

AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS RELATED TO JOB  
SATISFACTION OF SOCIAL WORK SUPERVISORS

---

DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE  
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY  
MARY COLEEN SHANNON, B.A., M.S.W.

---

DENTON, TEXAS

AUGUST, 1978

The Graduate School  
Texas Woman's University

Denton, Texas

June 8, 19 78

We hereby recommend that the dissertation prepared under  
our supervision by Mary Coleen Shannon  
entitled AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS RELATED TO JOB  
SATISFACTION OF SOCIAL WORK SUPERVISORS

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Committee:

Charles R. Albert

Chairman

Elmer Johansen  
Ethelene Davis  
Reta Bucklew  
Carl W. M. Heehon

Accepted:

Shyllis Bridges

Dean of The Graduate School



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dissertations are not produced by one person. This one is the end product of a complex and extensive social system. Indeed the division of labor is alive and well. Many talented, generous people, and marvelous machines are involved in the process. There have been many social debts incurred along the way and most of them can never be repaid, only given a word of appreciation.

The project would not have been possible without the enthusiastic support and cooperation of Bobbie Mae Matthews, Program Manager, Protective Services for Children, Texas Department of Human Resources. She was especially helpful in hand addressing and mailing the questionnaires to all of the supervisors. Then the supervisors themselves made the study possible by such a large response to the questionnaire.

The administrators of the Graduate School of Social Work at the University of Texas at Arlington gave both encouragement and time to me so that I could complete my studies and this project. Dr. Fernando G. Torgerson and Dr. James Callicutt demonstrated time after time their confidence in my abilities.

The faculty and my fellow students at Texas Woman's University were also helpful to me in providing new knowledge and helping to refine ideas. My dissertation

committee, Professors Rodney Albert, Elinor Johansen, Reba Bucklew, Ethelyn Davis, and Carl McGeehon have been particularly helpful and supportive throughout the process. Their creation of a supportive atmosphere allowed me to make mistakes and then to correct them.

Others in the social system responsible for production of this project include readers Jane Watson and Charlotte Barron who put in and took out commas, Doris Cochran who was always ready to type another page, and Orrand Carroll who was always ready to make one more computer run. In addition, were my caretakers Karen Carroll and Dorothy St. John whose "chicken soup methods" enabled me to get through the long days and nights of writing. Finally an acknowledgement goes to my parents, Fern and George Shannon, for their absolute faith in my ability to accomplish whatever goal I set.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Problematic Situation . . . . .	1
Research Problem. . . . .	6
Theoretical Problem . . . . .	14
Hypotheses and Definitions of Concepts. .	24
Summary . . . . .	27
II. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	29
Study Population. . . . .	29
Distribution Procedures . . . . .	34
Instruments . . . . .	35
Work Rewards. . . . .	36
Overall Job Satisfaction. . . . .	38
Job Opportunities and Work Load . . .	40
Work Values . . . . .	41
Background Information. . . . .	45
Analysis of Data. . . . .	46
III. THE STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION:	
A REVIEW OF LITERATURE. . . . .	47
Personality and Job Satisfaction. . . . .	50
Employee Characteristics and	
Job Satisfaction. . . . .	53
Sex . . . . .	54
Education or Intelligence . . . . .	56
Age . . . . .	57
Race. . . . .	59
Marital Status. . . . .	62
Work-Role Characteristics and Job	
Satisfaction. . . . .	63
Specific Job Characteristics. . . . .	65

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

		Page
	Early Theoretical Development . . . .	76
	Alienation and Job Satisfaction . . . .	88
	Work Values, Job Rewards and Job Satisfaction. . . . .	98
	Summary . . . . .	114
IV.	WORK VALUES AND JOB REWARDS . . . . .	118
	Measurement of Work Values. . . . .	120
	Variation in Work Values. . . . .	124
	Measurement of Job Rewards. . . . .	139
	Variation in Job Rewards. . . . .	143
	Summary . . . . .	152
V.	JOB SATISFACTION. . . . .	153
	Measurement of Job Satisfaction . . . . .	153
	Variations in Job Satisfaction. . . . .	156
	Net Effects of Values and Rewards . . . .	163
	Summary . . . . .	168
VI.	CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	171
	Empirical Findings. . . . .	171
	Work Values and Job Rewards . . . . .	173
	Job Satisfaction. . . . .	179
	Summary . . . . .	182
	Theoretical Conclusions . . . . .	184
	Practical and Research Implications . . .	191
Appendix		
A.	RESEARCH INSTRUMENT . . . . .	195
B.	ITEMS COMPRISING THE JOB REWARDS AND WORK VALUES SCALES. . . . .	207
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	210

# LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Selected Population Characteristics . . .	30
2.	Length of Employment of D.H.R. Supervisors . . . . .	32
3.	Means and Standard Deviations for Work Values of Workers in the Quality of Employment Survey and Department of Human Resources Supervisors . . . . .	122
4.	Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Determinants of the Six Types of Work Values for D.H.R. Supervisors. .	126
5.	Work Value Means for Educational Attain- ment of Supervisors by Job Dimensions	132
6.	Work Value Means for Male and Female Supervisors by Job Dimensions . . . .	133
7.	Work Value Means for Race of Supervisors by Job Dimensions . . . . .	134
8.	Work Values for Job Tenure of Supervisors by Job Dimensions . . . . .	135
9.	Work Values for Wage Earner Responsi- bility of Supervisors by Job Dimension . . . . .	137
10.	Means and Standard Deviations for Job Rewards of Workers in the Quality of Employment Survey and the Department of Human Resources Supervisors. . . .	141
11.	Means and Rank Ordering of Job Rewards by D.H.R. Supervisors and Twelve Occupations . . . . .	146
12.	Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Values and Rewards with Each of the Six Dimensions for the Quality of Employment Survey and D.H.R. Supervisors. . . . .	157

# LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
13.	Regression Coefficients from Regressing Job Satisfaction on Values and Re- wards for Each of the Six Dimen- sions of Work: Quality of Employ- ment Survey and D.H.R. Supervisors .	161
14.	Coefficients Obtained from Regression of Job Satisfaction on All Work Values and Job Rewards Simultaneous- ly for Workers in the Quality of Employment Survey and D.H.R. Supervisors. . . . .	163

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The present study concerns the interactional relationships between work values, job rewards, and job satisfaction. It is an attempt to understand the variations in work experiences of individuals in light of job characteristics they deem important and rewarding. A primary purpose of the research project is to examine the factors related to job satisfaction of social work supervisors employed by a large public welfare agency. The larger objective is to contribute to a theoretical understanding of the manner in which job satisfaction varies in relation to job rewards and work values. This chapter addresses the problematic situation, the research problem, and the theoretical problem.

#### Problematic Situation

Work is a major aspect of adult life. With most Americans spending forty or more years of their time, energy, and interest in vocational pursuits of one type or another, job satisfaction becomes an essential factor to the well-being of individuals. Besides consuming a great deal of time and energy, work serves to link individuals

together and integrate them into society through job-patterned social interaction.

From a sociological perspective work serves the obvious economic function of providing the goods and services needed by society. In addition, it defines a set of social relationships.<sup>1</sup> Individuals find that the workplace provides structure for the process of social interaction. A variety of types of relationships are created with their continuance made possible through formal and informal organizational patterns of interaction. In traditional societies, the problem of fitting individuals into jobs is solved as children gradually assume the work roles of their parents. In modern, more complex societies, work roles are assumed as a result of education, specialized training, and experience. The individual is thus required to balance several variables, including his values, to achieve a proper fit in the choice of jobs. Not only is the choice of jobs a complex phenomenon, but the quality of the work experience, as expressed in job satisfaction, becomes equally complex and problematic in complex societies.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ronald M. Pavalko, Sociology of Occupations and Professions (Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1971), p. 2.



The problematic question of concern here, the quality of the work experience and what influences it, has long been a subject of sociological interest. It is recognized that when a worker sells his labor, he also sells a degree of autonomy. His areas of independent decision making become limited and subject to management by others. In an industrial society, jobs are defined primarily by their relation to other jobs.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, jobs are not tied to particular persons. The factory system with its mechanization process has altered the relation between individuals and jobs by increasing the complexity of the division of labor and separating the individual from the means of production. Thus the trend toward large bureaucratically organized corporations which maximize control and predictability while minimizing the independence of workers means that the quality of the work experience is more problematic to understand.<sup>2</sup>

The work role is recognized as influential not only in the work setting but in aspects of the worker's non-work

---

<sup>1</sup>Arne L. Kalleberg, "Work Values, Job Rewards and Job Satisfaction: A Theory of the Quality of Work Experience" (Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1975), p. 2.

<sup>2</sup>Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Work in America (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1973), p. 21.

life also. Satisfaction in the work role is an important predictor of longevity and of physical and mental health. In studies on aging the strongest predictor of longevity is work satisfaction. Occupational stress, a concept closely related to job satisfaction, is linked to several diseases including heart disease, peptic ulcers, arthritis, gout, and stroke.

Recognition of the crucial nature of work for societies as well as for individuals continues to produce multiple approaches to research concerning job satisfaction. For example some investigators are interested in the quality of the work experience from their own personal value system, assuming that work which enables satisfaction of one's needs should further the dignity of the human individual. They further assume that job characteristics limiting the development of personal potential are to be avoided or changed. Thus, one aim in examining these issues is to improve the quality of the work experience of individuals.

Other researchers, interested in the quality of life outside of the work role, become interested in work in terms of its total life influence. Still others are motivated to study the issue out of a wish to improve productivity and organizational functioning by improving the quality of work experiences. Whatever research motivation is present, there is consistent recognition of the

importance of work in the total life experience of the individual and for larger social organizations as well.

Job satisfaction remains an elusive concept in spite of a large number of studies utilizing a variety of approaches. Almost every research finding is matched by a conflicting result. Such discordant information makes comparisons difficult. Another difficulty in comparing studies is due to the wide range of methodological techniques employed. Attempts made to bring order to the field by suggestions of theoretical frameworks are usually thwarted by evidence suggesting alternative explanations.

In spite of these difficulties in establishing links between empirical findings and explanatory theoretical positions, some trends can be identified. For example, there is a clear connection between overall job satisfaction and social status. Generally, the higher the status, the higher the satisfaction. There are also background factors consistently related to job satisfaction. Women, older people, those free of close supervision, and those having an orderly work history show greater satisfaction from their work.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>John P. Robinson, Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics, ed. John P. Robinson, Robert Athanasiow, and Kendra B. Head (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1969), p. 66.

The difficulty which arises when one attempts to explain empirically established findings related to job satisfaction is that thus far theories concerning job satisfaction are only able to offer typologies of empirical generalizations. It is the aim of this study to investigate empirically factors related to job satisfaction and to suggest links between the findings and a larger theoretical perspective.

#### Research Problem

The problematic situation is obviously too complex to be completely explored in one study. Therefore, the present study is an attempt to understand the variation in the quality of work experiences of individuals employed in similar status positions in a large, bureaucratically organized, social agency. Job satisfaction is analyzed in terms of its relationship to work values and job rewards measured on six job dimensions.

The model applied here has not been used with a specific group of workers. Its first and developmental use was with a secondary analysis of data from The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey conducted by the Survey Research Center

of the Institute for Social Research.<sup>1</sup> Arne Kalleberg, developer of the approach, was interested in job satisfaction as a function of the relationships between the values individuals seek to fulfill through work and the rewards their jobs provide. He attempted to overcome the primary problem of the unidimensional approach of previous studies. Most investigators have been satisfied to explain job satisfaction solely on the basis of job characteristics. Until Kalleberg's work in 1975, there had been "no successful attempt to systematically and empirically establish the way in which meaning and the various satisfactions that work provides combine to determine job satisfaction based on a heterogeneous and diverse sample of workers."<sup>2</sup> As a result of his study, Kalleberg offered a "theory" of job satisfaction.<sup>3</sup> His argument for a theory was based on the fact that he developed a "set of empirically-supported

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert P. Quinn and Linda J. Shepard, The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey (Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1974), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Arne L. Kalleberg, "Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction," American Sociological Review 42 (February 1977):125-26.

<sup>3</sup>Idem, "Work Values, Job Rewards, and Job Satisfaction," p. 167.

generalizations that explain the variation in job satisfaction on the basis of the conditions and processes that produce this variation."<sup>1</sup>

However, as Kalleberg wisely recognizes, the validity of a theory cannot be demonstrated on the basis of an analysis of a single set of data. One line of research needed to supplement his study is a series of investigations carried out within particular organizations.. Studies within a single organization allow a closer examination of the meanings individuals impute to their work.

Since Kalleberg's concern was with the development of a general model for describing processes, it was important to focus the analysis on a sample of the total work force. In this study, however, the task is to elaborate more fully the model by focusing on a specific group of workers. The choice of workers in a single organization occupying the same status-position can provide useful information concerning the effect of individual differences in work values for producing job satisfaction. Since workers are doing the same type of work, job rewards are held relatively constant, allowing Kalleberg's suggested exploration of the relationship of rewards, values, and job satisfaction.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 168.

The population chosen for study here includes all supervisors employed in the Child Protective Services Program of the Texas Department of Human Resources. This population is important for study for a number of reasons. The primary reason for this group's selection is that social work supervision, in social work literature, is distinguished by a general absence of empirical research.<sup>1</sup> The lack of systematic investigation of social work supervision and supervisors is surprising since there is general consensus that the role of supervisor may be of increasing significance to the professionally trained social workers. As both the National Association of Social Workers and the Council on Social Work Education move toward recognition of the Bachelor of Social Work (B.S.W.) as a first professional degree for entry-level positions, greater emphasis is being placed on Master of Social Work (M.S.W.) training as preparation for supervisory, consultation, administrative, and planning tasks. This shift in the function of the master-

---

<sup>1</sup> Alfred Kadushin, Supervision in Social Work (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976), p. 1.

level worker from practice to supervision, confirmed by recent studies, is expected to continue for some time.<sup>1</sup>

According to frequency distributions from the manpower data bank of the National Association of Social Workers in February, 1975, supervision was the primary job responsibility listed by 8.1 percent of the membership and a secondary responsibility for an additional 4.5 percent. This meant that nearly 8,000 out of 63,000 members had supervisory duties. When the number of social workers employed in supervisory positions is considered, it is again surprising to note the lack of knowledge concerning social work supervisors.

Further evidence of the importance of the role social work supervisor comes from the 1973 report on personnel in public welfare published by the National Center for Social Statistics, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It indicates that as of June, 1973, there were 11,100 casework supervisors employed in public welfare agencies. According to this report, there is approximately one supervisor for every five caseworkers.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 2-3.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 22.



Scott Briar expressed concern over the lack of research on social worker supervision in his review of social work research published in 1971. He commented that "no significant studies of supervision have been offered since the last review" which covered the years prior to 1965.<sup>1</sup> Since 1970, the only studies which can be located are eight doctoral dissertations and one nationwide survey. None of the studies is concerned with job satisfaction, and only the Kadushin survey included any questions related to the topic.<sup>2</sup> It is apparent from these facts that there is a need for information for a social work role that is recognized as becoming increasingly important to the social work profession. A large number of social workers are supervisors, and supervision is a primary responsibility among the M.S.W. worker's tasks. One aim of this study is to contribute to an understanding of the quality of the work experience of social work supervisors.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>2</sup>Alfred Kadushin, "Supervisor-Supervisee: A Survey," Social Work 19 (May 1974):291.

Following Kalleberg's social action model, the balance social work supervisors obtain between their work values and the rewards their jobs provide may be viewed as important in determining their degree of job satisfaction, a useful indicator evaluating the quality of work experience. It is important that the variation in job satisfaction be understood in terms of the interplay between the two types of factors. Both the meanings that individuals impute to their work activity and the rewards they obtain from specific dimensions of their jobs must be included. The interplay between these factors can be represented by the concept of their relationship so that supervisors with better relationships between work values and job rewards will have higher job satisfaction than supervisors with poor relationships. Workers experiencing a high level of job satisfaction generally report high levels of perceived job rewards and low levels of values sought, which indicates that they perceive their jobs as supplying rewards that are important. On the other hand, workers with poor relationships and low job satisfaction tend to have higher levels of work values sought than perceived job rewards. Therefore, they are not receiving rewards that are valuable to them and experience a lower level of job satisfaction. In other words, job satisfaction is maximized if rewards

greatly exceed values since the worker has more than adequate opportunities to fulfill his values.

In summary, the research presented here is an elaboration and application of a newly developed model of job satisfaction. Kalleberg's social action theoretical model was developed with a large and diverse sample. He adequately demonstrated that work values and job rewards work together to produce variations in job satisfaction. However, the model has not until now been used with a population of workers occupying similar status-positions within a single complex organization. Another factor to be considered is that social work supervisors, although important to their profession, are a neglected group. Very little is known empirically about this expanding group of social workers.

A third and interesting point for consideration is the theoretical perspective offered by Kalleberg. His model offers an examination of job satisfaction by directing attention to the variety of meanings that individuals impute to their work. It is considered a social action approach since the investigator attempts to understand the subjective meaning of the acts to the actors. With the emphasis on understanding by investigation of subjective meanings, Kalleberg develops a tie to Weber's social action approach. According to Kalleberg this approach has "great potential

for advancing our knowledge of job satisfaction and the quality of work experience of individuals in general."<sup>1</sup>

Although the social action approach is an improvement over theories viewing job satisfaction as solely a function of job characteristics, it appears to be too limiting for adequate explanation. Social action, as recommended by Weber, was never fully developed as a perspective but instead has been seen as a forerunner of a broader perspective, symbolic interactionism. This broader, more complex perspective offers greater power in interpretation of the findings.

#### Theoretical Problem

Although there is an abundance of empirical studies concerning job satisfaction, very few have foundations in theoretical frameworks. Even fewer attempts have been made to develop and make use of theory in understanding job satisfaction. It is ironic to note that early sociological thinkers were highly interested in the problematic integration of the individual into society through the work role and the quality of the work experience.

---

<sup>1</sup>Kalleberg, "Work Values, Job Rewards and Job Satisfaction," p. 23.

Sociologists can turn to the writings of Durkheim and Marx for theoretical guidance in the study of job satisfaction. Durkheim offers the classical analysis of the separation of individuals and jobs produced by industrialization. He stresses the functional consequences for social integration produced by the interdependence among jobs created by the division of labor. In his discussion of the formation of interdependence among persons as the basis for "organic solidarity" he places little emphasis on the negative consequences of the division of labor. He does, however, acknowledge that negative "relationships" do occur. He states that "for the division of labor to produce solidarity, it is not sufficient, then that each have his task; it is still necessary that this task be fitting to him."<sup>1</sup> Such mismatches are classified as an anomic form and not a normal form of the division of labor. He discusses the abnormal form as resulting from the "forced" division of labor. According to Durkheim, when the division of labor is forced by the institution of classes and

---

<sup>1</sup>Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labor in Society, trans. George Simpson (New York: Free Press, Macmillan Publishing Co., 1933), p. 375.

castes those in the lower classes are not satisfied with their role and civil wars arise.<sup>1</sup> People suffer when their natural tastes and aptitudes are not taken into account in their daily occupations. In the usual case of the division of labor "the only cause determining the manner in which work is divided, then, is the diversity of capacities."<sup>2</sup> Durkheim concludes: "Thus, the harmony between the constitution of each individual and his condition is realized of itself."<sup>3</sup>

Durkheim's viewpoint leaves the impression that if individuals have dissatisfactory work experiences, it is due to an abnormal, forced division of labor. The usual or average experience is for the worker to do the job he is most qualified to do. Therefore, most individuals are content in their work. Since Durkheim's major focus is the development of theory concerning the more usual forms of the division of labor and its resulting type of organizational solidarity, very little subsequent exploration of the quality of the work experience utilizes his theoretical framework.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 374.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 386.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

In contrast to Durkheim, Marx saw the separation of individuals from their jobs and the problematic nature of the quality of the work experience as fundamentally significant to the capitalistic society. His theoretical foundation for a discussion of the manner in which the institutions of capitalism, private property, market economy, and money separate the individual from the factors determining the activities associated with work roles and the products of one's labor was first explicated in the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. He argues that alienation or separation of individuals and jobs is a basic feature of capitalist societies. According to Marx, alienation is a complex process. The first step in the process is the separation of men from the means of production and subsistence. As men are alienated from their property they are forced to sell their labor power to capitalists. The ensuing relationship is estranged since it is based on conflicting interests. The worker then begins to consume his energies in the production of things, and his labor power becomes objectified in commodities. Thus the worker "feels himself outside his work and his work feels outside himself."<sup>1</sup> Marx summarizes his discussion of alienation by

---

<sup>1</sup>Irving M. Zeitlin, Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968), p. 87.

stating that "all these consequences are contained in the definition that the worker is related to the product of his labor as an alien object."<sup>1</sup>

There are several advantages in the use of alienation as a conceptual framework. One of the most important is that variations in job satisfaction are recognized as being at least partially determined by the individual. In other words, it provides some understanding of the meanings individuals impute to the work experience, thereby moving away from the one-sided viewpoint of job satisfaction as completely determined by job characteristics.

There are, however, some limitations to this perspective which must also be considered. Despite the fact that the theory has been and continues to be a fruitful perspective, it makes certain assumptions regarding needs that individuals seek to fulfill through work and imputes certain emotional states to workers whose assumed needs are not fulfilled. These limitations have been recognized and discussed by several writers. For example, Blauner states:

With all its social-psychological subtleties, it does not fully comprehend the complexities and ambiguities of the inner meaning of work to the individual. . . . Because it ignores what might be called the bipolar or two-sided ambivalence of work, alienation theory

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.



cannot totally explain the relationship between work and human happiness. For even the most alienated work is never totally unpleasant, never completely rejected by the worker. Necessity and force is never the whole story. The very worst jobs are rarely only means to exist but often become ends in themselves in some regard. Marx's conception of the function of work for man was too narrow, or perhaps too philosophical: he did not accept as essential the myriad of functions that even alienated work plays in the life-organization of human beings. Observation and research have disproved his statement that "as soon as no physical or other compulsion exist, labor is shunned like the plague." The need for sheer activity, for social intercourse, and for some status and identity in a larger society keeps even unskilled workers on the job after they are economically free to retire.

Work is inherently ambivalent also at the opposite pole of freedom and non-alienation. Even in the most non-alienated conditions, work is never totally pleasurable; in fact, the freest work, that of the writer or artist, usually involves long periods of virtual self-torture. Such non-alienated work is never completely an end in itself; it is never totally without the element of necessity.<sup>1</sup>

Alienation represents only one component of the experience rather than being an indicator of the overall quality of work. It can be pointed out that the notion of alienation in work refers to intrinsic rewards, but intrinsic rewards are not the only types of rewards received from work. Extrinsic rewards, those outside of the task itself, may also provide sources of meaning and gratification for the

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert Blauner, Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 31.

worker. Consideration of the range of rewards available from work is necessary for a comprehensive investigation of the quality of work experience. It is clear that although alienated workers may be dissatisfied, this may not necessarily be the case. Alienated workers will be dissatisfied when they have needs for control, initiative, and intrinsic meaning in work. Workers may, on the other hand, compensate for the absence of intrinsic rewards with other types of rewards available from work. Thus, alienated workers may be satisfied with their jobs in general.

In summary, it can be noted that alienation, with its emphasis on intrinsic rewards, cannot provide a broad enough framework for study of the quality of work experience. Job satisfaction represents an outcome of the rewards individuals obtain from both intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of work. It is seen as a function of both the values individuals seek to fulfill through work and the rewards their jobs provide. Since it is essential to consider job satisfaction within a perspective that will enable the incorporation of individual differences and is not limited to intrinsic rewards, another theoretical perspective must be considered.

Kalleberg and others interested in understanding the subjective meaning individuals impute to work suggest a social action approach derived from Max Weber. While it is

true that Weber rejected the assumption of any objective meaning and restricted the understanding and interpretation of meaning to the subjective intentions of the actor, the social action concept was not fully developed methodologically.<sup>1</sup> However, his basic statements regarding the subject matter and methodology of sociology have certainly influenced the development of modern sociological perspectives. According to Weber, the central task of sociology was to undertake the interpretation of action in terms of its subjective meaning. When explanations were to be made in terms of motive the given act was to be placed in a more inclusive context of meaning.<sup>2</sup> Action theory, in the form spelled out by Weber, has declined from its heyday in the 1930s and 1940s to the present. According to Ritzer, it "has proven to be a virtual dead-end, and its significance lies in the role it played in the development of symbolic interactionism and modern phenomenological sociology."<sup>3</sup> Despite similar interest in the orientation of the actor

---

<sup>1</sup>Max Weber, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, trans. ed., and with an introduction by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 58.

