

JOB SATISFACTION AMONG BLUE-COLLAR WOMEN;  
A SALIENCY CRITERION FOR MEASUREMENT

by

Paula C. Morrow

Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Sociology

APPROVED:

Steven K. Paulson, Chairperson

Richard F. Schëig

James H. Dorsett

December, 1974

Blacksburg, Virginia

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my committee members, past and present, for their aid and encouragement in the writing of this thesis:

	and	A special
thanks is reserved for	and for my 'estranged' husband,	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
CHAPTER I.      THE CONCEPT OF SALIENCY IN JOB SATISFACTION RESEARCH . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	4
The Theoretical Perspective . . . . .	7
CHAPTER II.     OPERATIONALIZATION AND DISCUSSION OF KEY CONCEPTS . . . . .	13
Saliency . . . . .	13
External Factors . . . . .	18
Measuring the Cognitive Component of Job Satisfaction . . . . .	22
Absenteeism--A Behavioral Indicator of Job Satisfaction . . . . .	26
Description of the Sample . . . . .	28
Method of Data Collection . . . . .	29
Implementation of the Research Design . . . . .	30
CHAPTER III.    ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND THE RESEARCH FINDINGS . . . . .	32
Introduction . . . . .	32
Overall Ranking of the Seventeen Dimensions . . . . .	32
The Effect of the External Factors and Pay . . . . .	34
Job Satisfaction Scales . . . . .	45
CHAPTER IV.     SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	49
Summary . . . . .	49
Conclusions . . . . .	51
Implications . . . . .	51
REFERENCES . . . . .	56
APPENDIX A . . . . .	62
APPENDIX B . . . . .	71
VITA . . . . .	76
ABSTRACT	

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Dimension of Job Satisfaction by Saliency Evaluation	33
II	Saliency Rankings of Job Satisfaction Dimensions by Age Group	36
III	Saliency Rankings of Job Satisfaction Dimensions by Marital Status	38
IV	Saliency Rankings of Job Satisfaction Dimensions by Number of Children	40
V	Saliency Rankings of Job Satisfaction Dimensions by Pay	42
VI	Saliency Rankings of Job Satisfaction Dimensions by Perceptions of Role Conflict	44
VII	Age Distribution of Sample	71
VIII	Marital Status Distribution of Sample	72
IX	Number of Children Per Respondent	73
X	Average Weekly Take-Home Pay Per Respondent	74
XI	Distribution of Scores on the Perception of Role Conflict Scale	75

## CHAPTER I

### THE CONCEPT OF SALIENCY IN JOB SATISFACTION RESEARCH

#### Introduction

The concept of job satisfaction has been used extensively as both an independent and dependent variable in studies of human work. Unfortunately the concept does not have a universal meaning among social scientists; perhaps this is because there are too many different dimensions to be incorporated within a single concise definition. The ambiguity surrounding the concept has been further confounded by the two distinct perspectives that industrial psychologists and industrial sociologists have utilized in their approaches to the topic. Industrial psychologists were initially brought into this research area by business concerns who were interested in particular industrial problems such as absenteeism or low production levels. As a result these researchers usually adopted management's problem-solving perspective in conducting their investigations; their goal became the development of "tests, techniques, procedures, and conditions that . . . promote productivity and cut costs" and not the scientific understanding of job satisfaction (Robinson et al., 1973:ii). The industrial sociologists were similar to the industrial psychologists in that they too initially adopted a problem-solving perspective in their research. The sociologists, however, emphasized the social problems of the workers: rural to urban work transition, ethnic discrimination, and the marginal status of some occupational groups (Kimmel, 1973:17-23). Studies which described a

particular occupational group in detail, including the non-work related interests and activities of the workers, were also popular in the 1920's and 30's (Nosow and Form, 1962). These two approaches thus produced conflicting opinions with respect to the true determinents of job satisfaction: The psychologists maintained that such things as individual motivations to work and the effects of interpersonal relationships at the workplace were of paramount importance while the sociologists were concerned with more structural aspects such as the effect of the worker's position in the workplace hierarchy and the amount of control the worker had over the conditions of work.<sup>1</sup>

The more contemporary research, however, appears to be "more systematic and disinterested" rather than problem-solving in nature (Kimmel, 1973:22) and has become more of a blend of psychological and sociological perspectives. Researchers from both camps have adopted multi-faceted definitions of job satisfaction which often include dimensions from disciplines other than their own. This agreement over the multi-dimensional approach to job satisfaction is clearly evidenced by the inclusion of several components within a given researcher's satisfaction measure (Morse, 1953; the Survey Research Associates (SRA) Employee Inventory, 1954; Herzberg et al., 1959; the Job Descriptive

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be clearly established that the different perspectives utilized by these two groups of researchers were not based on the traditional disagreement over the unit of analysis (individual versus group); in fact, both groups took a situational (that is, the individual within his social context-environment) approach to their study of job satisfaction. It was the selection of the specific contingencies to be examined which varied.

Index by Smith, Kendall and Hulin, 1969; Hage and Aiken, 1970; among others).<sup>2</sup>

Despite the general recognition that job satisfaction is a complex concept involving at least several dimensions which must be tapped within a given research measure, few studies employing the multi-dimensionality theory have demonstrated that their attitudinal measures (indicators) correlate highly, if at all, with other objective indicators of job satisfaction; that is, job turnover rates, production indexes, absenteeism, labor disputes, and grievance files. There are several plausible explanations for this apparent discrepancy. First, one may argue that those factors which produce worker satisfaction or dissatisfaction are simply not the factors which cause the other indicators. Herzberg et al. (1957: 99) provides support for this argument in their extensive literature review by reporting that of 26 studies relating morale (job satisfaction) and productivity, fourteen studies demonstrated a positive relationship, nine studies showed no relationship, and three indicated an inverse relationship. A second explanation would maintain that there really is no discrepancy at all; that is, attitudes are not accurate predictors of behavior and thus there is really no reason to expect a high correlation between satisfaction measures and the other behavioral indicators (Bain, 1928:940-957; LaPiere, 1934:230-37; and Deutscher, 1966:235-54). The third possible argument is based on the belief that attitudes are

---

<sup>2</sup> Some researchers still maintain that job satisfaction can be measured by a single dimension (such as the worker's interest in and enjoyment of his job) as evidence by the continued use of such scales as Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) index of job satisfaction.

indicative of behavior "in situations which occur repetitively within the common behavioral context of the individual" (Tittle and Hill, 1971:469). The lack of correlation between work related attitudes and behaviors may therefore be attributed to faulty measures of job satisfaction. Support for this argument is found in Tittle and Hill's (1971:468-78) study of the relationship between various types of attitude measures and behavioral indexes; they state (1971:476):

It is clear that attitude measurement alone, as examined herein, is not totally adequate as a predictor of behavior. However, when it is possible to obtain an average of .543 using a Likert scale in its crudest form, it seems entirely possible that technical refinements and additional methodological considerations could increase predictive efficiency. Investigation of the performance of the various measuring instruments suggests certain refinements and considerations meriting further explorations.

This last argument, which explains the attitude-behavior discrepancy in terms of measurement error will be explored in this research.

It is posited that the major problem with existing measures of job satisfaction is that the workers involved are not asked directly to estimate if and to what extent a given dimension contributes to their satisfaction or dissatisfaction. In other words, the researchers have failed to address themselves to the issue of saliency.

### The Problem

The primary purpose of this research is to explore the concept of saliency in job satisfaction measurement.

When a researcher presents a set of job characteristics or factors to a group of workers with the intent of measuring their job satisfaction on the basis of those workers' evaluations, he is obviously making some



assumptions about what factors are important to those particular workers. Within the context of any research, assumptions are unavoidable; however, the researcher should be able to provide some tenable arguments that those dimensions he has selected for evaluation are indeed the crucial determinants of satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) for that group of workers. In the past, these 'tenable arguments' have largely been based on observational experiences, past research efforts, related job satisfaction literature, and common sense. Furthermore, researchers have seldom challenged one another on this point; as Robinson et al. state in their review of job satisfaction studies (1973:4):

It is assumed that the author knows enough about the field to construct the instrument so that it will cover an important theoretical construct well enough to be useful to other researchers in the field.

It appears, however, that this may not really be the case. There are indications that job satisfaction researchers have not truly been judicious in their selection of dimensions to be included within their attitude measures for evaluating job satisfaction. While hard-core evidence is not available to support this contention, the 'indications' for it may be summarized as follows:

(1) There appears to be an unawareness of prior and related research among scientists who study job satisfaction (Robinson, 1973:2). This unawareness is evidenced by seemingly pointless replication and the use of poorer and non-established scales when better and more established ones are available. Such efforts do little for the theoretical development of job satisfaction.

(2) There appears to be little consultation with workers by researchers for the purpose of appreciating the workers' perspective regarding what job factors are most salient. Consistent with this lack of concern for the workers' viewpoint is the general absence of pre-tests to determine if the proposed measures are indeed valid.

(3) Job satisfaction researchers have traditionally ignored the specific content of the job, particularly an appreciation of the technology involved (Davis, 1971:176:93). As Davis states (1971:180):

. . . almost universally the studies take technology as given.

Completely disregarded are the variables concerned with job boundaries, activities performed, regulation and control of system variations, control of input and output, and access to information within and across job boundaries, all of which have a strong bearing on the satisfaction responses that a job holder would make. These job content variables clearly are not constant from job to job.

(4) As previously noted, the conflicting evidence surrounding the relationship between attitudinal and behavioral indicators of job satisfaction may be a problem in job satisfaction measurement. This possible explanation has not received the consideration it deserves.

(5) Finally, the lack of concern with the selection of job satisfaction dimensions appears even more crucial in light of the growing number of studies which indicate that various occupational groups vary in both the degree and type of satisfactions that are derived from their work experience (Blauner, 1960:473-87; Robinson, 1973:25-78).

In consideration of these indications that researchers have not been properly sampling job satisfaction dimensions, it appears that what

is needed is documentation from the workers themselves that the truly salient job dimensions are being presented to them for their evaluation. Two recent researchers, among those few who have begun to actively use the concept of saliency in their work, state this need succinctly (Wild and Hill, 1970:33):

. . . a large proportion of an interview sample may feel that their place of work is noisy or dirty. This attitude cannot be construed as representing a source of dissatisfaction unless it can be shown that quietness or cleanliness is important to this particular sample. The evaluative framework for assessing the significance of attitudes must therefore be developed by an examination of detailed motives.

It is proposed here that this "evaluative framework for assessing the significance of [job satisfaction] attitudes" (Wild and Hill, 1970:33) can be provided through the use of saliency evaluations by the workers. In turn, this framework generated by the saliency evaluations can be used to improve overall job satisfaction measurement.

### The Theoretical Perspective

The conceptualization of attitude and the approach to attitude research that is presented here has been largely drawn from the work of consistency theorists. This group of theorists maintains that there are three basic components of attitude: (1) an affective component which corresponds to feeling; (2) a cognitive component equatable with knowing or belief; and (3) a conative component meaning action tendency or behavioral readiness (e.g. Campbell, 1947; Chein, 1948; Doob, 1947; Harding, Kutner, Prohansky and Chein, 1954; and Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey, 1962; as cited by McGuire, 1967:402). While each of these researchers has presented theories which differ from one another in many respects (termed balance, congruity, symmetry, and dissonance), they

all share the notion "that the person tends to behave in ways that minimize the internal inconsistency among his interpersonal relations, among his intrapersonal cognitions, or among his beliefs, feelings, and actions" (McGuire, 1967:401). Thus the concept of consistency theory is used to refer to three sets of relationships: (1) the relationship among attitude clusters, (2) the relationship within an attitude component, and (3) the relationship among the three outlined attitude components. The discussion here will be primarily concerned with the second reference to consistency theory--that of the relationship among elements within an attitude component. More specifically, the examination will focus upon the cognitive component of job satisfaction.

