

## INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the original text directly from the copy submitted. Thus, some dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from a computer printer.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyrighted material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is available as one exposure on a standard 35 mm slide or as a 17" × 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. 35 mm slides or 6" × 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.



300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA



**Order Number 8805041**

**Job satisfaction and its relationship to gender, career  
orientation, and childcare needs among white collar and blue  
collar residence hall employees**

**Arthur, Virginia C., Ph.D.**

**Iowa State University, 1987**

**U·M·I**

**300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106**



**PLEASE NOTE:**

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy.  
Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs or pages \_\_\_\_\_
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print \_\_\_\_\_
3. Photographs with dark background \_\_\_\_\_
4. Illustrations are poor copy \_\_\_\_\_
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy ✓
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page \_\_\_\_\_
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓
8. Print exceeds margin requirements ✓
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine \_\_\_\_\_
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print \_\_\_\_\_
11. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered \_\_\_\_\_. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages \_\_\_\_\_
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received ✓
16. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

U·M·I



Job satisfaction and its relationship to gender, career  
orientation, and childcare needs among white collar and  
blue collar residence hall employees

by

Virginia C. Arthur

A Dissertation Submitted to the  
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education  
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa

1987

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Statement of the Problem	3
Statement of Assumptions	5
Limitations of the Study	6
Definitions	6
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Job Satisfaction and Dispositional Variables	11
Job Performance and Job Satisfaction	12
Job satisfaction and productivity	12
Job Satisfaction and Job Behavior	15
Underlying Theories Supporting Job Satisfaction	17
Need satisfaction theory	18
Value congruence theory	18
Opponent-process	19
Social comparison theory	21
Job Satisfaction and Personal/Dispositional Variables	21
Demographics: Age, race, sex	22
Age	22
Sex	23
Race	24
Race/sex of supervisor	25



Type of employee	29
Extra-work variables	30
Distance between home and workplace	30
Children and childcare arrangements	31
View of job	32
Household income	32
Summary	32
CHAPTER 3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	34
Subjects	35
Instruments	37
Procedures	41
Hypotheses	44
Data Analysis	45
CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	52
Job Type and Service	54
Gender and Race	58
Location of Home and Workplace	68
Children and Childcare	72
View of Job	82
Income Earned	92
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, SUMMARY	95
Recommendations for Future Research	100
Summary	102
BIBLIOGRAPHY	108
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	122

APPENDIX A.	MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE	123
APPENDIX B.	EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION SURVEY	129
APPENDIX C.	LETTER FROM DIRECTOR OF RESIDENCE	136
APPENDIX D.	INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS	138
APPENDIX E.	HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE APPROVAL FORM	141
APPENDIX F.	MEMORANDUM TO CENTRAL STAFF	144
APPENDIX G.	MEMORANDUM TO SUPERVISORS	146
APPENDIX H.	TABLES	148

## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction has been an important area of study since the 1930s. Motivated workers were thought to be more productive than non-motivated employees and job satisfaction was believed to be the primary motivator (Ruch & Hershauer, 1974). Much of the previous research has focused on this relationship. This study is designed to investigate a number of work related and non-work related factors which may effect job satisfaction.

The potential link between job satisfaction and productivity was one of the initial reasons that made job satisfaction an attractive area for investigation. Research efforts were therefore targeted toward identifying the work-related factors which comprised job satisfaction (Hopkins, 1983; Vroom, 1976; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1964; Parker, 1976). One of the most popular of these investigators was Herzberg. Herzberg's studies involved accountants and engineers in private industry which led to the development of his taxonomy identifying satisfiers and dissatisfiers as the components of job satisfaction (1966). Herzberg's theory maintains that only satisfiers contribute to job satisfaction while dissatisfiers serve only to lessen job satisfaction. Satisfiers are identified as achievement, recognition, responsibility advancement, and work itself. Dissatisfiers include company policies, supervision, salary, job security and working conditions. Satisfiers result from job content while dissatisfiers are products of the environment.

Job satisfaction research has focused on the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity for populations composed primarily of white male professionals in the private sector. The research has neglected certain groups of employees including women, minorities, and low-wage earners. When these groups have been included, the scope of the investigations has been narrow (i.e., male employee job satisfaction versus female employee job satisfaction; white collar job satisfaction versus blue collar job satisfaction; white employee job satisfaction versus black employee job satisfaction) (Weaver, 1977) and the results have been inconclusive. The research relating to job satisfaction of women versus men is inconsistent, at times finding women more or less satisfied than men. With regard to race, the research is limited to blacks and whites, generally finding blacks to be less satisfied with their job than whites. Research investigating the relationship between job satisfaction and sex or race of supervisor has been limited and the results have been inconsistent. The measurement of job satisfaction for different types of employees (i.e., white collar versus blue collar) has been extensive (though narrow in scope) and has consistently indicated white collar employees to be more satisfied than blue collar employees. In addition, Staw, Bell and Clauson (1986) note that interest in dispositional and personal variables has been virtually non-existent since the 1930s (Hoppock, 1935; Fisher & Hanna, 1931). Consequently, the research has not accounted for the relationship between work and non-work related factors. Additional issues

identified for this study which could add to the understanding of job are: 1) children and childcare, 2) previously overlooked employee groups, and 3) view of job.

#### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this investigation was threefold: 1) to discover whether or not selected demographic, attitudinal and environmental factors, as well as non-work-related characteristics were related to employee job satisfaction; 2) to assess the job satisfaction among various employee groups; and 3) to identify any interaction between job satisfaction factors and employee groups.

#### **Statement of the Problem**

This research project was designed to 1) identify a population which included groups not previously studied in depth regarding job satisfaction, and 2) to investigate a combination of work and non-work factors which impact upon those groups. Specifically, the factors included in this investigation were job type, sex, race, children, childcare, view of job, distance between home and workplace, and percent of household income earned.

For the purposes of this investigation, Iowa State University was selected as an ideal workplace that offered a variety of job classifications and a work environment that was representative of many organizations. The population for the study was drawn from the Department of Residence at Iowa State University because it was representative of groups of staff (other than faculty) existing

within the university (clerical, custodial, maintenance, food service, student life and administrative staff).

Staff at Iowa State University are classified into three major categories: faculty, Professional and Scientific (P&S), and Merit. The P&S and Merit staff provide services which assist with the smooth functioning of the institution. This combined staff group tends to be extremely diverse, ranging from well-paid, highly educated, experienced white collar management, professional administrative and technical staff to less well paid, less well educated, blue collar support staff.

P&S staff may include department heads, facility or program directors, physicians, librarians, scientists, counselors, student group advisors, supervisors, and dieticians. Their jobs include such duties as managing the finances of the institution, coordinating and administering the library, financial aid, admissions, counseling services, student life services, health care services, alumni affairs, student housing and food service. Advanced degrees and/or extensive experience are generally necessary to obtain these positions.

Merit staff typically include clerical, maintenance, custodial and food service employees. These staff maintain the physical condition of buildings and grounds, provide meals for students, and provide clerical services in administrative and faculty offices. Merit staff are usually supervised by P&S staff. Education and experience requirements are likely to be related to a specific skill or trade rather than a degree.

Clearly these employees are integral to the daily operation of

the work environment being studied. Their perceptions of the work place are critical to understanding the institutional work environment.

Understanding all employee attitudes, satisfaction and concerns is valuable because it may be useful in achieving: 1) reduction of employee turnover, absenteeism and tardiness, 2) increase in employees' efforts toward organizational effectiveness, 3) analysis of known problems, 4) identification of potential problems, and 5) evaluation of current policies and procedures (Dunham & Smith, 1979).

Another reason for investigating P&S and Merit staff attitudes toward their work environment is because of the inclusion of the competitively disadvantaged groups who are typically neglected in job satisfaction research. Several of the staff groups mentioned previously (clerical, custodial, maintenance and food service) include in large numbers the competitively disadvantaged. Using Iowa State University as an example, clerical employees and food service workers are almost always women. In the university setting, all of these groups (clerical, food service, custodial, and maintenance) perform the "dirty work" of the institution, receiving low pay and enjoying little prestige. As such, they fit Barbash's (1976) definition of "competitively disadvantaged" groups which have been neglected in job satisfaction research.

#### **Statement of Assumptions**

This study assumes the following:

1. The quality of work life, as perceived by the employee, can be measured as job satisfaction.

2. Perceptions of employees are an acceptable measure of job satisfaction because job satisfaction is highly personalized and subjective.

#### Limitations of the Study

The following limitation applied to this study:

1. The research was limited to full time budgeted employees (as opposed to part time employees) of the Department of Residence at Iowa State University during January 1987.

#### Definitions

Definition of terms used throughout the research are as follows:

1. Job satisfaction is the emotional response to the fulfillment or gratification of certain needs of the individual that are associated with his/her work.
2. Full time budgeted employees refers to those employees who are in positions identified in the budget as full time (40 hour minimum) and permanent.
3. Professional and scientific (P&S) staff refers to those employees in positions which require formal higher education or extended work experience in a particular discipline and are exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act. These employees provide professional, scientific and or administrative support to the university. Also referred to as White Collar.
4. Merit staff refers to those employees who are non-faculty,



non-Professional and Scientific staff and fill positions of a service nature which do not require formal higher education. Also referred to as Blue Collar.

5. Clerical staff refers to those Merit employees who are primarily responsible for clerical and secretarial functions.
6. Maintenance staff refers to those Merit employees who are primarily responsible for the maintenance, repair and minor renovation of Department of Residence facilities.
7. Custodial staff refers to those Merit employees who are primarily responsible for cleaning Department of Residence facilities.
8. Room service staff refers to those employees who are assigned to non-food units and perform administrative, maintenance, custodial and student life tasks related to student housing.
9. Food service staff refers to those employees who are assigned to non-room service units and are responsible for the production of meals. Also, those food stores employees who are responsible for the purchasing, warehousing and delivery of food and food preparation products.
10. Exempt refers to those Merit employees who are ineligible for union membership.
11. Competitively disadvantaged is the phrase Barbash (1976) uses to describe groups typically neglected in job

satisfaction research, including ". . . foreign workers, minorities, women, low-wage earners, the aging, under-educated, over-educated. . ." (p. 30).

12. Non-work-related variables refers to those factors which are not directly associated with work or work place.
13. Job type is a category which refers to the Merit and Professional and Scientific classifications.
14. Service is a category which refers to the food and room staff groups within the Department of Residence.
15. View of job is a category which refers to employee perception of job as a career or as a paycheck.

## CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

One of the difficulties of reviewing the job satisfaction literature is the volume of research that has been conducted on the topic. The research spans several disciplines, including education, business, psychology, and sociology. In order to accomplish a thorough review of the literature, each of these disciplines was explored through library computer searches; text books used to obtain a general overview of job satisfaction literature (Muchinsky, 1983; Landy, 1985), books, journal articles, dissertations, newspaper and popular magazine articles, and unpublished manuscripts.

This search revealed a sizeable body of literature about job satisfaction. In reviewing the literature eleven years ago Locke (1976) reviewed over 3,300 articles and dissertations related to job satisfaction. To narrow the focus of this review to one which is complete and relevant to this investigation, the author has taken an historical approach. As a result of the review of materials what appears to be a circular pattern emerged. The investigator will document this circular pattern which initially focused on the relationship between dispositional factors and job satisfaction; then shifted to consideration of the connection between job satisfaction and work-related variables, before returning to a resurgence of interest in personalized or dispositional factors and their relationship to job satisfaction. Studies reflective of this pattern will be summarized in the context of research design and findings.

Additionally, a description of prominent theories upon which job

satisfaction research has been based will be reviewed. Emphasis will be given to those theories (value congruence, opponent-process and social comparison) which are critical to this investigation.

In order to discuss the material in a meaningful manner, the review of literature is divided into four categories:

1. **Job Satisfaction and Dispositional Variables.** This section includes a review of early job satisfaction research which focused on dispositional variables or personal characteristics as opposed to work-related factors.
2. **Job Performance and Job Satisfaction.** Included in this section is a presentation of research which attempted to relate job satisfaction to productivity, job behavior and other work-related factors.
3. **Underlying Theories Supporting Job Satisfaction.** This section reviews theories relevant to the previous job satisfaction research and illustrates the theoretical base for the shift in focus from work-related variables to personal, non-work-related factors.
4. **Job Satisfaction and Personal/Dispositional Variables.** Studies which consider the relationship between job satisfaction and personal and non-work-related factors are reviewed in this section. Included for review are those studies which address the relationship between job satisfaction and the variables identified for this investigation.

### Job Satisfaction and Dispositional Variables

Early job satisfaction studies focused on the relationship between personal or dispositional variables and job satisfaction. A 1935 study of job satisfaction of workers in New Hope, Pennsylvania conducted by Hoppock, concluded that although workers were generally "happy," some workers in some occupations were "happier" than others. Hoppock concluded ". . . there is some reason to believe that people bring a frame of reference to the work setting. This frame of reference influences how and what they see" (Landy, 1985, p. 380). Several others (Fisher & Hanna, 1931; Schaffer, 1953; Porter, 1962) supported this view, including Munsterberg (1913) who maintained "the feeling of monotony depends much less upon the particular kind of work than upon the special disposition of the individual" (Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986, p. 59). Fisher and Hanna (1931) observed that the current emotional state of an employee could have as much impact on his/her job perception as any other factor. Similarly, Schaffer (1953) asserted that variables within the individual contribute to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Workers look through "need-colored glasses" in their attempt to satisfy the twelve basic needs which Schaffer identified. Porter (1962) agreed with Schaffer's emphasis on individual variables and their impact on job satisfaction.

Interest in dispositional factors and their influence on job satisfaction waned in the late 1930s and has been "distinctly out of favor for at least 20 years" (Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986, p. 59). The decline in interest is best summarized by Staw, Bell, and Clausen

(1986).

"Because of interpretive and empirical problems with need theory (Wahba & Bridwell, 1976) as well as the recent emphasis on situational influences, the field has very nearly eliminated individual-level variables from the study of job attitudes. The field is no longer interested in what the individual brings to the work setting in terms of behavioral tendencies, traits, and personality (now commonly subsumed under the rubric of personal dispositions) as in how the organization can externally prod the individual to evoke more positive job attitudes and behavior" (p. 57).

Since the decline in interest related to dispositional impact on job attitudes, much of the job satisfaction research has been designed to determine the work-related causes of job satisfaction. Identification of work-related causes of job satisfaction would potentially enable the employer to impact on employee job satisfaction (Hopkins, 1983; Vroom, 1976; Herzberg et al., 1964; Parker, 1976). The primary motivating force behind this interest in increasing employee job satisfaction has been the belief that increased job satisfaction has a direct relationship to increased productivity (Ruch & Hershauer, 1974).

### Job Performance and Job Satisfaction

#### Job satisfaction and productivity

In their review of the literature, Brayfield and Crockett (1955) concluded that there was no demonstrable relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. In 1957, Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell reviewed the same literature and determined

there was a systematic relationship between job satisfaction and certain work behaviors, as well as between job dissatisfaction and other work behaviors. An explanation for the differences noted above was offered by Katzell (1957). As he pointed out, Herzberg included absenteeism and turnover in his description of job performance; Brayfield did not. Herzberg was receptive to suggestive findings; Brayfield only considered those findings which were statistically significant. Brayfield and Crockett generalized prior to considering the parameters involved in relationships between attitudes and performance; Herzberg took those influences into account in arriving at his overall judgment. The result of these differences was that Herzberg's conclusions led to revolutionary proposals, whereas Brayfield's primary concerns were methodological and had less long term impact on job satisfaction research.

Herzberg continued to pursue his conclusions that job behaviors (including productivity) were related to job satisfaction. Together with Mausner and Snyderman (1959), he investigated the job satisfaction of 203 accountants and engineers. The results of this investigation led to the development of Herzberg's two factor or motivator-hygiene theory. Briefly, Herzberg asserted that individuals have two sets of needs regarding job satisfaction. The first set or extrinsic (hygiene) factors are not specially related to job tasks. These factors are more descriptive of the work environment and include working conditions, salary, policies, job security, and supervision. The second set or intrinsic (motivator) factors have to

do with the need for professional growth. Intrinsic factors include quality of work, recognition, achievement, and responsibility. Only intrinsic factors have the ability to motivate employees and cause job satisfaction. Extrinsic factors play no part in job satisfaction but rather serve only to add to or diminish job dissatisfaction. More importantly, according to Herzberg" (1966) only intrinsic factors could increase employee productivity.

