

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSCIENTIOUSNESS, SOCIAL NEEDS AND WORK VALUES

Mehmet ÇETİN*

Abstract

This paper aims to investigate the associations between conscientiousness, social needs and work values. Particularly, it asserts research questions on how conscientiousness and need for power, need for achievement, need for affiliation and need for autonomy are linked with personal, normative, economic and spiritual work values. Data was collected from 107 employees working in various sectors through convenience sampling method. Findings demonstrate significant relationships between conscientiousness and normative and economic work values. Need for achievement and need for affiliation are significantly correlated with all of the sub-dimensions of work values. Need for autonomy is significantly correlated with all sub dimensions of work values except personal work values. Where the only significant relationships between need for power and work values is in the economic work values dimension. The valuable insights provided from findings are shared at the end of the study.

Key Words: Conscientiousness, Social Needs, Work Values

SORUMLULUK SOSYAL İHTİYAÇLAR VE İŞ AMAÇLARI ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ

Özet

Bu çalışma sorumluluk, sosyal ihtiyaçlar ve Çalışma değerleri arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma özel olarak, sorumluluk kişilik özelliğinin, güç ihtiyacı, başarı ihtiyacı, duygusallık ihtiyacı ve otonomi ihtiyacının kişisel, normatif, ekonomik ve manevi çalışma Amaçları ile nasıl bir ilişki içerisinde olduğunu sorgular. Çalışmanın verileri kolay ulaşılabilirlik metodu ile çeşitli sektörlerde çalışmakta olan 107 çalışan üzerinden toplanmıştır. Çalışmanın bulguları sorumluluk ile normatif ve ekonomik Çalışma Amaçları arasında anlamlı ilişkiler göstermektedir. Başarı ihtiyacı ve duygusallık ihtiyacı tüm Çalışma Amaçları alt boyutları ile anlamlı bir ilişki göstermiştir. Otonomi ihtiyacı kişisel Çalışma Amaçları dışındaki her ihtiyaçla anlamlı ilişki içindedir. Güç ihtiyacı sadece ekonomik Çalışma Amaçları ile ilişkili bulunmuştur. Çalışmanın sonunda bulgulardan üretilen öngörüler paylaşılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sorumluluk, Sosyal İhtiyaçlar, Çalışma Amaçları

Introduction

People invest a great amount of their time and effort in their work life. We do what we do for reasons. The reasons and values behind this investment is very a significant concept to investigate for understanding and predicting individuals' attitudes and behaviors in the workplace. This paper specifically aims to investigate two possible antecedents of work values: conscientiousness and social needs in order to contribute to the conceptualization of what determines our work values. One possible answer for the variation of our work values/reasons may be our various needs. What we need determines what we value and seek in life. Another variable that is effortful on why we work may be our personality. We chose conscientiousness dimension of big five-personality taxonomy in order to enhance our knowledge on this area.

1. Method

1.1. Data Analysis

Data gathered through questionnaires analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 25).

* Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi
İYBF /İşletme / İstanbul/Turkey - Mehmet.cetin@izu.edu.tr

Coefficient alphas were generated through reliability analysis in order to assess the internal consistency of the scales. We used exploratory factor analysis to investigate the factor structures of the questionnaires. KMO tests were used to assess the properness of the sample. Correlation analysis was used to investigate the associations among study variables.

1.2. Sample

Data was collected from 107 employees working in İstanbul in various sectors through convenience sampling method. We administrated 170 questionnaires and so the response rate %62. Approximately 57 percent of the participants were men and average age was 29.

1.3. Measures:

1.3.1. Social Needs Scale:

We used the revised version of the Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Steers and Braunsteins (1976). The original questionnaire consist of four needs need for dominance, need for affiliation, need for autonomy, and need for achievement. Çalışkan (2006) revised the scale to fix the construct validity problem (with Turkish sample) and evidenced adequate coefficient alphas of the dimensions of the questionnaire: need for dominance .82, need for affiliation .76, need for autonomy .72 and need for achievement .72.

1.3.2. Conscientiousness Scale:

To measure the conscientiousness levels of participants we used the sub-scale of Big Five Personality Inventory (John, Donahue & Kentle, 1992). The original scale measures all the big five dimensions. We used the items that were addressing conscientiousness sub-dimension. John and Srivastava (1999) evidenced .82 Cronbach alpha score for this dimension. Sümer and colleagues (2005) translated the scale into Turkish. Keçeci (2017) calculated .90 reliability score for this dimension on a Turkish sample. A six-point likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” (6) to “strongly disagree” (1) was used to assess the levels of conscientiousness of the participants.

1.3.3. Work Values Scale:

The scale conducted for measuring the work reasons/values of respondents was developed by Tevrüz & Turgut, (2004). They generated 79 items to measure the work values of employees in 12 dimension in the first step and then they conducted a second order factor analysis and reached a 12 items 3 dimensions construct as: normative, individualistic and earthly reasons for work. They calculated .82, .66, and .68 Cronbach Alpha scores for the dimensions in order.

2. Findings

2.1. Results of Factor Analysis

We conducted exploratory factor analysis to investigate the factor structures of the questionnaires. Coefficient alphas were generated though reliability analysis in order to assess the internal consistency of the scales. KMO tests were used the asses the properness of the sample. Social Needs Measure demonstrated the 4 dimensions structure as it is in its original form. All Cronbach alpha coefficients were above 70. The variances explained by each dimension, their means and results of the KMO analysis were given in the table.

Table 1. Results of Factor and Reliability Analysis for Social Needs Measure

Dimensions	Cronbach Alpha	MEAN	%VAR
Need for Power	,762	4,2146	33,579
Need for Affiliation	,730	4,6589	12,085
Need for Autonomy	,715	4,5935	8,667
Need for Achievement	,733	4,9408	6,805
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sampling Adequacy : ,814 Chi-Square: 521,557 Df: 105 Sig: ,000			

The factors for work values shaped as personal work values, normative work values, economic work values and spiritual work values. All Cronbach alpha coefficients are above or near .70.