Implicit in consistency theory is the notion that general prediction of behavior (and not just behavioral readiness alone) is possible given adequate knowledge of the three attitude components. However, proponents of this theory have encountered a great deal of difficulty in obtaining the necessary empirical evidence to document their position. Telford (1934) was able to lend some support when he demonstrated that the attitude toward church highly correlated with the frequency of church attendance. Another moderately good correspondence between attitude and behavior was obtained in a 1969 study by J. A. Green (as cited in Lemon, 1973:246). Green reported that white students with favorable attitudes towards blacks were more willing to be photographed with them (as measured by the signing of photographic releases) than were students with unfavorable attitudes. The product moment correlation between the racial attitude and the signing of the release was .43 ( $p < .05$ ).

These research findings which lend support to consistency theory have tended to be more the exception than the rule. Many studies (see Wicker, 1969:41-78 for a complete review) indicate the inconsistency between attitudes and behavior. Perhaps the most famous of these is the LaPiere (1934) study: LaPiere travelled throughout the United States with a Chinese couple noting the hotels and restaurants where they were served; they were denied service only once. He then wrote to each of the hotels and restaurants they had visited and asked if service would be extended to Chinese guests. Over 90% of the responding proprietors replied that they would not serve Chinese--in spite of the fact that all had previously served the Chinese couple. LaPiere, of course, concluded that attitudes were not always consistent with behavior.

Consistency theorists have offered a variety of explanations for the lack of correspondence between attitude and behavior in their research. One explanation is that few studies demonstrating consistency are published; journal editors have regarded them as "trite and insufficiently substantive for publication" (Lemon, 1973:250; cf. Insko and Schopler, 1967). Methodological explanations include criticisms of single-item (unidimensional) indicators of beliefs and behaviors which have often been used (Cook and Selltiz, 1967; Lemon, 1973) as well as the use of inferior attitude scales (Tittle and Hill, 1971). In a more theoretical vein, some theorists suggest that consistency theory be modified and expanded to include a situational factor (Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey, 1962:163; Rokeach, 1968:126-29; Lemon, 1973:250-51). For example, Lemon (1973:250-51) suggests that the discrepant findings presented in the LaPiere (1934) study on hotel and restaurant discrimi-

nation against Chinese can be explained by the notion that face to face situations have a lower probability of discriminatory behavior than do beliefs expressed on paper. Another theoretical explanation, suggested by Insko and Schopler (1967), is that people will be reluctant to engage in behaviors "that have negative instrumental relations to positive goals or positive instrumental relations to negative goals." Thus Insko and Schopler would argue that the reason the hotel and restaurant proprietors served the Chinese couple was that the expression of their negative attitude (discrimination) would have jeopardized their positive goal (profit-making). A final explanation is that offered by Jerome Singer (1968:396):

Saliency. A third factor which may relate to the production of bothersomeness accompanying inconsistency is the saliency of the belief, that is, the extent to which it predominates the subject's cognitive system at any given time.

It is posited here that this concept of saliency is a useful explanation for the discrepancy which has been shown to exist between attitudes and behavior. Nearly all existing consistency theories have failed to consider the role of saliency within their explanatory frameworks--despite the realization of its importance by some (e.g. Smith, Bruner and White, 1956; Cook and Selltiz, 1967; Scott, 1968). Saliency, according to Cook and Selltiz (1967), is the extent to which the attitude object figures predominately in the respondent's organization of his environment. It may also refer to the relative importance of various dimensions used to evaluate an attitude object (Lemon, 1973:92). Saliency then may be said to refer to the importance one attaches to a given belief within one's cognitive system.

Following the implications suggested by this concept, it seems plausible to hypothesize that the more salient the given attitudinal belief (which is usually comprised of a series of dimensions), the greater the probability that the related behavior will be consistent.<sup>3</sup> Beliefs which are relatively inconsequential or only minimally involve the individual are more easily modified or ignored in situations where the prevailing social norm (or some other contingency) is counter to what would be the 'consistent behavior.' In contrast, beliefs central to one's 'organization of the environment' are not so easily ignored; to engage in behavior inconsistent with a highly salient belief requires much more justification or adjustment by the individual. One would expect then to observe fewer belief/behavior conflicts when highly salient beliefs are being examined than when non-salient beliefs are in question.

In consideration of the multi-faceted attitude known as job satisfaction, it is proposed that the beliefs or dimensions which comprise the cognitive component are of differing degrees of saliency. It will be the purpose of this thesis to further explore the concept of saliency in job satisfaction measurement; determining the saliency of various dimensions to a given group of workers, what influence factors external to the job have upon the saliency evaluations, and finally to establish whether job satisfaction measures which utilize

---

<sup>3</sup>This hypothesis could also be reversed; that is, the more salient the behavioral act, the greater the probability that a consistent attitude will be expressed.

the notion of saliency in evaluating the cognitive component are better correlates of the behavioral indicator of the attitude.



## CHAPTER II

### OPERATIONALIZATION AND DISCUSSION OF KEY CONCEPTS

#### Saliency

The failure of many researchers to incorporate the concept of saliency within their studies of job satisfaction can partially be attributed to the difficulties encountered in operationalizing and measuring the concept. Techniques for assessing the saliency of job satisfaction dimensions have not been developed. This is rather surprising in as much as Arthur Kornhauser gave specific recognition to the problem as early as 1944(132):

The percentage of employees who are pleased or displeased about a particular condition gives no indication of the importance or significance of those feelings as determinants of general satisfaction. If 75 per cent of a group express dissatisfaction with lockers or dirty windows, while only 25 per cent say they are dissatisfied about wage rates, it certainly does not mean that management is justified in giving attention to the former and ignoring the latter. The important additional problem is how urgently the expressed attitudes are felt and how influential they are in determining the overall orientation of the individual.

Since Kornhauser's statement of the problem, only one empirical investigation to this researcher's knowledge has attempted to deal with this issue. Wild and Hill (1970) conducted a survey analysis of 2,495 female electronics workers in order to assess their attitudes toward work in that industry. They prefaced their questionnaire with a 47 item section asking workers to evaluate statements describing various job characteristics according to the importance they attached to their content. Examples of these statements included: "The work should be

such that you are fully satisfied doing it," and "The working areas of a factory should be clean and tidy" (Wild and Hill, 1970:33). Each of these 47 statements corresponded to another question posed in a different section of the survey. This second set of questions asked workers to evaluate how closely their job approximated a given job description or dimension of satisfaction; for example, 'Working areas at my job are generally kept clean.' This technique of directly asking workers what dimensions of satisfaction are salient to them is a solution to the problem of saliency measurement.

The use of saliency items, such as the ones used by Wild and Hill (1970), enables the researcher to determine how important or central a given dimension is to the worker's "organization of his environment" (Cook and Selltiz, 1967). They provide him with an evaluative framework for his interpretation of job description or scale items; that is, responses to Wild and Hill's (1970) second set of questions as exemplified by 'Working areas at my job are generally kept clean.' When these scale items are evaluated along with their corresponding saliency measures, it becomes apparent that strongly negative or positive endorsements of scale items are meaningless in terms of explaining job satisfaction if the worker has informed us that the dimension was nonsalient to him in the first place. The incorporation of saliency can therefore be viewed as a significant contribution to the study of job satisfaction if it can be demonstrated that it aids the researcher in obtaining a more accurate view of how workers feel about their job. More explicitly, it may provide him the opportunity to reduce measurement error through the elimination of inappropriate scale items.

A second, related benefit of saliency evaluations is that of reducing researcher bias in the construction of the survey instrument. When saliency evaluations are included within the context of the items constructed, the researcher is allowing a greater opportunity for uniqueness of the individual, or of a group of individuals, to surface. As has already been indicated, the anticipated result is a more accurate evaluation of job satisfaction. However, in allowing every individual the freedom to evaluate a given dimension as salient or non-salient, he has also been extended greater freedom to disagree with societal (normative) definitions as to what constitutes an important aspect of the job. This necessarily creates some interpretative problems for the researcher, particularly since the worker's definitions as to what constitutes important aspects are not obtained in many instances. Examples of this phenomenon include the assembly line worker who prefers 'monotonous' work because it is 'easy' and the skyscraper window-washer who does 'menial' work but likes his job because it is both dangerous and financially rewarding.<sup>4</sup> Traditional job satisfaction measures do not permit respondents such freedom; they tend to assume that the dimensions presented within their scale items are universally desirable and their task is simply to ascertain to what extent the actual job matches the ideal condition. With such saliency evaluations, the researcher can appreciate

---

<sup>4</sup>I am indebted to John F. Krol, through informal conversations, for helping me to clarify my thinking along the above outlined points.

individual and group differences and evaluate their level of job satisfaction on the basis of what is important to the workers themselves.<sup>5</sup>

While it is anticipated that the inclusion of saliency evaluations will improve our measurement of job satisfaction, one related problem still remains unresolved and deserves our consideration: how does one determine what job factors and characteristics to present to workers in the first place? After all, saliency evaluations are of little value if the dimensions which contribute significantly to job satisfaction are absent from the analysis. There are no clear answers to this problem but one can expect that the final selection of job dimensions will be based upon specifiable sources and rationales (such as field observation, participant observation, interviews, pre-tests validated by the workers, or past job satisfaction studies with an identical or similar group) and not "measurement by fiat" (that is, arguing that job satisfaction consists of the given dimensions by the researcher's definition) (Cicourel, 1964: 14-33). Only through a delineation of how and why each dimension is selected for saliency evaluation can a researcher gain any confidence that he has considered all relevant sources of information and has not overlooked a significant dimension in the workers' perspective.

The saliency dimensions used in this study were derived from a review of job satisfaction literature, with a special emphasis on those studies involving blue collar workers or female samples (Herzberg et al., 1957;

---

<sup>5</sup>It should be noted that while this discussion has implied that saliency may be useful in explaining individual differences with respect to job satisfaction, the level of analysis to be used in this thesis is that of the group. The concern will be on determining what is salient for a defined occupational group.

Argyle, 1972; and Wild and Hill, 1970) and an observational experience at the workplace which included some informal conversations with the workers. As the sample was to consist of blue collar women, and little is known about the determinants of job satisfaction for this group, it was decided to include any dimensions which appeared in the literature or were suggested by the observational experience. Seventeen dimensions were selected as possible sources of job satisfaction and are presented here along with how they were operationalized for saliency evaluation within the questionnaire (see questionnaire--Appendix A):

(1) The importance of having work that is intrinsically satisfying; the value of the work itself. Operationalized: It is important for me to get a feeling of accomplishment from my job.

(2) The importance of fringe benefits. Operationalized: Company benefits are an important part of any job.

(3) The importance of having interesting work or enjoying one's work. Operationalized: A good job, among other things, should not be boring.

(4) The importance of having some input into the decision-making process at work. Operationalized: Workers should not be consulted about production decisions; they are the responsibility of the supervisor or management.

(5) The importance of job security. Operationalized: Having job security is very important to me.

(6) The importance of variety in one's job. Operationalized: For me, a good job has a variety of work tasks.

(7) The importance of opportunities for advancement or promotion; also perceptions of the equity with which promotions are distributed. Operationalized: It is important to me to have a job which I know I can advance in if I work hard.

(8) The importance of individual autonomy in performing work tasks. Operationalized: It should be up to me to decide how to work, not the supervisor.

