

FOR REFERENCE

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

AN ANALYSIS OF THE SEVERAL ASPECTS OF
JOB SATISFACTION BETWEEN DIFFERENT OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

by

F.ASLI BAYCAN

B.A., Boğaziçi University, 1982

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in
Social Psychology
Department of Psychology,
Institute of Social Sciences

Bogazici University Library



39001100540072

14

Boğaziçi University

1985

This thesis, submitted by F.Asılı Baycan to the Institute of Social Sciences of Boğaziçi University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Degree of Master of Arts is approved.

Hamit Fişek

Thesis Committee:

Thesis advisor:

Doç.Dr.Hamit Fişek

Meral Çulha

Member: Doç.Dr.Meral Çulha

Ayhan Koç

Member: Doç.Dr.Ayhan Koç

Date: 26/VI/1985



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my thanks to Dr.Hamit Fişek for his valuable comments on this study. As my thesis advisor, Dr.Fişek read all drafts and his suggestions and directions shaped this research.

Dr.Meral Çulha was contributory in the preparation of this study. We talked several times on this subject and she gave me valuable ideas. I thank her for her suggestions, which helped to improve this thesis.

Dr.Ayhan Koç has also read all drafts and gave valuable suggestions. I thank her not only for this study but also for her great help during my studies in Boğaziçi University.

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. The Basic Concept	1
1.1.1. Historical Overview	2
1.1.2. Theories of Job Satisfaction	4
a) Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory	4
b) Social Reference Group Theory	7
c) Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory	8
1.1.3. The Effect of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors on Job Satisfaction	12
1.1.4. Job Level and Job Satisfaction	16
1.1.5. Job Choice and Job Satisfaction	22
1.1.6. Job Satisfaction and Turnover	25
1.2. The Purpose of This Study	28
1.3. Hypotheses and Variables	29
1.3.1. Hypothesis 1	30
1.3.2. Hypothesis 2	30
1.3.3. Hypothesis 3	30
1.3.4. Hypothesis 4	30
1.3.5. Hypothesis 5	30
2. METHOD	31
2.1. <u>Subjects</u>	31
2.1.1. Descriptive Statistics	32
2.2. Materials	33
2.3. Design and Procedure	34

2.3.1. The Turkish Translation of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire	34
2.3.2. Administration of the Questionnaire	35
2.3.3. Statistical Analyses	35
3. RESULTS	37
4. DISCUSSION	45
REFERENCES	62
APPENDIX 1	66
APPENDIX 2	69

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate job satisfaction of employees from different occupational levels with respect to different aspects of the job and the job environment. Questionnaire data were collected in 4 organizations from a sample of 120 individuals who were managers (n:40), office clerks (n:40), and janitors (n:40). The following hypotheses were tested:

- ① The higher the level of the job, the greater the general satisfaction of the individual.
- 2) The higher the level of the job, the greater the intrinsic satisfaction of the individual over and above the difference observed in general satisfaction scores.
- 3) Individuals will express less satisfaction related to extrinsic factors than intrinsic factors.
- 4) Individuals who make job choices on intrinsic factors will express more general satisfaction than those who make the decision based on extrinsic factors.
- 5) Individuals who want to leave their jobs will express lower levels of job satisfaction than individuals who do not want to leave their jobs.

The hypotheses are confirmed and findings are discussed in terms of Herzberg's two-factor theory, Maslow's need hierarchy theory, Deci's cognitive evaluation theory and Darley and Hagenah's occupational level theory.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The basic concept

The investigation of job satisfaction must begin with an identification of the terms constituting the concept. Since a job is not an entity, the meaning of it can be understood by analyzing the relationship of roles, tasks, responsibilities and interactions. Since satisfaction is an emotional response, the meaning of it can be discovered by analyzing the individual's mental processes. In 1976, Locke defined job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (cited in Dunnette, 1976, p.1300). DuBrin (1974) said that "job satisfaction refers to the feelings of contentment related to work. These feelings range from extremely negative through neutral to extremely positive" (p.264).

The concept of job satisfaction contains several dimensions rather than a single dimension. For example, employees can be found who report that they are very satisfied with their supervisors and very dissatisfied with their salaries. Therefore, it seems to be necessary to specify these dimensions in order to understand the concept of job satisfaction. If we describe a person as satisfied with one aspect of the job, we mean that the person has positive attitudes toward that job dimension. Positive attitudes toward the job are equivalent to job satisfaction and negative

attitudes toward the job are equivalent to job dissatisfaction.

Generally, job satisfaction is measured by interviews or questionnaires in which employees are asked to state the degree to which they like or dislike several aspects of their jobs. The degree to which a person is satisfied with his job is understood from his responses to one or more questions about how he feels about his job. Other more indirect methods have been developed but they have not had very wide use.

1.1.1. Historical Overview

Systematic attempts to study the nature and causes of job satisfaction did not begin until the 1930s. The Hawthorne studies which Mayo and his colleagues started in the late 1920s began as a study of the effects of certain factors on productivity. But the emphasis soon changed to the study of "attitudes" because the Hawthorne researchers discovered that the employees' decisions about the work situation affect their reactions to it.

The first intensive study of job satisfaction was published by Hoppock in 1935 (cited in Dunnette, 1976, p.1299). He used samples which included most employed adults in one small town and 500 schoolteachers from several communities. Hoppock's study included several factors that could affect job satisfaction such as fatigue, monotony, working conditions, super-

vision and achievement. The Hawthorne studies rather than Hoppock's shaped the research in the area for the next two decades, however. The growth of this work in World War II resulted in the "Human Relations" movement. This view emphasized the importance of the supervisor and the work group in determining employee satisfaction and productivity. The Human Relations movement was influential in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman published a monograph in 1959 and this publication started a new trend which refocused attention on the work itself. This new trend suggested that real satisfaction with the job could only be provided by allowing individuals enough responsibility to enable them to grow mentally (Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, 1959).

In general, three major schools of thought can be identified concerning the factors that are responsible for job satisfaction. The Physical-Economic School emphasized the role of the physical arrangement of the work, physical working conditions and pay. Its major representatives were Taylor and the British Industrial Health Research Board and most American researchers of the 1920s. The Social (Human Relations) school, beginning in the 1930s, emphasized the role of good supervision, cohesive work groups and friendly employee-management relations. Its representatives were the Hawthorne investigators and more recent industrial sociologists. The contemporary Work Itself (Growth) School emphasizes the attainment

of satisfaction through growth in skill, efficacy and responsibility.

1.1.2. Theories of Job Satisfaction

There have been three major theories of job satisfaction.

a) Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory

Most conceptions of the process of motivation begin with the assumption that behavior is directed towards the satisfaction of needs or motives. Maslow, a personality theorist and clinical psychologist, has developed a theory of motivation which helps us to understand the motivation to work. Maslow's theory in 1943 (cited in Leavitt and Pondy, 1973, p.7) suggests that man has five basic categories of needs:

1) Physiological needs. These needs include food, water, air, etc. It would be difficult to identify jobs in business, industry or government which block the satisfaction of basic physiological needs.

2) Safety needs. These needs include freedom from physical threats and harm as well as economic security.

3) Belongingness or social needs. Physiological and safety needs center around the person himself. Belongingness needs

involve interaction with other people for purposes of giving and receiving love, or to feel part of a group. Organizations usually provide opportunities to satisfy social needs. Two exceptions might be when an individual dislikes his co-workers or when he is placed in an isolated position.

4) Esteem needs. These needs include the need for mastery and achievement, and the need for recognition and approval of others. They are based on the belief that people want esteem in terms of both their own standards and the standards of others. There is a reciprocal relationship here. Respect from others usually leads to self-respect. In general, people must have positive attitudes toward the nature of their work (consider their job worthwhile) in order to satisfy esteem needs through their jobs.

5) Self-actualization. This represents the highest level need. It is defined as "the tendency to become actualized in what he is potentially" or "the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming" (Leavitt and Pondy, 1973, p.17). Self-actualization takes into account an individual's own goals and potentials. Jobs which provide people opportunities to work toward self-actualization are infrequent. Higher level managerial and some professional jobs are among the kinds of occupational activities that can contribute to self-actualization.

The theory argues that these needs are arranged in a hierarchy of "prepotency", the order from most to least prepotent being that given above. According to Maslow, the less prepotent needs are not desired until the more prepotent needs are satisfied. He maintains that when a lower need is satisfied, the next need in his hierarchy is aroused. The main supporting evidence for this theory comes from the lowest needs in the hierarchy. When people are very hungry, thirsty, cold, or afraid they are not concerned about higher needs, as the studies of Cofer and Appley in 1964 have shown (cited in Argyle, 1972, p.96). There is no clear evidence about the upper part of the hierarchy. However, studies of the motivational concerns of workers at different occupational levels are consistent with Maslow's hypothesis. At lower levels people are most concerned about pay and security, at higher levels (where they are paid more) they are concerned about achievement and success. Vroom (1964) found that higher-level managers attach more importance to autonomy and self-actualization. Maslow did not develop a specific theory of work motivation, but the implications of his theory are obvious. If the individual is in a situation where his needs are met, then he evaluates the situation positively. On the other hand, if his needs are not met, then he evaluates the situation negatively. According to this theory, job satisfaction is positively related to the degree to which the individual's personal needs are satisfied in the job situation. This theory is criticized for many reasons and the studies that have been done using

WJ

this approach have not shown support for it. For example, Hall and Nougaim in 1968 (cited in Argyle, 1972, p.97) tested this theory in a study of 49 young managers over an interval of five years. Only very weak connections were found between greater lower-need satisfaction and increases in higher-need strength, much the same was found for correlations at one point of time between lower satisfaction and higher needs.

