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ABSTRACT

The Herzberg two-factor theory of job satisfaction states that two groups of factors exist in the work situation. These factors have different consequences for job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. The so-called 'intrinsic' factors influence job satisfaction but not job dissatisfaction, whereas the so-called 'extrinsic' factors influence job dissatisfaction but not job satisfaction.

The purpose of this research project is to test the validity of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction with a sample of professional social workers. A correlational study method is utilized. The literature suggests that the two-factor theory tends to be upheld when the Herzberg storytelling method is used to study it, but not to be supported when other methods are used. The literature also suggests that the theory operates differently for different occupational groups.

This study was conducted with 28 social workers employed at the Children's Aid Society of The County of
Essex, Windsor, Ontario. The study participants met with the researcher in small group meetings of three or four people to complete the study instruments, which were contained in a three-part questionnaire. The first section of the questionnaire requested demographic information. The second section consisted of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) which measured the intrinsic factors of 'work', and 'promotions' and the extrinsic factors of 'pay', 'supervision', and 'co-workers'. In the third section, information was obtained about the respondents' overall satisfaction-dissatisfaction, overall satisfaction, and overall dissatisfaction as measured by the G.M. Faces Scales.

The intrinsic and extrinsic factors measured by the JDI were correlated with the general satisfaction measures on the G.M. Faces Scales. The associations between the intrinsic and extrinsic factors and the general satisfaction measures had been postulated in the form of six hypotheses. Four of the hypotheses were based on predictions from the two-factor theory; two of the hypotheses suggested alternative explanations for the operation of the factors.

Statistical analysis was performed using the SPSS sub-programmes of Frequencies and Pearson Corr. The hypothesized relationships were tested, and the data were analyzed for other statistically significant relationships.

The results showed no support for the hypothesized relationships. This finding also held when the hypotheses
were tested within sub-groups of the sample consisting of team leaders, team members, male workers, and female workers.

The data indicated that Essex County Children's Aid social workers tended to experience a generally positive feeling of satisfaction with their jobs. They expressed moderate to high levels of satisfaction with the areas of 'work', 'pay', 'supervision', and 'co-workers'. The most dissatisfaction was expressed in the area of 'opportunities for promotion'.

Among the other findings there was an indication that workers with formal social work training tended to report more satisfaction with the nature of their work; and that as the age of the workers increased so did their satisfaction in all of the job satisfaction areas which were measured. The findings showed that as the length of time employed increased, there was a tendency for workers to be more satisfied with their colleagues. As well, there was a tendency towards increased satisfaction among all workers the longer they had been employed at the Essex County C.A.S., and the longer they had been in their present position.

In this study, the two-factor theory failed to find any support for its operation as predicted. It is concluded that the two-factor theory does not provide a suitable framework to explain the job satisfaction of
social workers. It is suggested that this study be replicated using alternative data collection methods with a larger cross-section of the social work community.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Since it was first published in 1959 the Herzberg two-factor theory has been surrounded by continuing controversy on the methods used to study its operation. As well, there have been calls to extend the testing of the theory to more occupations and "to realize the need for amalgamating more intensive investigation within single occupation" (Robinson et al., 1969, p. 66). Therefore, in order to add to the general knowledge on the theory's operation this study tests six hypotheses about the relationships between job variables. These hypotheses are developed from the two-factor theory and are tested with an occupational group which has not been involved previously in such a correlational study. This study also has the objective of contributing to the refinement and development of theoretical formulations on job attitudes among social workers, about whom there is a dearth of information at the present time.

Outline of the Study

The discussion of this study has begun with a
paragraph on the purpose of the study. In the introductory chapter there is also a discussion on the development of the study problem by the researcher. As well, the chapter provides an introduction to the concept of job satisfaction, its definition, and the importance of studying job satisfaction. Chapters II, III, and IV present a three-part review of the literature. In Chapter II Herzberg's study, from which the two-factor theory originated, is described. Chapter III outlines the concepts and terms of the theory. Significant findings reported in the literature are reviewed in Chapter IV. Each of these study findings purports to support or refute the two-factor theory or some aspect of it.

The research design of this study is discussed in Chapter V. Included in the chapter are descriptions of the subjects, the data collection method, the hypotheses and the operational definitions.

The analysis of the study findings are discussed in Chapters VI, VII, and VIII. Chapter VI provides descriptive information about the sample. The findings relating to the study hypotheses are found in Chapter VII, and Chapter VIII contains information on the significant relationships found among the study data.

A summary of the study findings is presented in Chapter IX. Suggestions for further study are also given in the final chapter.
Problem Formulation

In this researcher's experience much of the research in social work has focused on the worker/client relationship, on the attitudes and perceptions of selected groups of social workers, or on the needs and problems of designated client groups. There seems to have been little attention given to the relationship between social workers and the organizations in which they work, or their functioning in relation to any number of administrative problems. In particular, this researcher has found that the extensive study of job satisfaction has given virtually no attention to workers in the human service professions.

In this researcher's review of the literature on job satisfaction the Herzberg two-factor theory emerged as an important theoretical formulation. Therefore, in choosing a problem which was in accordance with the generally recognized considerations for formulating a significant problem, this researcher chose a problem based on the theoretical framework of the Herzberg two-factor theory of job satisfaction.

The method which is used to study the theory and the occupational group on which the theory is studied both seem to exert an important influence on the theory's findings. This study uses a sample of social workers and
a correlational study method. This researcher is not aware of any correlational study which has been undertaken with social workers previously. The study adheres to the basic concepts of the two-factor theory. The study hypotheses have been developed from the relationships between variables predicted by the theory. Therefore, this study may be said to be designed to fill a gap in the research on the theory which has been done up to this time.

This study's findings can be considered cumulative with previous study findings; they will permit some generalization, and add to general research knowledge on the two-factor theory.

**Historical Perspective**

Work has traditionally been important to people for self-respect and meaning in life. However, the nature of work in contemporary North American society is markedly different from what it has been in previous eras. As the work force has become more educated they have become more critical and demanding; people now expect work to provide more than just material rewards. There is a feeling that work should be a source of pride and contribute to personal values. According to Kanter (1978) surveys of work attitudes indicate that many people want an organization of work which is congruent with what they would like to do in the rest of their life.
During the past four decades considerable attention has been given to the various aspects of the job that can contribute to the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of employees. Investigations in this area have shown an increasing concern in work as a source of non-material reward, and in assessing the impact of interesting and meaningful work on employee job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Concept of Job Satisfaction

There seems to be sufficient evidence to support the idea of a general factor of job satisfaction, though it may consist of a number of smaller components. Argyle (1972) reports on several recent studies showing the components all correlate to form a general factor of job satisfaction, "rather analogous to the general factor of intelligence" (p. 224).

Mikes (1965) developed Vroom's idea that job satisfaction is an attitude toward the job situation (Vroom, 1964, p. 99) into a concept of several attitudes each relating to a discriminable aspect of the job situation. Mikes' formulation of job satisfaction related it not only to variables present in the job situation, but also to past experiences of the worker which influence his frame of reference and expectations. Smith (1967) supports the view that job satisfaction is
an effective response of the worker to his job resulting from the worker's experience on the job in relation to what he wants or expects from it. Locke (1970) also supports this view adding his thought that satisfaction is a value response which relates to the worker's perception of the relationship between what his job offers and what he wants from his job.

**Definition of Job Satisfaction**

After their extensive review of the job satisfaction literature, Herzberg and his colleagues concluded that "job satisfaction itself cannot be defined precisely" (Herzberg et al., 1957, p. 2). Despite Herzberg's conclusion it is necessary to provide a working definition. In this study the terms "job satisfaction" and "overall job satisfaction" will refer to satisfactions deriving from the total job situation, and "satisfaction with the work itself" will be used to refer to satisfactions deriving from actually performing the work. This terminology has been used by many researchers (e.g., Ewen, 1965; Friedlander, 1964; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Locke, Smith, Kendall, Hulin, & Miller, 1964).

**The Study of Job Satisfaction**

Why study job satisfaction? On a basic level this question can be answered by taking a look at the
place of work in people's daily lives. When we look around us it seems clear that work occupies an important place in the lives of a great many people. A substantial portion of people's lives is concerned with actually working, or thinking about their work, or in transporting themselves to and from their place of employment. On humanitarian grounds alone there is justification in seeking to understand better what contributes to making work a satisfying experience for people. People should find pleasure in the work which occupies half of their daily lives.

Job satisfaction not only influences people at their jobs, it has a bearing on their off-the-job lives too. Armstrong (1971) in concluding that job satisfaction remained a vital concept for future research quoted from Thompson (1963) as follows:

Inasmuch as a job provides outlets for personality characteristics and basic needs, job satisfaction is conceived as having an important effect upon success and satisfaction in nonjob areas of life. (Thompson, 1963) (Armstrong, 1971, p. 65).

Research into job satisfaction has implications for organizational practices in that it has the potential for contributing to revisions in the practical application of administrative methods. Administrators in every organization can authenticate the costs to their enterprise which are attendant upon a lack of job satisfaction among
their employees. Staff turnover, lack of enthusiasm, and low efficiency are but a few of a long list of such costs. The gaining of insight into how to cut organizational costs through administrative practice changes is an important consideration in favour of pursuing research on job satisfaction.

Summary

This chapter provided an introduction to the concept of job satisfaction, its definition, and the importance of continuing to study job satisfaction. The development of a significant study problem by this researcher and a statement of the specific purpose of the study were also included in this chapter. Following the purpose of the study there was an outline of what was to be discussed in each chapter on the study.
CHAPTER II

DEVELOPMENT OF THE TWO-FACTOR THEORY

The purpose of this chapter is to provide some background information on the Herzberg et al. (1959) study which led to the formulation of the two-factor theory. As the theory is often criticized as being a product of the method by which it was developed, it is important to understand how this development took place. In addition, it is the researcher's intent to provide some insight into Herzberg's philosophical frame of reference on the nature of man. Herzberg's beliefs about the nature of man were a significant influence in developing his theory.

Background to the Original Study

Prior to the research which led to the drafting of the two-factor theory, Herzberg and his associates — Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell — undertook a comprehensive review of the literature on job attitudes from 1900 to 1955. This review was published in a book entitled *Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion*.

During their literature review, Herzberg et al. made two observations which had an important influence on their subsequent research. First of all, they noted a
difference in the primacy of factors depending upon whether the study focused on things the worker liked about his job or things he disliked. This finding suggested to Herzberg and his colleagues the existence of one set of factors which acted as "satisfiers" and another set which acted as "dissatisfiers". Their second observation had to do with the characteristics of "job attitude" studies. They found that demographic studies had paid attention to variations in job attitudes among many different populations, and factors affecting job attitudes had been identified and their relative potential evaluated. Also, studies of the effects of job attitudes had been carried out. Herzberg et al. concluded that a weakness in this previous work on job attitudes had been its' fragmentary nature. They perceived the problem as needing "an investigation of job attitudes, in toto, a study in which factors, attitudes, and effects would be investigated simultaneously" (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 11).

Herzberg's Study Hypotheses

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman based their study design on a unit concept of the factors that affect attitudes, the attitudes themselves, and the effects of these attitudes. With this basic frame of reference they set out to investigate whether different kinds of factors were responsible for bringing about job satisfaction
and job dissatisfaction, and to derive information concerning relationships among the measurables, factors, and effects present in the design. These study questions were posited in the form of two hypotheses:

1) The factors leading to positive attitudes and those leading to negative attitudes would differ.
2) The factors and effects involved in long-range sequences of events would differ from those in short-range sequences. (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 29).

Traditional Procedures

In order to study the factors in job attitudes and the basic question of what the worker wants from his job Herzberg et al. identified three ways of developing answers which had been used in previous research. The first method consisted of presenting workers with an a priori list of factors for them to rate or rank as to desirability. For example, such a list could include factors like wages, supervision, company and management policies, etc. A second method asked workers to indicate spontaneously what it was they liked or disliked about their jobs; and then carry out an analysis of the responses to determine the existence of some of the factors listed. The third method required the administration of multiple-item inventories or questionnaires which allowed the application of statistical techniques to derive factors whose content could be deduced from a
study of the interrelationships among the items.

Method Chosen

Herzberg et al. carried out their study using a variation on the third method. Instead of a multiple-item inventory or questionnaire, data were gathered using a variation of Flanagan's 'critical incident' methodology. Flanagan's work (1954) had focused on the evaluation of job performance with the use of critical incidents based on a need to specify good and bad behaviour on the job. The criteria were external to the psychological processes of reporting individuals. But, as Herzberg explained: "In our approach the choice of incidents is based on a need to specify good or bad behavior on the job" (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 12).

This approach to the study of job attitudes is based on the two assumptions that job attitudes vary for each individual from one period to another, and that people are capable of placing their own feelings about their jobs on a continuum, identifying the extremes of the continuum, and reporting on those extreme situations (Herzberg et al., 1959). The work of Hersey (1936) was cited by Herzberg as providing evidence that workers can identify mood swings and report on them systematically.

Herzberg et al. chose the individual or idiographic approach for their study. The approach began with the
premise that the relationship among the components of the factors-attitudes-effects complex should be studied within the individual. There was an attempt to determine how given kinds of factors lead to high or low morale and the consequences of the morale state as indicated by various criterion measures. They felt a likely way to do this would be to obtain from the individual accounts of his periods of high and low morale. According to Herzberg:

In getting these accounts we would be able to find out what goes on during those times that lead to higher or lower morale and what the reactions of the respondent are. Thus in analyzing the reports of such periods in an individual's life we would be able to delineate the factors-attitudes-effects complex. (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 12).

Herzberg et al. set out to identify factors from an analysis of the forces reported to affect morale during specific episodes in the subjects' lives. The effects of job attitudes was assessed by the worker himself. It was Herzberg's contention that the worker, with a reasonable degree of self-insight and willingness to communicate could:

best tell whether his work suffered or benefited during the period he is describing, whether he was thinking about leaving his job because of his attitudes toward it, and whether his interactions with other people or his own adjustment were affected. (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 16).
Data Collection Procedure Used in Herzberg's Study

The semi-structured interview was the type of interviewing technique chosen for the data collection. The questions were designed to get the required factors—attitudes—effects information but the interviewers were allowed to raise, in addition to the previously specified questions, any lines of inquiry suggested during the course of the interview. Subjects were given the freedom to report on the kinds of events they wanted to report. In explaining this data collection technique, Herzberg says:

We decided to ask people to tell us stories about times when they felt exceptionally good or bad about their jobs. We decided that from these stories we could discover the kinds of situations leading to negative or positive attitudes toward the job and the effects of these attitudes. (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 17).

The basic question on the interview schedule was as follows:

Think of a time in the past when you felt especially good or bad about your job. It may have been on this job or any other. Can you think of such a high or low point in your feelings about your job? Please tell me about it. (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 20).

Following the question there were probes designed to clarify the nature of the events and the subjects' personal reactions to those events. Usually, subjects were asked to provide one or more sequences of events
for satisfied and dissatisfied periods of job morale. Altogether then, the subjects reported periods of high job satisfaction and periods of low job satisfaction, the factors which caused satisfaction or dissatisfaction, the attitudes at the time, and the effects on their individual adjustment.

To summarize, the study design was characterized by the request made to the subjects that they identify periods of time in their own history when their feelings about their jobs were without a doubt either higher or lower than usual.

Data Analysis Used in Herzberg’s Study

The stories relayed by the study respondents, about high and low periods during their work history, were analyzed by Herzberg et al. on two levels. The first level of analysis identified the actual objective events which had been reported by the respondents. This consisted of a description of the person telling the story, a comprehensive description of the sequence of events, and a description of the objective situations in the sequence of events. These were referred to as the first-level factors. The second level of analysis focused on the perceptions of the person speaking and a description of the behavioural and other effects of his attitudes. The researchers wanted to determine the
reasons why the particular event reported led to a change in the respondents' feelings about their jobs.

**Herzberg's Study Findings**

The pattern which Herzberg identified among the data provided the raw material for the two-factor theory. Herzberg identified the commonalities among the factors which people had reported as making them happy or unhappy. He found that the factors which made people happy were all related to what people did, their job content. Contrariwise, he found that what made people unhappy was related to their job environment or job context. Herzberg summarized his analysis as follows:

What makes people happy is what they do or the way they're utilized, and what makes people unhappy is the way they're treated. (Herzberg, 1976, p. 302).

In assessing the subjective reactions of respondents as to why various factors affected employees the way they did, Herzberg found that for the job satisfied there were feelings of psychological growth and fulfillment of self-actualizing needs. Whereas, for job dissatisfaction, there were feelings about being treated unfairly; they found the situation unpleasant or painful. Herzberg explained these findings as:

An approach-avoidance dichotomy with respect to job adjustment. A need to avoid unpleasant job environments led to job dissatisfaction; the need for self-realization led to job satisfaction when
the opportunity for self-realization was afforded. (Herzberg & Hamlin, 1961, p. 396).

Historical Context

In order to better understand Herzberg's frame of reference in developing the two-factor theory, some attention will now be given to Herzberg's perception of history and of how Maslow's need hierarchy relates to his own ideas about need fulfillment.

Concept of Man

Before examining Herzberg's view of the historical development of the relation between people and their work, Herzberg's conceptualization of the opposing concepts of man's nature are presented.

Herzberg's 'Adam' concept of man was derived from the notion that man's sinfulness originated "as a sentence of suffering from Adam's fall" (Herzberg, 1967, p. 49). This view regarded man's overriding need to be the avoidance of pain-provoking events in the environment. In other words, man's basic motivation was the avoidance of pain.

Herzberg's 'Abraham' concept of man presented a much more optimistic view of mankind. People were regarded as capable because they had been given innate potential, and because of this innate potential "God has chosen him (man) to be His emissary on earth" (Herzberg,
Herzberg has interpreted history in the context of the particular idea about the nature of man which prevailed at each age. He has stated his view that "dominant societal bodies have capitalized . . . on convenient definitions of human nature in order to serve their organizational needs" (Herzberg, 1967, p. 12).

In general terms, Herzberg outlined history in the following way.

Middle Ages

During this period the church attempted to unify all life - politically and economically. The church exerted tremendous control over the life of the individual and the family. People were constantly reminded of their sinful nature and the dominant concept was that of the natural depravity of man, - in other words, Herzberg regarded the 'Adam' view of human nature as prevailing.

Renaissance

The 15th century saw the rise of a middle class of merchants and bankers who began to defy religious and state authorities. This rising interest in the secular world lead to a change in the definition of human nature. According to Herzberg:

Man was in revolt against the idea that it was sinful to obtain satisfaction from human achievements. Renaissance men felt that human accomplishments were worthwhile when they gave men pleasure, which was yet another manifestation of God's will.
as essential to man's well-being as was the need for salvation. (Herzberg, 1967, p. 22).

