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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Preface

The study presented here is in an area of industrial psychology, which has been investigated, conceptualized and analyzed more than most others. Locke (1976, reported in Dunnette, M.D., 1976, p. 1297) indicated that an APA literature study using the key words "job satisfaction" (and related terms) yielded 556 references on the topic between 1967 and early 1972. Prorating this average of about 111 per year back through 1958 yields a total of 999 in that interval. Summing the above three figures gives a total of 3,350 articles (or dissertations) on the subject to date. This must be considered a minimum figure since neither literature search was totally exhaustive.

Obviously, a comprehensive review of the literature over even the last decade would be impossible, and it probably would not be desirable since much of this literature is either trivial, repetitive or inconclusive. Under these circumstances, it might seem superfluous to add one more study to the number of investigations.
Nevertheless, it seems to be acceptable and necessary to continue the research for several reasons:

1. The complexity of the subject requires further research to clarify contradictory results of the past.

2. Better knowledge about the construct "job satisfaction" can lead to the development of more reliable and valid instruments for the measurement of job satisfaction than are now available.

3. "Job satisfaction" is a political construct. Accepting the fact that most of the adults of a society spend more than one third of their waking life in a given job setting, the requirement that a job should be pleasurable as possible is a natural one. On the other side, satisfaction is not for the benefit of the employee alone, it is also important for the effective functioning of an organization. Dissatisfaction is reported to be highly intercorrelated with employee withdrawal, which is a cost factor in nearly every organization.

For every organization and for every job, satisfaction can be different. As a result, continued research is necessary.

Theoretical Frame

As noted, the purpose of this study is the measurement of job satisfaction. The concept of job satisfaction has been
approached in a variety of ways. Because job satisfaction is an affective response to one's job, it can be only identified through a conceptual identification directed to one's mental content or process. Locke (1975, p. 1300) defined job satisfaction as:

"... a pleasurable and positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience."

Another definition was published by Smith (1967, p. 342):

"Job satisfaction is an affective response of the worker on the job. It is viewed as a result or consequence of the worker's experience on the job in relation to his values, i.e., to what he wants or expects from it. Satisfaction can be viewed as similar in meaning to pleasure."

Causal theories of job satisfaction attempt to specify relevant variables for job satisfaction (needs, values and expectations) and how these variables combine determine job satisfaction. Campbell, et al. (1970) divided the theories into two groups. The content theories emphasize different variables and the process theories deal with the process of satisfaction.

Content theories include Maslow's need hierarchy theory and Herzberg's two factor theory. Both define different needs and specify the method satisfying these needs. Herzberg (1959) modified Maslow's need concepts for the job setting and identified factors in the job which are important for the satisfaction of the different needs. He distinguishes between "Motivators" and
"Hygiene factors." The Motivators are able to increase satisfaction and Hygiene factors only decrease dissatisfaction. Process theories include a dynamic and cognitive component. Vroom (1964) and Porter and Lawler (1968) pointed out the importance of the cognitive component for job satisfaction. They dealt with the question "how does it benefit me" which every worker will sometimes ask himself before putting forth effort. Equity theory presented by Adams (1965) based on Homans (1961) emphasized that people prefer to receive rewards which they perceived to be equitable. That means that workers will be satisfied with their job when there is no discrepancy between their outputs and their beliefs about what is an equitable outcome. A similar theory, the discrepancy theory, sees job satisfaction simply as a function of rewards and expected outcomes (Katzell, 1964; Locke, 1969).

Generally most of the theories on the topic of job satisfaction would agree that in some sense an individual satisfaction is dependent upon the interaction between the individual and his work environment. The major differences in the theories are concerned with which process determines satisfaction.

There is agreement among the different theorists that certain job and individual conditions influence or determine job satisfaction. It has been found that work content, rewards, and
work context are important factors for determining satisfaction or dissatisfaction on the job.

In the following discussion, some of the most important job and individual variables which could influence satisfaction are analyzed. In addition, two different consequences or effects of job satisfaction are presented.

Job Variables

Work

The work itself is considered by Herzberg, et al (1959) and Herzberg (1966) as the longest lasting and most frequent source of satisfaction on the job. Work is considered a motivator, which means that if work is designed so that it includes opportunities to learn, to create, to be responsible, and to control, it should lead to satisfaction. This was verified in recent studies by Hackman and Lawler (1971), Hall and Lawler (1971), Locke (1973), Patchen (1970), Barnowe, et al (1972), and Locke, et al (1970). These studies emphasized the importance of challenge and the possibility for achievement as a source of satisfaction for the worker.

Pay and Promotion

Locke (1976, p. 1323) says:
"Satisfaction with promotion can be viewed, like pay, as a function of the frequency of promotion in relation to what is desired and the importance of promotion (or pay) to the individual."

The equity concept is used to understand the influence of rewards on the satisfaction.

