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ABSTRACT

There are many factors influencing managers' job satisfaction. This study is designed to examine the relationships between pay satisfaction, autonomy satisfaction, and job satisfaction of managers. It was proposed that job satisfaction of managers is influenced by their pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction. It was suggested that deficiencies in any one of these two variables (pay and autonomy) can be compensated by an increase in the supply of the other, with no appreciable change in managers' job satisfaction.

To test the hypotheses derived from these propositions, a primary research project was constructed. To gather the necessary data, 496 questionnaires were sent to 19 Louisiana Manufacturing companies for distribution among their managers. The final sample consisted of 254 responses, or more than 51 percent of all questionnaires distributed among managers. Each of the respondents completed a four part questionnaire designed to measure pay satisfaction, autonomy satisfaction, and job satisfaction. The questionnaire also included questions related to personal data.
The research findings showed that managers attitudes toward their jobs is influenced by their attitudes toward their pay and autonomy. It was found that managers who were satisfied with their pay/or with their autonomy were more satisfied with their jobs as compared to those who were not satisfied with their pay and/or autonomy.

Arranging managers in groups of "satisfied" and "not satisfied" with pay and autonomy, and making comparisons between them, the study found that:

1. Job satisfaction of managers was higher if they were satisfied with both of the two factors, pay and autonomy, as compared with those who were satisfied with only one, pay or autonomy.

2. Those managers who were satisfied with their pay or autonomy had higher job satisfaction than managers who were not satisfied with either autonomy or pay.

3. Comparing two groups of managers, each being satisfied with only one factor (pay or autonomy), but not satisfied with the other (autonomy or pay), the two groups were equally satisfied with their jobs. In other words, the positive effect of one factor would offset the negative effect of the other, causing no appreciable change in managers attitudes toward their jobs.
The results of this study demonstrated the influence of pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction on job satisfaction of managers. It supported the position that the more intrinsically rewarding a job, the less need for extrinsic rewards. This points out the possibility of a trade off between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

People join organizations, work in organizations and continue their memberships based on certain reward expectations. If these expectations are met, the relationship continues, or even grows. Since organizations are created as the result of the dynamic relationships of the interacting persons they can, in the final analysis, remain functioning only if they meet the expectations of their constituting members. As Hicks and Gullett stated: "Persons join or form an organization because they expect that participation in it will satisfy personal needs."\(^1\) The quality of interactions among the members determines the success or failure of any organization. A cycle of interaction between the individual and the organization exists which is mutually reinforcing. If one believes the organization helps him to achieve his personal objectives, he contributes to the organization. This helps the organization in attaining organizational

objectives, and the cycle repeats itself. In this manner, "The effectiveness of the member's participation is directly related to the person's idea of how the organization helps to achieve one's individual objectives." The survival of the organization, in turn, depends on the contributions of the individuals. "When an existing organization ceases to satisfy personal objectives, it must change or go out of existence."

According to Barnard, an organization's capacity to survive, or its efficiency, is based on its ability to continue to offer enough inducement for the satisfaction of individual motives. Viewing the organization as an open system, it can survive if it receives inputs or energy by meeting individual's expectations. Otherwise it moves toward less efficiency and death; it acquires

\[ ^2 \text{Ibid., p. 25.} \]
\[ ^3 \text{Ibid., p. 25.} \]
\[ ^5 \text{Chester I. Barnard, Organization and Management, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1948), pp. 55-57.} \]
entropy.  

In order to meet these expectations, organizations provide their members with rewards in one form or another. Basically, these rewards can be classified into two categories, intrinsic and extrinsic. While the combination of these two forms of rewards vary from organization to organization (and also within a given organization for different individuals), it is the desired combination that would bring the best results.

Whenever the expectations of an individual are met, the individual will be satisfied with his job. A person's job satisfaction "is determined by the difference between the characteristics of the job, what he wants from it, and what he feels he receives from it." What he wants from a job or membership in an organization constitutes his expectations, and what he feels he receives from it is in the form of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards that an organization offers.

---


In this research project, job satisfaction has been employed as a denominator with which satisfaction with extrinsic and intrinsic rewards could be measured. It also is the author's opinion that job satisfaction, irrespective of its direct relation to performance, is an important factor that will influence overall performance of an organization.

The new problems that organizations are faced with have added a new dimension to the importance of job satisfaction. The shortage and scarcity of some commodities, especially the energy shortage has caused the re-evaluation of future goals of organizations. The organizational goal of survival is reexamined in light of restricted growth. With restricted growth extrinsic rewards tend to stabilize, and job satisfaction gains added importance. Consequently, it will be desirable, and in some cases necessary, for an organization to be concerned about its employees' job satisfaction.

In the following pages, the importance of job satisfaction and its indirect impact on organizational performance will be discussed.
The Importance of Job Satisfaction

Although the relationship between job satisfaction and performance is an unsettled subject; researchers and scholars have become increasingly convinced that there is no necessary relationship between these two variables. However, job satisfaction cannot be regarded as an unimportant factor in organizational setting, particularly in a democratic society. "Concern with employee satisfaction results not only from a desire to be regarded as an acceptable employer, but also from the recognition that employee satisfaction is related to such indexes of personal effectiveness as turnover and absenteeism." 

Hulin, in a study of 350 female clerical workers, found that workers who were satisfied with their jobs were likely to remain on these jobs. He also reported a


9Ibid., pp. 196-200.

decrease in the rate of turnover (from 30 percent to 12 percent) among a large group of clerical workers (298) after the implementation of a program which resulted in an increased job satisfaction.\(^{11}\)

Vroom, in a review of literature, reported that there appears to be a consistent negative relationship between job satisfaction and propensity to leave. He, also found a negative relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism, but this relationship was somehow less consistent.\(^{12}\) In a research conducted by Schneider and Synder they found that job satisfaction and turnover were correlated. A similar finding was reported by L. K. Walters and Darrell Roach.\(^{14}\)

\(^{11}\)Ibid., pp. 280-285.


\(^{13}\)Benjamin Schneider and Robert A. Synder, "Some Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 60, Number 3, (June, 1975), pp. 318-328.

Porter and Steers, in a critical examination of research findings about turnover and absenteeism covering more than a decade, have found overall job satisfaction to be consistently and inversely related to turnover. They also have pointed out that based on preliminary evidence, overall job satisfaction appears to have significant impact on absenteeism. In an effort to break down the global concept of job satisfaction they utilized four categories of factors: (a) organizational-wide factors, (b) immediate environment factors, (c) job-related factors, and (d) personal factors. Several variables in each of the four categories were found to be related fairly consistently to both turnover or absenteeism or both.15

March and Simon have proposed that "The greater the individual's satisfaction with his job, the less the propensity to search for alternative jobs .... Dissatisfaction makes movement more desirable and also (by stimulating search) makes it appear more feasible."16


A similar point of view is suggested by Lofquist, Lloyd, and Davis. They stated that: "The probability that an individual will voluntarily leave the work environment is inversely related to his job satisfaction."

Hebert S. Parnes, in reference to research findings, suggested that workers generally do not have adequate knowledge of the characteristics of other jobs. Thus, very seldom can they make a valid comparison between them. Consequently, we can say the nature of the jobs that they are engaged in is an important factor in determining a decision to leave. "To a considerable extent even workers who voluntarily change jobs are not really attracted by more desirable jobs elsewhere so much as they are 'pushed out' of jobs that they find unsatisfactory, and there is no assurance that they subsequently will find jobs better than the ones they leave."

Although good performance cannot be considered a direct result of job satisfaction, everything else being


\[19\] Ibid., p. 189.
equal, a satisfied worker being exposed to a less frustrating situation should be expected to have a better performance. A frustrated person may demonstrate aggression and hostility which, in turn, may negatively effect his or her behavior on the job. According to Korman, frustration is "a state of the organism resulting from a dissatisfying event: the emotion which a person feels when he is in a situation which does not provide him with satisfaction."\textsuperscript{20} Aggression is the most common response to a frustration-causing agent.\textsuperscript{21} In the work environment, having workers that are not frustrated certainly is much more desirable than the ones that may create trouble for themselves and others as a result of their dissatisfaction with their jobs.

Beside the effect of job satisfaction on absenteeism and turnover, there are other important relationships that require consideration. In three separate


\textsuperscript{21}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 165.
studies Iris and Barrett,22 Weitz,23 and Kornhauser,24 have found the existence of a significant correlation between attitudes toward life and attitudes toward the job.

Kornhauser found that "men satisfied with one aspect of their life tend to be satisfied with other aspects."25 He states that: "If we focus on feelings of satisfaction with life as a whole we see that it is closely related to both family-and-home satisfaction and job satisfaction and substantially, though considerably less, to leisure-time satisfaction."26 He also argues that his findings indicate that "favorable or unfavorable job feelings (carry) over to produce corresponding feelings in other sectors of life."27 Thus, dissatisfaction from the


25Ibid., p. 205.

26Ibid., p. 205.

27Ibid., p. 89.
job can produce dissatisfaction with one's life in general. Because satisfaction and happiness are socially desirable, we cannot afford to ignore the importance of job satisfaction. Kornhauser's findings indicate that satisfied workers have a better mental health. According to him, "Jobs in which workers are better satisfied are conducive to better mental health; jobs in which larger numbers are dissatisfied are correspondingly conducive to poorer average mental health." The greater proportions of workers in high mental health groups are satisfied with their jobs compared to those in low mental health groups. A similar conclusion was presented by Locke:

"Job satisfaction, itself or in combination with the conditions (both in the individual and the job environment) which brings it about, has a variety of consequences for the individual. It can affect his attitude toward life, toward his family, and toward himself. It can affect his physical health and adjustment, and plays a casual role in absenteeism and turnover." The failure of research to show direct relationship between job satisfaction and performance does not

\[28\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 89.}\]

\[29\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 86.}\]

mean the end of scholars' interest in studying job satisfaction. Now researchers are trying to unravel the impact of job satisfaction on factors such as absenteeism, turnover, accident, and mental health. Today, job satisfaction "is seen more as a reaction to one's work and one's organizational membership than as a determinant of one's performance. Viewed in this way, (job) satisfaction has become an important topic of study in its own right."\(^\text{31}\)

The impact of job satisfaction on performance has evolved from being considered as the cause of better performance; to being the result of good performance; to no direct cause and effect relationship. But the importance of job satisfaction and the consequence of lack of job satisfaction has progressed to be a subject of considerable research and has become an entirely separate topic.

Though this study does not directly deal with the effects of job satisfaction on workers' performance, the author takes the point of view that job satisfaction is an important factor, in an organizational setting, regardless of its direct relationship to performance.

Statement of the Problem

This study is an attempt toward clarification of the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards and their impact upon job satisfaction. It focuses on managers' satisfaction with their "pay" (extrinsic reward) and "autonomy" (intrinsic reward) and how these two factors influence managers' attitudes toward their jobs (job satisfaction). It also, is the intention of this study to find out if deficiencies in any one of these two factors (pay and autonomy) can be compensated by an increase in the supply of the other, without a negative impact upon managers' attitudes toward their jobs. In other words, if organizational structure does not permit a desired amount of autonomy for managers, can this be offset by an increase in pay? Or, is it possible to improve managers' satisfaction by increasing their autonomy in case organizational limitations do not permit an increase in the amount of pay?

Purpose of the Study

This research is concerned with the following purposes:
To find out the relationships between managers' attitudes toward their pay and their autonomy and how these affect their job satisfaction. More specifically, to examine the effect of managers' perceived satisfaction with pay and autonomy on their overall job satisfaction, and to find out if managers who are less/more satisfied with their pay or with their autonomy are also less/more satisfied with their jobs. To accomplish this objective, six hypotheses are developed to be tested. They are presented in pages 25 through 29.