<sup>2</sup>Don Martindale, Prominent Sociologists Since World War II (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1975), pp. 49-50.

<sup>3</sup>George Ritzer, Sociology: A Multiple Paradigm Science (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975), p. 91.

and the use of the method of "verstehen," the action theorists never really did much with this process of interpretation, while the symbolic interactionists made it the center of their work.

Because of the reasons discussed above, the present study is conducted within the theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism. From this point of view, man creates his own world. The central focus becomes individuals and the way they orient themselves to each other. A basic principle providing guidance in the present investigation is that "if men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences."<sup>1</sup> Thus, the social work supervisors' own definitions of the situations in which they are engaged are taken as an initial basis for the explanation of their level of job satisfaction. This systematically directs attention to the variety of meanings which work may have for them. Such meanings are regarded as not only arising outside the organization and brought into the work situation but as something deriving from the individual's total experience.

---

<sup>1</sup>W. I. Thomas, The Child in America (New York: Knopf, 1928), p. 584.

As the symbolic interactionist perspective is translated into a systematic empirical investigation, a difference of opinion concerning methodology arises. Blumer, a major architect of the perspective, is an advocate of naturalistic investigation. The researcher must be able to see the objects as they are seen by those who are being studied.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, concepts should be what he labels "sensitizing concepts" which impose only enough structure to suggest directions for the researcher. The overall recommendation is to utilize participant observation techniques.

Manfred Kuhn, on the other hand, disagrees with Blumer's recommended methodological approach. His efforts are aimed at making symbolic interactionism more quantitatively empirical. According to Kuhn, the concepts of symbolic interactionism can be operationalized and used in empirical, scientific research. In terms of concepts, Kuhn supports operational concepts prescribing what the researchers will find rather than the more general sensitizing concepts advocated by Blumer.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Herbert Blumer, Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969), p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> Ritzer, p. 107-108.

The present study is seen as adhering to the more empirically oriented position as stated by Kuhn. Methodological and conceptual advances made by Kalleberg are more fully elaborated through a systematic empirical investigation of the meanings a specific group of workers impute to their jobs. In the attempt to develop future theory it is advantageous to operationalize concepts and pose hypotheses for testing.. Findings can then be interpreted in the light of the larger symbolic interactionism perspective.

#### Hypotheses and Definitions of Concepts

It is recognized that work may provide a variety of meanings in an industrial society, and an assessment of job satisfaction requires not only a consideration of the range of rewards that jobs provide, but an examination of the importance of these rewards as well. Several questions emerge regarding the application of Kalleberg's model to a specific population. Will the relationships between work values, job rewards, and job satisfaction as measured in social work supervisor sample be similar to the findings in the national sample? In other words, does the model work? If it does, what do social work supervisors find satisfying about their jobs? Specifically, what dimensions of the job are rewarding, and what dimensions are valued as important?

Kalleberg's model implies that the highest levels of job satisfaction will be experienced by those workers with

high rewards and low values, while the lowest levels of job satisfaction will be experienced by those workers with low rewards and high values. This general hypothesis is divided into the following two hypotheses to be tested:

1. There will be a positive relationship between job rewards and job satisfaction
2. There will be a negative relationship between work values and job satisfaction

There are several major concepts within the study needing definition. The first one, job satisfaction, is regarded as an overall affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles they are presently occupying. It is recognized that jobs are composed of a number of discriminable elements, each of which may provide some degree of satisfaction. A person may be satisfied with one dimension of his job and dissatisfied with another. However, the underlying assumption is that it is possible for individuals to balance these specific satisfactions against specific dissatisfactions and thus to arrive at a composite satisfaction with the job as a whole.

The concept work value refers to the conceptions of what individuals hold as desirable with respect to their work activity. Work values may be regarded as general attitudes referring to the meaning that an individual attaches to his work role as distinguished from his satisfaction

with that role. They reflect the individual's awareness of what he seeks from his work situation.

Job rewards refer to gratifications perceived to be true with respect to work activity. It is important to recognize that it is not the objective state of these rewards that affects employee attitudes and behavior, but rather how they are experienced by the worker.

Both values and rewards are measured on six job dimensions. The first dimension, intrinsic, refers to those characteristics associated with the task itself. The convenience dimension refers to job characteristics that provide solely creature comforts. Convenience is viewed as intrinsic to the task. The financial dimension is extrinsic and reflects present and future monetary rewards from a job. Another extrinsic dimension, relations with co-workers, refers to job characteristics allowing the opportunity for satisfying social needs. The concept career relates to job characteristics allowing advancement and recognition. The final dimension is resource adequacy and refers to resources with which to do the job well. Successful role performance is not only contingent upon the demands of a role and the characteristics of the person occupying it but also upon the amount of resources or facilities that are supplied to the role occupant.



The concepts described above constitute the major variables examined in this study. All of the variables are measured on Likert-type scales designed to elicit the respondent's attitudes toward the specific aspects of these concepts. These scales and the specific methods and procedures for measuring these variables are discussed in chapter II.

### Summary

In the present chapter the problem to be examined has been presented in relation to the broad, theoretical context from which it arises and in terms of the specific element of the problem to be investigated. In general terms, this is an elaboration of a newly developed theory of job satisfaction. In examining the variation in job satisfaction, the study takes into account both job characteristics and the meanings individuals impute to their work. More specifically, the present study is an investigation of the manner in which social work supervisors fit work values and job rewards together to obtain job satisfaction. The research problem is approached from the conceptual framework of symbolic interactionism.

In chapter II the research procedures for examining the problem are discussed. In the third chapter the background of the problem is explored through a review of the

literature. The empirical findings of the study are presented in chapters IV and V. A summary of the findings and conclusions are presented in the final chapter.

## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY

The present study is designed to analyze the relationships between work values, job rewards, and job satisfaction. A survey design is utilized to explore the effects of work values and job rewards on job satisfaction of supervisors employed by a large public welfare agency. A standard form, mail delivered, questionnaire is used for data collection. All supervisors employed in the Child Protective Services Program of the Texas Department of Human Resources are included in the study. For ease of classification and protection of confidentiality, the category "supervisor" applies to all persons occupying positions higher than Public Welfare Worker I, II, and III classifications. Thus, all supervisors and administrators who in some way supervise others are included.

#### Study Population

The study population consists of supervisors employed in the Child Protective Services Program of the Texas Department of Human Resources. All supervisors and administrators throughout the state are included in the survey.

Agency records for the time period during which questionnaires were mailed, indicate 245 possible respondents. All possible respondents were sent questionnaires, with a total return of 215. This is an 88 percent return rate. With such a high rate of return it can be said that demographic characteristics of actual respondents represent the entire population. General population characteristics are presented in table 1.

Table 1  
Selected Population Characteristics

		Frequency	Percent
<u>Sex</u>			
Male		70	32.6
Female		145	67.4
	Total	215	100.0
<u>Ethnicity</u>			
Anglo		189	89.2
Black		10	4.7
Mexican-American		13	6.1
	Total	212	100.0
<u>Marital Status</u>			
Married		120	56.3
Divorced or Separated		50	23.5
Single		36	16.9
Widowed		7	3.3
	Total	213	100.0

Table 1 (Continued)

<u>Education</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than B.A.	2	.9
B.A. or B.S.: non social work major	82	38.1
B.A. or B.S.: social work major	27	12.6
Master's: non social work	13	6.0
M.S.W.	90	41.9
Other	1	.5
Total	215	100.0

The fact that females outnumber males with 67.4 percent of the total confirms social work as a female dominated profession. A little over half or 56.3 percent of the supervisors are married with, 26.8 percent having been married in the past, and the remaining 16.9 percent never married. The average age is 35.7 years with a range of 23 years to 63 years. Most supervisors have been employed by the Department of Human Resources (D.H.R.) for 5 years but the average length is 6.6 years. The average income is between \$14,000 to \$16,000.

Although most supervisors have the M.S.W. degree (41.9 percent) about as many (38.1 percent) have B.A. or B.S. degrees without social work majors. This may change as more M.S.W.'s are available for employment. Most supervisors,

152 or 70 percent, are major wage earners for their households. In general, supervisors are employed between two and three years before they are promoted to their current position. Also, supervisors rarely have work experiences in other agencies. The average number of years of experience in other agencies is 2.2, but most supervisors, 63.4 percent, have no experience in other agencies. Information concerning length of employment is summarized in table 2.

Table 2

## Length of Employment of D.H.R. Supervisors

<u>D.H.R. Employment</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 - 5 years	110	51.9
6 - 10 years	73	34.2
11 - 15 years	20	9.5
16 - 20 years	5	2.4
21 - 25 years	2	1.0
26 - 35 years	2	1.0
Total	212	100.0

Table 2 (Continued)

<u>Length of D.H.R. Employment Before Promotion</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 - 5 years	164	77.8
6 - 10 years	37	17.4
11 - 15 years	6	2.8
16 - 20 years	2	1.0
21 - 25 years	2	1.0
Total	212	100.0
<u>Employment in Other Agencies</u>		
0 - 1 year	136	63.8
2 - 5 years	54	25.3
6 - 10 years	12	5.6
11 - 15 years	5	2.4
16 and over	6	2.9
Total	213	100.0

In summary, it can be said that D.H.R. Child Welfare Supervisors are fairly young and have work experiences limited to D.H.R. Most supervisors became employed by the agency after completing their college degree and were promoted after a few years. They have very little experience in other agencies.

### Distribution Procedures

The questionnaires were mailed to the State Program Manager who in turn mailed a questionnaire to each supervisor. The questionnaire was accompanied by a memo from the investigator explaining the nature of the study and stating that participation was voluntary (see appendix B). The Program Manager did not contact the supervisors in any way to urge their participation.

Questionnaires were individually addressed and mailed first class. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included with each questionnaire. The return envelope was addressed to the investigator at the University of Texas at Arlington. Consequently, only the investigator had access to raw data, thus protecting anonymity and confidentiality of respondents. There were no hidden or secret markings employed to identify individual respondents.

A postcard was also enclosed with the questionnaire. Supervisors were invited to fill in their name and address and indicate by checking a box if they wished to receive a copy of the study results. The postcards were already pre-stamped and were received separately from returned questionnaires. A total of 207, or 84 percent, of the possible 245 postcards were returned. Only 6 of the 215 who returned the questionnaire did not want to receive a copy of the results.



## Instruments

The research instruments used are summarized here and described more fully in chapters IV and V. A standardized questionnaire was used. A copy is located in appendix A. Listed under the major concepts they are designed to explore, the following are the specific instruments used in the questionnaire:

## A. Work Rewards Instruments

1. Intrinsic Scale
2. Convenience Scale
3. Financial Scale
4. Co-workers Scale
5. Career Scale
6. Resource Adequacy Scale

## B. Overall Job Satisfaction Scale

## C. Job Opportunities and Work Load Instruments

1. Employment Opportunities Scale
2. Work Load Index

## D. Work Values Instruments

1. Intrinsic Scale
2. Convenience Scale
3. Financial Scale
4. Co-workers Scale
5. Career Scale
6. Resource Adequacy Scale

## E. Background Information

1. Personal Data
2. Educational Attainment
3. Job Information

### Work rewards

Work rewards are measured by scales representing six dimensions of job characteristics. The purpose of measuring these rewards is basically to assess their relationship to overall job satisfaction. This relationship can be measured in a number of ways. However, the important factor here is the worker's perception of the rewards he receives. For that reason it is important to ask workers to rate their opinion of the degree to which they perceive specific characteristics as true. The objective states of rewards are not being investigated but rather how they are experienced by the worker.

Supervisors were asked to check the most appropriate response ranging from "very true" to "not at all true" on 34 items. Each of the six dimensions is represented by three to eleven items. All items are taken from The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey.<sup>1</sup> In previous uses of the questions, respondents were asked to rate the degree of presence of rewards by a "card sort" procedure. The present study is

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert P. Quinn and Linda J. Shepard, The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1974), pp. 63-65.

the first to include these items in a self-administered mailed questionnaire. It is recognized that bias may be introduced, since respondents may adopt "response sets" to cope with the task of checking off answers to a long list of items.

Kalleberg<sup>1</sup> analyzed the 34 reward items in an attempt to discover their basic underlying dimensions. A factor analysis utilizing a principal factor procedure was used. Then the factor matrix produced by the analysis was rotated by a quartimax orthogonal rotation. Next, the first six factors, accounting for 88.4 percent of the total factor variance, were interpreted. Factor I represents a "resource adequacy" dimension, Factor II contains items relating to an "intrinsic" dimension, Factor III accounts for "relations with co-workers," Factor IV involves items relating to a "financial" dimension, Factor V is a "convenience" dimension, and Factor VI represents a "career" dimension.

Scales were then developed to measure rewards associated with each of the six dimensions. The items in each of the six reward scales correspond to those in each of the value scales and are listed in the appendix. Scale scores

---

<sup>1</sup>Arne L. Kalleberg, "Work Values, Job Rewards and Job Satisfaction: A Theory of The Quality of Work Experience" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1975), pp. 80-84.

are computed as the mean of an unweighted sum of their component items. Thus, despite the fact that scales have different numbers of items, each one has a range from 1.0 (low reward) to 4.0 (high reward). Missing data on a particular item are assigned the mean of items present on the scale. Reliability estimates for each of the six scales are based on Cronbach's  $\alpha$ . Reliability coefficients range from .68 for the convenience and financial scales to .87 for the resource adequacy scale.

Intercorrelations among the six dimensions of job rewards revealed that the various types of job rewards are positively related. A factor analysis is then computed to discover any "higher-order" dimension of job rewards to account more parsimoniously for the covariation. The resulting single factor solution suggested that the six dimensions can be most usefully considered as separate dimensions that are differentially rewarded.

#### Overall job satisfaction

Overall job satisfaction is measured by a scale consisting of five items inclusive of questions 2 through 6 on the questionnaire. It is a measure of a worker's general affective reaction to the job without reference to any specific facets or dimensions. The assumption underlying the present view is that people can balance specific satisfactions against specific dissatisfactions arriving at a

composite satisfaction with the job as a whole. Thus job satisfaction corresponds to what has been called in the literature "general" or "overall" job satisfaction and is measured by combining responses to five questions regarding workers' evaluations of their jobs as a whole.

A score is derived by taking the mean of an unweighted sum of the responses to the five questions. Scores on each item range from 1.0 to 5.0, a high score indicating high job satisfaction. Kalleberg<sup>1</sup> reports that the scale has an internal consistency reliability based on Cronbach's  $\alpha$  of .77. An investigation of validity through factor analysis of scale items suggests that the items are indicators of a single underlying construct.<sup>2</sup>

Factorial validity is further evidenced by the results of a principal factor analysis of the correlation matrix for the 34 job reward items and the 5 job satisfaction items. The factor matrix is rotated by means of a quartimax orthogonal rotation, and communality estimates which provides the squared multiple correlations. Results clearly indicate that the five job satisfaction items factor out

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 109.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 110.

from the specific job reward items. It is suggested that overall job satisfaction is a unitary phenomenon and distinct from the satisfactions associated with the specific dimensions of work.

#### Job opportunities and work load

The job opportunities and work load instruments include five items relating to the worker's perception of employment opportunities and the supervisory work load. Since the unemployment rate for the study population is not available, a question concerning perception of the ease of getting a comparable job is asked. Question number 7 (see questionnaire in appendix A) has been asked as a part of The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey.<sup>1</sup> Although it has been included in both the 1969 and 1972-73 cross-sectional study, no information is available concerning reliability and validity. It is included here as a guide to perception of demand by the market place. Kalleberg<sup>2</sup> considers the number of alternatives in the labor market as related to the degree of control over job rewards.

The work load index includes four questions giving a general estimation of the amount of work required by

---

<sup>1</sup>Quinn and Shepard, p. 198.

<sup>2</sup>Kalleberg, p. 139.

supervisory activities. An index is created by the sum of scores on questions 8 through 11. Thus, an index allows for the comparison of work loads as well as an examination of the relationship of work load to job satisfaction.

Items used in the index were originally a part of a mailed questionnaire developed by Alfred Kadushin.<sup>1</sup> In his survey of 469 supervisors, he explored the amount of time required and the supervisory context. There was no information available regarding validity or reliability of the questions. They did however, seem clear and understandable to the 22 respondents in the pretest of this instrument.

#### Work values

The valuation of 34 work characteristics is included in question 12 of the questionnaire. Work values are measured by scales representing six dimensions of job characteristics. The question asks the respondent to rate the importance of each of 34 characteristics. Thus both the content, referring to the particular dimension of work that is valued, and intensity, referring to the degree to which a particular dimension is desired, can be examined.

---

<sup>1</sup> Alfred Kadushin, "Supervision Questionnaire," School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin, 1973.

The 34 items are divided among six dimensions containing from three to eleven items each. Supervisors are then asked to check the most appropriate response ranging from "very important" to "not at all important." Like the question concerning job rewards, this question designed to analyze work values is taken from The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey.<sup>1</sup> As with the work rewards instruments, the work valuation instruments have previously been administered in a personal interview in which the respondent was asked to sort cards into stacks representing the degree of importance attached to each item. Bias may be introduced by "response sets" adopted by respondents attempting to cope with a long list of items. It is, however, important to increase the flexibility and usefulness of the instruments by applying them through a mailed self-administered questionnaire. Another source of possible bias inherent in a mailed questionnaire is the contamination of responses from the question on job rewards (see questionnaire in appendix A). Three precautions are taken to avoid a possible bias. First, the questions are worded differently with the question on values emphasizing the "ideal" aspect of a job. Secondly, items are arranged in a different

---

<sup>1</sup>Quinn and Shepard, p. 66.



order to prevent "response set." A third precaution is the placement of the question on value. The reward question is the first one and the value question is twelfth with questions concerning overall job satisfaction and other job characteristics intervening. These procedures do not guarantee an absence of bias but will help.

Originally, the 34 items were selected on the basis of previous factor analytic studies of job satisfaction and the response categories used to code an open-ended question dealing with attributes of an "ideal" occupation.<sup>1</sup>

Kalleberg<sup>2</sup> analyzed in detail the 34 items selected for The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey. In an attempt to discern the basic underlying dimensions, he factor-analyzed the 34 importance ratings. A principal factor procedure was with a quartimax orthogonal rotation. Communalities were then estimated by the squared multiple correlations of each variable with the others.

The first six factors, accounting for 85.9 percent of the total factor variance and 38.4 percent of the total variance, were interpreted. The results indicate that Factor I represents a "resource adequacy" dimension, Factor

---

<sup>1</sup>Kalleberg, p. 55.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 58.

II relates to an "intrinsic" dimension, Factor III accounts for "convenience," Factor IV reflects a "financial" dimension, Factor V accounts for the similarity among items referring to a "career" dimension, and Factor VI is interpreted to represent a "relations with co-workers" dimension of work.<sup>1</sup>

After the six dimensions were identified, items having the highest loading on particular factors were included in the scales representing that dimension. Items included in each scale are listed in appendix B. Like the reward scales, value scales scores were obtained by computing the mean of an unweighted sum of their component items. Despite the fact that scales have different numbers of items, each scale has a range of 1.0 to 4.0. Missing responses were given the mean of the cases present on that item.

Finally, Kalleberg computed reliability estimates for the six scales. Estimates based on Cronbach's  $\alpha$  ranged from .68 for the relations with co-workers to .85 for the resource adequacy scale. As Kalleberg points out, multiple-item indicators representing each construct are more reliable than single item indicators.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 59.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 62.

Background information

The background information instruments include 16 items relating to the supervisor's personal and educational background. Item number 13 asks for the level of education attained by the supervisor. The following code is utilized for scoring responses: 1 = less than B.A., 2 = B.A. or B.S. with a non-social work major, 3 = B.A. or B.S. with a social work major, 4 = M.A. or M.S. with a non-social work major, 5 = Master of Social Work degree, 6 = Other.

Questions 17 through 20 asks for personal information. Item number 17 requests the gender of supervisors. Responses are coded as 1.0 for males and 2.0 for females. Age, requested by item 18 and is coded as the exact number of years. Race is recorded in item 20 and coded as follows: 1 = white, 2 = black, 3 = Mexican American, and 4 = Other.

Job tenure is measured by item 22 which asks for the length of time employed by the agency. Responses are coded as the exact number of years employed.

Responsibility as the major wage earner in the family is one of several variables related to work values. It is measured by item 26 which is coded 1.0 for yes and 2.0 for no.

After the questionnaire was constructed, taking into consideration all of the above information, it was pre-tested for clarity and coherence. Respondents were participants in a supervision workshop held at the University of Texas at Arlington. All of the respondents were supervisors from social agencies similar to the Texas Department of Human Resources. The 22 people who volunteered to take the questionnaire reviewed it for ambiguities and inconsistencies. Only minor changes in wording and arrangement of questions were made as a result of the pre-test.

### Analysis of Data

Multivariate techniques of data analysis are used in the study. The majority of data is from scales analyzed as interval level measures. Although data obtained from scales are often considered ordinal level, it is necessary here to use interval level procedures so that the theory of job satisfaction suggested by Kalleberg utilizing The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey data can be adequately examined. Both Kalleberg and Quinn and Sheppard used the interval-level statistical and descriptive procedures which are used here. Since the parameters of the population are known, a strong case can be made for the advantages of parametric measures in this situation.

### CHAPTER III

#### THE STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION:

##### A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The quality of the work experience has intrigued social scientists for many years. This interest continues despite few agreed-upon theoretical proposition or empirical findings. A wide range of viewpoints has resulted from scientists entering the field of study with different motivations. For example, some have been interested in job satisfaction from a personal belief that work should further the dignity of the human individual. From this point of view, work must be fulfilling to enable an individual to reach his greatest potential. Consequently, an examination of issues concerning ways to improve the quality of the work experience is an important end in itself. Others have been interested from the point of view of improved production. Industrialists have at various times asked researchers to study job satisfaction within their industry with the thought that the results could ultimately lead to higher productivity. The assumption made was that a happy worker should produce more. Theoretically, the investigator would uncover changes to be made by the industrialist who would improve conditions and then increase his profits.

Somewhere between these two extreme views on job satisfaction have been scientists who have expressed interest in the concept because evidence has linked the degree of job satisfaction to the quality of life outside of the work role. While the motivations and concerns of social scientists may have been different, the importance of the work role and its impact on the total life experience have been generally recognized.

In order to place this study within a theoretical perspective, it is necessary to review the types of explanations which have been offered to account for the variation in job satisfaction. It is the purpose of this chapter to discuss general trends in job satisfaction research with specific examples included. Since the literature is massive, no attempt is made to cover each particular substantive finding but rather to address the modes of explanation.

Four major approaches are identified for discussion. These approaches, however, are not always clearly distinguishable in the literature, thus some studies may fit in more than one category. The first is an attempt to find relationships between the worker's personality and job satisfaction. Since most of the effort is to establish a relationship between adjustment or neuroticism and job satisfaction, very little theory is developed from this perspective.

A second approach, referred to as employee characteristics, consists of total or partial studies devoted to demographic data collection. In this case, the objective is to gather descriptive information for various uses. No theory development is attempted.

A third, and most extensively used, approach is to view job satisfaction as a function of differences in the nature of jobs people perform. Generally, the approach deals with certain work-role characteristics as independent variables and satisfaction as the dependent variable. Several theories, including the human relations perspective, Herzberg's dual-factor theory, and the concept of alienation utilize this approach.<sup>1</sup>

The last approach to be considered originates from the view that the satisfaction an individual obtains from a job is a function not only of the objective properties of that job but also of the motives of the individual. A social action perspective is utilized for a theoretical perspective in these studies. It is suggested here that symbolic interactionism offers an even more fruitful framework.

---

<sup>1</sup> Victor H. Vroom, Work and Motivation (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964), p. 160.

