVA					
	Model	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	P
R =.763 R ² = .613 R ² (adj) = .612	Regression	13741.231	1	13741.231	453.246	<.05
	Residual	8670.769	286	30.371		
	Total	22412.000	287			

The results in Table 2 above illustrated that intrinsic motivation significantly predicted job performance of industrial workers [R = .783; R² = .613; R² (adj) =.612; F_(1,286) = 453.246; p < .05]. This showed that 61.3 % of the variations in industrial worker’ job performance was accounted for by their intrinsic motivation. The findings rejected the null hypothesis of no significant contribution of intrinsic motivation to the prediction of workers job performance. The findings therefore imply that intrinsic motivation would predict performance of industrial workers.

Hypothesis Three:

There is no significant contribution of self-efficacy to the prediction of industrial workers job performance

Data were subjected to multiple regression analysis. Results of the multiple regression analysis that have been tested for significance are presented on Table 3 that indicates the regression coefficients and the analysis of variance.

Table. 3: Multiple Regression Analysis of the Prediction of Job Performance of Industrial workers from self-efficacy.

REGRESSION	ANOVA					
	Model	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	P
R =.903 R ² = .815 R ² (adj) = .814	Regression	18267.776	1	18267.776	1260.690	<.05
	Residual	4144.224	286	14.490		
	Total	22412.000	287			

The results in Table 3 above showed that self-efficacy significantly predicted job performance of industrial workers [R = .903; R² = .815; R² (adj) = 814; F_(1,286) = 1260.690; p < .05]. This showed that 81.5 % of the variations in industrial worker’ job performance was accounted for by their self-efficacy. The findings rejected the null hypothesis of no significant contribution of self-efficacy to the prediction of workers job performance. The findings therefore imply that self-efficacy would predict performance of industrial workers.

Hypothesis Four:

There is no significant contribution of job satisfaction to the prediction of industrial workers job performance

Data were subjected to multiple regression analysis. Results of the multiple regression analysis that have been tested for significance are presented on Table 4 that indicating the regression coefficients and the analysis of variance.

Table. 3: Multiple Regression Analysis of the Prediction of Job Performance of Industrial workers from job satisfaction.

REGRESSION	ANOVA					
	Model	Sum of Square	Df	Mean Square	F	P
R =.736 R ² = .541 R ² (adj) = .540	Regression	12135.909	1	12135.909	337.762	<.05
	Residual	10276.091	286	35.930		
	Total	22412.000	287			

The results in Table 4 above illustrated that job satisfaction significantly predicted job performance of industrial workers [R = .736; R² = .541; R² (adj) = .540; F_(1,286) = 337.762; p < .05]. This showed that 54.1 % of the variations in industrial worker’ job performance was accounted for by their job satisfaction. The findings rejected the null hypothesis of no significant contribution of job satisfaction to the prediction of workers job performance. The findings therefore imply that job satisfaction would predict performance of industrial workers.

Discussion

The result of hypothesis one revealed that intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and job satisfaction significantly predicted job performance of industrial workers. This means low performance of industrial workers as observed by Oloyede (1999), Ayodele (2002), Adikwu (2006), and Oba (2008) may have been as a result of lack of those variables mentioned above among the workers. This finding however corroborated the position of Olawoyin, (2000), Ololube (2006), Mckenna (2000), Peretomode (1991), Whawo (1993), Trentham, Silvern & Brogdon. (1985) and Bandura, (1977, 1986 & 1997) when they opined that factors of intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction and self-efficacy are essential for workers’ optimal productivity.

The result of hypothesis two revealed that intrinsic motivation significantly predicted job performance of industrial workers. This finding conforms to Cole (1995), Drucker (2002) and Mercer (1998) when they claimed that financial rewards and incentives are not sufficient positive motivator. To them, intrinsic motivation- such as natural or personal drives, desires, impulse etc belonging to a person internally, has a role to play in job performance of workers.

In workplace psychotic rewards (acknowledgement of competence), meaningful and varied work, tasks autonomy and participatory decision-making, positive feedback, collaboration, administrative support, reasonable work load, adequate resources and pay, and learning opportunities has been proved to be providing challenges and

accomplishment for workers (Firestone & Pennel (1993); Johnson, (1990) and Rosenboltz, (1989).

The outcome of tested hypothesis three revealed that self-efficacy significantly predicted job performance of workers. This confirms Bandura 1987, 1988 research findings that self-efficacy has the capabilities to produce designated level of performance. Also, according to Pajares (2007), and Schunk & Pajares (2001), research studies have demonstrated that self-efficacy affects the level of motivation, learning, and achievement. It cannot be disputed that self-efficacy has been a much more consistent predictor of behaviour and behaviour change than has any of the other closely related expectancy variables for example, self-concept (Graham and Weiner, 1995).

Hypothesis four which stated that job satisfaction will not significantly predict industrial workers job performance was rejected. This revealed that job satisfaction is a potent factor in productivity of workers. The finding agrees with Spector (1997), Peretomode (1991), Whawo (1993) and Ololube (2006) who were of the opinion that job satisfaction is necessary in order to achieve a high level of motivation and performance.

The implication of the findings is that organizations need to put policies in place so as to make the workers develop interest in their jobs and also help develop their efficacy beliefs which will lead to job satisfaction and enhancement of productivity.