The Renaissance brought about a refocusing from the after-life to the here and now and the quality of life on earth.

Industrial Revolution

Between the 18th and 19th centuries in Europe industry emerged as the dominant organization. Industry's philosophy of 'laissez-faire' economics dominated society; each worker bargained for his labour in the open market. Employers had no obligation beyond the wages paid. To balance the concept of individual freedom there were the unifying principles of the Protestant ethic which Herzberg interpreted as necessitating revisions to the traditional conception of the nature of man.

A later phase of Puritanism provided a religious sanction for the gathering of wealth. People began to feel they had wealth because they were good people. Herzberg stated that "virtue was defined as economic success, and economic success was defined as evidence of virtue" (Herzberg, 1967, p. 32).

To supplement these religious interpretations of human nature Social Darwinism provided a scientific explanation, and put an aura of scientific sanctity on the accumulation of wealth. According to Social Darwinism, "Those organizations and individuals that survived competition were evidently the hardiest - they had the proper
mutation for survival" (Herzberg, 1967, p. 34).

The 20th Century

The redefinition of human nature engendered by the Industrial Revolution resulted in a mere alteration in "the contents of man's avoidance needs" (Herzberg, 1967, p. 31). Herzberg identified this as taking place through the emergence of what he termed "welfare capitalism" - humanitarian considerations of the worker by employers in response to fears of radicalism. This was manifest in a form of paternalism with attention being paid to the environmental needs of workers, that is, treating them better, paying them more, etc.

The 20th century provided a number of explanations about the nature of human beings. Herzberg mentioned Taylor's "mechanistic man" - the view that workers needed efficiency, economic gain and humane physical treatment. All that the workers wanted was to be utilized efficiently, with a minimum of effort; workers were happy when they did not have to make decisions or have responsibilities of management.

Elton Mayo and others developed the idea of "emotional man" - a concept which enlarged on the ideas of scientific management. The manager was rational, he was able to control his emotions. The worker, on the other hand, was seen as being irrational and easily victimized by his emotions, and "in the final analysis,
the worker was 'by nature' inferior to the manager (Herzberg, 1967, p. 38).

Herzberg saw Freudian theory as fitting in nicely with these ideas. An interpretation of Freudian theory said that irrational adult behaviour might be understood as a manifestation of unresolved childhood needs. The logic went something to the effect that the worker was the victim of his emotions, emotions stem from childhood, therefore the worker was childish or child-like.

In light of this historical framework, Herzberg concluded that modern North American society had developed to the point where none of these previous ideas about man's nature were acceptable any longer, although he saw a continuing emphasis on people's basic material needs. Herzberg concluded that it was necessary to refocus attention on man's intrinsic needs - those congruent with his 'Abraham' concept of man. Herzberg felt that even though man's 'Adam' nature had been considered important historically, it was no longer relevant.

**Maslow's Needs Hierarchy**

Maslow's theory of human motivation arranged needs in an hierarchical order. At the bottom of the scale were man's physiological needs such as the need for food and shelter. Following these, higher on the scale, were the safety needs, needs of belongingness and love, and the
need for self-esteem. At the very top of the hierarchy Maslow placed the need for self-actualization — the intrinsic personal worth from one's own sense of accomplishment. According to the theory, man progressed up the ladder of needs in such a way that when a lower order need had been met man proceeded to try to find fulfillment for the next order need up the hierarchy. Once a lower order need was satisfied, it would no longer act as a motivator of behaviour, the result would be to put the individual under the stress of the next higher need in the hierarchy.

In analyzing the Maslow model and relating it to his own work, Herzberg found fault with the fact that the Maslow system failed to recognize that lower order needs never got satisfied. Herzberg felt there was a continuing demand for physiological and security guarantees, which in modern society manifest itself through such things as a never-ending search for status symbols. Further, Herzberg disagreed with Maslow's idea which stressed the material needs of man were primary to his more "human" moral motives. Herzberg saw biological and psychological needs of man as being parallel systems, but with an historical trend toward an increasing importance of higher order needs. Thus, Herzberg's statement, "today self-actualizing, self-fulfilling, achievement, and growth needs have come to the fore" (Herzberg, 1965, p. 367).
Summary

This chapter described the storytelling recall method Herzberg developed to study the factors that affect job attitudes, the attitudes themselves, and the effects of the attitudes in the work situation. It was revealed that Herzberg's study indicated a pattern of two factors operating. The one type of factor caused worker satisfaction and the other type caused worker dissatisfaction. This chapter also presented Herzberg's concept of man's dual nature, with one aspect being motivated by the desire to avoid pain and the other aspect by man's desire to realize his innate potential. This chapter provided some insight into Herzberg's philosophical frame of reference through an introduction of Herzberg's interpretation of history and his criticism of Maslow's needs hierarchy.
CHAPTER III

THE TWO-FACTOR THEORY

This chapter presents the ideas and concepts of the two-factor theory on which this researcher's study is based. The discussion will focus on Herzberg's intrinsic and extrinsic job factors, and their two-dimensional nature. In order to facilitate this discussion, attention will be given to the terminology used and the intrinsic and extrinsic factors will be defined and described.

Terminology

Herzberg's two classes of variables have been labeled at different times and by different researchers as 1) satisfiers and dissatisfiers; 2) motivation and hygiene variables; 3) content and context variables; and 4) intrinsic and extrinsic variables. As this study presents an empirical test of Herzberg's prediction of how the variables or factors will operate in an employment situation, the researcher believes the most neutral term should be used. The researcher has chosen to use the intrinsic/extrinsic classification although the content/context classification would have been just as suitable. The satisfiers/dissatisfiers classification and the motivation/hygiene classification were decided against.
because they seem to imply that the factors operate as predicted by Herzberg. The researcher believes this is a subjective bias which should be avoided.

A number of researchers have adopted the intrinsic-extrinsic terminology. For example, Graen (1966), who recommended the intrinsic/extrinsic classification because he found the satisfiers or intrinsic factors to be more potent affectors of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Graen's finding is tested in one of this study's hypotheses.

It should be noted that throughout this paper, whenever quotations are used from reference sources, the terminology chosen by that particular author will be utilized.

The Factors

The Herzberg study on job attitudes identified 16 distinctive factors. Herzberg characterized these factors as "a kind of shorthand for summarizing the 'objective' events that each respondent described" (Herzberg & Hamlin, 1963, p. 385). Six of the factors Herzberg identified as being intrinsic to the job and as leading to job satisfaction. Ten factors he labeled 'hygiene factors' and described them as being extrinsic to the job and as leading to job dissatisfaction.
Intrinsic Factors

The researchers in the Herzberg study, upon analyzing their data, identified two consistent patterns. They found that the high job satisfaction sequences contained mainly the intrinsic factors which related to the 'actual job'; they all seemed to describe man's relationship to what he did. Intrinsic factors were associated with job content, achievement on a task, recognition for task achievement, the nature of the task, responsibility for a task, and professional advancement or growth in task capability. The specific factors which were placed in this category were: 1) achievement; 2) recognition; 3) work itself; 4) responsibility; 5) advancement; and 6) growth.

Herzberg et al. interpreted these findings to mean that job satisfaction was determined by the feelings that the individual had to the content of his job, for example, his feelings towards a particular task. Herzberg et al. concluded further that the intrinsic factors, those which contributed to job satisfaction, provided for the human need to exercise one's capabilities as an instrumentality for psychological growth.

Extrinsic Factors

The second consistent pattern Herzberg et al. identified was a group of factors in the job dissatisfaction sequences which they referred to as hygenes or
extrinsic factors. Herzberg et al. identified these factors as being environmental and preventive and thus used the term 'hygiene factors' "in analogy with its medical usage of environmental and preventive" (Herzberg & Hamlin, 1965, p. 387). These factors were: 1) company policy and administration; 2) supervision; 3) relationship with supervisor; 4) work conditions; 5) salary; 6) relationship with peers; 7) personal life; 8) relationship with subordinates; 9) status; and 10) security.

Burke (1966) has characterized the extrinsic factors as those factors which tend "to represent environmental factors descriptive of the job context" (p. 317). Herzberg et al. found that when these environmental factors were satisfactory their study respondents were not dissatisfied; neither were they satisfied. Herzberg et al. concluded that extrinsic factors could not provide satisfaction and that the best that they could do when they were satisfactory was to take care of man's need to avoid unpleasant environments. According to Herzberg, such avoidance of unpleasantness was "an intrinsic property of all organisms, ... dictated by the laws of biological evolution" (Herzberg, 1965, p. 396).

Extrinsic factors are frequently referred to as maintenance factors. Herzberg explained the use of the term in relation to the idea that extrinsic factors primarily served to "maintain the employee rather than
to spur him to positive behavior and feelings towards his job" (Herzberg, 1965, p. 396).

Extrinsic factors were identified as being short-lived; Herzberg and Hamlin (1961) conceptualized the extrinsic factors as having the quality of opiates for meaningless work. Relief from job dissatisfaction caused by extrinsic factors had only a temporary effect, this added "to the necessity for more frequent attention to the job environment" (Herzberg & Hamlin, 1961, p. 393). Explaining this property of the extrinsic factors Herzberg said:

With the hygiene factors, you've got to have as much as, or more than, you had before to notice any difference, but with the motivators, you do not have to have as much as before to know the difference and feel the growth. (Herzberg, 1976, p. 304)

The Nature of the Factors

The nature of intrinsic and extrinsic factors are key concepts in the two-factor theory which provides the theoretical framework for this study. Therefore, the researcher feels that it is necessary to provide some further elaboration on the factors in the form of a direct quotation from Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman's book, The Motivation to Work. The book was published in 1959 and presents the details of their study on job attitudes.

The intrinsic and extrinsic factors are described
as follows:

The three factors of work itself, responsibility, and advancement stand out strongly as the major factors involved in producing high job attitudes. Their role in producing poor job attitudes is by contrast extremely small. Contrariwise, company policy and administration, supervision (both technical and interpersonal relationships), and working conditions represent the major job dissatisfiers with little potency to affect job attitudes in a positive direction. . . . Poor working conditions, bad company policies and administration, and bad supervision will lead to job dissatisfaction. Good company policies, good administration, good supervision, and good working conditions will not lead to positive job attitudes. In opposition to this . . . recognition, achievement, interesting work, responsibility, and advancement all lead to positive job attitudes. Their absence will much less frequently lead to job dissatisfaction. (Herzberg, et al., 1959, pp. 81-82)

Two-Factor Theory Concepts

Herzberg's two-factor theory does not exist in total isolation from the work of other organizational theorists. Herzberg's ideas may be grouped together with those of the humanistic organization theorists. With this frame of reference, the following section of the paper continues to elaborate on the two-factor theory by describing its important concepts, its applicability, and some of its possible consequences. Attention is also given to the particular interpretation of the theory which will be used in this study.
Humanistic Orientation

In a 1973 article in the *Public Administration Review* (January/February) Herzberg (1959, 1966) is cited as one of the major proponents of the humanistic school, along with Argyris (1957), Bennis (1966), Maslow (1954, 1965), McGregor (1960), and Likert (1961, 1967). The two main arguments which characterize humanistic organization theorists, according to Gibson and Teasley (1973), are that the satisfaction of human needs will lead to higher on-the-job performance, and that a primary function of the organization would be the satisfaction of member needs. In the opinion of this researcher, Herzberg may be regarded as exemplary of the humanistic school when he writes:

> The primary function (sic) of any organization, . . . should be to implement the means for man to enjoy a meaningful existence. For the first time in history we have the opportunity to satisfy man's inherent wants. (Herzberg, 1966, np. x)

Two-Dimensionality

The traditional theory of job satisfaction is based on the premise that a variable in the work situation can cause both job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Herzberg's two-factor theory challenges traditional theory with concepts which are derived from his 1959 study data.

Herzberg conceives of the concept of work adjustment as two components which represent two distinct dimensions. These two components of work adjustment -
the feelings of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are not identified as opposites but rather as two distinct dimensions; a separate set of factors needs to be considered for each. In other words, job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are seen as two separate and parallel continua; the opposite of job satisfaction is 'no' job satisfaction; the opposite of job dissatisfaction is 'no' job dissatisfaction.

Herzberg's theory says that the intrinsic factors involved in providing employee job satisfaction are 'separate' and 'distinct' from the extrinsic factors that lead to employee job dissatisfaction. The distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic factors is based on the assumption that these two sets of factors are independent. Just as the sets of factors are regarded as not being opposite to one another, so Herzberg draws conclusions about other aspects of the relationship between the intrinsic and extrinsic factors. One set of factors is not the absence of the other; neither is one set of factors primary to the other.

A summary of the two-dimensionality concept is given by Lindsay, Marks, and Gorlow (1967) as follows:

Conceptually then Herzberg posits two unipolar continua (satisfaction, dissatisfaction) which are unrelated and state that the variance in satisfaction is due to the presence and/or level of motivators, and the variance in dissatisfaction is due to the presence and/or level of hygienes. (p. 331)
The two-dimensionality concept is crucial to the two-factor theory. Reviewing Herzberg's co-authored book *The Motivation to Work*, Kahn (1961) comments:

Perhaps the single most important finding from this work is that satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the job are caused by different factors rather than by varying amounts of the same factor. (R. L. Kahn, Review of *Motivation to Work*, *Contemporary Psychology*, January 1961, p. 47)

Need Systems

The two-factor theory involves two different need systems. Herzberg hypothesizes the two opposite need systems as a part of all human nature and as an explanation for the differential effect of the two kinds of work factors.

The first set of basic needs are consistent with Herzberg's 'Adam' view of man. These needs are related to the environmental needs of 'man as animal' - that is, man's need to avoid pain. Herzberg identifies such needs as the avoidance of loss of life, hunger, pain, sexual deprivation and other primary drives as well as learned drives which become conditioned to the basic biological needs. As an example, Herzberg suggests that hunger - a basic biological drive - makes it necessary to earn money, and then money becomes a specific drive for the person. According to the two-factor theory, the stimuli which induce pain-avoidance behaviour - such as earning money - are found in the job environment, that is, in the
extrinsic factors (Herzberg, 1968, p. 57).

Herzberg's 'Abraham' concept of man is in accordance with the second set of needs. These needs Herzberg regards as distinctive human needs related to the tasks with which people are uniquely involved. They entail the ability of people to achieve and, through achievement, to experience psychological growth. The two-factor theory proposes that the stimuli for growth needs are tasks that induce growth. In the work situation these stimuli are part of the job content - that is, they are found in the intrinsic factors.

Universality

Herzberg presents the two-factor theory as being applicable throughout society, operating in the same manner for any individual in any job under any circumstances. Commenting on the operation of the intrinsic and extrinsic factors on job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, Herzberg says: "Age, job tenure, place of work and other demographic variables have no substantial effect on these relationships" (Herzberg & Hamlin, 1965, p. 385).

Herzberg also claims his theory is applicable in different national contexts. According to Herzberg (1976), the problems of managing people in the work situation are common to the U.S.A. and to the U.S.S.R. The ideology under which people work does not make a difference.
Consequences

Herzberg foresees the primary consequence of the two-factor theory in terms of its' implications for producing employee motivation.

Employees may be motivated by negative physical or psychological means. Physical or psychological punishment are described by Herzberg as the surest way to get someone to do something. This is essentially an 'Adam' view of man. Another approach described by Herzberg may be colloquially termed the 'carrot approach'. A reward is offered and the employee performs his duties in order to avail himself of the reward. Herzberg claims the employee is still not motivated but is only 'kicking himself' or giving himself physical punishment. According to Herzberg, a man is motivated when he no longer needs outside stimulation but he does his job because he wants to do it.

On the basis of his theory of job attitudes, Herzberg concludes "the only way to motivate the employee is to give him challenging work in which he can assume responsibility" (Herzberg, 1968, p. 53). Essentially, this is an appeal to man's 'Abraham' nature in order to produce employee motivation.

Summary

This chapter has discussed the nature of Herzberg's
factors and the terminology which will be used to describe them in this study. This chapter provided a description of the important concepts of the two-factor theory, the theory's applicability and some of its possible consequences. The description of the theory was essentially an interpretation of the theory used by the researcher in this study.
CHAPTER IV
THE INFLUENCE OF METHOD

The Herzberg two-factor theory has been subjected to many replications using an assortment of study methods. This section presents the most significant studies in the research literature classified according to the study's method of data collection. Following this study review there is a discussion about the methodological controversy which has surrounded the two-factor theory since it was first published by Herzberg and his colleagues in 1959.

Herzberg Storytelling Method

The basic storytelling method developed by Herzberg et al. (1959) has been used in a variety of replication studies. Schwartz, Jenuaitis, and Stark (1963) used the Herzberg design with the slight modification that the subjects wrote about two job experiences—one good and one bad—instead of relating them orally. The question under study was whether job-related or context-related factors were associated with high or low job-attitude sequences.

The subjects who wrote about their job experiences were 111 male supervisors employed by 21 utility companies.
Their job attitude sequences were studied by a chi-square analysis to determine whether job-related or context-related factors were associated with high or low job-attitude sequences. The study results were compared with those of the Herzberg study in which the frequency of occurrence of each of the first-level factors was tabulated independently for the high and for the low job-attitude sequences. Intercorrelations were computed between high and low first-level factors.

Schwartz et al. were able to generally substantiate the findings of Herzberg's original study. They concluded "that job- and context-related factors are differentially associated with good and bad job experiences" (Schwartz et al., 1963, p. 51). They were also able to support the universality of the theory in that "no variation was found in terms of subjects' age, job classification, education, personality characteristics, etc." (p. 53).

Saleh (1963) tested the two-factor theory on a group of preretirees from 60 to 65 years of age. These subjects were 85 male employees of managerial level from 12 Cleveland companies; all were facing compulsory retirement at 65. Saleh hypothesized that preretirees looking back on their careers would identify intrinsic factors as giving the most satisfaction and at extrinsic factors as giving the most dissatisfaction, whereas preretirees
assessing the period before their retirement would indicate extrinsic factors as the most important for job satisfaction.

Saleh gathered data on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction during middle age using the same semi-structured interview as in the original Herzberg et al. (1959) study. The data for the sources of satisfaction in the pre-retirement period was obtained by a scale (Job Attitude Scale) consisting of 16 statements representing the six intrinsic factors and the ten extrinsic factors. Each statement was paired with the other 15 in a forced-choice format.