Scope of the Study

There are many factors that influence managers job satisfaction. This study attempts to examine the relationships among managers' perceived satisfaction with autonomy, and perceived satisfaction with pay, and the effect of these two variables on overall job satisfaction of managers. The actual amount of autonomy and the actual amount of pay do not have any direct bearing on the study. It is the perception of managers concerning these variables that is the focus of this project, because the factor that contributes to liking or disliking any given phenomenon is one's perception about such a phenomenon, not its absolute amount in the outside world.
Justification for the Study

Professor Megginson in his book, Personnel: A Behavioral Approach to Administration, stated that:

"The financial rewards...are limited in supply and can be used only to a restricted extent in motivating employees by promising to satisfy their material needs. Conversely, the intrinsic rewards, such as working on an interesting and challenging assignment, recognition from superiors...give satisfaction within themselves and can be used to an unlimited extent."

Since the supply of financial rewards is limited, and their extent of application restricted, learning about the use of intrinsic rewards with their wide variety of possible uses can be very helpful in motivating employees for a better performance. Autonomy as an intrinsic reward is a factor that this study examines; its interaction with other variables such as pay and job satisfaction is analyzed.

Traditionally, money has been used as a means to elicit an expected behavior from employees. Its use still is an important source of compensation. However, our understanding of the interaction between money and other factors

remain in a rudimentary stage. As Opsahl and Dunnette have pointed out in the review of research and literature related to the effect of financial compensation on employee motivation, "Money has been and continues to be the primary means of rewarding and modifying human behavior in industry." The surprising fact is that, according to Opsahl and Dunnette, "We know amazingly little about how money either interacts with other factors or how it acts individually to affect job behavior." They raised the question: Can money act as an incentive for the "higher order" needs? It is obvious that money serves to satisfy needs for food, clothing, and shelter, but it is much less obvious how money may be related to higher order needs. In this area, solid relationships are lacking. Not only is the relationship between money and higher level needs not quite clear, but the number and complexity of higher order needs make it

34Ibid., p. 94.
36Ibid., p. 115.
very difficult to establish any scientifically tested conclusion. In order to increase our understanding in this area, attempts could be made to study each area specifically, and at the same time integrate several variables to study their relationships.

The relationship between job satisfaction and autonomy was demonstrated in a research conducted by Slocum and Misshauk. The research was conducted among two groups of employees differing in skill level and job autonomy. Sample consisted of 56 engineers and technical workers and 91 laborers. "Of specific interest (to this study) were the factors that were deemed important to operative employees with respect to their environment, their satisfaction with these environmental work factors, and the relationship between satisfaction and productivity."37 The results, though not pertinent to this study, showed that the relationship between satisfaction and productivity was varied for the two groups. Among the findings, of particular interest to this study, was the demonstration that job satisfaction of engineers was influenced by the

degree of perceived freedom to perform their jobs. It also showed that skilled employees rated freedom to perform jobs a more important factor than production workers.38

Jon M. Shepard's study was in the same direction. He found that lack of perceived satisfaction about autonomy related to low job satisfaction among workers. He also noticed that "income partly makes up for a deficit in autonomy" (difference between desired autonomy and perceived autonomy).39 These studies relate job satisfaction and autonomy of people with no managerial responsibilities. Although it could be assumed that the same relationships are true for managers, this concept should be scientifically tested.

Stuart M. Klein and John R. Maher set up a research project based on the literature which suggested that the autonomy of individuals in making decisions was an important determinant of job satisfaction. They tested the hypothesis that "decision making autonomy is

38Ibid., pp. 54-55.

directly related to perceptions of conflict..."\(^4^0\) Conflict and frustration were assumed to be the result of a lack of influence and autonomy: "...a lack of influence and autonomy makes the individual vulnerable to perceptions of personal conflict between himself and others he deals with..."\(^4^1\) They found that there was a relationship between lack of decision making—autonomy and perception of conflict. Thus, they have indirectly established some relationship between autonomy and job satisfaction.\(^4^2\) Further research would be needed to clarify if indeed job satisfaction and autonomy are related.

Tannenbaum has proposed some general propositions concerning control in organizations. If autonomy implies more control over the job by job occupants, then autonomy would lead to satisfaction. However, research would be needed to substantiate these propositions.

\(^4^1\)Ibid., p. 482.
\(^4^2\)Ibid., p. 511 and p. 513.
Tannenbaum proposed that:

"The exercise of control implies affecting the system in a manner consistent with the intents of the controller, the system is more fully instrumental in meeting the needs of one who exercises control than one who does not exercise control."\(^3\)

Thus, it seems that increased autonomy not only is intrinsically satisfying but it may also lead to the satisfaction of other needs such as esteem and recognition. The first step needed is to establish a positive relationship between job satisfaction and autonomy. Establishing this relationship is one of the objectives of this research project.

A number of researchers have established that autonomy and pay are among the factors that are more frequently cited by managers to be important to them.\(^4\) They also have established that these factors are not fully furnished by organizations. Lawler stated that the literature suggests that pay can be instrumental for the


satisfaction of a variety of needs, among them esteem and recognition.\textsuperscript{45} According to him, "A surprising amount of evidence suggests that pay is instrumental for satisfaction of autonomy and independence needs.\textsuperscript{46} He also concluded, "It is possible that other rewards to some extent can substitute for higher pay.\ldots In effect, satisfying certain needs by rewards other than pay may lead to pay itself becoming less important."\textsuperscript{47}

The above discussion clearly demonstrates the need for more analysis of the topic and the need for research projects that could increase our understanding of the relationship between pay, autonomy, and job satisfaction. As Porter said, "An understanding of the nature of job perception held by individuals in management positions would seem to be appropriate for the study of organizational problems."\textsuperscript{48}


\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., p. 34.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., p. 35.

It is proper to mention that in discussing different aspects of jobs, some basic principles are presented by Professor Megginson in his comprehensive analysis of "the role of work in improving performance."

"First, the greater the intrinsic value of the work being performed, the more satisfying it is to the individual performing it. Thus, the greater is its value and meaning to the worker. Second, the greater the satisfaction-yielding characteristics of the specific job, the less need there is for external motivation. Conversely, the less satisfaction yielding the job, the greater the need for external motivation." 49

Among the suggestions for future research proposed by Azumi and Hage is to test whether or not a lack of autonomy leads to more emphasis on reward or punishment. 50 Similarly, one of the conditions that should lead to pay dissatisfaction, according to Lawler, is availability of nonmonetary outcomes: "People who perceive that they receive few attractive nonmonetary outcomes from their job will be more dissatisfied (with their

---

49 Leon C. Megginson, op. cit., p. 588.

pay) than those who feel they receive many."\textsuperscript{51} Stated differently, "The more autonomy people feel they have in their jobs the more satisfied they are with their pay."\textsuperscript{52} An alternative nonmonetary income can be the amount of autonomy one has on his job. Thus, the relationship between pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction could be used for further research.

The previous material presented demonstrates the contributions that this study can provide for enriching the conceptual and theoretical knowledge about some aspects of work environment. It can also have some practical applicability. The understanding of the relationships between pay satisfaction and nonmonetary outcomes such as security and status is speculative, according to Lawler.\textsuperscript{53} Increased understanding of pay satisfaction and nonmonetary income, can be applied to the pay plans being implemented in organizations for a better result.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{51}]Edward E. Lawler III, \textit{Pay and Organizational Effectiveness}, op. cit., p. 217.
\item[\textsuperscript{53}]Edward E. Lawler III, \textit{Pay and Organizational Effectiveness}, op. cit., p. 226.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
"Instead of fitting the plan (pay plan) to organization, management can change the organization to fit the plan... 

...A pay plan can be used to initiate movement toward a more participative style. This can be done but we are just beginning to understand the process."54

The relationships between pay satisfaction, autonomy satisfaction and overall job satisfaction, and the direction of these relationships that are suggested by this study, if tested and proved, could be applied to improve the quality of the plans directed to enhance managers' performance. For example, if it is found that the managers who are not satisfied with their pay, but are satisfied with their autonomy have the same attitudes toward their jobs as those managers that are satisfied with their pay, but are not satisfied with their autonomy (hypothesis Number 6); then by increasing the amount of autonomy, if possible, we can in a way, change organization to fit the pay plan as recommended by Lawler.55

There is a limit to the amount of financial rewards available to any organization. This study might

54 Ibid., p. 284.
55 Ibid., p. 284.
provide organizations with an opportunity to improve their pay plans by demonstrating that it is possible to increase the attractiveness of monetary outcomes by modifying another organizational dimension besides pay.

Hypotheses

As shown in existing literature (see Chapter 2), it is expected that managers with more autonomy and more pay will be more satisfied than managers with less autonomy and less pay. Since both pay and autonomy are important factors in determining job satisfaction, it also is expected that an increased amount and/or strength of any one of these two factors can reduce the negative effect of the other, and result in relatively no change in the same level and degree of job satisfaction.

The following six hypotheses have been developed. They will be tested in order to find the existence of a possible relationship between pay, autonomy and job satisfaction.

The hypotheses are based on comparing job satisfaction of different groups of managers. Managers are grouped according to their pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction. This categorization provides six different pairs to be compared. This pairing is on the basis of all
possible combinations of pay, and autonomy satisfaction as
follows:

1. P+, A+ vs. P-, A-
2. P+, A+ vs. P-, A+
3. P+, A+ vs. P+, A-
4. P+, A- vs. P-, A-
5. P-, A+ vs. P-, A-
6. P+, A- vs. P-, A+

where:  P+ = satisfied with pay
        P- = not satisfied with pay
        A+ = satisfied with autonomy
        A- = not satisfied with autonomy.

Comparing job satisfaction of two groups of managers in each pair, the general null hypothesis proposes
that: there is no significant difference between job satisfaction of the two groups.

Based on the above six comparisons, we formulate six hypotheses along with their null forms.

Hypothesis 1: Managers who are satisfied with their pay and autonomy are more satisfied with their jobs than managers who are not satisfied with their pay and autonomy. (P+, A+ > P-, A-)
Null Hypothesis 1: Job satisfaction of managers who are satisfied with their pay and autonomy is not significantly different from job satisfaction of managers who are not satisfied with their pay and autonomy. (P+, A+ = P-, A-)

Hypothesis 2: Managers who are satisfied with their pay and with their autonomy are more satisfied with their jobs than managers who are not satisfied with their pay, but are satisfied with their autonomy. (P+, A+ > P-, A+)

Null Hypothesis 2: Job satisfaction of managers who are satisfied with their pay and autonomy is not significantly different from job satisfaction of managers who are not satisfied with their pay, but are satisfied with their autonomy. (P+, A+ = P-, A+)

Hypothesis 3: Managers who are satisfied with their pay, and their autonomy are more satisfied with their jobs than managers who are satisfied with their pay, but are
Null Hypothesis 3: Job satisfaction of managers who are satisfied with their pay, and their autonomy is not significantly different from job satisfaction of managers who are satisfied with pay, but are not satisfied with their autonomy.

\[(P^+, A^+ \rightarrow P^+, A^-)\]

Hypothesis 4: Managers who are satisfied with their pay, but are not satisfied with their autonomy are more satisfied with their jobs than managers who are not satisfied with their pay and autonomy.

\[(P^+, A^- \rightarrow P^-, A^-)\]

Null Hypothesis 4: Job satisfaction of managers who are satisfied with their pay, but are not satisfied with their autonomy is not significantly different from job satisfaction of managers who are not satisfied with their pay and autonomy.

\[(P^+, A^- = P^-, A^-)\]

Hypothesis 5: Managers who are not satisfied with their pay, but are satisfied with their
Null Hypothesis 5:

Hypothesis 6:

Null Hypothesis 6:

autonomy are more satisfied with their jobs than managers who are not satisfied with their pay and autonomy.

(P-, A+ > P-, A-)

Job satisfaction of managers who are not satisfied with their pay, but are satisfied with their autonomy is not significantly different from job satisfaction of managers who are not satisfied with their pay and autonomy.

(P-, A+ = P-, A-)

Managers who are satisfied with their pay, but are not satisfied with their autonomy are as equally satisfied with their jobs as managers who are not satisfied with their pay, but are not satisfied with their autonomy.

(P+, A- = P-, A+)

Job satisfaction of managers who are satisfied with their pay, but are not satisfied with their autonomy is not significantly different from job satisfaction of managers who are not satisfied with their pay, but are satisfied with their autonomy.