## Personality and Job Satisfaction

While more research has been conducted on the relationship between job characteristics and job satisfaction, the field of industrial counseling has been built on the idea that personality variables are related to job satisfaction. Researchers have assumed that people who are satisfied with their jobs differ in their personalities from those who are dissatisfied.<sup>1</sup> Studies carried out from the personality perspective have attempted to establish a relationship between healthy mental adjustment or neuroticism and job satisfaction. Investigators have followed the lead of early social psychological studies directed toward the relationship between personality traits or abilities and attitudes. Vroom<sup>2</sup> reports that there has been very little attempt to deal with empirically established relationships in theoretical terms. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell<sup>3</sup> further summarize the research efforts by indicating that the satisfied worker is generally a flexible,

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 161.

<sup>3</sup>Fredrick Herzberg, B. Mausner, R. O. Peterson, and Dora F. Capwell, Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion (Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957), p. 20.



better adjusted individual coming from a superior family environment. The dissatisfied worker is more rigid, inflexible, unrealistic in choice of goals, and unable to overcome environmental circumstances. Thus dissatisfaction is present in other aspects of life as well as the job.

An example of research concerned with personality variables is Kornhauser's study of the mental health of Detroit industrial workers. Kornhauser indicates that there is a strong and consistent relationship between level of occupation and better or poorer mental health. Dissatisfaction is greater among workers in routine, repetitive production jobs. People working in jobs which are dissatisfying also tend to be the ones with poor mental health.<sup>1</sup>

Kornhauser concludes that conditions of work and accompanying modes of life at lower skill levels impose more severe deprivations, frustrations, and feelings of hopelessness. Workers in higher level positions experience a greater degree of fulfillment of their wants and enjoy greater feelings of satisfaction and self-regard.<sup>2</sup>

Other studies investigating the relationship between personality and job satisfaction are varied. They include

---

<sup>1</sup>Arthur Kornhauser, Mental Health of the Industrial Worker: A Detroit Study (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965), p. 262.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

investigation of the relationships between job satisfaction and anxiety, aspirations, expectations, attitudes, creativity, esteem, flexibility, initiative, needs, and pride.<sup>1</sup> For example, the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research has sponsored a number of studies indicating a relationship between absence of job satisfaction and presence of psychosomatic illnesses, low self-esteem, anxiety, worry, tension, and impaired interpersonal relations. These problems are also correlated with low status, little autonomy, rapid technological change, isolation on the job, role conflict, role ambiguity, responsibility for managing people, shift work, and threats to self-esteem inherent in the appraisal system.

Although it is difficult to isolate the influence of occupation from other variables such as education and income, there is evidence of a causal link between physically hazardous conditions of work, such as those encountered by soldiers and mine workers, and symptoms of mental illness. Another consistent finding is that workers in low-skilled

---

<sup>1</sup>Alan Robinson, Ralph P. Connors, and G. Holly Whitacre, "Job Satisfaction Researchers of 1964-65," Personnel and Guidance Journal 45 (December 1966):372.

and unskilled jobs have poorer mental health than workers in skilled jobs.<sup>1</sup>

Although the study of personality variables as related to job satisfaction is interesting, it is inadequate when applied to the development of explanatory theory. Strong positive and negative relationships can be demonstrated, but the establishment of relationships without taking job characteristics into account becomes too limiting. Satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the work role cannot be explained merely on the basis of the personality of the worker. On the other hand, an inclusive approach to the study of job satisfaction must include some way to account for individual perceptions.

#### Employee Characteristics and Job Satisfaction

Specific worker characteristics are usually included within investigations of job satisfaction. Characteristics most likely to be included are 'sex, 'education or 'intelligence, 'age, 'race, and 'marital status. In addition to studies utilizing employee characteristics as part of the population description, some studies direct attention to these characteristics as independent variables.

---

<sup>1</sup>Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Work in America (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1973), p. 82.

Sex

An example of a study utilizing sex as an independent variable is one reported by Centers and Bugental. The major focus is the extent to which extrinsic or intrinsic job components are valued. Both sex and occupational levels are considered to be independent variables. Centers and Bugental conclude that no sex differences are found in the value placed on intrinsic or extrinsic factors in general. However, men do place a higher value on the opportunity to use their talent or skill while women place a higher value on "good co-workers."<sup>1</sup>

Hulin and Smith found a similar relationship among variables in their investigation of responses about certain job satisfaction concepts in 185 male and 75 female workers from an electronic plant in New England. Men and women exhibited different levels of satisfaction and different relationships between a variety of variables and various areas of job satisfaction. The researchers concluded that work and pay satisfaction could be predicted for male workers, but satisfaction with co-workers and supervisors could

---

<sup>1</sup>Richard Centers and Daphne E. Bugental, "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Motivations Among Different Segments of the Working Population," Journal of Applied Psychology 50 (June 1966):196.

not.<sup>1</sup> They further contend that it is not sex, per se, that is related to high or low job satisfaction, but rather an entire constellation of factors which themselves are related to sex. Such factors include pay, job level, and promotional opportunities.<sup>2</sup> However, conclusions reached by Hulin and Smith are contradicted by another study in which men and women received the same pay and held the same social position as men. In this case, the women reported higher job satisfaction than the men.<sup>3</sup>

In general, the conclusion can be reached that women tend to derive the same satisfaction as men do from the intrinsic rewards of work. ✓ However, such rewards are not as often available to women. Negative attitudes appear to relate to the discrepancy between women's high expectations about work and the actual low social and economic statuses of their jobs.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles L. Hulin and Patricia Cain Smith, "A Linear Model of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology 49 (June 1965):215.

<sup>2</sup>Idem, "Sex Differences in Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology 49 (April 1964):92.

<sup>3</sup>Glenn P. Fournet, M. K. Distefano, Jr., and Margaret W. Pryer, "Job Satisfaction: Issues and Problems," Personnel Psychology 19 (Summer 1966):170.

<sup>4</sup>Report, Work in America, p. 58.

Education or intelligence

It is difficult to analyze the relationship between education or intelligence and job satisfaction. Study results vary from a report of no relationship with job satisfaction to negative and/or positive findings. A major problem encountered in studying job satisfaction as a function of education is the fact that educational level is not a pure factor but is contaminated with age.<sup>1</sup>

Sheppard and Herrick discuss educational level in relation to both age and income. They note a tendency among young college-educated workers to be less satisfied with life and job than their contemporaries who had no college experience. However, in the group consisting of 45 years and older, the percentage of workers reporting dissatisfaction is the same for both levels of education. The suggested interpretation is that as workers grow older education has less influence on job satisfaction.

When education and income are combined and analyzed together with job satisfaction, new relationships emerge. In 1970, individuals with college experience earning less than \$5,000 per year have less job satisfaction than individuals without any college experience. This relationship

---

<sup>1</sup>Fournet, Distefano, and Pryer, p. 170.

is also seen in the \$5,000 to \$10,000 income level. When the worker reaches over \$10,000 per year the relationship changes and the worker with college experience registers as much job satisfaction as the worker without college.<sup>1</sup>

The relationship of education, intelligence, age, and income have not received adequate attention for generalizations to be made. There is a need for study of these together so that the relationships can become clear.

### Age

Studies consistently reveal that young workers are more dissatisfied with work than are older workers. According to Sheppard and Herrick, one of every four workers under age 30 feels dissatisfied, with only 13 percent of workers aged 30 to 44 expressing negative feeling toward their jobs. The percentage decreases to 11 for workers 55 and over.<sup>2</sup> Supporting evidence indicates that young workers expect a great deal of fulfillment from work but are not deriving a great deal from the work they are doing. Young workers place more importance on the value of interesting

---

<sup>1</sup>Harold L. Sheppard and Neal Q. Herrick, Where Have All the Robots Gone? Worker Dissatisfaction in the '70s (New York: Free Press, 1972), p. 8.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

work and ability to grow on the job and less importance on security than do older workers.<sup>1</sup>

Although findings concerning age and job satisfaction are consistent, suggested explanations are not. Herzberg suggests that age and tenure have a U-shaped relationship to job satisfaction. Specifically, he suggests that morale is high for the youthful employee immediately after employment, drops sharply after the first few years, and then begins to climb as employees continue on their jobs.<sup>2</sup>

As the result of a statistical analysis of data developed to test Herzberg's theory, Hulin and Smith question the suggested U-shaped relationship. The U-shaped model is not supported in their study, which suggest that workers are involved in a process of adjusting their expectations to what the environment is likely to provide. The more a worker can fit together his expectations with environmental returns the higher his level of job satisfaction. The assumption is then made that the longer a worker is on the job the more he knows what to expect from the job. Thus,

---

<sup>1</sup>Report, Work in America, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup>Fournet, Distefano, and Pryer, p. 169.



older workers with more tenure experienced a higher level of satisfaction.<sup>1</sup>

Support for the idea that satisfaction increases with age is also given in a study reported by Saleh and Otis<sup>2</sup> in which 80 males between ages 60 and 65, and 38 males between 50 and 55 indicated by rank the span of years of greatest job satisfaction. Both groups reported an increase in satisfaction with age up through the range of 50 through 59. Satisfaction then decreased in the pre-retirement years for the older group.

Thus, it can be said that age is positively related to job satisfaction. On the other hand, explanation for the phenomenon is not firmly established. Future study is needed to lend clarity to the issue of a U-shaped or linear relationship between age and job satisfaction.

### Race

According to the 1973 report submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the most dissatisfied American workers are young black people in white-collar jobs. Twice as many blacks as whites through age 44 express negative attitudes about their jobs. The percentage

---

<sup>1</sup>Hulin and Smith, p. 215.

<sup>2</sup>Robinson, Connors, and Whitacre, p. 375.

after that age decreases to a level below the level for whites.

Unlike the whites, experience, satisfaction for blacks does not increase with income until it becomes higher than \$10,000 per year.<sup>1</sup> This can be interpreted to mean that when income is below the \$10,000 level, blacks believe that small increments in income do not offer sufficiently greater ability to consume. In reality, the minority dollar at that level does not buy the same amount of goods as the white dollar.

Another important finding related to race is that although both minority and majority workers are dissatisfied with meaningless routine and authoritarian work tasks and environments, blacks place discrimination ahead of other issues of concern. Task force members report that blacks are concerned about security and survival in what they perceive to be a hostile and threatening work situation. Support for this interpretation comes from the fact that 22 percent of black workers under age 44 complain of racial discrimination with only 57 percent of blacks older than this age reporting such problems. When collar color is controlled, only 12 percent of blacks in blue-collar jobs as

---

<sup>1</sup>Incomes discussed here are based on 1972 data.

opposed to 29 percent of blacks in white-collar jobs say they experience discrimination. A conclusion reached in the report is that blacks most affected by racial discrimination are young, educated, and in white-collar jobs.<sup>1</sup>

In a study by Wayson, satisfaction was approached by evaluating reasons teachers leave or stay on their jobs. White teachers mentioned missionary zeal, professional autonomy, and inertia as reasons for staying. Black teachers on the other hand, said that organizational and opportunity constraints were reasons for staying. When asked for reasons for leaving, the black teachers interestingly named organizational and opportunity constraints.<sup>2</sup> Thus, the reasons for staying and leaving are the same for black teachers. Wayson interprets this to mean that both the teachers who leave and the ones staying appear to be reacting to discrimination.

Most of the known facts concerning race and job satisfaction are found as secondary parts of studies concerned with other subjects. Race as a variable is obviously related to occupational level, age, education, and collar

---

<sup>1</sup> Report, Work in America, p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> Robinson, Connors, and Whitacre, p. 375.

color. Direct attention to the complexity of the relationships of these variables is necessary if understanding is to emerge.

### Marital status

It is difficult to assess the influence of marital status on job satisfaction. Generally married workers report a higher level of job satisfaction than unmarried workers. However, when data are grouped by age, differences in satisfaction almost disappear. This stands to reason since most unmarried workers are under 30 years of age and young workers tend to be more dissatisfied.

Age is not the only confounding variable in the relationship between marital status and job satisfaction. Income must also be taken into consideration. Unmarried individuals making less than \$5,000 in 1964 were not more dissatisfied than married workers in the same income range. Differences in satisfaction also disappear at \$10,000 and over. However, in the category of \$5,000 to \$10,000 a difference is seen. In this category 20 percent of the unmarrieds are dissatisfied as compared to 12 percent of the marrieds.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

As with other employee characteristics, marital status by itself does not give meaningful information concerning job satisfaction. Marital status must be analyzed along with age, education, sex, and race for real meaning to develop. For a theoretical explanation to be given, the employee characteristics must be combined with certain job characteristics and individual motivations.

#### Work-Role Characteristics and Job Satisfaction

Another approach to the investigation of explanations of job satisfaction is the study of work-role characteristics. This has been the numerically dominant viewpoint. The attempt is to develop a measure of work-role characteristics and of job satisfaction. The two variables are studied with the idea of linking them in a causal relationship.

The work role is recognized to be multidimensional, and most researchers have investigated job satisfaction using multiple measures. These multiple measures of attitudes toward a large number of aspects of the work situation can be obtained and intercorrelated. Specific factors which have been studied include attitudes toward the company, professional opportunities, the content of the job, supervision, financial rewards, working conditions, and relations with co-workers.

Vroom, in an extensive review of studies of job characteristics as determinants of job satisfaction, points out that one can find contradictory evidence in many of the subject areas.<sup>1</sup> He suggests four possible explanations for such findings. First, people might have different aspirations or expectations from the job. Thus, some people might be easily satisfied while others may expect more. A second possibility is that a "response set" is in action. There may be a tendency to choose the "yes" or "agree" response resulting in a high satisfaction score. Also, the social desirability response set may be at work. Reporting a high level of job satisfaction may be thought of as socially desirable. A third possibility is that the job may provide more than one type of reward. Consequently, a job offering a high salary may also offer higher status and a greater variety of stimulation. Lastly, measures of satisfaction may be functionally interdependent. Therefore, changes in satisfaction of one aspect of the job may result in changed satisfaction in others.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Vroom, pp. 173-174.

<sup>2</sup> Vroom, pp. 173-174.

The basic assumption underlying this approach is that "there is a difference between the properties of a satisfying and a dissatisfying work role."<sup>1</sup> Negative attitudes toward the job are then thought to reflect unhealthy situations rather than unhealthy persons, and attempts to solve job frustrations involve changing work-role characteristics.

### Specific job characteristics

Studies utilizing this approach are carried out under the assumption that explanations of differences in satisfaction lie in the nature of the jobs people perform. In this case, job factors are designated as independent variables with satisfaction as the dependent variable. Since workers have different duties or work for different companies in different positions, it is logically assumed that they will have a different quality of work experiences. While this assumption is questioned, it has had and continues to have a pervasive influence on research. Following Vroom's lead, major studies using this approach will be summarized under the headings of (1) occupational level, (2) supervision, (3) the work groups, (4) job content,, (5) wages, (6) promotional opportunities, and (7) hours of work.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 103-104.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 105.

## Occupational level

One consistent overall finding in job satisfaction studies is that there is a clear connection between job satisfaction and social status. According to Gurin, Veroff, and Feld, people in higher status jobs not only receive more ego gratifications in their work, but also seek such gratifications. Better physical and mental health are also found among higher status employees.<sup>1</sup> In agreement with these findings, Porter states that the vertical location of management is important in determining the extent to which managers believe they can satisfy particular psychological needs.<sup>2</sup> In general, it can be said that workers in lower management positions are more dissatisfied than managers in top level positions. The higher the position the more ego satisfaction, status, pay, and self-direction. An interesting fact about the finding is that this trend holds whether the question asked is "open-ended or closed-ended, poorly or well worded, free of or subject to response set, or taking into account or disregarding the respondent's level of aspiration."<sup>3</sup> It even makes no

---

<sup>1</sup>John P. Robinson, Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics, ed. John P. Robinson, Robert Athanasiou, and Kendra B. Head (Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1969), p. 33.

<sup>2</sup>Fournet, Distefano, and Pryer, p. 171.

<sup>3</sup>Robinson, p. 66.



difference that lower status workers rate their jobs primarily in extrinsic terms and higher status workers do so in intrinsic terms. Higher status workers have the best of all worlds and have a higher quality of work experience.

### Supervision

Supervision has received a great deal of attention in studies concerning job satisfaction. Outcomes in this are mixed. For example, supervision was pinpointed as important as far back as the Hawthorne studies.<sup>1</sup> In a more recent literature review, it appears that job satisfaction is congruent with the immediate supervisor's personal interest in and support for the worker.<sup>2</sup>

On the other side, reviews conducted by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell suggest that, although supervision is often mentioned as a satisfier, it is much less frequently mentioned as a dissatisfier. In fact, the results of an analysis of 16 studies indicate that the highest ranking factor is security, followed by opportunity for advancement, company and management, wages, intrinsic aspects of the job, supervision, social aspects of the job, communications, working conditions, and benefits.<sup>3</sup> Giving

---

<sup>1</sup>Vroom, p. 105.

<sup>2</sup>Fournet, Distefano, and Pryer, 172.

<sup>3</sup>Vroom, p. 106.

some focus to the picture, Pelz indicates that a supervisor who sides with his employees tends to have a satisfied group of workers only if he has enough influence with his own supervisors to make his concern for the worker profitable in terms of benefits.<sup>1</sup>

#### The work group

The work group is considered important as a determinant of job satisfaction by a number of researchers. Most studies of satisfaction include relations in the work group as a variable for analysis. It is interesting to note that Elton Mayo in a reaction to the efficiency management approach, declared that man's strongest human characteristic is the desire to be associated in work with his fellows. As a reflection of Mayo's original interest in work groups, his followers continue to focus on the influence of the face-to-face work group on worker satisfaction.<sup>2</sup>

Other writers have found that people who are members of a group are more satisfied than those who are not members. Evidently the work group offers a way to gratify

---

<sup>1</sup>Fournet, Distefano, and Pryer, 172.

<sup>2</sup>Vroom, p. 119.

interpersonal and friendship needs. Since these needs are easily met in a group, the group becomes associated with increased satisfaction.<sup>1</sup>

It is difficult to challenge the work group as a major determinant of job satisfaction when particular workers experience co-workers as a major source of satisfaction. However, researchers in the subject area of work have not adequately identified the relationship between the work group and job satisfaction. Most of the current study on groups is being carried out by social psychologists who are more concerned about group properties than about the quality of the work experience.<sup>2</sup>

#### Job content

The actual duties a person is called upon to perform vary greatly from one work role to another. These actual duties or job content are assumed to play a role in the quality of work experience but have not always received much research attention. Until the Herzberg two-factor theory was developed, the assumptions of Mayo and his associates were followed. This viewpoint asserted that the

---

<sup>1</sup>Fournet, Distefano, and Pryer, p. 172.

<sup>2</sup>Vroom, p. 119.

crucial determinants of job satisfaction were the social relationships established by workers.

A new attitude toward job content factors was developed through Herzberg's questioning of workers concerning their good and bad job experiences. As workers spoke about their good and bad times it became clear to the researchers that job content factors were satisfiers and job context factors were dissatisfiers. Thus, good stories had to do with achievement, recognition, advancement, responsibility, and the work itself. Herzberg then concluded that where dissatisfaction exists an improvement in some desirable job context variable such as policy, administration, supervision, or salary will result in an increase in job satisfaction to the point where the worker is indifferent or neutral concerning the job. However, to achieve satisfaction, increased in some desirable job content variable will be required. The interpretation given is that satisfaction is composed of two independent factors.<sup>1</sup>

Since Herzberg's original study, others have attempted to replicate his findings with varying results. Theoretical and methodological questions concerning the limitations of this approach have already been discussed. The important point here is the recognition that Herzberg and his

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 126-127.

associates did view job content factors as important to the understanding of the quality of the work experience.

Rather than being concerned with overall job content like Herzberg, some investigators have concentrated their efforts on particular aspects such as the amount of specialization of the work role. Specialization has occurred in almost every occupation. Although social scientists have agreed that specialization has led to greater efficiency, concern has been expressed about the resulting decrease in job satisfaction.

A logical part of specialization is repetitiveness, which has received a great deal of study. For example, it is found that the degree to which employees in an automobile assembly plant expressed interest in their jobs is related to the number of operations they carried out. Drawing on conclusions from research projects several industries implemented job enlargement programs, with workers responding in a positive manner.<sup>1</sup>

#### Wages

The amount of money a person receives for his work is important to job satisfaction, but how important is open to question. Evidence for both the importance and lack of importance of wages continues to accumulate.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 132-133.

When Herzberg asked workers to rank different aspects of the job in terms of importance, wages were ranked behind security, opportunity for advancement, and management, but more important than job content, supervision, the social aspect of the job, communications, working conditions, and benefits. Then as different aspects of the job were classified as satisfiers and dissatisfiers, wages were found to be the most frequent source of dissatisfaction but the least frequent source of satisfaction.

Several other researchers suggest that satisfaction with wages may be based on a relative standard rather than an absolute amount of money. Such a standard may be an adaptation level derived from wages received at previous times or an idea of the amount of money received by other people. Patchen has provided support for this point of view with the results of his study of oil refinery workers.<sup>1</sup>

#### Opportunities for promotion

The opportunities for promotion of organizational members are highly variable and are also assumed to have an effect on job satisfaction. It is difficult, however, to assess the specific influence on satisfaction. For example, the type and size of promotion expected by two workers in

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 150-151.

the same organization may be very different. Another problem facing researchers is how to determine the probability of promotion.

In spite of these difficulties several studies have been carried out in an attempt to ascertain the influence of promotional opportunities on job satisfaction. Both Morse and Sirota have found positive relationships between ratings of promotional opportunities and attitudes toward the company and opportunities in it.<sup>1</sup>

In another study, Patchen found a relationship between frequency of absences and belief in promotional opportunities. Those people who believed that they deserved to be promoted demonstrated a higher frequency of absences when compared with those who stated that they did not think they deserved to be promoted.<sup>2</sup>

An obvious problem with research in this area is how to account for the fact that some people have accurate information concerning their promotional opportunities and others do not. If a worker thinks he has a good chance of promotion there may be a strong positive relationship between his rating and job satisfaction. Then he may later find out that his promotional opportunities are in reality poor, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 152.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 153.

the positive relationship may become negative. Thus, the association between the variables changes according to the worker's belief. This research problem remains to be dealt with by investigators of job satisfaction.

#### Hours of work

Vroom points out that the work role occupied by a person influences his life in many ways. One way this influence becomes apparent is in terms of the amount of leisure time available beyond working hours. Not only can the amount of time be a problem but also the scheduling or placement of the hours. In addition to the common working hours, many workers are required to work different patterns referred to as shift work. This cycle usually begins in the evening or at night.<sup>1</sup>

Work hours have not been a major area of focus for researchers, although questions concerning hours of work have been included in several larger studies. For example, Quinn and Shepard report in The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey that 57 percent of the sample reported inconvenient or excessive hours as a slight problem, and 25 percent indicated that hours were a sizable problem. With regard to specific problems, the starting and ending times presented the most problem with 24.9 percent of the workers designating

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 155.



it as such. Second in importance were problems with the work schedule's interfering with family life. This was chosen by 23.7 percent of the sample. Other problems such as overtime, irregular hours and excessive hours were chosen by very few workers.<sup>1</sup>

Difficulties with hours required by shift work are reported in an earlier study by Mann and Hoffman. In a comparison of two power plants, 35 percent of the workers in plant A and 73 percent of workers in plant B reported disliking shift work. Such different findings are explained by the investigator as resulting from differences in the way workers are rotated from one shift to another.<sup>2</sup>

Vroom on the other hand, offers an alternative model for predicting the affective consequences of work schedules. His central idea is that people will be more satisfied with their hours of work if the scheduling allows time to engage in activities that they enjoy and consider important. For example, a person who likes to fish or play golf will be happier working evenings than a person who enjoys evening time television shows. Consequently, the flexibility of

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert P. Quinn and Linda J. Shepard, The 1972-1973 Quality of Employment Survey (Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1974), pp. 137-138.

<sup>2</sup>Vroom, p. 156.

leisure time activities is a major determinant of a worker's satisfaction with his hours of work.<sup>1</sup>

It is apparent from the above discussion that various job characteristics are related to job satisfaction. However, the exact nature of these relationships is unclear with conflicting evidence from one study to another. An important observation here is that studies of this nature, while helpful to specific populations and settings, do not contribute to general knowledge building. Results reported in this section are generally from sections of larger studies or merely descriptive data without attempts to develop theoretical generalizations. The material is reviewed here because it is important to explore previous attempts to understand the quality of work experience.