Because of the interest in relating job satisfaction to to productivity, studies based on Herzberg's theory have been "voluminous and generally discouraging" (Landy, 1985, p. 384). The motivator-hygiene theory has been criticized for methodological weaknesses. Numerous investigators have tried to replicate Herzberg's study, correcting the methodological problems (Ewen, 1964; Ewen, Smith, Hulin, & Locke, 1966; Hinrichs & Mischkind, 1967; Hulin & Smith, 1965), however in most cases they were unable to duplicate or verify Herzberg's results. Additionally, King (1970) has criticized Herzberg's theory on conceptual grounds. King identified no less than five different theories proposed by Herzberg at various times based on the same data, with little evidence to support any of them (Landy, 1985). Consequently, Herzberg's two-factor theory has fallen out of favor, even though it is generally regarded as a good description of what, on the average, you might expect to find when surveying employees about their satisfaction. It does not, however, explain why you find it (Landy, 1985).

Locke (1970), Wanous (1974), and Porter and Lawler (1968) suggest



that successful job performance causes job satisfaction rather than the reverse. After his extensive review of the literature, Locke (1976) concluded that ". . . job satisfaction has no direct effect on productivity" (Locke, p. 1334). Brayfield and Crockett (1955) and Vroom (1964) concur. Contrary to these conclusions, a meta-analysis of the relationships between job satisfaction and performance led Petty, McGee, and Cavender (1984) to state "the results of the present study indicate that individual job satisfaction and job performance are positively correlated" (p. 719). Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) also found a positive correlation between job satisfaction and job performance in their meta-analysis of the relationship between these two variables.

#### Job Satisfaction and Job Behavior

The relationship between job satisfaction and job behavior, which may impact on productivity, is a related issue. Porter and Steers (1973) and Muchinsky (1977) maintain that rarely does the correlation between job satisfaction and absenteeism exceed  $-.35$ . Studies relating job satisfaction and absenteeism completed by Ilgen and Hollenback (1977) could generate a correlation no greater than  $-.09$ . Based on previous findings, Steers and Rhodes (1978) developed a model which identified many factors which intervene between job satisfaction and absenteeism. Earlier, Hinrichs (1974) agreed with Steers and Rhodes, maintaining that a review of the literature indicated that, with one exception, the relationship between satisfaction and performance was multi-faceted. Hinrichs' exception

was the area of employee turnover. He maintained that numerous studies demonstrated that employees left their jobs in direct relationship to their job satisfaction. Leaving their jobs was defined as quitting or just not showing up for work. Research by Andrisani (1978) is illustrative of this point. In his study, Andrisani found that highly dissatisfied workers were from 14 to 42 percentage points more likely to change employers than comparable highly satisfied workers. Supporting this view, Steers and Rhodes (1978) summarized the findings of 104 studies, by asserting that work attendance is dependent on job satisfaction, pressures to attend, and the ability to come to work. Nevertheless, Muchinsky and Morrow (1980) maintain that the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover may depend on the state of the economy. There are cognitive and behavioral phenomena which intervene between job satisfaction and actually resigning from a job.

Clearly the previous review supports Muchinsky's (1983) contention that voluminous studies regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity, or related behaviors which may impact on productivity, have generated inconclusive results. In acknowledgement of this lack of consensus, Hinrichs (1974) suggests "The specific theory to which one subscribes is not particularly relevant. The only significant point is that there are forces within an individual that shape his behavior and result in effort designed to satisfy his needs" (pp. 44-45). Supporting Hinrichs' opinion, job satisfaction research has become less issue-specific. The focus has

shifted from how the job impacts on the employee and therefore productivity, to viewing job satisfaction as a personalized issue, much as Hoppock (1935), Munsterberg (1913), and Fisher and Hanna (1931) maintained previously. The justification for job satisfaction research has changed from the potential of increasing employee productivity to a recognition that the quality of work life is in and of itself important, regardless of its impact on productivity (Hopkins, 1983). Delamotte and Walker (Barbash, 1976) state

"The work of man is not a product to be judged solely by economic considerations, and bought and sold like an inanimate object. Instead man has a need to and right to work, not only to survive but also to express his own nature and to take his place in society and the world" (p. 4).

#### **Underlying Theories Supporting Job Satisfaction**

The theoretical foundation for the research reviewed in the previous two sections shifted from one which acknowledged individual differences to one which viewed needs and responses to those needs as universal and rational. This theory is known as need satisfaction theory. Current theories related to job satisfaction, including value congruence, opponent-process and social comparison theories, support a resurgence of the investigation of individual/personal variables. These constructs view job satisfaction in a social setting, subject to emotional and personal reactions which may be influenced by non-work factors.

The basic premise of each of the theories mentioned above, as well as their impact on job satisfaction research, will be discussed

in the following sections.

### Need satisfaction theory

Previous job satisfaction studies have been based on need satisfaction theories which presume that thinking preceeds feeling. In this framework, an individual evaluates an environmental condition and chooses an appropriate reaction (Landy, 1985). These models have been popular, according to Salancik and Pfeffer (1977) because they ". . . are consistent with other models of human behavior that promote beliefs about human rationality" (p. 71). These models, however, deny that individuals have the ability to adapt to or cope with circumstances. In addition, they assume needs are universal and unchanging. Instead, Salancik and Pfeffer maintain ". . . the job is itself imbedded in a rich social setting which affects how people characterize and feel about their work" (p. 80). Weir (1976) concurs by pointing out that not all people want more responsibility. Employees are individuals who will have different orientations to work at different times in their lives. Gruneberg (1976) maintains that job satisfaction depends in part on the expectations people bring with them to the job.

### Value congruence theory

Locke (1976) departs from previous need based theories of job satisfaction by maintaining there is a difference between a value and a need. A need is something necessary for survival whereas a value is subjective, something to be desired. Job satisfaction for Locke

". . . is the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the perception of one's job as fulfilling or allowing the fulfillment of one's important job values, providing these values are compatible with one's needs" (Locke, p. 1342). Simply stated, different people value different things in their jobs. Although this makes intuitive sense (Landy, 1985), several studies have indicated that weighting importance of factors which impact on job satisfaction does not improve the ability to predict overall job satisfaction (Ewen, 1967; Mikes & Hulin, 1968). This may occur, however, because when people rate satisfaction with a single factor or facet, they also indirectly judge its importance (Dachler & Hulin, 1969; Muchinsky, 1983). Other researchers, including Schaffer (1953) and Lawler (1973) have incorporated the concept of individual differences in their process theories used to explain satisfaction.

#### Opponent-process

Landy (1978) is critical of the simplicity of the previous theories: ". . . when the simpler theories attempt to explain why two individuals respond differently to the same job conditions, their arguments become circular" (p. 539). The opponent-process theory is Landy's attempt to overcome this criticism. Opponent-process theory is "suggested as a reasonable deductive statement for a consideration of the phenomenon of satisfaction" (Landy, p. 533). Landy maintains that when an employee receives a reward (stimulus) he/she is very pleased (primary emotion) initially but this emotion begins to level off (opponent process) in a return to emotional neutrality. Over

time, the same stimulus results in less intense reaction. Therefore, employees will report both satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the same reward at differing points in time (Landy, 1978).

Landy's opponent-process theory is a significant departure from previous job satisfaction theories because it is based upon the general theories of emotion such as Schachter and Singer's theory of emotion (1962). Schachter and Singer define two critical processes, arousal and attribution. An event occurs which results in arousal and physiological changes which are interpreted as a function of context which results in emotion. No distinction is made between satisfaction or dissatisfaction since any psychological stimulus is capable of producing either satisfaction or dissatisfaction depending upon the interpretation of the stimulus made by the individual. Previous satisfaction theories differ critically from Landy's opponent-process theory and Schachter and Singer's theory of emotion because they are based upon the premise that thinking precedes feeling. An individual evaluates an environmental condition and chooses an appropriate reaction. Landy, Schachter, and Singer suggest that an individual experiences a reaction and then tries to determine what made the feeling or reaction occur.

Acceptance of Schachter and Singer's theory is critical to the interpretation of job satisfaction because they define reports of satisfaction or dissatisfaction as social and cognitive constructs. As such, elements other than specific actions occurring at work would impact greatly on the perception of job satisfaction and

dissatisfaction (Landy, 1985). In accord with this approach, Hopkins (1983) maintained there were three areas that affect job satisfaction: individual orientations; work situations; and unionization. Individual orientations included psychological orientation, job orientation, and personal attributes. The work situation was composed of job characteristics and job environment.

Several studies have supported this view which recognizes the potential impact of non-work-related variables on job satisfaction (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1982; James & Jones, 1980; Pulakos & Schmitt, 1983; Zajonc, 1980).

#### Social comparison theory

The social comparison theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977) provides a method of looking at job satisfaction as a social construct. People, the theory proposes, compare themselves to others in assessing their own feelings of job satisfaction. Weiss and Shaw (1979) concur on the basis of research conducted with electrical assembly workers who were shown a film in which actors demonstrated boredom or interest while completing tasks. Subsequently, the electrical assembly workers completed the same tasks and reflected similar reactions to the actors' in the film.

#### **Job Satisfaction and Personal/Dispositional Variables**

In conjunction with the increased interest in looking at job satisfaction from a more personalized, social construct context, was the suggestion made by Staw, Bell, and Clausen (1986) that it is time

to revive the research on personal dispositions and their relationship to job satisfaction. Weiss and Adler (1984) agree, but acknowledge a need to improve the assessment techniques. The sections which follow present a review of studies which investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and demographic, personal and dispositional variables, including those variables identified for use in the current project.

Demographics: Age, race, sex

Research relating job satisfaction to variables such as age, race, and sex raises more questions than provides answers (Landy, 1985). Age, race, and sex typically account for less than 5 percent of the variation in job satisfaction (Landy, 1985). In addition, when other variables such as education, occupational status, and pay are held constant, these differences disappear (Weaver, 1977, 1978).

Age Several studies indicate that global job satisfaction increases for males as they age (Hulin & Smith, 1965; Gibson & Klein, 1970). According to Glenn, Taylor, and Weaver (1977), the same is true for women. The relationship between different facets of job satisfaction and age is not so uniform. Hunt and Saul (1975) reported that satisfaction with work, supervision, working conditions, and co-workers increased with age in a sample of males, but the only significant positive relationship for females was for satisfaction with work. Satisfaction with promotional opportunities was negatively related to age for both sexes. There was no relationship between



satisfaction with pay and age for males and there was a negative relationship for women. Muchinsky (1978) reported different results, maintaining that older employees were less satisfied on four of the five Job Descriptive Index (JDI) scales: supervision, pay, promotions, and co-workers. The JDI is the most frequently used job satisfaction scale (Muchinsky, 1983) and is discussed in detail by Cook et al. (1981).

Sex The research concerning the relationship between gender and job satisfaction has produced inconsistent results. According to Hulin and Smith (1964), gender differences in satisfaction are due to education, pay, and tenure and, if these variables are controlled for, both males and females are equally satisfied. In a study of government employees, Sauser and York (1978) concur. The analysis of several nationwide surveys points out no consistent differences in job satisfaction between sexes (Quinn, Staines, & McCullough, 1974).

A study designed to investigate differences in job satisfaction between male and female mid-managers in a social work setting was conducted by Haynes (1983). Statistically significant differences were found on 5 of 9 scales (overall satisfaction; satisfaction with fellow workers; satisfaction with kind of work; satisfaction with pay; satisfaction with working conditions; satisfaction with supervision; satisfaction with specific job; satisfaction with the agency; and satisfaction with potential for growth). Satisfaction with 3 of the scales (kind of work, pay, and potential) was significantly higher for females; but satisfaction with working conditions and supervision was

significantly less for females. However, Haynes suggests caution in interpreting the results because of a large sample and low Cramer's V.

In a study of work and extra-work correlates of life and job satisfaction, Near, Rice, and Hunt (1978) collected data from 1,041 respondents in New York. Sex was not significantly related to job satisfaction, however males described themselves as more satisfied over time than did females. These results are similar to those of Quinn et al. (1971) and Quinn and Shepard (1974).

Race The research related to race and job satisfaction has been limited to black-white differences. The results have been comparable in demonstrating that blacks and whites differ in many job-related attitudes (Bloom & Barry, 1967; Milutinovich, 1976; Slocum & Strawser, 1972; Weaver, 1975) and that blacks are generally less satisfied with their jobs than whites (Weaver, 1974a, 1974b). Slocum and Strawser (1972) found black certified public accountants to be less satisfied than whites. Near, Rice, and Hunt (1978) reported that race (in this case classified as white or non-white, with the non-white sample being predominantly black) was reliably related to job satisfaction. These results concur with Quinn et al. (1971) and Quinn and Shepard (1974). In 1980, Weaver found very little difference between blacks and whites in their satisfaction with different facets of job satisfaction.

The question about why differences exist in job satisfaction between males and females and blacks and whites has remained unaddressed (Jones, James, Bruni, & Sells, 1977). Andrisani and

Shapiro (1978) investigated male-female differences in job satisfaction and discovered that females derive satisfaction from both context and content factors. To the contrary, Weaver (1978) found that both sexes obtained satisfaction from the same factors. According to Cavanaugh (1976), ". . . women are more likely than men to value good co-workers" (Centers & Bugental, 1966; Manhardt, 1972, p. 78). Moch (1980) investigated two potential determinants of satisfaction: structural aspects (the way employees are treated) and cultural aspects (satisfaction based on beliefs, values, or psychological states). The result of his investigation indicated that each aspect played a small but significant role in employee satisfaction and that an organization could easily impact on the structural aspects but not the cultural.

Race and sex, together with pay, occupational prestige, supervisory position and work autonomy, explain less than six percent of the variation in job satisfaction (Weaver, 1977). Weaver summarizes this phenomenon: "It is surprising that variables which have been the focus of so much interest with respect to job satisfaction have so little explanatory power. This finding should reinforce recent efforts to expand the traditional explanatory framework for job satisfaction by examining the effects of new independent variables" (Weaver, 1977, p. 444).

Race/sex of supervisor      One independent variable that has been identified as a possible determinant of job satisfaction has been difference in race between supervisor and supervisee. The issue of

how supervisors respond to and evaluate their supervisees who are of a different race has been addressed by Meltzer and Wickert (1976).

". . . black foremen tend to judge their black employees more favorably than do white foremen and to make more perceptive distinction, although they also could be very critical" (Cavanaugh, 1976, p. 75). Black supervisors tend to rate white subordinates less favorably. This rating appears to be somewhat dependent upon personality rather than on job skills (Flaughner et al., 1969).

"Ironically, when a black supervisor was appointed, whites and Spanish-speaking accepted that person as their supervisor more readily than did many of the blacks. Former fellow black employees gave the new black foreman a disproportionate number of problems" (Cavanaugh, 1976, p. 75). Because female managers and black managers are a relatively new occurrence in the work place, most of the studies that have been conducted concerning supervisory behavior and satisfaction with supervision of women managers and black managers has been limited to laboratory settings (Adams, 1978). These investigations have resulted in evidence of differential responses to black and to female supervisors (Bartol & Butterfield, 1976; Jacobson & Effertz, 1974). These studies, however, were simulations which took place in controlled settings where variables found in a field setting were absent. In addition, students participated in the simulations for extra credit or to fulfill course requirements. Bartol and Butterfield and Jacobson and Efferts acknowledged these limitations and suggested care be taken in making generalizations to

organizational settings.

The conclusions resulting from research investigating the reactions of employees supervised by women are inconsistent. According to Adams (1978), Hansen (1974) found that employees supervised by women were less satisfied with their jobs than employees supervised by men. Supporting this finding, Petty and Lee (1975) reported subordinates indicated less job satisfaction when their female supervisors demonstrated low consideration than when male supervisors displayed low consideration. These results may be a function of the cultural norm which defines consideration as a female trait. Employees expect women to demonstrate consideration and are displeased when it is missing or low, whereas low consideration is expected from male managers (Petty & Bruning, 1980). Contrary to these findings, Day and Stogill (1972) and Osborn and Vicars (1976) discovered no consistent differences in employee perceptions about their supervisor related to the supervisor's sex. In a study of 139 library employees, Feild and Caldwell (1979) used the Job Descriptive Index to assess job satisfaction of male and female employees. They reported significant differences in job satisfaction related to sex of supervisor. Both male and female employees reported significantly greater job satisfaction when their supervisor was female versus male.