b) Social Reference Group Theory

This theory is similar to "need hierarchy theory" except that it does not emphasize the needs of the individual but it emphasizes the opinions of the group to which the individual looks for guidance. These groups are defined as the "reference group" for the individual because they define "social reality" for him. According to this theory if a job meets the requirements and interests of the individual's reference group, he will like it, and if it does not, he will not like it. An example of this type of theory and how it can be tested has given by Hulin in 1966 (cited in Korman, 1971, p.144). In this study data were obtained which measured the job satisfaction of female clerical workers employed in 300 different catalogue order offices. In addition, information was also obtained as to the prosperity, unemployment, slums, farming productivity and general economic condition of the communities in which the catalogue order establishments were located. Hulin hypothesized that such economic conditions

would be negatively related to the job satisfaction of the employees. In other words, with job conditions held constant, if one's neighborhood is wealthy, the less likely it is he will like the job. But, if one's neighborhood is poor, the more likely he is to see any particular job condition as favorable. Hulin's results indicate strong support for his predictions and for his explanation of the findings as being due to the general frame of reference with which a person evaluates his outcomes. What is of most importance for us here is that Hulin provides strong evidence that such frames of reference for evaluation may be provided by one's social groups and general social environment. It is clear that, the social reference-group model can be used to interpret a large number of studies in the area of job satisfaction.

c) Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory

This theory of job satisfaction has influenced research in recent years. It was developed by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman in 1959. The original basis for the "Motivator - Hygiene Theory" was a study of some 200 engineers and accountants who were asked to describe a time when they felt especially satisfied and a time when they felt especially dissatisfied with their job (Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, 1959). They used a semistructured interview technique to get respondents to recall events experienced at work which resulted in a marked improvement or a marked reduction in

their job satisfaction. Interviewees were also asked, how their feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction affected their work performance, personal relationships etc. Content analysis of the interviews suggested that certain job characteristics led to job satisfaction, while different job characteristics led to job dissatisfaction. For example, job achievement was related to satisfaction while working conditions were related to dissatisfaction. Poor conditions led to dissatisfaction, but good conditions did not lead to satisfaction.

Herzberg used Maslow's theoretical explanations while he was formulating his model. He argued that "having the lower needs satisfied will not lead to satisfaction since these are pretty well guaranteed by our society. The best types of feelings that such need fulfillment can lead to is job attitude neutrality. However, not having such fulfillment will lead to dissatisfaction. Therefore, being satisfied on a job is basically a function of having the higher-order needs (such as ego and self-actualization) satisfied since these are hard to get. For the same reason, not fulfilling these needs will not lead to job dissatisfaction, but rather to job attitude neutrality" (Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, 1959). On the basis of these explanations Herzberg proposed his "two-factor theory" of job satisfaction. This theory argues that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction result from different causes, satisfaction depends on "motivator" factors

while dissatisfaction is the result of "hygiene" factors. The major "motivators" or "satisfiers" are achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement. The findings of their study suggest that these factors are effective in motivating the individual to superior performance and satisfy the individual's need for self-actualization at work. Herzberg (1968) explained why the "motivator" factors provide job satisfaction. He argued that growth is dependent on some achievements, but achievement requires a task. The motivators are task factors and are necessary for growth. They provide the worker a sense of accomplishment through the work itself. The major "hygiene" factors or "dissatisfiers" are company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions. Since these factors are work-supporting or environmental rather than task-determined, they do not induce people toward extra effort. Herzberg (1968) suggested that the "hygiene" factors operate only to fulfill man's physical needs, while the "motivators" serve to fulfill man's growth needs. Thus, it can be understood that "hygiene" factors enable the employees to maintain physical and social health, but, "motivator" factors make the employees creative on their jobs. The classification of "salary" as a "hygiene" factor rather than "motivator" is significant. As we all know, many organizations attempt to motivate employees with salary increases. Herzberg (1968) argued that the payment technique is a "hygiene" factor because it does not have the effect of producing an "increasing commitment" to job performance. On

the other hand, "motivators" are more reliable in producing employee commitment because they are psychological in their influence (Herzberg, 1968).

On the basis of their well-known study involving a series of interviews with engineers and accountants, Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) have revealed that "motivator" and "hygiene" factors determine the intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of job satisfaction. They suggested that alternative labels of "motivators" are "intrinsic factors" or "job content factors". The intrinsic factors, according to these researchers, are derived from the individual's relation to the job itself. Alternative labels of "hygiene factors" are "extrinsic factors" or "job context factors". The extrinsic factors, according to these researchers, describe the work environment and they are the sources of need satisfaction that stem from the organizational context. A number of investigations have been carried out using Herzberg's division of two sources of satisfaction. The theory has been influential, particularly in directing attention to the importance of the motivators. Perhaps the most important contribution of Herzberg's writings is in pointing to some of the intrinsic features of the work such as achievement and responsibility.



1.1.3. The Effect of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors on Job Satisfaction

The terms "intrinsic" and "extrinsic" have been used in the job satisfaction literature for a long time. By using these terms, it is possible to distinguish between general factors that are responsible for job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. However, there are differences among authors in their definitions and classifications of the intrinsic and extrinsic factors. For example, in 1969, Saleh and Grygier (cited in Dyer and Parker, 1975, p.455) defined "intrinsic factors" as "those directly related to the actual performance of the job" and "extrinsic factors" as "those related to the environment in which the job is being performed". In 1972, Deci defined intrinsic rewards as "those mediated by the person himself" and extrinsic rewards as "those mediated by someone other than the employee himself" (cited in Dyer and Parker, 1975, p.455). Also, in 1971, Slocum argued that "intrinsic rewards are associated with the satisfaction of higher order needs, while extrinsic rewards, such as pay, promotion and security are often primarily associated with satisfaction of the lower order needs discussed by Maslow" (cited in Dyer and Parker, 1975, p.455). Similarly, Wernimont in 1972 said that "all the intrinsic factors are internal feelings, while extrinsic factors are external situations" (cited in Dyer and Parker, 1975, p.455).

These definitions lead to some difficulties in the classifica-

tion of factors as either intrinsic or extrinsic. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) classified the extrinsic and intrinsic factors in the following way:

"Extrinsic Factors

- 1) Pay, or salary increase
- 2) Technical supervision, or having a competent supervisor
- 3) The human relations quality of supervision
- 4) Company policy and administration
- 5) Working conditions, or physical surrounding
- 6) Job security

Intrinsic Factors

- 1) Achievement, or completing an important task successfully
- 2) Recognition, or being singled out for praise
- 3) Responsibility for one's own or other's work
- 4) Advancement, or changing status through promotion
- 5) Work itself".

Dyer and Parker (1975) argued that "two frequently used factors that are symptomatic of the classification problem are recognition and advancement". They stated that "recognition was used as an outcome in 12 articles, in 8 it was classified as intrinsic and in 4 as extrinsic and advancement was used 15 times, 6 times as an intrinsic outcome and 9 as an extrinsic one" (Dyer and Parker, 1975, p.455).

In 1967, Dawis, Weiss, England, and Lofquist (1967) proposed a "Theory of Work Adjustment" and they made a distinction

between intrinsic and extrinsic factors which looked very much like Herzberg's intrinsic versus extrinsic dichotomy. In the present study, the classification system developed by Dawis, Weiss, England, and Lofquist (1967) was adopted. The factors, that describe the individual's relationship to what he does, were classified as intrinsic factors, that describe his relationship to the environment in which he does his job, were classified as extrinsic. The intrinsic factors included:

ACTIVITY: Being able to keep busy all the time.

INDEPENDENCE: The chance to work alone on the job.

VARIETY: The chance to do different things from time to time.

SOCIAL STATUS: The chance to be "somebody" in the community.

MORAL VALUES: Being able to do things that do not go against one's conscience.

SECURITY: The way one's job provides for steady employment.

SOCIAL SERVICE: The chance to do things for other people.

AUTHORITY: The chance to tell other people what to do.

ABILITY UTILIZATION: The chance to do something that makes use of one's abilities.

RESPONSIBILITY: The freedom to use one's own judgment.

CREATIVITY: The chance to try one's own methods of doing the job.

ACHIEVEMENT: The feeling of accomplishment one gets from the job

The extrinsic factors included:

ADVANCEMENT: The chances for advancement on the job.

COMPANY POLICIES AND PRACTICES: The way company policies are put into practice.

CO-WORKERS: The way one's co-workers get along with each other.

RECOGNITION: The praise one gets for doing a good job.

WORKING CONDITIONS: The working conditions.

COMPENSATION: The pay and the amount of work one does.

SUPERVISION-HUMAN RELATIONS: The way one's boss handles his employees.

SUPERVISION-TECHNICAL: The competence of one's supervisor in making decisions.

As we can see from this classification the intrinsic factors come from the performance itself and are internally mediated since the individual rewards himself. These factors can be thought of as satisfying higher order needs such as self-esteem and self-actualization. They involve such outcomes as feelings of accomplishment, feelings of achievement, and feelings of using and developing one's skills and abilities. On the other hand, the extrinsic factors are part of the job situation and are given by others. They are externally mediated and can be thought of as satisfying lower order needs. The fact that intrinsic factors are internally mediated sets them apart from the extrinsic factors in an important way. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) and Mitchell and Nebeker in 1973 (cited in Dyer and Parker, 1975, p.456) have presented data indicating that intrinsic factors are better motivators

than extrinsic ones. Centers and Bugenthal in 1966 (cited in Argyle, 1972, p.244) found that intrinsic factors are more strongly related to job satisfaction than extrinsic factors and that individuals at higher occupational levels regard intrinsic factors as more important. These findings may be due to the fact that the connection between the reception of intrinsic factors and performance is more direct than the connection between the reception of extrinsic factors and performance. Thus, it is probable that intrinsic factors can be excellent motivators.