(9) The importance of interaction with co-workers. Operationalized: I really enjoy talking to my fellow workers.

(10) The importance of being assigned to tasks which make the best use of a worker's skills and abilities. Operationalized: Companies should try to match a person's talents to a job.

(11) The importance of being assigned to tasks which make the best use of a worker's skills and abilities. Operationalized: Companies should try to match a person's talents to a job.

(12) The importance of the sex of the co-workers. Operationalized: The best jobs are those which hire an equal number of men and women.

(13) The importance of earning enough to support one's family; the importance of earning enough to live on. Operationalized: Workers should be guaranteed large enough wages to support themselves and their families.

(14) The importance of having a friendly relationship with one's supervisor. Operationalized: Supervisors should not concern themselves with the needs and wishes of employees.

(15) The importance of group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers. Operationalized: It is important to me to get along with the people I work with.

(16) The importance of management's consideration of the needs and wishes of employees. Operationalized: Management has an obligation to consider the needs and wishes of employees.

(17) The importance of pay in relationship to what other workers performing the same work earn or what comparable employers offer. Operationalized: Workers should be paid according to the work they do; that is, according to their skill and experience.

### External Factors

An examination of how factors external to the job setting influence saliency evaluations was conducted with two goals in mind. The first goal was to gain some notion of how 'stable' saliency evaluations are; that is, to understand whether the dimensions deemed salient by the sample as a whole are also salient to various sub-groups (as defined by the non-work related factors) within the sample. The second purpose was endemic to the study sample. The sample, as will be more fully described later in this chapter, consisted of 72 female workers. In the past, those job

satisfaction studies which have dealt with female workers (see Herzberg et al., 1957; Argyle, 1972) have evaluated their subjects according to the traditional concepts and measures originally designed for male workers. Researchers have recently indicated that the application of these traditional concepts and measures may not be valid for female workers; conventional theories of occupational choice, for example, have been shown to be ineffective in explaining occupational choice among women (Psathas, 1968; Almquist and Angrist, 1970). These findings suggest that other work-related theories, such as those used in job satisfaction, be re-evaluated in order to determine their applicability to female workers. In light of these considerations, it is quite conceivable that non-work related or external factors play a much larger role in determining job satisfaction than has been realized. It appears that a closer examination of these factors is therefore warranted.

The external factors which were examined in this study were age, marital status, number of children, and perceptions of role conflict. The influence of pay upon the saliency evaluations was also included for heuristic purposes. The following section describes how each of these factors was operationalized and how the values assumed by each of the factors were distributed within the sample; frequency distributions for each factor are also provided in Appendix B.

#### Age

Information concerning age was directly solicited from the workers; they were asked: "What is your age?" (see questionnaire--Appendix A). Respondents ranged in age from 19 to 66 years, with a median age of 32 years.

### Marital Status

Marital status was designated by workers' responses to the question "What is your marital status?". Suggested answers were provided (married, single, divorced, separated, and widowed) and respondents were asked to mark the appropriate response (see questionnaire--Appendix A). Slightly over half (59.7%) of the workers were married while about one quarter indicated that they were divorced (26.4%).

### Number of Children

The number of children each respondent had was ascertained by asking "How many children do you have?" (see questionnaire--Appendix A). Nearly all of the respondents (88.9%) had at least one child. Overall, the number of children per respondent ranged from none to seven with an average number of 2.2 children.

### Pay

Respondents were asked to estimate their income by the question "What is your average weekly take home pay?" (see questionnaire--Appendix A). Eight respondents (11.1%) refused to answer this question and thus sections of the analysis using this variable experienced a reduced number of cases. Weekly paychecks ranged from less than fifty dollars to one hundred dollars per week; the average paycheck was a little over sixty dollars.

### Perceptions of Role Conflict

As women's participation in the labor force has been steadily increasing from 20% in 1900 to 50% in 1970 (Oppenheimer, 1973), it was



anticipated that some of the female respondents might experience conflict between their traditional roles of wife and mother and the comparatively new role of worker. The presence or absence of role conflict, it is believed, may influence what job dimensions the female workers regard as most salient.<sup>6</sup> A scale designed to measure the amount of perceived role conflict includes the following five questions which were taken from a larger number of items (see questionnaire--Appendix A):<sup>7</sup>

"Have you ever quit a job because:

- (1) You found it too difficult to work and keep up with things at home?
- (2) You felt your job interfered with taking care of your children?
- (3) Your husband (wife) wanted you to stop working?
- (4) Your children wanted you to stop working?
- (5) You felt your job interfered with your being a good wife (husband)?"

Suggested responses to these questions were provided (yes or no); respondents were asked to mark the appropriate answer.

---

<sup>6</sup>At present this expectation is based more upon conjecture than upon previous social science research. The primary response among social scientists to women's increased participation in the labor force has been limited to (1) identifying those background characteristics predisposing women to work outside the home (Weil, 1961; Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Axelson, 1963; Nye and Hoffman, 1963); (2) evaluating the effects of women's employment upon the family (Nye and Hoffman, 1963; Gover, 1963; Orden and Bradburn, 1969); and (3) documenting the economic inequalities or advantages encountered by women in the labor force (Harbeson, 1967; Oppenheimer, 1973). Only recently have social scientists begun to recognize the 'female worker' as a distinct category suitable for investigation.

<sup>7</sup>It should be noted that the items included in the perception of role conflict scale are behavioral (and not attitudinal) indices of role conflict.

The selection of these particular five items (questions) for inclusion in the scale was based upon face validity and item analysis. The items logically appear to be measuring the same underlying concept and therefore it seems safe to assume that the variance in the measure is due to the relative presence or absence of role conflict. The item analysis procedure consisted of a comparison of all possible item-to-total correlations of scale items. The items with the highest correlations with the total score were then selected for inclusion in the final scale.<sup>8</sup> The item-to-total correlations of the final scale items were .7975, .7735, .7851, .8277, and .7937; respectively. The coefficient of internal consistency (reliability), as computed with the Kuder-Richardson #20 formula, was .82.<sup>9</sup>

Possible scale values ranged from 0 (indicating a minimum amount of role conflict) to 10 (indicating a maximum amount of role conflict). Perception of role conflict appeared to be a common experience as over 61% of the respondents registered a score of 10 on the scale.

#### Measuring the Cognitive Component of Job Satisfaction

For each of the seventeen dimensions of job satisfaction that were accorded saliency evaluations, a corresponding scale item was also devised. These scale items, which were designed to evaluate what workers

---

<sup>8</sup>For more information on the uses and limitations of item analysis, see "Notes on the Rationale of Item Analysis" by Marion W. Richardson (1936) and Bohrnstedt (1970:90-91).

<sup>9</sup>The Spearman-Brown coefficient was also calculated and found to be .62. All formulas can be found in Bohrnstedt (1970:86-89).

believe about their particular job, then served as a population of scale items from which items could be selected and used in the construction of job satisfaction scales. The seventeen dimensions and their corresponding scale item operationalizations were as follows (see questionnaire--

Appendix A):

(1) The importance of having work that is intrinsically satisfying; the value of the work itself. Operationalized: I'm really doing something worthwhile in my job.

(2) The importance of fringe benefits. Operationalized: Compared with other companies, employee benefits here are good.

(3) The importance of having interesting work or enjoying one's work. Operationalized: I am often bored with my job.

(4) The importance of having some input into the decision-making process at work. Operationalized: My supervisor really tries to get my ideas about things.

(5) The importance of job security. Operationalized: I can be sure of my job as long as I do good work.

(6) The importance of variety in one's job. Operationalized: I perform a variety of work tasks on my job.

(7) The importance of opportunities for advancement or promotion; also perceptions of the equity with which promotions are distributed. Operationalized: The people who get promotions around here usually deserve them.

(8) The importance of individual autonomy in performing work tasks. Operationalized: The supervisor criticizes me if I work too fast or too slow.

(9) The importance of interaction with co-workers. Operationalized: My job does not allow me enough time to talk to my fellow workers.

(10) The importance of good physical working conditions. Operationalized: Poor working conditions keep me from doing my best in my work.

(11) The importance of being assigned to tasks which make the best use of a worker's skills and abilities. Operationalized: I feel this company has placed me on the job for which I am best suited.

(12) The importance of the sex of the co-workers. Operationalized: I wish this company employed more workers of the opposite sex.

(13) The importance of earning enough to support one's family; the importance of earning enough to live on. Operationalized: My pay is enough to live on comfortably.

(14) The importance of having a friendly relationship with one's supervisor. Operationalized: When talking with my supervisor, I feel free to say what is on my mind.

(15) The importance of group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers. Operationalized: The people I work with help each other out when someone falls behind or gets in a tight spot.

(16) The importance of management's consideration of the needs and wishes of employees. Operationalized: I think top management here knows and understands the problems employees have.

(17) The importance of pay in relationship to what other workers performing the same task earn or what comparable employers offer. Operationalized: I am very much underpaid for the work that I do.

Suggested responses for each of these scale items were provided; respondents were asked to indicate if they agreed or disagreed with each item statement.

Six separate job satisfaction scales were constructed by using various combinations of the seventeen scale items. Three of the scales (A1, B1 and C1) used saliency information in determining their composition: they contained only scale items that had previously been endorsed as 'salient' by a certain percentage of the sample. The other three scales (A2, B2 and C2) represent the 'inverse' of scales A1, B1 and C1; that is, the scale items that were not included in the first scale of a given letter name were assigned to the second scale bearing the same letter name.

Scale A1 consisted of the seven scale items whose corresponding saliency items received 'salient' endorsements by over 90% of the sample;

specifically, scale item numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 13 and 15. Possible scale values ranged from 7 to 14 and on the basis of those respondents answering all seven scale items ( $N = 44$ ), the mean satisfaction score was 10.6.<sup>10</sup> The reliability of this scale, as calculated with the Kuder-Richardson alpha (#21) formula was .51. Scale A2 consisted of the remaining ten scale items: 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, and 17. It should be noted that these scale items represent those items receiving 'salient' endorsements by less than 90% of the sample. Possible scale values ranged from 10 to 20 with a mean score of 16.5 among the 49 respondents who answered all ten scale items. The Kuder-Richardson alpha was equal to .39.

Scale B1 was composed of those scale items whose matching saliency items were endorsed by over 80% of the sample; scale item numbers 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15. The range of possible scale values was 11 to 22 with a mean score of 17.4 among the 49 respondents who answered all scale items. The reliability of the scale was calculated to be .60 using the Kuder-Richardson formula. Scale B2 was comprised of the seven remaining scale items; that is, those items receiving endorsement by less than 80% of the sample (scale item numbers 4, 6, 8, 12, 16 and 17). Possible scale values ranged from 6 to 12 with a mean satisfaction score of 9.6 among those who answered all scale items ( $N = 53$ ). The

---

<sup>10</sup> In these descriptions of the ranges in job satisfaction scales, the smaller values are indicative of job dissatisfaction while the larger values are indicative of job satisfaction.

reliability of this scale, as measured with the Kuder-Richardson formula, was .36.

Scale C1 consisted of the fourteen scale items whose corresponding saliency items received 'salient' endorsements by over 69% of the sample. The scale items were 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17. The range of possible scale values was 14 to 28 and on the basis of those respondents answering all fourteen scale items ( $N = 48$ ), the mean satisfaction score was 22.2. The Kuder-Richardson alpha was equal to .58. Scale C2 was composed of the remaining three scale items (those receiving endorsement by less than 69% of the sample). The scale contains items number 4, 8 and 12. Possible scale values ranged from 3 to 6 with a mean score of 4.9 among the 57 respondents who answered all three items. The reliability of this scale, as calculated with the Kuder-Richardson formula, was .32.