#### Early theoretical development

Early writers using the job characteristics approach were considered to be production oriented. Since researchers were often hired by industry to solve specific problems with employees, efforts were directed toward industrial goals such as increasing productivity, maximizing efficiency, and cutting down absenteeism and turnover.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

Taking into account these reasons for investigating workers and their output, it is not surprising to find that researchers considered workers to be part of the production process. Major emphasis was given to worker output which was measured before and after a manipulation of some part of the working environment. The object was to raise production by changing particular job characteristics. These research techniques were first utilized by efficiency engineers and were merely applied to workers and their production.

Although some standardization of worker performance was established, study results were often difficult to interpret. One of these, the Hawthorne study project, led future researchers to consider the role of the work group rather than focusing exclusively on the worker as an individual.<sup>1</sup> The Hawthorne project, under the direction of Elton Mayo, became a well known series of studies. It took place between 1927 and 1932 when Elton Mayo of Harvard University was invited by management to study workers and their working conditions in the Cicero, Illinois plant of the Western Electric Company. Managers were concerned about

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul Kimmel, Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics, ed. John P. Robinson, Robert Athanasiou, and Kindra B. Head (Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1969), p. 18.

low production and morale. They were faced with workers who complained of fatigue and monotony in their work. Additionally, engineers who were well trained but relatively non-sensitive, were assigned the task of teaching workers to operate newly designed machines. As a result, both morale and production suffered.<sup>1</sup>

Outcomes from the Hawthorne studies were surprising and difficult to interpret. Researchers unexpectedly found that almost any manipulation of working conditions implemented with a group of female assembly workers resulted in increased productivity. Even when the original working conditions were reinstated output increased. Mayo and his associates, after interviewing the workers, concluded that the primary influencing factor was the attitudes of the participants toward each other and toward the experiment itself. The findings were sufficiently impressive to the managers that one of the first industrial counseling programs in a major industry was initiated.

A long range impact of the Hawthorne studies was a shift in the emphasis of viewing workers as part of the production process to seeing them as active participants in

---

<sup>1</sup>Fritz, J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, Organizations: Structure and Behavior, ed. Joseph A. Litterer (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1963), pp. 51-57.

the work process. Factors such as participation, morale, group cohesion, and supervision were given increased consideration after Mayo's beginning studies.<sup>1</sup>

As seen in the Hawthorne studies, early researchers dealt with events and issues rather than concepts. Consequently, their results were bound by time and place. In an attempt to study work conceptually without concern for changing work behavior, improving working conditions, or improving the situation of the individual worker, Robert Hoppock conducted a pioneering survey of workers. In his 1935 study, Hoppock sought to obtain a representative sample of workers. He developed a standardized set of questions and attitude scales which were administered to the working population of an entire community. Subsamples of employed and unemployed and satisfied and dissatisfied teachers were then selected for more intensive investigation. Expanded versions of the scales and questionnaire, along with intelligence tests, interest tests, and free association were utilized in the expanded investigations. Hoppock's interest in studying job satisfaction in general rather than as related to issues and events has continued to serve as a model. Researchers partially refined his basic approach to the study of job satisfaction.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Kimmel, p. 18

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

As pointed out by Kimmel, there was little research done on the concept of job satisfaction between 1935 and 1945.<sup>1</sup> In fact, when Herzberg reviewed the literature in 1957, he commented on the lack of well developed job satisfaction theory and the research to support it. His major conclusion was that almost any position concerning what affected people at work could be documented.<sup>2</sup> Out of his concern for the paucity of theoretical evaluations in the field, Herzberg and his associates decided to develop a way to study job attitudes in which job factors, attitudes, and effects of job characteristics would be studied simultaneously as a unit.<sup>3</sup>

Herzberg developed his study around the idea that job satisfaction represents a dichotomous rather than a continuous variable. The investigators concluded that determinants of job satisfaction, motivators, are different from the determinants of job dissatisfaction, hygienes.<sup>4</sup> In this case, motivators are defined as job content variables.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>3</sup>Fredrick Herzberg, Bernard Mausner, and Barbara Block Snyderman, The Motivation to Work (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959), p. 11.

<sup>4</sup>Carl A. Lindsay, Edmond Marks, and Leon Golow, "The Herzberg Theory: A Critique and Reformulation," Journal of Applied Psychology 51 (August 1967):330.

Satisfaction then results from such factors as the challenge, achievement, responsibility, growth, advancement, the task, and recognition.<sup>1</sup> Motivators are the only potent sources of job satisfaction since they function to satisfy the individual's need for self-actualization in work. Thus, the factors leading to satisfaction in a job have the potency to motivate workers and are termed "motivators" in the study.

Dissatisfiers, on the other hand, are thought to arise from the context of the job. These factors, or "hygienes" as they are termed, are analogous to the medical process of finding a preventative for pain and unhappiness.

Herzberg believes that hygienes act as potent sources of dissatisfaction because they can fail to meet the need of individuals for avoiding unpleasant situations. Thus, dissatisfiers are identified in the working environment including salary, interpersonal relations, company policy and administration, working conditions, factors in personal life, status, and job security.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Fournet, Distefano, and Pryer, p. 177.

<sup>2</sup>Kevin J Russell, "Variation in Orientation to Work and Job Satisfaction," Sociology of Work and Occupations 2 (November 1955):301-302.

The conclusion reached by Herzberg is that job satisfaction is composed of two unipolar traits. A lack of motivators can reduce satisfaction but will not produce dissatisfaction. Also, a surplus of hygienes will not increase satisfaction but can produce dissatisfaction.

In a study published in 1959, Herzberg first tested his dual-factor theory of job satisfaction. Participants consisted of 200 engineers and accountants. Methodologically, Herzberg employed the critical incident approach to investigate satisfiers and dissatisfiers. Subjects were asked to recall a time when they had felt exceptionally good about their jobs. Following the recounting of the experiences, the investigators explored the reasons for the feelings of satisfaction and the relationship of the satisfaction to job performance, personal life, and their well-being. Then the sequence of events leading the worker's attitudes to their "normal" or "usual" states were explored. Next, subjects were requested to describe incidents associated with exceptionally negative feelings about their job. Circumstances surrounding the events were analyzed in the same manner as with positive events to determine categories of events.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert J. House and Lawrence A. Wigdon, "Herzberg's Dual-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction and Motivation: A Review of the Evidence and a Criticism," Personal Psychology 20 (December 1967):369-370.



Although Herzberg found strong support for his two factor theory, attempts to replicate and generalize his work have produced mixed results. In a review of literature from 1963 to 1966, Burke examined 14 studies and presented them in tabular form. He drew three general conclusions from his analysis. The first one, which is supported by Herzberg's original study, is that "in many cases, factors causing job satisfaction are different from and not merely opposite to, factors causing job dissatisfactions."<sup>1</sup>

Secondly, "a given factor can cause job satisfaction in one sample and job dissatisfaction in another sample, and vice versa."<sup>2</sup> According to Burke, several intervening variables such as occupational level, age, sex, and time-dimension partially influence the direction a given factor will take. His third conclusion is that sometimes a given factor will cause both job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the same sample. In summary, Burke found ample evidence to suggest that Herzberg's two factors are not completely independent.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ronald J. Burke, "Are Herzberg's Motivators and Hygienes Unidimensional?" Journal of Applied Psychology 50 (August 1966):317.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 317.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 318.

In addition to Burke's criticism of lack of independence of Herzberg's two factors, House and Widgor have suggested three criticisms.<sup>1</sup> One is that the theory is methodologically bound. The story telling critical-incident method, requesting the subject to recall an extremely satisfying and dissatisfying job event, may itself account for the associations found by Herzberg. It is pointed out that people may, from a self-protecting position, take personal credit for positive events but blame their environment for negative ones. To provide adequate support for the theory, other methods are required.<sup>2</sup> If support is provided while utilizing an alternate method, findings can be considered more credible.

In addition to the Herzberg theory's being method bound, his research is considered by some to be procedurally deficient. In order to categorize data given by the participant, the researcher is required to interpret responses. In other words, the rating system and data do not completely determine the coding. Since raters are required to make interpretations of data, there is room for contamination of the dimensions. The dual-factor theory may in fact contaminate the coding procedure leading it to reflect the

---

<sup>1</sup>House and Wigdor, p. 371.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

rater's hypothesis rather than the respondent's own perceptions. This research problem could be minimized with the use of a more objective approach which permits the subjects to categorize their own responses.

Another criticism of the research foundation is that the operational definitions developed by Herzberg and his associates are inadequate. Several researchers have questioned the mutual exclusiveness of the dimensions.<sup>1</sup> This is, in fact, one of Burke's major criticisms. He concludes that "the results of this and other studies suggest that Herzberg's motivators and hygienes are neither unidimensional nor independent."<sup>2</sup> Others suggest that correlations between the factors may result from response-set effects by respondents.

The Herzberg study is also critized for not including a measure of overall job satisfaction. There is no way to know if a factor described as hygiene or motivator contributes to overall satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Other investigators state that a worker may find a job acceptable in spite of his dislike of certain aspects of it. The relationship also works in reverse as a worker may dislike a job despite many desirable characteristics.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 372-373.

<sup>2</sup>Burke, pp. 320-321.

Other procedural concerns raised by House and Wigdor include the lack of reliability data for the critical-incident method and the fact that the research does not deal solely with current satisfaction. Since there is no control over the sampling time for the data, results are a mixture of current and past job satisfaction.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to criticisms concerning the research techniques used by Herzberg, House and Wigdor point out several inconsistencies with previous research evidence. A major concern here is that the dual-factor theory leads to the expectation that highly satisfied people will be highly motivated and highly productive. However, evidence does not support this assumption. There seems to be general agreement among researchers that the effect of satisfaction on worker motivation cannot be clearly explained. Future investigations must keep in mind the distinction between recall of satisfying events and actual observation of motivated behavior. Recall of events may or may not be translated into actual motivated behavior.

After an extensive review of studies utilizing the Herzberg dual-factor theory based on methods other than the story telling method, House and Wigdor reach four conclusions which are similar to the ones reached by Burke.

---

<sup>1</sup>House and Wigdor, p. 373.

Their first conclusion is "that a given factor can cause job satisfaction for one person and job dissatisfaction for another, and vice versa."<sup>1</sup> Secondly, any given factor can cause job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the same sample. Their third conclusion is that both satisfying and dissatisfying job events are related to intrinsic or motivator factors. The final and most general conclusion is "that the Two-Factor Theory is an oversimplification of the relationship between motivation and satisfaction, and the sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction."<sup>2</sup>

It is clear that Herzberg's theory is still accumulating evidence for and against it. If, in fact, the dual-factor perspective is an oversimplification of the relationships among a number of variables, it may not receive clear cut support from future research. It appears that although a more objective methodology would help, there is a need for a different theoretical position. Awareness of this need brings the realization that in spite of the numerous studies of job satisfaction there are very few attempts to develop job satisfaction as a concept to be studied within

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 386.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 387.

a larger theoretical perspective. Herzberg's dual factor theory falls short of anything more powerful than empirical generalization. For that reason, its major contribution is in the form of a typology of satisfiers and dissatisfiers. An alternative theoretical perspective to the dual factor theory is the use of the Marxian concept of alienation as a framework for the examination of job satisfaction. Although alienation, like the Herzberg theory, is subject to limitation, researchers continue to use it as a basis for research studies.

#### Alienation and job satisfaction

Alienation continues to be a popular sociological concept to be used as an indicator of the quality of the work experience. Studies utilizing this theoretical approach are among the relatively few in which the researchers attempt to link concepts in a systematic pattern and offer predictions based on theory. Although results are often disappointing and contradictory, there is an effort to build and test theory. Out of the numerous studies conducted using alienation as a conceptual framework, the six reviewed here are chosen for their representativeness.

In a study done in a large mental hospital, Pearlin focuses on conditions which foster alienation. He is specifically interested in investigating particular

structures, role sets, and processes that have alienative consequences. For Pearlin, alienation is defined as "subjectively experienced powerlessness to control one's own work activities."<sup>1</sup>

When considering the authority structure of the hospital, Pearlin indicates that alienation is most pronounced under conditions allowing minimal interaction between superordinates and subordinates. The consequence of such a condition is that subordinates have reduced opportunities to influence informally their superordinates. Thus, alienation is increased when there is great positional disparity, where authority is communicated in a manner discouraging exchange, and where authority is exercised in relative absentia.

Another area of investigation is the overall opportunity structure of the hospital. As with other bureaucratically organized groups there are fewer relatively high positions than there are aspirants for them. As a consequence, alienation is the lowest among high achievers. However, alienation can be offset by satisfaction with pay, promotion and social mobility.

---

<sup>1</sup>Leonard J. Pearlin, "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel," American Sociological Review 27 (March 1962):314.

A final area of concern for Pearlin is the work group. In this case, alienation is examined in relation to affective bonds between fellow workers. The evidence suggests that those workers who establish extra-work friendships with fellow workers experience lower levels of alienation than those who do not develop such friendships.

Pearlin's findings lead him to point out that there are always some individuals who because of their personalities will be alienated. Alienation is not necessarily a by-product of a large bureaucracy. Large organizations, like the hospital under study, can be structurally organized to lessen alienation experience by the workers.<sup>1</sup>

In a well known study of social workers employed in 16 social welfare agencies, Aiken and Hage investigated the relationships between two types of alienation and two structural properties of organizations. The two types of alienation of concern were alienation from work and alienation from expressive relations. These were examined in relation to centralization and formalization of the chosen organizations.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 325-326.

<sup>2</sup>Michael Aiken and Jerald Hage, "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis," American Sociological Review 31 (August 1966):497.



Aiken and Hage state they are able to demonstrate that "highly centralized and highly formalized organizational structures are characterized by greater work alienations and greater alienation from expressive relations."<sup>1</sup> Specifically, alienation is present when workers are not allowed to participate in decisions concerning organizational policies and individual tasks. Both types of alienation are also seen where there are strict rules and where the rules are rigidly enforced. The authors conclude that as aspects of organizational structure vary different types of alienation may emerge.<sup>2</sup>

One of the most conceptually sophisticated studies of alienation among blue-collar workers was carried out by Robert Blauner. By drawing upon the conceptual framework developed by Seeman, he attempted to understand the conditions under which alienating tendencies of the modern factory work organization and technology were intensified. He was likewise interested in discovering the conditions leading to the minimization of alienation.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 506.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 507.

The study compared workers in several industries. Included were printers, textile workers, auto workers, and chemical operators. Structural differences such as level of technology, division of labor, social organization, and economic structure were taken into account as variations in alienation were analyzed.<sup>1</sup>

In summary, Blauner suggests that the most satisfied and thus least alienated workers, printers, are much like medieval craftsmen in terms of the freedom they have to plan and finalize their own work. Skilled textile and auto workers, on the other hand are the most alienated of the workers studied. They also have far less discretion in their work schedules.<sup>2</sup>

In an equally well executed study by Seeman, the consequences of alienated work were examined. It is an investigation of the notion that the price for alienated work extends beyond the denial of personal fulfillment, thus generating serious social effects. It was expected that alienation would generalize into political hostilities,

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert Blauner, Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 6-11.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 181.

frenetic leisure, social movements, and race cleavages. In order to test the negative consequences of alienated work, Seeman gathered data from a sample of the male work force in Malmo, Sweden. Using an index of work alienation, six correlates representing five propositions concerning generalization were analyzed. The six dependent variables representing generalized alienation were generalized powerlessness, intergroup hostility, political awareness, status-mindedness, normlessness, and expert orientation.<sup>1</sup>

Contrary to the expected outcome, Seeman states that he found "little evidence that alienated work, in the sense of work which is unrewarding in its own right, has the generalized consequences often imputed to it."<sup>2</sup> In other words, an alienated worker is not more hostile to ethnic minorities than a non-alienated worker. Politically, he is as likely to be knowledgeable and engaged in the political process as a worker who is not alienated. Additionally, the alienated worker is not less interested in the possibility of exercising control over socio-political events, and is not more status minded, or more anomic. Seeman also believes that

---

<sup>1</sup>Melvin Seeman, "On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work," American Sociological Review 32 (April 1967):273-276.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 283.

the failure to demonstrate these expected generalizations cannot be dismissed on methodological grounds. Support for this interpretation is given by other expected conclusions relating to one another in predictable ways.

In his final summary, Seeman states that these data adequately describe current theories of work and that the free use of the generalization model of alienation is probably unwarranted. It is clear that neo-Marxian theory appears to underestimate greatly the social-psychological subtleties of the work process.<sup>1</sup>

Despite the unexpected and sometimes negative outcomes of studies building on alienation as a conceptual framework, interest in it remains strong. This interest is seen in an impressive 1976 study by Melvin Kohn. In the opening paragraph he admits that alienation is both appealing and ambiguous as a research concept. Thus, his aim is to bring clarity to the issue by examining the relationship between social structure, in this case occupational structure, and the subjective experiences of alienation.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 285.

<sup>2</sup>Melvin L. Kohn, "Occupational Structure and Alienation," American Journal of Sociology 82 (July 1976):111.

To further his examination of alienation, Kohn constructed Guttman Scales of the four types. The first scale, powerlessness, was intended to measure the sense of being powerless. Secondly, self-estrangement attempted to identify the sense of detachment from self. The third index, normlessness, was developed on a continuum from the belief that it was acceptable to "do what one could get away with" to "upholding moral standards." Cultural estrangement, the last index, measured whether the respondent thought his beliefs differed from those of his friends, relatives, and other people of similar religious background.<sup>1</sup> Kohn then developed three indices relating to occupational structure. His three aspects included ownership and position in the supervisory hierarchy, division of labor, and the amount of opportunity a person has to exercise self-direction in his work.<sup>2</sup>

Interestingly, Kohn's results contradict those previously noted by Seeman. According to Kohn, the analysis clearly indicates that the conditions of occupational structure bear meaningfully on three types of alienation.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 115-117.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 118.

However, he found evidence not only for the relationships within the occupational sphere but also for a strong interconnection between conditions of occupational life and an orientation to non-occupational social reality. The suggestion is that, contrary to the widely accepted argument, there is carry-over from occupationally experienced alienation to alienation in non-occupational realms. Thus, lessons learned at work are relevant in other aspects of life.

Finally, Kohn's findings lead him to discuss current implications of alienation research. A number of investigators are calling for the alleviation of alienation by occupational rearrangements. It is Kohn's belief that elements necessary for changing alienation must include giving the worker meaningful control over the conditions "that impinge directly on his opportunities to exercise initiative, thought, and independent judgment in his work."<sup>1</sup> Otherwise, alienation will not be affected. A question yet to be answered is how large a measure of control is required for a worker to avoid alienation.

The suggestion of changing job and organizational structure to prevent dissatisfaction and alienation is seen throughout the literature on job satisfaction. Some of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 128.



recent investigators of alienation suggest job enlargement as a way to counter alienation produced by extreme functional specialization. After extensive discussion of previous studies, Shepard explores the effect of functional specialization. His conclusion is that whether a worker is alienated or not, job satisfaction increases with job size. Job specialization poses a more negative influence than has been thought. In fact, it appears to be a general phenomenon not necessarily connected with alienation.<sup>1</sup>

As previously stated, although alienation has been and continues to be a fruitful concept in the study of the world of work, it must be recognized that it offers a limited perspective. Rather than an indicator of the overall quality of the work experience, alienation represents only one component of this experience. As Seeman points out, alienation is related to intrinsic rewards which are not the only kinds of rewards available from work.<sup>2</sup> A number of rewards extrinsic to the task are also available to provide meaning and gratification for the worker.

---

<sup>1</sup>Jon M. Shepard, "Functional Specialization, Alienation, and Job Satisfaction," Industrial and Labor Relations Review 23 (January 1970):217.

<sup>2</sup>Seeman, p. 216.

### Work Values, Job Rewards, and Job Satisfaction

The theoretical and empirical approaches discussed thus far are demonstrated to be inadequate to explain variations in job satisfaction in view of their one-sidedness. Concentration on one factor with the exclusion of others cannot account for the major portion of variations in job satisfaction. Out of necessity other factors are neglected. For example, an observed relationship between work-role variables and job satisfaction disregards important variations within the population produced by individual differences. As has been shown in a previous study and as will be demonstrated here, individual differences do exist in the reaction of people to the same job characteristic. These differences often exert an independent effect on job satisfaction. This recognition of the interdependence of individual values with job rewards has led to a major, recently developed approach to the study of job satisfaction. A perspective incorporating individual differences does not negate the idea that certain job characteristics are more satisfying than others or that some characteristics are generally oppressive. However, the viewpoint here is that for an adequate theory of job satisfaction to be developed an incorporation of both individual differences and job characteristics is necessary.



The notion that job satisfaction was not only a function of the objective properties of the job, but also of the motives of the individual was suggested by Nancy Morse in 1953. Her initial theory that job satisfaction was simply a function of the rewards provided by the job was refuted by data indicating that this was not the only factor involved.

Morse states that the specific results suggest that two factors are operating on employee satisfaction. Although it is logical that those who work in more need-filling environments experience a high level of satisfaction, another variable identified as the strength of the individual's desires or his level of aspiration has to be included to predict job satisfaction more accurately. Thus, an environment which provides little possibility for need satisfaction elicits different responses from those with strong or weak desires. According to Morse, "the greater the amount the individual gets, the greater his satisfaction and, at the same time, the more the individual still desires, the less his satisfaction."<sup>1</sup> It can then be concluded that the amount an individual still wants and does not get reduces his satisfaction.

---

<sup>1</sup>Nancy C Morse, Satisfactions in the White-Collar Job (Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1953), pp. 27-28.

This concern for individual differences was also found in studies designated by Kalleberg as "task design" literature.<sup>1</sup> The interest was seen originally as associated with enlargement of highly specialized jobs. As these jobs were enlarged by increasing the number of tasks assigned and enriched by increasing the worker's authority, it was expected that job satisfaction would increase. According to human relations theories, enlargement and enrichment of jobs should have led to higher job satisfaction since the job would have been more compatible with the "higher order need" strivings of workers. When such predicted outcomes did not always occur, the idea of individual differences was offered as an explanation. It became a way to understand the differential responses to the enlarged and enriched jobs.<sup>2</sup>

In an early study by Turner and Lawrence, the expected positive relationship between job level and job satisfaction was not found. The investigators in an attempt to explain the findings, concluded that the sample had been drawn from two separate and distinct populations. A breakdown analysis

---

<sup>1</sup>Arne L. Kalleberg, "Work Values, Job Rewards and Job Satisfaction: A Theory of the Quality of Work Experience" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1975), p. 18.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

of the sample revealed that workers from factories in small towns responded as predicted, but workers from urban settings did not respond positively to job enlargement. In fact, urban workers were relatively satisfied with traditionally negative job attributes such as repetitiveness. These differences in reactions were interpreted by Turner and Lawrence as due to differences in the cultural backgrounds of the workers. The failure of urban workers to respond to the "white-collar" values attached to enlarged jobs was attributed to the finding that they were anomic.<sup>1</sup>

Blood and Hulin in a similar study reached different conclusions. They argued that urban workers were not anomic in the sense of normlessness but rather alienated from the work norms of the middle class. In this case, such norms were thought to include striving for advancement and belief in the intrinsic value of hard work. Urban workers were, however, integrated into the norms of their own particular subculture. These were the workers identified as responding negatively to enlarged jobs. Thus, blue-collar workers from small communities who were generally more integrated with middle-class norms responded positively to enlarged jobs as predicted. Blood and Hulin then concluded that the job enlargement model would be most successful

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

when applied to white-collar, supervisory, and rural or non-alienated workers.<sup>1</sup>

An assumption made in these studies is that workers within a particular cultural setting will respond in a homogeneous manner. These studies do not, however, account for the large number of individual differences between the town and city workers. In an attempt to overcome these difficulties, Hackman and Lawler explored the effect of higher order need strength on job satisfaction. Workers with high "higher order need strength" were defined as those having a greater preference for variety, autonomy, task identity, task feedback, management feedback, challenge, meaningfulness, and use of valued skills in their jobs. Their findings suggest that the degree of "higher order need strength" of the worker moderates the relationship between the intrinsic character of the job and the degree of job satisfaction. Consequently, workers with high "higher order need strength" are more satisfied with enriched jobs than workers with "low need strength."<sup>2</sup>

Measurement of individual differences in job satisfaction developed in the task design literature has been useful

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

to industrialists concerned with job enlargement and enrichment. It has not, however, made major contributions to the development of a theory of job satisfaction incorporating both individual differences and job characteristics. In this case individual differences are seen as moderators, and only job characteristics associated with the task are considered.