Lawler (1971), Pritchard, Dunnette, and Jorgenson (1972) found supporting results for Locke's definition. The value of pay is influenced by personal financial situations and by previous pay. This was verified in a study by Zedeck and Smith (1968). Hulin and Smith (1964) found women less satisfied with pay and promotion than men, which results, as they report, as a consequence of fewer opportunities for promotion and the lower wages that women receive. Herzberg, et al (1957) made an extensive survey of the importance of monetary incentives which showed that money was rated fifth in order of importance out of a total of ten variables.

**Working Conditions**

Working conditions that are not dangerous and uncomfortable are usually accepted by the workers. If there are no physically unpleasant conditions; if the temperature, noise and light are moderate, the working conditions are highly valued by employees (Barnowe, et al (1972; Whyte, 1955).
Herzberg, et al (1957) found that for women working conditions seem to be more important than for men.

**Supervision**

McGregor (1967, p. 78) states:

"My view is that one of the fundamental characteristics of an appropriate managerial strategy is that of creating conditions, which enable the individual to achieve his own goals best by directing his efforts towards organizational goals."

McGregor and other behavioral scientists support the use of participative leadership for increasing job satisfaction. Support for this position has been reported by Barnowe, et al (1972), Bower and Seashore (1966), Fleishman (1965), Tosi, Chesser and Carroll (1972).

Morse and Reimer (1956) found significant increases in productivity for both styles of leadership, the participative and the directive, but in different job settings. Simple tasks and highly structured activities seem to be satisfying for the employee under the directive leadership style (Shaw & Blum, 1964; Morse & Lorsch, 1975).

**Co-workers**

Overall job satisfaction seems to be highly correlated with
satisfaction with co-workers, as studies in Germany (Neuberger, 1975) have shown. Bass (1965, p. 122) argued that women are more "interaction oriented" than men, which would seem to indicate that this job dimension is more important for women than for men.

**Company**

The company is of overall importance for all the different dimensions of the work situation. The satisfaction with the company as a whole will be expressed through satisfaction with different job dimensions (Sommer, 1976; James & Jones, 1974).

**Individual Variables**

As mentioned previously individual variables have been isolated as factors of satisfaction. Age, sex, income, education, tenure, self-esteem, and various other variables, were isolated in studies of determinants of job satisfaction (Herzberg, et al., 1957; Korman, 1968; Weiner, 1971; Ingham, 1970; Greenhaus, 1971). In the following discussion just three individual characteristics are mentioned. These are age, sex, and tenure. These are considered to be strong indicators of job satisfaction (Smith, et al., 1969). Income and educational level are also important factors; however, in the present study, they are
considered to be homogeneous.

**Age**

In various studies, a positive relationship has been found between age and job satisfaction. Several studies in this area were done (Saleh & Otis, 1964; Saleh & Hyde, 1969; Glenn, 1974; Glenn, Weaver & Taylor, 1977). However, no satisfactory explanation has been given for the relationships found between age and job satisfaction.

**Sex**

Hulin and Smith (1964) concluded in their research that women are less satisfied than men, however, they did not maintain that (p. 88): "sex per se is the crucial factor which leads to either high or low satisfaction. It is, rather, the entire constellation of variables which consistently covary with sex; for example pay, job level, promotion opportunities, societal norms, etc."

Rosenmayer (1973) found in a study in Austria high levels of job satisfaction for women. He explained the observed result by noting the female socialization in our society.
Tenure

The relationship between tenure and job satisfaction although present is quite variable (Neuberger, 1975). Bass and Barrett (1972, p. 90) pointed out that "the relationship is complex since one would assume and evidence indicates, that those now dissatisfied with their jobs are likely to quit."

Tenure is also related to age, so that it is difficult to isolate when job satisfaction is caused by seniority on the job or the age of the employee, or both.

Effects of Job Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction

Job satisfaction or dissatisfaction is considered to be related to performance and withdrawal, such as absenteeism and turnover. The relationship between performance and job satisfaction, as well as the relationship between absenteeism and job satisfaction are discussed below.

Performance: An "Outcome" of Job Satisfaction

The findings of studies about the relationship between performance and job satisfaction are inconsistent. Brayfield and Crocket (1955) found in an investigation of the relationship between performance and job satisfaction that two out of 15
comparisons showed low but positive correlations. Korman (1971) showed that expectancies of others on the worker's competency and ability are also positively related to performance. Katz (1951) found a negative relationship between job satisfaction and performance.

That the relationship between job satisfaction and performance is highly complex and indirect was also demonstrated by Schwab and Comings (1970) and Schwab, et al. (1971). Sheridan and Slocum (1975) tested for a causal relationship between the two components but didn’t get any positive results.

**Absenteeism as an "Outcome" of Job Dissatisfaction**

The studies of the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism have tried to use "avoidable" absenteeism data as the major indicator or index (Chadwick-Jones, et al., 1973; Nicholson, et al., 1977). This distinction seems to include a high degree of bias. It is very subjective, for what is "avoidable" and what is "not avoidable" is difficult to differentiate.

Porter and Steers (1973) in an intensive study dealing with the relationship of withdrawal and satisfaction, found a consistent but an inverse relationship between absenteeism and job satisfaction. These consistent results were also obtained for the relationships between absenteeism and different job dimensions,
such as pay, work, etc.