(P+, A- = P-, A+)
Limitations of the Study

Factors affecting job satisfaction are numerous. A comprehensive analysis of all of the factors influencing job satisfaction is beyond the scope of this study. Any study using only a few variables is limited to drawing conclusions only about those factors. Consequently, any generalization drawn from the present study would be limited to the variables being employed. Any relationships that could be established between a limited number of variables can contribute to the overall understanding of the complex problem of job satisfaction. Such an attempt would provide the basis for furthering the horizons of knowledge.

The present study employs only two factors, namely, managers perception about autonomy and their perception about pay. In analyzing the collected information, no effort has been made to separate managers at different levels of organizational hierarchy. Drawing lines within the organizational hierarchy is an arbitrary categorization and would only add to the complexity of an already complex problem.

Besides, as H. Rosen and C. G. Weaver have found, there seems to be a high degree of commonality within the
four management levels regarding conditions of work considered to be important by the managers. 56

Definition of the Concepts Used

The following are definitions of concepts used in this study:

Pay Satisfaction

Pay satisfaction is the attitude of managers toward the total monetary income they receive in the form of salary, special incentive income, fringe benefits, and any other monetary income. It is the difference between two responses to two different questions that are asked from managers. The first question is how much they feel their pay is, on a one (low) to seven (high) rating scale. The second question is how much they feel their pay should be. The difference between actual pay and what individuals feel they should be paid can be either positive or negative, and would tend to indicate the manager's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their pay.

Autonomy Satisfaction

Autonomy satisfaction is the attitude of managers toward the amount of autonomy they have in their management position. Four factors make up autonomy
satisfaction: (a) authority, (b) opportunity for independent thought and action, (c) opportunity for participation in the setting of goals, and (d) opportunity for participation in the determination of methods and procedures. It is the difference between the amount of autonomy on a scale of one to seven a manager feels he has, and the amount of autonomy he feels he should have. The difference can be a positive figure indicating autonomy satisfaction, or a negative figure representing autonomy dissatisfaction.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a measurement of managers' overall attitudes toward their management position. It is the managers' response to an 18 item global job satisfaction index.

Preview

In the following chapter, a selective review of literature relevant to this study is presented.

In Chapter III, the research methodology and the procedures for the collection of data are described. The results of the research and the findings are delineated in Chapter IV.
The final chapter provides an interpretation of the findings of this research project and their implications. It also contains conclusions of this inquiry and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The relevant material in the literature dealing with job satisfaction, autonomy, and pay are discussed in this chapter. The great amount as well as the diversity of the subject matter makes it impossible to have an exhaustive presentation of the topic. The author has tried to be selective in the review of pertinent material and has presented materials most relevant to this research project. Consequently, there are many publications dealing with this area of inquiry that are not presented.

This chapter concentrates on the factors dealing with job satisfaction and attitudes of employees toward their pay and autonomy. The relationships found between these variables by researchers are analyzed, and the ramifications of the findings are discussed.

Autonomy, Pay, and Job Satisfaction

The literature is full of material covering different aspects of jobs and satisfaction with jobs. As early as 1925 it was known to management scholars that there were several factors of jobs that the workers
considered to be important which could influence the workers satisfaction with their jobs.

In the 1920's two studies by DeMan and Williams were noteworthy. Whiting Williams, in his book, *Mainspring of Men*, noted that it was the relative amount of pay that counted, not the absolute amount. He also noted that the nature of jobs may be more important to workers than wages.  

"The almost numberless factors and conditions of the job which lined up alongside the dollars and cents per hour to make a man's work the final, the supreme measure of the man himself."

He noted, almost two decades before Maslow, that there exists a set of needs that workers seek to satisfy, and these needs are a combination of physiological, social, and psychological factors. Thus, money for a worker can take a different form:

"The farther the worker's skill takes him away from the hunger minimum, the more his pay-check's ability to buy material things is overshadowed by its ability to purchase an immaterial something of equal

---


importance and of vastly greater intricacy. That something is his standing as a worker among his fellow workers."

Henri DeMan, in a study conducted among workers, asked them about their feelings toward their jobs. Among the positive factors of work, were "activities," "self-assertion," "to be constructive," and a desire for "mastery." Among the negative factors which prevented workers from enjoying their works were detailed and monotonous work, reduction of initiative, an unjust wage system, etcetera.

Goodwin Watson, in a 1939 study found that "salary received for work" and "freedom in working out one's own methods of doing work" were among the top eight "morale" factors.

Maslow's theory of motivation has identified five sets of needs in a hierarchicestial arrangement. It is widely accepted that workers expect to satisfy one or another set of these needs by engaging in work activities.

---

3 Ibid., p. 27.


These needs, in order of importance, were "physiological," "safety," "love," "esteem," and "self actualization."\(^6\)

A number of studies indicate that pay satisfies one or a combination of these needs. For example, in a study by *Fortune* magazine, executives chose high wages over security.\(^7\) Porter found that pay was more important to lower level management than autonomy, esteem, or social needs.\(^8\) Myer's research indicated that pay contributed to needs for achievement and recognition.\(^9\)

A study by the National Industrial Conference Board indicated that executives ranked compensation on the top of a list of 71 morale factors. In the same study, a list of 32 factors was presented by C. Stech of Stech and Associates, New York. This list was based on attitude


survey of several thousand employees in 13 different organizations. "Fair pay for work done" was the most important factor.\textsuperscript{10}

Megginson stated that money performs several functions in our economy.

"Money is a symbol, and the purchase of luxuries and oversupply of the essentials is an outward manifestation of the person's income which permits him to feel that he is an affective provider for his family and worthwhile member of society.... Although the desire for leisure, recognition, acceptance, prestige, better working conditions, and increased security are powerful motivational factors... a 'raise' in the rate of pay tends to provide all of these things."\textsuperscript{11}

Professor O. Jeff Harris, in a study of a group of upperclassmen nearing graduation found that a good monetary income was ranked first among the ten items presented to them.\textsuperscript{12} Robert L. Opshal and Marvin D. Dunnette

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Lyman W. Porter, \textit{Organizational Patterns of Managerial Jobs Attitudes}, (American Foundation for Managerial Research, 1964), pp. 5-29.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
in their critical review and evaluation of research and literature related to the effect of financial compensation on employees motivation stated that money satisfies higher order needs as well as needs for food, clothing, and shelter:

"Quite obviously, money serves to satisfy needs for food, clothing, and shelter, but it is much less obvious how money may be related to such other areas as need Achievement or need Power. It seems obvious that money serves these needs too, but solid evidence of relationship is lacking."13

In a study of perceived need satisfaction of 139 managers, Porter found that the pay was in second degree of importance only to security needs among bottom level managers. For middle managers, pay was behind self-actualization and security needs.14 The pay item was found to have the highest frequency of responses indicating deficiency in fulfillment among both bottom and middle managers.15

Comparing bottom level and middle management positions in terms of need fulfillment deficiencies, the


15 Ibid., p. 9.
larger differences were in areas of esteem, security, and autonomy. These needs were significantly more often satisfied in middle managers.15

In research conducted by Porter and Lawler among 1,916 managers, it was found that the higher level and older managers with more seniority were more satisfied with their pay. However, when all factors were held constant, lower level managers were better satisfied with their pay than higher level managers.16 This indicates that pay relates to other factors as Porter has mentioned in his previous study.

In a more recent study by Ronan and Organt, employing the same procedure utilized by Porter and Porter and Lawler, it was discovered that better educated, higher level, and older managers with more seniority were better paid. It also was demonstrated that other factors being held constant, the higher paid managers were more satisfied

15Ibid., p. 9.

with pay. The same result was reported by Schwab and Wallace Jr. in a research project involving a sample of 2,000 employees of a large manufacturing company.

John W. Slocum Jr. and M. J. Misshauk in a study of a group of 56 engineers and 91 laborers found that the highly skilled employees attached more importance to their job and freedom to perform their jobs than lesser skilled workers. Both groups put more importance on job and freedom to perform their jobs than they did on the the pay received. They found the most important factor affecting job satisfaction for engineers was freedom satisfaction.

Autonomy was considered one of the four most important goals reported by managers from different countries. In his research, Geert H. Holstede asked 2,500 professional technical personnel, 4,000 managers, 7,500 technicians, 1,600 clerical, and 3,200 unskilled workers. "Try to

---


18Donald P. Schwab and Mac J. Wallace, Jr., "Correlates of Employee Satisfaction With Pay," Industrial Relations, Volume 13, Number 1, (February, 1974), pp. 78-89.

think of those factors which would be important to you in an ideal job. Disregard the extent to which they are contained in your present job."\textsuperscript{20} The 19 goals reported could be grouped in three categories. The job content was first, then came interpersonal relationships, and the third was environmental factors. Autonomy was ranked second by managers, behind challenging work. Earnings was reported second by technicians in manufacturing plants; third by unskilled workers; and eighth, ninth, and tenth by professional, clerical, and managerial personnel.\textsuperscript{21}

Mitchell Fein reworked the data collected by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan. The data previously were used in the Survey of Working Conditions by the Center. The SRC sample was composed of all categories of workers. Almost 60 percent of the sample were professional, technical, managerial, and clerical workers. Thus, a weighted average response of all subjects reported as representative of all working people cannot be a valid conclusion. Fein rearranged the data by


\textsuperscript{21}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 72-80.
occupation. The findings were presented in two tables. They showed that the professional, technical, and managerial group ranked "interesting work" first among 23 factors. Although the question for autonomy was very strongly worded, it still was ranked quite high. The question of importance of autonomy was: "I am given a lot of freedom to decide how I do my own work." People may desire some freedom to do their work, but they may interpret a lot of freedom as a sign of lack of order, in the work environment. Probably the responses to this question can be regarded as somehow distorted. Pay was ranked 9.5 in order of importance; the availability of the pay was seventeenth. This may indicate that this group of people felt they were not adequately compensated.

S. M. Klein and J. R. Maher, in a study designed to measure the relationship between perception of conflict and decision making autonomy of 400 managers in 12 manufacturing companies, found that "considering all managers in the sample, there is statistically significant relationship between lack of decision making autonomy and

perception of conflict." 23 Everything else being equal, and assuming that normal people prefer "no conflict" over "conflict," their finding implies that autonomy has positive relation to satisfaction. As Tannenbaum puts it:

"...The exercise of control is a positive value for most organization members. While individual differences certainly exist, organization members generally prefer exercising influence to being powerless.... This desirability of control may be attributed to the psychological or symbolic satisfactions that come from exercising control, or from pragmatic implications of power. 24

This exercise of control is the basis for psychological integration of members into a system. Having control over a system means that the system is consistent with intents of the member. Thus, "Psychologically, the system is an extension of the person who exercises control more than one who does not. Hence, the person who exercises control is less alienated from the system than his uninfluential counterparts." 25


25 Ibid., p. 308.
Jerald G. Bachman and A. S. Tannenbaum set up a research project, based on Blauner's conclusion, to analyze the relationship between control and satisfaction. Blauner's statement was as follows: "It is possible to generalize on the basis of the evidence that the greater the degree of control that a worker has (either in a single dimension or as a total composite) the greater his satisfaction."

Bachman and Tannenbaum's hypothesis was: "Across areas of experience, satisfaction will be a positive function of control." The research consisted of two studies. The first study utilized 489 workers in a Canadian oil refinery. The second study had a sample of 4,199 employees of a large United States automobile manufacturing corporation.

Their findings were consistent with those reported in the literature concerning job satisfaction. They


found that "individuals tend to be more satisfied with those aspects of life or their jobs over which they have some control than with those over which they have none." 28 Jon M. Shepard found job satisfaction to be lowest among workers who had a deficit in autonomy (the difference between desired autonomy and perceived autonomy). 29

Summary

The literature and research findings show that there are several relatively independent factors contributing to job satisfaction. 30 They are: work itself, or intrinsic job satisfaction; pay; supervision; opportunity for promotion and advancement; and characteristics of coworkers. In addition to these, the characteristics and personality of individuals can affect their attitudes

28 Ibid., p. 247.


The early writings in the field of human behavior and motivation asserted that workers not only were concerned about the amount of money they received, but were also interested in other aspects of their jobs, such as the opportunity for "self-assertion," "mastery," and the prestige associated with the job.