The most recently developed view of job satisfaction utilizing both individual differences and job characteristics can be referred to as the social action approach. Major contributions of concepts have come from British industrial sociologists, Goldthorpe and his associates, and Beynon and Blackburn. A major emphasis among writers utilizing this approach is the issue that factors outside the workplace are important to the study of job satisfaction. For example, Goldthorpe asserts that:

. . . the question of satisfaction from work cannot in the end be usefully considered except in relation to the now basic question of what we would term orientation towards work. Until one knows something of the way in which workers order their wants and expectations relative to their employment--until one knows what meaning work has for them--one is not in a position to understand what overall assessment of their job satisfaction may most appropriately be made in their case.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>John H. Goldthorpe, David Lockwood, Frank Bechhofer, and Jennifer Platt, The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 36.



In a major study of British industrial workers, Goldthorpe et al. found that although the workers did not receive a high degree of intrinsic rewards from their jobs, they were not estranged or alienated from themselves or from societal institutions. In fact, they were often highly satisfied with their jobs. An important consideration in the interpretation of the data is that many of the workers had abandoned jobs offering some degree of intrinsic or expressive rewards in favor of jobs offering a higher rate of economic return. Thus, work for them was instrumental or a means to an end rather than a source of emotionally significant experiences or social relationships. Such needs were satisfied outside of the work context.<sup>1</sup>

According to Kalleberg, the most important contribution made by Goldthorpe et al, in their extensive study is the emphasis on the need to explain and understand social life within the work context by reference ultimately to the structure and processes of the wider society in which the work context exists.<sup>2</sup> A second important contribution is the attempt to establish empirically ways to understand how wants and expectations influence and shape work attitudes.

In their attempt to combat the then-popular approach to the study of job satisfaction by limiting the investigation

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Kalleberg, p. 22.

to job characteristics, Goldthorpe and his team may have overstated the importance of extra-work influences. Beynon and Blackburn comment that there is a danger in such an overstatement. Investigators should beware of creating a false dichotomy between work and non-work life. It is important that "an orientation to work should not be thought of as arising outside and brought into the work situation but as something which derives from the individual's total experience."<sup>1</sup>

In an attempt to bring clarity to the theoretical approach of Goldthorpe's and their own study, Beynon and Blackburn explain that the starting point is the belief that a person's understanding of their work is important. Such an understanding is affected by their experience of work and is related to their understanding of other aspects of their lives.<sup>2</sup> It is important to note that the uniqueness of the social action approach is derived from Weber's demand that "understanding and interpretation of meaning be

---

<sup>1</sup>H. Beynon and R. M. Blackburn, Perceptions of Work (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1972), p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Max Weber, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, ed., trans., with an introduction by Hans H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press), p. 58.

restricted to the subjective intentions of the actor."<sup>1</sup> The promise of the social action approach lies in the ability to consider individual differences in the satisfactions experienced by people with the same job characteristics. Directing attention to the variety of meanings that individuals impute to their work has great potential for advancing our knowledge of job satisfaction and the quality of work experience of individuals in general.

As noted by Kalleberg in 1977, the potential is regarded only as a promise.<sup>2</sup> Kalleberg attempts to bring the promise to life as he describes the purpose of his study as twofold. He is first concerned to establish systematically and empirically "the way in which meanings and the various satisfactions that work provides combine to determine job satisfaction based on a heterogeneous and diverse sample of workers."<sup>3</sup> Secondly, he is interested in systematically linking these considerations to the factors that affect the attainment of jobs. Since Kalleberg's study does fulfill his proposed purposes, it can be said that he

---

<sup>1</sup>Arne L. Kalleberg, "Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction," American Sociological Review 42 (February 1977):125.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 126.



has made an important and major contribution to the development of an integrated theory of job satisfaction. His methodological contribution is extremely valuable if not the most important step forward thus far in job satisfaction theory construction.

Kalleberg was able to meet his first goal of a study of a heterogeneous and diverse sample by conducting a secondary analysis of data gathered for The 1972-1973 Quality of Employment Survey conducted by the Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan. This sample is representative of the U.S. National employed civilian work force. Data for the study were gathered by personal interviews with 1,496 persons. These data were ideal for the study purposes since they allowed Kalleberg to go beyond Goldthorpe's and Beynon and Blackburn's earlier single organizational studies.

In order to examine empirically the process underlying the notion of job satisfaction, the concept is defined as referring "to an overall affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying."<sup>1</sup> It is important to distinguish this concept from satisfaction with specific dimensions of those work roles. The assumption is made that individuals balance

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

specific satisfactions against specific dissatisfactions to arrive at a composite overall satisfaction. Thus, overall satisfaction is measured by the responses of workers to five questions concerning how satisfied they are with their jobs as a whole.

The view presented here and in the Kalleberg study is that the process underlying the variation in job satisfaction can be accounted for by two types of factors. The first is perceived job characteristics representing the amount of satisfaction available from particular dimensions of work. Such perceptions of satisfactions are referred to as job rewards. A second factor is work values representing the meanings that individuals attach to these perceived job characteristics.

As individuals impute meanings to their work activity these meanings can be understood by specifying the range of gratifications available from work and then assessing the degree to which particular individuals value each of these dimensions. This use of the concept of "work value" is regarded as a special usage of the general concept of value. It is the conception of what is desirable that individuals hold with respect to their work activity. Thus, general attitudes regarding the meaning that an individual attaches to the work role can be distinguished from his satisfaction with that role.

It then becomes apparent that as dimensions of work become differentially valued they constitute potential sources of rewards to the worker. Thus, in the quest for a more complete understanding of the variation in workers' job satisfactions it is necessary to consider not only the values that individuals have toward work but the types of rewards that are available as well. It is important to note that the measure is of "how true" each of 34 characteristics is for the respondent's job. Consequently, the measures are evaluative judgments rather than representing objective properties of the job.

The results of the Kalleberg study are interesting and supportive of the social action viewpoint. When job satisfaction is correlated with each value and reward, it is revealed that rewards are positively and relatively highly correlated with job satisfaction. Values, on the other hand, are correlated near zero with job satisfaction. A regression of satisfaction on rewards and values indicates that rewards have a large and positive effect on job satisfaction while values have a smaller but statistically significant negative effect on job satisfaction. Other results from the regression analysis indicate that rewards tend to have greater effects on job satisfaction than do values. It is not the correspondence of values to rewards that produces job satisfaction but rather both

values and rewards have independent although unequal effects on job satisfaction. An implication here is that "the highest levels of job satisfaction will be experienced by those workers with low rewards and high values."<sup>1</sup>

In further analysis, a rank ordering of the influence of dimensions is identified. The resulting evidence is that the intrinsic dimension of the job has the greatest single effect on job satisfaction as a whole. The intrinsic dimension is followed by the financial dimension in influence. Other dimensions are much less influential with resource adequacy, career, convenience, and co-workers listed in order. The problem with this attempt to rank the influence of various job dimensions is that it is computed from individual data which are aggregated. Thus, conclusions drawn on the basis of these aggregations may not apply to particular populations or subgroups. These data may also be historically specific. For example, the intrinsic dimension may be important in the United States today because of efforts to reduce the variation in the financial dimension. As people are paid more, the intrinsic dimension may replace the financial in the ranking.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 133.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 136.

The second aspect of Kalleberg's study is a consideration of the degree of control workers have over valued job characteristics. It is assumed that workers seek jobs that conform to their values, even though such jobs may not be available given the job opportunity structure at a given point in time. Kalleberg identifies two primary sets of factors producing variation in the degree of control workers have over their attainment of job rewards. A primary factor is the existing demand for the worker's services in the labor market. A wider range of opportunities should enable the worker to find jobs providing greater rewards than if the choice is restricted. A measure of such a factor is the unemployment rate.

The second factor identified by Kalleberg is the amount of resources available to the worker. Resources give power in the market place with respect to obtaining job rewards. Four indicators are used to represent resources. The first is the length of time the worker has been in the labor force. It serves to represent the age of the worker and the general skills he has accumulated. A second indicator is educational attainment which is a measure of the credentials possessed by the worker. The third indicator, the worker's race, represents the degree of likelihood that the worker has experienced discrimination in the labor market.

The fourth and final indicator is whether or not the worker belongs to a union or employee association and serves as a measure of the organizational resources available for bargaining for job rewards.<sup>1</sup>

Data concerning these factors were analyzed by regression. Kalleberg indicates from the study that the unemployment rate is negatively related to the attainment of intrinsic, financial, and career rewards. Another clear result is that workers with more experience in the labor force perceive that they have greater rewards than workers with less experience. When race is considered, whites perceive that they attain higher rewards on all dimensions except for convenience than non-whites. Education, on the other hand, is significantly related to rewards only on the financial dimension. In an interesting result concerning membership in a union or employee association, workers who are members perceive that they have greater rewards with respect to the financial dimension and lower rewards with respect to the intrinsic and resource adequacy dimensions of work.

As pointed out by Kalleberg, there are a number of limitations of the findings listed above. The study results are suggestive of the complexity of the relationship between degree of control and the attainment of rewards.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.



It can also be said that an elaboration of this type of reasoning may prove fruitful for the development of a sociological theory of the distribution of job rewards among various groups in society.<sup>1</sup> However, Kalleberg's findings fall far short of that development, which would require extensive and specific exploration of the topic. Since Kalleberg's measures were not adequate to indicate clear relationships and some of them are not always available for study, it is difficult to use them systematically.

In summary it can be said that Kalleberg has made a major contribution to the development of a sociological theory of job satisfaction. His methodological approach to the relationship of job satisfaction to work values and job rewards is valuable to the understanding of the meanings imputed to the work experience.

However, it must also be noted that Kalleberg's contributions are limited in some areas. As he comments, "the validity of a theory cannot be demonstrated on the basis of an analysis of a single set of data."<sup>2</sup> A suggested line of research is a series of investigations carried out within particular organizations. Ideally, a fully elaborated

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 138.

<sup>2</sup>Kalleberg, "Work Values, Job Rewards, and Job Satisfaction," p. 168.

theoretical model should ideally be able to provide understanding and guidance both within and between fully distinct employment situations.

### Summary

Social science literature regarding the quality of the work experience has been reviewed in this chapter as a means of establishing the background of the problem. The review suggests that although a large number of studies have been conducted concerning job satisfaction, systematic theory construction is in an early phase of development. Several approaches used in the study of job satisfaction can be identified. One is to relate job satisfaction to the personalities of individual workers. Most of the empirical work, however, involves an attempt to establish a relationship between adjustment or neuroticism and job satisfaction rather than dealing with the relationship between personality variables and job satisfaction in theoretical terms. Although studies from this viewpoint are interesting and sometimes useful, they ignore the association of job satisfaction with characteristics of the job.

A second approach focusing on employee characteristics are studies usually intended to be simply descriptions of workers in a specific industry or in a large cross-



sectional sample. Information gathered in such surveys can then provide guidelines for organizational and program planning. There is no intention or attempt to build theory in these descriptive studies. They can, however, be used for secondary analysis which may provide clues for new directions or help validate findings from other studies.

The most extensively used approach is to view variation in job satisfaction solely as a function of differences in the nature of jobs people perform. A wide range of types of job characteristics have been used with investigators finding that job satisfaction varies, often considerably, with one or more of the variables. The best known attempt to develop theory utilizing this approach is the Herzberg dual-factor theory. His ideas, although producing conflicting empirical evidence, are helpful to employers wishing to manipulate job content and context factors in the hopes of increasing job satisfaction.<sup>1</sup> In addition to Herzberg's emphasis on work role characteristics, a number of investigators have placed their work in the framework of alienation. Despite the practical utility of this type of reasoning, this view is equally as unidimensional as explorations based on personality. Another concern is that it raises important theoretical problems that bring to mind questions concerning its usefulness for a thorough understanding of

---

<sup>1</sup>House and Wigdor, p. 370.

job satisfaction. By neglecting the differences between individuals occupying work roles with similar characteristics, the assumption is made that these differences are equal to zero. In addition to this viewpoint is giving rise to a one-sided explanation, it has not led to development of a congruent theoretical statement. For a theory of job satisfaction to contribute to an understanding of the phenomenon, a perspective allowing for the incorporation of individual differences is necessary.

The last and most promising perspective to be utilized is referred to as the social action approach. This view, suggesting that the satisfaction an individual receives from a job is a function of both the objective properties of the job and the motives of individual, is developed to account for the failure of previous types of explanations to account for particular findings of job satisfaction studies. This approach utilizes Weber's theoretical statement concerning the necessity of knowing the subjective meaning of an act to the actor in order to achieve understanding. Kalleberg's study made methodological advances allowing a more precise understanding of the relationships between work values, job rewards, and job satisfaction.<sup>1</sup> However, several limitations can be noted. Kalleberg's methodological procedures

---

<sup>1</sup>Kalleberg, "Work Values, Job Rewards, and Job Satisfaction," p. 23.

were built on data originally gathered by personal interview. Thus, the question concerning the flexibility of the procedure arises. Is his theory method-bound in a manner similar to Herzberg's? In other words, would the relationships identified in the original study hold if data were gathered in a different manner? Can the same questions be asked in a mailed questionnaire format with similar results?

In addition to methodological questions, theoretical development is important. Social action theory is limited in explanatory power. Although Weber believed in understanding the subjective meaning imputed by actors, social action remained an undeveloped concept since he did not utilize it in his own investigations. Understanding of subjective meaning is more extensively and comfortably used by sociological thinkers adhering to symbolic interactionism. If the relationships found by Kalleberg can be located in other populations, symbolic interactionism offers a broader theoretical perspective for both predicting and explaining.

In the next two chapters the theoretical material and empirical findings presented in this chapter will be applied to the relationship between work values, job rewards, and job satisfaction. Then general conclusions concerning the nature of these relationships will be made in chapter VI.

## CHAPTER IV

### WORK VALUES AND JOB REWARDS

Work may have a variety of meanings and rewards for individuals in an industrial society. An understanding of these various types of meanings and the conditions under which individuals impute them to their work activity is an important initial step toward understanding the variation in the quality of work experiences. The addition of the analysis of the range of job rewards perceived to be present allows a fuller understanding.

Work values and job rewards are distinguished from each other in several ways. Work values are defined as the conception of the desirable that individuals hold with respect to their work activity. Work values are distinguished from expectations, which denote one's beliefs about what will occur in the future. What is expected may not correspond to what is wanted, and, conversely, what is valued may or may not correspond to what is expected. Values are also distinguished from needs, which refer to the objective requirements of an organism's well-being.<sup>1</sup> Thus, work values

---

<sup>1</sup>Arne L. Kalleberg, "Work Values, Job Rewards and Job Satisfaction: A Theory of the Quality of Work Experience" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1975), p. 52.



values refer to general attitudes regarding the meaning that an individual attaches to his work role, as distinguished from his satisfaction with that role. Although valuation of particular job characteristics may in certain cases correspond to the availability of those characteristics, such correspondence is by no means certain. Job rewards are defined as gratifications perceived to be true with respect to work activity. Thus, in order to understand the variation in workers' job satisfaction, it is necessary not only to consider the values that individuals have toward work, but the types of rewards that are available from their jobs as well.

Both work values and job rewards are measured on six job dimensions which include 34 job characteristics. These six dimensions, as previously indicated, have been identified through a factor analysis process. The six dimensions defined are intrinsic, convenience, financial, relations with co-workers, career, and resource adequacy. Work values and job rewards are then measured by scales related to the six dimensions. Detailed analysis of measurement of work values, variation in work values, measurement of job rewards, and variation in work rewards are discussed in the following sections.

## Measurement of Work Values

Work values, like other values, cannot be observed. Consequently, an alternative method of measurement is used here. People are simply asked what they value. As Kalleberg points out, such testimony may not always be fully accurate, but it can be a useful method of obtaining information about work values, provided that people's assertions are subjected to critical examination.<sup>1</sup>

The original data collection for The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey was accomplished by personal interviews. Each respondent was presented with a set of job characteristics and asked to rate the importance of each item on a Likert scale.

In the present study, the valuation of 34 job characteristics is included in question 12 of the mailed questionnaire.<sup>2</sup> Supervisors are instructed to check the most appropriate response concerning the importance of each

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 54.

<sup>2</sup>The questionnaire is located in appendix A.

item ranging from "very important" (4.0) to "not at all important" (1.0). Although it is recognized that bias may be introduced by response sets, steps (described in chapter II) are taken to minimize the problem.

In the present study, the supervisor's assessment of the "importance" of various job dimensions to him constitutes the operational definition of his valuation of these characteristics. The assumption is made that these importance ratings accurately reflect the valuation that the supervisor attaches to particular job characteristics. Thus, high scores equal high evaluations.

The means and standard deviations of the six work scales for both the respondents of The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey and the Department of Human Resources supervisors are presented in table 3.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Work Values of Workers in  
the Quality of Employment Survey and Department  
of Human Resources Supervisors

Work Dimensions	Quality of Employment Survey		D.H.R. Supervisors	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Intrinsic	3.38	.51	3.68	.30
Convenience	2.91	.62	3.07	.43
Financial	3.43	.64	3.51	.49
Relations with Co-workers	3.20	.62	3.09	.52
Career	3.33	.71	3.52	.48
Resource Adequacy	3.42	.50	3.56	.31

In Kalleberg's interpretation of the distribution for workers in general, he notes the complexity of the "typical" worker's orientation toward the job. There are only two major theoretical positions in conflict with Kalleberg's data, each of them in an extreme direction. For example, his data do not fit the pure "economic man" tradition regarding the worker as a hedonistic creature interested in obtaining the greatest economic rewards with the least investment of effort. Neither is the typical worker single-minded in his emphasis on self-actualization.



According to Kalleberg, the typical worker does not value one dimension as overwhelmingly more important than the others, although "convenience" can be singled out as least important.<sup>1</sup>

The D.H.R. supervisors, like Kalleberg's typical workers, do not indicate that one job dimension is overwhelmingly more important than all others. There are, however, some interesting observations to be made. When the respondents from The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey are compared with the Department of Human Resources supervisors, the means are higher for the supervisors on all but one dimension. The one dimension with more value for the average worker than for supervisors is relations with co-workers.

Since these are aggregate numbers, they describe only a typical worker and supervisor. They are statistical creations, and generalizations made on this basis may not be applicable to any individual or groups of individuals in the population. It is important, therefore, to attempt to describe those factors which produce variation in the variables.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 63.

### Variation in Work Values

The importance of values in this study lies in the fact that they represent the individual's contribution of meaning to the work process. Analysis of the variation in work values allows the investigator to achieve a fuller understanding of these meanings. Variation can be analyzed by utilizing a variety of approaches.

For the purposes presented here, values are thought of as resulting from three major sets of social factors which are then brought to play in the present work role. The first major set of factors is socialization and other types of life experiences which occur prior to the individual's entry into the labor force. These socializing experiences shape the individual's view of the importance of the various dimensions of work. A second set of forces influencing values relates to non-work social roles. These various roles impose constraints and contingencies on the types of meanings that the individual can seek from the work activity. Final considerations here are work experiences which affect the supervisor's valuation of the potential rewards associated with work.

As Kalleberg appropriately notes, a thorough understanding of the relative contributions of these general factors cannot be obtained with cross-sectional data. Both work values and the types of social factors discussed

above change over time. Therefore, measures of these concepts at one point in time probably reflect changes that have occurred previously.<sup>1</sup> There is no claim here or by Kalleberg to present a complete analysis of the influence of certain identified social forces on work values. A longitudinal study offers the best potential for such an analysis.

An attempt is made in the present study, however, to approximate the social processes involved by developing measures which serve as proxies for these social factors. Then the statistical associations between the proxies and various types of work values can be analyzed. The variables used here are sex, race, educational attainment, job tenure, and responsibility as a major wage earner. Standardized coefficients obtained from regressing each of the six work value measures on these five proxy variables are analyzed and compared to similar measures developed by Kalleberg. Table 4 presents the regression coefficient.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 64.

Table 4

Standardized Regression Coefficients for the  
Determinants of the Six Types of Work Values  
for D.H.R. Supervisors

Work value	Standardized Regression Coefficients (Significance level)					R <sup>2</sup>
	Education <sup>a</sup>	Sex <sup>b</sup>	Race <sup>c</sup>	Job Tenure	Major Wage Earner <sup>d</sup>	
Intrinsic	-.029	.152	.079	.029	-.149	.034
Convenience	-.081	.043	.101	.144	.128	.063
Financial	-.254	.180	.107	.037	-.124	.092
Co-workers	-.135	-.005	-.172	.047	-.030	.052
Career	-.178	.046	.126	.019	-.064	.046
Resource Adequacy	-.212	.068	.017	.075	.056	.065

<sup>a</sup>Coded: 1=less than BA; 2=BA or BS non social work;  
3=BA or BS in social work; 4=Masters non  
social work; 5=M.S.W.; 6=Other.

<sup>b</sup>Coded: 1=Male; 2=Female.

<sup>c</sup>Coded: 1=White; 2=Black; 3=Mexican American;  
4=Other.

<sup>d</sup>Coded: 1=Yes; 2=No.

Education is a key variable serving to index life experiences prior to entry into the labor force. Since educational attainment is a primary mechanism facilitating the attainment of occupational position in the United States, it is likely to have some effects on work values. Results from table 4 indicate that education has strong negative effects on valuation of the financial, relations with co-workers, and resource adequacy dimensions. These results are also found by Kalleberg in his analysis of the data from The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey and in The 1969-70 Survey of Working Conditions.<sup>1</sup> The suggestion is that higher-educated workers value the "extrinsic" dimensions of work less than their lesser-educated counterparts do. This does not, however, explain the small negative influence of education indicated by the D.H.R. supervisors on the intrinsic dimension.

There are several factors which should be noted here. The educational range for supervisors is much smaller than for the general U.S. population. Only two supervisors did not have a college degree, and most of them have a masters degree. This difference in educational level may account for Kalleberg's finding of almost no influence on the intrinsic dimension while the present study findings indicate a negative influence.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 68.

Sex is a variable that may be an indicator of pre-labor force socialization experience, as well as non-work social role contingencies that may partially result from these experiences. Data analysis reveals a positive influence by the variable on valuation of the intrinsic and financial dimensions. This is an interesting finding when compared to those by Kalleberg. According to his results, men place higher valuation on the intrinsic dimensions of work, while women value convenience and resource adequacy to a greater extent.<sup>1</sup> In contrast to Kalleberg's findings, female D.H.R. supervisors value intrinsic and financial dimensions, more than men.

Although race is another variable that may serve to index socialization experiences, it is the one that is the most confusing to interpret. Kalleberg's findings indicate that whites value the intrinsic, co-workers, and resource adequacy dimensions more than non-whites. However, the findings from the present study indicate very little variable influence on the intrinsic, co-workers, and resource adequacy dimensions. The one similar finding for the two studies is the valuation of co-workers by whites. Other

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 65.

dimensions influenced by race in the D.H.R. study are convenience, financial, and career.

Evidence from the present study suggests that there may be differences with respect to whites and non-whites regarding valuation of work dimensions which may reflect prior socialization experiences. It is, however, difficult to specify these differences on the basis of the data. The scoring range of 1.0 to 4.0 in effect gives more weight to the non-white scores making interpretations a problem. This difficulty is increased since there is little information from previous studies to indicate what might be expected in terms of racial differences in work values.<sup>1</sup>

In consideration of valuations of work dimensions, it is important to incorporate some measure of time. Thus, the length of time a worker has been on his job can serve as another indicator of work experience. Results of data analysis indicate one similarity between the D.H.R. supervisors and workers in general. The longer a worker stays

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 67.



on the job, the more he is interested in obtaining greater comforts from the job. In addition, Kalleberg's findings indicate that the longer a worker has been an incumbent of a particular job, the more he values financial rewards. However, this is not present among D.H.R. supervisors.