The results supported the two-factor theory. Saleh found that when preretirees looked back on their middle age they identified intrinsic factors as providing satisfaction and extrinsic factors as providing dissatisfaction. For the sources of satisfaction in the preretirement period the picture was reversed. The experimental group indicated the extrinsic factors in preretirement as the factors providing satisfaction while they stressed the intrinsic in their middle age. The control group, who were middle aged, indicated the intrinsic as the source of satisfaction.

Herzberg-type interviews were conducted by Myers (1964) with 282 professionals - male scientists, engineers, manufacturing supervisors and technicians, and 52 semi-
skilled workers - female hourly assemblers, in a study of job characteristics. Content analysis revealed that job characteristics grouped naturally into intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomies as predicted by the two-factor theory.

Friedlander and Walton (1965) undertook a study whose purpose was to apply the theoretical framework showing that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not caused by the same factors to the questions of why people remain with or leave their organization. On the basis of the two-factor theory, Friedlander and Walton speculated that the reasons people remained with an organization differed from (and were not merely opposite to) the reasons for which people might leave the organization. Further, they hypothesized that the reasons people remained with an organization (positive motivations) were concerned primarily with work-process factors; the reasons an employee left an organization (negative motivations) dealt primarily with factors peripheral to the work process itself or with factors related to the community environment.

As in the Herzberg et al. (1959) study, personal interviews were conducted with the 82 subjects. However, the open-ended questions asked about what factors were important in keeping people in the organization and what factors might cause them to leave. The verbatim transcripts of the interviews were the sole source of data for the
study. The study was conducted in an isolated single-employer community.

The study results indicated that neither hypothesis could be rejected. That is, the scientists and engineers in the study indicated that the reasons for remaining with their organization were quite different from (and not merely opposite to) those that might cause them to leave it.

Friedlander and Walton summarized their findings as follows:

In summary, the degree to which an individual is satisfied would seem contingent upon the intrinsic content and process of the work itself, while the degree to which he is dissatisfied is influenced by the contextual and environmental setting of the job. Work-process and work-context characteristics are thus capable of appealing to differing motives and, in turn, will tend to elicit differing behaviors. (1965, p. 207)

Herzberg (1966) reported findings supportive of the two-factor theory from nine replications of his original investigation using 17 populations. Among the cross-section of occupational groups included in these studies were lower-level supervisors, professional women, agricultural administrators, men about to retire from management positions, hospital maintenance personnel, manufacturing supervisors, nurses, food handlers, military officers, female assemblers, accountants, Finnish foremen, and Hungarian engineers.

Typical of this group of studies, and one which
Herzberg regarded as providing cross-cultural validation of his study, was a study using a sample of lower-level supervisors from a wide range of industry in Finland.

One hundred and thirty-nine subjects were given a questionnaire containing a translation of the interview used in Herzberg's original Pittsburgh study with accountants and engineers. Content analysis revealed that among the Finnish supervisors five of six intrinsic factors were significantly unidirectional, appearing more frequently in the job satisfaction events, "the only one not found more frequently in the high versus-the low feeling sequences was the possibility for growth, as with the original study" (Herzberg, 1965, p. 399).

A very interesting study of Herzberg's two-factor theory was conducted by Macarov (1972), School of Social Work, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Macarov tested the two-factor theory in an Israeli kibbutzim where salary was not and could not be a factor. He wanted to determine whether the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic would hold, and whether the same factors were important in a situation where pay would not be a factor or an influence on other factors.

Eleven graduate social workers interviewed 219 Kibbutz members in interviews of approximately an hour and a half, over a period of six days. The interviews included factual information questions and 52 forced-
choice questions concerning the work. As well, there were two general questions about what things gave subjects satisfaction with their present work and what things caused them dissatisfaction with their present work. They differed from Herzberg's original questions in that they did not ask for a time when the respondent felt particularly satisfied or the reverse. The response to these questions were classified along the lines of Herzberg's categories. Classification was done by an independent judge who was not informed concerning the nature or goals of the study.

Macaroy concluded that the study findings supported the Herzberg two-factor theory. Satisfactions arose from the nature of the work itself, while dissatisfactions had to do with the conditions surrounding the work. Macaroy pointed out that the same factors seemed to create both satisfaction and dissatisfactions to a much greater degree than they did in other studies - that is, Herzberg's studies and their replications. However, Macaroy stated:

The two-factor theory of work motivations seems well enough supported by these findings to be given credence. In particular, the absence of salary as a factor to be taken into consideration did not upset or reverse the basis of the theory. It seems reasonable, then, to agree with Herzberg that salary in itself may often be highly overrated as a work motivator except when it is seen as an evidence of recognition and advancement, on the one hand, or a symptom of unfairness on the other. (Macaroy, 1972, p. 492)
Rating and Ranking Methods

A second grouping of studies on the two-factor theory used data collection methods which have been classified as having a rating or ranking nature. Exemplary of this group of studies was an exploratory study conducted by Ewen (1964) to attempt to determine the generality of the Herzberg theory. A sample of 1,021 full-time insurance agents were given a 58-item four-point anonymous attitude scale which they answered as two separate groups in 1960 and 1962. Ewen found that the intrinsic factors and the extrinsic factors did not, in all cases, act as predicted by the two-factor theory. Ewen's overall conclusion was that the nature of the intrinsic and extrinsic factors was far from clear, and that it could be different in different jobs. He suggested that further research should be undertaken in different occupational situations.

A sample of insurance agents was also used by Gordon (1965) in his research on the two-factor theory. The 683 respondents rated their degree of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with 54 items comprising four scales. The measures on the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions were then related to criteria of performance, enthusiasm for the job, and turnover. The results only partially supported the two-factor theory; some of Gordon's
results were similar to those of Ewen's (1964) study, which found a given factor can cause job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in the same sample.

Burke (1966) undertook to test the assumption that Herzberg's two classes of factors affecting job satisfaction and dissatisfaction represented unidimensional constructs. The subjects were 187 college students enrolled in an introductory industrial psychology course. Each student ranked 10 job characteristics - 5 intrinsic and 5 extrinsic - from 25 possible paired comparisons, in order of importance. These preference orders were analyzed by the unfolding technique in one dimension developed by Coombs (1964). From the research results and his literature review, Burke concluded that there was consistent evidence to suggest that the intrinsic and extrinsic factors were "'neither' unidimensional 'nor' independent constructs" (Burke, 1966, p. 321).

Following his study, Burke expressed the opinion that Herzberg's two-factor theory possibly oversimplified representation of job satisfaction. However, he remained convinced of the usefulness of the concept for research. He stated: "the basic distinction between intrinsic job characteristics and environmental job characteristics seems to be a useful one for purposes of research" (Burke, 1966, p. 317).

Halpern (1966) conducted a study on the two-
dimensional character of the Herzberg hypothesis with 
98 subjects surveyed by means of a questionnaire measuring 
four intrinsic job aspects, four extrinsic job aspects, 
and overall job satisfaction. Subjects responded to a 
7-point graphic rating scale which measured aspects of 
their best-liked job. The intrinsic factors included in 
the study were: achievement, work itself, task responsi-
bility, and advancement; the extrinsic factors included 
were: company policies, supervision, interpersonal 
relations, and working conditions.

Halpern found his subjects to be equally well-
satisfied with the intrinsic and with the extrinsic 
aspects of their job. A prediction of the two-factor 
theory was upheld in that intrinsic factors contributed 
significantly more to overall satisfaction than extrinsic 
factors - the average correlation between intrinsic job 
aspects and overall satisfaction was significantly 
higher than the average correlation between extrinsic 
job aspects and overall satisfaction. The conclusion 
reached was that the study findings provided support for 
the basic thesis of the two-factor theory. Halpern (1966) 

In spite of the fact that Ss were equally satisfied 
with both aspects of their jobs, it is the 
motivators - the factors related to personal 
success in work and individual growth - that are 
primarily related to job satisfaction. (p. 200)
Factor Analysis

In 1963 Friedlander published a study about the underlying sources of job satisfaction. The study had three purposes: 1) an analysis of the elements within a job context so as to obtain construct validation of the underlying sources of job satisfaction; 2) identification and description of employees for whom each group of job factors is of greatest importance as a source of satisfaction; 3) an analysis of differences in overall satisfaction among the groups of employees.

A questionnaire was administered by a large midwestern manufacturing company to its engineering, supervisory, and salaried employees. Over 92 per cent of approximately 10,000 employees completed the questionnaire. Two hundred of each of the three position-occupation groups were selected in random fashion from the entire group and their replies were factor analyzed.

The results of the study indicated that: 1) there were three underlying groups of job elements important to job satisfaction: a) social and technical environment, b) intrinsic work aspects, c) recognition through advancement; 2) the factor of greatest importance to each employee was identified, and factored groups of employees were described in terms of demographic variables (age, salary, and occupational patterns). No significant
differences in overall job satisfaction among the three groups were found.

Friedlander (1963) concluded:

Since those questions which dealt with sources of job satisfaction in the study by Herzberg elicited responses concerned primarily with intrinsic and growth aspects, one might expect a general intrinsic work aspect factor to emerge as the dominant one from a factor analysis of questions dealing only with satisfactions. The results of the current study tend to indicate that the underlying structure of job satisfaction is somewhat more complex than this. Both intrinsic and extrinsic job factors were found as sources of job satisfaction. (p. 249)

**Forced-Choice Checklist**

Wernimont (1966) began his study with statements written to tap five Herzberg content (intrinsic) dimensions (achievement, recognition, responsibility, work itself, advancement) and five context (extrinsic) dimensions (salary, company policies, supervision, relations with co-workers, working conditions). A forced-choice checklist was constructed with pairs of statements such that each pair of statements contained one content statement and one context statement. On the basis of the two-factor theory, Wernimont predicted his subjects would choose mostly content statements for describing satisfying situations and mostly context statements for describing dissatisfying situations. Wernimont's sample of 82 engineers and 50 accountants endorsed more content statements (over 60 per cent) for describing 'both' types
of situations — contrary to the two-factor theory prediction. Wernimont concluded that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors could be sources of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction, but intrinsic factors were stronger in both cases. He reasoned that the satisfaction or intrinsic variables were not unidirectional in their effects and that expectations had a strong influence on the extent of satisfaction with job factors.

**Job Descriptive Index — JDI**

Ewen, Hulin, Smith, and Locke (1966) conducted an empirical study in which four hypotheses, about which traditional unidimensional theory and the Herzberg theory made different predictions, were tested. A sample of 793 male employees from various jobs were given the JDI to measure the intrinsic variables of work itself and promotions, and the extrinsic variable of pay; the GM Faces Scale measured overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Neither the Herzberg theory nor the traditional theory was supported by the data. The intrinsic factors were found to be more strongly related to both overall satisfaction and overall dissatisfaction than the extrinsic factor of pay. It was concluded that the two-dimensional concept of "satisfiers" and "dissatisfiers" did not accurately represent the manner in which job satisfaction variables operated. Ewen et al. suggested the findings
should be replicated with reference to the operation of job satisfaction variables in relation to such variables as age, tenure, and job level.

The Ewen et al. (1966) study data were subjected to further analysis by Graen (1966a). Graen performed tests of significance and tested the strength of the relationships. This analysis provided support for the traditional theory against the two-factor theory. Graen (1966a) stated:

The present analysis supports the findings of Friedlander (1964) and Wernimont (1966) that intrinsic factors are more important contributors to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction than extrinsic factors. (p. 554)

Graen (1966a), in agreement with Ewen et al. (1966), concluded that:

The terms "satisfiers" and "dissatisfiers" imply a distinction which stands upon empirical data derived from a questionable recall procedure and against an overwhelming body of data gathered through many different procedures. (p. 554)

Graen (1968) developed six hypotheses for which the Herzberg two-factor theory and the traditional theory made different predictions concerning the relationships between satisfaction with job factors and overall job satisfaction. The sample consisted of 167 male employees and 152 female employees of one corporation who completed the JDI and the General Motors Faces Scale. An analysis of variance was made on the data. Graen's conclusions proved to be damaging to the two-factor theory. The
results of four of the six hypotheses were not as predicted and in three out of four of the hypotheses the results were in a direction 'opposite' to predictions. The hypotheses of the traditional theory were generally supported in the study. As well, Graen (1968) stated:

This study also supports the conclusions of Friedlander (1966) that content (intrinsic) variables are more strongly related to overall satisfaction-dissatisfaction than are context. (p. 370)

Discussion of Methods

The foregoing section of this paper presented the major studies which used the Herzberg storytelling technique of data collection or a modified form of it, and which supported the two-factor theory. They were: Schwartz, Jenusaitis, and Stark (1963); Saleh (1963); Saleh and Otis (1963); Myers (1964); Friedlander and Walton (1965); studies reported by Herzberg (1966); Macarov (1972). There were three studies which used the Herzberg technique but did not support the theory. They were: Friedlander (1963); Friedlander (1964); and Wernimont (1966).

The studies which used a technique different from the Herzberg method and which did not substantiate the two-factor theory were: Burke (1966); Ewen, Hulin, Smith, and Locke (1966); Gordon (1965); Graen (1966 & 1968); Ewen (1964); Lindsay, Marks, and Gorlow (1967); Levine and Weitz (1968); Wolf (1967). As well, there are several
other studies in this category which are discussed later in this paper. Notably, Dunnett, Campbell, and Hakel (1967); Hulin and Smith (1967); Malinovsky and Barry (1965); and Centers and Bugental (1966). The study which used a method different from Herzberg's and supported his theory was Halpern (1966).

With regard to a list similar to the one in the foregoing paragraph, Behling, Labovitz and Kosmo (1968) identified a consistently negative pattern, that is, none of the studies which supported a uniscalar explanation used Herzberg's storytelling technique. The extent to which the two-factor theory seems to be an artifact of the Herzberg storytelling method has received considerable attention in the literature. The researcher will now proceed to discuss this issue.

Dunnette et al. (1967) credited the Herzberg method with a break in static tradition by emphasizing those job features which lead to changes in feelings toward the job and discovering the features of a job situation which can make the difference between satisfaction and dissatisfaction. They charged, however, that the two-factor theory was 'shackled' to the storytelling method.

Dunnette et al. (1967) pointed out that, "The critical incidents methodology has given essentially the same results in a variety of different settings and across
many occupational groups" (p. 145). They cited five studies as examples. Supervisory personnel in a public utility (Schwartz et al., 1963), employees in five different jobs with Texas Instruments, Inc. (Myers, 1964), civilian scientists and engineers in Army Research and Development installation (Dyson, 1965), Salesman, research and production engineers, and production employees (Dunnette, 1965), and Finnish supervisors (Herzberg, 1965).

Dunnette et al. (1967) identified the storytelling data as being highly subjective. They said there was difficulty in reliably classifying incidents according to different job features, and there was the possibility of experimenter biasing effects in analyzing the data.

Ewen et al. (1966) regarded the storytelling method as "extremely suspect". They cautioned that replications obtained by the method alone could not be regarded as giving unequivocal support to the Herzberg theory (Ewen et al., 1966, pp. 544-545). From their study, Lindsay, Marks, and Gourin (1967) found their evidence pointed "to the possibility that the main conclusions of the Herzberg theory were a function of the method used by Herzberg" (p. 338). Similarly, Hulin and Smith (1967) concluded, "that Herzberg's (1959, 1966) results appear to be method bound and the conclusions appear to pivot on method variance rather than true content.
or scale variance" (p. 401). Hinton (1968) also identified a tendency for support or rejection of the two-factor theory according to the methodology of data collection, and the existence of some evidence of inconsistency of results 'across' methodologies.

Schwab and Heneman (1970) noted a tendency for persons critical of the two-factor theory to also be critical of the storytelling method. This was the case with Dunnette et al. (1967) and House and Wigdor (1967). Schwab and Heneman identified this as being in contrast to theory supporters who found the storytelling method to be not only acceptable but even superior to other data-gathering procedures. For example, Herzberg (1966) and Whitsett and Winslow (1967).

**Subjectivity**

Schneider and Locke (1971) maintained that the Herzberg system of classifying factors confused two levels of analysis, namely, 'events' (what happened) and 'agents' (who made it happen). They felt that Herzberg's system classified the reported incidents sometimes according to event and sometimes according to agent, but it did not consistently classify them according to either. Thus, the data categorized with this system could not be interpreted in a consistently logical manner. They argued that:
A logically adequate classification system for job incidents would have to classify 'separately' by events and agents. Anything that caused a person to be satisfied or dissatisfied would be perceived (at least in part) as being the result of some event which occurred or some perceived condition (e.g., success, praise, etc.); and every event or condition which occurs should be perceived as being caused by someone or something (e.g., supervisor, self, nature, etc.).

(Schneider & Locke, 1971, p. 442)

Schneider and Locke (1971) developed a new classification system based on the event-agent dichotomy. Using several predominantly white-collar samples, they found that the same categories of events produced both satisfaction and dissatisfaction, although different agents were judged to be primarily responsible for these events—the self for satisfying events and others for dissatisfying events. The study found that 74 per cent or more of reported incidents fell into Herzberg's motivator categories.

Schneider and Locke concluded that their results indicated that Herzberg's two-factor theory was not an artifact of the critical incident method as such but it was the result of an illogical, inconsistent classification system. They recommended the use of a more logical system with the result that the 'same' categories of events were judged to lead to 'both' good and bad days on the job.

Schneider and Locke's results with respect to events agreed with the findings obtained by researchers
using a variety of different methods - Ewen et al. (1966); Lindsay et al. (1967); and Wernimont (1966).

**Individual vs. Aggregate Responses**

Schwab and Heneman (1970) designed a study to research two criticisms of Herzberg's storytelling method. In response to the criticism that individual responses might not prove to be stable if sampled over time, Schwab and Heneman studied 1) the reliability of response classification using Herzberg's procedure; and 2) an analysis and interpretation of individual responses in contrast to aggregate responses.

A sample of 85 first- and second-level supervisors in state government departments were asked to describe favourable and unfavourable job-related sequences of events. Schwab and Heneman analyzed the sequences using Herzberg's procedure to classify the responses into the 16 first-level factors. An analysis of the aggregate results tended to confirm the findings of previous studies using the storytelling method, however, the method inadequately predicted individual responses to favourable and unfavourable sequences. Less than 50 per cent of the supervisors' responses were correctly predicted by the two-factor theory. The factors of achievement and recognition were mentioned by over 25 per cent of the supervisors in describing both favourable and unfavourable
sequences.