More recent studies have supported the general understanding of early writers in terms of factors affecting job satisfaction. These studies, applying more rigorous methodology, not only have identified factors influencing the workers' attitude toward their jobs, but they also have specified the extent of influence of these factors and their relationships.

It has been demonstrated that there exists a difference in the orientation and attitudes of blue-collar workers and white-collar employees toward their jobs. Among white-collar workers, managers have been considered a separate category, and their attitudes toward work situations

---

have been the subject of numerous investigations. Research findings show that managers put more emphasis on factors such as esteem, autonomy, and other higher needs.

Money, as a motivating factor, has been the subject of much controversial argument. Some scholars have downgraded the importance of money in providing satisfaction in work environment. However, it is accepted that money not only serves to satisfy basic needs of individuals, but it is related to higher order needs such as the need for achievement, need for power, and prestige.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the methodology utilized in this research is presented in several steps. First, the sample and method of data collection is discussed. Second, the instruments used in the measurement of pay satisfaction, autonomy satisfaction, and job satisfaction are explained. The last part is devoted to the presentation of the procedure used in this investigation.

The Sample and Method of Data Collection

A total of 266 managers from 19 different Louisiana manufacturing companies were used as the sample for this study. All management levels were included in the sample, from the first level supervisors who directly deal with workers up to and including the president.

These 19 manufacturers could be classified into seven different categories, as presented in Table 3-1. These firms each had 250 or more employees.

A list of all Louisiana manufacturers with 250 employees or more was prepared from the Louisiana Directory of Manufacturers 1975 (64 Companies). Letters (Appendix I) were mailed to the president or general
### Table 3-1

**Classification of Manufacturers Included in the Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firms</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chemical and Allied Products</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Electrical Machinery, Equipment and Supply</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fabricated Metal Products, Except Machinery and Transportation Equipments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Paper and Allied Products</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Petroleum Refining and Related Industries</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Primary Metal Industries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Printing and Publishing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                          | **19** |
managers of these 64 companies, requesting the participation of the firms' managers in the study.

Of the 64 companies contacted, 26 firms responded to the letter of invitation. Four firms refused to participate in the study for reasons such as: too much work load, strike, or being involved in a similar project of their own. Five other companies asked for more information or a copy of the questionnaire. Two of these five firms offered their cooperation in the study, after they were given additional information, or a copy of the questionnaire. The remaining three companies did not reply. In all, 19 firms, including the two that were given additional information, agreed to participate in the project, and permit their managers to complete a questionnaire.

The 19 firms participating in the study provided a potential sample of 496 managers. The questionnaires were sent, in bulk, directly to the president, general manager, or the manager of public relations of the companies for distribution among their managers.

Each questionnaire was accompanied with a cover letter (Appendix I) requesting participation of individual managers in the study. A complete copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix II of this dissertation. A
business reply mail was used for the return of the questionnaires. The envelopes were addressed to the researcher, Department of Management, Louisiana State University.

The survey materials were designed such that the identity of respondents, and their employers, would remain anonymous. This was arranged so that the individual managers could respond without fear of being identified. It would, hopefully, also increase the number of responses. This point was emphasized in the cover letter that accompanied each questionnaire.

A total number of 266 responses, or 53.63 percent of the questionnaires, were returned. Of the 266 questionnaires, 12 were incomplete, and were excluded from the sample. The final sample consisted of 254 responses or 51.21 percent of all questionnaires distributed among managers.

Some additional information, beyond the need of this study, was gathered for future use. Parts of this information is personal data. The personal data of the sample are presented in Table 3-2 through Table 3-6. Some of the 254 responses had one or more missing answers related to personal data. The missing information has caused the difference in the total observations for each table.
Table 3-2
Sample Distribution by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>63.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>36.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>252</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-3
Sample Distribution by Management Levels *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>57.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>242</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information about the method of classifying management levels is presented in Appendix III.
Table 3-4

Age Distribution of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3-5

**Education Distribution of the Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Graduate Degree</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>51.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>252</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-6

Yearly Income Distribution of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-14,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-19,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-24,999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-29,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-34,999</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-39,999</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-44,999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000-Over</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>215</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Questionnaires

The questionnaires used in this study contained four parts. The first three parts dealt with the measurement of autonomy satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and overall job satisfaction of managers. The last part consisted of personal information. A cover letter, (See Appendix I) to persuade managers to participate, and instructions for filling out the questionnaire was provided. A complete copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix II of this dissertation.

The instrument to measure autonomy satisfaction and pay satisfaction was taken from the questionnaires developed by Porter\(^1\) and has been utilized in numerous studies by other researchers. The permission to use this questionnaire was obtained from Professor Porter, and Richard D. Irwin Inc. A copy of the letters requesting permission to use this questionnaire, and subsequent permissions are presented in Appendix I.

Overall job satisfaction was measured by means of a questionnaire developed by Arthur H. Brayfield and Harold F. Rothe. Permission to use this questionnaire was granted by the American Psychological Association. Letters requesting the use of this questionnaire addressed to Professor Brayfield, and the American Psychological Association, and the permission letter are in Appendix I.

The cover letter contained the information about the general nature of the study and a request for managers' participation in the study. It emphasized that the questionnaire was designed such that the identity of respondents and their employers would remain anonymous.

The instruction for completing the first two parts were presented at the beginning of each part. Respondents were asked to answer parallel questions related to autonomy and pay. For each question they were asked to indicate (on a one to seven scale) the extent to which each characteristic (a) actually existed in his management position, and (b) should exist in his management position.

---

The measure of autonomy satisfaction was obtained by the difference between how much autonomy managers felt they should have, and how much they felt they actually had. The measure of pay satisfaction was obtained in the same manner.

For the completion of the third part (overall job satisfaction), instructions were provided at the beginning.

The last part included questions requesting personal information. This part was self-explanatory and did not need any instruction.

The Procedure

In this section the procedure used in scoring the questionnaires and method of data analysis are described.

The first section of the questionnaire consisted of four parallel questions that were a part of the need satisfaction questionnaire developed by Porter. (See Appendix II) In the first part of each question the respondent was asked to indicate, on a scale of one to seven, how much of the certain characteristic, described in the question, he felt was related to his management position. In the second part of each question he was asked how much of that characteristic he felt should be related to his management position, on a one to seven scale. By subtracting the
score of the second part from the score of the first part of each question, and adding the result of all four questions, a score for autonomy satisfaction was obtained. The possible score range was from a minimum of -24 to a maximum of +24. This meant that each question had a possible score range of -6 to +6. With four questions in this part, and each having a range of -6 to +6 the total possible range, as it was mentioned, was -24 to +24. Scores of zero and more were treated as an indication of autonomy satisfaction, and scores of below zero as a lack of autonomy satisfaction. This treatment was based on the position that when a person receives what one thinks he or she should receive, the outcome should be a feeling of satisfaction and contentment. In order to be satisfied it is not necessary to receive more than what one expects to receive. It is sufficient for expectations to be met. This condition is met when one scores the answer to the question: "How much is there now" equal to or greater than the answer to the question: "How much should there be?" Besides, not too many people will admit that they are receiving more than they deserve. In our sample there were only eight managers out of 254 which had scores of above zero for autonomy and pay questions, while 80 of them had scores of zero for
autonomy, and 93 of them had scores of zero for pay.

The second section of the questionnaire dealt with the measurement of pay satisfaction. This section contained one parallel question, and was scored similar to the first section. The minimum possible score was -6 and the maximum was +6. Scores of zero and above were regarded as pay satisfaction, and scores of below zero as lack of pay satisfaction.

To facilitate answering these two sections, a simple instruction and two sample questions were provided. These two questions were deliberately chosen from the "esteem" and "self-actualization" part of the Porter questionnaire. It was hoped that if they were answered, scores of these questions could possibly be helpful in data analysis.

The third part of the questionnaire was the measurement of overall job satisfaction. An 18-item job satisfaction index developed by Brayfield and Rothe was utilized in this section.3 This index is useful for

measuring general job satisfaction. The overall job satisfaction was represented by the score of respondents to this 18-item index. The scale for each item was: Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. Half of the items were positively worded, and the other half were negatively worded. Items 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, and 17 scored five points for Strongly Agree, four points for Agree, and so on. The rest of the items were scored five points for Strongly Disagree, four points for Disagree, etc. The word "worker" in the original item 15 was replaced with the word "manager" to be appropriate for our study. This item after the change took the form of: "I like my job better than the typical manager does like his job."

The scoring weights for each item ranged from one to five, and the range of possible total scores was 18 to 90, with undecided or neutral score of 5.

The last part of the survey material consisted of some personal information. The personal data is summarized in Tables 3-2 through 3-6.

---

To analyze the data, two procedures of statistical analysis were utilized in this research. They were factorial analysis of variance and correlation analysis. Analysis of variance was used to test hypotheses one through six. Correlation coefficient was used to measure the correlation (relationship, association, or dependence) between the variables in this study.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Orientation to the Chapter

The results of the statistical analysis are presented in this chapter. Interpretation of the results will be discussed in Chapter V. Before the results of correlation analysis and analysis of variance are discussed, a brief explanation of these two techniques, and a summary of the characteristics of sample will be presented. The characteristics of sample are depicted in forms of mean scores for different variables.

Analysis of Variance and Correlation Coefficient

As previously mentioned, analysis of variance technique, and correlation analysis were used in the testing of hypotheses and measuring the relationships between variables.

The analysis of variance technique shows what part of the total variation of data might be attributed to specific "causes," or sources of variation, and then compares it with that part of the variation of the data
which can be attributed to chance.\(^1\) In this method, a
general null hypothesis of no difference among the means
of various groups is tested.\(^2\) If the difference among
the means of various groups is greater than they could be
attributed to chance, the null hypothesis would be re-
jected. In such a case, the alternative hypothesis will be
accepted, and it will be concluded that the differences
among the means are associated with the sources of vari-
ation that the researcher has stated in the alternative
hypothesis.

The coefficient correlation measures the strength
of linear relationships between two variables. It "tells
us whether or not it is reasonable to say that there
exists a linear relationship (correlation) between \(x\)
and \(y\)."\(^3\) The statistic \(r\) (Pearson product-movement coeffi-
cient of correlation) has an upper limit of one. The

\(^1\) John E. Freund and Benjamin M. Perles,

\(^2\) N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, *Basic Statistical

\(^3\) Benjamin Perles and Charles Sullivan, *Freund
and Williams' Modern Business Statistics*, Revised Edition,
stronger the relationship between two variables, the closer to one will be the correlation coefficient. If the relationship is weak, r will be close to zero. The direction of relationship is denoted by the sign of r (+ or -). A positive relationship is represented by +r, and a -r is an indication of a negative association.

"The interpretation of a correlation coefficient as a measure of the linear relationship between two variables does not involve any cause and effect implications.... A high value for the coefficient of correlation simply indicates a high degree of 'co-relation.'"

In presenting a correlation coefficient, we need to provide information concerning three aspects. First, the degree of relationship (r), second the direction of relationship (+ or -), and finally, the probability that the relationship might be due to chance (P).

---

4Ibid., p. 309.


Characteristics of the Sample

The total sample consisted of 254 managers from 19 different Louisiana manufacturers. The sample characteristics in forms of mean scores for different variables are shown in Table 4-1. The mean score for job satisfaction of the sample was 68.878, with minimum and maximum scores of 34.00 and 86.00 respectively. Autonomy satisfaction mean score of the sample was -2.217, with the minimum score of -17.00 and maximum score of 9.00. The sample's mean score for pay satisfaction was -0.972, with the minimum of -6.00 and maximum of +1.00. The mean scores for other variables that were not directly used in the study can be seen in Table 4-1. These mean scores alone represent only a very crude generalization about the sample.