The last proxy variable to be considered as influencing valuation of work dimensions is whether an individual is a major wage earner for the family. Kalleberg uses a similar measure in his consideration of the number of dependents a worker might have. However, since there are more females than males among the D.H.R. supervisors, it seems a more accurate measure of family constraints on valuation to consider the influence of the individual's being a major wage earner. Results of the present study clearly indicate that people who have the major responsibility for earning a living for themselves and their families value the financial along with the intrinsic dimensions of work. Those not in the position of major responsibility tend to value convenience.

It must again be noted that the effects of these social factors for producing variation in the work values of workers is best understood through the use of longitudinal data. In addition, the comparisons of results of multiple regressions described, although helpful in an



overall sense, are not a complete analysis. A detailed breakdown analysis of the proxy variables means offers a more comprehensive understanding of this specific population.

Each of the six dimensions is examined according to each of the five proxy variables. A general finding is that the supervisors as a whole have similar values toward all of the work dimensions. There are very few differences when the total group is divided into subgroups. The following tables represent the breakdown of the various work dimensions by a single proxy variable.

A detailed analysis of the means for various educational levels attained by supervisors supports the idea that education influences work values. As the educational level increases supervisors place less importance on extrinsic job dimensions such as financial and resource adequacy. An analysis reveals that those in the first four categories (those with less than a college degree, bachelor's degree with non-social work major, bachelor's with social work major, and non-social work master's) value the financial dimension more than supervisors with the master-level social work degree. The valuation of resource adequacy is also influenced by education. As educational level rises, resource adequacy becomes less important. A

Table 5

## Work Value Means for Educational Attainment of Supervisors by Job Dimensions

Educational Attainment	Job Dimensions					Resource Adequacy	N
	Intrinsic	Convenience	Financial	Co-workers	Career		
Less than a Bachelor's degree	3.65	3.10	3.65	3.05	3.85	3.75	2
B.A. or B.S.: non-social work major	3.67	3.11	3.59	3.15	3.59	3.61	82
B.A. or B.S.: social work major	3.69	3.11	3.65	3.25	3.50	3.67	27
Master's: non- social work	3.59	2.99	3.61	3.00	3.72	3.45	13
M.S.W.	3.68	3.02	3.37	3.01	3.41	3.48	90
Other	4.00	3.10	3.30	2.50	3.70	3.30	1
Total	3.68	3.06	3.51	3.09	3.51	3.55	215

third dimension influenced by education, although to a smaller degree, is career. Differences on this dimension are accounted for by valuation on the part of supervisors without a college degree and those with a master's degree in fields other than social work. The importance of promotional opportunities and the chance to get ahead is understandable when the job market is considered. There are very few social work jobs available and an abundance of qualified social workers to fill those few. It is very likely that this particular dimension is in reality unrewarding to these two groups.

Sex is the second proxy variable. It represents socializing experiences and is examined in table 6.

Table 6

Work Value Means for Male and Female  
Supervisors by Job Dimensions

Sex	Job Dimensions						N
	Intrinsic	Convenience	Financial	Co-Workers	Career	Resource Adequacy	
Male	3.63	3.02	3.42	3.12	3.49	3.52	70
Female	3.70	3.08	3.55	3.08	3.52	3.57	145
Totals	3.68	3.06	3.51	3.09	3.51	3.55	215

When the means for males and females are compared for the six dimensions, it becomes clear that the two groups have similar values. Both males and females probably entered social work because of their interest in people and the desire to help others. The only difference resulting in a trend is found in the financial dimension with females placing slightly more importance on it. This, however, may reflect females who are single heads of households who are supporting children. So sex may not be the major factor here.

Race, the next variable under consideration, is interesting in the similarity of importance expressed by the supervisors. A review of table 7 gives a more detailed view of these similarities.

Table 7

Work Value Means for Race of Supervisors  
by Job Dimensions

Race	Job Dimensions						N
	Intrin- sic	Conven- ience	Finan- cial	Co- workers	Career	Resource Ade- quacy	
White	3.67	3.07	3.49	3.13	3.50	3.55	189
Black	3.67	3.03	3.57	2.75	3.63	3.39	10
Mexican- American	3.76	2.91	3.66	2.86	3.69	3.63	13
Totals	3.68	3.07	3.50	3.09	3.51	3.55	212*

\*3 cases missing

Black supervisors have a mean score of 3.63 and Mexican Americans 3.69. Both scores are higher than the 3.50 mean for white supervisors. Further analysis of work values indicate that both blacks (2.75) and Mexican Americans (2.86) place less importance on relations with co-workers than do whites (3.13). Prior socialization experiences may lead minority supervisors to view their co-workers as not offering friendly help and support.

The fourth proxy variable, job tenure, is broken down by actual number of years on the job resulting in a range of 1.0 to 35.0 years. Table 8 presents this breakdown.

Table 8

Work Value Means for Job Tenure of Supervisors  
by Job Dimensions

Years of job Tenure	Job Dimension					Resource Ade- quacy	N
	Intrin- sic	Conven- ience	Finan- cial	Co- workers	Career		
1	3.75	2.91	3.44	3.13	3.55	3.47	12
2	3.60	3.13	3.48	3.06	3.51	3.51	16
3	3.66	2.96	3.55	3.11	3.54	3.52	28
4	3.71	3.12	3.66	3.15	3.75	3.61	22
5	3.63	2.94	3.50	2.96	3.48	3.56	32
6	3.60	3.07	3.47	3.12	3.50	3.55	14
7	3.75	3.20	3.55	3.15	3.44	3.35	22
8	3.72	3.08	3.56	3.26	3.34	3.57	15
9	3.78	3.05	3.44	3.24	3.42	3.58	9

Table 8 (Continued)

Years of job Tenure	Job Dimention					Resource Ade- quacy	N
	Intrin- sic	Conven- ience	Finan- cial	Co- workers	Career		
10	3.59	2.83	3.26	2.95	3.26	3.47	13
11	3.71	3.10	3.32	3.17	3.82	3.52	8
12	3.62	3.24	3.66	3.04	3.32	3.58	5
14	3.90	3.45	2.80	2.30	2.35	3.50	2
15	3.84	3.46	3.80	3.42	3.60	3.66	5
17	3.70	3.40	3.30	3.00	3.70	3.80	1
19	4.00	3.40	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.90	1
20	3.93	3.03	3.10	2.63	3.76	3.40	3
21	3.80	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.90	1
25	3.70	3.40	3.00	3.30	4.00	3.90	1
33	3.80	3.60	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.80	1
35	3.30	3.10	4.00	2.80	3.70	3.70	1
Total	3.68	3.06	3.50	3.09	3.51	3.55	212*

\*3 cases missing

As observed in table 8, supervisors who have been on the job for over 19 years do value good pay and other aspects of the financial dimension more than do supervisors with less tenure. This difference, however, is not large. The only sizable difference is seen in the importance placed on career by supervisors with more than 17 years of job tenure.

The last proxy variable of concern here relates to the amount of financial responsibility experienced by the supervisor. It is assumed that supervisors who have major financial responsibilities for their families value different job dimensions than those without such responsibility. As noted earlier, the influence of this variable is seen in the financial and intrinsic dimensions. However, when those supervisors who are major wage earners are compared to those who are not, the differences in importance are not large. Table 9 presents supporting data for this interpretation.

Table 9

Work Value Means for Wage Earner Responsibility of Supervisors by Job Dimension

Major Wage Earner	Job Dimensions					Resource Adequacy	N
	Intrinsic	Convenience	Financial	Co-workers	Career		
Yes	3.69	3.03	3.51	3.12	3.51	3.53	152
No	3.64	3.16	3.48	3.07	3.50	3.60	60
Total	3.68	3.07	3.50	3.10	3.51	3.55	212
3 cases missing							

The largest difference in valuation of the various job dimensions is found in the importance of convenience factors. Supervisors who are not the major wage earner for their families place more importance on items such as the

convenience of the travel to work, the amount of work, physical surroundings, and conflicting demands of the job. Supervisors who do carry major financial responsibilities, on the other hand, place more importance on the financial dimension. These findings make sense in the light of the different financial responsibilities of the two groups.

Although a longitudinal study would provide an ideal analysis of changes in the valuation of various job dimensions by social work supervisors, the data presented here do provide the basis for a beginning understanding of the forces influencing such variations. When the total group is divided into subgroups according to variables designated to approximate forces outside of the job context, some differences are revealed. Although the group as a whole places similar values on the job dimensions, the differences identified here do illustrate that individuals bring unique meanings to the quality of their work experience.

Examination of the meanings of work experience for individuals constitutes only the first step toward an understanding of their work experience, however. Just because individuals value certain rewards does not mean that they obtain such rewards. An assessment of their overall job satisfaction requires not only a consideration of work



values but job rewards as well. The next section is devoted to an examination of the rewards that are available from work.

#### Measurement of Job Rewards

Since it is not the "objective" state of job rewards that affects employee attitudes and behavior, but rather how they are experienced by the workers, it is necessary to measure job rewards by asking the worker about his job. As Hackman and Lawler explain, it is not the amount of various types of rewards a worker really has in his work, but how much he perceives that he has which affects his reaction to the job. They further comment that

Objective job characteristics are important because they do affect the perceptions and experiences of employees. But there are often substantial differences between objective job characteristics and how they are perceived by employees, and it is dangerous to assume that simply because the objective characteristics have been measured (or changed) that the way that job is experienced by employees has been dealt with as well.<sup>1</sup>

Consistent with these considerations, supervisors were asked to indicate the extent to which the 34.

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Richard Hackman and Edward E. Lawler III, "Employee Reactions to Job Characteristics," Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph 55 (June 1971):264-265.

characteristics discussed in chapter II were true of their jobs. The question concerning job rewards was the first one on the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to check the most appropriate response ranging from "very true" to "not at all true." Scale scores for each of the six dimensions were computed as the mean of an unweighted sum of their component items. Although scales had different numbers of items, each one ranged from 1.0 (low reward) to 4.0 (high reward).

The means and standard deviations of the six job reward scales are presented in table 10. Comparisons can be made between the job rewards of workers from The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey and the social work supervisors.

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for Job Rewards of  
Workers in the Quality of Employment Survey  
and the Department of Human  
Resources Supervisors

Work Dimensions	Quality of Employment Survey		D.H.R. Supervisors	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Intrinsic	3.16	.69	3.19	.42
Convenience	3.03	.55	2.57	.46
Financial	3.09	.77	2.92	.61
Relations with Co-workers	3.30	.61	3.33	.47
Career	2.63	.82	2.49	.60
Resource Adequacy	3.34	.52	2.99	.49

These distributions are interesting in their similarity. No one reward is perceived as overwhelmingly more available from jobs than others, though if one dimension is to be singled out as being least available it would be that associated with the attainment of a career. On four out of six dimensions, D.H.R. supervisors score slightly lower than the Quality of Employment Survey workers. However, on two dimensions, relations with co-workers and intrinsic, the supervisors are slightly higher on their scores. Another interesting observation is that the standard deviations

for D.H.R. supervisors is consistently smaller than for the Quality of Employment workers. It can be interpreted that D.H.R. supervisor responses are closer to the mean than are the general workers' responses. Perhaps there is less variability among the supervisors because they perceive rewards in a similar manner.

Although the aim of the study is to achieve understanding of the subjective meanings of social work supervisors through their perception of rewards, it could be argued that these perceptions are biased and bear little relationship to the rewards in an "objective" sense. Such considerations raise the issue of "convergent" validity, or the extent to which these perceptions agree with ratings of these same characteristics by other methods. Since no ambiguous standard of accuracy is available, it is not possible to demonstrate conclusively that the supervisors' judgments are objectively accurate. If judgments made through different methods show substantial agreement, confidence in the measurement would be increased. However, such direct demonstration of validity is not possible since the information is solely obtained from the worker.

Even though the present data cannot clarify the issue, Hackman and Lawler provide evidence leading to an optimistic view that such an analysis would show a good deal of convergence among the various methods. In their

study of 208 employees and 62 supervisors in an Eastern telephone company, four rating procedures are used to assess the presence of certain job characteristics. They find that the four methods are substantially intercorrelated, leading to the conclusion that "the employees were able to provide generally undistorted descriptions of the characteristics of the jobs."<sup>1</sup> It remains for future research to clarify these issues. For the present, it is sufficient to understand the workers' perceptions of rewards available to them in their jobs.

#### Variation in Job Rewards

Three kinds of variation in rewards are associated with jobs. The first are variations associated with the job being located within an occupational-industrial category in a societal division of labor. The second are those variations associated with jobs being located as a unit in an interrelated set of roles that constitute the organization. Although these are major sources of variation, Kalleberg suggests job rewards may also be a function of worker's molding their jobs to meet their preferences. Kalleberg notes that it is unlikely that a great deal of variation can be accounted for by worker molding.<sup>2</sup> However, in the present study, the first two sources of variation are held relatively constant

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 269.

<sup>2</sup>Kalleberg, p. 93.

so that consideration of the third type becomes more important.

Job rewards vary in relationship to job characteristics. Jobs can be defined as sets of activities carried out in the production of goods and services. These activities have the potential of providing workers with a number of different types of rewards. These rewards may be conceived of as properties associated with specific jobs. Rewards then ultimately depend on the types of activities and functions these jobs perform within a division of labor. Jobs may be grouped together and classified as "occupations" by the similar types of activities associated with them. Also, jobs resulting in the production of similar goods and services may be grouped together and classified as representing particular "industries." The types of activities and functions which the job performs within a societal division of labor are largely determined by the occupational-industrial category to which the job belongs. Therefore, variation in the types of rewards is associated with occupational-industrial groups.

Another important classification for jobs comes from the organization in which the role is performed. Since jobs are generally performed within organizations, they may be considered to be components of an interrelated set of roles. The activities related to jobs are then translated into more specific activities and functions within the organizational division of labor. Since the definitions of job



activities are at the discretion of management, similar job activities may be defined differently in different organizations. Through this process of translation, similar jobs can take on different activities and offer different rewards.

Kalleberg admits that with his broad, representative sample of workers it is difficult to understand thoroughly the sources of variation in job rewards. He does determine that intrinsic rewards are most strongly related to occupational-industrial groups, followed by financial and career rewards, respectively. The other three rewards, relations with co-workers, convenience, and resource adequacy seem to be determined primarily by characteristics unique to particular organizations.<sup>1</sup>

Although data from the present study, like the Kalleberg investigation, do not allow for a complete analysis of the variation in job rewards, a sense of understanding can be developed. A comparison of the means and their rank-ordering between D.H.R. supervisors and twelve major occupational groups can facilitate interpretation. A comparison of D.H.R. supervisors can be seen in table 11.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 94.

Table 11

Means and Rank Ordering of Job Rewards by D.H.R.  
Supervisors and Twelve Occupations

Occupation	Intrinsic		Convenience	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
D.H.R. Supervisors	3.19	7	2.57	12
Professional, Technical	3.49	3	3.08	4
Managers, Administrators	3.52	2	2.99	8
Sales	3.37	4	3.09	3
Clerical	2.89	10	3.11	2
Craftworkers	3.28	5	3.07	5
Operators, except transport	2.70	12	2.89	11
Transport equip- ment operators	3.01	9	3.01	7
Non-farm Laborers	2.85	11	3.01	7
Farmers	3.75	1	2.91	10
Farm laborers, farm foremen	3.23	6	2.92	9
Service workers except private household	3.01	9	3.06	6
Private household workers	3.16	8	3.44	1



Table 11 (Continued)

Financial Mean	Rank	Co-workers Mean	Rank	Career Mean	Rank	Resource Mean	Adq. Rank
2.92	8	3.33	2	2.49	7	2.99	10
3.27	2	3.28	5	2.78	2	3.35	3
3.28	1	3.32	3	2.92	1	3.31	6
3.01	6	3.46	1	2.71	4	3.38	2
3.18	3	3.18	7	2.65	5	3.29	8
3.11	5	3.19	6	2.75	3	3.35	3
2.93	7	3.15	8	2.37	9	3.19	9
3.14	4	3.32	3	2.63	6	3.34	4
2.92	8	3.18	7	2.42	8	3.33	5
*	—	3.33	2	*	—	*	—
2.66	11	3.06	9	2.23	12	3.38	2
2.81	10	3.29	4	2.36	10	3.44	1
2.83	9	3.33	2	2.34	11	3.30	7

\*Occupation contains many self-employed, and thus measure is not comparable between self-employed and wage earners.

The rank ordering of means across occupational categories gives a basis of understanding the variation of rewards between groups. For this analysis, means of the twelve occupational groups were extracted from The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey and listed with the computed means of D.H.R. supervisors. Then the means were ranked according to each of the six job reward dimensions. Variations in rewards can thus be discussed by noting the rankings of various rewards by occupations.

For example, intrinsic rewards are ranked high by occupations that are generally regarded as requiring self-direction. Such occupations include farmers, managers, professionals, and sales workers. On the other hand, occupations which typically do not require self-direction rank low on this dimension. Operators, clerical workers, and non-farm laborers are included in this group. In regard to convenience, private household, clerical, and sales workers are the highest ranking occupations. On the low end are farmers, operators and D.H.R. supervisors. Convenience refers to such characteristics as travel to and from work, hours, quality of physical surroundings, whether work is excessive, and degree of conflict. Taking the organizational requirements and job tasks into account leads to some understanding of D.H.R. supervisors' last place position on this dimension.

The perception that D.H.R. supervisors have concerning the convenience dimension may be quite accurate. Supervisors are often required to travel to several counties, work evenings, do excessive amounts of work, be on call at night and weekends, and experience a high degree of conflict. One of the difficulties of the position is the conflict between the needs of their workers and the requirements of organizational policy. When the data were gathered, several respondents noted special problems with this reward dimension.

With respect to financial rewards, managers, professional and technical workers, clerical workers, and transportation equipment operators rank high. It is expected that those in management positions and heavily unionized groups would rank high. D.H.R. supervisors are not represented by any union or employee association. Although salaries are in the upper range of social work wage ranges with their average income between \$14,000 and \$16,000 per year, several respondents commented that the fringe benefits were not viewed as rewarding.

Relations with co-workers refer to such things as whether the job permits chances to make friends, whether co-workers are friendly and helpful and whether one's co-workers take a personal interest in him. This dimension depends largely on the nature of the informal group

structures within specific organizations and the priorities placed on such relationships by individuals. Interestingly, several occupations rank high on this dimension. Occupations with high mean scores include sales workers, private household workers, farmers, and D.H.R. supervisors. According to the survey, D.H.R. supervisors find relations with co-workers to be the most rewarding of the dimensions.

For career rewards, occupational groups that are generally regarded as having "low ceilings" rank low. Service workers, farm laborers, and operators are included in this group. On the other hand, professional and management groups rank high on the dimension. Although D.H.R. supervisors are considered managers they rank seventh which is quite a bit lower than managers in general. Variations in economic structures, such as growth rates and trends in demand, affect the numbers of positions that are open at higher levels in the organization. Changes in the growth rate of the Department of Human Resources may have influenced responses to this reward. During the three months prior to the survey, the agency went through a 10 percent reduction in force. A fairly low ranking on this dimension is probably an accurate perception of the rewards available.

Resource adequacy refers to such things as whether the help, equipment, authority, and information required for



performance are adequate, whether co-workers are competent and helpful, and whether the supervision is conducive to task completion. The first four items listed refer to the way roles are structured within organizations and depend on the extent to which organizational decision-makers are able to minimize role conflict and ambiguity. The other two relate to the abilities and personalities of co-workers and supervisors. In the comparison of occupations, service workers, farm laborers, sales workers, and professionals perceive themselves as having the most resources available. D.H.R. supervisors rank low on the dimension which may reflect the cutback in manpower and the increase in job responsibility.

In general, Department of Human Resources supervisors ranked lower than most other occupational groups on their perceptions of job rewards. The highest ranking of rewards compared to other groups is their perception of "relations with co-workers." Positive perceptions regarding co-workers may be supportively helpful to supervisors who have difficult jobs to do.

While these rank-orderings appear plausible and congruent with what is known concerning occupational realities, it is difficult to assess the exact degrees of validation for the reward measures. It is recognized that there may be variation within as well as between groups. Also, the

difficulty of interpretation becomes more problematic because no research evidence exists regarding what these ranks "should" in fact be for social work supervisors.

### Summary

In this chapter, an attempt has been made to examine both the range of meanings that social work supervisors impute to their work activity and the type of rewards that their jobs provide. Measures were developed of the degree to which supervisors value each of the six dimensions of work and the extent to which their jobs provide rewards on these dimensions. Variations in work values were then examined in terms of the types of social factors producing it and variation in job rewards analyzed as related to occupational groups. As was stated in chapter I, overall job satisfaction is a function of both of these sets of variables. The next chapter will focus on a primary task of this study, to show how work values and job rewards of the Department of Human Resources supervisors combine to influence job satisfaction.

## CHAPTER V

### JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction is viewed as a function of the interplay of work values and job rewards. The previous chapter describes conceptualization and measures of both of these key concepts. Work values represent the types of meanings individuals seek from work with job rewards representing the types of satisfactions that jobs provide. Since job satisfaction is considered to be a function of these two variables, it is important to examine empirically the interaction of these two components of job satisfaction.

This chapter focuses on the interaction process in detail. It deals with the conceptual and measurement issues involved in the use of Kalleberg's model of job satisfaction. It is also an empirical examination of the process by which job satisfaction of Department of Human Resources supervisors is related to its components.

#### Measurement of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction, as previously defined, is distinguished from satisfaction with specific dimensions of work

roles. Jobs are viewed as composed of a number of discriminable elements, each of which may provide some degree of satisfaction. Certainly, an individual may be satisfied with one dimension of his job and dissatisfied with another. It is assumed here that it is possible for social work supervisors to balance the specific satisfaction against the specific dissatisfactions to arrive at a composite satisfaction with the job as a whole. This approach corresponds to what is called in the literature "general" or "overall" job satisfaction.

In the present study, job satisfaction is measured by combining responses to a number of questions regarding supervisors' evaluations of their jobs as a whole. According to Kalleberg, this method offers advantages of an approach that measures job satisfaction by combining responses to questions regarding specific dimensions of jobs. The first advantage is that by measuring job satisfaction as a whole disagreements over how specific satisfactions should be combined into an overall measure in order to compare results with previous research can be avoided. Second, the present method allows an examination of the way work values and job rewards combine to influence job



satisfaction. Thirdly, since job satisfaction may reflect satisfaction with other aspects of life as well, the present approach allows an assessment of how much of the variation in job satisfaction is attributable to work-related factors and how much is not. A final advantage of this approach is that the relative effects of the specific satisfactions associated with the job can be examined. It is for these considerations that Kalleberg recommends the use of questions referring to the job as a whole to measure job satisfaction.<sup>1</sup>

As was discussed in chapter II, validity and reliability of the measure of job satisfaction are adequately demonstrated by Kalleberg. The five items constituting the scale are taken from The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey.<sup>2</sup> A job satisfaction score is computed by taking the mean of a sum of responses to the five questions.

Kalleberg's study indicates that American workers are in general rather satisfied with their jobs. The mean for

---

<sup>1</sup>Arne L. Kalleberg, "Work Values, Job Rewards and Job Satisfaction: A Theory of the Quality of Work Experience" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1975), p. 108.

<sup>2</sup>Robert P. Quinn and Linda J. Shepard, The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey (Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1974), pp. 54-55.

workers is 4.09 out of a possible high score of 5.0 with a standard deviation of .94.<sup>1</sup> In comparison, the Department of Human Resources supervisors scored somewhat lower on overall satisfaction with a mean of 3.60 and a standard deviation of .98. Although the supervisors are less satisfied than typical workers, they are in the somewhat satisfied range. These findings are typical of job satisfaction measures throughout the literature and are not surprising in light of social reality. In other words, people employed in particular jobs tend to derive some satisfaction from their jobs or they would quit. Workers seek those satisfactions which are possible since it is better to be employed than unemployed.

As stated throughout the present study, variations in job satisfaction can best be understood in light of the interplay between work values and job rewards. Overall job satisfaction is a function of both of these sets of variables.

#### Variations in Job Satisfaction

The model of job satisfaction developed by Kalleberg implies that the highest levels of job satisfactions are experienced by those workers with high rewards and low values, while the lowest levels of job satisfaction are

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 111.

experienced by those workers with low rewards and high values. His general hypothesis is divided into two hypotheses to be tested. The first is that there will be a positive relationship between rewards and job satisfaction. The second one is that there will be a negative relationship between values and job satisfactions.