In a related study, Petty and Bruning (1980) tested whether or not considerate supervisory behavior of female leaders was more positively correlated with subordinates' satisfaction than was considerate supervisory behavior of male leaders. Questionnaires were

distributed to 4,260 employees of a financial assistance and social service agency. The results indicated that only one of twenty pairs of correlations was significantly different in a positive direction. In three of the twenty pairs, there was a significantly different correlation in the negative direction, where female employees' male supervisors' consideration was more positively correlated with job satisfaction than was female supervisors' consideration. This study fails to generate support for the relationship between sex-role consideration behavior and subordinate job satisfaction. The authors note, however, that there may be several reasons for this, including organizational factors, use of partial correlation analysis which may have unduly restricted the variance in satisfaction measures, and the characteristics of the individual employees of the organization. In a study involving six black male supervisors, eight white female and ten white male supervisors, Adams (1978) compared the response of 406 subordinates on their job satisfaction, perceptions of leadership, communication influence and job problems measures. Job satisfaction and job problems were not found to be significantly different for black male or white female managers when they were compared to white male managers. Black male and white female supervisors were reported to demonstrate more consideration behavior than white male supervisors. When subgroup differences were analyzed, black employees supervised by black managers reported the highest mean on consideration as well as fewer job problems than whites with black supervisors. However, black subordinates with black supervisors

indicated more job problems than white employees supervised by white females, but fewer problems than when blacks were supervised by white females.

Type of employee      The issue of differences in job satisfaction between groups of employees has tended to center on occupational status (Weaver, 1977). Reviews of the literature (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957; Vroom, 1964) indicate a high level of consistency in the relationship between occupational prestige and job satisfaction. Quinn, Seashore, Mangione, Campbell, Staines, and McCullough (1971), and Kahn (1972) concur, offering several possible explanations for this occurrence. Higher status jobs may offer more autonomy, greater ego gratification from the challenge and autonomy of the work and more prestige (Kahn, 1972). According to Parker (1976), professional workers are most satisfied, while semi-skilled and unskilled workers are least satisfied. Noting an increase in white collar dissatisfaction, Hinrichs (1974) warns that young potential "stars" may have a motivation problem because prestige jobs they would typically move into are filled by employees who may not leave or retire for many years. In their study of work and extra-work correlates with life and job satisfaction, Near, Rice, and Hunt (1978) generate additional data which supports this view. They found a general positive relationship between occupational prestige and job satisfaction, using Duncan's socioeconomic status scale to classify occupations in terms of status.

Related to occupational prestige is supervisory status. Morse

(1953) and Porter and Lawler (1965) indicate that supervisors are generally more satisfied with their jobs than non-supervisors.

#### Extra-work variables

Most of the job satisfaction literature focuses on job-related variables, or on worker personality or characteristics (Near, Rice, & Hunt (1978). Exceptions to this are the studies of environmental effects related to job satisfaction by Blood and Hulin (1967), Katzell, Barrett, and Parker (1961), and Turner and Lawrence (1965). As noted by Near et al. (1978), this provides an unbalanced view of the potential determinants of job satisfaction. For purposes of this investigation, the extra-work variables of distance between home and work place; employees with children who live at home; satisfaction with childcare arrangements; perception of job as either a career or a paycheck; and percentage of household income earned were considered.

Distance between home and workplace      The literature reveals little concerning the relationship between job satisfaction and the distance between the employee's home and work place. Location of work or residence (i.e., suburban vs rural vs urban) has been used as a variable in job satisfaction studies (Blood & Hulin, 1967; Hulin, 1966; Hulin, 1969; Hulin & Blood, 1968). This research suggests that location of employment has an effect on job satisfaction, with employees who live in suburban locations being more satisfied with their job than those who live in urban or rural areas.



Children and childcare arrangements

The job satisfaction research related to children and childcare arrangements is extremely limited and focuses primarily on the satisfaction or career paths of women as employees. In her dissertation, Ferrar (1978) examined the relationship between working mothers' job satisfaction and their childcare arrangements. Ferrar surveyed 324 working women, 208 with children over six years of age or without children; and 116 working women with children of preschool age. The women worked in five occupational categories and had various childcare arrangements. The result indicated that there was a negative relationship between job satisfaction and the presence of preschool children (supported at .01 level) and that levels of job satisfaction were related to levels of childcare satisfaction.

In a related study, Albers (1982) surveyed 40 couples who were employed full time in status occupations with growth potential and who had children attending day care. Job satisfaction and marital adjustment were measured by the Job Description Index and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Albers' results demonstrated no significant relationship between job satisfaction and marital adjustment; however, there was a direct relationship between wives' job satisfaction and husbands' marital adjustment.

Using those women employed in 1975, Steczak (1980) collected data from the National Longitudinal Surveys conducted by The Ohio State University and the Bureau of the Census. She concluded that the career path for mothers were very different from women who were not

mothers. Employed mothers tended to have less stable careers and were more likely to be employed in non-professional, non-managerial positions. In addition, working mothers were part of an increasing number of women competing for the same part-time, low-income, entry level jobs.

View of job      There appears to be no research concerning the relationship between job satisfaction and perception of the job as a career as opposed to a paycheck.

Household income      Job satisfaction related to household income has been studied solely in the context of total amount of income earned. There has generally been a positive relationship between income and job satisfaction (Vroom, 1964), although Near et al. (1978) reported no relationship between household income and job satisfaction.

### Summary

The review of literature in this chapter supports Near et al. (1978) who contend ". . . it appears that job satisfaction research could profit from a broader perspective than is, with few exceptions, adopted by organizational researchers" (p. 263). The research designed to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and work-related variables, productivity, and job behavior is extensive. Attention has been paid also to job satisfaction and demographic variables, such as sex, race, and age. Until recently, however, investigators have failed to look at job satisfaction in a broader

social context, considering non-work related variables, or combinations of variables which might impact upon job satisfaction. There is little, if any, research on the relationship between job satisfaction and variables such as children, childcare, or view of job, or the interaction effect between these variables and sex or job type.

### CHAPTER 3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this investigation was threefold: 1) to discover whether or not selected demographic, attitudinal and environmental factors, as well as non-work-related characteristics were related to employees' job satisfaction; 2) to assess the job satisfaction of employee groups, and 3) to identify any interaction between job satisfaction factors and employee groups. Two questionnaires were used to obtain the necessary data for analysis in this study: the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Employee Satisfaction Survey.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, developed by Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist is associated with the theory of work adjustment of Lofquist and Dawis (1969). This theory "is constructed around the assumption that each person seeks to achieve and maintain correspondence with his or her environment" (Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981). The second instrument, the Employee Satisfaction Survey was designed by the investigator to elicit information related to the following independent variables: job category, sex and race of employee, sex and race of immediate supervisor, distance between home and work, children at home, satisfaction with childcare arrangements, view of job and percentage of household income earned.

### Subjects

In search of a population that would be diverse enough to include groups previously neglected in job satisfaction research (competitively disadvantaged) as well as representative of each job type at the university (other than faculty), the Department of Residence at Iowa State University was identified. Contact was made with the Director of Residence, Charles F. Frederiksen, to ascertain departmental interest and support.

The population used in this study included all full time budgeted employees in the Department of Residence on January 1, 1987. The total sample numbered 358 subjects. They were divided into five categories (see Chapter 1, Definitions).

Table 1 (pages 47-51) displays characteristics of the sample, including sex, race, age, education, marital status, how employees view their job, and spouse support, which contribute to a more complete description of the sample. Over half of the employees who responded to the surveys were female (59.4%). Almost all of the respondents were white (92.8%), with the next largest racial group being black, followed by Asian-American, then Native American, Hispanic, and other. Over half (53.1%) of the respondents were between 31-50 years old with the rest being normally distributed between 20 and 61 or older. All but 4.8% of the employees had completed at least a high school education, with approximately one-third having completed college or graduate school. Most respondents (83.4%) were either married at the time the survey was administered or

had been at one time. All employees with the exception of the Professional and Scientific staff and staff in other categories who are exempt, were eligible to be members of AFSCME, the local union. Half the employee group has been in their job for more than five years. As a group, employees perceived themselves to be performing good to excellent work. For the most part they expected to be in their job as long as they have been and have stayed for positive reasons.

Most employees said they worked 40 hours per week, with 18% indicating they worked more than 40. Approximately the same percentage of respondents who worked more than 40 hours/week said they took work home, worked late or worked overtime at least once a week. The majority of the respondents thought the pace of their job was busy which was defined as "a lot to do but manageable." When asked to evaluate their own performance, almost all employees responded good or excellent. Slightly over half of the respondents indicated they had held their job between 0-5 years, with most of the rest indicating under 15 years. Three-quarters of the employees had expected to be in their position for as long as they had. The reasons identified for staying longer than anticipated were, for the most part, positive. Salary, location and enjoy the people were the most frequently identified reasons. Twenty percent considered their job to be the highest level position they wished to attain, while 42% saw their job as a stepping stone. Spouses were perceived to be supportive of the employees' work (85.2%) and giving up a job for a spouse had never

been an issue for most employees (79.2%).

### **Instruments**

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) 1977 copyright (Appendix A) was selected to determine job satisfaction with several different areas of work environment; is written for 5th grade reading level; can be completed in 15-20 minutes; and meets ". . . the accepted level of reliability and shows evidence of validity" (Weiss et al., 1967). The long form of the MSQ was used as it purportedly provides ". . . much more information for the very short additional times it requires (Weiss et al., 1967).

The MSQ short form was reviewed by Cook, Hepworth, Wall, and Warr (1981). They state that the items were worded to enhance readability. Reading level or difficulty was an important consideration in selecting the MSQ for this study given the wide range of educational preparation of subjects.

A major reason for choosing the MSQ as the primary inventory used for this study was the successful use of the MSQ by Walsh (1980) in his study of food service staff at Iowa State University, University of Iowa, and University of Northern Iowa. Many of the subjects in the current study had a similar educational background to those in Walsh's study. Walsh's subjects were able to read, comprehend, and respond to the MSQ in a reasonable amount of time (20-25 minutes) and generate useable data.

Cook et al. also found that the MSQ ". . . appears to yield a sound measure of overall job satisfaction, although some items may not

represent universally valued features. . .; this is a problem which faces many scales requiring responses to specific job features" (p. 24).

According to both Landy (1985) and Muchinsky (1983) job satisfaction researchers tend to invent their own instruments which makes it difficult to compare results. Cook et al. observe that the MSQ and the Job Description Index appear to be the most commonly used inventories. Therefore, another reason for using the MSQ was its previous frequent use which provided the potential for future comparisons of data generated by this project.

The MSQ consists of 100 items, each of which refers to a reinforcer in the work setting. The respondent is asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with each item on a scale consisting of five alternatives: very dissatisfied (1), dissatisfied (2), neither (3), satisfied (4), very satisfied (5). There were twenty MSQ scales and there are five questions which compose each scale. The scales and item numbers are:

Ability utilization 7, 27, 47, 67\*, 87

Achievement 19, 39, 59, 79, 99\*

Activity 20, 40, 60, 80, 100\*

Advancement 14, 34, 54, 74\*, 94

Authority 6, 26, 46, 66\*, 86

Company policies and practices 9, 29, 49, 69\*, 89

Compensation 12, 32, 52, 72\*, 92

Co-workers 16, 36, 56, 76, 96\*



Creativity 2, 22, 42, 62, 82\*  
 Independence 4, 24\*, 44, 64, 84  
 Moral values 3, 23, 43\*, 63, 83  
 Recognition 18, 38, 58, 78, 98\*  
 Responsibility 17, 37, 57, 77\*, 97  
 Security 11, 31, 51\*, 71, 91  
 Social service 1, 21, 41, 61\*, 81  
 Social status 8, 28\*, 48, 68, 88  
 Supervision-human relations 10, 30\*, 50, 70, 90  
 Supervision-technical 15, 35\*, 55, 75, 95  
 Variety 5, 25\*, 45, 65, 85  
 Working conditions 13, 33, 53, 73, 93\*

For purposes of this analysis, the investigator used the general satisfaction score. Items used to obtain a general satisfaction score are indicated by an asterisk (\*). Responses to these twenty items are averaged, resulting in a general satisfaction score. The investigator developed the Employee Satisfaction Survey (ESS) (Appendix B) to replace the demographic data sheet of the MSO which was insufficient for this study. The ESS included questions that would generate data necessary to respond to the hypotheses posed in this study. In addition, the ESS was intended to reflect questions which arose in the literature and those which appeared in other questionnaires. This questionnaire was designed to elicit information concerning children and childcare satisfaction, distance between home and workplace, knowledge and use of university benefits; race and sex

of immediate supervisor and perceptions of job and work environment. Additional questions were posed which would provide more specific information to the investigator about job satisfaction/dissatisfaction, as well as whether or not employees belonged to the union.

Consultation with the Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) staff, the Director of Residence, the Personnel Manager, and members of this investigator's doctoral committee combined with Dr. Walsh's previous research experience with a similar population contributed to the face validity of the instrument. An Employee Satisfaction Survey pilot was submitted to a committee of experts composed of selected members of the sample (including representatives from both P&S and Merit employee groups) and a member of the RISE staff. Committee members reviewed the questionnaire for clarity, readability, length, format, and content. Changes were made based upon their comments before administering the ESS to the study subjects.

There were 37 questions on the Employee Satisfaction Survey. The questions related to specific variables to be studied follow. Items used to generate data for hypotheses are identified by an asterisk (\*).

Gender & race of employee	1*, 12*
Age of employee	2
Schooling of employee	3
Marital status of employee	4
Children	5*

Childcare	6, 7, 8*
Distance between home/work	9, 10*, 11
Job classification	13*
Perception of job	14, 15, 16
Tenure at ISU	17
Job longevity	18, 19, 20
Percent of household income earned	21*
View of job	22, 23*, 24
Spouse support	25, 26
Self evaluation	27
Union membership	28
Sex/race of immediate supervisor	29*, 31*
Comfort with sex/race of immediate supervisor	30, 32
Satisfaction/knowledge/use of benefit package	33, 34

Questions 35-37 were open ended and designed to provide an opportunity for employees to comment further on their work experience.

### Procedures

The Human Subjects Committee reviewed the proposed research, a letter from the Director (Appendix C), instructions for the participants (Appendix D), and the two questionnaires and granted approval (Appendix E) of the research instruments and procedures on 12-18-86.

Employees received a letter from Charles Frederiksen, Director of Residence, indicating departmental support of the project and the voluntary nature of participation in the study. The Department's

intended use of the data was explained as identifying concerns of employees that need to be addressed and resolved so that staff members would be more satisfied with their work environment.

The investigator met with Central Staff members (heads of administrative units within the department) to explain the project and procedures for administering the survey instruments. Central Staff members agreed to inform employees within their administrative unit when and where the surveys would be administered. The investigator reviewed this procedure in a memorandum to Central Staff members (Appendix F). The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Employee Satisfaction Survey were administered to Department of Residence employees during regularly scheduled work time according to the following schedule:

DATE	EMPLOYEE GROUP	EXPECTED NUMBER	ACTUAL NUMBER
January 6, 1987	Richardson Court Food Service	62	43
January 6, 1987	Union Drive Food Service and Food Stores	55	37
January 9, 1987	Towers Food Service	38	32
January 8, 1987	Administrative Office	15	21
January 12, 1987	Towers Room Service	37	39
January 12, 1987	University Student Apartments	33	29
January 14, 1987	Helser Maintenance	25	21
January 14, 1987	Union Drive Room Service	43	36

January 15, 1987	Richardson Court Room Service	50	51
January 26, 1987	Make-up Session		23
<b>Total</b>		<b>358</b>	<b>332</b>

The questionnaires were administered in work locations convenient to the employee group being surveyed.

The investigator identified employees who could not attend their scheduled session and notified their supervisor (Appendix G). Supervisors made follow up contact with those employees and encouraged them to attend a following session. A total of 332 (93%) employees completed the questionnaires.

The investigator read aloud the same set of instructions to each group. Employees were asked to complete the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire first, then to proceed on to the Employee Satisfaction Survey. Most completed both questionnaires within 35 minutes. Responses to the MSQ were recorded by the employee on General Purpose--National Computer Service (NCS)--Answer Sheets. These responses were transferred to a computer file by the Iowa State University Test Service. Responses to the Employee Satisfaction Questionnaire were recorded directly onto the questionnaire booklet. The Iowa State University Statistics Laboratory coded information recorded on the Employee Satisfaction Survey onto a file.

### Hypotheses

To evaluate the data generated by the MSQ and the ESS, the investigator developed the following hypotheses:

1. There is no difference in job satisfaction between Merit employees and Professional and Scientific employees.
2. There is no difference in job satisfaction between room service employees and food service employees.
3. There is no interaction in terms of satisfaction between the job type and service variables.
4. There is no difference in job satisfaction between male employees and female employees.
5. There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees with same sex immediate supervisor and employees with different sex immediate supervisor.
6. There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees of different races.
7. There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees with same race immediate supervisor and employees with different race immediate supervisor.
8. There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees who live in Ames and employees who do not live in Ames.
9. There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees based on distance between job site and home.
10. There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees based upon their preference of living closer to job site.