Correlation Coefficient Statistics

To measure managers satisfaction with pay and autonomy, parts of Porter's need satisfaction questionnaire were utilized. Included in the instruction for filling out the questionnaires were two sample questions to familiarize respondents with the techniques of answering. These questions were chosen from the "esteem" and "self-actualization" parts of Porter's need satisfaction questionnaire. A total of 206 managers filled out these two
Table 4-1
Characteristics of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>68.878</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>18  90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy Satisfaction</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-2.217</td>
<td>-17.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>-24 +24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Satisfaction</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-0.972</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-6 +6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem Satisfaction</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>-0.578</td>
<td>-4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-6 +6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>-0.990</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-6 +6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Level</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>52.021</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>0  99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Present Position</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4.635</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years With Firm</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>18.599</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>45.411</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education*</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4.099</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income ($ Yearly)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>31565.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>90,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Some High School
   2 = High School Degree
   3 = Some College
   4 = Undergraduate Degree
   5 = Graduate Degree
questions. Since these questions were a part of the instructions to the survey materials, it could be argued that their scores may not be a precise representation of the respondents' attitudes toward the variables. With this limitation in mind, the scores for these two items were included in the correlation analysis for extra information.

The relationships between job satisfaction and the two other variables of autonomy satisfaction and pay satisfaction are statistically highly significant. These relationships are positive, indicating that the variation in job satisfaction is in the same direction with autonomy satisfaction and pay satisfaction.

The results of correlation analysis are presented in Tables 4-2 and 4-3.

As already mentioned, there were other data gathered by the survey materials for future use. Since they will add to the depth of this study, they will be briefly reviewed.

A part of Tables 4-2 and 4-3 show the results of correlation analysis for these variables. From Table 4-2 it can be seen that there is a highly significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and esteem and self-actualization. There is a negative correlation between
Table 4-2
Correlation Coefficients Measuring the Degrees of Association Between Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Autonomy Satisfaction</th>
<th>Pay Satisfaction</th>
<th>Self-Actualization</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>N=254</th>
<th>N=254</th>
<th>N=206</th>
<th>N=254</th>
<th>N=254</th>
<th>N=242</th>
<th>N=252</th>
<th>N=252</th>
<th>N=252</th>
<th>N=220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.41 **</td>
<td>.28 **</td>
<td>.44 **</td>
<td>.52 **</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy Satisfaction</td>
<td>.17 **</td>
<td>.45 **</td>
<td>.55 **</td>
<td>.16 *</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.14 *</td>
<td>.19 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Satisfaction</td>
<td>.21 **</td>
<td>.28 **</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.19 **</td>
<td>33 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>.50 **</td>
<td>.17 *</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.14 **</td>
<td>.19 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Actualization</td>
<td>-.21 **</td>
<td>-.31 **</td>
<td>-.05 *</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.17 *</td>
<td>.29 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Level of Significance = .05
** Level of Significance = .01
App. = Approaching Significance Level of .05
N.S. = Not Significant
Table 4-3

Correlation Coefficients Measuring the Degrees of Association Between Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Autonomy Satisfaction</th>
<th>Pay Satisfaction</th>
<th>Esteem</th>
<th>Self-Actualization</th>
<th>Management Level</th>
<th>Years in Present Position</th>
<th>Years With Firm</th>
<th>Age (Years)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Level</td>
<td>- .19**</td>
<td>- .16**</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>- .17</td>
<td>- .21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>- .23**</td>
<td>- .16**</td>
<td>- .36**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years In Present Position</td>
<td>- .12</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>- .31**</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>- .40**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>- .22**</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years With Company</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>- .05</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>- .40**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>- .29**</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>- .23</td>
<td>- .45</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>- .14**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>- .16**</td>
<td>- .22**</td>
<td>- .20**</td>
<td>- .14**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Level of Significance = .05
** Level of Significance = .01
App. = Approaching Significance Level of .05
N.S. = Not Significant
scores of management level and job satisfaction at .01 significance level. (For precise probability figures refer to Appendix III, Correlation Coefficients). To interpret this negative correlation, we have to recall the method of scaling management level. The scoring system for this variable was such that the higher levels were represented with lower scores, and vice versa. Since the direction of correlation is negative, it indicates that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and management levels. To put it simply, variations in the job satisfaction of managers are correlated with variations in management levels, in the same direction. Job satisfaction and the number of years in the present management position are negatively correlated approaching the 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that the longer a manager has stayed at a given position the lower his score on job satisfaction.

The correlation between job satisfaction and four other variables of age, education, income, and number of years of employment with the firms are not significant at either .01 or .05 levels of significance.

Autonomy satisfaction is positively correlated with pay, esteem, self-actualization, and income at .01 level of significance. There is a very strong correlation
between autonomy and job satisfaction. This relationship is significant beyond the .01 level of significance. (There is only .0001 probability that these two items are not correlated. Refer to Appendix III, Correlation Coefficients). This shows that managers with more autonomy have higher scores on job satisfaction. The correlation between autonomy and management level have a negative sign, because of the nature of scoring for management level. (See Appendix III) Scoring for management level was such that higher levels were represented with lower scores, and lower levels with higher scores. The range of scoring was from zero to 100. Hence, a negative correlation between this item and other variables demonstrates that as the score for management level decreases (indicating upward move on management hierarchy), the other variables increase. For example, as one moves upward on the management hierarchy, his or her salary will increase, and his or her score on management level will decrease. Then the relationship between his or her pay and the score on management level, in this manner, will be a negative one.

As it can be seen from Table 4-3, all of the correlation coefficients for the management level are negative, indicating that the higher level managers had higher mean
scores on all of the items that were statistically significant. For instance, as management level increases, scores on job satisfaction, autonomy satisfaction, esteem, and self-actualization increases. It shows also that the higher management levels are associated with higher age, more education, and more income.

The correlation between pay satisfaction and five other variables of job satisfaction, autonomy, esteem, education, and income is highly significant. Pay satisfaction and the rest of the variables do not show any significant relationships. The correlation coefficient for pay satisfaction and income is strong and highly significant, indicating the higher paid managers have higher score on the pay satisfaction item.

The correlation coefficients for the rest of the variables are presented in Table 4-3. As can be seen, education is either significantly, or highly significantly, correlated with all variables except job satisfaction. It is the same for the income item. There exists a positive correlation between income and other items, except for job satisfaction and years in present position, at the .05 or .01 level of significance. This may be an indication that job satisfaction is not influenced by the absolute
amount of pay, rather by its relative importance. Such a relationship has already been discussed in the form of a positive and significant correlation between pay satisfaction and job satisfaction. The lack of significant correlation between years in the present position, and income, may be a sign that increased income comes mostly as a result of promotion and moving to different positions, not stagnating on a given job. Among all variables, the highest correlation coefficient exists between age and years of employment. It is quite logical for older managers to have more years of employment.

To summarize the data pertinent to the hypotheses proposed by this study: the correlation analysis indicates that the relationships between job satisfaction, autonomy satisfaction, and pay satisfaction of managers are positive and highly significant.

The correlation analysis provides us with the gross relationships between the variables without specific explanations. It only demonstrates that there exists an association between the factors that are examined. To determine the specific effects of each variable on others, and to find the net influence of each factor, we utilize the analysis of variance technique. The analysis of
variance should give us information regarding the effect of pay and autonomy satisfaction upon managers' attitudes toward their jobs.

**Analysis of Variance Statistics**

It was demonstrated in the previous pages that there exists a strong and positive relationship between job satisfaction of managers and their pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction. In the following pages, the results of analysis of variance in the testing of the hypotheses will be presented.

In order to test these hypotheses, a simple model of the relationships between these three variables is introduced. What is actually wanted is to decide, on the basis of the sample data, whether or not there really is a difference in the mean job satisfaction of groups of managers with different pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction. The characteristics of pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction of managers whose job satisfaction are examined can be simplified in Table 4-4.

Before testing all of the possible combinations in Table 4-4, we can construct a simpler model to examine if the variation in job satisfaction is a result of variation in pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction.
Table 4-4

Model for Pay and Autonomy Satisfaction
Characteristics of Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autonomy Satisfaction</th>
<th>Pay Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>- +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To put it in statistical form:

\[ Y_{ijk} = \mu + P_i + A_j + (PA)_{ij} + E_{ijk} \]

Where:

- \( Y_{ijk} \) = job satisfaction for \( k^{th} \) individual with \( j^{th} \) autonomy satisfaction and \( i^{th} \) pay satisfaction
- \( \mu \) = overall mean
- \( P_i \) = effect of \( i^{th} \) pay satisfaction
- \( A_j \) = effect of \( j^{th} \) autonomy satisfaction
- \( E_{ijk} \) = sampling error

The above formula of relationships is actually a regression model. It is basically the same as the analysis of variance. However, the difference is that regression is more general.

"In analysis of variance, the total variance of a set of dependent variable measures can be broken down into systematic variance and error variance. The simplest form of such a breakdown is: the variance between groups (experimental variance) and the variance within groups (error variance), which are parts of the total variance. Actually, statisticians work with sums of squares because they are additive. In regression analysis, we do virtually the same thing."
The main difference is that the regression approach is more general."

In analyzing the data, the computer system at Louisiana State University was utilized. The GLM (General Linear Model) procedure in the computer system "uses the principle of least square to fit a fixed-effects linear model to virtually any type of data, the procedure performs both univariate and multivariate analysis, including the simple linear regression, multiple linear regression, analysis of variance, analysis of convariance, and partial correlation analysis."8

With this background information, we now turn to the statistical analysis provided by computer printouts. The computer printout, Table 4-5 presents the result of regression analysis for the testing of the model on page 77. The regression analysis provides support for our model on page 77 and shows that variation in job satisfaction is a result of variation in pay satisfaction and


## Table 4-5

Regression Analysis for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1610.62521</td>
<td>536.87507</td>
<td>8.40096</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>15976.59133</td>
<td>63.90637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>17587.21654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>17587.21654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
autonomy satisfaction. The probability that this relationship is due to chance is .0001. In other words, it can be stated at a confidence level of 99.9999 that the variation of job satisfaction of the sample is due to variations in pay and autonomy satisfaction. It shows that pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction have an influence over job satisfaction. However, this does not indicate which one of the factors is the source of variations in job satisfaction. This information is provided in computer printout, analysis of variance, Table 4-6. The analysis of variance provides specific information related to our model of page 77.

Table 4-6
Analysis of Variance for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Partial SS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>491.82561</td>
<td>7.69603</td>
<td>0.0060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>755.72006</td>
<td>11.82543</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay X Autonomy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.79075</td>
<td>0.20015</td>
<td>0.6550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In interpreting Table 4-6, and referring to our simple model of page 77, we can answer three questions in regard to the influence of pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction, on job satisfaction of managers. The first question is about the relationship between pay satisfaction and job satisfaction: Is there a difference in job satisfaction of managers due to pay satisfaction (averaged over autonomy satisfaction)? The answer is, "Yes!"

The second question to answer: Is there a difference in job satisfaction of managers due to autonomy satisfaction (averaged over pay satisfaction)? The answer is "Yes!"

The above two answers were based on the F Value for pay variable and autonomy variable in Table 4-6. The ANOVA Table 4-6 represents that the difference in the mean score of job satisfaction of managers who had negative pay satisfaction scores, and those who had positive pay satisfaction scores is highly significant.

Table 4-7 shows that 153 managers had negative pay satisfaction, with the mean score of job satisfaction of 67.4314. The mean score for job satisfaction of 101 managers with positive pay satisfaction score is 71.0693. The difference between these two means is highly significant.
Table 4-7

Mean Job Satisfaction Score of Managers With Different Pay Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pay Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>Mean Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>67.4314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>71.0693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ANOVA Table 4-6 also indicates that the difference in the mean score of job satisfaction of managers, as shown in Table 4-8 with different autonomy satisfaction, is highly significant.

Table 4-8

Mean Job Satisfaction Score of Managers With Different Autonomy Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Autonomy Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>Mean Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>67.3519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>71.5652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is one more question to answer. This question is related to the interaction between pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction, and their combined influence on job satisfaction. The concern about the effect of interaction is an important part of analysis of variance.

