



6-1964

## An Investigation of Employee Attitudes and Employee Performance

Richard V. Washburn

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters\\_theses](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses)



Part of the Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons

---

### Recommended Citation

Washburn, Richard V., "An Investigation of Employee Attitudes and Employee Performance" (1964).  
*Master's Theses*. 4043.

[https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters\\_theses/4043](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/4043)

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact [wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu](mailto:wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu).



AN INVESTIGATION OF EMPLOYEE  
ATTITUDES AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

by  
Richard V. Washburn

A thesis presented to the  
Faculty of the School of  
Graduate Studies in partial  
fulfillment of the  
Degree of Master of Arts

Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, Michigan

June, 1964

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN 49001

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation for the assistance of E. J. Asher, F. A. Fatzinger and R. H. Schmidt in the preparation of this paper.

The extensive cooperation of E. S. Feenstra, Pathology Department Manager at The Upjohn Company, is also greatly appreciated.

Richard V. Washburn

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements . . . . .	ii
Index of Tables . . . . .	iv
Introduction . . . . .	1
Method	
Subjects . . . . .	6
Materials . . . . .	6
Procedure . . . . .	7
Results . . . . .	8
Discussion . . . . .	15
Summary . . . . .	19
Appendix . . . . .	20
References . . . . .	25

INDEX OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 The Relationship Between Performance and Sex, Marital Status and Education . . . . .	10
Table 2 The Relationship Between Performance and Age, Number of Dependents and Length of Service . . . . .	11
Table 3 Statistical Analysis of Job Satisfaction Index (Part II) <u>vs.</u> Performance Rank . . . . .	12
Table 4 Rank of Each Job Preference Factor (Part III) <u>vs.</u> Performance Rank . . . . .	13
Table 5 Statistical Analysis of Company Satisfaction Index (Part IV) <u>vs.</u> Performance Rank . . . . .	14

AN INVESTIGATION OF EMPLOYEE  
ATTITUDES AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Industrial managers are showing an increasing interest in employee attitudes, opinions and morale. This conclusion is reflected in the fact that many companies conduct attitude and opinion surveys, train their supervisors in human relations and provide other functions designed to create favorable attitudes.

Management concern for the promotion of favorable employee attitudes may be attributed to two main factors. Part of the concern may be attributed to a general trend toward greater social responsibilities of industry. The other, and perhaps greater part can be attributed to an assumption that employees with favorable attitudes are more productive than those with generally unfavorable attitudes. Management interest in a relationship such as this is quite understandable in the modern competitive economic system, where productivity is emphasized to such a great extent.

Brayfield and Crockett (1955) suggested, however, that it is time to question the strategic and ethical merits of selling to industry an assumed relationship between employee attitudes and employee performance. They emphasized that, although productivity or performance has economic value to industry, it does not mean that productivity is the only or even the most important aspect of organizational behavior.

At any rate it is apparent that the economic motives of management (and ultimately the society) have influenced the methodology of investigations of the relationship between employee attitudes and employee performance. This influence manifests itself particularly in the selection of performance criteria, a point which will be discussed in detail following a survey of pertinent research into the area of employee attitudes and employee performance.

Investigations of employee attitudes have multiplied geometrically during the past few years. Although Houser pioneered the field in 1927, little interest was generated until the early 1940's. In 1957 the Psychological Service of Pittsburgh made an intensive review of research on job attitudes covering nearly two thousand writings. The bulk of these writings was produced in the last twenty years.

The classic study of employee attitudes was the investigation by Kornhauser and Sharp (1932). The study took place in 1930 in a Neenah, Wisconsin mill operated by Kimberly-Clark Corporation. The subjects were 200-300 young girls engaged in routine, repetitive jobs at machines. Attitudes were assessed by questionnaire and interviews. The questionnaire was patterned after Houser's and covered a wide range of specific attitudes (toward supervisor, repetitiveness and speed of work, personnel policies, wages, etc.). Relationships between attitudes and intelligence, age, schooling, marital status, home life, emotional adjustment and supervision were also studied. Scores were computed for groups of items and item responses were analyzed. Inter-correlations among the item groups ran about .4 to .5. Kornhauser and Sharp concluded that efficiency ratings of employees showed no relationship to their attitudes.