11. There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees who have children living at home and employees who do not have children living at home.
12. There is no difference in job satisfaction between those employees who have children living at home who require childcare and those employees who have children living at home who do not require childcare.
13. There is no relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with childcare arrangements.
14. There is no relationship between job satisfaction and how employees view their job.
15. There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees who earn all the household income and those who earn part of the household income.

### Data Analysis

The programs designed to generate the statistical analyses necessary to respond to the hypotheses were developed by the Iowa State University Statistics Laboratory in conjunction with Drs. Mack Shelley and Mary Huba, resource statistician for this dissertation project.

The following statistical methods were used for these analyses:

1. Analysis of variance, as computed by PROC GLM in SAS.
2. Pearson Correlation Coefficient
3. Chi square

Specifically, hypotheses 1 through 12 and 15 were analyzed using

ANOVA, and Pearson Correlation Coefficient was employed for hypotheses 13 and 14. The significance level used throughout this study was .05.



Table 1. Characteristics of sample: Sex, Race, Age, Education,  
Marital Status, Description of Job, Tenure, Performance, View  
of Current Position, Spouse Support

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	130	40.6
Female	<u>190</u>	<u>59.4</u>
Total	320	100.0
<b>Race</b>		
White	297	92.8
Non-white		
Black	9	2.8
Hispanic	3	0.9
Asian American	6	1.9
Native American	4	1.3
Other	<u>1</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Total	320	100.0
<b>Age</b>		
20 or younger	1	0.3
21-30	51	17.3
31-40	82	27.9
41-40	74	25.2
51-60	64	21.8
61 or older	<u>22</u>	<u>7.5</u>
Total	294	100.0

Table 1. (continued)

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<b>Education</b>		
Grade School	15	4.8
High School	195	61.9
College	75	23.8
Graduate School	<u>30</u>	<u>9.5</u>
Total	315	100.0
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	53	16.6
Married	203	63.6
Divorced	41	12.9
Separated	4	1.3
Widowed	<u>18</u>	<u>5.6</u>
Total	319	100.0
<b>Hours Worked/Week</b>		
40 or less	14	4.3
40	263	77.4
40-45	33	10.1
46-50	23	7.0
51-55	2	0.6
55 or more	<u>2</u>	<u>0.6</u>
Total	327	100.0

Table 1. (continued)

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<b>Pace of Job</b>		
Frantic	31	9.6
Busy	185	57.1
Mixed	91	28.1
Okay	16	4.9
Slow	<u>1</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Total	324	100.0
<b>Take Work Home</b>		
Yes	62	19.0
No	<u>264</u>	<u>81.0</u>
Total	326	100.0
<b>Number of Years in Job</b>		
0-5	142	51.6
6-10	66	24.0
11-15	41	14.9
16-20	16	5.8
21-30	<u>10</u>	<u>3.7</u>
Total	275	100.0

Table 1. (continued)

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<b>Expect to Be in Job This Long</b>		
Yes	240	74.5
No	<u>82</u>	<u>25.5</u>
Total	322	100.0
<b>Why Stayed Longer</b>		
Spouse's Career	23	6.6
Salary	73	21.0
Location	58	16.7
Enjoy the People	93	26.8
Lack of Opportunity	64	18.4
Other	<u>36</u>	<u>10.4</u>
Total	354 <sup>a</sup>	100.0
<b>Rate Own Job Performance</b>		
Excellent	111	34.7
Good	195	60.9
Not Sure	11	3.4
Fair	2	0.6
Poor	<u>1</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Total	320	100.0

---

<sup>a</sup>Multiple responses account for N larger than 320.

Table 1. (continued)

<u>Characteristic</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<b>View of Current Position</b>		
Stepping Stone	110	42.0
Highest Position	53	20.2
Not Applicable	<u>99</u>	<u>37.8</u>
Total	262	100.0
<b>Spouse Supportive of Work</b>		
Yes	195	85.2
No	<u>34</u>	<u>14.8</u>
Total	229	100.0
<b>Given Up a Job for Spouse</b>		
I Did	27	11.9
He/She Did	8	3.5
We Both Did	12	5.3
Has Never Been an Issue	<u>179</u>	<u>79.2</u>
Total	226	100.0

## CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The presentation of findings begins with the findings from the fifteen hypotheses, accompanied by pertinent discussion.

Employees were asked to indicate their level of job satisfaction using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). General satisfaction scores were obtained for each subject by summing his/her response to the 20 items (one from each of the twenty scales), and dividing the total by twenty. Three hundred twenty employees generated useable general satisfaction scores. The mean general satisfaction score for the total group of full time budgeted employees of the Department of Residence was 3.53 with a standard deviation of 0.62. The distribution, as seen in Table 2, is slightly negatively skewed. The range of scores was 1.35-4.85. For over half (187) of the subjects, averaged total scores fall in the neutral range, which on the original scale was defined as "I can't decide whether I'm satisfied or not. . . ." Of the remaining respondents, more indicated satisfaction with their job (24.1%) than indicated dissatisfaction (17.5%). A general satisfaction score between 3.00-3.99 could be interpreted as somewhat satisfied, i.e., satisfied with some aspects of their job, dissatisfied with others.

Fifteen hypotheses were identified, as outlined in Chapter 3. The findings which are grouped by topic, (job type, gender, race, children, location of home, view of job, and income earned) are discussed on the following pages.

Table 2. Distribution of Averaged Total General Job Satisfaction  
Scores for Total Group of Employees

Averaged Total General Satisfaction Score	M	SD	N	%	Cum. %
4.00-4.99	4.27	.210	77	24.1	24.1
3.00-3.99	3.53	.264	187	58.4	82.5
2.00-2.99	2.59	.300	52	16.3	98.8
1.00-1.99	1.55	.248	4	1.2	100.0
<b>Total</b>	3.53	.620	320		

Note: Job Satisfaction Scale

1 = very dissatisfied

2 = dissatisfied

3 = neutral, can't decide

4 = satisfied

5 = very satisfied

### Job type and service

Hypotheses 1-3 are grouped together under the heading of job type because they were designed to compare the job satisfaction of different types or groups of employees using analysis of variance.

Hypothesis #1: There is no difference in job satisfaction between Merit employees and P&S employees. As can be seen in the last row of Table 3 P&S employees had a higher mean general satisfaction score than Merit employees. The results of a two-way analysis of variance computed on general satisfaction scores by job type and service are presented in Table 4. The main effect of job type is statistically significant, supporting rejection of this hypothesis at the .05 level ( $p=.023$ ).

Hypothesis #2: There is no difference in job satisfaction between room service employees and food service employees. The data presented in the right hand column of Table 3 indicate room service employees were slightly more satisfied with their job than food service employees. As shown in Table 4, this difference was not significant, therefore this hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis #3: There is no interaction in terms of job satisfaction between the job type and service variables. The relevant data for testing this hypothesis are presented in Table 3. Because there was a significant interaction between variables (as shown in Table 4), Tukey's Studentized Range Test was used to generate the confidence levels for comparisons of all possible group pairs. The only pair which generated significant results at the .05 level was



Table 3. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees by Job Type and Service

	Job Type								
	Merit			P&S			Combined		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Room	3.57	.055	131	3.64	.133	22	3.58	.051	153
Food	3.44	.063	98	3.86	.137	21	3.52	.057	119
Combined	3.51	.041	229	3.75	.096	43			

Table 4. Two-way Analysis of Variance Source Table for General  
Satisfaction Scores by Job Type and Service

Source	DF	SS	MSE	F	P
Main Effect	3	3.297	1.099	2.82	.040
Job Type	1	2.034	2.034	5.22	.023
Service	1	0.236	0.236	0.60	.438
Interaction					
Job Type*Service	1	1.028	1.028	2.64	.106
Error	268	104.490	0.390		
Corrected Total	271	107.787			

Merit food service and P&S food service. A 95% confidence interval for the difference between means for these two groups was (.02332, .80321) which does not include zero. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected based upon differences in job satisfaction among food service staff. There were no other significant differences in job satisfaction related to the job type and service variables.

In order to determine whether or not there were any significant differences in job satisfaction among the four Merit groups of employees (clerical, custodial, maintenance, and Merit food), a one-way analysis of variance was used. The data, displayed in Table 5, includes mean general job satisfaction scores for each group. There were no significant differences in job satisfaction between these four groups. Analysis of data generated from the three previous hypotheses indicates when room service and food service are combined there is a significant difference between P&S and Merit, but when room service and food service are looked at separately, only the differences between food service Merit and P&S are significant. This finding is consistent with the literature which generally reports professional or white collar employees to be more satisfied with their jobs than blue collar employees (Herzberg et al., 1957; Vroom, 1964; Quinn et al., 1971; Kahn, 1972; Weaver, 1977). There appears to be, however, a lack of research which would suggest an explanation for why the difference appears between Merit and P&S food service staff but not between job type within the room service staff. Although the difference in general job satisfaction between P&S employees and Merit

employees was statistically significant, it should be noted that the practical significance of the difference between 3.75 and 3.52 may be minimal. The more critical issue from a management perspective might be deciding whether or not having any employee group's general job satisfaction score between 3.5 and 3.75 is acceptable.

It may be of interest to note that within the Merit classification, although not statistically significant, the two groups which have the lowest general job satisfaction scores are food service employees ( $M=3.44$ ) and clerical employees ( $M=3.48$ ). Both of these employee groups are composed almost totally of women, whose jobs tend to be low status occupations. These findings are reflective of the literature which indicates a high level of consistency in the relationship between occupational prestige and job satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957; Vroom, 1964).

#### Gender and Race

Hypotheses 4 through 7 were concerned with the relationship between gender and race of employee and immediate supervisor and employee job satisfaction.

Hypothesis #4: There is no difference in job satisfaction between male employees and female employees. The data, as shown in Table 6, indicate males are slightly more satisfied than females, but not to a statistically significant degree (Table 7).

These findings are consistent with the results of previous investigations (Near, Rice, & Hunt, 1978; Quinn et al., 1971; Quinn & Shepard, 1974).

Table 5. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Merit Staff

Group	M	SD	N
Clerical (room)	3.47	.150	18
Maintenance (room)	3.60	.099	41
Custodial (room)	3.57	.075	71
Merit Food	3.44	.064	98

$F(3,224) = 0.87$   
 $p = .458$

Table 6. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees with Same Sex  
and Different Sex Supervisors

	Supervisor								
	Male			Female			Combined		
Employee	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Male	3.58	.104	93	3.34	.080	61	3.56	.050	154
Female	3.34	.112	31	3.57	.058	116	3.52	.052	147
Combined	3.52	.056	124	3.56	.047	177			

Table 7. Two-way Analysis of Variance Source Table for General  
Satisfaction Scores by Sex of Supervisor and Sex of  
Employee

Source	DF	SS	MSE	F	P
Main Effect	3	1.396	0.465	1.19	0.314
Sex of Sup.	1	0.099	0.099	0.25	0.616
Sex of Emp.	1	0.292	0.292	0.75	0.388
Interaction					
Sex of Sup.*Sex of Emp.	1	1.005	1.005	2.57	0.110
Error	297	116.192	0.391		
Corrected Total	300	117.589			

Hypothesis #5: There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees with same sex immediate supervisor and employees with different sex immediate supervisor. A high number of both male and female employees had an immediate supervisor who was female (39.6% of males, 78.9% of females). As shown in Table 8, almost half of the employees indicated they had a female supervisor. The majority of these employees were merit either custodians or food service workers. Although infrequent in other areas, it is typical for supervisors to be female in food service operations.

This hypothesis was examined by indirect and direct methods. The indirect method was through use of analysis of variance which computed the differences in job satisfaction between employees with same sex supervisor and employees with different sex supervisor. Since there was no statistically significant interaction between sex of supervisor and sex of employee (Table 7), the hypothesis was not rejected.

The direct method used to examine this hypothesis was to ask (in the ESS) employees who had a supervisor of a different sex to indicate if they would be more comfortable with a supervisor of the same sex. There was a strong indication that sex of supervisor was not seen as important, since 72.5% of the respondents selected "doesn't matter" as their response and, an additional 21.6% answered "no." The remaining 5.9% answered yes.

Both the indirect and direct methods of examining this hypothesis indicate sex of supervisor is not a factor which significantly



Table 8. Characteristics of Sample: Comfort with Sex/Race of  
Immediate Supervisor

Characteristic	N	Percent
<b>Sex of Supervisor</b>		
Employees with Male Supervisor	162	50.9
Employees with Female Supervisor	<u>156</u>	<u>49.1</u>
Total	318	100.0
<b>Race of Supervisor</b>		
Employees with White Supervisor	304	95.3
Employees with Black Supervisor	10	3.1
Employees with Asian American Supervisor	1	0.3
Employees with Hispanic Supervisor	0	0.0
Employees with Native American Supervisor	3	1.0
Employees with Other Supervisor	<u>1</u>	<u>0.3</u>
Total	319	100.0

Table 8. (continued)

Characteristic	N	Percent
<b>Would Prefer Same Sex as Supervisor<sup>a</sup></b>		
Yes	6	5.9
No	22	21.6
Doesn't Matter	<u>74</u>	<u>72.5</u>
Total	102	100.0
<b>Would Prefer Same Race Sex as Supervisor<sup>b</sup></b>		
Yes	0	0.0
No	14	31.8
Doesn't Matter	<u>30</u>	<u>68.2</u>
Total	49	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Responses of employees who currently have different sex supervisor.

<sup>b</sup>Responses of employees who currently have different race supervisor.

interacts with employee job satisfaction.

Hypothesis #6: There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees of different races. Although the data presented in Table 9 failed to support rejection of this hypothesis, it should be noted that the N for non-white employees was extremely small in comparison to white employees. There were originally 5 separate race categories in addition to white identified on the Employee Satisfaction Survey, but because of the small number of respondents in each category, all 5 were collapsed into one category titled non-white. The findings related to race and job satisfaction are somewhat inconsistent with studies that have been reported in the literature. Race has been found to be related to job satisfaction in several studies (Weaver, 1974a, 1974b) and not to be related in others (Weaver, 1980). As noted earlier, care should be taken when interpreting the results related to race in this study because of the small N for non-whites.

Hypothesis #7: There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees with same race immediate supervisor and employees with different race immediate supervisor. A comparison was made of the average satisfaction scores of two groups: employees with same race supervisor and employees with different race supervisor (Table 10). Analysis of this comparison by Scheffé's test indicated the difference between these two groups was not statistically significant at the .05 level ( $F(1,301) = 3.87$ ). A direct method of examining this hypothesis was also used. This method entailed asking (on the ESS)

Table 9. Mean General Job Satisfaction of White and Non-White  
Employees

Group	M	SD	N
White	3.55	.037	288
Non-White	3.40	.136	21
F(1,307)=1.05			
p=.307			

Table 10. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees with Same Race Supervisor and Employees with Different Race Supervisor

Group		M	SD	N
<b>Employees/Supervisor Same</b>				
White	White	3.56	.038	269
Non White	Non White	3.65	0	1
Total		3.56	.038	270
<b>Employee/Supervisor Different</b>				
White	Non White	3.47	.166	14
Non White	White	3.37	.142	19
Total		3.41	.109	33

employees who had a supervisor of a different race to indicate if they would be more comfortable with a supervisor who was the same race as the employee. The response is shown in Table 8. The results were similar to those regarding sex of supervisor: most (68%) indicated having a supervisor of the same race "didn't matter," and the remaining 32% answered "no." Race of supervisor therefore does not appear to be important to those employees who have a supervisor of a different race than themselves.

Again, as with Hypothesis #6, caution should be taken when interpreting these results because of the extremely small N for both non-white employees and non-white supervisors. Table 8 provides the data which illustrate the overwhelming number of staff who had a white supervisor (95.3%).

#### **Location of Home and Workplace**

The next three hypotheses were related to distance between home and workplace. Table 11 displays data which indicate over half of the respondents live outside of Ames, with most of them living between 11 and 30 miles from their work site. Despite the distance from work, only 18.8% indicated a desire to live closer.

Hypothesis #8: There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees who live in Ames and employees who do not live in Ames. The data presented in Table 12 failed to reject this hypothesis.