An initial step in testing the two hypotheses is provided by an examination of zero-order correlations. The correlations between job satisfaction and each value and reward are presented in table 12.

Table 12

Relationships between Job Satisfaction and Values  
and Rewards with Each of the Six Dimensions  
for the Quality of Employment Survey and  
D.H.R. Supervisors

Work Dimensions	Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation	
	Quality of Employment Survey	D.H.R. Supervisors
<u>Intrinsic</u>		
Value	.057	.074
Reward	.493	.532
<u>Convenience</u>		
Value	-.038	-.172
Reward	.339	.242
<u>Financial</u>		
Value	-.024	-.089
Reward	.396	.112

Table 12 (Continued)

Work Dimensions	Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation	
	Quality of Employment Survey	D.H.R. Supervisors
<u>Co-workers</u>		
Value	.054	-.014
Reward	.323	.303
<u>Career</u>		
Value	-.054	-.079
Reward	.364	.380
<u>Resource Adequacy</u>		
Value	.054	-.132
Reward	.405	.429

An examination of the correlations between job satisfaction and the two factors, work values and job rewards, demonstrates relationships very similar to the ones identified by Kalleberg. Rewards are positively and relatively highly correlated with job satisfaction. In fact, rewards are positively related to job satisfaction on all six work dimensions. This finding leads to rejection of the null hypothesis of no relationship between job satisfaction and rewards, giving support to the first research hypothesis predicting the positive relationship. The expected relationship can probably be explained by the fact that the greater the perceived rewards one obtains from these specific dimensions of the job, the greater the satisfaction with the job in general.



An analysis of the relationships between values and job satisfaction also reveal expected results. Kalleberg's findings indicate near zero correlations. However, findings from the present study lead to the rejection of the null-hypothesis of no relationship between work values and job satisfaction. Thus, support is given for the research hypothesis stating that values are negatively related to job satisfaction. Although the associations are generally small, they are larger than those found by Kalleberg. Also, values are negatively correlated with job satisfaction on five of the six dimensions, whereas Kalleberg's analysis indicates negative relationships on four out of six dimensions. Not only are the expected relationships present, they are stronger than first demonstrated by the model.

To gain a more explicit understanding of the interactional effects of work values and job rewards, Kalleberg suggests a regression of job satisfaction on both the values and rewards associated with a particular dimension of work. A regression of these variables offers the opportunity for the examination of the influence of each value and reward for each dimension on job satisfactions. The concern here is to clarify the relationship between work values and job satisfaction. It is suggested that rewards may be "suppressing" the association between values and

job satisfaction, which means it is necessary to control for one of these variables when examining the effects of the other.<sup>1</sup>

Table 13 presents regression coefficients for both the Quality of Employment Survey and the D.H.R. supervisors. In order to offer a complete comparison, standardized and unstandardized coefficients along with  $R^2$  values are presented in the table.

As suggested by the Kalleberg model, the pattern of results from the regression indicates that by removing the positive association of values and job satisfaction produced by the positive correlation of values and rewards, the negative net effect of values on job satisfaction is revealed.<sup>2</sup> When each dimension is considered separately, rewards have a large positive effect on job satisfaction. In contrast to rewards, values have a small negative effect. Only values on two of the six dimensions indicate a large influence. These are the convenience and resource adequacy dimensions. Another dimension, co-workers, also indicates a smaller influence.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 115.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

Table 13

Regression Coefficients from Regressing Job Satisfaction on Values and Rewards for  
Each of the Six Dimensions of Work: 1973-73 Quality of Employment  
Survey and D.H.R. Supervisors

Work Dimension	Quality of Employment Survey			D.H.R. Supervisors		
	Stan- dardized	Unstan- dardized	R <sup>2</sup>	Stan- dardized	Unstan- dardized	R <sup>2</sup>
<u>Intrinsic</u>		2.666 (inter- cept)	.267		.368 (intercept)	.287
Value	-.169	-.309		-.072	-.233	
Reward	.561	.773		.551	.368	
<u>Convenience</u>		2.809	.137		3.334	.078
Value	-.158	-.236		-.135	-.310	
Reward	.388	.651		.222	.473	
<u>Financial</u>		2.972	.165		3.674	.019
Value	-.087	-.126		-.083	-.167	
Reward	.410	.500		.108	.175	
<u>Co-workers</u>		2.698	.116		1.879	.102
Value	-.119	-.177		-.104	-.196	
Reward	.378	.594		.332	.699	
<u>Career</u>		3.482	.150		2.324	.146
Value	-.135	-.175		-.034	-.719	
Reward	.395	.451		.376	.613	
<u>Resource Adequacy</u>		2.094	.176		2.817	.210
Value	-.117	-.217		-.160	-.516	
Reward	.450	.820		.439	.873	

Kalleberg, on the other hand, comments that, although values have a smaller effect than rewards, all of the effects are significant beyond  $p = < .001$ .<sup>1</sup> It is clear from inspection that in the present application of the model values do not have as much power as in Kalleberg's development of it. However, the direction of the relationships are consistent with expectations. Thus, the Kalleberg model functions in the predicted manner. While rewards lead to job satisfaction, there is important variation in satisfaction produced by individual differences in the valuation of these rewards.

The analysis just described provides a great deal of information concerning the form of these relationships for each dimension. They do not, however, provide much information about the relative effects of these components on overall job satisfaction. It has been previously stated that job satisfaction represents a composite of the specific satisfactions that workers experience with respect to the various dimensions of work. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the relationship of job satisfaction to all six values and six rewards simultaneously, in order to assess their net effect.

---

<sup>1</sup>  
Ibid.



Net Effects of Work Values and Rewards  
on Job Satisfaction

In order to examine the net effects of all values and rewards together on job satisfaction, the latter is regressed on all values and rewards simultaneously. The results of the regression are then compared to Kalleberg's model. Regression coefficients for both the workers from the Quality of Employment survey and the Department of Human Resources are presented in table 14.

Table 14

Coefficients Obtained from Regressions of Job  
Satisfaction on All Work Values and Job  
Rewards Simultaneously for Workers in  
the Quality of Employment Survey  
and D.H.R. Supervisors

Work Dimensions	Unstandardized Coefficients (significance)	
	1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey	D.H.R. Supervisors
<u>Intrinsic</u>	1.680 (intercept)	.977 (intercept)
Value	-.245 (.000)	-.104
Reward	.486 (.000)	.929 (.001)
<u>Convenience</u>		
Value	-.069	-.691
Reward	.091 (.051)	.191 (.005)
<u>Financial</u>		
Value	-.030	-.101
Reward	.262 (.000)	-.861

Table 14 (Continued)

Work Dimensions	Unstandardized Coefficients (significance)	
	1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey	D.H.R. Supervisors
<u>Co-workers</u>		
Value	-.035	.143
Reward	.058	-.104
<u>Career</u>		
Value	-.094 (.006)	.118
Reward	.077 (.012)	.222
<u>Resource Adequacy</u>		
Value	.044	-.225
Reward	.233 (.001)	.293
<hr/>		
R <sup>2</sup> :	.364	R <sup>2</sup> : .345
	.359 (corrected)	.306 (corrected)

According to the Kalleberg model, rewards are expected to have greater effects on job satisfaction than do values. Also, rewards are expected to have positive net effects on job satisfaction, while values are expected to have negative net effects.<sup>1</sup> Comparisons of the regressions from the Quality of Employment Survey analyzed by Kalleberg and regressions from the D.H.R. supervisors survey indicate support for the model. Rewards in the earlier study reach

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 123.

a statistically significant level of influence on five out of six dimensions. Results from the regressions with D.H.R. supervisors indicate that rewards are generally a positive influence with only two showing a negative influence.

Values according to Kalleberg generally have negative net effects. Results from regressions done by Kalleberg indicate a statistically significant influence by values on the career and intrinsic dimensions. In the D.H.R. study, values on four of the six dimensions were in the negative direction.

The results from the D.H.R. supervisors' study provide some interesting insights regarding the overall job satisfaction level. As previously noted, supervisors as a whole scored lower, 3.60, than workers in general, 4.09. When overall effects are analyzed, the rewards on the financial and co-workers dimensions, in comparison to other rewards, negatively influenced job satisfaction. This finding, combined with the generally negative influence of the values, may account for the slightly lower job satisfaction mean for D.H.R. supervisors.

Results from table 14 indicate that four out of six rewards have positive net effects on job

satisfaction. This finding may be interpreted to mean that even though supervisors perceive that they do not obtain rewards on certain dimensions of work, they may receive compensatory opportunities to obtain rewards on other dimensions and can be relatively satisfied with their jobs as a whole. Since individuals seek a variety of meanings from work, there are a variety of ways that job satisfaction may be obtained. Another important consideration in the evaluation of a theoretical model is the total amount of variation it can explain. In Kalleberg's original development of the model, he was able to explain 36.4 percent of the variation in overall job satisfaction. Which, as Kalleberg remarks, "is not bad by current standards in the social sciences."<sup>1</sup> The results from the D.H.R. study lend support to the ability of the model to achieve a respectable level of variation explained. In this case, the model explains 34.5 percent of the variation in overall job satisfaction.

Although the total amount of variation explained is important, the adequacy should be judged primarily by its ability to represent a particular process. In other words, the ability to explain variation in the dependent variable

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 133.

is only part of the story. Although the model represents the process quite well, it cannot account for all variation for several reasons. One difficulty is that the measures of the concepts represented in this model are not perfectly reliable. For example, the job satisfaction measure has an estimated reliability coefficient of .77. Therefore, not more than 77 percent of the variation could be explained because of error from lack of reliability.

Even with perfectly reliable measures, one cannot expect to explain all of the variation by means of the interaction of work values and job rewards. There are many factors outside of the work role which affect job satisfaction. Hoppock recognized this concern many years ago. He stated that there may not be anything such as "job satisfaction independent of the other satisfactions in one's life."<sup>1</sup> Indeed, other factors such as family relationships, health, and relative status in the community may be just as important as the work role itself. In light of these considerations, the Kalleberg model is an attempt to explain as much of the variation in job satisfaction as can be

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert Hoppock, Job Satisfactions (New York: National Occupational Conference, Harper and Brothers, 1935), p. 5.

attributed to work-related factors. In general it can be said that this particular model does lead to an understanding of the interplay of meanings and perceived rewards and their relationship to job satisfaction. The model does work when applied to Department of Human Resources supervisors and can serve as a guide to understanding job satisfaction with other groups as well.

### Summary

The measurement of job satisfaction is accomplished by computing the mean of responses to five items. The questions are designed to measure satisfaction with the job as a whole. The social work supervisors studied here indicate a somewhat lower mean on the satisfaction scale than average workers. Although the mean is lower, supervisors still register in the satisfied range.

When variations in job satisfaction are analyzed, both research hypotheses receive support. In other words, there is a positive relationship between job rewards and job satisfaction and a negative relationship between work values and job satisfaction.

A more explicit understanding of the interplay of work values and job rewards is gained through a regression of job satisfaction on each of the values and rewards for

each dimension. When each dimension is considered separately, rewards have a large positive effect on job satisfaction. Values, on the other hand, have a small negative effect. These findings for the supervisors continue to offer support for the Kalleberg model.

In an analysis of the net effects of all work values and job rewards together on job satisfaction, the findings again lead to support for the Kalleberg model. Rewards generally have a positive influence on job satisfaction. Values show a negative influence, although not as strong an influence as in the original model.

Another important consideration is the amount of variation explained by the model. Although the ability in the present study to explain 34.5 percent of the total variation is not as high as Kalleberg's 36.4 percent, it is respectable by social science standards.

From the above evidence a conclusion can be drawn that the model applied here correctly guides one to an understanding of job satisfaction as a function of the meanings imputed and rewards available. Variation in job satisfaction can be accounted for by job rewards, but individual variations also strongly influence job satisfaction. As a model of job satisfaction, the one presented here is superior to those utilizing only rewards as predictors.



These considerations conclude the present examination of the factors related to job satisfaction of social work supervisors. A final chapter summarizes the findings of this study and indicates their relevance for a theoretical understanding of these issues. Practical implications for the findings are also considered. Finally, suggestions for further research helpful to the reinforcement and extension of these results are discussed.



## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSIONS

The present study has been concerned with the interactional relationship between work values, job rewards, and job satisfaction. Variation in job satisfaction was viewed as a function of the way individuals assess job characteristics as important and rewarding. A primary purpose of the research project was to examine the factors related to job satisfaction of social work supervisors employed by a large public welfare agency. The theoretical objective was to contribute to conceptual understanding of the manner in which job satisfaction varies in relation to job rewards and work values. The empirical observations from this examination have been presented in chapters IV and V. The purpose of the concluding chapter is to integrate the evidence from the empirical findings in order to evaluate the understanding they shed upon the theoretical problem. In addition, implications for future practical and research applications are explored.

#### Empirical Findings

In chapter I a general statement of the theoretical model of job satisfaction is made. The implication is that

the highest levels of job satisfaction are experienced by those workers with high rewards and low values, while the lowest levels of job satisfaction will be experienced by those workers with low rewards and high values. This statement brings to mind several questions to be investigated. First, will the relationships between work values, job rewards, and job satisfaction as measured with social work supervisors be similar to the findings in the previous national sample? In other words, does the model work? If it does, what do social work supervisors find satisfying about their jobs? Specifically, what dimensions of the job are rewarding and what dimensions are valued as important? The theoretical statement is divided into the following two hypotheses to be tested:

1. There will be a positive relationship between rewards and job satisfaction
2. There will be a negative relationship between values and job satisfaction

The study population consists of supervisors employed in the Child Protective Services Program of the Texas Department of Human Resources. Agency records for the time period during questionnaire mailing indicate 245 possible respondents. All possible respondents were sent questionnaires, with a total return of 215. This is an 88 percent return rate. With such a high rate of return, it

can be said that the demographic characteristics of actual respondents represent the entire population.

Information concerning the theoretical issues represented by the two hypotheses was collected by a mailed questionnaire. Scales utilized by Kalleberg in his developmental study were adapted from a personal interview format to a self-administered questionnaire. Both work values and job rewards were measured on 34 job characteristics composing six work dimensions. Job satisfaction was measured by the unweighted sum of responses to five questions regarding the job as a whole.

#### Work values and job rewards

An important initial step toward understanding the variation in job satisfaction of the social work supervisors is an examination of the various types of meanings individuals impute to their work activity and the range of job rewards perceived to be present. Both work values and job rewards are measured on six job dimensions which include 34 job characteristics. These dimensions are identified as intrinsic, convenience, financial, relations with co-workers, career, and resource adequacy.

Findings from the analysis of the means of work values according to the six dimensions do not indicate that one job dimension is overwhelmingly more important than all

others. However, when social work supervisors are compared with workers in general five out of six means are higher for supervisors. The only dimension with more value for the average worker is relations with co-workers.

Variations in work values represent the individual's contribution of meaning to the work process. Values are thought of as resulting from three major sets of social factors which are brought to play in the present work role. The three sets are socialization and other types of life experiences, non-work roles, and work experiences. Although a thorough understanding of the relative contribution of these general factors cannot be obtained with cross-sectional data, an attempt is made to approximate the social processes involved. Measures serving as proxies for the social factors are utilized. The variables used are sex, race, educational attainment, job tenure, and presence or absence of responsibility as a major wage earner.

In order to analyze the influence of these variables, a regression of each dimension on the five proxy variable is computed. Examination of the regression analysis reveals that education has strong negative effect on the financial, relations with co-workers, and resource adequacy dimensions. These results are similar to those of Kalleberg. The suggestion is that higher-educated workers value the "extrinsic"



dimensions of work less than their lesser-educated counterparts do. This does not, however, explain the small negative influence of education on the intrinsic dimension indicated by the D.H.R. supervisors. The negative influence may be related to the narrow range of the educational attainments of the supervisors. All but two have at least a college degree. More information is needed to understand this specific finding.

Further analysis indicates a positive relationship between sex and the valuation of the intrinsic and financial dimensions of work. Kalleberg, on the other hand, reports that men place more importance on the intrinsic dimensions while women value convenience and resource adequacy.

Race is another variable which serves to index socialization experiences. Kalleberg indicates that whites value the intrinsic, co-workers, and resource adequacy dimensions more than non-whites. However, the social work supervisors showed very little variable influence on these dimensions. The one finding similar for the two studies is the high valuation of co-workers by whites. Other dimensions influenced by race in the D.H.R. study are convenience, financial, and career. Evidence from both of the studies suggests that there may be differences with respect to whites and non-whites regarding valuation of work dimensions which may reflect prior socialization experiences. It is, however, difficult to specify these differences since there is little

from previous studies to indicate what might be expected in terms of racial differences.

Job tenure, another proxy variable, gives a clue to the way past work experiences influence work values. One finding similar in both Kalleberg's and the present study is that the longer a worker stays on the job, the more he is interested in obtaining greater comforts from the job. The two studies differ in terms of valuation of financial rewards. Kalleberg reports that the longer a worker is in a job the more he values financial rewards. This trend is not present among social work supervisors.

The last proxy variable to be considered as influencing valuation of work dimensions is whether or not an individual is a major wage earner for the family. It is assumed that having the major responsibility for earning a living for the family influences the valuations of specific dimensions. Kalleberg attempts to approximate this influence by a measurement of the number of dependents. It is possible, however, for an individual to have several dependents but not be the major wage earner. Results from the present study show that people who have the major responsibility for earning a living for themselves and their families value the financial along with the intrinsic dimensions of work. Those not in the position of major responsibility tend to value convenience.

In order to gain a more detailed analysis, the job dimensions are then broken down by each proxy variable so that the means may be compared. When education is examined in detail, it is noted that as the educational level increases supervisors place less importance on extrinsic job dimensions such as financial and resource adequacy. When males and females are compared for the six dimensions, it becomes clear that both groups have similar values. Race, the next variable considered, is interesting in the similarity of work values for all groups. The only real difference among groups is that whites place more importance on relations with co-workers. Tenure, the fourth proxy variable is broken down by actual number of years on the job. Supervisors with high job tenure value good pay and other aspects of the financial dimension more than supervisors with less tenure. Another and stronger finding is that supervisors with more than 17 years of job tenure place importance on the career dimension. In analysis of the means of supervisors according to their responsibility as a major wage earner, results indicate that supervisors who are not major wage earners have a higher valuation on the convenience dimension.

Although a longitudinal study would provide an ideal analysis of changes in the valuation of various job dimensions, the data presented here do provide a beginning

understanding of the forces influencing such variations. However, the examination of the meanings of work experience for individuals is only the first step toward an understanding of job satisfaction. Just because individuals value certain rewards does not mean that they obtain such rewards.

Since it is not the "objective" state of job rewards that affects employee attitudes and behavior, but rather how they are experienced by the supervisors, it is necessary to measure job rewards by asking the supervisor about his job. Supervisors were asked to rate 34 job characteristics in terms of their perceived availability as rewards. A comparison of means of social work supervisors and workers in general reveal that the two groups are quite similar in their perceptions of rewards. No one reward is perceived as overwhelmingly more available than others. However, one dimension is singled out for both groups as being least available. It is composed of those items having to do with the attainment of a career. On all but two dimensions, relations with co-workers and intrinsic, supervisors scored lower than average workers.

Two types of variations in job rewards are associated with jobs. The first are variations associated with the job being located within an occupational-industrial category, and the second are those variations associated with a



job being located as a unit in an interrelated set of roles that constitute the organization.

To understand better the variation in job rewards, the means of rewards according to the six job dimensions were computed. These means were then compared with the means of twelve major occupational groups. Then the means were ranked for all categories on each dimension. In general, Department of Human Resources supervisors rank lower than most other occupational groups on their perceptions of job rewards. The highest ranking of rewards compared to other groups is their perception of "relations with co-workers." The social work supervisors are in second place in their perception of the availability of this reward. A difficulty of interpretation of these findings is that no research evidence exists regarding what the ranks "should" in fact be for social work supervisors.

#### Job satisfaction

Measurement of job satisfaction in the present study is based on an overall affective orientation toward the work role. It can be thought of as similar to "general" or "overall" approaches seen in the literature. It is distinguished from the measurement of satisfaction with specific facets of the job.

Means were computed from the five-item scale of job satisfaction. The mean of supervisors was then compared to the mean obtained by Kalleberg for the average worker. Supervisors score somewhat lower, with a mean of 3.60, than general workers, whose mean was 4.09. Although the supervisors are less satisfied than workers in general their mean is still within the somewhat satisfied range, with the possible range extending from a low score of 1.0 to a high score of 5.0. These findings characterize job satisfaction measures throughout the literature and are not surprising in light of social reality. It is thought that people derive some satisfaction from their jobs or they would quit.

Other factors are also important in evaluating this finding. The slightly lower job satisfaction score may reflect an historical event affecting the entire population. In the three months prior to data collection the Department of Human Resources underwent a 10 percent reduction in force. This meant that a number of workers and supervisors lost their jobs. The reduction was the result of legislative action and was the first time in the agency's 38-year history that such a reduction had taken place. The impact of this event is hard to assess. Since the model of job satisfaction functioned so close to the expected level, the reduction in staff may have had only a slight

depressing effect. Another factor to be considered is the idea that managers are in general a dissatisfied group. There is some evidence that "middle managers perceive that they lack influence on organizational decision making, yet they must implement company policy--and often without sufficient authority or resources to effectively carry it out."<sup>1</sup> Managerial problems can lead to tension, conflict, and unproductive and frustrating in-fighting. It cannot be said that the lower mean score reflects such discontent. Comparative studies of managers in different organizations would help to supply data for an adequate interpretation.

The heart of Kalleberg's model is the predicted relationships between work values, job rewards, and job satisfaction. The model was put to the empirical test for social work supervisors by the testing of two hypotheses. The first one, there will be a positive relationship between job rewards and job satisfaction, received support through a correlational analysis. Rewards on all six dimensions are positively correlated with job satisfaction. The second hypothesis, there will be a negative relationship between

---

<sup>1</sup> Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Work in America (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1973), p. 41.

work values and job satisfaction, also received support. The analysis of correlations reveals that values on five out of six dimensions are negatively related to job satisfaction.

Then, to obtain a more explicit understanding of the interactional effects of work values and job rewards, a regression of job satisfaction was conducted on both the values and rewards associated with each of the six job dimensions. Results from the regressions offer further support for Kalleberg's model. When each dimension is considered separately, rewards have a large positive effect on job satisfaction. Values have a small negative effect. The negative effects of values reach their highest level of influence on convenience and resource adequacy. Kalleberg, on the other hand, indicates that in his study all values relationships are negative and reach a significant level. It appears that values in the present study are not as influential as in the original model. However, the negative influence is clearly at work.

The next step in the examination of job satisfaction as a function of work values and job rewards is to analyze a regression of job satisfaction on both variables and all dimensions. This allows an understanding of the net effects of work values and job rewards. Results of the analysis indicates support for the model. Again rewards are more

influential than values. Also, rewards positively influence job satisfaction while values are negative in their influence. Values on four of the six dimensions are negative and rewards positive on four of the six dimensions. A suggested interpretation of this finding is that although supervisors perceive that they do not obtain rewards on certain dimensions of work, they may receive compensatory opportunities to obtain rewards on other dimensions, and can be relatively satisfied with their jobs as a whole.

Another way to evaluate the quality of a model is to examine the total amount of variation it can explain. In Kalleberg's developmental use of the model, he explains 36.4 percent of the variation of job satisfaction. In the D.H.R. supervisors study 34.5 percent of the variation is explained by the model. Both results are respectable in social science circles. Other variation is produced by unreliability in the measures, random error, and influences outside of the control of the study.

In answer to the questions raised earlier in this study, the relationships between work values and job rewards are found to be similar to those found by Kalleberg in his study. The model does work as a predictive device. It can serve as a guide when examining the concept of job satisfaction. Since the model receives empirical support, the next step is to interpret the findings in the



light of a larger theoretical perspective.

### Summary

The empirical findings of the present study support the following specific conclusions:

1. The model of job satisfaction suggested by Kalleberg, which includes not only rewards but also meanings imputed to the work experience, does function as expected when applied to a specific group of workers in a single organization.
2. The hypothesis that there will be a positive relationship between job rewards and job satisfaction receives support.
3. The hypothesis that there will be a negative relationship between work values and job satisfaction receives support.
4. The highest levels of job satisfaction among Department of Human Resource supervisors are experienced by those supervisors with high rewards and low values, while the lowest levels of job satisfaction are experienced by those supervisors with low rewards and high values.