1.1.4. Job Level and Job Satisfaction

One of the most important correlates of job satisfaction is job level. A positive relationship between the level of the employee's job and his job satisfaction has been reported by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) and Vroom (1964). Comparisons of occupational groups show that the more skilled the job, the more its members enjoy their jobs. A study by Hoppock in 1935 (cited in Katz and Kahn, 1966, p.368) revealed that more than 90 per cent of a group of 500 teachers liked their work, whereas Bell in 1937 (cited in Katz and Kahn, 1966, p.368) found that 98 per cent of young people working in canning factories and textile mills hated their jobs. In another study by Hoppock in 1935 (cited in Katz and Kahn, 1966, p.368), of 309 people in a small Pennsylvania town, the greatest dissatisfaction with work occurred among

the unskilled laborers. Satisfaction increased with occupational level, with the greatest satisfaction among professional groups. The reason of the positive relationship between job level and job satisfaction were summarized by Tiffin and McCormick in 1965 (cited in Korman, 1977). They argued that "Blauner has attempted to explain the gross differences that exist among people in different occupations and industries, and has set forth four factors that seem useful in explaining the difference. These are (1) occupational prestige, (2) control, (3) integrated work groups and (4) occupational communities. Of these, differences in occupational prestige seem to be particularly important, as reflected by the fact that the rank order of job satisfaction of various occupational groups corresponds generally with the rank order of prestige of the groups. The control factor deals with the relative amount of "control" inherent in jobs. Satisfaction generally is higher in the case of people whose jobs involve control over their own work and that of others, and is lowest for those people who are in jobs that are at the lower end of the organizational hierarchy, for whom there is little opportunity for such control ..." (Korman, 1977, p.223).

The positive relationship between job satisfaction and occupational level has also been found in studies by Hull and Kolstad in 1942, Thorndike in 1935, Super in 1939, and by Uhrbrock in 1934 (cited in Katz and Kahn, 1966, p.368).

A study by Gurin, Veroff, and Feld in 1960 (cited in Katz and Kahn, 1966, p.368) is important since it was based upon a national sample of the United States population. These researchers report that the greatest amount of job satisfaction occurs among the professional, technical, and managerial personnel, and the least amount among unskilled workers. Forty-two per cent of persons employed in professional-technical occupations report that they are very satisfied with their jobs as compared with only 13 per cent of workers in the unskilled category. In general, reported job satisfaction declines with occupational level. The groups intermediate in satisfaction are the clerical, sales, and manually skilled and semiskilled. The conclusion drawn by Vroom (1964) is that the positive relationship between job level and job satisfaction is due to the fact that positions at high levels provide more rewards to their occupants than those at lower levels. Jobs which are high in level are generally more highly paid, less repetitive, provide more freedom and require less physical effort than other jobs low in level (Vroom, 1964). In most of the studies, job satisfaction is used to cover overall liking for the job situation as well as intrinsic job satisfaction deriving from the content of the job. For example, in 1953, the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan conducted a survey of employee moral in which 580 employees were interviewed (cited in Katz and Kahn, 1966, p.370). In this research intrinsic job satisfaction was measured by an index which summarized the answers

to four questions: How well do you like the sort of work you are doing? Does your job give you a chance to do the things you feel you do best? Do you get any feeling of accomplishment from the work you are doing? How do you feel about your work, does it rate as an important job with you? In this study employees were grouped into four classes on the basis of job level: high-level technical, semi-supervisory, varied clerical, and repetitious clerical. In the high-level technical group only 7 per cent of their members reported low intrinsic job satisfaction, compared with 41 per cent of the group doing repetitive clerical work. This relationship was not reduced when salary was held constant. These results suggest that the greater satisfactions found among high-level occupational groups are not a function of salaries and conditions of work. Individuals derive satisfaction in the expression of their skills, in interesting and challenging work, and in the sense of accomplishment from successful performance. In the same study, the employees who were higher on intrinsic job satisfaction tended to be the people who described their jobs as having variety and as giving them some chance to make decisions. Also, when comparing managers, Bass and Barrett (1972) found that the higher the level of management, the greater the job satisfaction. This finding of increased satisfaction with high job level in the organization is not surprising, since a number of other satisfaction related job factors are implied by higher levels, including responsibility, social status and more intrinsically rewarding work.

In a study by Porter in 1962 (cited in Vroom, 1964, p.130) 2000 managers were questioned about how well five of their needs were being satisfied. Respondents were classified into five managerial levels: Presidents, Vice Presidents, Upper - Middle Managers, Lower-Middle Managers, and Lower Managers. Holding age constant, Porter observed a tendency for the amount of difference between ratings. Satisfaction was found to increase with each higher level of management for the esteem, autonomy and self-actualization needs. But security and social need satisfaction was high and relatively constant across all level of management sampled. These results imply that the greater satisfaction of higher level managers is due to greater opportunities to satisfy esteem, autonomy and self-actualization needs. Moreover, a large number of studies have reported that, at different levels in the organization, different needs are important to employees. For example, Dawis, Weiss, England and Lofquist (1966), in their study of 1430 employees, found that at higher occupational levels "intrinsic" job factors such as achievement, responsibility were more valued, while "extrinsic" job factors such as salary, working conditions, were important for the employees at lower level jobs. Centers and Bugental in 1966 (cited in Locke, 1973, p.67) obtained results similar to those of Dawis, Weiss, England and Lofquist (1966) with a cross-sectional sample of working adults in a major urban area. These subjects were asked to rank six factors in terms of their importance in "keeping you on your present job". Centers and Bugental found

that white-collar workers were more likely to rank work interest, use of skills, and intrinsic satisfaction and less likely to rank pay, co-workers, and security among the top three factors than were blue-collar workers. A study of 1000 white-collar workers and 400 blue-collar workers by Friedlander in 1966 (cited in Bass and Barrett, 1972, p.91) found that, white-collar employees rated social-environmental factors such as security, co-workers as significantly less important and intrinsic factors such as achievement, use of abilities as significantly more important than blue-collar employees. In 1971, Armstrong (cited in Locke, 1973, p.67) compared engineers with assemblers using the same type of importance ratings as Friedlander. The engineers ranked job content factors or intrinsic factors (responsibility, achievement, work itself) higher and the job context factors or extrinsic factors (salary, security, supervision, company policy, working conditions) lower than the assemblers. In a recent study by Harris and Locke (1974) white-collar and blue-collar employees were asked to describe sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the job. The Harris and Locke (1974) study revealed that, white-collar employees were more likely to derive satisfaction and dissatisfaction from "motivator" events (especially achievement), and blue-collar employees from "hygienes" (especially money).

From these studies it seems clear that employees in different occupational levels find different satisfactions in work. The

conclusion that can be drawn from these findings is that, individuals in high-level jobs can aspire the satisfaction of higher needs since their lower needs are satisfied. For this reason they may derive satisfaction from intrinsic factors that enable the individuals to fulfill their higher needs (growth needs). Also, in a study, which measured the generality of Herzberg's theory, Ewen in 1964 (cited in Zytowski, 1968, p.420) found that, the nature of satisfiers and dissatisfiers were different in different jobs.

1.1.5. Job Choice and Job Satisfaction

In the previous section, the relationship between job level and job satisfaction has been discussed. We now shift our focus to deal with the factors that the individual considers in making a job choice because these factors are important in affecting the employee's satisfaction with that job. The individual must make a decision to choose one firm and job. Therefore, the following question needs to be posed: On what basis does the individual make this decision?

At the psychological level, a number of researchers have examined how individuals choose among jobs. Since we deal with the relationship between job choice and job satisfaction, we have to analyze the factors under which the job choice decision is made. A person is described as "intrinsically motivated" if he performs an activity for its own sake and "extrinsically motivated" if the activity is performed to

obtain a reward or to avoid a punishment (Ross, 1975). In other words, if the person attributes his behavior to external consequences, it is assumed that he will act as if he was extrinsically motivated. Similarly, if the person perceives himself as performing the activity for its own sake, it is assumed that he will behave as if he was intrinsically motivated.

In 1971, Kruglanski, Friedman, and Zeevi (cited in Ross, 1975, p.246) found that, subjects tended to rate a task as less enjoyable when it was performed for a reward. deCharms in 1968 argued that "increasing extrinsic rewards lead individuals to perceive their behavior as under the control of the rewards and that this, in turn, reduce their intrinsic motivation" (cited in Calder and Staw, 1975, p.76). Ross (1975) and Calder and Staw (1975) tested this hypothesis and revealed that the presence of an extrinsic reward reduce intrinsic motivation. Deci, has also followed deCharms in predicting that intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are not additive in their effect on motivation, and that the introduction of monetary rewards reduces intrinsic motivation to perform an activity (Deci, 1971, Deci and Cascio, 1972). Pritchard, Campbell, and Campbell (1977) also demonstrated that attitudinal measures of intrinsic motivation, such as ratings of interest and liking for a task, could be used with similar results. In 1958, Heider argued that "when a person is intrinsically motivated the locus of causality is within himself. However, when he receives external rewards he begins

to perceive that he is doing the activity for the external rewards, so the perceived locus of causality changes from within himself to the external reward leaving him with less intrinsic motivation" (cited in Deci, Cascio, and Krusell, 1975, p.82).