#### Absenteeism--A Behavioral Indicator of Job Satisfaction

Absenteeism was used as a behavioral indicator of job satisfaction in this study. While it is appreciated that a certain amount of absenteeism is normal and unrelated to job satisfaction attitudes, there is research which indicates that one may exhibit job dissatisfaction by simply failing to show up for work (Metzner and Mann, 1953; Report of the Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, 1973; and Flanagan et al., 1974). While other forms of expressing job dissatisfaction are available (quitting, striking, filing complaints with management), absenteeism is often preferable as it involves minimal risk while offering

"some relief from the frustration of unsatisfactory work" and the opportunity to look for a better job (Flanagan et al., 1974:107).

The absenteeism rates among female workers have been afforded special attention by social scientists because of their relatively high levels when compared with male workers. Explanations for the higher absenteeism rates have centered upon the family obligations incurred by women; however, for female industrial workers at least, family related explanations have been shown to be insufficient (Isambert-Jamati, 1962). It appears that the skill level at which women are employed is a better predictor of the level of absenteeism, with the higher levels of absenteeism being associated with the lower skill levels (Isambert-Jamati, 1962). Given that absenteeism can be an expression of job dissatisfaction and that absenteeism is common among female workers at low skill levels, it was anticipated that a high level of absenteeism would be found among female garment workers in general and that among the dissatisfied workers, an even higher level would be recorded.

In this study, the amount of absenteeism was ascertained by asking workers to estimate how often they were late to work or missed work for the following reasons (see questionnaire--Appendix A):

(1) A member of your family was sick and you had to stay home and take care of him/her?

(2) You had to take your child or children somewhere (to doctor, shopping, school, etc.)?

(3) You had to pay some bills or see about money matters (car license, taxes, bank loan, department store lay-away, etc.)?

(4) You wanted to go someplace with your family or friends?

(5) You had to be at home because a repairman was going to repair something around the house (TV, washer, carpet, etc.)?

(6) You were out late the night before and felt too tired to go to work?

(7) Your husband (wife) was off work and wanted you to be with him(her)?

(8) You had to do some work around the house (cleaning, cooking, painting, etc.)?

(9) You just didn't feel like going to work that day?

(10) Your child (or children) were going to do something special at school or in a club and wanted you to see him/her?

(11) You were sick?

(12) Are there any other reasons why you miss work or are late to work? If so, what are they?

For each of these suggested reasons, respondents were asked to estimate how often they missed or were late to work by the following question:

How often?

1 or 2 times \_\_\_\_  
 3 or 4 times \_\_\_\_  
 5 or 6 times \_\_\_\_  
 more than 6 times \_\_\_\_

The absenteeism index itself consisted of the sum of the estimated frequencies of absence for each respondent. The index had a possible range of zero (indicating no absenteeism) to forty-eight (indicating high absenteeism); the average absenteeism score was 18.5.

#### Description of the Sample

The sample was drawn from a population of 79 garment workers employed in a small, non-unionized garment factory in Roanoke, Virginia. The factory produces a variety of clothing for men, women and children and employs approximately one hundred people. In terms of representativeness, this particular factory was somewhat smaller than other garment factories in the area. However, the workers, many of whom had



worked in other plants, indicated that this factory was comparable to the others. Typical comments by the workers included, "They're all about the same." The Roanoke standard metropolitan statistical area, which employed around 2700 garment workers in January 1974 (period of data collection), was representative of other garment factories throughout the state with respect to such things as hourly pay, weekly earnings, and number of working hours per week (Trends in Employment Hours and Earnings, Virginia and Standard Metropolitan Areas, 1974).

At the time of the survey the plant manager stated that the factory was experiencing a turnover rate of approximately 105% annually and had a problem with absenteeism (20-30%) on Mondays and Fridays. While on the surface this appears to be a unique problem, research indicates that it is not at all uncommon for a garment factory to have such a high turnover rate (Summerour, 1964).

As nearly all of the workers (91.1%) were female and performed similar tasks, the analysis was restricted to female employees exclusive of those engaged in supervisory, clerical or managerial service; in all, the sample consisted of seventy-two women.

#### Method of Data Collection

Initial access to the factory was secured through a relative of the factory owner; the factory owner was interested in finding someone who might evaluate his factory and make some suggestions for reducing labor turnover and absenteeism. Professors Richard F. Scheig and Charles A. Ibsen of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University agreed to conduct such an investigation in the winter and spring of 1974. This

researcher worked as a member of that research project and thus the data presented here was collected as part of a larger industrial study.

The actual data collection process began with a cover letter which explained the purpose of the study, expressed management's approval and solicited the support of the workers. The letter was posted throughout the plant and distributed to the workers. One week later, a paper and pencil (self-administered) questionnaire was administered to all of the workers over a two day period. On the first day all factory employees present were asked to come to a central location in the plant (the lunchroom) and complete the questionnaire presented in Appendix A. Workers were compensated for their time away from their jobs as many were piece rate workers. The second day was used for administering the questionnaire to absentees. Seventy-nine usable questionnaires were acquired; of these, 72 were completed by women and were used to constitute the study sample.

#### Implementation of the Research Design

Three goals or aims were identified for this thesis: (1) to demonstrate that each of the cognitive components of job satisfaction has a degree of saliency attached to it; (2) to explore whether these saliency evaluations are influenced by factors external to the job; and (3) to demonstrate that job satisfaction measures which incorporate relatively salient items are higher correlates of a behavioral indice of job satisfaction than are satisfaction measures which incorporate less salient items. The first goal was implemented by the presentation of a rank order listing of the dimensions of job satisfaction; this rank

ordering was determined by the percentage of the sample endorsing each dimension as salient. In the case of ties, the dimension with the least number of non-salient evaluations was presented first. The second goal of demonstrating the influence of external factors was instrumented through a series of saliency ranking comparisons. More explicitly, for each level of an external factor (i.e. divorced, married, widowed), a rank ordering of the seventeen dimensions was established. The degree of association among these rank orderings was then established using Kendall's coefficient of concordance  $W$  (Siegel, 1956:229-39). The implementation of the last goal was attempted by comparing the correlations between each of the proposed job satisfaction scales and the behavioral measure of absenteeism.

## CHAPTER III

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

#### Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the research findings. The first section is concerned with the range in saliency evaluations to be found among the seventeen dimensions of job satisfaction. The saliency rankings for each of the dimensions will be presented. The second discussion of findings will focus upon the effect of certain external factors (and pay) upon the saliency rankings. Tables describing how the rank ordering of dimensions shifts for a given level of an external factor are included. The final section involves a comparison between two types of job satisfaction scales--those which utilize saliency information and those which do not.

#### Overall Ranking of the Seventeen Dimensions

As was noted in Chapters I and II, the cognitive component of job satisfaction consists of the seventeen dimensions of job satisfaction that were selected for this study. In order to establish if and to what extent each dimension was regarded as salient by the sample, the percentage of the sample endorsing each dimension as salient was computed. The results of this tabulation are recorded in Table I.

The data in Table I indicate that there is in fact a range in the saliency evaluations for the seventeen job satisfaction dimensions. Saliency endorsements ranged from 95.8% (which indicated almost total agreement with the belief that work should be intrinsically satisfying

TABLE I  
 DIMENSION OF JOB SATISFACTION BY SALIENCY EVALUATION

Dimension	% Endorsing as Salient
<u>90% and over</u>	
Having work that is intrinsically satisfying; the value of the work itself	95.8
Having interesting work or enjoying one's work	94.4
Fringe benefits	93.1
Job security	91.7
Good physical working conditions	91.7
Earning enough to support one's family; earning enough to live on	91.7
Group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers	90.3
<u>80% to 89%</u>	
Amount of interaction with co-workers	87.5
Opportunities for advancement or promotion; equity with which promotions are distributed	87.5
Being assigned to tasks which use workers' skills	86.1
Having a friendly relationship with one's supervisor	81.9
<u>70% to 79%</u>	
Management's consideration of the needs and wishes of employees	76.4
Pay in relationship to what other workers performing the same work earn or what other employers offer	72.2
<u>60% to 69%</u>	
Job variety	69.4
<u>Less than 60%</u>	
Having some input into the decision-making process at work	44.4
Individual autonomy in performing work tasks	36.1
Sex of the co-workers	34.7

N = 72

to 34.7% (which indicated that only about a third of the sample agreed that the sex of their co-workers was important). While it is apparent that each of these dimensions is salient to at least some of the respondents, other dimensions are much more commonly held to be important. In sum, the data demonstrate that not all of the dimensions of job satisfaction presented to the workers were of equal salience.

These findings suggest that one may not assume that the elements comprising the cognitive component of job satisfaction are of equal centrality.

#### The Effect of the External Factors and Pay

A comparison of saliency evaluations among each of the various values of several external factors was made in order to ascertain if the saliency of a given dimension could be influenced by either pay or a non-job related factor. For each of these factors, a table has been constructed which presents the saliency rank of each job satisfaction dimension, for each value of the factor. Accordingly, the ranks range from 1 to 17. Ties, however, were common and thus many dimensions share the same rank as others for a given value. The following section describes the research findings associated with the external factors and pay.

#### Age

The sample was divided into four groups for the purpose of evaluating the influence of age: 19 to 25 years ( $N = 19$ ), 26 to 31 years ( $N = 17$ ), 32 to 45 years ( $N = 16$ ), and 46 to 66 years ( $N = 20$ ). While most of the dimensions were accorded similar saliency evaluations by each of the

four groups, some shifts were discernable (see Table II). The widest disagreements in saliency assessments involved the dimensions termed 'interaction among co-workers' and 'management's consideration of the needs and wishes of employees.' The importance of interaction among co-workers was strongly underscored by those women aged 26 to 31 years and received a ranking of 2.5 on the scale. Women 46 to 66, however, judged it to be less salient as they ranked it 12th. The management dimension received a 4.0 rank by those aged 46 to 66, indicating fairly strong saliency. In contrast, the other groups gave the management dimension rankings of only 12.5, 12.0 and 13.0. It appears that management's consideration of the needs and wishes of employees is far more important to the older workers than the younger workers.

Considering all of the rankings together, the four groups demonstrated a moderate level of agreement. The Kendall coefficient of concordance  $W$ , with adjustment made for the number of tied rankings, was found to be .79.<sup>11</sup> This measure of association was found to be significant

---

<sup>11</sup>The formula for computing Kendall's  $W$ , correcting for the number of tied rankings is as follows (Siegel, 1956:234):

$$W = \frac{s}{1/12 k^2 (N^3 - N) - k_T T}$$

where  $s$  = sum of squares of the observed deviations from the mean

$k$  = number of sets of rankings

$N$  = number of entities (dimensions) ranked

$1/12 k^2 (N^3 - N)$  = maximum possible sum of squared deviations

$T = \frac{(t^3 - t)}{12}$  (where  $t$  = number of observations in a group of a given rank)

TABLE II

## SALIENCY RANKINGS OF JOB SATISFACTION DIMENSIONS BY AGE GROUP

Variable	Age Groups			
	19-25 <sup>a</sup>	26-31 <sup>b</sup>	32-45 <sup>c</sup>	46-66 <sup>d</sup>
<u>Dimension</u>				
Having work that is intrinsically satisfying; value of the work itself	3.5	2.5	3.0	1.5
Having interesting work or enjoying one's work	3.5	2.5	3.0	6.0
Fringe benefits	3.5	2.5	3.0	10.0
Job security	3.5	6.5	3.0	7.0
Good physical working conditions	8.0	6.5	3.0	4.0
Earning enough to support one's family; earning enough to live on	3.5	6.5	8.5	4.0
Group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers	10.5	6.5	8.5	1.5
Amount of interaction with co-workers	10.5	2.5	6.0	12.0
Opportunities for advancement or promotion; equity with which promotions are distributed	3.5	9.5	11.0	8.5
Being assigned to tasks which use workers' skills	3.5	11.0	8.5	11.0
Having a friendly relationship with one's supervisor	9.0	14.0	8.5	8.5
Management's consideration of the needs and wishes of employees	12.5	12.0	13.0	4.0
Pay in relationship to what other workers performing the same task earn or what other employers offer	12.5	13.0	12.0	13.5
Job variety	14.0	9.5	14.0	13.5
Having some input into the decision making process at work	15.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Individual autonomy in performing work tasks	16.0	16.0	17.0	17.0
Sex of the co-workers	17.0	17.0	16.0	16.0

<sup>a</sup>N = 19<sup>b</sup>N = 17<sup>c</sup>N = 16<sup>d</sup>N = 20



at the .001 level, allowing 16 degrees of freedom.<sup>12,13</sup> While age is not apparently responsible for wide differences in saliency assessment, it does appear to produce some differences among the various groups.