Time Frame

Hinrichs and Mischkind (1967), in response to criticisms about the distorting effect which takes place when people are asked to recall past incidents, designed a study to look at the two-factor theory using data solely assessing 'present' satisfaction with a 'current' job situation. They tested an alternate formulation to the two-factor theory - "That motivators are the prime influencers of satisfaction while hygiene factors act to limit complete satisfaction for highs and complete dissatisfaction for lows" (p. 191). Hinrichs and Mischkind predicted intrinsic factors to be prime contributors to job satisfaction (by their presence), and to job dissatisfaction (by their absence), the extrinsic factors were predicted to be the weak factors. Using 613 technicians employed by a national company, Hinrichs and Mischkind's data supported neither the two-factor theory or alternate formulations, but "were more adequately coordinated with the alternate conception" (Hinrichs & Mischkind, 1967, p. 191).

In Defense of the Two-Factor Theory

Grigaliunas and Herzberg entered the methodological
controversy with their study results in 1971. Grigaliunas and Herzberg identified the two basic methodologies as the events methodology (or storytelling method) which was the original Herzberg method, and a rating procedures methodology. As exemplary of studies using the rating procedure, Grigaliunas and Herzberg identified the following: Burke (1966); Dunnette et al. (1967); Ewen, Smith, and Hulin (1966); Friedlander (1965); Friedlander (1964); Graen (1966); Rosen (1963); and Wernimont (1966).

Grigaliunas and Herzberg attributed the failure of rating and ranking items to replicate the two-factor theory predictions to the fact that the ratings and rankings were heavily contaminated by irrelevancy, and because there were biases produced by social desirability, value systems, and misinterpretations or reinterpretations of items by the respondents. With this perspective, Grigaliunas and Herzberg designed a study whose purpose was to compare the two methodologies used in studying the two-factor theory and include a measure of relevance in order to determine its effect on the producing of empirical inconsistencies.

A total of 81 junior and senior university students participated in the study. Each student completed a College Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) developed by Stern (1969). The first section was very similar to the Herzberg storytelling method; it elicited two incidents – one
high and one low. Section two examined the incidents in terms of the reasons given by respondents for their feelings. Subjects rated 20 statements per experience as to importance of that statement in producing the high or low feeling for that experience.

Grigaliunas and Herzberg reported the following findings from their study. First of all, the traditional two-factor theory analysis resulted in a replication with the student population; secondly, using the analysis of the ratings by subjects without considering relevance did not follow the two-factor theory; and, thirdly, when the relevance of statements was considered in the analysis of the statements, a replication of the two-factor theory predictions resulted. Grigaliunas and Herzberg concluded that the failure of rating and ranking of items to replicate the two-factor theory predictions was apparently due to the fact that 1) ratings and rankings tended to be heavily contaminated by irrelevancy, and 2) because there were biases produced by social desirability, value systems, and misinterpretations or reinterpretation of items by the respondents.

Vroom's Criticism

Vroom felt that bias was injected into the story-telling procedure by a tendency for individuals to see causes for satisfaction as coming from within themselves
primarily the intrinsic factors and to attribute dissatisfaction to elements in the environment, that is, extrinsic factors (Wolf, 1970). Vroom thought the results of the studies using the storytelling methodology could be explained in terms of defensive mechanisms on the part of the respondents, and that the Herzberg interviews did not provide any safeguards against defensive replies. Vroom (1964), argued:

It is . . . possible that obtained differences between stated sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction stem from defensive processes within the individual respondent. Persons may be more likely to attribute the causes of satisfaction to their own achievements and accomplishments on the job. On the other hand, they may be more likely to attribute their dissatisfaction not to personal inadequacies or deficiencies, but to factors in the work environment, i.e., obstacles presented by company policies or supervision. (p. 129)

Vroom also argued that "people tend to take the credit when things go well, and enhance their own feelings of self-worth, but protect their self-concept when things go poorly by blaming their failure on the environment" (1966, pp. 7-8).

In order to avoid subjectivity in interpreting interview reports and to avoid the effects of respondents' defensive reactions alleged by Vroom (1964), Dunnette, Campbell, and Hakel (1967) developed a new data collection method. Dunnette et al. utilized the Herzberg taxonomy to develop two sets of 36 standardized statements which
were used by respondents for describing previously satisfying and dissatisfying job events. Twelve Herzberg features were tapped.

From group statistics and gross group comparisons of their six occupational groups, Dunnette et al. noted that satisfying and dissatisfying job situations shared many features in common and that the features cut across diverse occupational categories. They found that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction could reside in job content, job context, or a combination of both jointly. They concluded that the Herzberg two-factor theory was an oversimplified explanation of the means by which job satisfaction or dissatisfaction came about.

After comparing their results with the results of other studies on the Herzberg hypothesis, Dunnette et al. (1967), wrote:

The most striking point of similarity coming from such a comparison is that certain job dimensions— notably Achievement, Recognition, and Responsibility— seem uniformly to be important for 'both' satisfying and dissatisfying job events and that certain job dimensions— notably Salary, Working Conditions, Company Policies and Practices, and Security— are relatively less important. (p. 169)

Another study which specifically took into account Vroom's criticism was Bobbitt and Behling's (1972) study. They tested Vroom's alternate explanation that individuals attribute satisfaction to their own actions and dissatisfaction to those of others in order to appear in a
favourable light to significant others. In effect, the test measured the effects of varying opportunities to "look good" on the patterning of intrinsic and extrinsic responses when a critical incident technique similar to Herzberg's was used.

A questionnaire, employing a critical incident technique similar to Herzberg's, was used with three sample groups of first-line supervisors. One group of 42 males worked in the office of a large insurance company; a second group of 32 males and females were employed in nursing, dietary, maintenance and lab functions in a paediatric hospital, the third group consisted of 36 oil station managers.

The results did not support Vroom's alternate explanation. The researchers suggested that further research be carried out on another interpretation of Vroom's alternate explanation - essentially the one developed by Davis and Allen (1970), and Evans (1970) - that the two-factor dichotomy was a function of the individual's attempt to protect a favourable self-concept.

Protection of Self-Concept

Davis and Allen (1970) conducted a study with over 700 respondents employed in the three largest banks in a Western state in the United States. They used the standard Herzberg methodology with a follow-up question to analyze
the length of time that high and low feelings persisted for employees according to each of Herzberg's 16 factors. Davis and Allen found that all of the factors which made the top three rankings for high feelings were intrinsic or motivational factors under Herzberg's classification system. The top three factors were achievement, recognition, and advancement. A phenomenon identified by the study was the consistent tendency of high feelings to persist longer than low feelings. They explained these study findings in terms similar to Vroom's ideas about the defensive reactions which Herzberg's interviews would engender in the subjects. Davis and Allen believed there was a tendency in the memory mechanism to minimize significance of low incidents and feelings, while magnifying the significance of high incidents and feelings, in accordance with Freudian psychology.

Of special interest is Davis and Allen's (1970) comment on the factor of recognition:

Recognition emerges as a strong motivator for all time periods, and lack of recognition is a strong dissatisfier for short time periods. This information seems to be consistent with views of experienced administrators who say that recognition is one of their most effective ways to relate to people. (p. 75)

The Influence of Occupation

The importance of the occupation variable on job satisfaction has been acknowledged for some time.
Herzberg et al. (1957) found in their literature review that the job satisfaction which people achieved was influenced by their occupations. Following an analysis of level of occupation and job satisfaction, Herzberg et al. concluded that those in the lower level occupations had the least job satisfaction.

From a review of studies on the Herzberg two-factor theory, Robinson et al. (1969) found that one of the major factors which influenced findings on the Herzberg hypothesis was the occupational composition of the sample investigated. There was a major difference between white-collar and blue-collar workers. People in white-collar occupations found their job satisfaction in intrinsic factors while blue-collar occupations defined their satisfaction primarily in extrinsic terms. In commenting on the apparent influence which the respondents' occupation had on their findings, Robinson et al. (1968) stated:

There has been recently a plethora of studies in this area and, considering the diversity and limited scope of the samples used, together with the polemical disposition of researchers, a definitive answer to Herzberg's proposition seems a long way off. (p. 61)

Relevant Studies.

Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960) conducted a lengthy investigation into the mental health of a national cross-section of 2,460 American adults. Different components of job satisfaction were investigated. It was found that the
types of satisfaction varied considerably by occupation, "with intrinsic satisfactions being experienced most prevalently in the higher white- or blue-collar occupations with the opposite being true for extrinsic satisfaction" (Robinson et al., 1969, p. 33).

In the Gurin et al. study intrinsic dissatisfactions were consistently mentioned more by white-collar workers than by the blue collar respondents. Gurin et al. interpreted these findings as meaning that:

People in higher status jobs not only receive more ego gratifications in their work but also seek such gratifications more, and consequently experience frustration when they feel that these needs are not gratified. (Robinson, 1969, p. 33)

Through the use of a highly structured job attitude questionnaire and factor analysis, Rosen (1963) probed the motivational significance of a broad spectrum of job needs to a sample of 105 research and development personnel. These employees were a heterogeneous group with respect to area of specialty, educational level, and organizational level. Rosen concluded that white-collar workers associated varied, complex, demanding jobs with job satisfaction, whereas blue-collar workers tended to associate these qualities with low job satisfaction.

Studies on both sides of the Herzberg methodological controversy have noted the differences according to occupation. In the previously discussed study by
Myers (1964) he found, using Herzberg's method, that the frequency of appearance for the two types of job factors differed for his professionals (engineers) and semi-skilled workers (assemblers).

Malinovsky and Barry (1964) conducted an exploratory study upon the Herzberg theory of work attitudes with unskilled and semi-skilled blue-collar workers in a university setting. The job attitudes of the 117 blue-collar workers were determined through factor analysis of a 40-item work attitude survey. It was found that job attitudes could be separated into two relatively independent sets of variables, however, contrary to the two-factor theory predictions, both sets were related positively to job satisfaction.

Malinovsky and Barry found an intrinsic and an extrinsic set of work attitude determinants for blue-collar workers. The two sets of work attitudes were found to be not totally independent, and there was no support for the Herzberg hypothesis that intrinsic variables are most important to job satisfaction, while extrinsic variables are most important to job dissatisfaction. The Herzberg two-factor theory was only partially supported.

Malinovsky and Barry (1965) felt that occupational variables were critical to their findings. It was their opinion that, in general, blue-collar workers were more preoccupied with fulfilling basic needs than higher occupa-
tional level workers. "Only after these basic needs are satisfied do they become interested in the personal growth aspects in the work environment" (p. 450). They hypothesized that in higher level occupational groups the basic needs are satisfied and people have more energy to devote to the personal development of themselves.

The possibility that blue-collar workers tend to respond to both hygiene and motivator variables, while higher level occupational groups tend to respond primarily to motivator variables, may account for the less than complete independence found between motivator and hygiene sources of job satisfaction in the present study. (Malinovsky & Barry, 1965, p. 460)

The Malinovsky and Barry study gave rise to the speculation that the two-factor theory was applicable to higher occupational levels but not to lower level occupations. Such an idea is, of course, a refutation of Herzberg's claims that the two-factor theory can be used to describe the job attitudes of workers from all occupational levels.

The hypothesis that higher occupational level individuals would place a greater value on intrinsic job factors than would individuals at lower occupational levels and vice versa was tested by Centers and Bugental (1966). They conducted a cross-sectional survey of 692 adults, selected to be representative of the 'entire' working population, living in Los Angeles. Respondents were asked to choose three of six factors (three intrinsic
and three extrinsic) as the most important in keeping them on their present jobs. Centers and Bugental found intrinsic job components to be more valued among white-collar groups than among blue-collar groups; all three extrinsic job components were more valued in blue-collar groups than in white-collar groups. There were no consistent sex differences in overall value placed on intrinsic versus extrinsic job components, although women placed more importance on co-workers, while men placed more importance on the chance to use a talent or skill.

Another large study was carried out by Goodwin (1969) who published findings on the general occupational goals and satisfactions of the American work force, which had resulted from over 1100 interviews with a probability sample of all regularly employed Americans. Goodwin found that American workers regarded the work system as a place for self-achievement and self-fulfillment, and that workers lower in the occupational and social structure were more concerned about environmental factors and monetary returns, whereas workers higher up, with better physical conditions and higher salaries, indicated more concern for social relationships and making a social contribution. Goodwin found that more educated workers showed greater job satisfaction than less educated ones.

Armstrong (1971) set out to research Herzberg's theory using both a high- and low-level occupation and
examining the effect of the satisfaction versus the importance dimension in assessing the intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The specific hypotheses studied were that 1) for the high-level occupational group, the intrinsic factors made a relatively greater contribution to overall job satisfaction than did the extrinsic factors, and 2) for the low-level occupational group, the extrinsic factors made a relatively greater contribution to overall job satisfaction than did the intrinsic factors.

Armstrong used a four-part questionnaire which measured overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with 13 specific job factors, the relative importance of the same 13 factors, and demographic data. Ratings of satisfaction and importance for the job content and context factors and overall job satisfaction were obtained from 200 engineers and 153 assemblers.

Armstrong found that satisfaction with the intrinsic factors made the greatest contribution to overall job satisfaction, regardless of occupational level. Ratings of job factor importance were a function of occupational level, content aspects were most important for engineers, context for assemblers. The first hypothesis was confirmed and there was evidence of the saliency of the intrinsic factors regardless of occupational level. These findings were similar to those of Centers and Bugental (1966).
The findings of Armstrong (1971) and Centers and Bugental (1966) were not confirmed by Starcevich (1972) in a study in which managerial and professional employees judged the importance of 18 job factors as contributing separately to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Starcevich's (1972) findings were that:

The occupational level, within management levels, of those employees studied did not significantly affect the judged order of importance that various job factors had in contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. (p. 470)

Starcevich did not contrast a white-collar and a blue-collar group, but only different levels of the managerial class.

Further research into the area of satisfaction sources for white-collar and blue-collar employees was conducted by Locke in 1973. The purpose of Locke's study was to attempt to replicate previous findings which indicated that the same categories of events produced both satisfaction and dissatisfaction on white-collar and blue-collar subjects. Locke used Herzberg's storytelling method but a new classification system developed by Schneider and Locke (1971). Two "accidental" samples of white- and blue-collar employees described satisfying and dissatisfying job incidents. The samples were "accidental" in that no attempt was made to sample a given organization, industry, location, or occupational group (although there was matching on age and sex). The results were consistent
with the findings of Herzberg et al. (1957) which showed that white-collar employees placed more importance on task factors and less importance on reward and/or context factors than blue-collar employees, with one of the samples but not with the other sample.

A study by Locke and Whiting (1974) replicated the previously obtained differences between white-collar and blue-collar employees with respect to sources of satisfaction for a nationwide sample of workers in the same occupation. The basic design involved a national stratified random sample of 911 employees in agencies engaged in solid waste management. The employees were given a 46-item questionnaire, including Herzberg-type questions which were coded the same, i.e., used the same categories as those used by Locke (1971) as adapted from Schneider and Locke (1971).

The data did not support the Herzberg two-factor theory. It was found that white-collar employees were more likely to derive satisfaction and dissatisfaction from intrinsic sources and less likely to derive them from extrinsic sources than were blue-collar workers. White-collar employees were more satisfied with their jobs than were blue-collar employees, and blue-collar employees and secretarial employees were more satisfied than were employees at the same job levels in other types of work. These differences were attributed to salary and
work differences between solid waste management and other occupations.

Cummings (1975) studied the relationship of intrinsic and extrinsic factors to the hierarchy level of individuals. Cummings used 310 employees drawn from various levels within the hierarchy of a single chemical company. Subjects completed a questionnaire which tested 10 work values with a choice between job satisfiers and dissatisfiers through the use of a rank-order selection method. Cummings found a correlation between intrinsic and extrinsic factors within each of the five levels of the organizational hierarchy. Among the conclusions which Cummings drew were that Herzberg's theory could be supported—that intrinsic factors were separate and distinct from extrinsic factors and that there was a significant change in work values as one moved up within the organizational structure.

The impact of the characteristics of specific organizations has not been studied a great deal. Pennings' study (1970) related the value systems of white-collar workers to the promotion rates of their organization. Pennings found that the importance attributed to intrinsic work aspects varied with promotion rates in the organization.

Summary

It was stated in this chapter that Herzberg et al. (1957) and Robinson et al. (1969), in their respective
literature reviews, found that people's occupations influenced the job satisfaction which they achieved. Herzberg et al. (1957) found that, generally, those in lower level occupations had the least job satisfaction; a finding confirmed by Goodwin's (1969) study. Herzberg et al. (1957) also noted a tendency for different categories of factors to be important to white-collar and blue-collar employees. Findings in this area were replicated by Locke (1973) and Locke and Whiting (1974).

This researcher's review of the literature on the two-factor theory revealed that one of the major variables which seemed to influence findings about the theory was the occupational composition of the sample investigated (Rosen (1963); Myers (1964); Saleh (1964); Malinovsky & Barry (1965); Dunnette et al. (1965); Friedlander (1966); Centers & Bugental (1966)). A contradictory study was that of Armstrong (1971) who found that the intrinsic factors made the greatest contribution to overall job satisfaction, regardless of occupational level.

Ewen (1964), a leading researcher of the Herzberg hypothesis, suggested a possible different in the nature of intrinsic and extrinsic factors in different jobs and recommended research in different occupational situations to further clarify the problem. Despite this recommendation there had been very little research undertaken with people
employed in the human services. The one exception of which this researcher was aware was the direct replication and comparison of Herzberg's 1959 study, with a sample of social workers, conducted by seven University of Toronto M.S.W. students in 1964.

The sample in the Toronto study, 133 professional social workers employed in welfare, recreation, health and education organizations, comprised one-half of all professionally qualified social workers in the Metro Toronto area who were members of the Canadian Association of Social Workers. The study participants were interviewed and their responses classified according to the standard methods used in the Herzberg et al. (1959) study. The two-factor theory was not given unqualified support. For example, the factor achievement influenced the high job attitudes of social workers while failure to achieve was the most frequently cited factor in low job attitudes. Thus, achievement was ranked as both a primary satisfier and a primary dissipfier. Mable (1964) concluded that the study posed "a serious threat to Herzberg's theory" (p. 158).

In a general comparison of the Toronto study with Herzberg's work, there was a difference in the satisfying and dissatisfying factors for social workers as compared with engineers and accountants. These differences were attributed to the differences in the nature of the work itself.
This researcher concluded that, in general, the job attitudes of social workers had not been given very much consideration and specifically, the operation of the two-factor theory with social workers had only been subjected to one test.

The Toronto study used the Herzberg methodology which, as discussed previously in this paper, has been surrounded with controversy. The controversy centres on the criticism that the Herzberg storytelling method produces results supportive of the two-factor theory which have not been consistently replicated with other methods.