The Kornhauser and Sharp study illustrates the individual analysis technique of surveying attitudes. This type of study relates a distribution of individual scores on an attitude scale to some index of individual performance on the job. Characteristically, a single occupational group is studied in such an investigation and generally a single over-all index of attitudes is used, although this was not the case in the Kornhauser and Sharp study.

Another individual analysis investigation was reported by Gadel and Kriedt (1952). The attitudes of 193 male IBM operators at numerous divisions of the Prudential Insurance Company were analyzed. The performance criterion consisted of rank-order ratings on over-all job performance made by the immediate supervisor. Ratings were converted to standard scores and the correlation found between the performance ratings and the index of job satisfaction was found to

be .08, which was considered insignificant.

In the sales field, Habbe (1947) reported the studies of the Life Insurance Agency Management Association. In this investigation the performance criterion was an arbitrary line drawn at \$200,000 in sales (obtained by self-reports of salesmen). The correlation found between sales performance and job satisfaction was insignificant.

Bernberg (1952) investigated the attitudes of nearly 1,000 employees of an aircraft plant. The performance criterion was the weighted score of a graphic rating scale with the five dimensions of adaptability, dependability, job knowledge, quality and quantity. Correlations between the four attitude measures and the performance criterion ranged from .02 to .05.

In a similarly designed study, Baxter (1953) found a correlation of .23 between job satisfaction and job performance which was significant at the .01 level of significance. Performance criterion in the Baxter study consisted of supervisors ratings on a 5-point, 9-item graphic rating scale.

Another procedure for assessing employee attitudes and relating them to performance is termed group analysis. Here, attitudes are determined individually, but the average for the group or the percentage responding in a certain manner is related to some estimate of performance or productivity of the group as a whole. Comparisons are generally made by departments within a firm rather than by occupation.

The prototype study for group analysis was reported by Katz and associates (1950). It was undertaken at the Prudential Insurance Company. Four attitude variables were specified: a) pride in work group, b) intrinsic job satisfaction, c) company involvement, and d) financial and job status satisfaction. Performance criterion was quantity of work based on production records. Only pride in work group showed a significant relationship with performance. Company involvement in this case was synonymous with company identification rather than satisfaction with the company.



A second study by Katz and associates (1951) investigated attitudes of section-hand employees of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad. Productivity criteria consisted of over-all quality and quantity ratings by supervisors. No relationship was found.

Lawshe and Nagle (1953), in a more recent study, investigated 208 non-supervisory office employees of the International Harvester Company in an attitude toward supervisor scale. The scores were related to group productivity by means of the paired comparison method. Executives were asked to indicate "the department in each pair which is, in your opinion, doing it's job better." The authors were careful to point out that one does not know for certain what criterion the raters used. The correlation coefficient was .86, significant at the .01 level. The results from this study have been criticized by Brayfield and Crockett (1955) who suggest that, in this case, the attitude measure might better have been called a supervisor behavior- or performance-rating device.

The results from the group analysis design are, according to Brayfield and Crockett (1955), substantially in agreement with the previous findings of minimal or no relationship between employee attitudes and employee performance. Gilmer (1961) pointed out in a more optimistic statement that in 1957, twenty-six studies were cited in which some quantitative relationship between productivity and job attitudes had been measured. Fourteen studies indicated positive correlations, nine studies indicated no relationship and in three studies a negative correlation was found.

The contradictions between these studies are still without absolute resolution. Gilmer suggested that they may in part be due to differences in research methods, in the workers surveyed or in the work situation. Brayfield and Crockett (1955) indicated that such contradictions might be due to differences in operational definitions (that is, in the form of different questionnaires) or perhaps in the performance criteria. Harding and associates (1961) suggested that one reason for the lack of relationship usually found between attitudes and performance is the failure to take into account important biographical and situational variables.