#### Marital Status

The influence of marital status upon saliency evaluations was assessed by first dichotomizing the sample into two groups, married (N = 43) and unmarried (N = 29), and then comparing the saliency rankings for each dimension (see Table III). This comparison indicated a substantial degree of agreement between the two groups; rankings rarely differed by more than two positions. The widest differentiations were observed to be over the salience of 'good physical working conditions' and 'group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers.' The married group assigned only a moderate amount of salience to 'good physical working conditions' (7.5) in comparison with the unmarried group who ranked the dimension 1.5. 'Group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers,' on the other hand, was quite important to the married women (3.5) while not so important to the unmarried (9.5).

---

<sup>12</sup>When N is larger than 7, as in this case where N = 17, the chi square distribution may be used for tests of significance (Siegel, 1956:236). The formula which may be used is as follows:

$$\chi^2 = k(N - 1) W$$

The symbols used in this formula are the same as those defined in footnote 10.

<sup>13</sup>The importance of significance levels has been minimized for this rather exploratory piece of research. Instead, emphasis has been placed upon the direction and the strength of the relationship. Significance levels of less than .25 (indicating a willingness to make a type I error one fourth of the time) were deemed acceptable for this study.

TABLE III

## SALIENCY RANKINGS OF JOB SATISFACTION DIMENSIONS BY MARITAL STATUS

Variable	Marital Status	
	Married <sup>a</sup>	Unmarried <sup>b</sup>
<u>Dimension</u>		
Having work that is intrinsically satisfying; value of the work itself	1.5	1.5
Having interesting work or enjoying one's work	1.5	3.5
Fringe benefits	3.5	5.0
Job security	6.0	3.5
Good physical working conditions	7.5	1.5
Earning enough to support one's family; earning enough to live on	5.0	7.0
Group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers	3.5	9.5
Amount of interaction with co-workers	7.5	9.5
Opportunities for advancement or promotion; equity with which promotions are distributed	9.0	6.0
Being assigned to tasks which use workers' skills	10.0	8.0
Having a friendly relationship with one's supervisor	11.0	11.0
Management's consideration of the needs and wishes of employees	12.0	13.0
Pay in relationship to what other workers performing the same task earn or what other employers offer	14.0	12.0
Job variety	13.0	14.0
Having some input into the decision making process at work	15.0	15.0
Individual autonomy in performing work tasks	17.0	16.0
Sex of the co-workers	16.0	17.0

<sup>a</sup>N = 43<sup>b</sup>N = 29; this category includes those who are single, separated, divorced or widowed.

In terms of the statistical degree of agreement between the two groups, the relationship was extremely close. Kendall's W was found to equal .92 (correcting for ties), indicating very little disagreement over the rank ordering of the dimensions. The relationship was found to be significant at the .02 level. Of all the external factors (and pay) examined, marital status produced the highest level of agreement among the respective values (categories) assumed by each factor. This finding suggests that marital status is not a significant influence in determining what job dimensions are viewed as salient.

#### Number of Children

The influence of the number of children upon saliency evaluations was determined by studying three groups; those with no children or only one child (N = 29), those with two children (N = 18), and finally those with three children or more (N = 25). As has been the case with the other external factors, there appears to be general agreement over the rank ordering of the dimensions. Several interesting deviations, however, can be noted (see Table IV). The salience of 'group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers,' for example, seems to be inversely related to the number of children. Those women with either no children or only one ranked the dimension 9.5; those with two children assigned the dimension 6.5; and those with three or more children gave it a 2.0. A similar pattern is visible for the dimension termed 'having a friendly relationship with one's supervisor.' Finally, one of the widest disagreements in saliency evaluations, regardless of the external factor involved, can be observed for 'opportunities for advancement or

TABLE IV

## SALIENCY RANKINGS OF JOB SATISFACTION DIMENSIONS BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN

Variable	Number of Children		
	None or One <sup>a</sup>	Two <sup>b</sup>	Three or More <sup>c</sup>
<u>Dimension</u>			
Having work that is intrinsically satisfying; value of the work itself	2.0	2.0	2.0
Having interesting work or enjoying one's work	4.0	2.0	2.0
Fringe benefits	6.0	2.0	6.0
Job security	2.0	4.0	8.0
Good physical working conditions	6.0	6.5	4.5
Earning enough to support one's family; earning enough to live on	6.0	6.5	7.0
Group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers	9.5	6.5	2.0
Amount of interaction with co-workers	9.5	6.5	10.0
Opportunities for advancement or promotion; equity with which promotions are distributed	2.0	12.0	10.0
Being assigned to tasks which use workers' skills	8.0	11.0	10.0
Having a friendly relationship with one's supervisor	11.5	9.5	4.5
Management's consideration of the needs and wishes of employees	14.0	9.5	12.0
Pay in relationship to what other workers performing the same task earn or what other employers offer	13.0	13.0	13.0
Job variety	11.5	14.0	14.0
Having some input into the decision making process at work	15.0	15.0	16.0
Individual autonomy in performing work tasks	16.0	17.0	17.0
Sex of the co-workers	17.0	16.0	15.0

<sup>a</sup>N = 29<sup>b</sup>N = 18<sup>c</sup>N = 25

promotion' dimension. Women with one child or none at all ranked this dimension as highly salient (2.0); women with two children ranked it 12th--for a difference of ten scale positions. (Women with three or more children gave the dimension a rank of 10.0). It appears then that the concern for advancement and the equity with which promotions are distributed is much more salient to women with smaller families.

The statistical comparison of the rank orderings indicated that the three groups were fairly well in agreement with each other. The Kendall coefficient W was calculated to be .83 (after correcting for ties) and was significant at the .001 level.

#### Pay

In order to investigate the influence of pay upon saliency evaluations, the sample was divided into two groups; those taking home \$60 or less each week ( $N = 34$ ) and those taking home more than \$60 ( $N = 28$ ). Inspection of the rank orderings (see Table V) indicates the presence of only slight differences between the two groups. The most differentiated rankings were recorded for 'amount of interaction with co-workers' (10.0 for those earning \$60 or less; 2.5 for those earning more than \$60) and 'earning enough to support one's family; earning enough to live on' (11.0 and 4.0, respectively). Thus it appears that the 'amount of interaction with co-workers' and 'earning enough to support one's family' are more salient to those earning higher incomes.

The Kendall coefficient of concordance W was calculated to be .88 after correction for the number of ties. The relationship was significant at the .05 level. In summary, the data indicate fairly close agreement

TABLE V  
SALIENCY RANKINGS OF JOB SATISFACTION DIMENSIONS BY PAY

Variable	Weekly Take-Home Pay	
	\$60 or less <sup>a</sup>	More than \$60 <sup>b</sup>
<u>Dimension</u>		
Having work that is intrinsically satisfying; value of the work itself	1.5	2.5
Having interesting work or enjoying one's work	4.5	1.0
Fringe benefits	4.5	6.0
Job security	1.5	5.0
Good physical working conditions	6.5	7.5
Earning enough to support one's family; earning enough to live on	11.0	4.0
Group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers	3.0	9.0
Amount of interaction with co-workers	10.0	2.5
Opportunities for advancement or promotion; equity with which promotions are distributed	6.4	7.5
Being assigned to tasks which use workers' skills	8.5	10.0
Having a friendly relationship with one's supervisor	8.5	12.0
Management's consideration of the needs and wishes of employees	12.0	13.5
Pay in relationship to what other workers performing the same task earn or what other employers offer	14.0	11.0
Job variety	13.0	13.5
Having some input into the decision making process at work	15.0	15.0
Individual autonomy in performing work tasks	16.5	16.0
Sex of the co-workers	16.5	17.0

<sup>a</sup><sub>N</sub> = 34

<sup>b</sup><sub>N</sub> = 28

in saliency evaluations between the two groups with the major disagreement centering around the 'amount of interaction with co-workers' and 'earning enough to support one's family; earning enough to live on' dimensions.

#### Perceptions of Role Conflict

The sample was divided into two groups in order to evaluate the relationship between perception of role conflict and saliency evaluations. Those scoring between 0 and 9 on the perception of role conflict scale were assigned to the low perception group (N = 28) while those scoring 10 were placed in the high perception group (N = 44). The saliency evaluations for these two groups are recorded in Table VI.

Three dimensions appear to be of wide variation in salience for these two groups: (1) 'group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers' (1.0 for the low perception group versus 9.0 for the high perception group); (2) 'having a friendly relationship with one's supervisor' (5.0 versus 13.0, respectively); and (3) 'job security' (10.0 versus 3.0, respectively). The rankings associated with the first two dimensions suggest that interpersonal aspects of the job may be more important to those with low perceptions of role conflict than to those with higher perceptions of role conflict. The minimization of the importance of 'job security' by the low perception group (10.0 ranking) is interesting though not readily explicable. No other group within the sample (as defined by the values taken by the external factors and pay) ranked this dimension as less salient. The overall rank orderings by each of the two groups were in moderate agreement; Kendall's W was .83 (after correction for ties) and significant at the .05 level.

TABLE VI  
SALIENCY RANKINGS OF JOB SATISFACTION DIMENSIONS  
BY PERCEPTION OF ROLE CONFLICT

Variable	Perceptions of Role Conflict	
	Low Perception <sup>a</sup>	High Perception <sup>b</sup>
<u>Dimension</u>		
Having work that is intrinsically satisfying; value of the work itself	3.5	1.0
Having interesting work or enjoying one's work	3.5	3.0
Fringe benefits	7.0	3.0
Job security	10.0	3.0
Good physical working conditions	7.0	5.0
Earning enough to support one's family; earning enough to live on	2.0	7.0
Group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers	1.0	9.0
Amount of interaction with co-workers	9.0	8.0
Opportunities for advancement or promotion; equity with which promotions are distributed	11.0	6.0
Being assigned to tasks which use workers' skills	7.0	10.0
Having a friendly relationship with one's supervisor	5.0	13.0
Management's consideration of the needs and wishes of employees	12.0	11.5
Pay in relationship to what other workers performing the same task earn or what other employers offer	14.0	11.5
Job variety	13.0	14.0
Having some input into the decision making process at work	16.0	15.0
Individual autonomy in performing work tasks	17.0	16.0
Sex of the co-workers	15.0	17.0

<sup>a</sup>N = 28

<sup>b</sup>N = 44



### Summary of the Effect of the External Factors and Pay

This examination of pay and external factors has demonstrated the influence of these factors upon saliency evaluations to be relatively small. Regardless of the factor involved, the measures of association among the rank orderings were high (.79 to .92) and thus indicative of substantial agreement.