Various forms of the correlational study have provided the standard alternative method for studying the two-factor theory. King (1970) explained the use of correlational studies as follows:

In correlational studies, the extent to which job factors contribute toward satisfaction and dissatisfaction is not determined by self-report but is inferred from the correlations between measures of satisfaction with individual job factors and measures of overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction. (pp. 26-27)

When the basic proposition of the two-factor theory - that each intrinsic factor contributes more to satisfaction than to dissatisfaction, and each extrinsic factor contributes more to dissatisfaction than to satisfaction - is studied by collecting correlational data, the proposition is supported when each intrinsic factor correlates more with job satisfaction than with job dissatisfaction, and
each extrinsic factor correlates more with job dissatisfaction than with job satisfaction.

King (1970) recommended that "in order to eliminate the possible defensive biases of the measures used in critical incident studies, correlational studies should be considered" (pp. 26-27). This researcher concluded, from his review of the literature, that there was no evidence that the correlational study method had been used to test the two-factor theory with social workers.
CHAPTER V

RESEARCH DESIGN

The objective of this chapter is to describe the research design which this researcher developed to test the two-factor theory in a correlational study with a sample of social workers. The study design is consistent with the methodological and occupational considerations outlined in the literature review. This consistency may be further clarified by referring to the study's purpose on page 1. The chapter will also focus on the study hypotheses, with an explanation of the terms used in them, together with a description of the data collection method and the subject population. This chapter begins with the study's classification and ends with the study's limitations.

Classification of the Study

According to the classification system developed by Trippdi, Fellin, and Meyer (1969) this study was a quantitative-descriptive study of the sub-type hypothesis testing. This study was not experimental, it included variables which were amenable to measurement, and it contained, in the research design, explicit hypotheses to be tested.
Description of the Agency

Children's Aid Societies in Ontario have their organization and responsibilities defined according to The Child Welfare Act, R.S.O. 1970, Ch. 64. The legislation stipulates that Children's Aid Societies will provide the services of investigating allegations of neglect, protecting children where necessary, caring for children not able to remain in their own homes, placing children for adoption, serving unmarried parents, and their children, providing guidance, and counselling and other services for the prevention of circumstances requiring the protection of children. In a summary statement, it may be said that the goal of The Children's Aid Society of Essex County is to contribute to the well-being of children, families, individuals, and communities.

The Children's Aid Society of Essex County is one of 51 Children's Aid Societies in Ontario. It is operated by a Board of Directors which is elected annually by the membership of the Society. The Board of Directors is responsible for controlling the policies and operation of the C.A.S. Funding for Children's Aid services is provided by two levels of government. The provincial government pays 80 per cent of the C.A.S. costs, and the municipalities pay 20 per cent. The courts are responsible for interpreting the legislation which defines the minimum standards of care to be provided for children in the
community.

The Children's Aid Society of Essex County may be regarded as typical of the standard child welfare agency in the province. It is located in the City of Windsor, a medium-sized city of about 200,000 people, and has responsibility for providing services to both the urban population of Windsor and the rural residents of Essex County. In the opinion of the researcher, the Essex County C.A.S., because of its service mandate as a primary social service agency and its size and location, is representative of many similar agencies in Ontario.

Subjects

The sample consisted of 8 males and 20 females employed as social workers by the Children's Aid Society of Essex County. Eight of the respondents were 'team leaders' who were responsible for coordinating the activities of a two- or three-person team who provided services to a particular geographic location or programme area.

All of the workers in the study were responsible for some aspect of the direct delivery of social work services. These employees are important because they represent the 'backbone' of social work. Their responsibilities in carrying out services according to government legislation through direct intervention techniques are
similar to the job responsibilities of the majority of social workers. Their job attitudes and their functioning within the organization are important determinants in the quality of the service their agency is able to provide.

The method of data collection was consistent for eight of the agency's teams and differed for one of them. This researcher met with eight of the teams during their weekly team meetings. The purpose of the study and the questionnaire format were explained. Team members spent 15-25 minutes completing the questionnaires. When it was necessary, respondents asked the researcher for clarification as they filled out the questionnaires. The questionnaires were then collected by the researcher for subsequent tabulation.

With one group, it was not convenient to meet during a team meeting so the group members were provided with the questionnaires, a letter of explanation (see Appendix A) and stamped addressed return envelopes. The subjects mailed their questionnaires to this researcher when the questionnaires had been completed.

The rate of return of questionnaires was high. A total of 28 out of a possible 32 participants returned completed questionnaires. This represents a rate of return of 87.5 per cent. The researcher believes that the data collection method of meeting with the teams, asking subjects to complete the questionnaire on the spot
and collecting the questionnaires immediately was the reason for the high return rate.

Measurement of Job Satisfaction

In order to test general theories about job attitudes the researcher must have available to him measures of the concept he is studying. Smith (in Fleishman, 1967) identifies a number of desirable characteristics for a useful measure of job satisfaction. According to Smith, such a measure should be capable of being used over a wide range of job classifications. That is, the meanings of words should be common to workers in many different kinds of jobs and readily understood by differentially educated individuals. The measure or test should be short, easily administered, and easily scorabled. The last points are important to the researcher because of the inevitable time and financial constraints of most research.

Smith goes on to state: "The measure should generate scores indicative of satisfaction with a number of discriminatingly different aspects of the work situation" (Smith in Fleishman, 1967, p. 345). These measures are regarded as being particularly useful for studies to identify the relationships between different aspects of the job situation and individual and agency characteristics.

Of course, in order for the researcher to use any
test or measure, two points must be adequately demonstrated. First of all, it must have high "reliability" - that is, the test must give consistent results when repeated measures of employee attitudes are obtained. Secondly, it must have high "validity" - that is, the test must be shown to measure what it purports to measure.

Probably the most commonly used method of investigating job attitudes has been to ask workers to answer direct questions about aspects of their jobs which they like or dislike. As explained by Wanous and Lawler (1972) this method consists of simply asking people to rate their jobs or facets of their jobs on a Likert-type satisfaction scale. According to Herzberg et al. (1959), the primary usefulness of such an approach is in investigating demographic variables, that is, the comparison of the job satisfaction of workers differing in, for example, age, sex, educational level, or position in a hierarchy. An example of this approach is the pioneering research on job satisfaction conducted by Hoppock (1935).

Another method of measuring job satisfaction is to ask workers to evaluate their feelings about the many specific aspects of their work through the use of scaled inventories of job attitudes. Workers could be requested to respond to questionnaires rating the importance of given job characteristics as sources of satisfaction and
dissatisfaction. In addition to being useful for demographic studies, Herzberg et al. say that this approach permits the investigation of the specific components of job attitudes through the analysis of the inventories by various statistical techniques. A good example of a scaled inventory would be the 'Employee Inventory' developed by Science Research Associates (1951).

Job attitudes can also be inferred from the observed behaviour of workers, with no specific measures of attitudes, feelings, and motives being taken. Such an approach was characteristic of the classic Hawthorne studies of worker behaviour (Herzberg et al., 1959, pp. 5-6). As well, inferences about job attitudes can be derived from a content analysis of interviews or written stories.

Another method of measuring the sources of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction is to conduct a factor analysis of an interview, written story, or questionnaire data. This approach was used by Herzberg and his colleagues in developing the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. Factor analysis also permits the investigation of job satisfaction by finding how large a correlation there is between satisfaction and a particular factor (Argyle, 1972).

For this study, the researcher chose a scaled inventory method. Study participants were requested to respond to two instruments on job satisfaction. The one
instrument evaluates the respondents' feelings about five aspects of their work through their responses as to whether or not any, all, or some, of a series of adjectives applied to their job. The other instrument evaluated general attitudes towards job satisfaction from a single reply to a 6-item graphic rating scale. There were three such scales. The scaled inventory method was chosen because it could be used by a single researcher working alone and there were inventories available which were suitable for the purposes of this study. As well, these inventories met the criteria for a good measure of job satisfaction, as discussed in the first two paragraphs on the 'measurement of job satisfaction' section of this paper.

Data Collection Method

A three-part questionnaire was designed for use in this study. Part I of the questionnaire consisted of nine questions requesting demographic information, Part II was the UDI, and Part III was three variations of the General Motors Faces Scale (See Appendix B).

Handyside and Speak (1964) have pointed out that when using a questionnaire it must be remembered that information is derived from what people 'say' in response to the questions, and it is often not possible to know if their responses are justified by objective facts about
working conditions. Bias may be introduced by non-response; or the relative inflexibility of the questionnaire technique in comparison with "open-ended" interviewing. However, even with these limitations the questionnaire can still be a means of collecting good data for "what employees believe to be true is frequently of greater importance than what is actually true" (Jurgensen, 1947, p. 558).

General Questionnaire

Part I of the overall questionnaire was a general questionnaire which collected information on straightforward demographic variables. Respondents identified their job position and whether or not they were a team leader, how many years of formal education they had, what degrees and certificates they possessed, how long they had been employed by the agency, and how long they had been in the position they held at the time of completing the questionnaire. Where applicable, respondents were asked to describe up to five of their immediately preceding social work positions - beginning date, ending date, job title, and agency. Respondents also placed themselves in one of five salary ranges - the lowest being 'under 10,000' - the highest 'over 25,000', in one of five age ranges - from the first 20-29 to the last 60 and over, and indicated their sex.
The Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

The JDI measures a worker's attitude toward five job aspects - the work itself, present pay, opportunities for advancement, supervision, and co-workers. The JDI consists of five cumulative-point adjective checklists which ask the worker to describe his job in terms of these five dimensions by indicating whether an adjective applies to his particular job. For example, to the adjective 'challenging' the respondent could respond by using a "yes" or "no" or "?" in the appropriate blank space. The worker is not asked directly how satisfied he is, but rather he is asked to describe his job, and satisfaction is inferred from these job descriptions.

The Job Descriptive Index was developed as part of a nationwide survey of retirement satisfaction conducted by Cornell University researchers (Hulin, Smith, Kendall, & Locke, 1963; Kendall, Smith, Hulin, & Locke, 1963; Locke, Smith, Hulin, & Kendall, 1963; Locke, Smith, Kendall, Hulin, & Miller, 1964; Macaulay, Smith, Locke, Kendall, & Hulin, 1963; Smith, 1963; Smith & Kendall, 1963). Nine hundred people in seven organizations were used in the development of the JDI. It has been subjected to intensive validation and has been shown to possess acceptable construct validity according to the criteria of convergent and discriminant validity (Hulin, Smith, Kendall, & Locke, 1963; Kendall, Smith, Hulin, & Locke, 1963; Locke, Smith,
Hulin, & Kendall, 1963; Locke, Smith, Kendall, Hulin, & Miller, 1964). The JDI also demonstrates adequate internal reliability and "scores on the JDI scales agree well with more direct measures of job satisfaction" (Smith in Fleishman, 1967, p. 300).

Vroom (1964) called the JDI "without doubt the most carefully constructed measure of job satisfaction in existence today" (p. 100). In commenting on the JDI's usefulness Vroom indicated that he felt the extensive methodological work done on the measure and the available norms should "insure its widespread use in both research and practice" (Vroom, 1964, p. 100). Ewen (1965) also expressed the hope that future investigators would avail themselves of the JDI.

In discussing the use of the JDI in their research Hulin and Smith (1964) outlined several other desirable characteristics which the JDI possesses.

1) The scores on it are unaffected by acquiescence or yes-saying and no-saying tendencies.
2) The resulting five scales, while not completely orthogonal, have the virtue of relatively low intercorrelations (.30 to .50) with each other.
3) Factor analysis of the data from several samples indicate that the workers are indeed capable of thinking along the lines of five separate aspects of job satisfaction. The factors extracted do seem to correspond to the five dimensions chosen by the investigators.
4) The five scales, while being quite short and easily administered, have adequate split-half reliabilities (.80 to .88 corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula). (p. 90)

The JDI was selected for this study because of the
foregoing considerations and also because the instrument is short, it can be administered easily, and it can be scored easily. The decision to use the JDI was also influenced by the fact that it was readily available from Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio. A copy of the JDI may be found in Appendix B.

General Motors Faces Scale

The General Motors Faces Scale (Kuhin, 1955) is a one-item graphic scale to measure overall job satisfaction. This study used three variations of the scale which were developed, with consideration of the Hulin and Smith (1967) study, from the original G.M. Faces Scales. These variations — a satisfaction-dissatisfaction scale, a satisfaction scale, and a dissatisfaction scale — were administered to all of the social workers participating in this study.

The General Motors Faces Scale has been found to possess adequate convergent and discriminant validity (Locke, Smith, Kendall, Hulin, & Miller, 1964). Locke et al. used a validation procedure outlined in the model of convergent and discriminant validity proposed by Campbell and Fiske (1959) to test the Faces Scales, using 133 randomly selected employees, against four varieties of graphic rating methods. Out of these non-verbal rating methods — Faces scales, direct graphic scales, triadic graphic scales, and Boxes scales — the Faces scale and a
direct graphic rating method (Direct Graphic Scales) were best according to the criteria of convergent and discriminant validity. That is, the measure was found to be an adequate and meaningful measure of job satisfaction and was able to reliably discriminate between particular areas of satisfaction. Locke et al. (1964) went on to state that the Faces method was the best graphic rating method of the four employed.

In a previous paragraph, reference was made to the influence of the Hulin and Smith (1967) study. According to Hulin and Smith the G.M. Faces Scale "assumes that job satisfaction-dissatisfaction is a continuum and job satisfaction is merely a low level of job satisfaction" (p. 397). They felt such a concept was inconsistent with the two-factor theory which suggests that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are qualitatively different. Hulin and Smith regarded the use of the G.M. Faces Scale with its continuum concept to be a serious shortcoming in the research by Ewen et al. (1966) and Graen (1966). Hulin and Smith (1967) stated:

It would seem that in order to adequately test the two-factor theory it must be assumed that it is correct and satisfaction is qualitatively different from dissatisfaction, and overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction must be measured on different scales. If the Ewen et al. and Graen findings are supported after the separate measurement of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, then much more confidence could be placed in the validity of their conclusions. (p. 397)
In order to do this for their study, Hulin and Smith developed three scales from the General Motors Faces Scale. Using Kunin's 11 faces ranging from a deep frown to a broad smile, a dissatisfaction scale was developed using faces 1 through 6, a satisfaction scale was developed using faces 6 through 11, and a satisfaction-dissatisfaction scale was constructed with faces 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 11. The satisfaction-dissatisfaction scale was reported to be identical to the scale used by Ewen et al. (1966) and Graen (1966) in their studies.

In the same manner as Hulin and Smith (1967) this researcher constructed three scales from the General Motors Faces Scale, using the same numbered faces for the dissatisfaction, satisfaction and satisfaction-dissatisfaction scales. There was, however, one important difference. Hulin and Smith chose to use Kunin's characterized faces. These faces have facial features drawn quite explicitly. For this study, Kunin's simpler line-drawing faces were used. These faces look much like a series of 'happy-faces' with changes in the mouth line indicating various degrees of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The line faces were chosen over the characterized faces because the latter, drawn with a 1950's hairstyle, looked somewhat dated. A copy of the G.M. Faces Scales used in this study may be found in Appendix B.
Hypotheses

The study hypotheses originated from the findings of previous studies and from the expectation that the relationships between two or more variables would be replicated. The formulation of the hypotheses was simplified by the fact that relevant theory and research findings were available. These hypotheses were deduced from existing theory.

On the basis of the two-factor theory it may be expected that the relationships outlined in the following hypotheses will be confirmed.

Hypothesis 1 - For social workers, intrinsic factors* will correlate more highly with overall** job satisfaction than with overall job dissatisfaction.

Hypothesis 2 - For social workers, extrinsic factors*** will correlate more highly with overall job dissatisfaction than with overall job satisfaction.

*In this study the intrinsic factors are the JDI satisfaction areas of 'work' and 'promotions'.

**Overall is used here to be consistent with the literature, even though the researcher realizes that the term overall has a lack of specificity.

***In this study the extrinsic factors are the JDI satisfaction areas of 'pay', 'supervision', and 'coworkers'.

**Hypothesis 3** - For social workers, intrinsic factors will correlate more highly with overall job satisfaction than will the extrinsic factors.

**Hypothesis 4** - For social workers, extrinsic factors will correlate significantly more highly with overall job dissatisfaction than will the intrinsic factors.

**Hypothesis 5** - Intrinsic factors will relate more strongly to both overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction than will extrinsic factors.

**Hypothesis 6** - The relationship between extrinsic factors and overall satisfaction-dissatisfaction depends on the level of satisfaction with the intrinsic variables.

**Operational Definitions**

All concepts which appear in a testable hypothesis must be operationally defined. In this study, job satisfaction is measured using a standard index of job satisfaction, the underlying assumption being that job satisfaction can be measured with a reasonable degree of accuracy. It is also assumed that social workers in the sample will experience greater or lesser degrees of job satisfaction.

Overall job satisfaction - This concept is defined to mean job satisfaction as measured by the General Motors
Faces Scale (Kunin, 1955) as revised by Hulin and Smith (1967).

**Overall job dissatisfaction** - This concept means job dissatisfaction as measured by the General Motors Faces Scale (Kunin, 1955) as revised by Hulin and Smith (1967).

**Overall satisfaction-dissatisfaction** - This concept is defined according to the satisfaction-dissatisfaction measure derived from the General Motors Faces Scale (Kunin, 1955) as revised by Hulin and Smith (1967).

**Intrinsic factor** - This concept is defined to mean the intrinsic factors which are measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed at Cornell University. The specific factors are the 'work itself' and 'opportunities for promotion'.

**Extrinsic factor** - This concept is defined to mean the extrinsic factors which are measured by the JDI. The extrinsic factor according to the Herzberg classification is that of 'pay', although 'supervision' and 'coworkers' are also considered to be in this category (see for example, Hulin & Smith, 1967).

The concepts in the study are all operationally defined in relation to available testing techniques.
Limitations of the Study

The researcher feels that the most significant limitation of the study is the fact that the study sample was composed of only 28 persons. The small sample meant that there was sometimes difficulty in interpreting the data when only a few people constituted a large percentage of a category. For example, 12.5 per cent of the male workers report they have 15 years of formal education, however, this is only 1 person. Also, the researcher believes that a larger sample could have allowed for more confidence to be placed in the generalizability of the study findings.

When one develops a questionnaire of this nature there are always decisions which must be made about what is to be included and what is to be excluded. There are any number of features of the respondents' lifestyle, personality, etc., which could have been investigated to determine whether or not they seemed to influence job satisfaction. However, due to time and monetary considerations the size of the general questionnaire had to be limited.