Hypothesis #9: There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees based on distance between job site and home. This

Table 11. Characteristics of Sample: Distance Between Job and  
Home

Characteristic	N	Percent
<b>Live in Ames</b>		
Yes	126	39.4
No	<u>194</u>	<u>60.6</u>
Total	320	100.0
<b>Distance from Ames</b>		
10 miles or less	62	29.0
11-20 miles	109	50.9
21-30 miles	40	18.7
31-40 miles	<u>3</u>	<u>1.4</u>
Total	214	100.0
<b>Prefer to Live Closer to Job</b>		
Yes	57	18.8
No	148	48.9
Doesn't Matter	<u>98</u>	<u>32.3</u>
Total	303	100.0

Table 12. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees by Location of  
Home

Group	M	SD	N
Live in Ames	3.61	.056	124
Live Outside of Ames	3.48	.046	185

$F(1,307)=2.94$   
 $p=.088$



Table 13. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees by Distance  
Between Home and Work

Group	M	SD	N
Ames	3.63	.057	116
Outside Ames/10 Miles from Work	3.56	.080	60
Outside Ames/11-20 Miles from Work	3.45	.061	102
Outside Ames/20 Miles from Work	3.43	.095	42

$F(3,316)=1.91$   
 $p=.127$

hypothesis was not rejected based upon the data displayed in Table 13.

Hypothesis #10: There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees based upon their preference of living closer to job site. The data presented in Table 14, failed to support rejection of this hypothesis.

This investigation addressed the issue of location of work and residence differently than previous studies. The earlier research (Blood & Hulin, 1967; Hulin, 1966; Hulin, 1969; Hulin & Blood, 1968) viewed location of work or residence in terms of suburban vs rural vs urban. This previous research suggests that people who live in suburban locations report significantly greater job satisfaction than people who live in urban or rural areas (Near et al., 1978). The investigator in this study studied location of work and home in terms of distance between the two, and preference for location of home. The findings of this study do not relate directly to previous research, but they do supplement the literature regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and location of home and workplace.

#### Children and Childcare

The next three hypotheses were related to children and childcare issues. The data displayed in Table 15 indicate slightly less than half of the respondents have children living at home, with most having 1 or 2 children. The most frequent arrangement for childcare was either 1) a daycare center, nursery school or babysitter, or 2) the child took care of him/herself. Over half of the respondents who used childcare services (excluding those who had children who watched

Table 14. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees by Preference  
Regarding Distance Between Home and Work

Group	M	SD	N
Prefer to Live Closer	3.43	.085	56
Would Not Prefer to Live Closer	3.57	.053	144
Doesn't Matter	3.50	.066	93
F(2,290)=1.13			
p=.326			

Table 15. Characteristics of Sample: Children and Childcare

Characteristic	N	Cum %	Percent
<b>Children Living at Home</b>			
0	183		56.5
1	53		16.4
2	63		19.4
3	16		4.9
4	8		2.5
5	0		0.0
6 or more	<u>1</u>		<u>.3</u>
Total	324		100.0
<b>Type of Childcare</b>			
Self	54	41.9	41.9
Member of Household	25	61.2	19.4
Day Care	40	92.2	31.0
Unpaid Non-Member of Household	2	93.8	1.6
Paid Non-Member of Household	<u>8</u>	100.0	<u>6.1</u>
Total	129		100.0

Table 15. (continued)

Characteristic	N	Cum %	Percent
<b>Hours of Childcare/Week Day</b>			
1-3	19	24.7	24.7
4-6	11	39.0	14.3
7-9	20	64.9	25.9
10 or more	<u>27</u>	100.0	<u>35.1</u>
Total	77		100.0
<b>Satisfaction with Childcare</b>			
Very Satisfied	50	37.9	37.9
Satisfied	41	69.0	31.1
Neutral	15	80.4	11.4
Dissatisfied	7	85.7	5.3
Very Dissatisfied	4	88.7	3.0
Not Applicable	<u>15</u>	100.0	<u>11.4</u>
Total	132		100.0

themselves) used them 7 or more hours per week. The majority of the respondents (69%) were satisfied with their childcare arrangements.

Hypothesis #11: There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees who have children living at home. As shown in the right hand column of Table 16, employees who had children living at home expressed satisfaction with their job that was significantly lower than those employees who did not have children at home. Table 17 presents the data generated from a two-way analysis of variance which supports rejection of this hypothesis. The interaction, however, between general job satisfaction and job type and children at home was not found to be significant. To determine whether or not the addition of sex as a variable would modify the results of the previous analysis, a three-way analysis of variance was performed. None of the interactions was significant, however individually, as shown in previous analyses, job type and having children living at home were significant in relationship to job satisfaction. Data for this analysis are presented in Appendix H.

Hypothesis #12: There is no difference in job satisfaction between those employees who have children living at home who require childcare and those employees who have children living at home who do not require childcare. As can be seen in Tables 18 and 19, the data did not support rejection of this hypothesis at the .05 level. Although the interaction between the two independent variables in this analysis just missed being statistically significant, two observations may be worth noting. First, P&S employees who have

Table 16. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees by Job Type  
and Children Living at Home

	Job Type								
	Merit			P&S			Combined		
Children at Home	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Yes	3.43	.061	105	3.68	.148	18	3.47	.057	123
No	3.60	.057	122	3.80	.126	25	3.64	.052	147
Combined	3.52	.042	227	3.75	.096	43			

Table 17. Two-way Analysis of Variance Source Table for General  
Satisfaction Scores by Job Type and Children Living at  
Home

Source	DF	SS	MSE	F	P
Main Effect	3	3.670	1.223	3.09	.028
Job Type	1	1.811	1.811	4.57	.033
Children at Home	1	1.832	1.832	4.63	.032
Interaction					
Job Type*Children	1	.028	0.28	.07	.792
Error	266	105.340	.396		
Corrected Total	296	109.009			



Table 18. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees by Job Type  
and Childcare

	Job Type								
	Merit			P&S			Combined		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Child-care									
Yes	3.54	.084	69	3.54	.202	12	3.54	.078	81
No	3.22	.117	36	3.96	.285	6	3.33	.108	42
Combined	3.43	.069	105	3.68	.165	18			

Table 19. Two-way Analysis of Variance Source Table for General  
Satisfaction Scores by Job Type and Childcare

Source	DF	SS	MSE	F	P
Main Effect	3	4.002	1.334	2.73	.047
Job Type	1	.951	.951	1.94	.166
Childcare	1	1.201	1.201	2.46	.120
Interaction					
Job Type*Childcare	1	1.851	1.851	3.79	.054
Error	119	58.188	.489		
Corrected Total	122	62.191			

Note: Scheffé Test with  $\alpha = 0.05$  resulted in  $F(3,119) = 2.681$ .

P&S/no vs. P&S/yes (-0.5707, 1.4124)

P&S/no vs. Merit/no (-0.1383, 1.6106)

P&S/yes vs. P&S/no (-1.4124, 0.5707)

P&S/yes vs. Merit/yes (-0.6197, 0.6208)

children who require childcare report the same level of job satisfaction ( $M=3.54$ ) as Merit employees who have children who use childcare. Second, although P&S employees whose children do not require childcare express greater job satisfaction ( $M=3.96$ ) than P&S employees whose children require childcare ( $M=3.54$ ), the effect is reversed for Merit staff. The general job satisfaction score for Merit employees with children who do not require childcare ( $M=3.22$ ) was lower than for Merit employees who used childcare services ( $M=3.54$ ). Because of these two observations, Scheffé's Test was used to generate the confidence levels for comparisons of all possible group pairs. As shown at the bottom of Table 19, none of the results were significant.

A three-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether or not there was interaction between job satisfaction and sex, job type and childcare. The main effect was not significant, nor were the interactions. The means associated with this analysis, as well as the analysis of variance source table, are included in Appendix H.

Hypothesis #13: There is no relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with childcare arrangements. This hypothesis was rejected based on a correlation coefficient of .252 ( $df=113$ ) which is low, but significantly different than zero ( $p=.0068$ ). The data indicate there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with childcare arrangements.

The mean general job satisfaction scores for employees by job type, sex and satisfaction with childcare arrangements are presented

in Table 20. The vast majority of respondents were satisfied with their childcare arrangements which resulted in vacant cells for dissatisfaction with childcare arrangements. Consequently, no statistical analysis was performed on these data. Based upon analysis of the data generated for the previous three hypotheses, and the post hoc analyses, it appears that having children at home is a factor which may influence employee job satisfaction.

The need for childcare services and how comfortable employees are with those arrangements may also be somewhat influential as demonstrated by the correlation ( $r=.252$ ) generated for Hypothesis #13. Ferrar (1978), Albers (1982), and Steczak (1980) conducted studies which support these observations.

The analysis of the data generated in this investigation regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and childcare issues lend support to the opinions, recently reported in The Des Moines Register (September 6 and 9, 1987). Educators, personnel directors and politicians suggested that childcare arrangements will be the critical job-related benefit of the 1990s.

#### View of Job

Hypothesis #14: There is no relationship between job satisfaction and how employees view their job. A Pearson Correlation Coefficient of .305 ( $df=300$ ) supported rejection of this hypothesis. The correlation is low, but significantly different than zero ( $t=5.55$ ,  $p=.0001$ ). The relationship between employee job satisfaction and how employees viewed their job was positive. Employees who viewed their

Table 20. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees by Job Type,  
Sex, and Satisfaction with Childcare

Sex									
<u>Male</u>									
Job Type	Satisfied			Not Satisfied			Combined		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Merit	3.36	.377	27	2.94	.319	5	3.30	.126	32
P&S	3.81	.357	4	2.85	.714	1	3.62	.319	5
Combined	3.42	.128	31	2.93	.292	6			
- - - - -									
<u>Female</u>									
Job Type	Satisfied			Not Satisfied			Combined		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Merit	3.49	.117	37	2.72	.412	3	3.43	.113	40
P&S	4.20	.292	6	0	0	0	4.20	.292	6
Combined	3.60	.108	43	2.72	.412	3			

job as a career expressed greater job satisfaction than employees who saw their job as a paycheck.

The relevant data for determining whether or not there was a difference in job satisfaction based on job type and view of job is presented in Table 21. Regardless of job type, employees were consistently more satisfied with their job when they viewed their job as a career rather than a paycheck. A two-way analysis of variance for general job satisfaction by job type and view of job generated the data shown in Table 22. The data in this table regarding the relationship between general job satisfaction and view of job ( $F(1,179)=24.98$ ,  $p=.0001$ ) support the correlation (.305) between job satisfaction and view of job. Contrary to previous analyses in this study, the relationship between job satisfaction and job type was not found to be significant in this two-way analysis of variance. The interaction between job satisfaction and job type and view of job was also insignificant. The difference between means for Merit and P&S employees who viewed their job as a career was very small, however the difference between means for P&S and Merit employees who saw their job as a paycheck was larger. The small cell size and large standard deviations for P&S employees who viewed their job as a paycheck as shown in Table 21, could account for the differences not being significant.

The data resulting from these analyses may lend support to Gruneberg's (1976) contention that job satisfaction depends in part on the expectations people bring with them to the job. If employees

Table 21. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees by Job Type and View of Job

View of Job	Job Type								
	Merit			P&S			Combined		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Career <sup>a</sup>	3.79	.120	69	3.84	.123	27	3.81	.065	96
Paycheck <sup>b</sup>	3.30	.072	80	3.67	.242	7	3.33	.068	87
Combined	3.53	.052	149	3.80	.120	34			

<sup>a</sup>Includes those who responded with 4 or 5 on a 5 point scale with 5=career.

<sup>b</sup>Includes those who responded with 1 or 2 on 5 point scale with 1=paycheck.

Table 22. Two-way Analysis of Variance Source Table for General  
Satisfaction Scores by Job Type and View of Job

Source	DF	SS	MSE	F	P
Main Effect	3	11.081	3.694	9.04	.0001
Job Type	1	.396	.396	.97	.3260
View of Job	1	10.207	10.207	24.98	.0001
Interaction					
Job Type*View of Job	1	.478	.478	1.17	.2810
Error	179	73.151	.409		
Corrected Total	182	84.232			



Table 23. Frequency Distribution for View of Job by Job Type and Sex

		Job Type					
<u>Merit</u>		Male		Female		Combined	
View of Job		F	Percent	F	Percent	F	Percent
5		15	17.05	19	13.67	34	14.98
4		14	15.91	23	16.55	37	16.30
3		32	36.36	42	30.22	74	32.60
2		14	15.91	17	12.23	31	13.66
1		13	14.77	38	27.34	51	22.47
Total		88	100.00	139	100.00	227	100.00

- - - - -

		Male		Female		Combined	
<u>P&amp;S</u>							
View of Job		F	Percent	F	Percent	F	Percent
5		7	43.75	7	28.00	14	34.15
4		6	37.50	7	28.00	13	31.71
3		3	18.75	3	12.00	6	14.63
2		0	0.00	2	8.00	2	4.88
1		0	0.00	6	24.00	6	14.63
Total		16	100.00	25	100.00	41	100.00

Note: Scale for View of Job was 5=Career, 4, 3, 2, 1=paycheck.

perceive their job as a career, their expectations may include satisfaction with their work which may then be translated into perceived job satisfaction.

Table 23 presents the frequency distribution for view of job by job type and sex. Using the combined totals of 4 and 5 as career, approximately twice as many P&S employees viewed their job as a career (65.86%) as did Merit employees (31.28%). The reverse was also true: Merit staff saw their job as a paycheck (36.13) almost twice as often as P&S staff (19.51), using the combined totals of 1 and 2 to indicate paycheck.

Still using the combined totals of 1 and 2 to indicate paycheck and 4 and 5 to indicate career, several observations are worth noting. The first is that for male Merit, female Merit, and female P&S about 30-40% regard their job as a paycheck. No male P&S staff view their job in this way. Further investigation reveals that among clerical and food service merit employees (the groups who had the lowest level of job satisfaction), 70% view their job as a paycheck (not shown in table). These groups are composed almost entirely of women who tend to be older than P&S female staff, and non-degreed. Among those employees who view their job as a career, there are almost twice as many female P&S employees as female or male Merit staff.

However, almost 30% more male P&S staff saw their job as a career than P&S women. Similarly, more male Merit staff viewed their job as a career than did female Merit staff, but the difference was not large.

A two-way analysis of variance was used to analyze view of job by job type and sex of employee. The relevant data used for this analysis are presented in Table 24. The source table for this two-way analysis of variance (Table 25) displays data which suggest view of job is significantly related to job type and to sex individually, but the interaction between sex and type is not significant. The reason for this lack of significance, however, may be because of the small n and large standard deviations among P&S staff.

One might expect P&S staff to report their view of their job as career in greater numbers than merit staff based upon issues related to occupational prestige and preparation necessary to attain those positions. The data above appear to reflect that expectation. The similarity between female P&S (32%) and female merit (40%) employees who view their job as a paycheck combined with the marked difference between female P&S (32%) and male P&S (0) employees who view their job as a paycheck contributes to the appearance that sex is related to view of job.

A question which remains is why women on the average, regardless of job type, view their job less as a career than do men. Further investigation is necessary to adequately respond to this question.

Table 24. Mean View of Job by Job Type and Sex of Employee

	Job Type								
	Merit			P&S			Combined		
Sex of Employee	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Male	3.05	.142	88	4.25	.333	16	3.23	.131	104
Female	2.77	.113	139	3.28	.266	25	2.85	.104	164
Combined	2.88	.088	227	3.66	.208	41			

Table 25. Two-way Analysis of Variance Source Table for View of Job  
Scores by Job Type and Sex of Employee

Source	DF	SS	MSE	F	P
Main Effect	3	34.505	11.502	6.48	.0003
Job Type	1	21.231	21.231	11.96	.0006
Sex of Employee	1	9.292	9.292	5.24	.0229
Interaction					
Job Type*Sex of Employee	1	3.982	3.982	2.24	.1353
Error	264	468.491	1.775		
Corrected Total	267	502.996			

### Income Earned

Hypothesis #15: There is no difference in job satisfaction between employees who earn all the household income and those who earn part of the household income. Based on the data displayed in Table 26, the investigator failed to reject this hypothesis. Table 27 provides supplementary data to Hypothesis #15. One hundred thirty-three people said they earned all of the household income, although only 55 viewed their income as the only household income. Responses to the question which asked employees to indicate how they viewed their income reflect confusion with the question.

This chapter presented the findings based on data generated by the hypotheses, along with pertinent discussion. The major findings will be reiterated in Chapter 5.

Table 26. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees by Percentage  
Household Income Earned

Group	M	SD	N
Earn all Household Income	3.55	.054	133
Earn Over Half Household Income	3.56	.070	81
Earn Half or Less Household Income	3.47	.065	93
F(2,304)=0.41			
p=0.661			

Table 27. Characteristics of Sample: View of Income

Characteristic	N	Percent
View of Income		
Necessary to Make Ends Meet	229	71.6
Extra Household Income	36	11.2
Only Household Income	<u>55</u>	<u>17.2</u>
Total	320	100.0



## CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, SUMMARY

This chapter will present conclusions and recommendations based upon the data generated in this investigation, as well as a summary of the study.