Age as an indicator of absenteeism was also found. Age seems to be positively related to absenteeism but the relationship is weak (Porter & Steers, 1973, p. 164-165).

Measurement of Job Satisfaction

A number of different methods and measuring instruments have been used to gather information about job satisfaction. One problem for all of these measures is the validity of the instrument. No single generally acceptable criterion is available for job satisfaction.

Two carefully developed scales will be discussed and used in this study. The following analysis of these two measurements will also give some general information about job satisfaction measures.

Job Description Index

Hoppock (1935) indicated the importance and the practicability of direct verbal self reports to measures of satisfaction. A variety of format has been used for this purpose, such as Likert scales, Thurstone scales, face scales, etc.

One of the most frequently used scales to measure job satisfaction is the JDI (Job Description Index) which were
presented by Smith, et al. (1969). The following are some of the reasons why the JDI was applied in this study.

1. It is a well established and often tested instrument.
2. It operationalizes the theoretical approach to this research.
3. It is a well fitting instrument for the used sample.
4. It measures the most important job dimensions.

The JDI was developed at Cornell University where the researchers used different criteria for useful measures of job satisfaction, such as:

1. The instrument should be capable of being used over a wide range of job classifications and with people of varying educational levels.
2. The measure should meet some practical requirements as being short in format, easy to administer, and easy to score.
3. The measure should generate scores indicative of satisfaction with a number of discriminable different aspects of work situations (pay, supervision, work, co-workers, promotion).
4. The scale should be free from biases, such as acquiescence, the tendency to "agree" with an item independent of item content, in order that the tendency for artificially high
scores is reduced.

5. The time perspective should be the present job situation.

6. The worker's frame of references, his standards of judgment, when responding to the items, either should be taken into consideration when constructing and scoring the measure or should be demonstrated not to effect the answer markedly.

7. The measure should be descriptive, not evaluative. It should also be reliable and valid.


Based on the reliability data presented by the designers, the JDI fulfills the requirements (Robinson, Athanasion, & Head, 1969; Smith, et al., 1969).

The five different scales in the JDI differ in the number of items. The scales for pay and promotion have nine items, the other three scales (work, supervision, co-workers) each have 18 items. An answer which indicates satisfaction is valued with "3" and an answer indicating dissatisfaction is evaluated with "0." To get equal total scores for all scales, the scale values for pay and promotion are doubled.

Smith (1967), in Fleishman, 1967, p. 349) reported the internal consistency reliabilities of the five JDI scales ranged
from .80 to .88, as determined by split-half technique, on the basis of responses of eighty male employees from different electronic plants. Other studies which following this report found similar results.

Smith (1967, in Fleishman, 1967, p. 349) also discusses the problem of validity:

"There is no single general criterion measure which can be used to validate a measure of job satisfaction. What is needed is evidence that the scales relate to other independent meaningful indices of satisfaction in the situation."


Further studies have shown that the average intercorrelation of different scales is .37, which is low enough to potentially aid a good discrimination. The scales correlate highly with other measures of job satisfaction (average = .70). In this sense the JDI has validity in measuring job satisfaction.

Normative data were developed for different populations using more than 2,500 persons. Separate norms are provided for females and males. Also, norms are available which were stratified by different individual variables such as income, age, job tenure, community prosperity and community decrepitude (Smith, 1967).
ABB Questionnaire (Arbeitsbeschreibungsbogen)

Another instrument, which is supposed to have the advantages of the JDI and also scales for additional variables of job satisfaction, is a questionnaire developed in Germany. The original idea was to translate the JDI into German but there were some reasons why this was considered inadequate (Neuberger, 1975a, 1975b). These are:

1. A direct translation was found to be inadequate because some words have a different connotation in German than in English. Therefore, a new item pool based on the dimensions of the JDI was created in Germany using a sample of 1,690 subjects.

2. The question was asked why the JDI has just five scales and why the pay and promotion scale have only half of the items of the other three scales. The ABB has added the scales "company" and "work conditions." Researchers of various investigators have found these two components important (Hulin, 1969; Friedlander & Margulies, 1969; Thornton, 1969) for measuring job satisfaction. The number of items is different for most of the seven scales (see Appendix C).

3. A Likert scale is used without the "?" in the answer categories because the "?" was considered ambiguous. The respondent can choose between "strongly agree," "agree,"
"disagree" and "strongly disagree."

4. ABB measures job dimensions in terms of their influence on the individual's job satisfaction. It also contains a rank order scale which requires the respondent to rank the different areas according to their importance of satisfaction.

5. Additionally, it was considered important to measure overall job satisfaction which is measured with the Kunin "face" scale (Kunin, 1955). This scale is also used to measure overall life satisfaction of the respondent. The Kunin scale is an often used scale for overall satisfaction but has the disadvantages of a one-item scale.

With all these changes, the ABB can be seen as an independently developed measure of job satisfaction. It was developed at the University in Munich (Germany) and tested in Germany (Neuberger, 1975; Allerbeck, 1975; Bergermaier, 1974; Genthe, 1974; Osterkorn, 1975; Schmidt, 1975; Rinke, 1975; Glueck, 1975) and Austria.