This author feels that the inconsistent findings of studies relating employee performance and employee attitudes are the result of a combination of factors; the most important of which is the varying performance criterion variable. It is hypothesized for the purpose of this study that the attitudes of employees ranked "high" on overall job performance will be significantly different than the attitudes of employees ranked "low" on the same criterion. In addition, it is hypothesized that a questionnaire which includes the attitude variables under study, accompanied by certain biographical variables can adequately reflect differences of employee attitudes, when interpreted within the situational framework of an organization.

## METHOD

### Subjects

The subjects were salaried employees in the research division of a local pharmaceutical concern. The majority of them were laboratory technicians although some were animal caretakers and a few were secretaries. All were members of a single department. Most of the subjects were non-supervisory personnel, but several performed supervisory functions.

### Materials

The questionnaire consisted of four main parts: a personal data section; a job satisfaction scale; a job preference section; and an orientation toward the company scale (Appendix).

Part I consisted of a personal data sheet designed to obtain information regarding sex, age, marital status, number of dependents, education and tenure of the subjects. The importance of obtaining biographical variables was indicated previously. Assessment of the biographical variables is also important in the analysis of the groups from a merit-rating standpoint. The limitations of ranking or rating can be attributed to certain tendencies on the part of the rater. Tiffin and McCormick (1958) emphasized the importance of analysis from this standpoint. Studies were cited which showed that age, length of service and other biographical variables influenced raters on numerous occasions.

Part II was the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Blank (1951). Likert's scoring technique was applied to eighteen Thurstone-scaled items. The index of job satisfaction has a maximum of ninety points and a minimum of eighteen points. When the form was completed by 231 female office workers, Brayfield (1951) reported a correlated split-half reliability coefficient of .87.

Part III consisted of a list of sixteen job preference factors. The items represent a compilation of items from studies by Wyatt (1937), Jurgensen (1948) and Raube (1947).

Part IV is a typical example of attitude scales designed to determine the general attitude of employee toward their company. The items have scale values determined by the Thurstone and Chave technique. The scale and its accompanying scale values was taken from an article

by Bergen (1939).

Procedure

The department manager was asked to rank the subjects using overall job performance as the criterion. Care was taken not to delineate the criterion measure any further. The questionnaires were coded to identify the upper and lower 30% of the employees (thirteen in each category) and the middle 40% (nineteen employees). The coding system was explained to the manager who then underlined the name of each employee on his appropriately coded questionnaire. In this way, the rank assigned to each employee remained unknown to all (including the experimenter) except the manager. The appropriate form was then given to each employee. The form was accompanied by a sheet explaining that the questionnaire was being used by the author for a graduate report. It stressed that individuals would not be identified in any way and that only results of the group as a whole would be reported. The author was a part-time employee in the department used for the research.

## RESULTS

A total of thirty-nine forms were returned: twelve ranked high; fifteen ranked middle; and twelve ranked low. The thirty-nine forms represented 86% of the total.

Table 1 indicates the percentage of respondents in each of the ranking categories in relation to the variables sex, marital status and extent of education. Approximately three-fourths of the respondents in each ranking category were males and nearly all (75%-92%) were married. About one-half of the respondents in each ranking category had a high school diploma while 25% of the high-ranked respondents had a college degree as compared with 8% of the low-ranked category.

Table 2 relates the ranking categories to age, number of dependents and tenure. The most frequently occurring age in the high group was 30-39 as compared with 40-49 in the low group. The average number of dependents in the high group was three while the average for the low group was two. In regard to length of service, 91% of the high group had fifteen years or less in comparison with 49% of the low group.

Since the frequencies in many of the categories were quite small, statistical analysis of the factors was considered inappropriate. From observation, two points deserved further mention. Nearly one-half of the respondents in the middle category had more than four dependents. This percentage is considerably larger than either of the other categories. It also appeared that the high category contained a smaller proportion of long tenure employees when compared with the low category.