In studying the factors under which the job choice decision is made, it is important to understand whether the individual chooses his job for intrinsic reasons or extrinsic reasons. The intrinsic job factors may include the intrinsic interest in the job itself, the responsibility the job provides and the opportunity for advancement. The extrinsic job factors may include the salary provided, the family pressures, the location of the job and the advice of others. Based on the findings of the previous studies we can conclude that, if the individual chooses a job for extrinsic rather than intrinsic reasons, such as, salary or location rather than intrinsic interest in the job, it may be that job satisfaction will be lower. In a study of Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) cadets, Staw (1974) found that the removal of an extrinsic reason to enroll in ROTC increased the commitment of those already obligated to the program. Similarly, the studies by Lepper and Greene (1975) and Wortman (1975) revealed that, when a person perceived the job choice to be based on external factors such as family pressures or salary, the individual was less satisfied than when the decision was made free from these factors. Also, a study conducted by O'Reilly III and Caldwell

(1980) examined the job choice process by focusing on those factors perceived by the decision maker as important in the choice of jobs. They found that, subjects who made job choices on intrinsic bases (e.g., intrinsic interest in the job, opportunity for advancement) were more satisfied and committed than those who made the decision based on extrinsic factors (e.g., external pressures such as family concerns and preference for geographic location). Their results are consistent with previous studies which have demonstrated that extrinsic reasons for job choice process decrease commitment and satisfaction.

Herzberg's (1959) "two-factor theory" suggested that the "intrinsic" aspects of work such as responsibility and achievement were more satisfying than "extrinsic" factors such as working conditions and company policies. Although certain problems have been identified with the theory, research has shown general support for it. Thus, a job choice based on extrinsic aspects of the job may be associated with lower satisfaction than one based on more intrinsic job factors.

1.1.6. Job Satisfaction and Turnover

In the previous sections, we considered conditions affecting the satisfaction of employees. We turn now to the implications of this satisfaction for their behavior on the job.

In general, the individual's tendency to remain or withdraw from the job seems to be related to his satisfaction or dissatisfaction with it. Therefore, the relationship between job satisfaction and the individual's desire to leave his present job should be investigated. The Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) surveys in a variety of occupations have shown that, where dissatisfaction was strong, turnover was greatest. This is especially true when "avoidable" turnover is differentiated from "unavoidable" turnover, such as military service. In 1966, Hulin (cited in Bass and Barrett, 1972, p.102) used matched groups of terminators and non-terminators to control for variables such as size, and still obtained the expected relationship between dissatisfaction and turnover. A recent study by Waters and Roach (1973) also found a consistent significant relationship between job dissatisfaction and turnover and supported the earlier findings. Thus, it may be expected that satisfied workers will be less likely to leave their jobs. When the individual chooses a job, it must be that it is chosen in the expectation of fulfilling some needs. Argyle (1972) suggests that job satisfaction depends on how far a person can satisfy his particular set of needs in his job. Therefore, the fulfillment of needs can be related to turnover. In a study by Ross and Zander in 1957 (cited in Vroom and Deci, 1982, p.61) a group of workers who had resigned was matched with company employees who remained. There was no difference between the groups in their reported strength of needs, but a significant difference

in the extent to which their needs had been fulfilled. Both recognition and autonomy were less often attained in the group that had resigned. The researchers concluded that workers whose personal needs are satisfied on the job are more likely to remain in the organization. In 1960, Blauner, in his study of work and retirement in six occupations found that, the proportion of men who wanted to continue working or had actually continued working after age sixty-five was more than 67 per cent for physicians, 65 per cent for department store salesmen, 49 per cent for skilled printers 42 per cent for coal miners, and 32 per cent for unskilled and semiskilled steelworkers (cited in Costello and Zalkind, 1963, p.80). He argued that, the individuals in high-level jobs satisfy their needs in their jobs and choose not to retire. Vroom (1964) indicated seven studies dealing with the satisfaction - turnover relationship, four of them using individuals as the unit of analysis and three using groups. All studies found the expected negative relationship between these variables although the significance of this relationship varies from study to study. While reported correlations between amount of satisfaction and turnover have been consistent and significant, they have not been especially high (usually less than .40). The reason for this condition is best explained by the fact that most employees do not act only on the basis of their feelings. Employee turnover depends on other factors besides job satisfaction. In general, it depends on the availability of other jobs, and it is found to be less in times of high

unemployment, and in small towns where there are no other firms offering similar work (Arglyle, 1972). If the probability of turnover is affected by the availability of other jobs, one should find higher turnover in times of full employment than in times of considerable unemployment. In 1953, Behrend (cited in Vroom, 1964, p.178) found evidence of this. Studying 55 factories in five large engineering and metal working companies in England, he found a marked reduction in rate of voluntary turnover from a period of full employment to a period of less than full employment.

1.2. The Purpose of This Study

The research to be reported here has theoretical and descriptive objectives. One purpose is to investigate job satisfaction of employees from different occupational levels with respect to different aspects of the job and the job environment. This kind of study is useful because two individuals may express the same amount of satisfaction with their work but for different reasons. For example, one individual may be satisfied with his work because it allows him to satisfy his needs for independence and security. Another person who is equally satisfied with his work is able to satisfy his needs for creativity and achievement. It is, therefore, important to discover the factors that are responsible for job satisfaction and to make comparisons between different occupational groups with respect to these

factors. The study focuses on the following major questions:

(1) How do the degree of job satisfaction of employees from high-level jobs compare with that of employees from low-level jobs? Are the employees who hold high-level jobs more satisfied than the employees who hold low-level jobs?

(2) What are the factors that lead to job satisfaction and are they unique for employees from different occupational levels?

A second objective of this research is to examine the relationship between job choice process and job satisfaction by focusing on those factors perceived by the decision maker as important in the choice of jobs.

Another purpose of the study is to analyze the relationship between the individual's desire to leave his present job and his job satisfaction.

A final important objective of this research is to try an instrument which can be used to assess the job satisfactions of the employees in Turkey.

1.3. Hypotheses and Variables

The main interest of this study is to investigate the factors about the satisfactions of employees in their jobs. In addition to providing a descriptive analysis of the factors, the purpose of the research is to test some hypotheses

regarding the employees' satisfactions. The basic concepts are adopted from the "Theory of Work Adjustment" developed by Dawis, Weiss, England, and Lofquist (1967). As an instrument, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is used. The following hypotheses are tested.

Hypothesis 1: The higher the level of the job, the greater the general satisfaction of the individual.

Hypothesis 2: The higher the level of the job, the greater the intrinsic satisfaction of the individual over and above the difference observed in general satisfaction scores.

Hypothesis 3: Individuals will express less satisfaction related to extrinsic factors than intrinsic factors.

Hypothesis 4: Individuals who make job choices on intrinsic factors will express more general satisfaction than those who make the decision based on extrinsic factors.

Hypothesis 5: Individuals who want to leave their jobs will express low-levels of job satisfaction than individuals who do not want to leave their jobs.

2. METHOD

2.1. Subjects

Questionnaire data were collected in 4 organizations from a sample of 120 individuals who were managers (n:40), office clerks (n:40), and janitors and maintenancemen (n:40). Twenty-five per cent of the respondents were employed in a large private construction firm, 25 % in a large private medical firm, 25 % in a large private trading firm and 25 % in a big hotel. These organizations were chosen because, for the purposes of this study, they included the occupations at different levels, they were the industrial and business firms of the private sector and they shared similar characteristics such as size, type of supervision, rate of pay and working conditions. These similarities were especially considered in order to prevent confounding the analysis. In each organization 30 subjects from three different occupational groups were selected. These groups were selected by convenience sampling. The sample was not chosen at random because of administrative difficulties within the organizations. Instead, most readily available full-time employees from appropriate occupational groups were asked to voluntarily participate in the study. The managers group included top executives from the company president through personnel managers, division managers and department heads. The group of office clerks included the individuals who performed variety of clerical duties and

secretarial work. The janitors and maintenancemen group included individuals who performed low-level jobs in the organization such as cleanup work, lifting, driving etc.

2.1.1. Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive characteristics of the samples are shown in Table 1 given in Appendix 1, pp.67-68.

One-hundred-twenty employees completed the questionnaire. The majority of the employee sample was male (60 %). Forty per cent of the sample was female. Of the male employees 43 % were managers, 20 % were office clerks and 36 % were janitors. Of the female employees 18 % were managers, 52 % were office clerks and 29 % were janitors.

The mean age of the managers was 40.8 years, the mean age of the office clerks was 30.6 years and the mean age of the janitors was also 30.6 years.

Of the managers, 82 % were university educated and 17 % were high school educated, while 57 % of the office clerks were high school educated. By contrast, 70 % of the janitors had only primary school education.

Seventy-four per cent of the employees indicated that they had been working in their organization at least for one year. Fifteen per cent of the employees in the sample had been in their present job between one and two years, 10 % between two

and three years, 5 % between three and four years, 8 % between four and five years, and 31 % more than five years.

Ninety-five per cent of the employees indicated that they had chosen their jobs by themselves.

More than half (65 %) of the managers indicated that their monthly income was more than 150.000 TL, while only 10 % of the office clerks indicated that amount. Fifty per cent of the janitors indicated that their monthly income was between 31.000 and 60.000 TL. Ninety-one per cent of the employees indicated that they had not thought of leaving their present job.

2.2. Materials

The data for this investigation was obtained by using a questionnaire. A short form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Dawis, Weiss, England, and Lofquist, 1967), that incorporated scales relevant to both intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of satisfaction was used. The short form MSQ was a Likert-type instrument and it consisted of 20 items, each item representing one of the MSQ scales. There were three scales in the questionnaire: Intrinsic Satisfaction, Extrinsic Satisfaction and General Satisfaction which was the sum of the first two. Scale scores were determined by summing the weights for the responses chosen for the items in each scale.