The internal consistency for all the seven different scales is in average $r = .85$ (N=3149), which results from the above mentioned researches (Neuberger, 1975c, p. 35). Of the above studies, one test for stability was obtained by test-retest. These values varied between .56 for co-worker and .83 for working conditions (Glueck, 1975).
Neuberger (1975) indicated that no validation studies have been done but validity can be assumed to exist, because of the strong similarity of the ABB and the JDI. He also says:

"An attempt to obtain convergent validity can be seen in the testing of the relationship of overall job satisfaction with different other scales."

This seems questionable because of the very low reliability of the Kunin scale. There was an attempt to correlate the ABB scales with other job satisfaction measures. This was done by correlating the ABB with the "Skala zur Messung der Arbeitszufriedenheit (SAZ)," which is considered to be a valid test of job satisfaction (Fisher & Lueck, 1972). The correlations were between .38 and .73 and were all significant.

Normative data for the ABB are not yet available, due to lack of representative samples.

The purpose of the following study is to compare these two different measures of job satisfaction. In particular, the purpose is to examine the German satisfaction scale with the American scale by using the scales on a sample of employees in America.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Purpose

This research is based on a survey which used two different job satisfaction questionnaires. The sample was randomly selected from a population of clerical workers and one of the two questionnaires was randomly assigned so that 50% of the persons answered the first and 50% the second questionnaire. The results of the job satisfaction survey were then related to performance ratings and absenteeism.

The main purpose was to examine the ability of both questionnaires to measure the different dimensions of job satisfaction and to see if such measures were similar. The second purpose was to compare the relationship of both measurements to performance and absenteeism.

This study was the first large investigation about job satisfaction in the particular organization and uses the ABB questionnaire for the first time in America.

Subjects

Out of the entire clerical staff of a midwestern university
(N=497), a sample of N=300 was selected. Ninety departments with two or more employees were involved in the investigation. Almost all participants were female.

Description of the General Procedure

The selected subjects were randomly assigned to the two questionnaires. Initially 150 persons were assigned to the JDI and 150 to the ABB.

The selected persons were asked in a letter, which was mailed out a week before the questionnaires were delivered, to participate in this investigation. They were informed of the purpose of the research and given the assurance that individual responses would be held in strict confidence. The questionnaires were marked with a number which made it possible for the researcher to identify the respondent only as much as necessary for the research.

In the middle of April, 1977, the questionnaires were sent out by university mail to the subjects. The employees had 10 days to answer the questionnaires. They were requested to write their name at the back of the questionnaire if they desired a short summary of the results of the investigation. More than 50% of the respondents used this opportunity.
The return rate was similar for the two instruments. The JDI population returned 85 out of 150 (57%) and the ABB population returned 79 out of 150 (52%). The returned JDI's all could be used and there was little missing data. For the ABB the situation was different. Six of the 79 returned questionnaires could not be used. The final useable questionnaires were 73 out of 150 (49%). There were some missing data, mostly in the scale "company." See Appendix A-C for information about the form of the questionnaires and the distributed letter.

Prior to this study, performance ratings had been accumulated from the supervisors by the University Personnel Office. These ratings were utilized as one possible correlate of job satisfaction. Additional data were also accumulated including sick leave hours for the different individuals, as well as annual leave hours. The data analysis was done by computer using a correlational model.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The results of this study are in two forms. First, the job satisfaction as measured by the JDI and second as measured by the ABB.

The results of the JDI shows high or moderate satisfaction in all scales except "pay" and "promotion." As shown in Table 1, "pay" got an unusually low score. The relationships between JDI scores and performance ratings are very inconsistent. The correlations are between $r = -.24$ and $r = .15$. The relationship between absenteeism and the JDI is inverted and shows correlations between $r = .08$ and $r = .22$.

The results of the ABB scales indicates low satisfaction in "pay," "working conditions" and "development." The scale measuring "company" indicates a low level of satisfaction with a $\bar{x} = 36.09$. The other means are shown in Table 3. The other scales show moderate satisfaction but no extreme values. The relationship between ABB scores and performance ratings are similar to the results of the JDI sample with correlations between $r = -.15$ and $r = .20$. The overall job satisfaction shows correlation (median $r = .35$) with the different scales of the ABB.
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Table 1

Comparison of the Different Means of the JDI and the ABB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>JDI $\bar{x}$</th>
<th>ABB $\bar{x}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>34.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>18.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>26.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>39.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>43.28</td>
<td>32.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>36.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>36.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means as shown in this table are not directly comparable, because of the difference in the scales, see Table 3 and Table 5.
Table 2

Frequency Distribution of the Two Different Samples for Age, Sex and Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE Years</th>
<th>JDI (N = 85/100%)</th>
<th>ABB (N = 73/100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequences</td>
<td>Percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 - 33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 - 42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - 52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 more</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>JDI (N = 85/100%)</th>
<th>ABB (N = 73/100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequences</td>
<td>Percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>95.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>JDI (N = 85/100%)</th>
<th>ABB (N = 73/100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequences</td>
<td>Percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or less</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 more</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age = 2.38
Sex = .34
Tenure = 2.26
correlation with performance is \( r = -.12 \), however, this relationship is negative and very small. A small negative relationship was obtained between the ABB scales and absenteeism data, see Table 9, page 35.