Several dimensions, however, should be noted as sources of controversy under the specific conditions defined by the external factors and pay. 'Group cohesion and friendliness among co-workers' registered wide differences in salience for the values assumed by marital status (3.5 to 9.5), number of children (2.0 to 6.5 to 9.5), and perceptions of role conflict (1.0 to 9.0). 'Amount of interaction among co-workers' produced discrepant rankings under age (2.5 to 6.0 to 10.5 to 12.0) and pay (2.5 to 10.0). These two dimensions may be said to be the most susceptible to influence by the external factors and pay.

### Job Satisfaction Scales

The value of saliency in job satisfaction measurement can be evaluated by a comparison between those scales which incorporate saliency information and those which do not. In this section, these two types of job satisfaction scales will be compared on the basis of their ability to predict the level of absenteeism. As was indicated in Chapter 2, an inverse relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism was anticipated.

## Scales A1 and A2

Scale A1 consisted of the seven scale items whose corresponding saliency items received 'salient' endorsements by over 90% of the sample; scale A2 consisted of the remaining ten scale items (see Chapter 2 for further description). Both of these scales were correlated with the absenteeism measure and the following results were obtained: The relationship between job satisfaction scale A1 and absenteeism produced a gamma of  $-0.25$  and was significant at the .21 level using a one-tailed test.<sup>14</sup> The correlation between job satisfaction scale A2 and absenteeism was less; the gamma was  $-0.12$  and significant at the .18 level using a one-tailed test. It should be noted that while both of the gammas were in the predicted direction, the scale which used saliency information (A1) had a larger gamma value. A comparison of these two scales appears to indicate that the scale which uses saliency is a better correlate of absenteeism. In terms advocated by the American Psychological Association, then, the use of saliency information increases the predictive validity of the scale.<sup>15</sup>

## Scales B1 and B2

Scale B1 was composed of the eleven scale items whose corresponding saliency items received 'salient' endorsements by over 80% of the sample.

---

<sup>14</sup>The procedure used for testing the significance of gamma is the prescribed by Freeman (1965:162-175).

<sup>15</sup>The American Psychological Association's Committee on Psychological Tests recognizes four types of validity: predictive, concurrent, content and construct; see Cronbach and Meehl (1967:243-270) for further description.

Scale B2 consisted of the six remaining scale items (see Chapter 2 for further description). The correlations between each of these job satisfaction scales and the absenteeism measure were as follows: The relationship between scale B1 and absenteeism resulted in a gamma of  $-0.21$  which was significant at the .03 level using a one-tailed test. The correlation between scale B2 and absenteeism was described by a gamma of  $-0.14$  which was significant at the .16 level using a one-tailed test. The direction of both of these gammas indicates that the higher levels of job satisfaction are associated with lower levels of absenteeism (i.e. an inverse relationship) while the absolute size of the gamma suggests that the scales which use saliency (B1) is a better correlate of absenteeism and thus more valid.

#### Scales C1 and C2

Scale C1 consisted of the fourteen scale items whose corresponding saliency items received 'salient' endorsements by over 69% of the sample; scale C2 consisted of the remaining three scale items (see Chapter 2 for further description). Both of these scales were correlated with the absenteeism measure and the following results were obtained: The relationship between job satisfaction scale C1 and absenteeism produced a gamma of  $-0.24$  and was significant at the .02 level using a one-tailed test. The correlation between job satisfaction scale C2 was smallest of all; the gamma was calculated to be  $-0.10$  and significant at the .23 level using a one-tailed test. A comparison of these two scales appears to indicate that the scale which uses saliency (C1) has better predictive validity.

### Summary of the Relationships Among the Scales and Absenteeism

In the above discussion, three sets of job satisfaction scales have been examined. Each set was comprised of two satisfaction scales, one which used saliency information in determining its composition (A1, B1, C1) and one which did not. All six scales were correlated with absenteeism. In each of the three sets, the scale which used saliency resulted in a higher correlation with absenteeism than did the scale which did not consider saliency. These findings suggest that saliency is both a viable and useful concept in the measurement of job satisfaction. More specifically, it suggests that the inclusion of saliency allows for a more accurate assessment of the cognitive component of the attitude termed job satisfaction.

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

#### Summary

The goal of this thesis, as set forth in Chapter One, was the exploration of the concept of saliency in job satisfaction measurement.

Three areas for exploration were formulated:

- (1) the viability of the concept: whether job dimensions are or are not of varying importance (saliency) to a given occupational group;
- (2) the stability of the concept: whether or not the saliency of a given dimension (or the rank ordering of all the dimensions taken together) is relatively stable or easily influenced by non-job related factors;
- (3) the utility of the concept: whether the scales which use a saliency criterion in determining their composition are any more valid than scales which do not.

The findings gave credence to each of these proposed attributes of saliency. The notion of viability was demonstrated by the varying percentages of the sample endorsing each of the dimensions as salient or non-salient. The stability of saliency within an occupational group was indicated by the substantial agreement in the rankings of dimensions under various external factors. Finally, the finding of higher predictive validity among the job satisfaction scales which used saliency underscored the utility of the concept.

Despite these findings which support the viability, stability and utility of saliency, other possible interpretations of the findings suggest that the utility of the concept be accepted only with reservation. A closer examination of the last set of findings reveals some information

that is not readily explicable: As the job satisfaction scales using the saliency criterion increase the number of scale items included (that is, accept items receiving a lesser percentage endorsement by the sample), the correlation with the absenteeism measure remains fairly constant. For example, scale A1, which contained seven items, had a correlation with absenteeism of  $-0.25$ ; scale B1 (eleven items) had a correlation of  $-0.21$ ; and scale C1 (fourteen items) had a correlation of  $-0.24$ ; thus as the number of items increased, the correlation did not change. There are at least three possible interpretations of this finding. One could argue that the first seven items predict so much of the correlation between job satisfaction and absenteeism that the additional predictive power to be gained through the inclusion of more scale items is miniscule. This interpretation still allows the researcher to continue his argument for the importance of saliency; if the researcher can specify the most salient items for a given group, then he can maintain that there is no need to include less salient items within the scale. A second interpretation of these findings would be to argue that saliency is of no real utility: The existence of similar correlations with scales using seven items and scales using fourteen items suggests that as long as researchers include a variety of job dimensions within their satisfaction scales, they can feel reasonably confident that the most salient dimensions (and therefore the best correlates of job related behaviors) will be included. The third interpretation is that at least some of the scale items which were added to scale A1 in order to form scale B1 (items 7, 9, 11 and 14) are poor correlates of the absenteeism measure. This interpretation would explain the drop in the gamma value associated with scale B1 when

an increase was anticipated. If this conjecture is demonstrated to be true, one will have to conclude that while saliency may be a necessary criterion for the selection of scale items, it alone may not be considered a sufficient criterion.<sup>16</sup>

### Conclusions

The conclusions one may draw from the findings are necessarily limited in light of the above discussion on the utility of saliency. The conclusions which may be drawn are summarized as follows:

- (1) Job dimensions are of varying degrees of salience (importance) to blue collar women.
- (2) Among blue collar women, the job dimensions which are viewed as salient are not readily influenced by factors unrelated to the job.
- (3) For blue collar women, job satisfaction scales which employ the most salient scale items are better correlates of absenteeism than are scales which employ the least salient items.

### Implications

The major theoretical issue presented in this thesis was the nature of the relationship between the cognitive component of attitude and behavior. Consistency theory suggested that there is a direct correspondence between attitudes and behavior and that the failure to obtain empirical support for this position may, at least in part, be a function

---

<sup>16</sup> Curtis and Jackson (1968) suggest that each individual indicator (scale item) of the independent variable (job satisfaction) should be correlated with the dependent variable (absenteeism) in order to establish if 'bad' items are included within a given scale. The researcher intends to follow and develop this line of inquiry in the future.

of measurement error (cf. Liska, 1974). Thus it was hypothesized that improvements in the measurement of attitudes (or behavior) would result in a greater correspondence between attitudinal and behavioral indicators. The concept of salience was proposed as a source of measurement improvement; specifically it was maintained that saliency could be used to achieve a more valid assessment of the cognitive component of job satisfaction and in so doing, a more consistent relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism would be demonstrated.

The implications of these findings may thus be addressed at two levels: the 'theoretical' (dealing with the problem of documenting a consistent relationship between attitudes and behavior as well as other sociological issues) and the 'substantive' (dealing with the theoretical development of job satisfaction).

At the theoretical level, the findings first suggest that each of the elements which comprise the cognitive component of an attitude has a level of saliency attached to it. Evidence for this implication was provided by the finding that job dimensions are of varying degrees of salience to blue collar women. Additional research will of course be required to establish whether salience is an attribute of all types of attitudinal cognitions. Replication alone, however, will be insufficient in securing consensual legitimation for the concept of saliency in attitude-behavior research. Other areas for exploration which come to mind when considering the role of saliency in the attitude-behavior problem are the notion of whether salience is applicable to the other two attitude components (affective, behavioral) and the question of whether salience is a nominal or other (ordinal, interval) level variable.



Perhaps a careful evaluation of each of the attitude components, using saliency, followed by an accurate synthesis of the evaluations would result in a higher correlation between attitudes and behavior and thus provide the consistency theorists with the empirical documentation that they have so ardently sought.

A second theoretical implication which can be drawn from the findings involves the use of saliency as an item analysis technique. Item analysis is the criterion or technique employed by the researcher in determining which items to retain for inclusion in a given scale. These techniques have mainly "consisted of the invention of various forms of an index of association between the test item and the total test score" (Richardson, 1936:395). Bohrnstedt (1970:90) has also advocated this type of procedure:

Perhaps the most straightforward item analysis procedure is the item-to-total correlation technique. One simply selects the items which have the highest correlations with the total score.

The findings presented here suggest that other, more theoretically grounded and sample oriented techniques for item analysis are tenable. The job satisfaction scales which employed a saliency criterion in determining their scale item composition demonstrated higher correlations with behavior than did the scales which essentially contained items selected at random from the population of possible scale items. One can thus infer that criteria other than statistical, atheoretical item-to-total correlations are possible. While this study did not provide any evidence to indicate the superiority (or even the equivalence) of the

saliency criterion over the item-to-total procedure, it appears that further investigation along these lines would indeed be fruitful.<sup>17</sup>

The substantive or job satisfaction related implications that can be derived from the findings are limited and as such constitute a major shortcoming of this study. This criticism is especially appropriate in light of the observation that while a great deal of literature (reflecting many empirical studies) is available on job satisfaction, few documented theories of job satisfaction have been developed (cf. Robinson, 1973:22). Herzberg (1966:148) made this point quite clearly in his review of job attitude literature:

The book was a saddening experience, because the major conclusion was that we could document almost any position one wished to take with respect to what affected people at work.

The first substantive implication was derived from the finding that salient job dimensions are not readily influenced by factors unrelated to the job. This finding suggests that the factors related to the job itself or the job setting, as opposed to non-job related factors, are of paramount importance in determining job satisfaction. While it remains to be demonstrated that this finding holds across various occupations and skill levels, the implication appears particularly plausible in view of the fact that a sample which faces many external types of job constraints--female workers, was employed in the study.