In this study, job satisfaction measurement was limited to what the G.M. Faces Scale measured for overall job satisfaction, and what was measured by the Job Descriptive Index, that is, five aspects of job satisfaction - work itself, pay, promotions, supervision, and
co-workers. A qualification to the data which results from the use of the JDI is that it generates data based upon only five of a possible N variables which contribute to overall job satisfaction. This qualification has been recognized and stated by Ewen et al. (1964) and by Graen (1966).

Summary

This chapter described the study design developed by this researcher to test the two-factor theory with a sample of 28 social workers employed with The Essex County Children's Aid Society. The chapter included a description of the study sample, the study hypotheses, and specific terminology used in the hypotheses. The measurement of job satisfaction and the selection of the data collection instruments was discussed.
CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS: DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

The intent in this chapter is to provide some descriptive information about the sample used in this study. This information includes such basic data as sex and age, as well as information on the respondents' job title, years of formal education, and degrees or certificates held, or both. The respondents' length of employment with the agency, length of time in their job position, and present salary are presented. Information on previous full-time social work employment is also included. The general attitudes of respondents towards the JDI satisfaction areas and the G.M. Faces Scales are discussed.

Data Collection and Analysis

A total of twenty-eight of the thirty-two social work employees surveyed at the Children's Aid Society of Essex County completed the questionnaire. Twenty respondents were team participants and eight were team leaders. All of the respondents were employed on a consistent basis by the Children's Aid. That is, none of the respondents were casual employees. Three of the respondents were employed on a part-time basis - two for
four out of five days a week, and another for two out of five days a week. For the purposes of this study, these respondents were included with the respondents in full-time employment because all of them were continuous employees, none were employed on a casual basis.

Once the questionnaire had been completed, the responses to the questions on the General Questionnaire, the Job Descriptive Index, and the General Motors Faces Scales were coded in order to transfer the data to IBM cards. For most of the questions, the answer could be translated into a number. The JDI Scales were developed in such a way that it was possible, by scoring the 'Y', 'N', and '?' responses to reduce each scale to a number. Each face in the G.M. Faces Scales had a corresponding number.

In some questions, responses evoking more than one variable were required. For example, Question 3 on the General Questionnaire asked about degrees or certificates, or both, held by the respondent. For the four categories of B.A., B.S.W., M.S.W., and Other, the respondents were categorized on a 'yes'/no' basis depending on whether they possessed the particular qualification or they did not. Such 'yes-no' questions were coded with a 1 for a 'Yes' response and a 2 for a 'No' response. If the respondent did not answer a question, usually because it did not apply to him, then
the non-response was coded with a 9.

The coded responses were key-punched onto IBM cards for processing by the computer. The results were tabulated according to five categories: "all social workers", "team leaders", "team participants", "male workers", and "female workers".

The raw data were analyzed according to techniques available through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Bent, & Hull, 1970). The subprogrammes used in this data analysis were the Frequencies programme which provided descriptive information about the sample, and the Pearson's Corr. which tested the hypothesized relationships between satisfaction with each of the five job factors* and measures of overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Correlations were also provided for characteristics of the sample and the various measures of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

From an examination of Table 6.1 it can be seen that there is a general trend toward fewer numbers of respondents in the higher age categories. A total of 78.6 per cent of the agency workers are under 40 years of age; 21.4 per cent of the workers reported being 40 or older. The ages of the team leaders ranged widely from the 30-39 age category to 60 and over. Generally, the

*Work, promotion, pay, supervision and co-workers.
### Table 6.1

Percentage Distribution on Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Categories</th>
<th>All Social Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Male Social Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Social Workers (N=20)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
study sample is composed of relatively young workers; 78.6 per cent of the respondents are under 40 years of age. Although only 21.4 per cent of the workers are over 40, they accounted for 62.5 per cent of the team leaders in the sample.

Table 6.2 points out that the study sample are nearly three-quarters female (71.4 per cent) and one-quarter male (28.6 per cent). This reflects the traditional bias in social work for the profession to be "female dominated". Despite this, the data in Table 6.2 indicate that the male workers tend to dominate the team leader position. However, this data should not be interpreted without reference to the age distribution and educational qualifications in the sample. This will be done in a later section of this paper.

**Formal Education**

Study respondents were asked how many years of formal education they had completed. In order to facilitate a consistent assessment by the respondents of their formal education an example was provided in the questionnaire. The example showed that a person with 13 years of elementary and high school and a 3-year university degree would indicate that he had had 16 years of formal education.
Table 6.2
Percentage Distribution on Sex of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>All Social Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The years of formal education in the total sample range from 15 years to 20 years. The mean number of years of formal education for the sample is 17.1 years, with a standard deviation of 1.3. A break-down of the data on formal education shows that the male workers have a mean of 17.5 years with a standard deviation of 1.7 years. The female workers are slightly lower, possessing a mean of 17 years with a standard deviation of 1.1 years. Team leaders have the highest mean number of years of education at 17.6 years with a standard deviation of 1.5 years. There is a definite trend toward higher levels of education among team leaders. When the team leaders' education is excluded from the calculation, the educational level for the rest of the agency drops to 16.9 with a standard deviation of 1.1 years.

The data in Table 6.3 show that the two highest categories of formal education, accounting for the education of 10 per cent of all workers, are occupied exclusively by males. In fact, 37.5 per cent of all the male workers are included in the top two categories. There is a pattern in the agency for the highest levels of education to have been attained by male workers. There also seems to be a trend towards a generally well-educated work group in the Essex County Children's Aid Society.
Table 6.3
Percentage Distribution on Years of Formal Education for Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years of Formal Education</th>
<th>All Social Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Male Social Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Social Workers (N=20)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When examining the data in Table 6.4 it should be kept in mind that the categories of educational qualifications are not mutually exclusive. For example, an employee with a B.A. and an M.S.W. would have been marked 'yes' in both the 'B.A.' and the 'M.S.W.' categories and 'no' in the 'B.S.W.' and 'Other' categories. There is no category which would include both the B.A. and the M.S.W. qualifications. The 'Other' category signifies any qualification which is not a B.A., B.S.W. or M.S.W.

The data presented in Table 6.4 indicate that 67.9 per cent of the Children's Aid workers in the sample possess a B.A. degree. A slightly higher percentage of females (70 per cent) than males (62.5 per cent) had this qualification. However, the percentage of team leaders (87.5 per cent) with a B.A. is almost 20 percentage points above the sample (67.9 per cent).

The figures in Table 6.4 show that 60.7 per cent of the agency's workers in the sample are educated to the Bachelor's level in social work. The percentage of males and females with a B.S.W. is relatively similar with 62.5 per cent for the males, and 60.0 per cent for the females. Exactly one-half (50 per cent) of the team leaders have a B.S.W., which is somewhat below the proportion of respondents with a B.S.W. in the sample as a whole.

The sample contains 14.3 per cent M.S.W. respondents. A total of 25 per cent of the male respondents have an M.S.W.
Table 6.4
Percentage Distribution on Type of Educational Qualification for Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Degree or Certificate Held</th>
<th>All Social Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Male Social Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Social Workers (N=20)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.W.</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
while only 10 per cent of the female respondents have a graduate social work degree.

A total of 28.6 per cent of the people in the sample have a qualification other than a B.A., B.S.W., or an M.S.W. Some of these respondents have community college certificates in social work, and a number of them are qualified in fields which are regarded as 'related' to social work, such as education or nursing.

There seems to be a trend toward the establishment of the B.S.W. as the standard working qualification in this C.A.S. agency. Over 60 per cent of the respondents have at least a Bachelor's degree qualification at the present time.

Length of Employment with the Children's Aid Society

The percentage distributions outlined in Table 6.5 show that staff turnover in the sample was remarkably consistent in the past six years. The turnover averaged just over 10 per cent of the total sample. The figures also reveal that a fairly high percentage (38 per cent) of the workers in the sample have been with the agency more than six years. The agency, as a whole, seems to have a substantial body of experienced social workers on which to rely. The even distribution of the length of employment with the agency, and therefore the rate of turnover would
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Employment</th>
<th>All Social Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Male Social Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Social Workers (N=20)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
<th>Team Members (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 yrs.</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 ≤6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4 ≤5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3 ≤4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2 ≤3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1 ≤2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 yr.</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seem to be quite unique to the Essex County Children's Aid. In the researcher's experience, social service agencies tend to be staffed by a large number of relatively new workers (under two years of experience), supplemented by a smaller number of workers with considerably more experience in the agency. The middle of the road group often seems to be missing.

In Table 6.5 there is a clear indication that the team leader positions tend to be occupied by the more experienced workers. No team leader has under 3 years of experience with the agency. This trend is further highlighted in Table 6.6 where it can be seen that the mean length of time that team leaders have been with the agency is 2 years, 6 months more than the mean length of time for the whole sample, and over 3 years longer than that of regular team members. As shown in Table 6.6, the males and females have a standard deviation which is 2 years, 5 months greater than that of the males, indicating more variability in the length of time that females have been employed in the agency.

In using a measure of central tendency to describe the length of employment, the researcher felt that perhaps it would be more accurate to use the median rather than the mean because in the female sample there were two individuals who had exceptionally long employment records, and their inclusion in the calculation of the mean may have
Table 6.6
Average Length of Employment for Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Social Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
<th>Team Members (N=20)</th>
<th>Male Social Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Social Workers (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x s.d.</td>
<td>x s.d.</td>
<td>x s.d.</td>
<td>x s.d.</td>
<td>x s.d.</td>
<td>x s.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 yrs. 5 yrs.</td>
<td>8 yrs. 4 yrs.</td>
<td>5 yrs. 5 yrs.</td>
<td>6 yrs. 3 yrs.</td>
<td>6 yrs. 5 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 m. 1 m.</td>
<td>7 m. 7 m.</td>
<td>2 m. 4 m.</td>
<td>1 m. 3 m.</td>
<td>1 m. 8 m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
been somewhat distorting.

Table 6.7 presents the length of employment expressed in terms of the median. It can be clearly seen that the team leaders are well experienced workers with a median of 8 years, 4 months of experience. The workers in the agency who are not team leaders have a median of 3 years, 5 months. The male workers have a higher median than the female workers by exactly one year, and they have just about one more year's experience than the combined group of all workers.

All of the foregoing figures illustrate the stability of the sample of social workers used in this investigation. Social workers have a reputation for being quite transient and moving from one job to another. It may be expected that all of the people in the sample had a good basis on which to evaluate their feelings toward their job situation because they had had enough experience with their job to have developed definite feelings toward it. At the same time, it should be remembered that workers may not have had very much opportunity to compare the conditions in their agency with those in other social service agencies.

Present Position

Respondents were asked to indicate how long they had been employed in their present position within the
### Table 6.7

Median Length of Employment for Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Social Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
<th>Team Members (N=20)</th>
<th>Male Social Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Social Workers (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 yrs.</td>
<td>8 yrs.</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
<td>5 yrs.</td>
<td>4 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 m.</td>
<td>4 m.</td>
<td>5 m.</td>
<td>4 m.</td>
<td>4 m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
agency. This question was asked in order to provide some insight into the mobility within the agency. Unfortunately, the question did not allow for an indication of whether employees were moving laterally from one team to another or whether they were moving into positions with more responsibility.

The answers to this question show that there was a wide range in the length of time employees have been working at their present job. The responses ranged from a minimum of 2 months to a maximum of 140 months. In view of the fact that there was one person who has held the same position much longer than anyone else in the agency, the median was chosen as an appropriate measure of central tendency.

Table 6.8 looks at the median length of time employees have been employed in their present positions. The data in Table 6.8 suggest a trend for agency workers to change positions within the agency on a fairly regular basis. Team leaders have been in their positions the longest; they have a median length of time on the job of 1 year, 9 months. The rather consistent rotation within the agency by the workers provides some further evidence that the sample used in this study is generally thoroughly familiar with their place of employment and that workers have formed their attitudes and impressions of their job on the basis of fairly wide exposure to different aspects.
Table 6.8

Median Length of Time in Present Position for Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Social Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
<th>Team Members (N=20)</th>
<th>Male Social Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Social Workers (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yr.</td>
<td>1 yr.</td>
<td>1 yr.</td>
<td>1 yr.</td>
<td>1 yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 m.</td>
<td>9 m.</td>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>4 m.</td>
<td>2 m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the agency.

Past Employment

In addition to indicating how long they had been with the agency and how long they had been in their present job, respondents were asked about any previous full-time social work positions held outside of the agency up to a maximum of five different jobs. Information was requested on when respondents started and finished, what position they had held, and where they had been employed. The data from this question was to be used to allow the researcher to assess how much work experience respondents possessed before they began working with The Children's Aid Society of Essex County.

The study data showed that only seven out of the 28 workers had any previous employment. Of the eight team leaders responding to the questionnaire, three reported that they had been employed in an agency outside of Essex County Children's Aid. One person indicated employment in two agencies other than C.A.S., two people reported employment in one other agency. Five team leaders reported no employment other than that with Children's Aid. Four team members reported that they had been employed in another agency before coming to Essex County Children's Aid. Two people had had one previous job and two people had had two previous jobs. Sixteen of the team members
had not worked for any agency other than C.A.S., and it may be assumed that the job at C.A.S. was their first full-time social work position.

There was no consistency in the kind of jobs these workers had previously held or in the length of time they had held them. The data reveal, however, that 75 per cent of the workers at Essex County Children's Aid have not had any work experience in a social work position outside of that agency. This suggests that three out of every four workers are 'company employees' - that is, they have received all of their on-the-job training from their present employer.

Salary

Study participants were asked to indicate their present salary level according to five possibilities. Three of the five salary categories are presented in Table 6.9. It can be readily seen that there were no workers earning either less than $10,000 or more than $24,999, so the lowest and the highest categories were not included in the table.

Table 6.9 shows that the average income for social workers in the sample clusters in the $15,000 to $19,000 category. Much as one would expect, the salaries of the team leaders are generally higher than those of the team members. Not only do team leaders receive some additional
Table 6.9
Salary Levels for the Five Groups of Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Workers</th>
<th>10,000-14,999</th>
<th>15,000-19,999</th>
<th>20,000-24,999</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All workers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
money for their responsibilities but they have generally more experience and higher educational qualifications which probably entitles them to somewhat higher salaries.

It is not possible to tell from the figures in Table 6.9 exactly how the income of the respondents is stratified. However, in view of the fact that 78.6 per cent of the respondents are in the $15,000 to $19,999 category, it seems safe to say that incomes among the workers do not vary a great deal throughout the sample of workers who participated in this study.

**Job Descriptive Index (JDI)**

On each of the five JDI scales, respondents can achieve a maximum score of 54. A score of 54 indicates that the respondent is very satisfied with the aspect of the job which the scale is measuring. The minimum which a respondent can score on the scale is 0 showing no job satisfaction with the job aspect being studied. The scales therefore range from 0 to 54, with the mid-point being 27. All of the interpretations of the JDI satisfaction areas are based on the scale ranging from 0 to 54.

**Work**

Table 6.10 shows that the intrinsic satisfaction which workers receive from their work ranges from a minimum category of 25-29 to a maximum category of 50-54.
Table 6.10
Responses to the JDI Satisfaction Area of Work*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Scores</th>
<th>All Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
<th>Team Members (N=20)</th>
<th>Male Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Workers (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response scores may range from 0 to 54
The results suggest that there is a fair amount of consistency between various groups in the agency as to how they feel about the work which they do. Approximately 50 per cent of the respondents in every group have responses in the 40-44 and the 45-49 categories. These categories are above the mid-point of 27 and seem to show that generally workers in the agency feel satisfied with their work. A total of 30 per cent of the team members are clustered in the 50-54 category, whereas there are only 12.5 per cent of the team leaders in this highest category. However, this does not seem to indicate a lot of dissatisfaction on the part of the team members in relation to the team leaders because, when the first three categories are observed, it can be seen that 75 per cent of the team leaders are in these categories and 80 per cent of the team members. These response rates are really quite even.

Pay

Table 6.11 suggests that workers are less satisfied with their pay than with the nature of the work which they do. The minimum category is 20-24 which is below the mid-point of 27. The male workers have a high percentage in this category - 37.5 per cent of their number compared to only 5.0 per cent of the female workers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Scores</th>
<th>All Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
<th>Team Members (N=20)</th>
<th>Male Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Workers (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>- %</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>- %</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response scores may range from 0 to 54*
The JDI score category of 40-44 contains 32.2 per cent of all the workers, with 50 per cent of the team leaders responding to this level of satisfaction.

The most dramatic difference in the satisfaction towards pay is between the male and the female workers. It may be that the male workers have more family responsibilities and therefore feel they need a higher income; it may also be that the male workers have higher expectations about what they should be earning and compare themselves somewhat unfavourably to males in other occupations. As a group, the workers' response scores are evenly distributed with the exception of the 40-44 category. Each of the other categories accounts for approximately 10.0 per cent of the respondents.

Opportunities for Promotion

Table 6.12 shows that among the workers as a whole there seems to be little satisfaction with promotional opportunities. A full 72 per cent of the respondents are satisfied with promotions at less than the mid-point category of 25-29. Three groups - all workers, team leaders, and team members - placed themselves in the minimum category of 0-4 which, for all practical purposes, means they are highly dissatisfied with their opportunities for promotion. Below the category of 20-24, 62.5 per cent of the male workers place their responses, while 80
Table 6.12
Responses to the JDI Satisfaction Area of Opportunities for Promotion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Scores</th>
<th>All Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
<th>Team Members (N=20)</th>
<th>Male Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Workers (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>- %</td>
<td>- %</td>
<td>- %</td>
<td>- %</td>
<td>- %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100.0%  100.0%  100.0%  100.0%  100.0%

*Response scores may range from 0 to 54
per cent of the female workers are in this category. Table 6.12 shows a clustering of the responses by female workers in the lower categories, even to a greater extent than the responses from the male workers. Table 6.12 is the only one of the five tables displaying responses to the JDI areas which has the lowest possible category included - that of 0-4. Not only that, but a full 25.0 per cent of the respondents indicate they feel their responses belong to this category.

Supervision

Responses to the area of supervision range from a minimum of 30-34 to a maximum of 50-54. The most strident feature of the data in Table 6.13 is the high percentage of respondents in the maximum category. For all of the workers, 42.8 per cent are in the highest category. In the two highest categories there are 75 per cent of all respondents. A total of 50 per cent of the female workers indicate satisfaction in the 50-54 category, while 87.5 per cent of the male workers responded to the top two categories of 45-49 and 50-54. Table 6.13 shows a trend towards generally high levels of satisfaction with the peer group system of supervision which is used at the Essex County Children's Aid. The majority of the responses are above the level of 40 on the JDI satisfaction scale.
Table 6.13
Responses to the JDI Satisfaction Area of Supervision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Scores</th>
<th>All Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
<th>Team Members (N=20)</th>
<th>Male Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Workers (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response scores may range from 0 to 54
This seems to indicate considerable satisfaction among the employees. As well, there do not appear to be any large differences between the responses of the five groups presented in Table 6.13. Generally, there seems to be agreement among all of the social workers in the sample that they are satisfied with the peer group supervision in which they participate.