### Theoretical Conclusions

Underlying the empirical investigation presented here is a theoretical framework. The broader objective has been to contribute to a theoretical understanding of the manner

in which job satisfaction varies in relation to job rewards and work values. It has been argued that the model of job satisfaction, as applied here with social work supervisors, most comfortably fits within the symbolic interactionism perspective. It is, in fact, this theoretical perspective which serves as a guide to interpretation of the empirical findings.

Early sociological thinkers were highly interested in the problematic integration of the individual into society through the work role and the quality of the work experience. For example, Durkheim offered a classical analysis of the separation of individuals and jobs produced by industrialization. He stressed the functional consequences for social integration produced by the interdependence among jobs created by the division of labor. Although he acknowledged negative consequences of the division of labor, his primary emphasis was on the formation of interdependence among persons as the basis for "organic solidarity." Mismatches of persons and tasks were classified as an abnormal form of the division of labor.<sup>1</sup> Since

---

<sup>1</sup>Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labor in Society, trans. George Simpson (New York: Free Press, Macmillan Publishing Co., 1933), pp. 374-375.

Durkheim's major focus was the development of theory concerning the more usual forms of the division of labor and its resulting social organization, very few scientists have utilized his theoretical framework as a basis for understanding job satisfaction. Neither Durkheim nor his followers, who primarily utilized a functional or general systems approach, offered guidelines for the study of job satisfaction in the manner suggested in the present study. Thus, other theoretical perspectives were examined to ascertain their abilities to explain variations in job satisfaction.

In contrast to Durkheim, Marx saw the separation of individuals from their jobs and the problematic nature of the quality of the work experience as fundamentally significant to the capitalistic society. He argued that alienation or separation of individuals and jobs was a basic feature of such a society.<sup>1</sup> His concept of alienation has been utilized to guide researchers in the study of job satisfaction.

There are both advantages and disadvantages to the use of alienation as a conceptual framework. One of the most important advantages is the recognition that variations

---

<sup>1</sup>Irving M. Zeitlin, Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968), p. 87.



in job satisfaction are determined in part by the individual. In other words, it provides some understanding of the meanings individuals impute to the work experience, thereby moving away from the unidimensional viewpoint of job satisfaction as completely determined by job characteristics.

There are also some disadvantages or limitations to this perspective. It makes certain assumptions regarding needs that individuals seek to fulfill through work and imputes certain emotional states to workers whose assumed needs are not fulfilled. In addition, alienation represents only one component of the experience rather than an indicator of overall quality of work. Alienation primarily refers to intrinsic rewards which are not the only types of rewards received from work. Extrinsic rewards, those outside of the task itself, also provide sources of meaning and gratification for the worker.

Since job satisfaction in the present study is viewed as an outcome of the rewards individuals obtain from both intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of work, alienation as a conceptual framework is too limiting. Empirical results show that although supervisors see the intrinsic dimension as rewarding with a mean of 3.19, the relations with coworkers dimension has a higher mean with 3.33. It can be interpreted that although supervisors perceive that they do

not obtain rewards on certain dimensions of work, they may receive compensatory opportunities to obtain rewards on other dimensions and can have a high overall job satisfaction rating. This leads to the consideration of another framework.

A third theoretical framework used in the study of job satisfaction is the social action approach derived from Max Weber. Kalleberg developed his model for understanding job satisfaction utilizing this approach. Weber's emphasis was on understanding and interpretation of meaning of the subjective intentions of the actor. He did not, however, develop the concept methodologically.<sup>1</sup> In fact, social action theory's major significance was in the foundation it provided for the development of symbolic interactionism and modern phenomenological sociology.<sup>2</sup>

The social action approach, like other theoretical approaches, has several advantages and disadvantages to its use. According to Kalleberg, a major advantage is that

---

<sup>1</sup>Max Weber, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, trans., ed., and with an introduction by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 58.

<sup>2</sup>George Ritzer, Sociology: A Multiple Paradigm Science (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975), p. 91.

"this view recognizes that the actions and attitudes of individuals are not a determined reaction to the machine structure of their work environment but reflect the interpretation and attempts to control this environment by individuals."<sup>1</sup> Although the social action approach does allow for an interpretation which takes into account the subjective meaning of individuals, the interpretation stops there. Social action as a guide to theoretical understanding and an empirical examination is limited.

The next logical step in the attempt to find a perspective offering both methods and theory to guide the examination of job satisfaction in terms of individual differences as well as gratifications available is to consider symbolic interactionism. It is suggested here that although Kalleberg developed his model of job satisfaction from a social action perspective that the interpretation of the present utilization of his model be viewed from the perspective of symbolic interactionism.

The major interactionist principle seen throughout the present study is the idea that men create their own world. This is in actuality an examination of the way

---

<sup>1</sup> Arne L. Kalleberg, "Work Values, Job Rewards and Job Satisfaction: A Theory of the Quality of Work Experience" (Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1975), p. 21.

individuals are defining situations and their work world. As this and previous investigations have demonstrated, individual differences do exist in the reactions of people to the same job characteristics. The implication is that there is no one-to-one correspondence between an objective real world and people's perspective of that world. Thus, the same events or objects can have different meanings for different people, and the degree of difference will produce differences in behavior.<sup>1</sup>

It can be concluded from a theoretical perspective that in order to understand the interplay of meanings and rewards and their influence on job satisfaction it is important to investigate the individual's own definition of the situation in which he is engaged. This directs attention systematically to the variety of meanings which work may have for him. Such meanings are regarded as not only arising outside the organization and brought into the work situation but as phenomena which derive from the individual's total experience.

---

<sup>1</sup> Peter McHugh, Defining the Situation: The Organization of Meaning in Social Interaction (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1968), p. 8.

## Practical and Research Implications

In a practical way the present study contributes to the sociology of social work. According to Weinberger, "sociological assessment of the role and status of social work is urgently needed."<sup>1</sup> There are a number of reasons for this plea for empirical investigations of various aspects of the profession. One reason is that in the last few years serious doubts have been expressed for the first time in 20 years as to whether social work has indeed become a profession. Questions concerning the status of social work come from a variety of sources. The one of interest here is that although an increasing number of graduate social workers have been employed, primarily as supervisors, in public welfare agencies, the number of persons receiving public assistance has increased dramatically. This contradicts predictions by social workers ten years ago. As Weinberger points out, the increase in graduate social workers employed by public welfare agencies and the correlational increase in the number of clients is probably coincidental but it does not help the professional image

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul E. Weinberger, Perspectives on Social Welfare (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1974), p. 419.

of social workers.<sup>1</sup> It is suggested that a systematic investigation of the social work supervisor's work role will add to the understanding of social forces confronting social work in general.

In an even more practical way, the knowledge obtained by this survey will guide organizational efforts by the Department of Human Resources. For example, one way to increase the job satisfaction of supervisors is to increase rewards in career and convenience dimensions. Such specific changes might include decreasing the amount of work required, creating more pleasant physical surroundings, making an attempt to free the supervisor from conflicting demands, and planning some relief from being "on call." In addition to these items related to convenience, changes in the promotional structure could lead to higher job satisfaction.

While the level of rewards may be increased somewhat, it is recognized that some rewards are in limited supply. It is then important to take into consideration the variation in job satisfaction resulting from individual differences in the valuation of other rewards. These considerations suggest the utility of an attempt to match individuals

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 420.



and jobs. If in the selection process prospective supervisors could be made aware of the rewarding and non-rewarding job dimensions they could make a decision about taking the position on the basis of their work values. It is also possible that a more formalized matching system could be developed. Such procedures are often a part of a standard organizational selection and placement procedure, where the skills and abilities of a prospective employee are matched with the skill requirements of the job for which he is being considered.

Matching procedures can also be utilized in graduate social work programs preparing students to assume supervisory work roles. At the most fundamental level, merely providing information regarding expected job rewards can allow self-selection to occur. On the other hand, a more formalized matching procedure, along with information concerning the availability of specific rewards, would be a valuable addition to the graduate social work student's education. Policy decisions aimed at increasing social work supervisors' job satisfaction must take into account both characteristics of the supervisor and the conditions of work and attempt to achieve a beneficial relationship between them.

This research project, while bringing some understanding to a complex social process among a specific population, is not complete in and of itself. The validation of a

model such as the one utilized here requires continued testing in the real work world under a variety of conditions. As suggested by Kalleberg, the effects of dimension of work on job satisfaction may differ for various subgroups within the national population. More explicit information is needed on subgroupings divided by sex, race, employment status and age.<sup>1</sup>

Another line of research which is necessary to supplement both this and Kalleberg's studies is a longitudinal panel study. This type of study would enable the processes underlying the development of work values to be observed.

In terms of research regarding social workers and their job satisfaction, there is much to be done. The information presented here is about only one group of social work supervisors. It is not known how similar they are to other social work supervisors in other agencies. This group also needs to be compared to other workers in the same agency. Individuals in different positions may perceive different job dimensions as rewarding and may value the dimensions differently. As more graduate social workers enter this increasingly important work role it is important to understand the quality of the work experience of social work supervisors.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 169.



## APPENDIX A



The University of Texas at Arlington  
Arlington, Texas 76019

Human Resource Center  
Graduate School of Social Work  
Box 19117  
273-3607

### Job Satisfaction of Supervisors

This questionnaire is a part of a study designed to learn more about supervisors in public welfare agencies. The information gained here will be helpful in planning future training which will be useful and relevant to your job.

The questionnaire consist of four parts. The first part contains questions concerning rewards in your current position. The second part relates to your work load. The third part consists of questions about things you value in an ideal job. The last part is a series of background questions.

Please do not sign your name. At the end of the form you will find a post card. Please return it separately upon completion of the questionnaire. This will allow anonymity and confidentiality of the respondents to be preserved but at the same time permit the follow-up mailings to respondents who have not returned a questionnaire.

As you probably are aware there are no "right" or "wrong" answers to any of the questions which follow. The only "right" answers to the questions are those which best describe your situation or express your own viewpoint. Since the questionnaire is designed to obtain an overall picture, some of the answers to be checked may not always reflect subtleties of your opinions. Please answer each question as carefully, completely and frankly as possible.

Your participation is essential for the success of the study. Thank you for your help.

Coleen Shannon  
Assistant Professor

1. Here are some statements describing different aspects of a person's job. Please indicate how true each of the following statements is for you in your job.

	<u>Very True</u>	<u>Somewhat True</u>	<u>Not too True</u>	<u>Not at all True</u>
I have enough time to get the job done.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The pay is good.	( )	( )	( )	( )
I can see the results of my work.	( )	( )	( )	( )
My employer is concerned about giving everyong a chance to get ahead.	( )	( )	( )	( )
My supervisor is friendly.	( )	( )	( )	( )
I have enough information to get the job done.	( )	( )	( )	( )
I am given a lot of chances to make friends.	( )	( )	( )	( )
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	( )	( )	( )	( )
I am free from conflicting demands that other people make of me.	( )	( )	( )	( )
I am given a lot of freedom to decide how I do my own work.	( )	( )	( )	( )
My supervisor is successful in getting people to work together.	( )	( )	( )	( )

	<u>Very True</u>	<u>Somewhat True</u>	<u>Not too True</u>	<u>Not at all True</u>
Promotions are handled fairly.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The people I work with are helpful.	( )	( )	( )	( )
I have enough authority to do my job.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The job security is good.	( )	( )	( )	( )
I receive enough help and equipment to get the job done.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The hours are good.	( )	( )	( )	( )
I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The physical surroundings are pleasant.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The people I work with are friendly.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The chances for promotion are good.	( )	( )	( )	( )
My supervisor is very concerned about the welfare of those under him/her.	( )	( )	( )	( )
My fringe benefits are good.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Travel to and from work is convenient.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The work is interesting.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The people I work with take a personal interest in me.	( )	( )	( )	( )

	<u>Very True</u>	<u>Somewhat True</u>	<u>Not too True</u>	<u>Not at all True</u>
My responsibilities are clearly defined.	( )	( )	( )	( )
My supervisor is helpful to me in getting my job done.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The people I work with are competent in doing their job.	( )	( )	( )	( )
I can forget about my personal problems.	( )	( )	( )	( )
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The people I work with are helpful to me in getting my job done.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.	( )	( )	( )	( )
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	( )	( )	( )	( )

2. All in all how satisfied would you say you are with your job?

- ( ) Very satisfied
- ( ) Somewhat satisfied
- ( ) Not too satisfied
- ( ) Not at all satisfied

3. If you were free to go into any type of job you wanted, what would your choice be?

- ( ) I would want the job I have now
  - ( ) I would want to retire and not work at all
  - ( ) I would prefer some other job
- If you have a particular job in mind, please specify
- 

4. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?

- ( ) I would decide without hesitation to take the same job
- ( ) I would have some second thoughts
- ( ) I would decide definitely not to take the job

5. In general how well would you say that your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?

- ( ) It is very much like the job I wanted
- ( ) It is somewhat like the job I wanted
- ( ) It is not very much like the job I wanted

6. If a good friend of yours told you he/she was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him/her?

- ( ) I would strongly recommend it
- ( ) I would have doubts about recommending it
- ( ) I would advise my friend against it

7. About how easy would it be for you to find a job with another employer with approximately the same income and fringe benefits you now have?
- ☐ Very easy
  - ☐ Somewhat easy
  - ☐ Not at all easy
8. How many social work supervisees do you currently supervise?
- ☐ 3 or less
  - ☐ 4 supervisees
  - ☐ 5 supervisees
  - ☐ 6 supervisees
  - ☐ 7 supervisees
  - ☐ 8 supervisees
  - ☐ 9 or more supervisees
9. During any one month how often are individually scheduled formal meetings held with each of your social work supervisees? (The concern here is with formally arranged, meetings and not informal, brief and unscheduled ones.)
- ☐ Once a month or less
  - ☐ Twice a month
  - ☐ Three times a month
  - ☐ Four times a month
  - ☐ Five times a month
  - ☐ Six times a month
  - ☐ Individual supervisory conferences are not used
10. Individual, regularly scheduled conferences with social work supervisees generally last
- ☐ Half-hour or less
  - ☐ Between half-hour and an hour
  - ☐ An hour or longer but less than two hours
  - ☐ Two hours or longer



11. Group supervisory conferences are scheduled

- ( ) One a month or less
- ( ) Twice a month
- ( ) Three times a month
- ( ) Four times a month
- ( ) Five times a month
- ( ) Six times a month or more
- ( ) Group supervisory conferences are not used

12. If you could have the Most Ideal job for you, no matter how farfetched, how important would each of the following things be to you?

	<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Not too</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Not at all</u> <u>Important</u>
Having good hours.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Having enough time to get the job done.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Convenient traveling to and from work.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The physical surroundings should be pleasant.	( )	( )	( )	( )
A job that allows me to forget my personal problems.	( )	( )	( )	( )
A job free from conflicting demands of other people.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Not being asked to do excessive amounts of work.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Interesting work.	( )	( )	( )	( )



	<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Not too</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Not at all</u> <u>Important</u>
An opportunity to develop my own special abilities.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Seeing the results of my work.	( )	( )	( )	( )
A chance to do the things I do best.	( )	( )	( )	( )
A lot of freedom to decide how I do my own work.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Having the problems I am expected to solve hard enough.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Good pay.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Good job security.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Good fringe benefits.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Having helpful people to work with.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Having friendly people to work with.	( )	( )	( )	( )
A lot of chances to make friends.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Having the people I work with take a personal interest in me.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Having enough information to get the job done.	( )	( )	( )	( )

	<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Not too</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Not at all</u> <u>Important</u>
Receiving enough help and equipment to get the job done.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Having enough authority to do my job.	( )	( )	( )	( )
A supervisor who is competent in doing his/her work.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Having my responsibilities clearly defined.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The people I work with should be competent in doing their job.	( )	( )	( )	( )
My supervisor should be very concerned about the welfare of those under him/her.	( )	( )	( )	( )
My supervisor should be successful in getting people to work together.	( )	( )	( )	( )
My supervisor should be helpful to me in getting my job done.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The people I work with should be helpful to me in getting my job done.	( )	( )	( )	( )
My supervisor should be friendly.	( )	( )	( )	( )
Promotions should be handled fairly.	( )	( )	( )	( )
The chances for promotions should be good.	( )	( )	( )	( )

Very	Somewhat	Not too	Not at all
<u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>

My employer should be concerned about giving everyone a chance to get ahead.

( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

13. Which of the following degrees do you hold?

- ( ) Less than a BA
- ( ) BA or BS degree without a major or concentration in social work  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- ( ) BA or BS degree with a major concentration in social work.
- ( ) Master's degree with a major in other than social work.  
(Specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- ( ) MSW degree
- ( ) Other. Specify. \_\_\_\_\_

14. How long ago did you receive your degree? \_\_\_\_\_ years.

15. Whether or not you have a degree in social work, how well would you say your training and experience before coming to this agency prepared you for your present job?

- ( ) Poorly
- ( ) Fairly well
- ( ) Quite well

16. How well would you say your training in the agency has prepared you for your job?

- ( ) Poorly
- ( ) Fairly well
- ( ) Quite well

17. Sex:    ☐ Male  
             ☐ Female

18. Age:    \_\_\_\_\_ years.

19. Marital status:

- ☐ Married
- ☐ Divorced or separated
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Widowed

20. Race or ethnic group: \_\_\_\_\_

21. What is your current position? \_\_\_\_\_

22. How long have you been employed by the Department of Public Welfare?  
\_\_\_\_\_ years.

23. How long were you employed by the Department of Public Welfare before  
assuming your current position?  
\_\_\_\_\_ years.

24. How many years of social work experience have you had in other agencies?  
\_\_\_\_\_ years.

25. What is your current yearly income? \_\_\_\_\_

26. Are you the major wage earner in your family?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

27. In your work do you travel to

- ☐ One county only
- ☐ Two to three counties
- ☐ More than three counties

28. In your opinion do you work in an area that is primarily

- ☐ Urban
- ☐ Suburban
- ☐ Semirural
- ☐ Rural
- ☐ Urban and Rural
- ☐ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your help.

## APPENDIX B

### Items comprising the job rewards and work values scales

---

#### Intrinsic

1. I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities.
2. The work is interesting.
3. I am given a lot of freedom to decide how I do my own work.
4. I am given a chance to do the things I do best.
5. The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.

#### Convenience

1. Travel to and from work is convenient.
2. I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.
3. The physical surroundings are pleasant.
4. I can forget about my personal problems.
5. I have enough time to get the job done.
6. I am free from the conflicting demands that other people make of me.
7. The hours are good.

#### Financial

1. The pay is good.
2. The job security is good.
3. My fringe benefits are good.

Relations with Co-workers

1. I am given a lot of chances to make friends.
2. The people I work with are friendly and helpful.
3. The people I work with take a personal interest in me.
4. The people I work with are friendly.

Career

1. The chances for promotion are good.
2. Promotions are handled fairly.
3. My employer is concerned about giving everyone a chance to get ahead.

Resource adequacy

1. I receive enough help and equipment to get the job done.
2. I have enough information to get the job done.
3. My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.
4. My responsibilities are clearly defined.
5. I have enough authority to do my job.
6. My supervisor is concerned about the welfare of those under him/her.
7. My supervisor is successful in getting people to work together.
8. My supervisor is friendly.
9. My supervisor is helpful to me in getting my job done.
10. The people I work with are helpful to me in getting my job done.



11. The people I work with are competent in doing their job.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Beynon, H., and Blackburn, R. M. Perceptions of Work. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Blauner, Robert. Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Blumer, Herbert. Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Goldthorpe, John H.; Lockwood, David; Bechhofer, Frank; and Platt, Jennifer. The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behavior. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Herzberg, Fredrick; Mausner, Bernard; Peterson, R. O.; and Capwell, Dora F. Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Services of Pittsburgh, 1957.
- Herzberg, Fredrick; Mausner, Bernard; and Snyderman, Barbara Block. The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.
- Hoppock, Robert. Job Satisfaction. New York: National Occupational Conference, Harper and Brothers, 1935.
- Kadushin, Alfred. Supervision in Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.
- Kimmel, Paul. Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics. Edited by John P. Robinson, Robert Athanasiow, and Kendra B. Head. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1969.
- Kornhauser, Arthur. Mental Health of the Industrial Worker: A Detroit Study. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962.
- McHugh. Defining the Situation: The Organization of Meaning in Social Interaction. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1968.

- Martindale, Don. Prominent Sociologists Since World War II. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1975.
- Morse, Nancy. Satisfactions in the White-Collar Job. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1953.
- Palvalko, Ronald M. Sociology of Occupations and Professions. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1971.
- Quinn, Robert P., and Shepard, Linda J. The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1974.
- Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Work in America. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1973.
- Ritzer, George. Sociology: A Multiple Paradigm Science. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975.
- Robinson, John P. Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics. Edited by John P. Robinson, Robert Athanasiou, and Kendra B. Head. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1969.
- Roethlisberger, Fritz J., and Dickson, William. Organizations: Structure and Behavior. Edited by Joseph A. Litterer. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1963.
- Sheppard, Harold L., and Herrick, Neal O. Where Have All the Robots Gone? Worker Dissatisfaction in the '70s. New York: Free Press, 1972.
- Thomas, W. I. The Child in America. New York: Knopf, 1928.
- Vroom, Victor H. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.
- Weber, Max. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Translated by, Edited by, and with an introduction by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Weinberger, Paul E. Perspectives on Social Welfare. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1974.

Zeitlin, Irving M. Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

#### Articles and Periodicals

Aiken, Michael, and Hage, Jerald. "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis." American Sociological Review 31 (August 1966): 497-507.

Burke, Ronald J. "Are Herzberg's Motivators and Hygienes Unidimensional?" Journal of Applied Psychology 50 (August 1966): 317-321.

Centers, Richard and Bergental, Daphne E., "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Motivations Among Different Segments of the Working Population," Journal of Applied Psychology 50 (June 1966): 193-97.

Fournet, Glenn P.; Distefano, M. K., Jr.; and Pryer, Margaret W. "Job Satisfaction: Issues and Problems," Personnel Psychology 19 (Summer 1966): 165-183.

Hackman, J. Richard, and Lawler, Edward E., III. "Employee Reaction to Job Characteristics," Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph 55 (June 1971): 259-286.

House, Robert J., and Wigdon, Lawrence A. "Herzberg's Dual-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction and Motivation: A Review of the Evidence and a Criticism," Personnel Psychology 20 (December 1967): 369-389.

Hulin, Charles L., and Smith, Patricia Cain. "Sex Differences in Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology 48 (April 1964): 88-92.

Hulin, Charles L., and Smith, Patricia Cain. "A Linear Model of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology 49 (June 1965): 209-16.

Kadushin, Alfred. "Supervisor-Supervisee: A Survey," Social Work 19 (May 1974): 288-297.

Kalleberg, Arne L. "Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction," American Sociological Review 42 (February 1977): 124-143.

Kohn, Melvin. "Occupational Structure and Alienation," American Journal of Sociology 82 (July 1976): 111-130.

Lindsay, Carl A.; Marks, Edmond; and Golow, Leon. "The Herzberg Theory: A Critique and Reformulation," Journal of Applied Psychology 51 (August 1967): 330-339.

Pearlin, Leonard J. "Alienation from Work: A Study of Nursing Personnel," American Sociological Review 27 (March 1962): 314-326.

Robinson, H. Alan; Connors, Ralph P.; and Whitacre, G. Holly. "Job Satisfaction Researches of 1964-65," Personnel and Guidance Journal 45 (December 1966): 371-79.

Russell, Kevin. "Variation in Orientation to Work and Job Satisfaction," Sociology of Work and Occupations 2 (November 1955): 299-322.

Seeman, Melvin. "On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work," American Sociological Review 32 (April 1967): 783-791.

Shepard, Jon. "Functional Specialization, Alienation, and Job Satisfaction," Industrial and Labor Relations Review 23 (January 1970): 207-219.

#### Unpublished Material

Kadushin, Alfred. "Supervision Questionnaire," School of Social Work, University of Wisconsin, 1973.

Kalleberg, Arne L. "Work Values, Job Rewards and Job Satisfaction: A Theory of the Quality of Work Experience," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1975.