Table 3 shows the mean job satisfaction index of high vs. low categories. A t-test of the difference between the means indicated a significant difference at the .01 level of significance. It should be noted that the two variances could not be considered equal and therefore could not be pooled in the test of significance. The variance of the low-ranked group was nearly four times larger than the high-ranked group variance.

Table 1

The Relationship Between Performance  
and Sex, Marital Status and Education

(Percentage of respondents in each category)

Biographical Variable		High	Middle	Low
Sex	Male	83	73	83
	Female	17	27	17
Marital Status	Single	8	13	25
	Married	92	87	75
Education	High School	50	53	58
	Some College	25	27	33
	College Degree	25	20	8

Table 2  
 The Relationship Between Performance  
 and Age, Number of Dependents and Length of Service

(Percentage of respondents in each category)

Biographical Variable		High	Rank Middle	Low
Age	19	0	7	0
	20-29	25	7	0
	30-39	50	27	33
	40-49	17	47	50
	50-	8	13	17
Number of Dependents	0	17	20	17
	1	8	7	17
	2	17	13	33
	3	33	7	17
	4	17	7	17
	More	8	47	0
Years of Tenure	5	33	7	8
	6-10	33	33	8
	11-15	25	20	33
	16-20	0	27	25
	21-25	8	13	17
	26-	0	0	8

Table 3  
 Statistical Analysis of Job Satisfaction  
 Index (Part II) vs. Performance Rank

	$\bar{x}$	SD <sup>o</sup>	SE <sup>o</sup>	"F"	t
High	69.5	6.4	1.8		
Low	55.7	12.5	3.6	3.8*	3.41**

\*F<sub>.95</sub> (11,11) = 2.82

\*\*t<sub>.01</sub> (11) = 3.11

<sup>o</sup>Estimate of population parameter based on sample scores.



Table 4 indicates the rank of each preference factor in relation to the total group and each of the three categories. Although statistical analysis was deemed inappropriate because of the low frequencies in many of the categories, casual observation revealed several apparent differences in the responses of the high and low groups.

For the group as a whole, "security" was the most frequently mentioned factor. "Good boss" ranked second and "opportunity to show initiative" ranked third. While "security" ranked first in the low group, the same factor ranked 4.5 in the high group. "Voice in decisions" ranked 16.0 in the low group but 8.5 in the high group. "Type of work" ranked 11.5 in the low group and 4.5 in the high group. Surprisingly, "opportunity for advancement" and "opportunity to learn a job" ranked higher in the low group than in the high group. The reverse was true, however, with the factor "steady work." The item with the largest apparent difference was "opportunity to use ideas," which ranked 1.5 in the high group and 16.0 in the low group.

The mean company satisfaction index of each category is found in Table 5. A t-test of the difference between the high vs. low group means indicated a significant difference at the .05 level of significance. Again, as with job satisfaction, it was a positive relationship.

Table 4  
 Rank of Each Preference Factor (Part III)  
vs. Performance Rank

Preference Factor	Performance Rank			Combined
	Low	Middle	High	
Voice in decisions	16.0	16.0	8.5*	13.5
Easy work	16.0	16.0	14.0	16.0
Opportunity to use ideas	16.0	7.0	1.5*	8.0
Good boss	3.5	4.5	1.5	2.0
Working conditions	11.5	11.5	16.0	13.5
Benefits	6.5	11.5	11.5	9.5
Security	1.0	1.0	4.5*	1.0
Type of work	11.5	4.5	4.5*	6.5
Opportunity to be of public service	11.5	9.0	11.5	11.0
High pay	8.5	11.5	8.5	9.5
Good working companions	3.5	7.0	4.5	4.5
Opportunity for advancement	3.5	7.0	8.5*	6.5
Opportunity to learn a job	8.5	16.0	16.0*	13.5
Steady work	3.5	2.5	8.5*	4.5
Working hours	11.5	11.5	16.0	3.0
Opportunity to show initiative	6.5	2.5	4.5	3.0

\*items with the largest apparent difference (high vs. low groups)

Table 5  
 Statistical Analysis of Company Satisfaction  
 Index (Part IV) vs. Performance Rank

	$\bar{x}$	SD <sup>o</sup>	SE <sup>o</sup>	"F"	t
High	7.35	1.49	0.43	2.46*	2.30**
Low	5.49	2.34	0.67		

\*F<sub>.95</sub> (11,11) = 2.82

\*\*t<sub>.05</sub> (22) = 2.07

<sup>o</sup>Estimate of population parameter based on sample scores.