The intrinsic aspects of job satisfaction was measured with the following scales Activity, Independence, Variety, Social Status, Moral Values, Security, Social Service, Authority, Ability Utilization, Responsibility, Creativity, Achievement. The extrinsic aspects of job satisfaction was measured with the following scales: Supervision-Human Relations, Supervision-Technical, Company Policies and Practices, Compensation, Advancement, Co-workers, Recognition, Working Conditions. The respondent indicated how satisfied he was with the reinforcer on his present job. Five response alternatives were presented for each item: Very Dissatisfied., Dissatisfied., Neither (dissatisfied nor satisfied)., Satisfied., Very Satisfied. Responses were scored 1 through 5 proceeding from left to right in the answer spaces. Directions for the respondent were at the beginning of the questionnaire. Before the questionnaire, respondents were asked to complete some biographical information.¹

2.3. Design and Procedure

2.3.1. The Turkish Translation of the MSQ

The translation of the questionnaire from English into Turkish was done by Deniz and Güliz Gökçora, M.A., Hacettepe University. The translation was then checked by back-translations by graduate students fluent in English and

¹ A copy of the short form MSQ and the accompanying sheet is presented on pp.70-73 in Appendix 2.

found to be adequate.

A pilot study done at the Sheraton Hotel showed that the translation of the questionnaire was easily understandable for employees both in low-level jobs and high-level jobs.

2.3.2. Administration of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was self-administering. It was administered to employees on the job. An explanation about the research appeared on an accompanying sheet. Item rating instructions were given at the top of the questionnaire. The respondent was directed to ask himself: "On my present job, this is how I feel about (the item).__." There was no time limit for the MSQ. However, the respondent was encouraged to answer the questions rapidly. Administration time for the questionnaire varied from about ten to fifteen minutes, with most individuals completing it in about ten minutes.

2.3.3. Statistical Analyses

The data were analyzed in the following ways.

- 1) A general satisfaction score was computed for the three occupational groups (managers, office clerks and janitors). This score was the sum of item scores for all 20 MSQ short-form items.

- 2) To examine the relationship between job level and job satisfaction, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used.
- 3) The level of satisfaction related to extrinsic factors and intrinsic factors was tested by matched-samples t-test.
- 4) To examine the effect of intrinsic and extrinsic considerations in the decision process on subsequent job satisfaction, t-test was used.
- 5) The relationship between the individual's desire to leave his present job and his job satisfaction was tested for statistical significance by using t-test.

3. RESULTS

The results obtained from the analysis of the data are presented in this section.

As for the hypothesis of the study, the first hypothesis stated that the higher the level of the job, the greater the general satisfactions of the individual. For this hypothesis each subjects' general satisfaction score on the satisfaction questionnaire was calculated by summing up the item scores for all 20 MSQ short-form items. Mean scores for each occupational group for the general job satisfaction are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. General satisfaction means for three occupational groups

OCCUPATIONAL GROUP	N	MEANS
MANAGERS	40	81.32
OFFICE CLERKS	40	77.47
JANITORS	40	68.52
TOTAL	120	75.77

One-way analysis of variance was used to test the significance of mean differences in general satisfaction scores among the three groups. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Computations for analysis of variance

	SUM OF SQUARES	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE OF VARIANCE	F	P
TOTAL	22269	N-1:119			
BETWEEN	3450	k-1:2	1725	10.72	.001
WITHIN	18819	N-k:117	160.84		

The results obtained from the analysis of variance indicated a significant difference among the individuals in high-level jobs and low-level jobs, $F: 10.72$, $df: 2/117$, $p < .001$. In other words, according to the obtained results, the general job satisfactions of the individuals in high-level jobs were significantly higher than that of the individuals in low-level jobs. Hence, the first hypothesis was supported by the results.

The second hypothesis claimed that, the higher the level of the job, the greater the intrinsic satisfaction of the individual over and above the difference observed in general satisfaction scores. Each subjects' intrinsic satisfaction score on the satisfaction questionnaire was calculated by summing up the item scores for intrinsic factors. Mean scores for each occupational group for the intrinsic job satisfaction are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Intrinsic satisfaction means for three occupational groups

OCCUPATIONAL GROUP	N	MEANS
MANAGERS	40	50.15
OFFICE CLERKS	40	46.47
JANITORS	40	41.40
TOTAL	120	46.00

This hypothesis was also tested by one-way analysis of variance. Results are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Computations for analysis of variance

	SUM OF SQUARES	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	ESTIMATE OF VARIANCE	F	P
TOTAL	7823	N-1:119		14.37	.001
BETWEEN	1543	k-1:2	771.5		
WITHIN	6280	N-k:117	53.67		

The results obtained from analysis of variance indicated a significant difference among the individuals in high-level jobs and low-level jobs, $F: 14.37$, $df: 2/117$, $p < .001$. The F values of the first and second analyses showed that, the higher the level of the job, the greater the intrinsic satisfactions of the individual over and above the difference observed in general satisfaction scores. Hence, the second hypothesis was also supported.

Aside from these statistical findings, satisfaction item means for the 20 satisfaction items for total group and three occupational groups are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Satisfaction item means for total group and three occupational groups

SCALE	OCCUPATIONAL GROUP			
	TOTAL GROUP	MANAGERS	OFFICE CLERKS	JANITORS
1 ABILITY UTILIZATION	3.91	4.42	3.90	3.42
2 ACHIEVEMENT	4.10	4.27	4.32	3.70
3 ACTIVITY	3.91	4.17	4.05	3.52
4 ADVANCEMENT	3.22	3.67	3.60	2.40
5 AUTHORITY	3.49	4.00	3.40	3.07
6 COMPANY POLICIES AND PRACTICES	3.70	3.90	3.70	3.50
7 COMPENSATION	3.49	3.87	3.22	3.37
8 CO-WORKERS	3.98	3.92	4.40	3.62
9 CREATIVITY	3.97	4.17	3.67	3.52
10 INDEPENDENCE	3.94	4.23	4.10	3.50
11 MORAL VALUES	3.95	4.22	4.17	3.47
12 RECOGNITION	3.75	3.87	3.80	3.57
13 RESPONSIBILITY	3.53	4.17	3.62	2.80
14 SECURITY	3.69	3.90	3.62	3.55
15 SOCIAL SERVICE	3.95	4.17	3.92	3.77
16 SOCIAL STATUS	3.75	4.15	3.92	3.20
17 SUPERVISION-HUMAN RELATIONS	3.80	3.95	3.87	3.57
18 SUPERVISION-TECHNICAL	3.91	3.90	4.12	3.72
19 VARIETY	3.94	4.25	3.92	3.65
20 WORKING CONDITIONS	3.88	4.15	4.15	3.35

For the total group, the highest mean was obtained on Achievement, while Advancement had the lowest mean. For managers, the highest mean was obtained on Ability Utilization and the lowest mean was obtained on Advancement. For office clerks, the highest mean was obtained on Co-workers, while Compensation had the lowest mean. For janitors, the highest mean was obtained on Social Service and the lowest mean was obtained on Advancement.

The third hypothesis of the study stated that, individuals will express less satisfaction related to extrinsic factors than intrinsic factors. This hypothesis was tested using a matched-samples t-test. For this hypothesis each subjects' intrinsic satisfaction score and extrinsic satisfaction score on the satisfaction questionnaire was calculated. The intrinsic satisfaction score was obtained by summing up the item scores for intrinsic factors and dividing by 12 since there were 12 intrinsic satisfaction items. The extrinsic satisfaction score was obtained by summing up the item scores for extrinsic factors and dividing by 8 since there were 8 extrinsic satisfaction items. Then, the difference between these two scores was computed for each subject. Extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction means for total group are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Extrinsic and Intrinsic Satisfaction means for total group (N:120)

	MEAN
EXTRINSIC	3.68
INTRINSIC	3.79

The results obtained from matched-samples t-test indicated a significant difference between the individuals' satisfaction scores related to extrinsic factors and intrinsic factors, $t: 2.327$, $df: 104$, $p < .05$. In other words, according to the obtained results individuals expressed less satisfaction related to extrinsic factors than intrinsic factors. Hence, the third hypothesis was supported by the results.

The fourth hypothesis of the study stated that individuals who make job choices on intrinsic factors will express more general satisfaction than those who make the decision based on extrinsic factors. This hypothesis was tested by a t-test. To examine the effect of intrinsic and extrinsic considerations in the decision process on subsequent job satisfaction, individuals were classified into two groups according to their choice of intrinsic and extrinsic decision factors and a t-test was run on their general satisfaction scores. Mean scores and standard deviations for each group for the general job satisfaction are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. General satisfaction means and standard deviations for individuals who made job choices on intrinsic factors (N:53), and individuals who made job choices on extrinsic factors (N:67).

GROUP	N	MEANS	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
Individuals who made job choices on intrinsic factors	53	80.7	11.5
Individuals who made job choices on extrinsic factors	67	71.8	14.0

The results obtained from t-test indicated a significant difference in general job satisfaction between the individuals who had made a job choice on the basis of intrinsic versus extrinsic factors, $t: 3.83$, $df: 118$, $p < .01$. According to the obtained results individuals who made job choices on intrinsic factors expressed more general satisfaction than those who made the decision based on extrinsic factors. The fourth hypothesis was also supported by the results.

The fifth hypothesis claimed that individuals who want to leave their jobs will express low-level of job satisfaction than individuals who do not want to leave their jobs. This hypothesis was tested by a t-test. For the fifth hypothesis, individuals were classified into two groups as those who wanted to leave their jobs and those who did not want to leave their jobs and a t-test was run on their general

satisfaction scores. Mean scores and standard deviations for each group for the general job satisfaction are shown in Table 9.