Testing of Significant Differences in the Two Samples

The two samples are slightly different in sex, age, and tenure. Table 2 shows the frequency distributions of the characteristics for both samples. The Chi-square test to detect significant differences between the two samples indicates that there are no significant differences at the .05 level between the two samples in age, sex, and tenure.

Using the same test, no differences between groups at the .05 level were found for absenteeism and performance. The significance tests were carried out with slightly smaller sample sizes for performance (JDI N=54, ABB N=52) because of incomplete data. These two smaller samples were almost the same as the larger sample (JDI N=85, ABB N=73) with regard to such factors as sex, age and tenure. The differences were also insignificant.

Description of the JDI Scales

In Table 3, the means, medians and standard deviations
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean Univ.</th>
<th>Mean Smith</th>
<th>Median Univ.</th>
<th>Median Smith</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Univ.</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>9.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>17.28**</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>13.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>13.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>41.13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>43.28</td>
<td>42.09</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(C - o) = 6.45 \quad p > .01*

of the different JDI scales are presented. They are compared with norm data provided by Smith, et al. (1967). Norms for females were used. (see Appendix B)

The maximum possible score is 54 and the minimum is 0. The data from Smith are representative of semiskilled female workers in America. There was a significant difference at the .01 level between the results of this study and the norm data for "Pay." The other scales are not significantly different from Smith's normative results.

The eleven intercorrelations of the different JDI scales, which are presented in Table 4, are low enough so that the discrim-
nation of each scale can be considered adequate. All but two are significant at the .05 level.

Table 4

Inter correlation of the JDI Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Co-worker</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05

Description of the ABB Scales

For the ABB scale there are no data available which can be used as norms. There are data available which were obtained in Germany but none from America. (see Appendix C)

The data of the ABB scales have the same dimensions as the JDI scales. High scores indicate high satisfaction and low scores indicate low satisfaction. Table 5 shows the different scale means, medians and standard deviations for all the ABB scales. The means, and medians must be analyzed in respect to
the highest and lowest item values, which is different for nearly every scale. The scales "supervision" and "co-worker" tend to express satisfaction and the other scales "development," "company," and "pay" tend to show dissatisfaction.

Table 5

Means, Medians, and Standard Deviations of all ABB Scales Illustrated by the Highest and the Lowest Possible Item Score/Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Possible Values</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39.64</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.76</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Conditions</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the comparison of the German item means and the item means obtained in the university group. This comparison shows that for certain job dimensions, the satisfaction in the university group is lower than in the German groups. These data indicate that the university group's satisfaction with "pay"
and "company" is relatively low. Higher satisfaction is found in the job dimension "work." The results for "supervision" and "co-worker" seem to be moderate values compared with the German values.

Table 6

Comparison of the German Item Means with the University Item Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>University Item Mean</th>
<th>German Item Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>3.47 (2.90 - 3.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>2.30 (2.60 - 3.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>2.63 (2.42 - 3.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>3.04 (2.82 - 3.52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>3.27 (3.13 - 3.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Conditions</td>
<td>2.78 (2.62 - 3.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>2.51 (2.64 - 3.55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another type of scale is contained within the ABB. This scale measures overall job satisfaction and life satisfaction. The overall job satisfaction had a mean of 4.58 and a median of 4 in this study. The highest possible score for this scale is 7 and the lowest is 1. Fifty percent of the scale would be 4, so a mean of 4.58 tends toward satisfaction. When compared with the German data, this
value is slightly below the overall value of 5. The German values are all over 5.

This moderate overall satisfaction with the job agrees with the different ABB scales as shown in Table 7. This table also contains the intercorrelations of the different scales and the median correlation is $r = .28$. It can be assumed from this that the scales do discriminate. This table also suggests that there is a significant intercorrelation between overall job satisfaction

Table 7

Correlation Matrix for Overall Satisfaction and ABB Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over Sat.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup.</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-w.</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Cond.</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co.</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05
and the "work," "pay," and "development," and "work conditions" scales. The relatively low overall satisfaction may result out of the low rating for "pay" and "development." Since the results of this study indicate that pay is strongly related to job satisfaction, it seems logical that a low rating on the "pay" scale would affect any overall rating of job satisfaction.

Overall life satisfaction, which is measured with the same scale as overall job satisfaction, has a mean and a median of 4 and shows a correlation with the overall job satisfaction of $r = .07$.

The ABB scale also provided for an overall ranking of the different job dimensions. This ranking indicates the importance of work as a motivator to this group of employees. Rewards were ranked second and peer group and supervision are next. The results show the following ranking:

1. Work
2. Pay
3. Co-worker, Development
4. Supervision
5. Working conditions
6. Company
7. ------

No factor seemed so unimportant that it was clearly ranked in the last place.
Description of the Performance Ratings

As previously mentioned, the analysis of performance rating used a sample of reduced size because only employees were used who were employed at least one year. (see Appendix D)

The average rating for both samples was in the category of "very good," which seems to be surprisingly high. Actual ratings used were "outstanding," "very good," and "competent." The evaluation "below standard" was only used once and the ranking "poor" was never applied.