## DISCUSSION

The information in Part I of the questionnaire characterized the biographical variables of the sample. The group as a whole was predominantly male, over thirty-five years of age, married and high school educated (at least). The factor which appeared most important from a comparison of high and low group standpoint was length of service. The factor, age, was also unequally distributed but to a lesser extent than length of service. The fact that a larger proportion of low-ranked employees had longer tenure when compared to the high-ranked group could have resulted from two possibilities. First, it could have been an accurate characterization. Secondly, as Tiffin and McCormick (1958) have pointed out, it could have been an artifact of the merit-rating system.

The finding that job satisfaction was positively related to performance both supports and contradicts previous findings. The relationship between company satisfaction and job performance was presumed to be a somewhat more original finding. The literature neither supports nor contradicts this finding. It was felt that Katz's "company involvement" could not be compared with the company satisfaction scale in this study. Katz's scale measured the degree of company identification, not the degree of satisfaction with the company.

The two relationships found between job satisfaction, company satisfaction and the performance criterion supported the hypothesis that attitudes can be differentiated with respect to over-all job performance. It is this author's opinion that job satisfaction and company satisfaction within this framework are extensions or reflections of the over-all job performance rating. This might explain the lack of relationship found when quantity or efficiency ratings are used because they fail to include the "over-all" concept.

Part III of the questionnaire, concerning job preference factors, provided some rather interesting results. One may conclude on the basis of Table 4 that the high-ranked employees attach more importance to "the opportunity to use ideas, voice in decisions and type of work." The low-ranked employees, however, emphasize the

importance of "security, opportunity for advancement, opportunity to learn a job and steady work."

The fact that security was the most frequently mentioned factor by the group as a whole was not surprising, even though it didn't support the findings of Wyatt (1937), Jurgensen (1948) and Raube (1947). The company is generally conceded to place considerable emphasis on security. The company's policies are entirely employee-centered with a particular orientation toward employee stability. It would have been surprising if security was not the most frequently mentioned factor. This point emphasized the importance of interpreting results within the situational framework of the company.

The hint in Part I of the questionnaire that long tenure is associated with low merit-ranking, in light of the security emphasis, might suggest that the policy of emphasizing security be questioned. If the rating is accurate, perhaps the long tenure employees become apathetic and lethargic in their security. This point undoubtedly deserves further investigation.

Criterion accuracy or reliability is always a problem in studies of this nature. Over-all job performance was used as the performance criterion because it was felt that quantity or efficiency ratings are comparatively narrow criteria. Efficiency ratings are primarily useful to the manager who is production-centered rather than employee-centered. Admittedly, one does not know exactly what the manager considered in ranking the employees. The concept of over-all job performance, however, implies the inclusion of both attitudes and production level. Perhaps in this study there can be no legitimate estimate of rating accuracy. It was felt that only the department manager was qualified to rate the employees since only he knew all of the employees well enough to rate them. As a result, we do not have a number of ratings with which to make comparisons in assessing reliability. This author isn't convinced that it is legitimate to pool ratings of over-all job performance because the concept is not well enough defined. Perhaps this could explain the lack of relationship found by Gadel and Kriedt (1952) since pooled supervisor ratings were used in their study.

A partial check on rating accuracy was made when the biographical variables were analyzed. In this investigation only length of service, and to a limited extent age, was not equally distributed. Therefore, we may not be certain that age and length of service are negatively related to performance. It may well be that the manager simply prefers the younger employee with a shorter length of service.