Table 9. General satisfaction means and standard deviations for individuals who wanted to leave their jobs (N:10) and individuals who did not want to leave their jobs (N:110)

GROUP	N	MEANS	STANDARD DEVIATIONS
Individuals who wanted to leave their jobs	10	59.6	14.9
Individuals who did not want to leave their jobs	110	77.2	12.6

The results obtained from t-test indicated a significant difference between these two groups, $t: 3.62$, $df: 118$, $p < .01$. According to the obtained results, individuals who wanted to leave their jobs expressed lower-level of job satisfaction than individuals who did not want to leave their jobs. Hence, the fifth hypothesis was supported by the results.

4. DISCUSSION

The aims of this study were theoretical and descriptive. One objective was to investigate job satisfaction of employees from different occupational levels with respect to different aspects of the job and the job environment. A further objective was to examine the relationship between job choice process and job satisfaction by focusing on those factors perceived by the decision maker as important in the choice of jobs. A third objective of the research was to analyze the relationship between the individual's desire to leave his present job and his job satisfaction. A final objective was to try an instrument which could be used to assess the job satisfactions of the employees in Turkey. The preceding chapter shows that these objectives were largely met. However, one must take the results of this study in the context of certain limitations. These are discussed below.

The concept of job satisfaction has been investigated by many theories from different perspectives for a long time. In most of these theories job level has been taken as the major determiner of job satisfaction of individuals. A positive relationship between the level of the employee's job and his job satisfaction has been reported by a large number of investigators. The present study tested the finding of these investigations in Turkey. For the first two hypotheses, job level was taken as the independent variable, and its relation

with job satisfaction was hypothesized as follows: the higher the level of the job, the greater the general satisfaction of the individual and the higher the level of the job, the greater the intrinsic satisfaction of the individual over and above the difference observed in general satisfaction scores. The results have supported these hypotheses, indicating that the general job satisfactions of individuals in high-level jobs are significantly higher than that of individuals in low-level jobs. When the F values of the first and second analyses were compared, it was clearly seen that, the intrinsic satisfactions of the individuals in higher-level jobs were greater over and above the difference observed in general satisfaction scores. These results indicate that, job satisfaction varies greatly by occupational level. In the present study the general measure of job satisfaction was obtained by combining employees' responses to a large number of questions, each of which dealt with a specific aspect of their jobs. This kind of measurement enables us to discuss the results concerning these specific aspects.

The most important finding that emerged in this study was that, managers expressed more satisfaction for most of the different aspects of job and job environment compared to office clerks and janitors. This appears logical since jobs providing one type of reward tend also to provide other types of rewards. For example, jobs which provide for steady employment also tend to offer chances for advancement on the

job, higher social status, and many other sources of rewards. Thus the employees' satisfactions with these different aspects of the job may be due to the fact that conditions which determine these attitudes are associated with one another. In general, jobs which are high in level, are more highly paid, less repetitive, provide more freedom and more social status than jobs low in level. Katz and Kahn (1966), in their theoretical analyses of the motivational basis of organizational performance demonstrated that, the more varied, complex, and challenging tasks are higher in worker gratification than less skilled, routine jobs. Argyle (1972) argued that, job satisfaction depends on how far a person can satisfy his particular set of needs in his job. It is obvious that, if the individual is in a job situation where his needs are met, then he tends to be satisfied with his job and evaluates the situation positively. But if the individual's needs are not met in the job situation, then his satisfaction related to his job decreases. For this reason, in the present study, the general job satisfactions of the individuals were found to increase with high level of job since they have greater opportunities to satisfy their needs. However, this study also indicated that, the higher the level of the job, the greater the intrinsic satisfactions of the individuals over and above the difference observed in general satisfaction scores. For example, managers perceived intrinsic aspects of the job such as ability utilization, achievement, variety independence, moral values, responsibility, activity, creativity

social status, authority and social service to have been more satisfying. Reported job satisfaction with respect to these factors declined with occupational level. This finding may be due to the fact that, individuals in high-level jobs can aspire the satisfaction of higher needs since their lower needs are satisfied. For this reason they may derive more satisfaction from intrinsic factors that enable them to fulfill their higher needs.

The "occupational level theory" by Darley and Hagenah in 1955 (cited in DuBrin, 1974, p.273) suggests that a person's occupational level determines whether context or content elements are involved in job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Extending their theory to motivation we can argue that a person's occupational level influences whether or not he tends to be satisfied from the fulfillment of a need. For example, giving more money to a poor individual for good performance may encourage him toward extra effort on the job. But giving more money may not have the same effect for a wealthy individual. Darley and Hagenah stated that "below some cut-off point in the occupational hierarchy, work is primarily a means to the end of survival and minimal subsistence., the tasks of the job are not in themselves (intrinsically) interesting, challenging or satisfying. Above this cut-off point, survival and subsistence needs are met, and the tasks of the job may appeal useful to intrinsic satisfactions, and needs" (cited in DuBrin, 1974, pp.273-274). From this theory we can also infer that,

there are differences in need satisfaction between job levels, higher needs are active for the individuals in high-level jobs since their lower needs are satisfied. Similarly, studies by Friedmann and Havighurst in 1962 and Morse and Weiss in 1962 (cited in Dunnette, 1976, p.1321) revealed that, there were important differences between job levels in the meaning of work. The lower level workers more often view work only as a means to keep busy or to earn a living, while the higher level workers more often view it as pleasurable in itself and as a means of fulfilling a variety of psychological needs. Herzberg (1968) argued that, intrinsic factors are task factors and serve to fulfill man's psychological needs (especially the need for growth). For this reason, in the present study, the highest satisfaction related to these factors might be expressed by the individuals in high-level jobs.

This study showed that, satisfaction increases with each higher level of job especially for the responsibility, ability utilization, authority, social status and advancement factors. This increase is best explained by the fact that individuals in high-level jobs, in this study, managers, have more freedom to use their own judgments, have more chances to do something that makes use of their abilities, have more chances to tell other people what to do. Also, these individuals have higher status in society and the organization is probably willing to give them new opportunities to advance in the organization.

These results again indicate that, the greater satisfaction of managers is due to greater opportunities to satisfy their needs related to these factors. For another interpretation of these findings, we must consider cultural norms with respect to job attitudes of different occupational groups. In our society, the individual in high-level job (e.g., manager) is expected to be more active, more powerful, more creative, more responsible and more directive. Since, reporting a high-level of job satisfaction may be thought as a socially desirable response, it is possible that individuals in high-level jobs may have the tendency to give these responses.

The present study tested a part of the Herzberg's "two-factor theory" with respect to comparisons of satisfying versus dissatisfying job factors. Herzberg's theory states that, job content elements (e.g., achievement, responsibility) are the major source of satisfaction, while job context elements (e.g., company policy and administration, working conditions and relations with other employees) are the main source of dissatisfaction. Analysis involving the measure of satisfaction related to intrinsic factors and extrinsic factors supported the third hypothesis of the study that, individuals express less satisfaction related to extrinsic factors than intrinsic factors. Although there are differences between our classifications, the intrinsic factors in the present study included most of Herzberg's "motivator" or "job content factors" and the extrinsic factors included "hygiene"

or "job context factors". Thus, the present findings seem to provide support for Herzberg's "two-factor theory".

The Herzberg study used the interview technique to measure job attitudes. In this method, subjects were asked to tell the times when they felt especially satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs and describe the cause of their feelings. This procedure could have led to biased results. First of all, Herzberg's focus was not on how much satisfaction or dissatisfaction individuals experienced, but on the feelings that derived from the description of some experiences. But, since the events producing satisfaction or dissatisfaction may affect the amount of this satisfaction, it seems necessary to include the measurement of this amount. In other words, Herzberg's study did not include the measure of general job satisfaction. Thus, in his findings, there was no evidence that, the factors described by the individuals caused general job satisfaction. For example, in 1963, Smith and Kendall (cited in Zytowski, 1968, p.421) showed that, a worker may dislike some aspects of his job, but still think that it is acceptable because "as jobs go, this is not bad". Similarly, workers may dislike the job, although it has many desirable characteristics.

In fact, there is a need for more than one method of measurement for the generality and validity of the findings. For this reason, the present study included the measurement of general job satisfaction.

The similarity between the findings of these studies can be explained by several reasons. Herzberg and his associates attribute these findings to the fact that, the "job-content factors" such as achievement, responsibility tend to produce satisfaction, but their absence does not tend to produce dissatisfaction. On the other hand, bad "job-context factors" like bad supervision, bad working conditions tend to produce dissatisfaction, but their absence does not produce satisfaction. In other words, Herzberg et al. concluded that "intrinsic factors" mainly affect satisfaction, while "extrinsic factors" mainly affect dissatisfaction, and that, satisfaction is mainly due to the "intrinsic factors", dissatisfaction to the "extrinsic factors".

The fact that, different factors affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction may be correct, but it is not the only possible interpretation.

In 1969, Rush argued that "people have an ego-defensive tendency to attribute the causes of their satisfaction to themselves, because of their need for esteem, while they are apt to blame others or external factors for their dissatisfactions" (cited in DuBrin, 1974, p.267). A study by Wall in 1973 (cited in Dunnette, 1976, p.1315) found evidence for the defensiveness thesis. He asked seventy-seven employees of a chemical process company to describe sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction for three different time periods. In each period, scores on a measure of "ego-defensiveness"

correlated significantly with the proportion of all dissatisfying factors mentioned which were "hygienes" in Herzberg's system. Since most of Herzberg's "hygiene" factors are other persons, the findings of Wall's study indicate that, Herzberg's results must be an artifact of defensiveness on the part of the employees. The present findings can also be interpreted in terms of defensiveness thesis. It is possible that differences in satisfaction related to intrinsic and extrinsic factors may come from the defensive process within the individual. First of all, intrinsic factors in the present study describe man's relationship to what he does and since individuals have an ego-defensive tendency to attribute the causes of their satisfaction to themselves, it is probable that, they might express more satisfaction related to these factors. Also, extrinsic factors describe the work environment and since individuals have a tendency to blame others for their dissatisfactions, it is probable that, they might express less satisfaction related to these factors.