Based upon the data reported in Chapter 4, the following conclusions were reached.

1. Employees who had children living at home reported significantly less job satisfaction than employees who did not have children living at home. There was no significant interaction, however, between job satisfaction and the two independent variables, job type, and children. A related finding was the significant, though small, relationship between job satisfaction and satisfaction with childcare arrangements. In contrast, there was no significant difference in job satisfaction between those employees who had children living at home who required childcare and those whose children living at home did not require childcare. However, two observations which may be worth noting resulted from this comparison even though the interaction between job type and childcare just missed being statistically significant. First, P&S employees who used childcare services reported the same level of job satisfaction as did Merit staff who used childcare services. Second, the effect of childcare services on job satisfaction appears to be reversed for Merit and P&S

staff. The job satisfaction of P&S employees whose children required childcare was lower than the job satisfaction of P&S employees who did not use childcare services. Merit staff who used childcare services, however, reported higher job satisfaction than Merit employees who did not use childcare services.

2. There was a small but significant relationship between job satisfaction and how employees viewed their job. Employees who considered their job to be a career expressed more job satisfaction than those who viewed their job as a paycheck (significant at .05 level). There was no significant difference in job satisfaction based on job type, nor was the interaction between job satisfaction, job type and view of job significant. These results, however, could have been effected by the large standard deviation and small cell size for P&S staff. Among those who viewed their job as a career, the difference (although not significant) in job satisfaction between Merit and P&S employees was small. The difference was larger, however, between Merit employees and P&S employees who viewed their job as a paycheck, with P&S employees being more satisfied. Approximately twice as many P&S employees as Merit saw their job as a career. Conversely, approximately twice as many Merit staff viewed their job as a paycheck as did P&S staff. The interaction between view of job by job type and sex was not significant,

but again could have been impacted by small cell size and large standard deviation for P&S staff. Nevertheless, several observations are worth noting. First, about 30-40% of female P&S, female Merit and male Merit employees regard their job as a paycheck. No male P&S employees, however, view their job in this way. Second, the difference between numbers of male P&S staff and female P&S staff who viewed their job as a career was greater than the difference between male Merit staff and female Merit staff. Finally, among those employees who viewed their job as a career, there were almost twice as many female P&S staff as there were female or male Merit staff, but almost 30% more male P&S staff viewed their job as a career than did female P&S employees.

3. There appear to be no significant differences in job satisfaction related to sex and race of employee, or sex and race of employee's immediate supervisor. Employees with a supervisor of a different sex or race were asked if they would be more comfortable with a supervisor of the same sex or race. In both instances, the responses overwhelmingly indicated sex and race of their supervisor were not important factors with respect to employee comfort. This finding supported the results of indirect analysis which also indicated no statistically significant relationship existed between job satisfaction and sex or race of

supervisor. It should be noted, however, that the number of non-white employees was very small in comparison to white employees suggesting caution in interpretation of results.

4. There was a significant difference in job satisfaction between Merit food service employees ( $M=3.44$ ) and P&S food service employees ( $M=3.86$ ) which accounted for the significant difference found between Merit employees as a total group ( $M=3.51$ ) and P&S employees as a total group ( $M=3.75$ ). Merit food service staff were significantly less satisfied with their job than were P&S food service employees. Although the difference was statistically significant, the practical significance is questionable because the averaged general job satisfaction score for the total group of employees was 3.53. No other significant differences in job satisfaction were found between P&S and Merit employees.
5. No significant relationship existed between job satisfaction and distance between home and work place. Specifically, there was no significant difference in job satisfaction between employees who lived in Ames and those employees who lived outside of Ames. Distance between home and work place was not significantly related to job satisfaction, nor was preference to live closer to work place.
6. There appeared to be no difference in job satisfaction between those employees who earned all the household income

and those who earned part of the household income.

Based on the data, issues related to children, job type and view of job appear to be related to employee job satisfaction. Several trends seem to emerge in that: children have a negative effect on employee job satisfaction, however, needing childcare for those children does not appear to impact on job satisfaction, but satisfaction with childcare arrangements does relate to job satisfaction. When room service and food service staff were combined, Merit staff expressed less job satisfaction than P&S employees, although when analyzed separately, this difference was significant solely among food service staff. Job type, however, was significant in relationship to view of job: almost twice as many P&S staff viewed their job as a career as Merit staff. This finding is important considering the significant relationship between view of job and job satisfaction, i.e., employees who viewed their job as a career were more satisfied than employees who viewed their job as a paycheck. Although sex was not significant in any of the analyses regarding job satisfaction, male P&S employees differed greatly from the other three groups of staff in how they viewed their job. There was also more difference between the number of male P&S staff and female P&S staff who viewed their job as a career than there was between male Merit employees and female Merit employees.

### Recommendations for Future Research

Based upon the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations for future research are suggested.

1. The relationship between job satisfaction, children and childcare issues raises additional questions. It is apparent that having children may have a negative impact on job satisfaction. What is not clear is the reason for this relationship. Two questions which warrant further investigation are: 1) Does age of children living at home have an impact on job satisfaction? and 2) If age of children living at home does have an impact on job satisfaction, is the reason related to childcare issues?

The relationship between satisfaction with childcare arrangements and job satisfaction suggests a need to study the experiences of organizations which have established on-site or cooperative childcare programs relative to employee job satisfaction, productivity, absenteeism.

2. An extension of the childcare issue is the care of elderly family members. Although beyond the scope of this study, the relationship between job satisfaction and elderly family member care is a timely question which bears investigation.
3. The data supporting a relationship between view of job and job satisfaction provide a base for further investigations. Among the questions which remain are: What accounts for the large difference between how male P&S staff view their job

and the other three groups of staff? Why is there more difference between how male P&S staff and female P&S staff view their job than there is between how male Merit staff and female Merit staff view their job? Do these differences hold true for other white collar and blue collar groups of employees? Why do women view their job as a career less frequently than men regardless of job type?

4. That significant differences in job satisfaction between Merit and P&S staff were reported for food service staff but not room service staff presents an opportunity for further investigation for those interested in this specific type of population.
5. Although no significant differences in employee job satisfaction were generated based upon sex and race of employee or sex and race of employee's supervisor, the overwhelming majority of white employees, and lack of non-traditional supervisors suggests a need to continue investigation of these issues with more representative samples.
6. In order to provide more detailed, precise information about the job satisfaction of employees, analysis of scores on each of the 20 scales of the MSQ is suggested. Although it was beyond the scope of this study, such an analysis would permit identification of specific areas on which management could focus, potentially increasing employee job

satisfaction.

7. Job satisfaction surveys, using the same instrument, should be administered at regular intervals to Department of Residence employees in order to build a comparative data base within the department. Longitudinal investigation would provide a more continuous, comprehensive picture of the attitudes of the staff toward their jobs.
8. There could be value in assessment of the job satisfaction of full-time Department of Residence employees at comparable institutions to establish a data base for comparative purposes. Similarly, the job satisfaction of types of employees within the same institution might be compared, i.e., all P&S employees throughout the university, all Merit, all faculty, etc. This would enable management within each department to assess the job satisfaction of each type of their employees in relative terms.

### Summary

The purpose of this study was 1) to discover whether or not selected demographic, attitudinal and environmental factors, as well as non-work related characteristics were related to employee job satisfaction; 2) to assess the job satisfaction among various employee groups; and 3) to identify any interaction between job satisfaction factors and employee groups. Additionally, the investigation was designed to examine the job satisfaction of groups of employees described as "competitively disadvantaged" (Barbash, 1976), such as



women, minorities, and under-employed, and the factors which impact on them.

Subjects for this study were all full time budgeted employees in the Department of Residence at Iowa State University on January 1, 1987. Two instruments were administered to each of the 332 employees who participated in the study. The long form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) 1977 copyright was selected to determine job satisfaction. The second instrument, the Employee Satisfaction Survey (ESS) was developed by the investigator to generate data necessary to respond to the hypotheses posited in this study. The ESS was designed to elicit information concerning children and childcare satisfaction, distance between home and work place, race and sex of employee and immediate supervisor and perceptions of work environment. Employees were invited by letter to participate in the study by Charles Frederiksen, Director of Residence at Iowa State University. Three hundred thirty-two of the 358 employees chose to participate.

The questionnaires were administered by the investigator to employees during work time in ten sessions over a three-week period from January 6, 1987 to January 26, 1987.

Analysis of the data generated from the questionnaires was formally organized by 15 hypotheses.

The first three hypotheses were designed to assess the job satisfaction of employees as related to job type or service (i.e., room service, food service, Professional and Scientific, and Merit). The

fourth through seventh hypotheses were concerned with the relationship between job satisfaction and gender/race of employee and immediate supervisor. Hypotheses 8-10 related to distance between job site and home. The next three hypotheses were concerned with issues related to children and childcare. The fourteenth hypothesis questioned the relationship between employees view of job and job satisfaction. The final hypothesis was related to employee job satisfaction and amount of household income earned.

Hypotheses 1 through 12 and 15 were analyzed using ANOVA. Where significant differences were found, Tukey's Studentized Range or Scheffé's test was used. Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used for Hypotheses 13 and 14.

Several post hoc analyses were conducted using three-way analysis of variance to determine whether or not there was interaction between job satisfaction and type, children, childcare, and satisfaction with childcare.

The following were the major findings of this investigation.

1. Employees who had children living at home expressed significantly less job satisfaction than those employees who did not have children living at home. The interaction between job satisfaction and job type and children was not statistically significant. There was a small yet significant relationship between satisfaction with childcare arrangements and job satisfaction. There was not, however, a significant difference in job satisfaction between

employees who had children living at home who required childcare and those who had children living at home who did not require childcare.

There was no interaction between job satisfaction, type, sex, and having children at home or having children who needed childcare. Similarly, no significant interaction was found between job satisfaction, sex, type, and satisfaction with childcare.

2. There was a small but significant relationship between job satisfaction and how employees viewed their job. Those employees who viewed their job as a career were significantly more satisfied with their job than those who viewed their job as a paycheck. There was no significant interaction between job satisfaction, job type and view of job. The interaction between view of job, job type and sex was also insignificant. In both cases, however, it is possible that the results were effected by the small cell size and large standard deviations of P&S employees. Although the interaction was not significant, several points may be worth noting.

Twice as many P&S employees viewed their job as a career than did Merit employees. Male employees of both job types consistently viewed their job as a career in greater numbers than female employees in the same job type, however, the difference was greatest between male and female P&S

staff. Female P&S employees, female Merit employees, and male Merit employees defined their job as a paycheck in much larger numbers than did male P&S employees. Groups of employees composed primarily of women (clerical and food service) overwhelmingly (70%) viewed their job as a paycheck.

3. No significant differences were generated related to race/sex of employee and race/sex of employee's immediate supervisor as related to job satisfaction. Caution is advised in interpreting these results because of the extremely small N for non-white employees. Additionally, although there were a large number of female supervisors, most of those were in food service which traditionally has been a female dominated field, even in the management area.
4. There was a significant difference in job satisfaction between P&S and Merit employees, with P&S staff being more satisfied than Merit staff. Further analysis indicated, however, that this difference existed only between P&S and Merit food service staff. The practical significance of this difference is questionable since the averaged general job satisfaction score for the total group of employees was 3.53.
5. There appears to be no relationship between job satisfaction and distance between job and home, or preference for living closer to job.

6. The difference in job satisfaction related to amount of household income earned was not significant.

The findings resulting from this study suggest several issues related to job satisfaction which warrant further investigation. First, the impact on job satisfaction of children and childcare has been previously overlooked. This topic holds promise for future research, especially in light of the increasing interest in childcare as a job-related benefit. Second, considering the significant relationship between view of job and job satisfaction, further study needs to be given to the differences in view of job related to sex and job type. Finally, although this study supported previous findings regarding blue collar versus white collar (Merit versus P&S) job satisfaction, it suggests an investigation of job type in conjunction with variables not previously considered (e.g., childcare) might add to the understanding of the difference in job satisfaction found between these two employee groups.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, E. (1978). A multivariate study of subordinate perceptions of and attitudes toward minority and majority managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63 (3), 277-288.
- Albers, E. (1982). Job satisfaction and marital adjustment for dual career couples with young children attending daycare. Dissertation Abstracts International, 52 (8-A) 3435.
- Andrisani, P. J. (1978). Work attitudes and labor market experience. New York: Praeger.
- Andrisani, P. & Shapiro, M. (1978). Women's attitudes toward their jobs: Some longitudinal data on a national sample. Personnel Psychology, 31, 15-34.
- Barbash, J. (1976). Job satisfaction attitudes surveys. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Bartol, K. & Butterfield, D. (1976). Sex effects in evaluating leaders. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 446-454.
- Blood, M. & Hulin, C. (1967). Alienation, environmental characteristics and worker responses. Journal of Applied Psychology, 51, 284-290.
- Bloom, R. & Barry, J. (1967). Determinants of work attitudes among negroes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 51, 278-292.
- Brayfield, A. & Crockett, W. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychology Bulletin 52, 396-424.

- Caldwell, D. & O'Reilly, C. (1982). Task perceptions and job satisfaction: A question of causality. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 361-369.
- Cavanaugh, G. (1976). Humanizing influences of blacks and women in the organization. In Meltzer, H. and Wickert, F. (Eds.), Humanizing organizational behavior (pp. 68-85). Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
- Centers, R. & Bugental, D. (1966). Intrinsic and extrinsic job motivators among different segments of the working population. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50, 193-197.
- Cook, J., Hepworth, S., Wall, T., & Warr, P. (1981). The experience of work: A compendium of 249 measures and their use. New York: Academic Press.
- Dachler, H. & Hulin C. (1969). A reconsideration of the relationship between satisfaction and judged importance of environmental and job characteristics. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4, 252-266.
- Day, D. & Stogill, R. (1972). Leader behavior of male and female supervisors: A comparative study. Personnel Psychology, 25, 253-260.
- Delamotte, Y. & Walker, K. (1974). "Humanisation of work and the quality of working life." IILS Bulletin (International Institute for Labour Studies), Geneva, No. 11.

- Dunham, R. & Smith, F. (1979). Organizational surveys: An internal assessment of organizational health. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman.
- Dunnette, M. (Ed.). (1976). Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Ewen, R. (1967). Weighting components of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 51, 68-73.
- Ewen, R. (1964). Some determinants of job satisfaction: A study of the generality of Herzberg's theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 48, 161-163.
- Ewen, R., Smith, P. Hulin, C., & Locke, E. (1966). An empirical test of the Herzberg two-factor theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50, 544-550.
- Feild, H. & Caldwell, B. (1979). Sex of supervisor, sex of subordinate, and subordinate job satisfaction. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 3 (4), 391-399.
- Ferrar, H. (1978). The relationship between a working mother's job satisfaction and her child care arrangements. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39 (8-A) 4710.
- Fisher, V. & Hanna, J. (1931). The dissatisfied worker. New York: Macmillan.
- Flaugher, R., Campbell, J. & Pike, L. (1969). Ethnic group membership as a moderator of supervisor's ratings (Bulletin PR-69-5). Princeton: Educational Testing Service.



- Gibson, J. and Klein, S. (1970). Employee attitudes as a function of age and length of service: A reconceptualization. Academy of Management Journal, 13, 411-425.
- Glenn, N., Taylor, P., & Weaver, C. (1977). Age and job satisfaction among males and females: A multivariate, multisurvey study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 189-193.
- Gruneberg, M. M. (1976). Job satisfaction. London: Macmillan Press.
- Hansen, P. (1974). Sex differences and supervision. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychology Association, New Orleans, September.
- Haynes, K. (1983). Sexual differences in social work administrators' job satisfaction. Journal of Social Service Research, 6 (3-4), 57-74.
- Herzberg, R. (1966). Work and the nature of man. Cleveland: World Press.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B. (1964). The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. & Capwell, D. (1957). Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
- Hinrichs, J. R. (1974). The motivation crisis. New York: AMACOM.