In regard to the size of the sample used in this investigation, this author concludes that the size was adequate in view of the goals. The reliability of the ranking made by the manager would undoubtedly decrease with an increasing sample size. It would be virtually impossible to rank more than fifty employees on the basis of over-all job performance simply because the manager couldn't know that many employees well enough. It should be pointed out that the statistical tests used in Part II (job satisfaction) and Part IV (company satisfaction) take size into consideration. Naturally, one would hesitate to generalize the results of this investigation to "employees in general." One of the findings of this study emphasized the importance of interpreting employee attitudes within the situational framework of the company. It was also pointed out that biographical variables must be determined before one can adequately interpret results from attitude surveys. Generalization, then, was not one of the primary goals of this study.

The results of this study suggest that, with two alterations, the questionnaire and particularly the methodology used in this investigation may well merit the attention of researchers and managers concerned with the relation between employee attitudes and employee performance. Part III (job preference factors) of the questionnaire should be changed to obtain a better distribution of choices. This might be accomplished by asking the respondent to rank three or five factors in order of importance to him. In addition it is suggested that a more objective criterion of over-all job performance be developed, such as a weighted check list, which might standardize the rating procedure and thereby improve rating accuracy.

The evidence presented in this investigation suggests that attitudes of employees can be differentiated with respect to an over-all job performance criterion. In this case the employees ranked high were more satisfied with their job and the company than were the low-ranked employees. They also differed with respect to the list of job preference factors. The high-ranked employees attached most importance to the factors "opportunity to use ideas, voice in decisions and type of work." The low-ranked employees, on the other hand, emphasized the factors "security, opportunity for advancement, opportunity to learn a job and steady work." Conclusions must be interpreted in light of the fact that the high-ranked employees were generally younger and had shorter lengths of service than the low-ranked employees.

## SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between employee attitudes and employee performance using over-all job performance as the criterion. The department manager ranked the employees from high to low and the questionnaires were coded to identify three categories: upper 30% (13 employees), middle 40% (19 employees) and lower 30%. Thirty nine questionnaires were returned: 12 high, 15 middle and 12 low.

A significant positive relationship was found between job satisfaction and performance. The same relationship was found between company satisfaction and performance. The author suggested that the two attitude variables might be extensions of the rating concept used in this study, a phenomenon which does not occur when quantity or efficiency ratings are used as performance criteria.

In addition, the high- and low-ranked groups were found to attach importance to different factors. The low-ranked employees as a group emphasized the importance of "security, opportunity for advancement, opportunity to learn a job and steady work." The high-ranked group emphasized "opportunity to use ideas, voice in decisions and type of work" as being most important to themselves.

The employees in the low-ranked group were generally older and had longer lengths of service than those ranked high. It was pointed out that the latter result could indicate a preference on the part of the rater or could actually characterize the group. It was felt that either alternative was possible.



APPENDIX

Part I  
Personal Data Sheet

Please check the appropriate blank.

Sex:

Male  
Female

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Age:

Under 20  
20-29  
30-39  
40-49  
50-

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Marital Status:

Single  
Married

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Number of Dependents (not including self):

1  
2  
3  
4  
More

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Education:

High School  
Some College  
College Degree

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Length of Service at this Company:

5 years or less  
6-10 years  
11-15 years  
16-20 years  
21-25 years  
Longer

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Part II

This part contains eighteen statements about jobs. You are to underline the phrase below each statement which best describes how YOU feel about your present job.

My job is like a hobby to me.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

I consider my job rather unpleasant.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

I enjoy my work more than my leisure time.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

I am often bored with my job.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

I am satisfied with my job for the time being.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

I feel that my job is no more interesting than others I could get.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

I definitely dislike my work.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

Each day of work seems like it will never end.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

I like my job better than the average worker does.

STRONGLY AGREE      AGREE      UNDECIDED      DISAGREE      STRONGLY DISAGREE

My job is pretty uninteresting.

STRONGLY AGREE    AGREE    UNDECIDED    DISAGREE    STRONGLY DISAGREE

I find real enjoyment in my work.

STRONGLY AGREE    AGREE    UNDECIDED    DISAGREE    STRONGLY DISAGREE

I am disappointed that I ever took this job.