Herzberg (1968) explained these results in terms of man's needs and argued that "the hygiene or maintenance events led to job dissatisfaction because of a need to avoid unpleasantness., the motivator events led to job satisfaction because of a need for growth or self-actualization" (p.75). This explanation is consistent with our findings, since the highest satisfaction related to intrinsic factors were expressed by managers whose active need is considered to be

self-actualization.

Based on our findings, we can also argue that the work roles of the individuals are important in the expression of satisfaction related to these factors. For example, in the present study, janitors expressed less satisfaction related to responsibility, authority (job-content-factors) while, they expressed high satisfaction related to social service, supervision, co-workers (job-context-factors). The possible explanation for this finding is that, individuals having lower level needs might obtain satisfaction from extrinsic or job-context factors.

These findings of this study are opposed to Herzberg's (1968) argument. Herzberg (1968) argued that, even in relatively low-level blue collar and service jobs, where presumably lower order needs are less well satisfied, the higher order needs are still the only ones seen by the workers as motivators or satisfiers. Herzberg did not consider the existence of occupational differences among employees as to reported sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. In fact, he did not replicate his findings with different workers in different job situations. Our data does not allow us to generalize Herzberg's results beyond the situation in which they were obtained.

As a result, from this study we can conclude that, the nature of satisfiers and dissatisfiers may be different in different jobs.

With respect to general job satisfactions of the individuals, the present study dealt with the factors that the individuals considered in making their job choices.

For the fourth hypothesis, individuals' focus on intrinsic and extrinsic factors in their job choices were taken as the independent variables, and their relations with general job satisfaction was hypothesized as follows: individuals who make job choices on intrinsic factors will express more general satisfaction than those who make the decision based on extrinsic factors.

The results have supported this hypothesis, since, individuals who made job choices on intrinsic bases such as intrinsic interest in the job, opportunity for advancement, were more satisfied than those who made the decision based on extrinsic factors, such as, family pressures and salary. These results are consistent with previous studies which have demonstrated that, extrinsic forces for behavior may decrease satisfaction (e.g., Staw, 1974., O'Reilly III and Caldwell, 1980).

These findings can be interpreted in terms of a "cognitive evaluation theory" (Deci, 1975). This theory states that, intrinsically motivated behavior is behavior that allows a person to feel competent and self-determining.

The studies conducted by Lepper and Greene (1975) and Wortman (1975) demonstrated the importance of self-determination as a determinant of subsequent satisfaction. Thus, we can conclude

that, if the individual chooses his job for internal reasons, such as intrinsic interest in the job, he may get satisfaction because since he is willing to perform it without any external pressure, he feels self-determining. On the other hand, if the individual chooses his job for external reason, such as salary, he may perceive that he is performing the job for this reason and does not feel self-determining, therefore his satisfaction may decrease.

Another interpretation of these findings can be done in terms of the "two-factor theory" of job satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, 1959). Although certain problems have been reported with the theory, the present study has shown that, intrinsic aspects of work such as responsibility, achievement are more satisfying than extrinsic factors such as working conditions and company policies. Thus, a job choice based on extrinsic aspects of the job may be associated with lower satisfaction than one based on more intrinsic job factors.

These findings of the present study are generally consistent with the theoretical literature on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation which suggest that the internal and external bases for the job choice decision may affect subsequent job satisfaction.

Keeping all of these facts in mind, new research might use a more complex model of job decision factors to measure the process of job choice decision.

Lastly, in the present study, the relationship between the individual's desire to leave his present job and his job satisfaction was tested. But, it might also be expected that satisfied workers would be less likely to leave their jobs than dissatisfied workers. In other words, job satisfaction may hold the individuals in the organization and job dissatisfaction may cause turnover. For the purposes of this investigation, the present study tested the relationship between the individual's tendency to leave or remain in his job and his dissatisfaction or satisfaction with it.

For the fifth hypothesis, individual's tendency to leave his present job voluntarily was taken as the independent variable, and its relation with general job satisfaction was hypothesized as follows: individuals who want to leave their jobs will express low-levels of job satisfaction than individuals who do not want to leave their jobs. The results have supported this hypothesis since the tendency of an individual's voluntarily leaving the job was inversely related to his general job satisfaction.

For the first interpretation of this finding, we must consider the fulfillment of needs as in our previous discussion. When the individual chooses a job, it must be that, it is chosen in the expectation of fulfilling some needs. If the individual's needs are not being met in the job situation, then his tendency to leave his present job will increase. With respect to the results of our first and second

hypotheses we argued that, if the individual's needs are not met in the job situation, his job satisfaction decreases. Therefore, if the individual would like to leave his job voluntarily, it is probable that his needs are not being met in the job situation which may also lead to low-level of job satisfaction.

The needs of the individuals were not measured in the present study, but depending on their answers to certain questions, we can reach some conclusions. First of all, those who would like to leave their jobs made their job choices for external reasons such as, salary, location of the job. In the case of these people the degree to which their extrinsic needs are satisfied on the job may affect their decisions. If they do not get enough money, it is probable that, they would like to change their jobs and express low-level of job satisfaction. In this study, for example, it was possible that, lower earnings might have affected the responses to the questions on job satisfaction and staying in the job. Related to this Vroom (1964) argued that "if we assume that measures of job satisfaction reflect the valence of the job to its occupant, then it follows from our model that job satisfaction should be related to the strength of the force on the person to remain in his job. The more satisfied a worker, the stronger the force on him to remain in his job and the less probability of his leaving it voluntarily" (p.175).

Finally, it is necessary to explain one thing related to this hypothesis. In the present study some individuals expressed low-levels of job satisfaction but they did not want to leave their jobs. In other words, they did not act in accordance with their degree of job satisfaction. This tendency is best explained by the fact that, most individuals do not act only on the basis of their feelings. They may consider certain factors such as availability of other jobs in making their decisions. Thus, although the correlation between amount of satisfaction and tendency to leave the present job has been consistent and significant, in order to explain the actions of individuals we need causal factors other than feelings.

Keeping all of these facts in mind, for further research on the same issue, a number of recommendations can be made. First of all, knowing the deficiencies a convenience sample creates, it will be more reliable to use a different sampling technique.

The second point is related with the measurement of job satisfaction. For example, it is possible that, individuals have developed different adaptation levels as a result of differences in their experiences in work situations. As a result of these differences some people might be easily satisfied if the work situation meets his minimal requirements. Also, since in many situations, reporting a high level of job satisfaction may be thought of as a socially desirable response, it is possible that, individuals have the tendency

to give such responses. This is especially true for individuals in certain occupational groups and certain occupational positions. In fact, certain things such as the individual's position in the organization may affect the way he fills out the satisfaction questionnaire. Thus, further research on satisfaction and future studies of satisfaction should employ multiple measures of satisfaction if possible. This kind of measurement should also include knowledge about the individual and the concept being measured.

Finally, the measurement of needs of the individuals and employee groups is necessary in order to make our interpretations more reliable.

In conclusion, it may be said that, although the primary goal of work is production, since individuals spend eight or more hours a day working, it is also important that they should enjoy their work.

This study enables us to consider the effects of different aspects of the job and the job environment on job satisfaction of employees from different occupational levels. As can be seen in the previous sections, the research hypotheses tested in this study were about the way employees feel about their present jobs and these hypotheses were confirmed. For administrative purposes it is very useful to know which sections of an organization are unhappy about what. To find this out, in the present study, employees from different

occupational levels were included and a questionnaire covering different aspects of the job and the job environment was used. It has been shown in this research that, individuals differ in the extent to which they report satisfaction with their jobs and that occupationally relevant needs must be satisfied in the organization if satisfaction is to be found. Thus, the primary function of any organization, whether political, industrial or commercial, should be to implement the means for individuals to enjoy a meaningful existence.

REFERENCES

- Argyle, M., The social psychology of work. New-York: Taplinger Publishing Co., Inc., 1972.
- Bass, B.M., and Barrett, G.V., Man work and organizations. Boston: Allyn And Bacon, Inc., 1972.
- Calder, B.J. and Staw, B.M., Interaction of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Some methodological notes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 76-80.
- Costello, T.W., Zalkind, S.S., Psychology in administration: A research orientation. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Dawis, R.V., Weiss, D.J., England, G.W. and Lofquist, L.H., Instrumentation for the theory of work adjustment (Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation: XXI). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center, Work Adjustment Project, 1966.
- Dawis, R.V., Weiss, D.J., England, G.W. and Lofquist, L.H., Manuel for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire (Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation: XXII). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center, Work Adjustment Project, 1967.

- Deci, E.L., The effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 18, 105-115.
- Deci, E.L. and Cascio, W.F., Intrinsic motivation, extrinsic reinforcement and inequity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 22, 113-120.
- Deci, E.L., Cascio, W.F. and Krusell, J., Cognitive evaluation theory and some comments on the Calder-Staw critique. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 81-85.
- DuBrin, A.J., The practice of managerial psychology, New York: Pergamon Press Inc., 1974.
- Dunnette, M.D., Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1976.
- Dyer, L. and Parker, D.F., Classifying outcomes in work motivation research: an examination of the intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 455-458.
- Harris, T.C. and Locke, E.A. Replication of white-collar-blue-collar differences in sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 369-370.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B., The motivation to work. New-York: Wiley, 1959.