- Hinrichs, J. R. & Mischkind, L. (1967). Empirical and theoretical limitations of the two-factor hypothesis of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 51, 191-200.
- Hopkins, A. (1983). Work and job satisfaction in the public sector. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowan and Allanheld.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hulin, C. (1969). Sources of variation in job and life satisfaction: The role of community and job-related variables. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, 279-291.
- Hulin, C. (1966). Effects of community characteristics on measures of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50, 185-192.
- Hulin, C. & Blood, M. (1968). Job enlargement, individual differences and responses. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 41-55.
- Hulin, C. & Smith, P. (1965). A linear model of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 209-216.
- Hulin, C. & Smith, P. (1964). Sex differences in job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 48, 88-92.
- Hunt, J. & Saul, P. (1975). The relationship of age, tenure and job satisfaction in males and females. Academy of Management Journal, 18, 690-702.
- Iaffaldano, M. T. & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin 97, 251-273.

- Ilgen, D. & Hollenback, J. (1977). The role of job satisfaction in absence behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 19, 148-161.
- Jacobson, M. & Effertz, J. (1974). Sex roles and leadership: Perceptions of the leaders and the led. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12, 383-396.
- James, L. & Jones, A. (1980). Perceived job characteristics and job satisfaction: An examination of reciprocal causation. Personnel Psychology, 33, 97-135.
- Jones, A., James, L., Bruni, J., & Sells, S. (1977). Black-white differences in work environment perceptions and job satisfaction and its correlates. Personnel Psychology, 30, 5-16.
- Kahn, R. (1972). The meaning of work: Interpretations and Proposals for measurement. In A. Campbell and P. Converse (Eds.) The human meaning of social change (pp. 159-204). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Katzell, R. (1957). Industrial psychology. Journal of Applied Psychology, 8, 237-268. Palo Alto: Annual Review.
- Katzell, R., Barrett, R., & Parker, T. (1961). Job satisfaction, job performance, and situational characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 45, 65-72.
- King, N. (1970). Clarification and evaluation of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. Psychological Bulletin, 53 (6), 460-466.

- Landy, F. (1985). Psychology of work behavior. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.
- Landy, F. (1978). An opponent process theory of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 533-547.
- Lawler, E. (1973). Motivation in work organization. Monterey: Brooks/Cole.
- Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1297-1349). Skokie, Illinois: Rand McNally.
- Locke, E. (1970). Job satisfaction and job performance: A theoretical analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5, 484-500.
- Lofquist, L. & Dawis, R. (1969). Adjustment to work; a psychological view of man's problems in a work-oriented society. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Manhardt, P. (1972). Job orientation of male and female college graduates in business. Personnel Psychology, 25, 361-368.
- Meltzer, H. & Wickert, F. (Eds.). (1976). Humanizing organizational behavior. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
- Mikes, P. & Hulin, C. (1968). Use of importance as a weighting component of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 52, 394-398.
- Milutinovich, J. (1976). A comparative study of work attitudes of black and white workers. In D. Ford (Ed.) Readings in minority group relations (pp. 135-155). LaJolla: University Associates.

- Moch, M. (1980). Racial differences in job satisfaction: Testing four common explanations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 299-306.
- Morse, N. (1953). Satisfactions in the white-collar job. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center.
- Muchinsky, P. (1983). Psychology applied to work. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.
- Muchinsky, P. (1978). Age and job facet satisfaction: A conceptual reconsideration. Aging and Work, 1, 1175-179.
- Muchinsky, P. (1977). Employee absenteeism: A review of the literature. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 10, 316-340.
- Muchinsky, P. & Morrow, P. (1980). A multidisciplinary model of voluntary employee turnover. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 17, 263-290.
- Munsterberg, H. (1913). Psychology and industrial efficiency. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Near, J., Rice, R., & Hunt, R. (1978). Work and extra-work correlates of life and job satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 248-264.
- O'Reilly, G. & Roberts, K. (1973). Job satisfaction among whites and non-whites: A cross-cultural approach. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57, 295-299.
- Osborn, R. & Vicars, W. (1976). Sex stereotypes: An artifact in leader behavior and subordinates satisfaction analysis. Academy of Management Journal, 19, 439-449.

- Parker, S. (1976). The experience and meaning of work today. In M. Weir (Ed.), Job satisfaction (pp. 125-134). Glasgow: Fontana/Collings.
- Petty, M., & Bruning, N. (1980). A comparison of the relationships between subordinates' perceptions of supervisory behavior and measures of subordinates job satisfaction for male and female leaders. Academy of Management Journal, 23 (4), 717-725.
- Petty, M. & Lee, G. (1975). Moderating effects of sex of supervisor and subordinate on relationships between supervisory behavior and subordinate satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60 (5), 624-628.
- Petty, M., McGee, G., & Cavender, J. (1984). A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. Academy of Management Review, 9 (4), 712-721.
- Porter, L. (1962). Job attitudes in management: Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. Journal of Applied Psychology, 46, 375-384.
- Porter, L. & Lawler, E. (1968). Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.
- Porter, L. & Lawler, E. (1965). Properties of organization structure in relation to job attitudes and job behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 23-51.
- Porter, L. & Steers, R. (1973). Organization, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. Psychological Bulletin, 80, 151-176.

- Pulakos, E. & Schmitt, N. (1983). A longitudinal study of a valence model approach for the prediction of job satisfaction of new employees. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 307-312.
- Quinn, R., Seashore, S., Mangione, T., Campbell, D. Staines, G., & McCullough, M. (1971). Survey of working conditions: Final report on univariate and bivariate tables (Document 2916-0001). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Quinn, R. & Shepard, L. (1974). The 1972-73 quality of employment survey. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.
- Quinn, R., Staines, G. & McCullough, M. (1974). Job satisfaction: Is there a trend? Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Ruch, W. & Hershauer, J. (1974). Factors affecting worker productivity. Occasional Paper Number 10. Arizona State University, Tempe: Bureau of Business and Economic Research.
- Salancik, G. & Pfeffer, J. (1977). An examination of need-satisfaction models of job attitudes. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 427-456.
- Sausner, W. & York, C. (1978). Sex differences in job satisfaction: A reexamination. Personnel Psychology, 31, 537-547.

- Schachter, S. & Singer, J. (1962). Cognitive, social, and physiological determinants of emotional state. Psychological Review, 69, 379-399.
- Schaffer, R. (1953). Job satisfaction as related to need satisfaction in work. Psychological Monographs, 67, (No. 304).
- Shaw, S. & Voss, M. (1987, September 9). Business world slowly adds day care to benefits. The Des Moines Register, pp 1A, 6A.
- Shaw, S. & Voss, M. (1987, September 6). Day care isn't just kid stuff: Rising social, political issue. The Des Moines Register, pp. 1A, 4A.
- Slocum, J. & Strawser, R. (1972). Racial differences in job attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56, 28-32.
- Steczak, C. (1980). The impact of availability of childcare arrangements on the career paths and eventual job satisfaction of women in vocational education. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41 (-A), 2578.
- Steers, R. & Rhodes, S. (1978). Major influences on employee attendance: A process model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 391-407.
- Staw, B., Bell, N. & Clausen, J. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. Administrative Science Quarterly, 31, 56-77.



- Turner, A. & Lawrence, P. (1965). Industrial jobs and the worker: An investigation of response to task attributes. Boston: Harvard University.
- Vroom, V. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.
- Wahba, M. & Bridwell, L. (1976). Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15, 212-240.
- Walsh, T. (1980). Job satisfaction assessment of residence halls food service personnel at three selected state universities. (Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University).
- Wanous, J. (1974). A causal-correlational analysis of the job satisfaction and performance relationship. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 139-144.
- Weaver, C. (1980). Job satisfaction in the United States in the 1970s. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 364-367.
- Weaver, C. (1978). Sex differences in the determinants of job satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 265-274.
- Weaver, C. (1977). Relationships among pay, race, sex, occupational prestige, supervision, work autonomy, and job satisfaction in a national sample. Personnel Psychology, 30 (3), 437-455.
- Weaver, C. (1975). Black-white differences in attitudes toward job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 438-441.

- Weaver, C. (1974a). Correlates of job satisfaction: Some evidence from the national surveys. Academy of Management Journal, 17 (2), 373-375.
- Weaver, C. (1974b). Negro-white differences in job satisfaction. Business Horizons, 17, 67-70.
- Weir, M. (Ed.). (1976). Job Satisfaction. Glasgow: Fontana, Collins
- Weiss, H. & Adler, S. (1984). Personality and organizational behavior. In B. Shaw and L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (pp. 1-50). Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Weiss, D., Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minnesota: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center.
- Weiss, H. & Shaw, J. (1979). Social influences on judgments about tasks. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 24, 126-140.
- Zajonc, R. (1980). Reeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. American Psychologist, 35, 151-175.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The investigator wishes to express her appreciation and thanks to the many individuals who assisted with the planning, execution and completion of this study.

Larry Ebberts, chair of my graduate committee deserves special thanks for devoting the time and attention necessary to see this project through to its completion. His personal support and caring approach were critical to my perseverance.

Dan Robinson, member of my graduate committee, provided invaluable insight into the dissertation process, as well as significant personal support.

Mary Huba, also a member of my graduate committee, challenged me to conquer my fear of statistics and to develop a more sound understanding of that discipline.

Three other members of my graduate committee deserve individual thanks.

Tom Walsh provided initial inspiration for my topic and generously shared his knowledge and resources, always in a supportive fashion.

Wilbur Layton graciously agreed to substitute during my orals and ultimately replace J. Stanley Ahmann as a permanent committee member.

J. Stanley Ahmann supported and assisted my development in the area of statistics, appreciating my limitations.

Three other people had significant impact on completion of

this project.

Richard Warren gently yet critically reviewed my work in the early stages.

Kathy Shelley and Morgan Wang from the Iowa State University Statistical Laboratory generated the programs necessary to analyze my data, oftentimes on short notice and at odd hours.

This project was totally funded by the Department of Residence at Iowa State University. Obvious thanks are in order for that monetary support.

Significantly more critical to this entire process, however, was the caring and support, both personal and job related, of my supervisor, Chuck Frederiksen. Without the understanding and encouragement of Chuck and my colleagues in the department this project would not have been completed. Working with people like this is what job satisfaction is all about.

Finally, thanks go to my husband, Jim, and two children, Courtney and Jeffrey, who tolerated with good humor (most of the time), patience and love all the delays and accompanying moods that occurred along the way.

**APPENDIX A. MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE**

# minnesota satisfaction questionnaire<sup>124</sup>

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell **how you feel about your present job**, what things you are **satisfied** with and what things you are **not satisfied** with.

On the basis of your answers and those of people like you, we hope to get a better understanding of the things people **like and dislike about their jobs**.

On the following pages you will find statements about your **present job**.

- Read each statement carefully.
- Decide **how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job** described by the statement.

Keeping the statement in mind:

- if you feel that your job gives you **more than you expected**, check the box under **"Very Sat."** (Very Satisfied);
- if you feel that your job gives you **what you expected**, check the box under **"Sat."** (Satisfied);
- if you **cannot make up your mind** whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check the box under **"N"** (Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied);
- If you feel that your job gives you **less than you expected**, check the box under **"Dissat."** (Dissatisfied);
- if you feel that your job gives you **much less than you expected**, check the box under **"Very Dissat."** (Very Dissatisfied).

- Remember: Keep the statement in mind when deciding **how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job**.
- Do this for **all** statements. Please answer **every** item.

**Be frank and honest.** Give a true picture of your feelings about your **present job**.

Ask yourself: How **satisfied** am I with this aspect of <sup>125</sup>my job?

**Very Sat.** means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Sat.** means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**N** means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

**Dissat.** means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Very Dissat.** means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

**On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .**

	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
1. The chance to be of service to others.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The chance to try out some of my own ideas.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Being able to do the job without feeling it is morally wrong.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The chance to work by myself.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The variety in my work.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The chance to have other workers look to me for direction.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The chance to do the kind of work that I do best.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The social position in the community that goes with the job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The policies and practices toward employees of this company.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The way my supervisor and I understand each other.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. My job security.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The amount of pay for the work I do.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. The working conditions (heating, lighting, ventilation, etc.) on this job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. The opportunities for advancement on this job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. The technical "know-how" of my supervisor.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. The spirit of cooperation among my co-workers.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. The chance to be responsible for planning my work.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. The way I am noticed when I do a good job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Being able to see the results of the work I do.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. The chance to be active much of the time.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. The chance to be of service to people.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. The chance to do new and original things on my own.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. Being able to do things that don't go against my religious beliefs.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. The chance to work alone on the job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. The chance to do different things from time to time.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.

Ask yourself: How <sup>126</sup>**satisfied** am I with this aspect of my job?

**Very Sat.** means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Sat.** means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**N** means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

**Dissat.** means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Very Dissat.** means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
26. The chance to tell other workers how to do things.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27. The chance to do work that is well suited to my abilities.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28. The chance to be "somebody" in the community.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29. Company policies and the way in which they are administered.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30. The way my boss handles his/her employees.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31. The way my job provides for a secure future.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32. The chance to make as much money as my friends.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33. The physical surroundings where I work.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34. The chances of getting ahead on this job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36. The chance to develop close friendships with my co-workers.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
37. The chance to make decisions on my own.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
38. The way I get full credit for the work I do.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39. Being able to take pride in a job well done.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40. Being able to do something much of the time.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41. The chance to help people.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42. The chance to try something different.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44. The chance to be alone on the job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45. The routine in my work.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
46. The chance to supervise other people.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
47. The chance to make use of my best abilities.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
48. The chance to "rub elbows" with important people.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
49. The way employees are informed about company policies.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
50. The way my boss backs up his/her employees (with top management).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.



Ask yourself: How **satisfied** am I with this aspect of <sup>127</sup>my job?

**Very Sat.** means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Sat.** means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**N** means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

**Dissat.** means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Very Dissat.** means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

**On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .**

	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
51. The way my job provides for steady employment.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
52. How my pay compares with that for similar jobs in other companies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
53. The pleasantness of the working conditions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
54. The way promotions are given out on this job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
55. The way my boss delegates work to others.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
56. The friendliness of my co-workers.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
57. The chance to be responsible for the work of others.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
58. The recognition I get for the work I do.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
59. Being able to do something worthwhile.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
60. Being able to stay busy.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
61. The chance to do things for other people.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
62. The chance to develop new and better ways to do the job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
63. The chance to do things that don't harm other people.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
64. The chance to work independently of others.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
65. The chance to do something different every day.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
66. The chance to tell people what to do.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
67. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
68. The chance to be important in the eyes of others.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
69. The way company policies are put into practice.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
70. The way my boss takes care of the complaints of his/her employees.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
71. How steady my job is.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
72. My pay and the amount of work I do.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
73. The physical working conditions of the job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
74. The chances for advancement on this job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
75. The way my boss provides help on hard problems.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.

Ask yourself: How **satisfied** am I with this aspect of my job?

**Very Sat.** means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Sat.** means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**N** means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

**Dissat.** means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Very Dissat.** means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
76. The way my co-workers are easy to make friends with. ....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
77. The freedom to use my own judgment.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
78. The way they usually tell me when I do my job well.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
79. The chance to do my best at all times.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
80. The chance to be "on the go" all the time.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
81. The chance to be of some small service to other people.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
82. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
83. The chance to do the job without feeling I am cheating anyone.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
84. The chance to work away from others. ....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
85. The chance to do many different things on the job. ....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
86. The chance to tell others what to do.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
87. The chance to make use of my abilities and skills.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
88. The chance to have a definite place in the community.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
89. The way the company treats its employees.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
90. The personal relationship between my boss and his/her employees.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
91. The way layoffs and transfers are avoided in my job. ....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
92. How my pay compares with that of other workers.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
93. The working conditions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
94. My chances for advancement. ....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
95. The way my boss trains his/her employees.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
96. The way my co-workers get along with each other. ....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
97. The responsibility of my job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
98. The praise I get for doing a good job. ....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
99. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
100. Being able to keep busy all the time. ....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.

**APPENDIX B. EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION SURVEY**

## Confidential

Your answers to the questions and all other information you give us will be held in strictest confidence.