---

<sup>17</sup> Non-statistical forms of item analysis have been recognized by past researchers. One explanation for the failure of researchers to follow this line of inquiry, offered by Oscar Buros (1949:403), is that subjective procedures for evaluating test items "will call for much more work and ability than our present cut-and-dried methods of item validation by . . . statistical methods."

The final implication to be discussed surrounds the debate over the utility of saliency. The findings suggest that scales which use a saliency criterion are effective in reducing attitude measurement error through their inclusion of more appropriate (salient) scale items. While reducing measurement error for a particular sample, however, a new problem is introduced. The more specific in content a job satisfaction scale becomes, the less utility (and therefore the less comparability) it has for other occupational groups. From a non-empirical standpoint, it appears that the benefits to be achieved through saliency (i.e., better assessment of the cognitive component of job satisfaction) may be offset by the loss of generalizability. This lack of generalizability, in turn, is one of the major problems retarding the development of job satisfaction theories. This study has obviously not attempted to deal with this issue; however, it is clear that a solution to the dilemma will have to be found before a saliency criterion can be recognized as truly useful in both the construction of job satisfaction scales and the general theoretical development of job satisfaction.

## REFERENCES

- Almquist, Elizabeth and Shirley Angrist  
1970 "Career salience and atypicality of occupational choice among college women." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 32 (May):242-249.
- Argyle, Michael  
1972 *The Social Psychology of Work*. New York: Taplinger Publishing.
- Axelson, Leland  
1962 *The Marital Adjustment and Marital Role Definitions of Husbands of Working and Nonworking Wives*. Storrs, Connecticut: National Council on Family Relations.
- Bain, Read  
1928 "An attitude on attitude research." *American Journal of Sociology* 33 (May):940-957.
- Blauner, Robert  
1966 "Work satisfaction and industrial trends in modern society." Pp. 473-487 in Reinhart Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (ed.), *Class, Status and Power*. New York: Free Press.
- Blood, Robert and Donald M. Wolfe  
1960 *Husbands and Wives, the Dynamics of Married Living*. New York: Free Press.
- Bohnstedt, George W.  
1970 "Reliability and validity assessment in attitude measurement." Pp. 80-99 in Gene F. Summers (ed.), *Attitude Measurement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Brayfield, Arthur H. and Harold F. Rothe  
1951 "An index of job satisfaction." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 35 (October):307-311.
- Buros, Oscar  
1949 "Criticisms of commonly used methods of validating achievement test items." Pp. 401-403 in William A. Mehrens and Robert L. Ebel (eds.), *Principles of Educational and Psychological Measurement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Campbell, D. T.  
1947 "The Generality of Social Attitudes." Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

- Chein, I.  
1948 "Behavior theory and the behavior of attitudes." *Psychological Review* 55 (May):175-188.
- Cicourel, Aaron V.  
1964 *Method and Measurement in Sociology*. New York: Free Press.
- Cook, S. W. and C. Selltiz  
1964 "A multiple indicator approach to attitude measurement." *Psychological Bulletin* 62 (July):36-55.
- Cronbach, Lee J. and Paul E. Meehl  
1967 "Construct validity in psychological tests." Pp. 243-270 in William A. Mehrens and Robert L. Ebel (eds.), *Principles of Educational and Psychological Measurement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Davis, Louis E.  
1971 "Job satisfaction research: the post industrial view." *Industrial Relations* 10 (May):176-193.
- DeFleur, Melvin and Frank Westie  
1958 "Verbal attitudes and overt acts: an experiment on the salience of attitudes." *American Sociological Review* 23 (December):667-673.
- Deutscher, Irwin  
1966 "Words and deeds: social science and social policy." *Social Problems* 13 (Winter):235-254.
- Doob, L. W.  
1947 "The behavior of attitudes." *Psychological Review* 54 (May):135-156.
- Flanagan, Robert J., George Strauss and Lloyd Ulman  
1974 "Worker discontent and work behavior." *Industrial Relations* 31 (May):101-123.
- Freeman, Linton C.  
1965 *Elementary Applied Statistics*. New York: Wiley.
- Gover, David A.  
1963 "Socio-economic differential in the relationship between marital adjustment and wife's employment status." *Marriage and Family Living* 25 (November):452-457.
- Green, J. A.  
1968 "Attitudinal and situational determinants of intended behavior toward negroes." Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado.

- Hage, Jerald and Michael Aiken  
1970 Social Change in Complex Organizations. New York: Random House.
- Harbeson, Gladys  
1971 Choice and Challenge for the American Women. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman.
- Herzberg, F. B., B. Mausner, R. Peterson and D. Capwell  
1957 Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
- Herzberg, F., B. Mausner and B. Snyderman  
1959 The Motivation to Work. New York: Wiley.
- Herzberg, F.  
1966 Work and the Nature of Man. New York: World Publishing.
- Insko, C. A. and J. Schopler  
1967 "Triadic consistency: a statement of affective-cognitive-conative consistency." Psychological Review 74 (September): 361-376.
- Isambert-Jamati, Vivian  
1962 "Absenteeism among women workers in industry." International Labor Review 85 (March):248-261.
- Kimmel, Paul  
1973 "Research on work and the worker in the United States." Pp. 17-24 in Robinson, et al., Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Kornhauser, Arthur  
1944 "Psychological studies of employee attitudes." Journal of Consulting Psychology 8 (May-June):127-143.  
  
1965 Mental Health of the Industrial Worker. New York: Wiley.
- Krech, D., R. Crutchfield and E. Ballachey  
1962 Individual in Society. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kutner, B., C. Wilkins and P. Yarrow  
1952 "Verbal attitudes and overt behavior involving racial prejudice." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 47 (July):649-652.
- LaPiere, Richard  
1934 "Attitudes vs. actions." Social Forces 13 (December): 230-237.

- Lemon, Nigel  
1973 Attitudes and Their Measurement. London: B. T. Batsford.
- Liska, Allen  
1974 "Emergent issues in the attitude-behavior consistency controversy." American Sociological Review 39 (April): 261-272.
- McGuire, William  
1967 "The current status of cognitive consistency theories." Pp. 401-421 in Martin Fishbein (ed.), Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. New York: Wiley.
- Metzner, Helen and F. C. Mann  
1953 "Employee attitudes and absences." Personnel Psychology 6 (Winter):467-485.
- Morse, Nancy  
1953 Satisfaction in the White Collar Job. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.
- Nosow, Sigmund and William H. Form  
1962 Man, Work, and Society. New York: Basic.
- Nye, F. Ivan and Lois W. Hoffman  
1963 The Employed Mother in America. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Oppenheimer, Valerie Kincade  
1970 The Female Labor in the United States. Berkeley: University of California.  
  
1973 "Demographic influence on female employment and the status of women." American Journal of Sociology 78 (January): 946-961.
- Orden, Susan and Norman Bradburn  
1969 "Working wives and marriage happiness." American Journal of Sociology 74 (January):392-407.
- Price, James  
1972 Handbook of Organizational Measurement. Lexington, Mass.: Heath.
- Psathas, George  
1968 "Toward a theory of occupational choice for women." Sociology and Social Research 52 (March):12-22.
- Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare  
1973 Work in America. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Robinson, John P., Robert Athanasiou and Kendra B. Head  
 1973 Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Rokeach, Milton  
 1968 Beliefs, Attitudes and Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Saenger, G. and E. Gilbert  
 1950 "Customer reactions to the integration of negro sales personnel." International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research 4:57-76.
- Scott, W. A.  
 1968 "Attitude measurement." Pp. 204-273 in Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson (eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.
- Siegel, Sidney  
 1956 Nonparametric Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Singer, Jerome  
 1968 "The bothersomeness of inconsistency." Pp. 393-399 in R. P. Abelson (ed.), Theories of Cognitive Consistency: A Sourcebook. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Smith, M. B., J. S. Bruner and R. S. White  
 1956 Opinions and Personality. New York: Wiley.
- Smith, Patricia C., Lorne M. Kendall and Charles L. Hulin  
 1969 The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Summerour, J. W.  
 1964 "Cost, causes and control of labor turnover." Paper read before the Regional Meeting of the Apparel Manufacturers' Association, Tupelo, Mississippi.
- Survey Research Associates  
 1952 The Survey Research Associates (SRA) Employee Inventory. Pp. 253-260 in Delbert Miller's Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: McKay.
- Telford, C. W.  
 1934 "An experimental study of some factors influencing the social attitudes of college students." Journal of Social Psychology 5:421-428.
- Tittle, Charles R. and Richard Hill  
 1971 "Attitude measurement and prediction of behavior: an evaluation of conditions and measurement techniques." Pp. 468-478



in Gene F. Summers (ed.), Attitude Measurement. Chicago:  
Rand McNally.

Virginia Department of Labor and Industry

1974 "February 1974." Trends In Employment Hours and Earnings--  
Virginia and Standard Metropolitan Areas 24 (February).

Weil, Mildred W.

1961 "An analysis of the factors influencing married women's  
actual or planned work participation." American Sociological  
Review 26 (February):91-96.

Wicker, Allan W.

1969 "Attitudes vs. actions: the relationship of verbal and  
overt to attitudes objects." Pp. 167-194 in Neil Warren and  
Marie Jahoda (eds.), Attitudes. Baltimore: Penguin.

Wild, Ray and A. B. Hill

1970 Women in the Factory. London: Lawrence Bros.

## APPENDIX A - QUESTIONNAIRE

### Introduction

The following questionnaire is part of a study sponsored by Lady Bird Apparel, Inc. The purpose of the study is to gather information about employee feelings so that management can make Lady Bird Apparel a better place for you to work. It is not necessary that you sign your name to the questionnaire. The research team will be the only ones to see the completed questionnaire and your answers will not be identified with you personally in any report of this study. It is extremely important that you answer all of the questions as honestly as you can.

Richard F. Scheig  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute  
and State University

REMEMBER, DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE!

### Section 1

First, we would like for you to tell us your opinion about various aspects of your job. The following inventory is designed to help you tell us your ideas and opinions quickly and easily. This is not a test. There are no "right answers" or "wrong answers." It is your own, honest opinion that we are interested in.

You will agree with some of the statements and you will disagree with others. In some cases you may not have strong feelings of agreement or disagreement, but we want you to mark the one which most closely describes your opinion about the statement. Please make sure you mark an answer for every statement.