Herzberg, F., Work and the nature of man. London: Crosby Lockwood Staples, 1968.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L., The social psychology of organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Korman, A.K., Industrial and organizational psychology. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

Korman, A.K., Organizational behavior, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Leavitt, H.J. and Pondy, L.R., Readings in managerial psychology. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Lepper, M.R. and Greene, D., Turning play into work: effects of adult surveillance and extrinsic rewards on children's intrinsic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 479-486.

Locke, E.A., Satisfiers and dissatisfiers among white-collar and blue-collar employees. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 58, 67-76.

O'Reilly III, C.A., and Caldwell, D.F. Job choice: The impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on subsequent satisfaction and commitment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1980, 65, 559-565.

Pritchard, R.D., Campbell, K.M. and Campbell, D.J., Effects of extrinsic financial rewards on intrinsic motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 9-15.

Ross, M., Salience of rewards and intrinsic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 245-254.

Staw, B.M., Attitudinal and behavioral consequences of changing a major organizational reward: A natural field experiment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 742-751.

Vroom, V.H., Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Vroom, V.H. and Deci, E.L., Management and motivation. Tennessee: Kingsport Press, Inc., 1982. 658.31402-V969M

Waters, L.K. and Roach, D., Job attitudes as predictors of termination and absenteeism: Consistency over time and across organizational units. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 341-342.

Wortman, C.B., Some determinants of perceived control. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 282-294.

Zytowski, D.G., Vocational behavior: Readings in theory and research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

- APPENDIX 1 -

DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLES

TABLE 1
Descriptive Characteristics of the Samples

	Managers (N: 40) %	Office Clerks (N: 40) %	Janitors (N: 40) %
CHARACTERISTICS			
SEX			
Male	77.5	37.5	65
Female	22.5	62.5	35
AGE			
20 to 29	12.5	50	45
30 to 39	37.5	37.5	37.5
40 to 49	22.5	7.5	10
50 to 59	20	2.5	-
Over 59	5	-	-
No response	2.5	2.5	7.5
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL			
No education	-	-	2.5
Literate	-	-	17.5
Primary school education	-	-	70
Junior high school education	-	10	10
High school education	17.5	57.5	-
University education	82.5	32.5	-
No response	-	-	-
LENGTH OF STAY IN THE PRESENT JOB			
Less than 1 year	20	37.5	20
1 to 2 years	10	20	17.5
2 to 3 years	12.5	5	15
3 to 4 years	7.5	2.5	5
4 to 5 years	7.5	10	7.5
More than 5 years	37.5	25	32.5
No response	5	-	2.5

	Managers (N: 40) %	Office Clerks (N: 40) %	Janitors (N: 40) %
CHARACTERISTICS			
PRIMARY REASON OF JOB CHOICE			
Intrinsic interest in the job itself	55	17.5	10
Responsibility the job provided	15	12.5	-
Opportunity for advancement	10	12.5	-
Salary provided	10	25	22.5
Family requirements	-	5	20
Location of the job	5	22.5	35
Advice of others	5	5	12.5
No response	-	-	-
MONTHLY INCOME (TL)			
Less than 30.000	-	17.5	20
31.000 to 60.000	-	27.5	50
61.000 to 90.000	12.5	17.5	27.5
91.000 to 120.000	5	15	-
121.000 to 150.000	15	12.5	-
More than 150.000	65	10	-
No response	2.5	-	2.5
DESIRE TO LEAVE THE PRESENT JOB			
Yes	7.5	15	2.5
No	92.5	85	97.5
No response	-	-	-

- APPENDIX 2 -

THE TURKISH TRANSLATION OF THE
MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE AND
THE ACCOMPANYING SHEET

Bu anket Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyal Psikoloji Bölümünde "işteki memnuniyet" konusunda yapılmakta olan bir çalışmanın bir kısmıdır ve halen bazı kuruluşlarda uygulanmaktadır. Sizin kuruluşunuz bu çalışma için seçilenlerden biridir. Çalışanların işleri ile ilgili düşüncelerini öğrenmek için en iyi yolun bunları doğrudan doğruya kendilerine sormak olduğu kanaatindeyiz.

Bu anketin amacı şimdiki işinizle ilgili düşüncelerinizi öğrenmek, işinizin sizi memnun eden ve etmeyen yönlerini belirlemektir. Sizin ve diğer birçok kişinin cevapları ışığında çalışanların işlerinde memnun oldukları ve memnun olmadıkları noktaları anlayacağımızı ve konuya ilişkin bazı hususları ortaya çıkarabileceğimizi umuyoruz.

Bu anketin değeri bunu cevaplandırmada göstereceğiniz samimiyet ve dikkate bağlıdır. Amacımız genel bir sonuç elde etmek olduğu için isminizi yazmayınız. Cevaplarınızı hiç kimse görmeyecek, anketler sadece araştırmayı yapan kişi tarafından değerlendirilecektir.

Bu anketi cevaplandırmaktan zevk duyacağınızı umuyor, yardımlarınız için şimdiden teşekkür ediyoruz.

APP-1

Aşağıdaki 1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11 numaralı sorularda size uygun seçeneği X işareti ile belli ediniz.

Sorulardan 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12'yi bırakılan boşlukları doldurarak cevaplayınız.

- 1) Cinsiyetiniz _____ KADIN _____ ERKEK
- 2) Doğum tarihiniz nedir? _____
- 3) Eğitim durumunuz nedir?
- _____ Hiç okumamış _____ Okur yazar _____ İlkokul mezunu
_____ Ortaokul mezunu _____ Lise mezunu _____ Üniversite/Yüksekokul mezunu
- 4) Mesleğiniz nedir? _____
- 5) Şu anda hangi kuruluştaki çalışıyorsunuz? _____
- 6) Bu kuruluştaki çalışmaya ne zaman başladınız? _____
- 7) Daha önce nerelerde ve ne kadar süre ile çalıştınız? _____
- 8) Şu anda çalışmakta olduğunuz işe kendi isteğiniz ile mi girdiniz?
- _____ EVET _____ HAYIR
- 9) Şimdiki işinizi seçmenizdeki en önemli neden nedir?
- _____ Yapmak istediğim bir işi yapabilme olanağımın olması,
_____ Büyük bir sorumluluk taşıma şansının verilmiş olması,
_____ İş hayatında ilerleme olanağı sağlaması,
_____ Ücret bakımından tatmin eden bir iş olması,
_____ Ailemin isteklerine uygun bir iş olması,
_____ Çalışma yerinin bana uygun olması,
_____ Başkalarının tavsiyesi üzerine bu işe girdim.
- 10) Şimdiki işinizden ayda ne kadar net ücret alıyorsunuz?
- _____ 30.000 TL'sından az _____ 31.000-60.000 TL _____ 61.000-90.000 TL
_____ 91.000-120.000 TL _____ 121.-150.000 TL _____ 150.000 TL'sından fazla
- 11) Şu sıralarda şimdiki işinizden ayrılmayı düşünüyor musunuz?
- _____ EVET _____ HAYIR
- 12) ("EVET" ise:) Sebebini belirtir misiniz?
- _____

Aşağıda işinizin çeşitli yönleri ile ilgili cümleler bulunmaktadır. Her cümleyi dikkatle okuyarak işinizin o cümlede belirtilen yönünden ne derece memnun olduğunuzu bir X işareti ile belli ediniz.

Her cümleye cevap verirken "bu yönden işimden ne derece memnunum" diye kendinize sorun.

ÇM'un anlamı bu yönden işimden çok memnunum.

M'un anlamı bu yönden işimden memnunum.

K'in anlamı bu yönden işimden memnun olup olmadığımı kararsızım.

MD'in anlamı bu yönden işimden memnun değilim.

HMD'in anlamı bu yönden işimden hiç memnun değilim.

ŞİMDİKİ İŞİMDEN:

	HMD	MD	K	M	ÇM
1) Beni her zaman meşgul etmesi bakımından	—	—	—	—	—
2) Tek başıma çalışma olanağımın olması bakımından	—	—	—	—	—
3) Ara sıra değişik şeyler yapabilme şansımın olması bakımından	—	—	—	—	—
4) Toplumda "saygın bir kişi" olma şansını bana vermesi bakımından	—	—	—	—	—
5) Amirimin emrindeki kişileri idare tarzı açısından	—	—	—	—	—
6) Amirimin karar vermedeki yeteneği bakımından	—	—	—	—	—
7) Vicdanıma aykırı olmayan şeyler yapabilme şansımın olması açısından	—	—	—	—	—
8) Bana sabit bir iş sağlaması bakımından	—	—	—	—	—
9) Başkaları için birşeyler yapabilme olanağına sahip olmam açısından	—	—	—	—	—
10) Kişilere ne yapacaklarını söyleme şansına sahip olmam bakımından	—	—	—	—	—
11) Kendi yeteneklerimi kullanarak birşeyler yapabilme şansımın olması açısından	—	—	—	—	—
12) İş ile ilgili alınan kararların uygulanmaya konması bakımından	—	—	—	—	—
13) Yaptığım iş ve karşılığında aldığım ücret bakımından	—	—	—	—	—

ŞİMDİKİ İŞİMDEN

	HMD	MD	K	M	ÇM
14) İş içinde terfi olanağımın olması açısından	---	---	---	---	---
15) Kendi kararlarımı uygulama serbestliğini bana vermesi bakımından	---	---	---	---	---
16) İşimi yaparken kendi yöntemlerimi kullanabilme şansını bana sağlaması bakımından	---	---	---	---	---
17) Çalışma şartları bakımından	---	---	---	---	---
18) Çalışma arkadaşlarımla birbirleri ile anlaşmaları açısından	---	---	---	---	---
19) Yaptığım iyi bir iş karşılığında takdir edilmem açısından	---	---	---	---	---
20) Yaptığım iş karşılığında duyduğum başarı hissinden	---	---	---	---	---