"The concept of interaction, in statistical and empirical parlance, refers to the contribution of two or more variables acting jointly, not singly. Thus an interaction essentially means that the two or more
variables are not independent, are not additive. On the other hand, the main effects of analysis involve the effects of each variable acting separately, an effect averaged over other variables in the design. Intuitively, it appears that there is involved here the implication that if an interaction is present (indicating a joint effect), one should not be interested in the single effects of each factor involved in the interaction.\footnote{John Gaito, \textit{Introduction To Analysis of Variance Procedures}, (New York: MSS Information Corporation, 1973), pp. 95-96.}

To answer our last question, we refer to Table 4-9 on page 86, and also to the last part of the ANOVA Table on page 81. Table 4-9 represents mean score of job satisfaction of managers with different pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction scores.

There were 107 managers with negative scores on pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction items. Forty-six managers had negative scores on pay satisfaction and positive scores on autonomy satisfaction. The mean job satisfaction scores for these two groups are 66.1869 and 70.3261 respectively. Fifty-five managers had positive pay satisfaction scores, and negative autonomy satisfaction scores. The mean job satisfaction score for this group
Table 4-9

Mean Job Satisfaction Score of Managers With Different Pay Satisfaction and Autonomy Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pay Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>Autonomy Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>Mean Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>66.1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>70.3261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>69.6182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>72.8043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is 69.6182. Forty-six managers had positive scores on pay satisfaction and negative score on autonomy satisfaction. The mean job satisfaction score for this group is 72.8043.

The ANOVA Table shows that there is no significant difference in the job satisfaction of managers that could be regarded as the result of interaction between pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction. This interaction is depicted in Table 4-10 which is constructed based on the information provided in Table 4-8.

Table 4-10

Interaction Between Mean Scores of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Satisfaction</th>
<th>Autonomy Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.1869</td>
<td>70.3261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.6182</td>
<td>72.8043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now we can answer the question related to the interaction between pay and autonomy satisfaction, and their combined influence on job satisfaction. The question is: Is the relative advantage of positive pay satisfaction (the influence of pay satisfaction of job satisfaction) over negative pay satisfaction the same at "negative autonomy" as at "positive autonomy?" The answer is: Yes it is the same. Figure 4-1 is a graphic presentation of Table 4-10 which shows the comparison between mean scores of job satisfaction of managers with different pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction. Figure 4-1 shows the difference between the mean score of 66.1869 and 69.6182 compared with the difference between the mean scores of 70.326 and 72.8043. When these two differences are compared, we find they are not statistically significant.

The previous question can be rephrased as follows: Is the relative advantage of positive autonomy satisfaction (the influence of autonomy satisfaction on job satisfaction) the same at "negative pay satisfaction" as at "positive pay satisfaction?" Again the answer is: Yes it is the same.

The graphic presentation of this version is depicted in Figure 4-2. Figure 4-2 shows that the difference
Figure 4-10

Mean Scores of Job Satisfaction of Managers With Different Pay and Autonomy Satisfaction

P = Pay Satisfaction
Figure 4-2

Mean Scores of Job Satisfaction of Managers
With Different Autonomy and Pay Satisfaction

A = Autonomy Satisfaction
between mean scores of 66.1869 and 70.3261 when compared with the difference between mean scores of 69.6182 and 72.8043 is not statistically significant.

With the above presentation we have answered the question related to the interaction between pay and autonomy satisfaction, and their combined influence on job satisfaction. We found that the joint effect of interaction between pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction on job satisfaction was not significant.

To summarize our discussion of the results of ANOVA, we refer to Table 4-11. Table 4-11 represents the mean job satisfaction scores of managers in different pay and autonomy satisfaction categories, along with the number of observations in each category. All of the data have been previously introduced in Tables 4-7 through 4-10. The scores inside the four cells are all from Table 4-10. The figures outside the cells are from Table 4-7 and 4-8; they also can be directly calculated by multiplying each mean score by its appropriate N, then adding these scores in each row or column, and dividing the total for each row or column by its appropriate N. The overall mean job satisfaction of the sample (68.88) is the result of the combination of all rows and columns, or the total
Table 4-11

Mean Job Satisfaction Score of Managers With Different Pay and Autonomy Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.1869</td>
<td>70.3261</td>
<td>67.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=107</td>
<td>N=46</td>
<td>N=153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>69.6182</td>
<td>72.8042</td>
<td>71.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=55</td>
<td>N=46</td>
<td>N=101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.35</td>
<td>71.57</td>
<td>68.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=162</td>
<td>N=92</td>
<td>N=254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scores of job satisfaction of managers divided by the total sample of 254.

Comparing interaction within the cells (pay X autonomy), or scores of 66.1869, 72.8042 and 70.3261, 69.6182, we find the difference statistically not significant, as seen in ANOVA Table 4-6. In other words, the difference in job satisfaction of managers cannot be attributed to the joint effect of interaction between pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction.

Comparing the scores of the top two rows, or 67.43 and 71.07, we find the difference highly significant. Stated differently, the effect of pay satisfaction on job satisfaction is highly significant. Or, job satisfaction of managers can be explained by their scores on pay satisfaction. The difference between the columns, or scores of 67.35 and 71.57 is also highly significant. Therefore, it can be stated that the effect of autonomy satisfaction on job satisfaction is highly significant.

Again, referring to ANOVA in Table 4-6, it shows that the difference in job satisfaction of managers in the sample is due to their differences in pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction. The probability that the differences in job satisfaction is not due to variation in pay
satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction is .006 and .0007 respectively. Therefore, it can be said at a confidence level of 99.994 that the difference in job satisfaction of the sample is due to differences in pay satisfaction. The variations in job satisfaction are also due to the differences in autonomy satisfaction, at a confidence level of 99.9993. The effect of interaction between pay and autonomy on job satisfaction is not significant.

Summary of the Statistical Results

The following is a summary of the results of statistical analysis for this study.

1. There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction of managers and their satisfaction with pay.

2. Job satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction are positively correlated.

3. There exists a difference in job satisfaction of managers due to the differences in their pay satisfaction.

4. There is a difference in job satisfaction of managers due to the differences in their autonomy satisfaction.
5. There is no significant difference in job satisfaction of managers due to the interaction between pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction. In other words, the joint effect of the pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction on job satisfaction is no greater than the combined individual effects of these two variables.

Summary of Results By Hypotheses

Based on the results of statistical analysis, it can be stated that managers who had higher scores on autonomy satisfaction or pay satisfaction had higher scores on job satisfaction; the interaction between pay and autonomy was not statistically significant. In other words, variations in job satisfaction of managers can be explained by their pay satisfaction, or autonomy satisfaction.

The six null hypotheses presented in Chapter I, page 25 were based on comparing all possible combinations of pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction of managers. This combination provided six groups. The groups were compared to find their differences in terms of job satisfaction as follow:
1. P+, A+ vs. P-, A-
2. P+, A+ vs. P-, A+
3. P+, A+ vs. P+, A-
4. P+, A- vs. P-, A-
5. P-, A+ vs. P-, A-
6. P+, A- vs. P-, A+

where: P+ = satisfied with pay
       P- = not satisfied with pay
       A+ = satisfied with autonomy
       A- = not satisfied with autonomy

The findings indicate that, the variation in job satisfaction is due to variations in pay satisfaction or autonomy satisfaction, and not due to the interaction between these two variables. Thus, in regard to the previous six comparisons we can say that:

1. The effect of interaction between pay and autonomy is not statistically significant. Hence, the outcome of the sixth comparison will be:

   P+, A- = P-, A+

2. Since the interaction is not important, the effect of a positive variable will be greater than the effect of a negative variable. We will have:
1. \( P^+, A^+ \) is different from \( P^-, A^- \)
2. \( P^+, A^+ \) is different from \( P^-, A^+ \)
3. \( P^+, A^+ \) is different from \( P^+, A^- \)
4. \( P^+, A^- \) is different from \( P^-, A^- \)
5. \( P^-, A^+ \) is different from \( P^-, A^- \)

The above six comparisons are actually mathematical presentation of our null hypotheses.

Examining the specific null hypotheses, the first five are rejected, and the sixth one is accepted. To summarize the findings as they relate to our hypotheses we can state:

1. Job satisfaction of managers who were satisfied with both their pay and autonomy was significantly different from job satisfaction of managers who were not satisfied with both their pay and with their autonomy. 
\( (P^+, A^+) \neq (P^-, A^-) \)

2. There was a statistically significant difference between job satisfaction of managers who were satisfied with both their pay and their autonomy, and job satisfaction of managers who were not satisfied with their pay, but were satisfied with their autonomy. 
\( (P^+, A^+) \neq (P^-, A^+) \)

3. There was a statistically significant difference between job satisfaction of managers who were
satisfied with both their pay and their autonomy, and job satisfaction of managers who were satisfied with pay, but were not satisfied with their autonomy. 
(P+, A+) ≠ (P+, A-)

4. Job satisfaction of managers who were satisfied with their pay, but were not satisfied with their autonomy was significantly different from job satisfaction of managers who were not satisfied with both their pay and their autonomy. (P+, A-) ≠ (P-, A-)

5. Job satisfaction of managers who were not satisfied with their pay, but were satisfied with their autonomy was significantly different from job satisfaction of managers who were not satisfied with both their pay and their autonomy. (P-, A+) ≠ (P-, A-)

6. Job satisfaction of managers who were satisfied with their pay but were not satisfied with their autonomy was not significantly different from job satisfaction of managers who were not satisfied with their autonomy, but were satisfied with their pay. 
(P+, A-) ≠ (P-, A+)
CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS,
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR
FUTURE RESEARCH

Orientation to the Chapter

As was stated in the first chapter, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationships between managers' attitudes toward their pay and their autonomy, and how these affect their job satisfaction. Specifically, the study attempts to find out the effect of managers' perceived satisfaction with pay and autonomy on their overall job satisfaction. It is proposed that different degrees of pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction make a difference in overall job satisfaction of managers. To validate these propositions six hypotheses were developed to be tested.

In this chapter, the results of the research reported in Chapter IV are interpreted and discussed. Initially, a summary of how the study was conducted will be presented. Then, the results of the investigation will be related to the hypotheses, and conclusions will be drawn for this study. The final part will be recommendations for future research.
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Summary of the Study

To measure job satisfaction of managers, an 18 item "Job Satisfaction Index" developed by Brayfield and Rothe was utilized.¹ (See Appendix II) Autonomy satisfaction and pay satisfaction were measured by means of using parts of Porter's "Need Satisfaction" questionnaire.² (See Appendix II)

A sample of 254 managers from 19 Louisiana manufacturing firms participated in this research. The questionnaires were sent to these companies for distribution among their managers. Responses were collected by means of business reply mail. The characteristics of the sample were presented in Chapter III. Two statistical tools of correlation analysis, and analysis of variance were used to analyze the collected data. The results of statistical analysis were discussed in Chapter IV. The research


²Lyman W. Porter and Edward E. Lawler III, Managerial Attitudes and Performance, (Homewood, Illinois: Irwin, 1968.)
findings indicate a highly significant correlation between job satisfaction and two variables of autonomy satisfaction and pay satisfaction. The findings also point to a highly significant influence of these two variables on job satisfaction. The influence stemming from the joint interaction of these two variables on job satisfaction is not significant.

The Relationships Between Pay and Autonomy Satisfaction, and Job Satisfaction of Managers

Interpretation of the Results of Correlation Analysis

The results of correlation analysis, presented in Chapter IV, show that job satisfaction of managers is associated with pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction (Chapter IV, Table 2).

The relationship between job satisfaction and pay satisfaction is a positive one and statistically highly significant. This means that for this study, job satisfaction of managers varies as their pay satisfaction varies. This association is positive, meaning that job satisfaction of managers increases or decreases as their pay satisfaction increases or decreases. There is a .0001 probability that this relationship can be attributed to chance.
Autonomy satisfaction and job satisfaction are also positively correlated. This indicates a positive relationship between job satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction of managers, denoting an increase or decrease in job satisfaction is associated with an increase or decrease in autonomy satisfaction. The probability that this variation can be attributed to chance is .0001.