1. Check (x) one: ☐ male ☐ female
2. How old are you?  years
3. Circle the number of years of schooling you have completed:
 

4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
(grade school)					(high school)				(college)				(graduate school)			
4. Are you (Check [x] one): ☐ single  
☐ married  
☐ divorced  
☐ separated  
☐ widowed
5. List the age(s) of all of your children who live with you in your home.  
, , , , , . If you have no children living with you in your home, skip to Question 9.
6. What is the typical arrangement for childcare for the youngest child in your household when you are at work and the child is not in school?  
 Check (x) one.
  - ☐ the child takes care of him/herself
  - ☐ a member of the household watches the child
  - ☐ the child goes to a day care center, nursery school or babysitter
  - ☐ an unpaid nonmember of the household watches the child in my home
  - ☐ a paid nonmember of the household watches the child in my home
7. How many hours of such child care are provided on a typical week day?  
 Check (x) one.
  - ☐ none
  - ☐ 1 to 3 hours
  - ☐ 4 to 6 hours
  - ☐ 7 to 9 hours
  - ☐ 10 or more hours

8. How satisfied are you with your current child care arrangements?  
 Check (x) one: ☐ very satisfied  
☐ satisfied  
☐ neutral  
☐ dissatisfied  
☐ very dissatisfied  
☐ not applicable
9. Do you live in Ames? ☐ yes ☐ no
10. If not, how far away from your job site do you live? \_\_\_\_\_ miles
11. Would you prefer to live closer to your job site?  
 Check (x) one: ☐ yes  
☐ no  
☐ doesn't matter
12. Are you (Check [x] one) ☐ white  
☐ black  
☐ Hispanic  
☐ Asian-American  
☐ Native American  
☐ other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
13. What is your job classification or title? (Example: Food Worker I, Custodian II, Coordinator of Residence Life) \_\_\_\_\_
14. How many hours per week do you generally work?  
 Check (x) one: ☐ less than 40 hours  
☐ 40 hours  
☐ 40-45 hours  
☐ 46-50 hours  
☐ 51-55 hours  
☐ more than 55 hours
15. How would you characterize the daily pace of your job?  
 Check (x) one: ☐ Frantic: too much to do all the time  
☐ Busy: a lot to do but manageable  
☐ Mixed: sometimes busy, sometimes slow  
☐ Okay: a reasonable workload  
☐ Slow: lots of unoccupied time on the job

16. Does your job require working late,<sup>132</sup> bringing work home, or working overtime at least once a week?
- \_\_\_\_\_ yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ no
17. How long have you worked for the Department of Residence at Iowa State University?
- \_\_\_\_\_ years    \_\_\_\_\_ months
18. How long have you been in your present job? \_\_\_\_\_ years    \_\_\_\_\_ months
19. Did you expect to be in your present job as long as you have been?
- \_\_\_\_\_ yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ no
20. If you have stayed in your present job longer than you expected to, what is (are) the reason(s)? Check (x) all that apply.
- \_\_\_\_\_ spouse's career/job  
\_\_\_\_\_ salary  
\_\_\_\_\_ location  
\_\_\_\_\_ enjoy the people I work with  
\_\_\_\_\_ lack of other opportunities  
\_\_\_\_\_ other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
21. In your household, do you (Check [x] one)
- \_\_\_\_\_ earn all of the yearly household income  
\_\_\_\_\_ earn over half the household income  
\_\_\_\_\_ earn half or less than half of the household income
22. How do you view the income you earn:  
(Check [x] one): \_\_\_\_\_ necessary to make ends meet  
                                \_\_\_\_\_ extra household income  
                                \_\_\_\_\_ only household income
23. Please circle the number that best reflects how you view your job.
- |            |   |   |   |          |
|------------|---|---|---|----------|
| 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5        |
| a paycheck |   |   |   | a career |

24. If you consider your job a career, how do you see your current position?

Check (x) one: ☐ a stepping stone to a higher level position  
☐ the highest position you wish to attain  
☐ not applicable

25. Is your spouse/partner supportive of your ambitions/career?

☐ yes

☐ no

If no, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

26. Have either you or your spouse/partner ever given up a job or job opportunity to support or advance the other's career?

Check (x) one: ☐ I did  
☐ he/she did  
☐ we both did  
☐ has never been an issue between us

27. How would you rate your current overall job performance?

Check (x) one: ☐ excellent  
☐ good  
☐ not sure  
☐ fair  
☐ poor

28. Are you a member of the AFSCME Union? ☐ yes ☐ no

29. Is your immediate supervisor ☐ male ☐ female

30. If your present immediate supervisor is of a different sex, would you be more comfortable if he/she were the same sex as you?

Check (x) one: ☐ yes  
☐ no  
☐ doesn't matter

31. Is your immediate supervisor

Check x one: ☐ white  
☐ black  
☐ Hispanic  
☐ Native American  
☐ Asian-American  
☐ other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

32. If your present immediate supervisor<sup>134</sup> is from a different race, would you be more comfortable if he/she were from the same race as you?

Check (x) one: ☐ yes  
☐ no  
☐ doesn't matter

33. How satisfied are you with the benefit package you receive at the University? Check (x) one: ☐ very satisfied

☐ satisfied  
☐ neutral  
☐ dissatisfied  
☐ very dissatisfied

34. For each of the following benefits, please place an "X" in the appropriate column(s).

<u>Benefit</u>	<u>I am aware that I have this benefit</u>	<u>I have used this benefit</u>
health insurance _____		
life insurance _____		
dental insurance _____		
sick leave _____		
maternity leave _____		
emergency leave _____		
disability _____		
workman's comp _____		
leave without pay _____		
vacation _____		
comp time _____		
break time _____		
food service discount _____		
professional development opportunities _____		
employee assistance program _____		
parking space close to work _____		
credit union membership _____		
flex time _____		



35. What benefits could be added that <sup>135</sup>would increase your satisfaction with the package? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
36. What do you like BEST about working for the Department of Residence at Iowa State? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
37. What do you like LEAST about working for the Department of Residence at Iowa State? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX C. LETTER FROM DIRECTOR OF RESIDENCE**

Iowa State University *of Science and Technology* Ames, Iowa 50012



December 15, 1986

Director of Residence  
1218 Friley Hall  
Telephone 515-294-5636

Name  
Address

Dear Name2:

Every year we conduct at least one survey to assess student satisfaction with the quality of life within the residence hall system at Iowa State University. In like manner, we are also interested in assessing employee satisfaction within the Department of Residence. The last time we formally assessed employee satisfaction with their work experience in the Department of Residence at Iowa State University was six years ago. At that time, Dr. Tom Walsh surveyed the food service staff about their level of job satisfaction as part of his doctoral dissertation research.

Ginny Arthur, Director of the Towers Residence Halls, has undertaken the task of assessing the job satisfaction of all budgeted employees of the Department of Residence. This project will hopefully provide the Department of Residence with information about each employee's job satisfaction as well as provide data necessary for the completion of Ginny's doctoral research.

The answers you provide will enable us to review the quality of work life for employees in the department. It may provide us with ideas for improving the work environment or suggest issues about which we need to gather additional information.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. I strongly urge you to take this opportunity to share your feelings with us about working for the Department of Residence at Iowa State University. Your responses will be confidential and used to help us identify those areas which staff feel good about and those areas that need improvement.

Ginny will be visiting with groups of staff during January to further explain this study and distribute two questionnaires for each person to complete.

Feel free to contact Ginny (294-5163) if you have questions about this study. Results of the study will be available to any participant who is interested in seeing them.

Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Frederiksen  
Director of Residence

sjb

**APPENDIX D. INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS**

Prior to the distribution of the questionnaires and answer sheet, the following information/instructions will be provided the prospective participants:

1. You are being asked to participate in a survey of Department of Residence Personnel at Iowa State University. The questionnaires which you will complete require approximately 25-35 minutes of your time and ask questions concerning your satisfaction about certain aspects of your job.
2. The results of the research project will be available to interested persons. Although immediate benefits are not expected, an understanding of your satisfaction toward various aspects of your job may encourage increased consideration concerning your job needs and expectations.
3. Feel free to ask any questions concerning the surveys.
4. You are free to discontinue your participation at any time.
5. Your response to questions asked will be confidential; in fact, your identity will not be known to anyone. Neither your name nor any identifying codes are included in the surveys.
6. The first questionnaire is called the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Do not pay attention to page 2, go to page 3.

7. You have a purple answer sheet on which to record your answers. Do not mark in the booklet itself. Do not fold the answer sheet.
8. Look at side one of the answer sheet. Note that the answer sheet is divided in half. The answers to Questions 1-10 are in the first column on the top half of the answer sheet. Questions 11-20 are in the second column, etc. Do not go to the bottom half of the answer sheet until you have completed Question 50.
9. If you are very dissatisfied, completely fill in the circle under A or circle 1; if dissatisfied, fill in the circle under B or circle 2, etc.
10. Before beginning, read all the instructions on the back of the answer sheet.
11. Once you have completed the MSQ, then read and answer the Employee Satisfaction Survey (ESS). Answer these questions directly on the survey booklet itself.

**APPENDIX E. HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE APPROVAL FORM**

# INFORMATION ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH

## IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

(Please follow the accompanying instructions for completing this form.)

142

1. Title of project (please type): Job Satisfaction of Full Time Budgeted Employees  
of the Department of Residence at Iowa State University

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are properly protected. Additions to or changes in procedures affecting the subjects after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review.

Virginia C. Arthur

Typed Name of Principal Investigator

12-15-86

Date

Virginia Arthur

Signature of Principal Investigator

C1265 Wallace-Wilson

Campus Address

294-5163

Campus Telephone

3. Signatures of others (if any) Date Relationship to Principal Investigator

4. ATTACH an additional page(s) (A) describing your proposed research and (B) the subjects to be used, (C) indicating any risks or discomforts to the subjects, and (D) covering any topics checked below. CHECK all boxes applicable.

- ☐ Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
- ☐ Samples (blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
- ☐ Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
- ☐ Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
- ☐ Deception of subjects
- ☐ Subjects under 14 years of age and(or) ☐ Subjects 14-17 years of age
- ☐ Subjects in institutions
- ☐ Research must be approved by another institution or agency

5. ATTACH an example of the material to be used to obtain informed consent and CHECK which type will be used.

- ☐ Signed informed consent will be obtained.
- ☒ Modified informed consent will be obtained.

6. Anticipated date on which subjects will be first contacted: Month 1 Day 5 Year 87

Anticipated date for last contact with subjects: Month 1 Day 16 Year 87

7. If Applicable: Anticipated date on which audio or visual tapes will be erased and(or) identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments:

Month Day Year

8. Signature of Head or Chairperson Date Department or Administrative Unit

Larry H. Enckes / M. H. H. H.

12-15-86

Professional Studies

9. Decision of the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research:

- ☐ Project Approved
- ☐ Project not approved
- ☐ No action required

George G. Karas

Name of Committee Chairperson

Date

Signature of Committee Chairperson



4. The purpose of this study is two fold: first to assess the level of job satisfaction of full time budgeted employees of the Department of Residence at Iowa State University. Although we often survey students living in the residence halls concerning their satisfaction with the environment, rarely have we attempted to systematically ascertain the opinions of the staff about their satisfaction with their work environment. The second purpose of this study is to determine whether or not selected environmental and demographic characteristics have a relationship to job satisfaction.

The following research questions will be explored:

1. Is gender or race of the immediate supervisor related to employee job satisfaction?
2. Is job satisfaction related to the distance between the employee's home and work place?
3. Is job satisfaction related to the employee's knowledge or use of university services and benefits?
4. Is there any group of employees (i.e. clerical, custodial, maintenance, food service, professional and scientific) that is more satisfied than another group?
5. Do primary wage earners have a different level of job satisfaction than secondary wage earners?
6. Is satisfaction with childcare arrangements related to job satisfaction?
7. Do those employees who view their work as a career have a different level of job satisfaction than those employees who view their work solely as a paycheck?
8. Is gender or race of employee related to job satisfaction?

Two questionnaires will be administered to all (349) full time budgeted employees of the Department of Residence during scheduled work time. Participation will be voluntary. The questionnaires are the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and one developed by the investigator. A copy of each is attached.

Employees will receive a letter from the Director of Residence indicating departmental support of the project and the voluntary nature of participation in the study. The letter will indicate the Department's intended use of the data: identifying concerns of employees that need to be addressed and resolved so that staff are more satisfied with their work environment.

Questionnaires will be administered by investigator to groups of employees numbering between 40-50 in their normal work setting (complex). Makeup times will be identified for those who were absent on the day(s) questionnaires were originally administered.

**APPENDIX F. MEMORANDUM TO CENTRAL STAFF**

# *Interoffice Communication*<sup>145</sup>

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY  
of Science and Technology

**DATE:** December 18, 1986

**TO:** Central Staff Members

**FROM:** Ginny Arthur

**Re:** Job Satisfaction Survey Schedule

Listed below are the dates, times and locations scheduled for department staff to meet to take the job satisfaction questionnaire we discussed last week.

January 6	8:30 AM	MWL Lge Conference Rm	Richardson Court Food Service
January 6	2:30 PM	West Friley Dining Rm	Union Drive Food Service and Food Stores
January 8	8:30 AM	WW Dining Room	Towers Food Service
January 8	2:30 PM	West Friley Dining Rm	Administrative Office Any food services staff who didn't make other sessions
January 12	10:30 AM	WW Conference Rm	Towers staff*
January 12	1:00 PM	100 University Village	USAC staff*
January 12	2:00 PM	100 University Village	USAC staff*
January 14	8:00 AM	Chessman Lounge	Helser Maintenance**
January 14	10:30 AM	Chessman Lounge	Union Drive staff*
January 15	1:00 PM	MWL Lge Conference Rm	Richardson Court staff*

If you have staff who want to participate but cannot attend their assigned session, please help them identify another scheduled time when they could attend. If you or your staff have any questions, please contact me. Your cooperation and encouragement of your staff to participate is GREATLY appreciated. Thanks!

\*Includes all maintenance, custodial, clerical and P&S staff

\*\*Includes all maintenance, clerical and P&S staff

**APPENDIX G. MEMORANDUM TO SUPERVISORS**

*Interoffice Communication*<sup>147</sup>

G  
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY  
of Science and Technology

DATE January 20, 1987

TO

FROM

Ginny Arthur *GA*  
Director, Towers Residence Halls

In an attempt to make sure all Department of Residence employees have ample opportunity to participate in the Job Satisfaction Survey, an additional, final time for answering the questionnaires has been scheduled. The session will be on:

Monday, January 26, 1987  
MWL Large Conference Room  
1:00 p.m.

The following employees assigned to your work unit have not yet responded to the questionnaires. Please share the information above with them. Thanks for your cooperation!

**APPENDIX H. TABLES**

Table H1. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees by Job Type,  
Sex, and Children

Sex									
<u>Male</u>									
Job Type	Satisfied			Not Satisfied			Combined		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Merit	3.35	.095	44	3.68	.094	45	3.52	.067	89
P&S	3.43	.222	8	3.76	.199	10	3.61	.148	18
Combined	3.36	.087	52	3.70	.085	55			
- - - - -									
<u>Female</u>									
Job Type	Satisfied			Not Satisfied			Combined		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Merit	3.49	.081	61	3.58	.073	74	3.54	.054	135
P&S	3.88	.199	10	3.86	.168	14	3.87	.128	24
Combined	3.54	.075	71	3.62	.067	88			

Table H2. Three-way Analysis of Variance Source Table for General  
Satisfaction Scores by Job Type, Sex and Children

Source	DF	SS	MSE	F	P
Main Effect	7	5.785	0.826	2.09	.0451
Job Type	1	1.818	1.818	4.60	.0330
Sex	1	.204	.204	.52	.4735
Children	1	2.105	2.105	5.32	.0219
Interaction					
Job Type*Sex	1	.511	.511	1.29	.2570
Job Type*Children	1	.030	.030	.07	.7844
Sex* Children	1	1.094	1.094	2.77	.0975
Job Type*Sex*Children	1	.024	.024	.06	.8037
Error	258	102.050	.396		
Corrected Total	265	107.835			



Table H3. Mean General Job Satisfaction of Employees by Job Type,  
Sex, and Childcare

Sex									
<u>Male</u>									
Job Type	Satisfied			Not Satisfied			Combined		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Merit	3.48	.141	25	3.18	.162	19	3.35	.106	44
P&S	3.41	.288	6	3.48	.498	2	3.43	.249	8
Combined	3.47	.126	31	3.20	.154	21			
- - - - -									
<u>Female</u>									
Job Type	Satisfied			Not Satisfied			Combined		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Merit	3.57	.106	44	3.27	.171	17	3.45	.090	61
P&S	3.67	.288	6	4.20	.352	4	3.88	.223	10

Table H4. Three-Way Analysis of Variance Source Table for General  
Satisfaction Scores by Job Type, Sex and Childcare

Source	DF	SS	MSE	F	P
Main Effect	7	5.115	.731	1.47	.1839
Job Type	1	.951	.951	1.92	.1690
Sex	1	1.027	1.027	2.07	.1531
Childcare	1	.976	.976	1.97	.1636
Interactions					
Job Type*Sex	1	.537	.537	1.08	.3003
Job Type*Childcare	1	1.424	1.424	2.87	.0930
Sex*Childcare	1	.034	.034	.07	.7940
Job Type*Sex*Childcare	1	.167	.167	.34	.5626
Error	115	57.075	.496		
Corrected Total	122	62.191			