STRONGLY AGREE    AGREE    UNDECIDED    DISAGREE    STRONGLY DISAGREE

## Part III

The following list represents a number of factors which various workers consider in their jobs. Of this list, check no more than three which are most important to YOU.

Voice in decisions  
 Easy work  
 Opportunity to use ideas  
 Good boss  
 Working conditions (temperature, humidity, equipment, etc.)  
 Benefits  
 Security  
 Type of work  
 Opportunity to be of public service  
 High pay  
 Good working companions  
 Opportunity for advancement  
 Opportunity to learn a job  
 Steady work  
 Working hours  
 Opportunity to show initiative

## Part IV

Please PLACE A CHECK in front of the following statement or statements which most nearly express your own personal feeling.	Scale* <u>Value</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I am made to feel that I am really a part of this organization.	9.72
<input type="checkbox"/> In my job, I don't get any chance to use my experience	3.18
<input type="checkbox"/> I can usually find out how I stand with my boss.	7.00
<input type="checkbox"/> I have never understood just what the company personnel policy is.	4.06
<input type="checkbox"/> I think the company's policy is to pay employees just as little as it can get away with.	0.80
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On the whole, the company treats us about as well as we deserve.	6.60
<input type="checkbox"/> I can never find out how I stand with my boss.	2.77
<input type="checkbox"/> I can feel reasonably sure of holding my job as long as I do good work.	8.33
<input type="checkbox"/> A large number of the employees would leave here if they could get as good jobs elsewhere.	1.67
<input type="checkbox"/> I think training in better ways of doing the job should be given to all employees of the company.	4.72

\*Scale values did not appear on the questionnaire.

## REFERENCES

- Baxter, B., Taaffe, A. A., & Hughes, J. F. A training evaluation study. Personnel Psychol., 1953, 6, 403-417.
- Bergen, H. B. Finding out what employees are thinking. The Conference Board Management Record, April, 1939.
- Bernberg, R. E. Socio-psychological factors in industrial morale: I. The prediction of specific indicators. J. soc. Psychol., 1952, 36, 73-82.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. An index of job satisfaction. J. appl. Psychol., 1951, 35, 307-311.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychol. Bull., 1955, 52, 396-424.
- Gadel, Margurite, & Kriedt, P. H. Relationships of aptitude, interest, performance and job satisfaction of IBM operators. Personnel Psychol., 1952, 5, 207-212.
- Gilmer, B. V. Industrial psychology. New York: McGraw Hill, 1961, p. 204.
- Habbe, S. Job attitudes of life insurance agents. J. appl. Psychol., 1947, 31, 111-128.
- Harding, F. D., & Bottenberg, R. A. Effects of personal characteristics on the relationship between attitudes and job performance. J. appl. Psychol., 1961, 45, 428-430.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. D. & Capwell, D. F. Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh, Penn.: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.
- Houser, S. D. What the employer thinks. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1927.
- Jurgensen, C. E. What job applicants look for in a company. Personnel Psychol., 1948, 1, 433-445.
- Katz, D., Maccoby, N., & Morse, Nancy. Productivity, supervision and morale in an office situation. Univ. of Michigan: Survey Research Center, 1950.

- Katz, D., Maccoby, N., Gurin, C., & Floor, L. G. Productivity, supervision and morale among railroad workers. Univ. of Michigan: Survey Research Center, 1951.
- Kornhauser, A., & Sharp, A. Employee attitudes: Suggestions from a study in a factory. Personnel J., 1932, 10, 393-401.
- Lawshe, C. H., & Nagle, B. F. Productivity and attitude toward supervisor. J. appl. Psychol., 1953, 37, 159-162.
- Raube, S. A. Factors affecting employee morale. Studies in Personnel Policy, 85 (New York National Industrial Conference Board, 1947).
- Tiffin, J., & McCormick, E. J. Industrial psychology. (4th ed.) New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1958, 204-235.
- Wyatt, S., Langdon, J., & Stock, F. G. Fatigue and boredom in repetitive work. Industrial Health Research Board, 77 (London, 1937).