An example item for personal work values dimension is “Works for making their dreams come true, to satisfy personal pleasures and hobbies, sightseeing and fun”. An example item for normative work values dimension is “Works for being beneficial to the community, contributing to national development and economy, to creating a peaceful society, serving and being leaving beneficial things to next generations”. An example item for economic work values dimension is “Works for having status and prestige, gaining respect and acceptance of society, having a good career and having authority and power”. An example item for spiritual work values dimension is “Works for having a direction in life, being done some significant things in their life and achieving spiritual fulfillment”.

Table 2. Results of Factor and Reliability Analysis for Work Values Measure

Dimensions	Cronbach Alpha	MEAN	%VAR
Personal Work Values	,720	3,3738	31,916
Normative Work Values	,703	4,3458	16,203
Economic Work Values	,669	4,6028	14,799
Spiritual Work Values	,668	3,9346	10,680
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sampling Adequacy : ,688 Chi-Square: 306,789 Df: 45 Sig: ,000			

The results of factor analysis for conscientiousness measure demonstrated a two dimensional structure where reverse coded items were clustered together as an anti-conscientiousness dimension. To simplify the analysis and understanding of findings we decided to sum the reverse coded dimension and the first dimension to get a total conscientiousness dimension. The variances explained by each dimension, their means and results of the KMO analysis were given in the table.

Table 3. Results of Factor and Reliability Analysis for Conscientiousness Measure

Dimensions	Cronbach Alpha	MEAN	%VAR
Conscientiousness	,833	5,0879	46,821
Conscientiousness (R)	,711	4,5377	12,237
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sampling Adequacy : ,846 Chi-Square: 351,202 Df: 36 Sig: ,000			

2.2. Results of Correlation Analysis

We used correlation analysis to investigate the associations among study variables. Findings demonstrate significant relationships between study variables. There is a significant and positive association between conscientiousness and normative (.336**) and economic (.350**) work values. Conscientiousness did not show any significant relationships with Personal and Spiritual work values.

Table 4. The correlations among Study Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Personal Work Values	1							
Normative Work Values	,240*	1						
Economic Work Values	,166	,198*	1					
Spiritual Work Values	,503**	,275**	,231*	1				
Conscientiousness	-,044	,336**	,350**	,117	1			
Need for Power	,109	,128	,410**	,133	,313**	1		
Need for Affiliation	,296**	,227*	,457**	,274**	,279**	,304**	1	
Need for Autonomy	,173	,200*	,443**	,274**	,296**	,589**	,288**	1
Need for Achievement	,220*	,277**	,454**	,334**	,526**	,506**	,345**	,493*

Need for achievement and need for affiliation are significantly correlated with all of the sub-dimensions of work values. Personal Work Values (.220*), Normative Work Values (.277**) Economic Work Values (.454**) and Spiritual Work Values (.334**) are correlated with need for achievement. For this dimension Economic Work Values (.454**) demonstrates the highest correlation. Personal Work Values (.296**) Normative Work Values (.227*), Economic Work Values (.457**) and Spiritual Work Values (.274**) are correlated with need for affiliation. Economic Work Values (.454**) demonstrates the highest correlation for this dimension too.

Need for autonomy is significantly correlated with all sub dimensions of work values except personal work values. Where the only significant relationships between need for power and work values is in the economic work values (.410**) dimension.

Discussion and Conclusion

Findings of the study support our curiosity for the associations between conscientiousness, social needs and work values as they demonstrate significant relationships among them. There are links between what individuals need and how their conscientiousness levels are with why they work. Further elaboration of these associations may provide valuable practical implications for management and leadership. As conscientiousness levels of employees increase the levels of economic and normative work values increase. Individuals who are high on conscientiousness tend to feel responsible, be self-disciplined, dutiful and orderly. These characteristics are in line with seeking economic freedom, security and providing for children. Also producing for the benefit of the society and the economical wealth of the country are some values that are very much in accordance with aforementioned adjectives. Jobs may have different characteristics that may provide better for or necessitate some of these work values. Therefore, individuals with different levels of conscientiousness and different structures of social needs may be better matches for such work domains. Employee selection and recruitment processes as well as retention efforts may adopt the findings of this study to their methods and practices.

References

- Tevrüz, S., & Turgut, T. (2004). Çalışma amaçlarının tesbiti ve çalışma amaçları testinin geliştirilmesi. Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Öneri Dergisi, 6(June), 33–44.
- John, O. P. & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Theoretical Perspectives. L. Pervin and O. P. John (Ed). Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research (2nd Ed.). Newyork: Guilford.
- John, O. P., Donahue, E., & Kentle, R. L. (1992). The Big Five Inventory: Versions 4a and 54. Technical Report, Institute of Personality Assessment and Research.
- Keçeci M. (2017). The Role of Supervisor and Coworker Incivility on Intention to Share Knowledge and Satisfaction: The Moderating Effect of Conscientiousness and The Mediating Effect Of Desire For Revenge. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Marmara University, Social Science Institute.
- Çalışkan K. (2006). Political Behavior In Organizations: Antecedents And Consequences. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Marmara University, Social Science Institute.
- Steers, R.M., Braunstein, D.N. (1976). A Behaviorally – Based Measure of Manifest Needs in Work Settings, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. Vol 9, 251 – 266.
- Sümer, N., Lajunen, T. ve Özkan, T. (2005). Big five personality traits as the distal predictors of road accident involvement. Underwood, G. (Eds.). Traffic and Transport Psychology. USA: Elsevier Ltd.