This tendency in the ratings may have different reasons:

1. The employees were ranked according to their performance level.

2. The employees who were low or poor performers were not employed more than one year and, therefore, not in this evaluation.

3. This skewed result of rating can be described as "leniency." The reasons for this phenomena could be that the appraisal or rating system was new and the supervisors had little experience with it, or when in doubt, tended to rate higher than the mid-point (see Creswell, 1963; Campbell, et al., 1973).

In Table 8, no significant correlation at the .05 level of this
Table 8
Correlation between Performance and Job Satisfaction for JDI and ABB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Performance Summary Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf. Sum. Eval.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Development</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study are similar to the findings of the previous studies. The relationship between job satisfaction and performance is supposed to be a very complex one and can result in positive as well as in negative relationships.

The two scales of the ABB, which are additional to the JDI scales, "work conditions" and "company" show very low correlations with performance (r work cond. = -.05, r company = -.03).
Development and promotion in both samples were related to performance. This result might be seen as indicating that a person with high possibilities of promotion should show some improved performance. Even though this positive relationship was found, the correlation was too low to make any definite conclusions. The correlations between performance and job satisfaction were also tested for non linearity, but no evidence of a non linearity was found.

Correlation between Absenteeism and Job Satisfaction

The obtained correlations between absenteeism and job satisfaction are in conflict with the results of other studies which show a consistent negative relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism. Table 9 shows that only one correlation is significant at the .05 level which is with "work."
### Table 9

Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Absenteeism Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Absenteeism Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Development</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05*
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Discussion of Findings

This research was primarily a study of job satisfaction using two different measuring procedures for two similar samples of employees. The two samples were shown to be similar in some important individual variables, such as age, sex, and tenure. Income and educational level were considered not to be essential since only one job level was involved. The ability to identify areas of job satisfaction was compared using the two questionnaires. Other comparisons were also made utilizing performance ratings and absenteeism data against job satisfaction scores.

As indicated in the discussion of the JDI scales, the very low value of satisfaction with "pay" is obvious. According to Locke (1976) the inequity of monetary rewards can be a highly important indicator of dissatisfaction. Nonmonetary rewards could possibly compensate for the dissatisfaction in this area. Some of these might be promotion, nonmonetary benefits, security of the job, etc. The satisfaction scores for promotion are also relatively low. This suggests that the nonmonetary

36
reward system available in this organization is also not satisfying for this group of employees.

These results are somewhat surprising because the other job dimensions suggest moderate or even high satisfaction. The satisfaction with "work," "supervisor" and "co-worker" might be explained by seeing that these areas are not directly dependent on the organizational policy but come from the work and the immediate people at work.

The results of the ABB scale are more complicated to analyze than the JDI scales, because of different number of items in the scales and the lack of nomative data for comparison. The comparative German data are only of value in providing a kind of orientation as to which values indicate satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The ratings on the ABB scale for "pay" suggest some level of dissatisfaction. The same can be said for the scale "development." Similar results are also apparent in the JDI scales. The two additional scales "working condition" and "company" also were rated low. The obtained mean for "company" is lower than for all eight German studies (see Table 6). From Table 7 it can be seen that "company" is highly associated with pay and development so that 34% of the variance on this item is accounted for by the "pay" variable. This high relationship
interfers with the interpretation of the remaining scales. Because "pay" and "development" are also significantly correlated with the overall satisfaction, it is possible that other dimensions of the job will be affected by the dissatisfaction with the reward system of the organization.

The ability of the two different questionnaires, JDI and ABB, to identify specific job dimensions which are associated with job satisfaction or dissatisfaction seem to be similar. Both scales identify two areas of employee dissatisfaction and both identified similar areas of satisfaction. However, the satisfaction with the "supervisor" is not as obvious in the ABB scale as in the JDI scale.

As noted previously, the relationship found between absenteeism and job satisfaction is low and inverted. This is consistent (except for "co-workers" in ABB) with the published findings. There are two or three possible reasons why the correlations between job satisfaction and absenteeism are so low: First, annual accumulated leave time is not eliminated from the absenteeism data. It is a policy of this organization that employees have, dependent on their tenure and job level, an amount of free hours available which can be used at the employees' discretion. Second, the studies of absenteeism which were reported earlier dealt only with avoidable absenteeism. In this study it was
impossible to make a distinction between avoidable and unavoidable absenteeism.

Finally, another reason is based on the individuals who were studied and not on the data. The population for this study consisted of 95% women and 56.5% of them are in the age between 20-30. This means that many of these women have children and families. Because it is still a primary responsibility for women to care for the family and children, even if they are working, then absenteeism for this group could be high. However, these absences need to be seen as unavoidable and not related to the satisfaction on the job.

The relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism in the two different samples was similar for some areas and different for other areas as shown in Table 9. The difference between the two scales in their relationship with performance is not particularly notable as shown in Table 8. The only important difference found was for the "co-worker" scale. In this instance there is a relatively high correlation of -0.24 (high in comparison to other scales) with performance rating on the JDI scale and essentially no correlation with the ABB scale.

The "High" relationship found between development and performance r=.20 would indicate that increased opportunities for promotion might make the job performance better.
"Work" shows a r=.12. This low positive relationship might be considered because of the high ranking of "work" in the ranking of the scales to be significant in a clinical sense in spite of not being statistically significant.

As indicated before, the relationship between absenteeism and satisfaction seems to be different for the JDI and the ABB. However, when performance and job satisfaction are compared, the results of the two measures are similar.

Additionally, it should be mentioned that the dissimilarities of the two measures in their relationship to absenteeism and performance may not be the fault of the job satisfaction scales, but rather due to the performance and absenteeism data. Only one performance scale was available and the general sick leave was used for absenteeism.

General Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to compare two measures of job satisfaction. Specifically, to compare the German ABB questionnaire and the American JDI. The results of the two questionnaires are similar. It, therefore, appears that the German scale does an effective job of measuring job satisfaction. The two additional scales of the ABB have their usefulness, but
in this study it was found that "company" was highly intercorrelated and as a consequence it is not very discriminative. "Work condition" is important if it is for the special purpose of a study to investigate this area. For the employees, it seems to be one of the least important factors for job satisfaction. The "low" correlation of overall job satisfaction with the different scales indicates that this scale measures an area which is different from the other measured areas, and, therefore, it is of value.

The varying results for satisfaction in the different jobs studied show that there are some problem areas for the organization that need further studies. The major area would be in the reward system of the organization and the general organizational policy. The human interactions are functioning very well and appear to be highly satisfactory for this employee group.

The job satisfaction of these employees seems to be primarily dependent upon the work and personal interactions and not the organization. This is probably true because many of these employees are at work here temporarily. These individuals may also find the university environment comfortable and appealing, thereby providing an incentive to take or keep such jobs. However, in spite of this, these employees still rate pay and organization lower than other satisfaction sources.
Based upon the results of this study, equivalence studies should be done in addition to this comparison study. In the present study this was not done due to an expected low return rate and high carry over effect.
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Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

Attached you will find the questionnaire I wrote you about last week. This is a short (about 10 to 20 minutes) survey about your job and your feelings about it. Please answer the questions as honestly as you can. Do not spend too much time thinking about your responses; simply give your first impression.

You have received one of two instruments I am studying. The intent of the study is to see which of these two might be most valuable in studying jobs like yours. Please be assured that your responses will be held in strict confidence and only group results will be developed. Because I am studying only a small group of jobs, it is important that each individual responds to the survey.

If you wish a summary of the results of this study, please indicate this on the back of the questionnaire along with your name and department.

Please return the questionnaire by Monday, May 2. I am asking this because I am an Austrian student on a fellowship. My fellowship expires in June and I would like to complete this project before I leave. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marianne Osterkorn

P.S. Please return the questionnaire to:

Marianne Osterkorn
c/o Institutional Research
THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX

CODE NUMBER

Company

City

Please fill in the above blanks and then turn the page.

Think of your present work. What is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word given below, write

Y for "Yes" if it describes your work

N for "No" if it does NOT describe it

? if you cannot decide

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

--- Fascinating
--- Routine
--- Satisfying
--- Boring
--- Good
--- Creative
--- Respected
--- Hot
--- Pleasant
--- Useful
--- Tiresome
--- Healthy
--- Challenging
--- On your feet
--- Frustrating
--- Simple
--- Endless
--- Gives sense of accomplishment

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words describe your present pay? In the blank beside each word, put

Y if it describes your pay

N if it does NOT describe it

? if you cannot decide

PRESENT PAY

--- Income adequate for normal expenses
--- Satisfactory profit sharing
--- Barely live on income
--- Bad
--- Income provides luxuries
--- Insecure
--- Less than I deserve
--- Highly paid
--- Underpaid

Bowling Green State University, 1975
Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words describe these? In the blank beside each word, put 

\( \frac{Y}{N} \) for "Yes" if it describes your opportunities for promotion 
\( \frac{N}{?} \) for "No" if it does NOT describe them 
\( \frac{?}{?} \) if you cannot decide

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION**

- Good opportunities for promotion
- Opportunity somewhat limited
- Promotion on ability
- Dead-end job
- Good chance for promotion
- Unfair promotion policy
- Infrequent promotions
- Regular promotions
- Fairly good chance for promotion

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words describe this supervision? In the blank beside each word, put 

\( \frac{Y}{N} \) if it describes the supervision you get on your job 
\( \frac{N}{?} \) if it does NOT describe it 
\( \frac{?}{?} \) if you cannot decide

**SUPERVISION ON PRESENT job**

- Asks my advice
- Hard to please
- Impolite
- Praises good work
- Tactful
- Influential
- Up-to-date
- Doesn't supervise enough
- Quick tempered
- Tells me where I stand
- Annoying
- Stubborn
- Knows job well
- Bad
- Intelligent
- Leaves me on my own
- Around when needed
- Lazy