Conclusion

This study concluded that intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction and self-efficacy are very essential for optimal productivity of industrial workers, acknowledgement of competence and commitment would boost workers morale.

Recommendation

Based on the findings of this study, it is therefore recommended that organizational orientation programme should be designed and organized to encourage inner drives and fulfillment in workers. Also organizations should consider job enrichment, acknowledgement of competence and commitment as measures that would boost workers morale.

REFERENCES

- ADIKWU, E. (2006) NLC Pickets Nigerchin at Last. Retrieved from <http://www.comunistvoice.org> on 12th August, 2009.
- AYODELE, K.O. (2002) Nigerian Workers: satisfied or dissatisfied? An unpublished monograph
- BANDURA, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- BANDURA, A. (1977). Self- efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behavioural change *psychological review*, 84, 191-215.
- BANDURA, A (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: Witt Freeman and Company.
- BOUFFARD-BOUCHARD, T., Parent, S. Lariv, E & Egrave, S. (1991). Influence of self efficacy on self-regulation and performance among Junior and Senior High- School Aged Students. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, 14, 153-164
- COLE, G.A. (1996). *Management Theory and Practice*. London: Letts Educational Aldine Place.
- COLLIINS, J. L. (1982) Self-efficacy and ability in achievement behaviour. *Paper resented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. New York.
- COVEY, S.R. (1994). *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*. London: Simon & Schuster.
- Democratic Socialist Movement (2009). Victory for Kabelmetal. Retrieved from workerscwi@worldsoc.co.uk on 12th August, 2009S
- DESSLER, G. (1994). *Human Resources Management*. 6th Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

- DRUCKER, P. (2002) *The Practice of Management*. New Delhi. Allied Publishers Private Ltd.
- FIRESTONE, W.A. & Pennel, J.R.(1993). Teacher commitment, working conditions and differential incentive policies. *Review of Educational Research*. 63 (4). 489-525.
- GRAHAM, S. & Weiner, B. (1995). *Theories and Principles of Motivation*. In D.C Berliner & R.C Calfe (Eds). Handbook of Educational Psychology. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.
- HACKETT, G. (1995). Self-efficacy in career choice and development in A. Bandura (Ed). *Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies* (pp, 232-258). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- HEZBERG, F., Mausner, B. & Synderman, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- JOHNSON, S.M. (1990). *Teachers at Work*. New York: Basic books.
- KATZ, N.R. (2005). Improving workers job performance. Accessed on 21st September 2007 from <http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/visions/performance/management/katzincentives.htm>.
- LENT, R.W. & Hackett, G. (1987). Career self-efficacy: Empirical status and future directions. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*. 30, 347-382
- MAGAL, R.F. (1992) No self-efficacy, no performance. *Training*. Mineapolis April.
- MASLOW, A.H. (1970). *Motivation and Personality* 2nd edition. New York: Herper and Row.
- MAXWELL, J.C. (1995). *Developing the Leaders around You*. Port Harcourt: Spiritual Life Outreach Inc.
- MCDONALD, T. & Siegall, M. (1993). The effects of technological self-efficacy and job focus on job performance, attitudes, and withdrawal behaviours. *Journal of Psychology*. 5. 465-475.
- MCKENNA, E. F. (2000). *Business Psychology and Organizational Behaviour: A student Handbook*. Hove; Psychology Press.
- MERCER, M. R. (1998) <http://www.coursework.info/1/73471.html> Viewed last on 24th September, 2006.
- OBA, J. O. (2008) Modern slavery of local workers. Retrieved from <http://www.comunistvoice.com>.
- OLA, R. F. (2001). *Techniques in Administration Management*. Lagos: Amfitop Books
- OLAWOYIN, S.J. (2000). *The effect of motivation on staff teaching effectiveness in private and public secondary schools in Osun State*. An Unpublished M.A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Educational Administration and Planning, Obafemi Awolowo University. Ile-Ife.
- OLOLUBE, N.P. (2006). Teachers job satisfaction and motivation for school effectiveness. An assessment. Retrieved on 12th December 2007 from <http://www.usca.edu/essays/vol182006/ololubepdf>
- OLOYEDE, O (1999). African factory management: A study of some factories in Southern Nigeria. *African Sociological Review*, 3 (1) 94-100.
- PAJARES, F. (2007). Overview of social cognitive theory and of self-efficacy. Retrieved on June 31, 2007 from <File://A:\self-efficacy%20defined.htm>
- PERETOMODE, V.F. (1991). *Educational Administration: Applied Concepts and Theoretical Perspective*. Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers.
- ROSENHOLTZ, S. (1989). *Teachers' Workplace: The social organization of schools*: New York: Teachers College Press.
- SCHUNK, D.H. & Pajares, F. (2001). The development of academic self- efficacy. In A.Wigfield & J. Eccles (Eds). *Development of Achievement Motivation*. San Diego: American Press.
- TRENTHAM, L., Silvern, S. & Brogolon, R. (1985). Teacher efficacy and teacher competency ratings. *Psychology in Schools*. 22(3). 343-352.
- UBEKU, A.K. (1975). *Personnel Management in Nigeria*. Benin City: Ethiopia Publishing Corporation.
- WHAWO, D.D. (1993). *Educational Administration: Planning and Supervision*. Benin City: Jodah Publicatons.
- YALOKWU, P.O. (2000). *Management Concepts and Techniques*. (2nd, Ed). Lagos: Peak Publishers.