Autonomy satisfaction and pay satisfaction show a positive and weak correlation. This correlation may have been caused by the relationship of pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction with other variables. To analyze this correlation we can refer to the other correlation coefficients: The relationship between pay satisfaction and income is positive and highly significant, indicating that better paid managers have higher pay satisfaction. The correlation between income and management level is highly significant, which means that higher level managers are paid more. Management level and autonomy satisfaction are correlated at .01 level of significance, representing that higher level managers have more autonomy satisfaction. Managers who have more autonomy are paid better, as indicated by a positive and highly significant relationship between autonomy satisfaction and income. The chain relationships
just presented include pay and income, income and management level, management level and autonomy, autonomy and income. This points out that better paid managers have more pay satisfaction, and that they are at the higher level of organizational hierarchy. The higher level managers have more autonomy, and they also have more income. As a result, autonomy satisfaction of managers, in this study, and their pay satisfaction is weakly correlated.

As was expected, the correlation analysis shows a definite relationship between pay satisfaction and job satisfaction of managers. It also demonstrates an association between job satisfaction of managers and their autonomy satisfaction.

Knowing that the correlation coefficients indicate the existence of a relationship, its direction, and the likelihood that the relationship could be due to chance, we turn to analysis of variance. The analysis of variance along with correlation analysis provides support for the hypotheses proposed in this study.

Interpretation of the Results of Analysis of Variance

With the aid of analysis of variance technique, the study examined the influence of autonomy and pay on job satisfaction of managers.
The results of analysis of variance show that the interaction between pay and autonomy is not statistically significant. This implies that variations of job satisfaction of managers (if any), can be explained by the individual effects of these two variables separately. The findings indicate that the difference in job satisfaction of managers is due to the differences in their pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction. In other words, managers who are satisfied with their autonomy are more satisfied with their job than those who are not satisfied with their autonomy. It also indicates that managers who are satisfied with their pay are more satisfied with their jobs than those who are not satisfied with their pay.

Interpretation of Results
By Hypotheses

As already mentioned, based on the results of statistical analysis, null hypotheses 1 through 5 were rejected, and null hypothesis 6 was accepted. (Chapter IV, page 97). This means the acceptance of all six hypotheses as follow:

1. Managers who were satisfied with their pay and autonomy were more satisfied with their job than those
who were not satisfied with their pay and autonomy. 
(P+, A+ > P-, A-)

2. Managers who were satisfied with their pay and autonomy were more satisfied with their jobs than those who were not satisfied with their pay, but were satisfied with their autonomy. (P+, A+ > P-, A+)

3. Managers who were satisfied with their pay and autonomy were more satisfied with their jobs than those who were satisfied with their pay, but were not satisfied with their autonomy. (P+, A+ > P+, A-)

4. Managers who were satisfied with their pay, but were not satisfied with their autonomy had more job satisfaction than those who were not satisfied with their pay and autonomy. (P+, A- > P-, A-).

5. Managers who were not satisfied with their pay, but were satisfied with their autonomy were more satisfied with their jobs than those who were not satisfied with their pay and autonomy. (P-, A+ > P-, A-)

6. Managers who were satisfied with their pay, but were not satisfied with their autonomy were as equally satisfied with their jobs as those who were not satisfied with their pay, but were satisfied with their autonomy. (P+, A- = P-, A+)
Having explained the results of statistical analysis as they related to the purposes of this study, and also having interpreted the data in regard to the hypotheses, the summary and conclusion will be presented.

Summary and Conclusion

The objective of this study was to determine the relationships between job satisfaction of managers and their autonomy satisfaction and pay satisfaction. Since both autonomy and pay are important factors in determining job satisfaction, this research attempted to find out if pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction could be substituted for each other, without causing any appreciable change in the amount of job satisfaction of managers.

The results of correlation analysis showed that job satisfaction of managers and their pay satisfaction and autonomy satisfaction are positively related. The correlation analysis along with the results of analysis of variance sustained the researcher's propositions presented in Chapter One.

The research findings supported all of the hypotheses presented in this study. These findings demonstrated that managers attitudes toward their jobs is
influenced by their attitudes toward pay and autonomy. It was found that managers who were satisfied with their pay and/or with their autonomy were more satisfied with their jobs as compared to those who were not satisfied with their pay and/or autonomy.

Arranging managers in groups of "satisfied" and "not satisfied" with pay and autonomy, and making comparisons between them, the study found that:

1. Job satisfaction of managers was higher if they were satisfied with both of the two factors, pay and autonomy, as compared with those who were satisfied with only one, pay or autonomy. (Hypotheses 1-3).

2. Those managers who were satisfied with either pay or autonomy had higher job satisfaction than managers who were not satisfied with neither autonomy nor pay. (Hypotheses 4 and 5).

3. Comparing two groups of managers, each being satisfied with only one factor (pay or autonomy), but not satisfied with the other (autonomy or pay), the two groups were equally satisfied with their jobs. (Hypothesis 6) In other words, the positive effect of one factor would offset the negative effect of the other, causing no appreciable change on managers' attitudes toward their jobs.
As previously stated, the main objective of this study was to examine the relationships between pay satisfaction, autonomy satisfaction, and job satisfaction of managers, and to find out if managers' attitudes toward their jobs are influenced by their pay and autonomy satisfaction.

The results of this study demonstrated that job satisfaction of managers was influenced by their pay satisfaction or autonomy satisfaction. According to the findings, if an organization attempts to increase managers job satisfaction, it could, among other things, increase their pay or grant them more autonomy, or use a combination of the two.

As we may recall, some extra information was gathered that the researcher intended to use in future studies. These data support some findings by other researchers. For example, Robinson, et al., reported that self-actualization and autonomy appeared to be the most important factors related to the job satisfaction of managers. The present study found that job satisfaction of managers was related, among other factors, to self-...

---

actualization ($r = .52$) and esteem ($r = .44$).\(^4\)

Opsahl and Dunnette\(^5\) proposed that pay not only satisfied "lower order" needs, such as needs for food, clothing and shelter, but it also may act as an incentive for "higher order" needs. The implications of the present study suggests that pay satisfaction and level of pay are related to job satisfaction, esteem, and self-actualization. These relationships are represented in the form of correlation coefficients of .28 between job satisfaction and pay, .21 between pay and esteem, .28 between pay and self-actualization, .19 between level of income and esteem, .29 between level of pay and self actualization, .44 between esteem and job satisfaction, and .52 between job satisfaction and self-actualization. All of these correlations are highly significant.

The information provided by our research is in accord with assumptions made by Tannenbaum. He stated

\(^4\)As we may recall from Chapter III the information related to esteem, and self-actualization should be treated with caution. Because esteem and self-actualization items were the workout sample questions included in the instruction part of the questionnaires.

that having control over work situation is desirable, and it will lead to a sense of self-respect by workers.\(^6\) We found that managers' autonomy satisfaction influences their job satisfaction and is correlated to esteem.

Slocum and Misshauk's study about engineers,\(^7\) and a study by Shepard about workers,\(^8\) showed that autonomy satisfaction was related to job satisfaction. The present study provided evidence that this relationship is true for managers also.

It is known that people having control over their work situation will have a sense of self-respect, that their less influential colleagues may lack. It is also evident that the lack of job satisfaction is directly related to factors such as turnover, absenteeism, and accidents. The present study also found that job satisfaction of managers is influenced by their autonomy satisfaction. Thus, if we

---


seek improvements in our organizational settings we should be willing, whenever possible and desirable, to grant more autonomy to managers. This study also provided evidence that autonomy and other higher order needs such as esteem and self-actualization are highly correlated. Consequently, it suggests that some improvements, as far as working situations for managers are concerned, can come through changes in distribution of amount of influence and autonomy among managers.

It is known that extrinsic rewards in the form of pay is a major source of providing employees with a feeling of contentment and satisfaction with their jobs. However, successful application of pay as a means of satisfying employees is difficult, and organizations cannot solely depend on pay for rewarding their members. First of all, based on the law of diminishing return, each additional dollar has less impact than its previous one. Consequently, an organization should be able and willing to spend large sums, if it is going to be successful in the application of pay for making people satisfied with their jobs. Second, there are individual differences in the perception of employees toward money. These differences make a uniform application of pay, for eliciting the same response, an impossible task.
To solve this problem, scholars have suggested some alternatives. Professor Megginson has stated that the more intrinsically rewarding a job, the less need for extrinsic rewards. The evidence of this research provides empirical support for this position. It was found that the positive effect of pay satisfaction or autonomy satisfaction can offset the negative influence of each other, resulting in no appreciable change in overall job satisfaction of managers. In other words, managers on jobs that offer them more intrinsic rewards (more autonomy) and less extrinsic rewards (less pay) were as equally satisfied with their jobs as their colleagues who had the opposite situation. This points out the possibility of a trade off between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.

E. E. Lawler, taking the same position, points out the possibility that some other rewards to some extent can be substituted for higher pay. Our present research


tested this possibility by examining the influence of
different degrees of pay and autonomy on job satisfaction
of managers. As already mentioned, the clues provided by
our research tends to substantiate these suggestions.

Lawler has proposed that with more knowledge
about pay and other variables, it may be possible to make
some changes in the structure of organization to increase
the attractiveness of rewards offered by organizations.\footnote{Ibid., p. 284.}
Traditionally, pay plans are designed to fit the existing
structure of an organization. With this method, the
structure usually remains constant and changes are applied
in pay plans to make them fit the organizational structure.
Often, this creates some problems. A pay plan that can
satisfy everyone is not only next to impossible, but can
be very costly. Many organizations simply do not have the
resources to do this. It is quite advantageous to be able
to modify the organizational structure as well as the pay
plan. This research has provided the empirical evidence
pointing out the possibility that there may exist such
an alternative. As has already been pointed out, the
findings suggest that it may be possible to substitute pay and autonomy for one another. In other words, there is a likelihood that deficiencies in any one of these two factors (pay and autonomy) could be compensated with the increased supply of the other, without a negative impact upon managers' attitudes toward their jobs. To state it differently, if the organizational limitations do not permit an increase in the amount of pay, it may be possible to improve managers' satisfaction by increasing their autonomy. Of course, without a certain minimum level of pay, no amount of autonomy can be effective in increasing job satisfaction. If the organizational structure cannot be changed, meaning there is no room for increased autonomy of managers, this might be offset by an increase in their pay. In this regard, it is proposed to change the structure of the job, or pay, or both depending on the situation, for better results. Of course, we should be very cautious in the immediate application of these findings. If the results of this study can be substantiated by other investigations, it can be said that organizations could be equipped with a better choice in implementing a more workable pay system.
Suggestions for Future Research

The most important conclusion drawn from this study was the possibility of the practical application of some of the findings. It was suggested that we may be able to modify organizational structure to fit a given pay plan. This modification, it was proposed, could come in the form of offering more autonomy to managers, whenever possible and desirable. By doing so, we may increase the attractiveness of pay. However, before taking any action, we should gather additional information for further testing of these suggestions.

First of all, a replication of this study should be helpful in reexamining the validity of our findings. The findings of this study indicate the possibility of changing organizational structure to fit a given pay plan. However, the study does not recommend how these changes should be applied. More research is needed to specify the manner with which such a program could be implemented. It is quite obvious that different individuals react differently toward a raise in their pay, or an increase in the amount of autonomy they have on a job. It is important to find out about the nature of individuals' characteristics that could make a difference in the success of our program.
We also need to discover ways of incorporating these in the plan.

Another area for future research could be to expand on this study, and include more variables so that the applicability of the findings could be improved. Our study did not include age, education, sex, and management levels in the formulation of the propositions. However, it did open up a door for more inquiry in the complex area of managers' attitude toward different dimensions of their jobs. The future researchers could use the same general format of this study, and include some of the above mentioned variables.