Think of the majority of the people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words describe these people? In the blank beside each word, put 

\( \frac{Y}{N} \) if it describes the people you work with 
\( \frac{N}{?} \) if it does NOT describe them 
\( \frac{?}{?} \) if you cannot decide

**PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB**

- Stimulating
- Boring
- Slow
- Ambitious
- Stupid
- Responsible
- Fast
- Intelligent
- Easy to make enemies
- Talk too much
- Smart
- Lazy
- Unpleasant
- No privacy
- Active
- Narrow interests
- Loyal
- Hard to meet
APPENDIX C

ABB - QUESTIONNAIRE

On the following pages, please indicate your feelings about your present job (e.g., co-workers, work conditions, supervisor, etc.). Please give your personal opinion.

**MY SUPERVISOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unpopular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have confidence in him/her</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Poor communicator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you find your supervisor trustworthy, a good communicator but not very popular, you should mark (as in the above example) "Agree" for Unpopular, "Strongly Agree" for I have confidence in him/her, and "Strongly Disagree" for Poor Communicator.

It is clear that every job has its good and bad points. You should answer for the way in which you generally view your job. Please don't take long to answer; your first opinion is best. Please don't skip lines. Check one of the four alternatives on each line.

**MY CO-WORKERS**

By co-workers, it is meant those persons with whom you work directly or with whom you have contact through your job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stubborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am content with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quarrelsome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Sympathetic
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6. Unable
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

7. Work together
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

8. Lazy
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

9. Dull
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

10. Pleasant
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

**MY SUPERVISOR**

You should respond only about your direct supervisor; that is, the one who is one echelon higher than you, the one who can give you orders, and who controls your work.

11. Unjust
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

12. Active
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

13. Considerate
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

14. Impolite
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

15. Unable
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

16. Supportive
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

17. Fair
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

18. Unpopular
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

19. Trustworthy
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

20. Poor communicator
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

21. Democratic
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

22. Complaining
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

**MY WORK**

Consider the content of your job and the functions it fulfills.

23. Pleasant
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

24. Boring
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

25. No change
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

26. Not stimulating
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

27. Useless
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

28. Respected
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

29. Frustrating
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

30. Not challenging
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

31. I can see results
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

32. I can utilize my abilities
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

33. I can utilize my own ideas
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

34. Responsible
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree
### MY WORKING CONDITIONS

Consider the conditions under which you are working (environment, temperature, hours spent, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Exhausting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Confusing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Good illumination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Noisy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Confining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Unhealthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Comfortable temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Fatiguing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Convenient working time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MY COMPANY

Consider the university as an entire organization (not only your department).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48. Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Is interested in the opinions of its employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Unresponsive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Progressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Complicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Bad working climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Is confusing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I am proud of it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. I feel comfortable here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Disappointing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Poor planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Does just a little for its employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Secure place to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MY DEVELOPMENT

Consider your personal development (the possibility of promotions, the possibility of training, the opportunity to function with more responsibilities, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62. Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Not obvious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Not regulated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. No possibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. According to efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Disappointing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Lets me grow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MY PAY

Consider the salary you receive for your work (including extra pay).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72. Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Feel content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Not appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Not just</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Confusing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. According to my efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. According to my responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you now consider everything which is included in your job, how content are you, generally speaking, with your work?

Please mark the appropriate face.
If you now consider not only your work situation, but the whole situation in which you are living right now (apartment, cost of living, health, love, politics, neighbors, etc.), how content, generally speaking, are you with your life?

Please mark the appropriate face.

You were asked this questionnaire to indicate your opinions of different parts of your working situation. These parts, however, may not be of equal importance to you (e.g., your working conditions may be more important than your pay, etc.). Therefore, you are now asked to rank each of these seven parts in the order in which they are most important to you. Please use number 1 to indicate the most important, number 2 to indicate the second-most important, and so on to number 7, which indicates the least important to you. Place the number on the line to the left of the category.

1. My Co-Workers
2. My Supervisor
3. My Work
4. My Working Conditions
5. My Company
6. My Development
7. My Pay

Thank you very much!

Please return this questionnaire to:

Marianne Osterkorn
C/o Institutional Research
Western Michigan University
APPENDIX D

Summary Evaluation

Please check the evaluation which, on an overall basis considering all relative factors, most closely reflects performance of this staff member relative to job requirements.

___ A. Outstanding
___ B. Very Good
___ C. Competent
___ D. Below Standard
___ E. Poor

STAFF MEMBER'S COMMENTS

This evaluation was discussed with me on ____________________________ (date)

REMARKS:

(Staff Member's Signature) (Date)
Your signature is required to attest to the fact that you have been rated and have been made aware of what the rating is. Your signature does not bind you to total agreement or disagreement with the rating.

PERFORMANCE REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE: ____________________________ Date

TITLE: ____________________________________________________________

RATING REVIEWED BY: ____________________________________________

(Reviewer's Signature) Date

TITLE: ____________________________________________________________