- |  | Agree | Disagree |
|--|-------|----------|
| 1. It is important to me to get a feeling of accomplishment from my job. | —     | —        |
| 2. Company benefits are an important feature of any job.                 | —     | —        |

	Agree	Disagree
3. I am often bored with my job.	_____	_____
4. I feel this company has placed me on the job for which I am best suited.	_____	_____
5. A good job, among other things should not be boring.	_____	_____
6. I perform a variety of work tasks in my job.	_____	_____
7. My pay is enough to live on comfortably.	_____	_____
8. I think top management here knows and understands the problems employees have.	_____	_____
9. In my opinion, the pay here is lower than in other companies.	_____	_____
10. I think that I am changed from one operation to another more than is necessary.	_____	_____
11. Workers should not be consulted about production decisions; they are the responsibility of the supervisor or management.	_____	_____
12. The best qualified employee gets the promotions in this company.	_____	_____
13. Having job security is very important to me.	_____	_____
14. For me, a good job has a variety of work tasks.	_____	_____
15. When talking with my supervisor, I feel free to say what is on my mind.	_____	_____
16. It is important to me to have a job which I know I can advance in if I work hard.	_____	_____
17. I can be sure of my job as long as I do good work.	_____	_____
18. My supervisor really tries to get my ideas about things.	_____	_____
19. I'm really doing something worthwhile in my job.	_____	_____
20. It should be up to me to decide how to work; not the supervisor.	_____	_____
21. I really enjoy talking to my fellow workers.	_____	_____

	Agree	Disagree
22. Good working conditions (heat, noise, light, etc.) are important for the kind of work I do.	_____	_____
23. I am very much underpaid for the work that I do.	_____	_____
24. Management here is really interested in the welfare of employees.	_____	_____
25. The people I work with help each other out when someone falls behind or gets in a tight spot.	_____	_____
26. Companies should try to match a person's talents to a job.	_____	_____
27. The supervisor criticizes me if I work too fast or too slow.	_____	_____
28. The best jobs are those which hire an equal number of men and women.	_____	_____
29. My job does not allow me enough time to talk to my fellow workers.	_____	_____
30. Workers should be guaranteed large enough wages to support themselves and their families.	_____	_____
31. I wish this company employed more workers of the opposite sex.	_____	_____
32. There are plenty of good jobs here for those who want to get ahead.	_____	_____
33. Supervisors should not concern themselves with employee needs and problems.	_____	_____
34. My talents could be better used on another job in this company.	_____	_____
35. Poor working conditions keep me from doing my best in my work.	_____	_____
36. It is important to me that I get along with the people I work with.	_____	_____
37. The people who get promotions around here usually deserve them.	_____	_____
38. I really feel loyal to this company.	_____	_____

	Agree	Disagree
39. Management has an <u>obligation</u> to consider the needs and wishes of employees.	___	___
40. Workers should be paid according to the work they do; that is, according to their skill and experience.	___	___
41. Compared with other companies, employee benefits here are good.	___	___
42. My supervisor has an interest in me and understands my problems.	___	___

## Section 2

All of us sometimes find that we have to miss going to work or be late to work for reasons that have little to do with the job we have. People sometimes have to miss work or are late for work for reasons like the ones listed below. We would like to know if you have ever missed or been late to work for any of these reasons. Please read the reasons and then mark "yes" if you have ever missed or been late to work for that reason, or if that was part of the reason you missed or were late to work, or mark "no" if it was not. In addition, please tell us about how often, 1 to 2 times, 3 to 4 times, 5 to 6 times, more than 6 times, you have missed or been late to work for that reason.

Have you ever missed work or been late to work at Lady Bird because:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
(a) a member of your family was sick and you had to stay home and take care of him/her?	___	___
How often?		
1 to 2 times ___		
3 to 4 times ___		
5 to 6 times ___		
more than 6 times ___		
(b) you had to take your child or children somewhere (to doctor, shopping, school, etc.)?	___	___
How often?		
1 to 2 times ___		
3 to 4 times ___		
5 to 6 times ___		
more than 6 times ___		

- |  | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|--|------------|-----------|
| (c) you had to pay some bills or see about money matters<br>(car license, taxes, bank loan, department store<br>lay-away, etc.)? | _____      | _____     |
| How often?   |            |           |
| 1 to 2 times _____   |            |           |
| 3 to 4 times _____   |            |           |
| 5 to 6 times _____   |            |           |
| more than 6 times _____  |            |           |
| (d) you wanted to go someplace with your family or friends?  | _____      | _____     |
| How often?   |            |           |
| 1 to 2 times _____   |            |           |
| 3 to 4 times _____   |            |           |
| 5 to 6 times _____   |            |           |
| more than 6 times _____  |            |           |
| (e) you had to be at home because a repairman was going to<br>repair something around the house (TV, washer, carpet,<br>etc.)?   | _____      | _____     |
| How often?   |            |           |
| 1 to 2 times _____   |            |           |
| 3 to 4 times _____   |            |           |
| 5 to 6 times _____   |            |           |
| more than 6 times _____  |            |           |
| (f) you were out late the night before and felt too tired<br>to go to work?  | _____      | _____     |
| How often?   |            |           |
| 1 to 2 times _____   |            |           |
| 3 to 4 times _____   |            |           |
| 5 to 6 times _____   |            |           |
| more than 6 times _____  |            |           |
| (g) your husband (wife) was off work and wanted you to be<br>with him (her)?   | _____      | _____     |
| How often?   |            |           |
| 1 to 2 times _____   |            |           |
| 3 to 4 times _____   |            |           |
| 5 to 6 times _____   |            |           |
| more than 6 times _____  |            |           |
| (h) you had to do work around the house (cleaning, cooking,<br>painting, etc.)?  | _____      | _____     |
| How often?   |            |           |
| 1 to 2 times _____   |            |           |
| 3 to 4 times _____   |            |           |
| 5 to 6 times _____   |            |           |
| more than 6 times _____  |            |           |

- |   | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|---|------------|-----------|
| (i) you just didn't feel like going to work that day?   | _____      | _____     |
| How often?  |            |           |
| 1 to 2 times _____  |            |           |
| 3 to 4 times _____  |            |           |
| 5 to 6 times _____  |            |           |
| more than 6 times _____   |            |           |
| <br>(j) your child (or children) were going to do something special at school or in a club and wanted you to see him/her? |            |           |
| How often?  |            |           |
| 1 to 2 times _____  |            |           |
| 3 to 4 times _____  |            |           |
| 5 to 6 times _____  |            |           |
| more than 6 times _____   |            |           |
| <br>(k) you were sick?  | _____      | _____     |
| How often?  |            |           |
| 1 to 2 times _____  |            |           |
| 3 to 4 times _____  |            |           |
| 5 to 6 times _____  |            |           |
| more than 6 times _____   |            |           |
| <br>(l) Are there any other reasons why you miss work or are late to work?  |            |           |
| If so, what are they?   |            |           |
| _____   |            |           |
| _____   |            |           |
| _____   |            |           |
| _____   |            |           |
| _____   |            |           |
| How often?  |            |           |
| 1 to 2 times _____  |            |           |
| 3 to 4 times _____  |            |           |
| 5 to 6 times _____  |            |           |
| more than 6 times _____   |            |           |

## Section 3

All of us sometimes find that we have to quit a job for reasons that have little to do with the job itself. People sometimes have to quit their jobs for reasons like the ones listed below. We would like to know if you have ever quit a job for any of these reasons. Please read the reasons and then mark the "yes" if you have ever quit a job for that reason or if that was part of the reason you quit or the "no" if you have not.

Have you ever quit a job because:	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
(a) you (your wife) were going to have a baby?	_____	_____
(b) you found it too difficult to work and keep up with things at home?	_____	_____
(c) someone in your family (other than yourself) got sick and you had to care for them?	_____	_____
(d) your husband's (wife's) work required that you move?	_____	_____
(e) you felt your job interfered with taking care of your children?	_____	_____
(f) you were going to get married?	_____	_____
(g) your husband (wife) wanted you to stop working?	_____	_____
(h) you had the opportunity to get a better job?	_____	_____
(i) your children wanted you to stop working?	_____	_____
(j) you felt your job interfered with your being a good wife (husband)?	_____	_____
(k) of some other reason?	_____	_____

If so, for what reason?

---



---



---



---



## Section 4

GENERAL INFORMATION: THE INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE IN THIS SECTION WILL NOT BE USED TO IDENTIFY YOU PERSONALLY IN ANY WAY. It will be used only to make the results of the study more meaningful.

Would you please tell us:

1. How long have you worked at Lady Bird Apparel? \_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_ months
2. In which unit or section do you presently work? \_\_\_\_ pressing  
\_\_\_\_ cutting  
\_\_\_\_ sewing  
\_\_\_\_ shipping
3. (a) What is your date of birth? \_\_\_\_\_  
(b) What is your age? \_\_\_\_ years
4. What is your marital status? \_\_\_\_ married; \_\_\_\_ single; \_\_\_\_ divorced;  
\_\_\_\_ separated; \_\_\_\_ widowed
5. Do you live with: (a) your husband \_\_\_\_, (b) your parents \_\_\_\_,  
(c) by yourself (or with roommates) \_\_\_\_
6. Do you own or rent? \_\_\_\_\_
7. What is your current address? \_\_\_\_\_
8. How many children do you have? \_\_\_\_\_  
If you have children, what are their ages? \_\_\_\_\_
9. What is your average weekly take home pay from your present job?  
\_\_\_\_\_
10. Please circle the highest number of years of formal education that you have completed.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 / 7 8 / 9 10 11 12 / 13 14 15 16 / 17 or more
11. What is your husband's (wife's) average weekly take home pay?  
\_\_\_\_\_
12. Do you have charge accounts? \_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_ no  
Where? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
13. Do you do most of your buying with cash or credit? \_\_\_\_\_

14. Do you have a savings account? ☐ yes ☐ no  
 If you do have a savings account, approximately how much money  
 do you have in savings? ☐ less than \$500.00  
☐ \$600.00 to \$1,000.00  
☐ over \$1,000.00
15. Is the income from your job used mostly to:  
☐ keep up with day to day expenses  
☐ try to build a savings account  
☐ other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
16. What is the most important reason why you work? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
17. What do you like most about your job? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
18. What do you like least about your job? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
19. If you are married, what is your husband's (wife's) occupation?  
 (Please be specific. For example: brakeman with the railroad,  
not railroad employee.) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
20. If you are married, please circle the highest number of years of  
 formal education completed by your husband (wife).  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 / 7 8 / 9 10 11 12 / 13 14 15 16 / 17 or more

PLEASE CHECK TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL  
 THE QUESTIONS. THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.

## APPENDIX B

TABLE VII  
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

Age Group	Frequency
19 to 25	19
26 to 31	17
32 to 45	16
46 to 66	20

N = 72

TABLE VIII  
MARITAL STATUS DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

Marital Status	Frequency
Married	43
Single	2
Divorced	19
Separated	5
Widowed	3

N = 72

TABLE IX  
NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER RESPONDENT

Number of Children	Frequency
None	8
One	21
Two	18
Three	12
Four	6
Five	4
Six	2
Seven	1

N = 72

TABLE X  
AVERAGE WEEKLY TAKE-HOME PAY PER RESPONDENT

Take-Home Pay	Frequency
less than \$50	10
\$51 to \$60	24
\$61 to \$70	17
\$71 to \$80	10
\$81 to \$90	1
\$91 to \$100	2
no response	8

N = 72

TABLE XI  
DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES ON THE PERCEPTION  
OF ROLE CONFLICT SCALE

Score	Frequency
0	5
1	3
2	3
3	0
4	0
5	3
6	2
7	1
8	6
9	5
10	44

N = 72

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**



JOB SATISFACTION AMONG BLUE COLLAR WOMEN:  
A SALIENCY CRITERION FOR MEASUREMENT

by

Paula C. Morrow

(ABSTRACT)

The lack of correspondence between job satisfaction attitudes and behavioral indicators of job satisfaction exemplifies the more widely recognized problem of attitude-behavior inconsistency. While various theoretical and methodological explanations for this inconsistency have been offered, it is posited that this inconsistency can be reduced through a more accurate (valid) assessment of the cognitive component of attitudes. The notion of a saliency criterion in the evaluation of the cognitive component of job satisfaction is suggested as such a technique for achieving more accurate assessment.

The concept of saliency itself as well as the notion of a saliency criterion is explored using a sample of 72 blue collar women. The concept is found to be both viable and relatively stable for various subgroups within the sample, as defined by several factors external to the job. Job satisfaction scales using specified saliency criteria are compared with scales which do not consider saliency on the basis of their ability to correlate with a behavioral measure of job satisfaction (absenteeism). The findings, with certain delineated reservations, indicate that scales which employ saliency criteria are better correlates of behavior. Saliency thus may be viewed as at least a partial solution to the problem of attitude-behavior inconsistency.