People

Table 6.14 shows that there are high levels of satisfaction among employees with regard to their fellow workers. In the sample of all workers, 50 per cent of the workers place themselves in the top two categories of satisfaction with this area. Table 6.14 shows a general trend for all groups of workers to feel satisfied with their co-workers. The majority of the respondents place themselves above the 35 score on the scale.

Of all the respondents, the team leaders are the ones who seem to be the most dissatisfied with their fellow workers. But even with this group, only 25 per cent of the team leaders are below the 40-44 category on the scale. These data seem to indicate that within the agency, the workers get along well with their co-workers and there do not appear to be any groups which are feeling a lot of dissatisfaction in this area in comparison with any other groups. There is a small percentage of the
Table 6.14

Responses to the JDI Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Scores</th>
<th>All Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
<th>Team Members (N=20)</th>
<th>Male Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Workers (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

*Response scores may range from 0 to 54
workers who are dissatisfied below the mid-point of 27, but these workers are well in the minority. In characterizing the general attitude of the respondents, it may be said that satisfaction with co-workers is at a moderately high level in the agency.

**Overall Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction**

Table 6.15 presents the responses to the G.M. 7 Faces Scale on Overall Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction. The two lowest categories with numeric values of 2 and 4 elicited no responses. The responses cluster about the number 7 category. On the scale, the face which had the numeric value of 7 was the first smiling face to the right of the neutral face - the face which was neither smiling nor frowning. The faces with numeric scores of 9 and 11 evoked a 35.7 per cent response from all the workers, a 25 per cent response from team leaders and a 40 per cent response from team members, with the male workers scoring 37.5 per cent and the female workers 35 per cent. The female workers appear to be slightly more satisfied as 10 per cent of their number responded to the face with numeric score 11 - the maximum possible score.

The general feeling which seems to be expressed in Table 6.15 is that workers in the Children's Aid experience more satisfaction from their job than dissatisfaction. About 15 per cent of the workers feel
Table 6.15
Scores on the G.M. Faces Scale of Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faces Scale Score</th>
<th>All Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
<th>Team Members (N=20)</th>
<th>Male Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Workers (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents chose one of 6 faces which had corresponding numeric scores of 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11
neutral towards their job which seems to suggest that they are not very happy about their job but that they are not experiencing enough dissatisfaction to motivate them to leave their position unless there was some substantial incentive for them to do so. Table 6.15 shows a definite trend towards a loading on the positive end of the scale, with no negative responses being recorded.

**Overall Satisfaction**

Table 6.16 presents the scores for the responses to the G.M. Faces Scale on Satisfaction. The respondents indicated the extent of their satisfaction with their job by marking one of six faces which ranged from a neutral face with a numeric score of 6 to a smiling face with a numeric score of 11.

The data in Table 6.16 show that the responses range from 6 to 11, with the highest percentage of responses for all workers being 39.3 per cent in the number 9 category. Team leaders are clustered in this category particularly, with 62.5 per cent of their responses at 9 and the remaining responses in the top two categories of 10 and 11. A full 50 per cent of the team members have responses which are less than 9.

In examining the data for male and female workers, it can be readily seen that the female workers are evenly spread throughout all of the response categories while the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faces Scale Score</th>
<th>Male Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Workers (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Members</td>
<td>Team Leaders (N=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents chose one of 6 faces which had corresponding numeric scores of 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.
male workers tend to cluster much lower with 62.5 per cent of their responses in the lowest two categories. These results seem to indicate that the workers are generally satisfied with their job, especially the team leaders, although there is a discrepancy between the feelings of male and female workers. The female workers generally feel more positively about their jobs; the male workers noticeably less so.

**Overall Dissatisfaction**

Table 6.17 presents the scores for the responses to the G.M. Faces Scale on Dissatisfaction. The respondents indicated how they felt about their job by marking one of six faces which ranged from a face with a deep frown with a numeric score of 1, to a face with a neutral expression which had a numeric score of 6.

The data in Table 6.17 show that 92.8 per cent of the workers in the agency chose the most positive three categories on the dissatisfaction scale. This finding is consistent throughout the other groups. The lowest score was in the number 2 category and was recorded by 12.5 per cent of the team leaders and by 12.5 per cent of the male workers. This is the only incongruous finding in otherwise consistent data which tends to indicate that worker dissatisfaction, although present, is not pronounced. There is nothing to suggest that there are aspects of their jobs
Table 6.17
Scores on the G.M. Faces Scale
of Dissatisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faces Scale Score</th>
<th>All Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
<th>Team Members (N=20)</th>
<th>Male Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Workers (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

*Respondents chose one of 6 faces which had corresponding numeric scores of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
with which workers are extremely dissatisfied.

Summary

This chapter has given a basic description of the sample of social workers used in this study. The sample was described in terms of all of the demographic variables from Part 1 of the questionnaire. This included sex, age, job title, years of formal education, and degrees or certificates held, or both; as well as length of employment with C.A.S., length of time in present job, previous social work jobs done, and salary. The chapter also included discussion about the general attitudes of workers in the sample towards the JDI satisfaction areas and the G.M. Faces Scales.
CHAPTER VII

ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY HYPOTHESES

In Chapter V, six hypotheses were proposed for testing in this study. The purpose of this chapter is to present and discuss the collected study data which relate to these hypotheses. The following format will be used: the hypothesis will be stated, the data relating to the hypothesis will be presented in tabular form, and the data will be discussed in terms of its implications for the Herzberg two-factor theory. It should be noted that the correlations between satisfaction with supervision and co-workers (people), and the overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction scales are presented in the interests of hypothesis formulation since, strictly speaking, these variables are not classified by Herzberg as extrinsic factors and therefore predictions were not made for these two variables. Treating the variables of supervision and co-workers in this manner is consistent with their treatment by Hulin and Smith (1967).

**Hypothesis 1**

Hypothesis 1 - For social workers, intrinsic factors will correlate more highly with overall job satisfaction than with overall job dissatisfaction.

133.
Table 7.1 shows that for the intrinsic factor of work there is a correlation of .09 with overall satisfaction and a correlation of .29 with overall dissatisfaction. For the intrinsic factor of promotions, the table shows a correlation of .23 with overall satisfaction and a correlation of .10 with overall dissatisfaction.

The correlations relating work with overall satisfaction and overall dissatisfaction are the opposite to the correlations predicted by Hypothesis 1. The correlations involving promotions are consistent with the hypothesized relationships. However, the correlation coefficients are so small that it may be said that there is no association between promotions and dissatisfaction and only very little association between promotions and satisfaction.

The study data presented in Table 7.1 provides no support for Hypothesis 1. The data fail to show that the intrinsic factors of work and promotions are more highly associated with overall job satisfaction than with overall job dissatisfaction.

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2 - For social workers, extrinsic factors will correlate more highly with overall job dissatisfaction than with overall job satisfaction.

In Table 7.2 the extrinsic factor of pay correlates
Table 7.1.
Correlations Between Satisfaction with Intrinsic Aspects of the Job and Overall Job Satisfaction for All Social Work Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Areas (Intrinsic)</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction (N=28)</th>
<th>Overall Dissatisfaction (N=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2

Correlations Between Satisfaction with Extrinsic Aspects of the Job and Overall Job Satisfaction for All Social Work Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Areas (Extrinsic)</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction (N=28)</th>
<th>Overall Dissatisfaction (N=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
with overall satisfaction at the .11 level, and with overall dissatisfaction at the .13 level. Supervision has a correlation of -.19 with overall satisfaction, and a correlation of .16 with overall dissatisfaction. In contrast, the table shows the extrinsic factor of co-workers has a moderate correlation of .40 with overall dissatisfaction. The correlation is significant at the 0.05 level of significance. The correlation between co-workers and overall satisfaction is .00.

The correlation coefficients for pay and supervision are too small to suggest the existence of an association between them and the overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction measures. But the data do seem to indicate a relationship between the overall measures and co-workers. In the context of the two-factor theory, this finding about co-workers means that social workers who are happy with their colleagues do not experience a significant increase in their overall satisfaction, but social workers who are unhappy with those with whom they work feel a significant measure of dissatisfaction with the work situation.

According to the data in Table 7.2, Hypothesis 2 has received little support. Although the findings for the co-workers variable do support the theory, there is not the slightest support for the theory from the data on pay and supervision. It must be inferred from this data
that the hypothesized relationship between the extrinsic factors and overall dissatisfaction and satisfaction does not exist with this sample of social workers from the Essex County Children's Aid.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 - For social workers, intrinsic factors will correlate significantly more highly with overall job satisfaction than will the extrinsic factors.

The responses of 28 Children's Aid workers in relation to Hypothesis 3 are displayed in Table 7.3.

In Table 7.3 there are very small correlations between satisfaction and work \((r = 0.09)\), pay \((r = 0.11)\), and supervision \((r = -0.19)\). There is no correlation for co-workers \((r = 0.0)\). The intrinsic factor of promotions and overall satisfaction has a moderate correlation of 0.23.

The correlation coefficients for work, pay, and supervision are very small, and it is non-existent for co-workers, so that it may be said there is no association between either the intrinsic or the extrinsic satisfaction and areas of overall satisfaction. The moderate association between promotions and overall satisfaction does not support the prediction made by Hypothesis 3.
Table 7.3
Correlations Between Satisfaction with Different Aspects of the Job and Overall Job Satisfaction for All Social Work Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Areas</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction (N=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings displayed in Table 7.3 do not support Hypothesis 3. According to the Herzberg theory, the intrinsic factors have more influence on overall satisfaction of workers than do the extrinsic factors. This study data suggests that none of the five satisfaction areas measured in this study have any significant influence on the workers' overall satisfaction, and that there is no distinction between the influence of the intrinsic, as opposed to the influence of the extrinsic, factors on overall satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 - For social workers, extrinsic factors will correlate significantly more highly with overall job dissatisfaction than will the intrinsic factors.

Table 7.4 presents the data concerning Hypothesis 4. It can be seen that the intrinsic factors of work and promotions correlate with overall dissatisfaction at the .29 and .10 levels respectively. Among the extrinsic factors there is a correlation coefficient of .13 between pay and dissatisfaction, and a correlation coefficient of .16 between supervision and dissatisfaction. In contrast to these findings, Table 7.4 shows that the extrinsic factor of co-workers has a correlation coefficient of .40 at the 0.05 level of significance.
Table 7.4
Correlations Between Satisfaction with Different Aspects of the Job and Overall Job Dissatisfaction for All Social Work Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Areas</th>
<th>Overall Dissatisfaction (N=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extrinsic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
The only finding of significance is that of the co-workers variable which was discussed in a previous section on Hypothesis 2. The data do not indicate any trend in favour of support for Hypothesis 4, and it seems that the relationship predicted in that hypothesis does not exist.

**Hypothesis 5**

Hypothesis 5 - Intrinsic factors will relate more strongly to both overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction than will extrinsic factors. This hypothesis was developed as a possible alternative to the Herzberg prediction about the operations of intrinsic and extrinsic factors.

Table 7.5 shows the correlations between the intrinsic factors and overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and the same correlations between the satisfaction concepts and extrinsic factors. The correlation coefficients are all small and, except for the association between co-workers and dissatisfaction, none of the relationships are significant.

As has been noted previously, the very small correlation coefficients suggest that there is no support for an association between the variables and overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The exception is the co-workers variable which, in isolation, is basically meaningless to Hypothesis 5. There is no trend in the
Table 7.5
Correlations Between Satisfaction with Different Aspects of the Job and Overall Job Satisfaction for All Social Work Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Areas</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction (N=28)</th>
<th>Overall Dissatisfaction (N=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
findings in Table 7.5 to show that the intrinsic factors
tend to relate more strongly to both overall satisfaction
and dissatisfaction than do the extrinsic factors. There
is no support for Hypothesis 5.

Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 - The relationship between extrinsic
factors and overall satisfaction-dissatisfaction depends
on the level of satisfaction with the intrinsic variables.
This hypothesis was also developed as a possible alterna-
tive to the Herzberg predictions about the operations of
intrinsic and extrinsic factors.

The pattern between the variables and the overall
satisfaction-dissatisfaction scale suggested in Hypothesis
6 does not emerge from the data in Table 7.6. The associa-
tions between the extrinsic factors and the overall
satisfaction-dissatisfaction measure appear to be quite
random and do not depend on the level of satisfaction with
the intrinsic factor. Hypothesis 6 does not seem to
provide a viable alternative explanation to the operation
of the job factors.

Discussion

An examination of the study data in relation to
the six study hypotheses has provided virtually no
support for the ideas of the Herzberg two-factor theory.
Table 7.6

Correlations Between Satisfaction with Different Aspects of the Job and Overall Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction for All Social Work Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Areas</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction (N=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
Two possible alternative explanations for the behaviour of the intrinsic and extrinsic variables have fared no better; they have received no support from the study findings. However, before discussing some of the perhaps lesser, but nevertheless interesting, findings several alternative presentations of the study data will be given. The data have been analyzed for the subgroups of team leaders, team members, male workers, and female workers.

**Team Leaders**

Table 7.7 presents the data relating to the six study hypotheses for the Essex County Children's Aid team leaders. It can readily be seen from Table 7.7 that the intrinsic factors of work and promotions correlate more highly with overall satisfaction than with overall dissatisfaction. For the intrinsic factor of work, the correlation is .70 (p < 0.05). The trend towards support for Hypothesis 1 cannot be considered to be a strong one in view of the fact that only one significant relationship is revealed by the data. The data in Table 7.7 provide no support for any of the other five study hypotheses.
Table 7.7
Correlations Between Satisfaction with Different Aspects of the Job and Overall Job Satisfaction for All Team Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Areas</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction (N=8)</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction (N=8)</th>
<th>Overall Dissatisfaction (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
Team Members

In Table 7.8 the study findings are presented according to the correlations between satisfaction with the intrinsic and extrinsic factors and the overall measures of job satisfaction for all Essex County C.A.S. team members, except for the team leaders. An examination of the data in Table 7.8 reveals that there is no support for Hypothesis 1. Similarly, the data do not support Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4. Although the extrinsic factor of co-workers does correlate significantly more highly with overall dissatisfaction than do any of the intrinsic factors, the correlation is modest and does not provide evidence of a trend supporting any of the hypotheses. Also, Table 7.8 shows that the relationships predicted by Hypotheses 5 and 6 are not supported by the study findings.

Male Workers

Table 7.9 displays the study data resulting from an analysis of the responses of only the Essex County C.A.S. male workers. The data provides no support for any of the six study hypotheses. None of the associations between the intrinsic or extrinsic factors and the overall measures is statistically significant. In fact, the majority of the correlation coefficients are small.
Table 7.8

Correlations Between Satisfaction with Different Aspects of the Job and Overall Job Satisfaction for Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Areas</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction (N=20)</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction (N=20)</th>
<th>Overall Dissatisfaction (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.50*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
Table 7.9

Correlations Between Satisfaction with Different Aspects of the Job and Overall Job Satisfaction for All Male Social Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Areas</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction (N=8)</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction (N=8)</th>
<th>Overall Dissatisfaction (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
enough that it is not inappropriate to conclude that no relationships exist between the JDI satisfaction areas and overall job satisfaction.

**Female Workers**

Table 7.10 displays the data on the responses of the female workers in the Essex County Children's Aid. The table shows two statistically significant associations. One is the correlation between supervision and overall satisfaction-dissatisfaction; the other is the correlation between co-workers and overall dissatisfaction. However, these findings do not provide enough evidence to confirm any of the proposed relationships in the six study hypotheses.

**Summary**

This chapter has examined the study data in relation to the six study hypotheses. The data have been analyzed for the entire sample of Children's Aid social workers and for the groupings of team leaders, team members, male social workers, and female social workers. The data supporting the theory was inconsistent and was seldom statistically significant. An analysis of the various groupings did not provide any increase in support for the two-factor theory. It may be said that the two-factor theory has received no meaningful support.
Table 7.10
Correlations Between Satisfaction with Different Aspects of the Job and Overall Job Satisfaction for All Female Social Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Areas</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction (N=20)</th>
<th>Overall Dissatisfaction (N=20)</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction (N=20)</th>
<th>Overall Dissatisfaction (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05  
** p < 0.01
Neither has there been any support for the other variations of the theory which were outlined in Hypotheses 5 and 6.
CHAPTER VIII

FINDINGS: SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS

This chapter presents all of the significant relationships which were found to exist between the satisfaction measures and the demographic variables. The discussion focuses on each of the five groups which have been discussed previously, namely, all workers, team leaders, team members, male workers, and female workers.

Significant Relationships

Besides providing the required information relating to the study hypotheses, the data analysis furnished some additional information about the variables operating to effect levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with various job aspects. The purpose of this chapter is to present the relationships which indicate a degree of association which has a degree of statistical significance of less than 0.05. For each of the five JDI job aspects and for the three measures of satisfaction on the G.M. Faces Scales all of the significant relationships have been analyzed for each of the variables in Part 1 of the questionnaire and according to the five data analysis groups - all social workers, team leaders, 154.
team members, male workers, and female workers.

Work

Table 8.1 presents the data on the degree of association between the nature of the work as measured by the JDI and several educational qualifications. It must be remembered that the educational categories are not mutually exclusive so that a respondent may possess more than one of the qualifications.

For the sample of all workers there is a positive relationship between those with B.S.W. degrees and the amount of satisfaction they receive from their work \( (r = .35) \). This finding suggests that social workers in the Essex County C.A.S. who have a B.S.W. degree generally are satisfied with the nature of the work in which they are engaged. No significant relationships exist for any of the other worker groupings.

Among workers with an M.S.W. degree there is a significant negative relationship between satisfaction with the nature of the work and the possession of an M.S.W. among the female workers \( (r = -.46) \). This implies that female workers who have M.S.W. degrees are not as satisfied with their work as are some other groups in the agency.