The future researcher could explore the influence of pay on other higher level needs, and how the outcome could effect managers attitudes toward their jobs. The final suggestion is the use of different instruments for measuring the variables under investigation. The validity of our findings can be strongly substantiated if the use of other instruments produce the same results. The future research could employ any one of the the tested questionnaires such as Job Description Index (JDI), or Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The outcomes could be compared, and hopefully more understanding of the problem could result.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX I
FIRM PARTICIPATION REQUEST LETTER

I am presently working on my doctoral dissertation from Louisiana State University in management. My dissertation is about managers as a professional group, and does not deal with any particular company or individual persons. In this particular study anyone who manages the work of others is considered a "manager", from first level supervisors that directly deal with workers to the president.

In order to collect my data, it is necessary for numerous managers from different companies to complete a questionnaire. The questionnaire is designed such that the identity of the respondents and the companies will remain anonymous. A self-addressed stamped envelope accompanies each questionnaire and it will take ten minutes to fill out. Without the cooperation of companies such as yours this project cannot be completed. Therefore, I need your assistance by permitting as many of your managers as possible to participate in this study.

Your company will be provided a copy of the findings of this study. Your cooperation and assistance will be greatly appreciated. Please feel free to contact me at the University if there are any questions. I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely

Kamal Fatehi-Sedeh

KF:1f
Dear Sir:

I would like to request your assistance and cooperation in a research program which is part of a doctoral dissertation in the Management Department, Louisiana State University. This is a Ph.D. dissertation research study dealing with managers as a professional group, and does not deal with any particular company or individual person.

Here is a short questionnaire that you are asked to read and answer. Your response to this questionnaire is vital to the success of the study. Knowing that this is a demand upon your valuable time, the questionnaire is prepared such that it should not take more than ten minutes of your time.

As you will notice, there is no name or identification marks that would reveal the identity of the respondent. Your response, along with the responses of other managers, will be collected by the researcher himself in a ballot box, at a designated time at your place of employment. In this manner, the anonymity of the respondents and confidentiality will be assured.

Your participation and cooperation in this research project is a very important factor that can determine the success of the study, and the researcher will be grateful for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Mr. Kamal Fatehi-Sedeh
Ph.D. Candidate
Management Department
Louisiana State University
May 21, 1976

Professor Arthur H. Brayfield
Claremont Graduate School and
University Center
Claremont, California 91711

Dear Professor Brayfield:

I am writing to request your permission to use "An Index of Job Satisfaction" questionnaire developed by you in my doctoral dissertation.

As I do not wish to impose upon your valuable time, I will take the liberty of assuming that you have approved the use of your questionnaire if I do not hear from you.

Sincerely,

Kamal Fatehi-Sedeh

KF:1f
June 15, 1976

Permissions Office
American Psychological Association
1200 Seventeenth Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Sir,

I am writing to request your permission to use
"An Index of Job Satisfaction" developed by Arthur H. Brayfield and Harold F. Rothe which appeared in your
October 1951 issue of the Journal of Applied Psychology
in my doctoral dissertation. (Vol. 35, P. 307-11. Fig. 1, P. 309)

Sincerely,

Mr. Kamal Fatehi-Sedeh

KF:lf
Permission is granted for use of copyrighted material listed on the attached application with the conditions indicated below. This permission grants use of the material in the forthcoming edition only, world distribution rights, and is non-exclusive.

a. This permission is contingent upon like permission of the author of each article.

b. A permission fee must be paid according to the following: $10 per page, $10 per table or figure for one-time use. If an entire article is used, figures and tables are included in the $10-per-page fee.

Based on your request for use of ___ pages, ___ tables, ___ figures, the total fee is $_______. You will be billed for this amount.

c. The republished material must include full bibliographic citation and the following notice: Copyright (indicate year) by the American Psychological Association. Reprinted by permission.

d. One copy of the finished work should be sent to the Permissions Office.

e. Other: 

2. The following exemptions apply where indicated on your application:

f. No permission or fee is necessary for paraphrased passages or quotations of 500 words or less from one article.

g. No permission or fee is necessary, material is now in the public domain. However, No. lc above is required.

h. No fee is necessary for authors using their own material. However, lc above is required.

i. Author's permission and fees are waived but No. lc above is required.

j. Fees are waived, but No. la and c above are required.

May 21, 1976

Professor Lyman W. Porter  
Graduate School of Administration  
University of California  
Irvine, California 92664

Dear Professor Porter:

I am writing to request your permission to use parts of the "Satisfaction With Pay Questionnaire" and "The Need Satisfaction Questionnaire" developed by you in my doctoral dissertation.

As I do not wish to impose upon your valuable time, I will take the liberty of assuming that you have approved the use of your questionnaire if I do not hear from you.

Sincerely,

Kamal Fatehi-Sedeh

Mr. Kamel Fatehi-Sedeh:

I am happy to grant you permission to use the above-mentioned questionnaires and wish you the best of luck in your research.
July 1, 1976

Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
1818 Ridge Road
Homewood, Illinois 60430

Dear Sir:

I am writing to request your permission to use parts of the "Satisfaction With Pay" and "The Need Satisfaction" questionnaires in my doctoral dissertation.

The above mentioned questionnaires are on pages 187 and 191-192 of the Managerial Attitudes and Performance by Lyman W. Porter and Edward B. Lawler III which was published by your company in 1968.

Your consideration is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Kamal Fatehi-Sedeh

KF:1f
July 29, 1976

Professor Kamal Fatehi-Sedeh  
Department of Management  
Louisiana State University  
and Agricultural and Mechanical College  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Dear Professor Fatehi-Sedeh:

Permission is granted to reprint portions of the questionnaires on pages 187 and 191-92 of Porter and Lawler's MANAGERIAL ATTITUDES AND PERFORMANCE for inclusion in your doctoral dissertation.

Proper acknowledgment must be given to the authors, title, and publisher.

Sincerely yours,

Jeanine Amerson  
Permissions Editor
APPENDIX II
Listed below are several characteristics related to your management position. For each characteristic you are asked three questions:

a) How much of the characteristic is there now related to your management position?

b) How much of the characteristic do you think should be related to your management position?

c) How important is this position characteristic to you?

Each question is on a seven-point scale. The scale looks like this:

(minimum) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (maximum)

If you think there is very little of that characteristic you should circle one, and if you think there is a little of that characteristic circle 2 and if you think there is a great deal, but not the maximum amount, you should circle number 6. The maximum amount is number 7. Circle only one number for each scale. Please do not omit any scale. You can work out the sample items numbered o and oo

o. The feeling of self-esteem a person gets from being in my management position.

a) How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

b) How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

c) How important is this to you?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

oo. The opportunity for personal growth and development in my management position.

a) How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

b) How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

c) How important is this to you?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
1. The authority connected with your management position:
   a) How much is there now?
      (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
   b) How much should there be?
      (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
   c) How important is this to you?
      (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

2. The opportunity for independent thought and action in your management position:
   a) How much is there now?
      (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
   b) How much should there be?
      (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
   c) How important is this to you?
      (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

3. The opportunity in your management position, for participation in the setting of goals:
   a) How much is there now?
      (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
   b) How much should there be?
      (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
   c) How important is this to you?
      (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

4. The opportunity, in your management position for participation in the determination of methods and procedures.
   a) How much is there now?
      (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
   b) How much should there be?
      (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
   c) How important is this to you?
      (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
II

Listed below are three questions related to the pay you receive for your management position. Here the term "pay" means the total income you receive from your employer in forms of salary, special incentive income and fringe benefits and any other monetary incomes. Each question is on a seven-point scale like this:

(minimum) 1  2  3  4  5  6  7 (maximum)

Low numbers represent minimum amount and high numbers maximum. If you think there is very little of the characteristic, you should circle the number 1. If you think there is a great deal, but not the maximum amount, you should circle number 6. Circle only one number for each scale. Please do not omit any scale.

1). How much is your pay now?
   (minimum) 1  2  3  4  5  6  7 (maximum)

2). How much do you feel your pay should be?
   (minimum) 1  2  3  4  5  6  7 (maximum)

3). How important is your pay to you?
   (minimum) 1  2  3  4  5  6  7 (maximum)
Some jobs are more interesting and satisfying than others. We want to know how managers feel about their jobs. The following are eighteen statements about jobs. You are asked to circle the phrase below each statement which best describes how you feel about your present job. There are no right or wrong answers. We would like your honest opinion on each one of the statements. Please answer all of the questions. You can work out the sample item numbered (0).

0. There are some conditions concerning my job that could be improved.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

1. My job is like a hobby to me.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

2. My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

3. It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

4. I consider my job rather unpleasant.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

5. I enjoy my work more than my leisure time.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

6. I am often bored with my job.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

7. I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

8. Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

9. I am satisfied with my job for the time being.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
10. I feel that my job is no more interesting than others I could get.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

11. I definitely dislike my work.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

12. I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

13. Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

14. Each day of work seems like it will never end.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

15. I like my job better than the typical manager does like his job.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

16. My job is pretty uninteresting.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

17. I find real enjoyment in my work.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

18. I am disappointed that I ever took this job.
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
PERSONAL DATA

Please answer the following questions:

1. Is your position a line or staff. (check one)
   - Line management ___
   - Staff management ___

2. How many levels of supervision are there in your company (from first level to president). First level supervisors are ones who directly deal with workers. Give number ___

3. How many levels of supervision are there above your position? Give number ___

4. How many years have you been in your present position? ______

5. How many years have you been with your present company? ______

6. Approximately how many employees does this company have (management and nonmanagement)? _____

7. How old are you? ______

8. Years of Education:
   - Some high school_____ Undergraduate Degree____
   - High School Degree____ Graduate____
   - Some College_____  

9. What is your present yearly income from your position with this company? ____________
APPENDIX III
### Correlation Coefficients/Prob. > |r| under H0: Rho=0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Esteem</th>
<th>Self Actual</th>
<th>Wgt Level</th>
<th>Years in Position</th>
<th>Present with Co.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=254</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.4089</td>
<td>0.2784</td>
<td>0.4448</td>
<td>0.5214</td>
<td>-0.1888</td>
<td>-0.1227</td>
<td>-0.0493</td>
<td>-0.0369</td>
<td>0.0241</td>
<td>0.0967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aut.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=254</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.1709</td>
<td>0.4462</td>
<td>0.5525</td>
<td>-0.1582</td>
<td>0.0891</td>
<td>0.0921</td>
<td>0.1064</td>
<td>0.1377</td>
<td>0.1857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=254</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.2128</td>
<td>0.2834</td>
<td>-0.0530</td>
<td>-0.0492</td>
<td>0.0356</td>
<td>-0.0159</td>
<td>0.1929</td>
<td>0.3376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=206</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.4992</td>
<td>-0.1739</td>
<td>-0.1023</td>
<td>-0.1036</td>
<td>0.0460</td>
<td>0.1448</td>
<td>0.1853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=206</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.2072</td>
<td>-0.3065</td>
<td>-0.0455</td>
<td>-0.0602</td>
<td>0.1682</td>
<td>0.2894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=242</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0237</td>
<td>-0.0829</td>
<td>-0.3469</td>
<td>-0.1999</td>
<td>0.0799</td>
<td>0.2346</td>
<td>0.0674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=252</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.3969</td>
<td>0.4532</td>
<td>-0.2220</td>
<td>-0.0349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YW Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=252</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.7571</td>
<td>-0.2029</td>
<td>0.2884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=253</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.1415</td>
<td>0.2805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=220</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.3737</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=220</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHOD OF CLASSIFYING MANAGEMENT LEVELS

In classifying management levels, the number of levels above the respondent's position was divided into the total number of management levels in the firm, and the result was multiplied by 100 to develop a point system.*

\[
\frac{\text{Number of management levels above the respondent}}{\text{Total number of management levels in the firm}} \times 100
\]

Arbitrarily, scores of 0-39 were assigned to top management, those of 40-69 were classified as middle management, and 70-100 range was considered lower level.

*This is a modified version of the system used by ElSalmi and Cummings. See A. M. ElSalmi and L. L. Cummings, "Managers' Perceptions of Needs and Need Satisfactions As A Function of Interactions Among Organizational Variables," Personnel Psychology, Volume 21, No. 4 (Winter, 1968), p. 467.
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