There are negative relationships between the nature of the work and the possession of a qualification other than that of a B.A., B.S.W., or an M.S.W. for the three
Table 3.1
Correlations Between the Nature of the Work and Educational Qualifications for Four Groupings of Social Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Qualification</th>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Area of Work</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Workers (N=28)</td>
<td>Team Members (N=20)</td>
<td>Male Workers (N=8)</td>
<td>Female Workers (N=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.W.</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
<td>-.80*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
groupings of all workers, team members, and male workers. There is also a relationship which is negative but not significant for the female workers. The consistency of this significant finding across so many groupings gives a fairly strong indication that workers who have some or perhaps all of their educational training in an area other than social work do not experience as much satisfaction from the nature of the work in which they are engaged as workers with formal social work training. It may be speculated that these people often find that their concept of social work and the reality of the delivery of social work services is at variance, or that the nature of their day-to-day duties is not what they expected, or, quite naturally, what they had been trained to do.

A review of the significant correlations in Table 8.2 reveals that there is a positive association between satisfaction with the nature of the work and the length of time employed by C.A.S. for three groupings of workers. For all workers, all team members, and the female workers there is a pronounced tendency to feel more satisfied with the work the longer that they have been employed in the agency. It seems that as workers become more familiar with their responsibilities and the expectations of their job they tend to be more satisfied with their work.

Consistent with the data in Table 8.2, the data in Table 8.3 indicate that for all workers, for the groupings
Table 8.2
Correlations Between the Nature of the Work and Length of Employment with C.A.S. for Five Groupings of Social Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Area of Work</th>
<th>Length of Time Employed by C.A.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All workers</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team leaders</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members</td>
<td>.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male workers</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female workers</td>
<td>.54**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05  
**p < 0.01
Table 8.3
Correlations Between the Nature of the Work and Length of Time in Present C.A.S. Position for Five Groupings of Social Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Area of Work</th>
<th>Length of Time in Present C.A.S. Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All workers</td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team leaders</td>
<td>.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members</td>
<td>.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male workers</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female workers</td>
<td>.43*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
of team members and team leaders, and for female workers there is a tendency to experience greater satisfaction with the work as the length of time at the present job increases. The possible explanations cited for the data on length of employment in Table 8.2 are congruent with the data in Table 8.3. It is interesting to note that in neither case is the length of time at the job or in the agency associated with increased feelings of satisfaction with the work for the male workers. It may be that male workers find familiarity with the job somewhat frustrating and prefer the challenge of a new position rather than familiarity with a general work routine.

Pay

For the male workers there is a negative correlation between pay and possession of a B.A. qualification \( r = 0.77; p < 0.05 \). Team leaders also show a negative correlation between pay and having a B.A. \( r = 0.83; p < 0.01 \). These findings may be said to be of a spurious nature. There are no male workers or team leaders in the agency who are working with a B.A. qualification and no other formal training. The relationship between the variables seem likely to be the result of a relationship to some third variable or combination of variables.

The data on male workers shows an association between pay and length of time employed in the agency
(r = .85; p < 0.01). A similar association between pay and time employed also appears for team leaders (r = .65; p < 0.05). These figures indicate that the longer a male worker, and/or a team leader has been employed in the agency the more likely that he will be satisfied with the rate of pay. This finding is not surprising when it is considered that those who have been employed the longest are probably those who are making the best salaries.

**Supervision**

In the JDI satisfaction area of supervision the findings show a strong tendency for high levels of satisfaction with the peer group supervision system at Essex County C.A.S. among the team leaders who have M.S.W. degrees. However, there is also a trend for the team leaders to feel more dissatisfied with the supervisory system as their educational level increases (r = -.71; p > 0.05), and as their salary level increases (r = -.79; p > 0.01).

More experienced and educated team leaders may feel that they do not experience as much 'growth' in terms of their own professional development as they would like to experience. It may be speculated that this dissatisfaction results to some extent from a feeling that there are fewer opportunities for promotion than they would like, and therefore they experience more frustration in the
present set-up although the study data do not reveal any significant associations between promotion and any other variables.

People

The findings show a significant correlation between workers' satisfaction with their co-workers and the number of years they have been employed at Children's Aid (r = .33; p > 0.05). There is also a significant negative correlation between team leaders' satisfaction with their colleagues and the possession of a B.A. degree (r = -.73; p > 0.05).

The association between satisfaction with people and length of employment in the agency suggests that workers who have been employed longer, and presumably know their colleagues and their jobs the best, feel more satisfaction with their fellow workers. This may also mean that new employees do not feel as satisfied with their fellow workers because they have not had as much opportunity to get to know them. Possibly the more experienced workers have established friendship networks which more recently employed workers have not been invited to join.

The negative association between satisfaction with people and possession of a B.A., which is found among the team leaders, must be regarded as a spurious finding.
Only one team leader in the sample did not have a B.A. degree.

The data reveal some other relationships for the team leaders. For the team leaders the data show high correlations between the number of previous jobs and satisfaction with co-workers \((r = -0.99; p < 0.008)\). Also for team leaders there is a high correlation between the time spent on the previous job and satisfaction with co-workers \((r = -0.99; p < 0.008)\), and a high correlation between time spent at previous jobs and overall satisfaction \((r = 1.00; p = 0.000)\).

These extremely high correlations suggest that among the team leaders, those who have had the most previous job experience and have spent the most time at previous jobs are those who are most dissatisfied with their co-workers. The correlations also suggest that these same team leaders tend to experience more overall satisfaction in relation to the more previous jobs they have had and the longer the time they spent at these previous jobs.

**JDI Satisfaction Areas and Age**

Table 8.4 shows the association between the JDI satisfaction areas and age for five groupings of social workers. The first column of Table 8.4 indicates a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Satisfaction Area</th>
<th>All Social Workers (N=28)</th>
<th>Male Workers (N=8)</th>
<th>Female Workers (N=20)</th>
<th>Team Leaders (N=8)</th>
<th>Team Members (N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.69*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
**p < 0.01
relationship of increased satisfaction with all of the JDI areas as the age of the social work sample increases. The areas of work, promotions and people are statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

When the data are examined according to sex, different patterns of increased satisfaction are revealed for males and females. Male workers tend to experience a significant degree of satisfaction with the variables of pay and supervision at higher age levels, while for females the association between increased age and higher levels of satisfaction is significant for the intrinsic variables of work and promotions.

The data in Table 8.4 reveal that, for team leaders, there is a significant association between increased age and more satisfaction with co-workers. The data also reveal that as age among team leaders increases, satisfaction with the work tends to decrease, although this relationship is not significant.

Among team members there is a significant positive association between age and satisfaction with work. This is consistent with a similar finding for female workers and is not surprising as most of the team members are female.

**Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction**

The study findings show that, among all workers, those with M.S.W. degrees tend to express significantly
more satisfaction ($r = .37; p < 0.05$). Also, among this group less satisfaction tends to be expressed the higher the salary level ($r = 0.32; p < 0.05$). For team leaders, the data indicate that years of education ($r = -.67; p < 0.05$), time at the job ($r = -.73; p < 0.05$), and increasing salary ($r = -.69; p < 0.05$) all tend to be negatively associated with satisfaction on the G.M. Faces Scale for satisfaction-dissatisfaction. Team leaders with M.S.W. degrees have a positive correlation with the G.M. Faces Scale ($r = .69; p < 0.05$). The length of time on the job is negatively associated with satisfaction for the group of male workers ($r = .74; p < 0.05$).

In looking at these findings, it should be kept in mind that the satisfaction-dissatisfaction scale used in this study was composed of only 6 of a possible 11 faces. Consequently, it is a much cruder measuring instrument than either the satisfaction only faces scale or the dissatisfaction only faces scale, each of which has 6 faces, but which measures only one aspect of the satisfaction/dissatisfaction concept.

The findings in this section seem to indicate that among the team leaders, the higher the educational level, the more experienced and the more highly paid, the greater the tendency to be less satisfied with the job. Such feelings may be the result of some boredom or the lack of challenge, or perhaps the result of feelings of
frustration at having reached the top with nowhere else to advance. It may be that those with the highest qualifications feel undervalued by the agency.

**Overall Satisfaction**

The study findings show an association between length of time on the job and overall satisfaction \((r = .70; p < 0.05)\). It seems that as the length of time on the job increases, team leaders experience more satisfaction with their work. This data is consistent with the findings presented in Table 8.3 which show a positive correlation between the JDI satisfaction area of work and the length of time a team leader has been on the job \((r = .74; p < 0.05)\).

For the grouping of female workers, the findings show a negative correlation between possession of an M.S.W. and overall satisfaction \((r = -.40; p < 0.05)\). Although the correlation is only moderate it does seem to indicate a tendency for female workers with M.S.W. degrees to be less satisfied with their job overall compared with other groups of workers such as male employees with M.S.W. degrees.

**Overall Dissatisfaction**

Among the team members, those people who have had the most previous job experience and who have therefore had
more changes of employment tend to be dissatisfied with their job. There is a positive correlation between past employment and dissatisfaction for team members. \( r = .91; \) \( p < 0.05 \). They also register a correlation between the number of job changes and overall job dissatisfaction.

It may be speculated that those workers with higher job turnover rates left their previous jobs because they were dissatisfied, and that dissatisfaction with their job is a pattern with them.

**Summary**

This chapter has presented the significant correlations which were found in the study data between the demographic variables and the satisfaction measures. The nature of the associations was given and some reasons for their occurrence were put forward in a speculative discussion.
CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter the foregoing study will be summarized. As well, some suggestions for further research will be given.

Purpose

The Herzberg two-factor theory of job satisfaction states that two groups of factors exist in the work situation. These factors have different consequences for job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. The so-called 'intrinsic' factors influence job satisfaction but not job dissatisfaction, whereas the so-called 'extrinsic' factors influence job dissatisfaction but not job satisfaction.

The literature on the two-factor theory identified two areas of continuing controversy. The one area concerned the method by which the theory was studied. It revealed a tendency for the theory to be supported whenever the Herzberg storytelling method was used, but to fail to be confirmed whenever another data collection procedure was followed. The second area in the literature suggested that the theory operated differently for different occupational groups.
The purpose of this study was to test the validity of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction using a method of data collection other than the storytelling method, and to select a study sample from an occupational group which had not been tested previously with such an alternative method. The result was a correlational study of the two-factor theory using a sample of social workers.

**Instruments**

In this study, the factors were measured using the Job Descriptive Index, which measures the intrinsic factors of 'work', 'promotions', and the extrinsic factors of 'pay', 'supervision', and 'co-workers'. These intrinsic and extrinsic factors were correlated with overall satisfaction-dissatisfaction, overall satisfaction, and overall dissatisfaction measured by the G.M. Faces Scales.

**Hypotheses**

The main focus of the study was on six hypotheses. Four of the hypotheses were formulated from predictions about the association between variables, that is, between the intrinsic or extrinsic variables and the overall measures of satisfaction. Two of the hypotheses were designed as possible alternative explanations to the workings of the two-factor theory.
The study hypotheses were as follows:

Hypothesis 1 - For social workers, intrinsic factors will correlate more highly with overall job satisfaction than with overall job dissatisfaction.

Hypothesis 2 - For social workers, extrinsic factors will correlate more highly with overall job dissatisfaction than with overall job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3 - For social workers, intrinsic factors will correlate significantly more highly with overall job satisfaction than will the extrinsic factors.

Hypothesis 4 - For social workers, extrinsic factors will correlate significantly more highly with overall job dissatisfaction than will the intrinsic factors.

Hypothesis 5 - Intrinsic factors will relate more strongly to both overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction than will extrinsic factors.

Hypothesis 6 - The relationship between extrinsic factors and overall satisfaction-dissatisfaction depends on the level of satisfaction with the intrinsic variables.

Study Procedure

The study questionnaire consisted of three parts - a general questionnaire asking for demographic information, the Job Descriptive Index, and the G.M. Faces Scales. The questionnaire was administered to twenty-eight social workers employed at the Essex County Children's Aid Society. The researcher passed out the questionnaires to social work teams of three or four workers and the workers completed the questionnaires and returned them immediately to the researcher.
Data Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using the SPSS computer sub-programs of Frequencies and Pearson Corr. The hypothesized relationships between variables were tested, and the data were analyzed for other statistically significant relationships as well.

Findings

Contrary to the relationship predicted by Hypothesis 1, the intrinsic factors were not more highly associated with overall job satisfaction than with overall job dissatisfaction. Conversely, the predicted relationship in Hypothesis 2, that extrinsic factors would correlate more highly with overall job dissatisfaction than overall job satisfaction, was not supported except for the 'coworkers' variable. Despite this support, the extrinsic variables of 'pay' and 'supervision' failed to provide any supplementary support, so that Hypothesis 2 was rejected. The third hypothesis predicted that the intrinsic factors would correlate significantly more highly with overall job satisfaction than would the extrinsic factors. The findings did not affirm this hypothesis; there was no distinction between the influence of the intrinsic and the extrinsic factors on overall job satisfaction. Similarly, the study results failed to provide support for the pre-
diction of Hypothesis 4, that extrinsic factors would correlate significantly more highly with overall job dissatisfaction than would the intrinsic factors. The 'co-workers' variable supported Hypothesis 4, but the extrinsic variables together did not support a trend in favour of its confirmation.

Hypotheses 5 and 6 were developed to provide alternative explanations for the operation of the intrinsic and extrinsic variables as predicted by the two-factor theory. There was no trend in the findings to support the idea of the fifth hypothesis that intrinsic factors would relate more strongly to both overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction than would extrinsic factors. The suggestion in Hypothesis 6, that the relationship between extrinsic factors and overall satisfaction-dissatisfaction, would depend on the level of satisfaction with the intrinsic variables.

In addition to being analyzed for the entire sample of social workers, the data were also studied in four sub-groups. Testing the six study hypotheses within the sub-groups of team leaders, team members, male workers, and female workers provided no increase in support for either the two-factor theory or the two possible alternatives to it.

This study failed to find any support for the
operation of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction as predicted.

The questionnaire responses of the study participants were summarized descriptively. This summary of the data yielded information about the job satisfaction of the social workers of the Essex County Children's Aid Society who took part in the study.

For the Job Descriptive Index satisfaction areas, the following assessments were made about the job satisfaction of study participants.

1. Work - The social workers in the study expressed satisfaction with their work at a "moderately high" level. That is, their responses tended to cluster in the three highest satisfaction categories on the satisfaction scale.

2. Pay - Satisfaction with pay was lower than satisfaction with work. The majority of the social workers responded to one of the two satisfaction categories immediately below the highest category. There were several responses below the mid-point on the scale.

3. Opportunity for Promotion - This satisfaction area elicited responses which showed less satisfaction with it than with any other area that was measured. A full 25 per cent of the sample checked the bottom category on the scale, indicating they were highly dissatisfied with their chances for advancement within the agency.
There was a noticeable dichotomy along sex lines. Female workers were more dissatisfied with promotional opportunities than were male workers. Of the female workers, 90 per cent responded at the mid-point or lower, compared to 62.5 per cent of the male workers.

4. Supervision - There was a high level of satisfaction with supervision among the study respondents. Most of the replies in this area were clustered in the two highest categories on the satisfaction scale. There were no responses below the mid-point.

5. People - The responses on the people or co-workers scale indicated that study participants felt a "moderately high" degree of satisfaction with their co-workers. There were several exceptions where workers suggested they were very dissatisfied. However, the level of satisfaction can be said to be generally high because 32.2 per cent of all workers replied to the highest category on the satisfaction scale.

For the G.M. Faces Scale, general measures of job satisfaction, the following insights about the sample were produced by the data.

1. Overall Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction - There was a trend towards a heavy loading of responses on the positive end of this scale. Generally, social workers in the sample felt they experienced more satisfaction than dissatisfaction with their job.
2. Overall Satisfaction - Results on this measure confirmed that the study respondents were satisfied with their jobs. According to this measure, team leaders appeared to be well satisfied, although the responses of female workers in the sample tended to be somewhat more positive than the responses of the males.

3. Most workers, with only a few exceptions, placed themselves towards the high or 'least dissatisfied' end of the measure indicating generally low levels of dissatisfaction.

The study data were also analyzed to determine if there were significant relationships among the study variables. In order for a relationship between two variables to be deemed significant, it had to have a statistically significant level of $p<0.05$, and the relationship had to be amenable to a non-spurious explanation. In this manner, the following significant relationships between variables were identified.

1. Social workers who had some or perhaps all of their educational training in an area other than social work tended not to express as much satisfaction with the nature of their work as did workers with formal social work training.

2. There was a tendency for satisfaction with fellow workers to increase as length of employment with the Essex County Children's Aid increased.
3. There was a tendency for satisfaction with all of the Job Descriptive Index satisfaction areas to increase as the age of the workers in the sample increased.

4. For all workers, team members, and female workers, there was a tendency towards increased satisfaction with their work the longer that they had been employed by the Essex County C.A.S.

5. For all workers, team leaders, team members, and female workers, there was a tendency to experience greater satisfaction with their work the longer they had been at their present job within the agency.

6. For team leaders, there was a trend to feel more dissatisfied with supervision as their educational level increased, and as their salary level increased.

7. For team leaders, there was a tendency for those who had had the most previous job experience and had spent the most time at previous jobs to be most dissatisfied with their co-workers. These same people tended to express higher levels of overall satisfaction.

8. For team leaders, there was a trend towards increased satisfaction with co-workers as their age increased.

9. For team leaders, there was a tendency towards increased overall job satisfaction as the length of time on their job increased.
10. For team leaders, as the educational level, the years of experience, and the pay level increased, there was a greater tendency to be less satisfied with the job on the Overall Satisfaction-Dissatisfaction Scale.

11. For team leaders and male workers, there was a trend towards greater satisfaction with pay the longer they had been employed by the Children's Aid Society.

12. For team members, those who had the most previous job experience and therefore had more changes of employment, tended to be more dissatisfied with their jobs.

13. For team members and for female workers, there was a tendency towards increased satisfaction with work as their ages increased.

14. Male workers tended to experience increased satisfaction with the variables of pay and supervision as their age increased.

15. For female workers, there was a tendency for those who had M.S.W. degrees to be less satisfied with their work than groups with other educational qualifications.

16. Female workers tended to experience increased satisfaction with the intrinsic variables of work and promotion as their age increased.

The foregoing significant findings are essentially
autonomous from one another. Each finding provides some understanding about job satisfaction, but they do not lend themselves to being summarized into a comprehensive synopsis about the job satisfaction of the social workers at the Essex County Children's Aid.

Suggestions for Further Study

In this study, the two-factor theory was tested with a limited sample of social workers. The researcher suggests that this study be replicated with a larger sample of social workers, perhaps a cross-section of workers randomly selected from the social work community. The location could be a city such as Windsor, or it might be expanded to include workers from all across the province of Ontario.

The researcher also recommends that consideration be given to including other human service professionals in a study on the two-factor theory. For example, study participants could include psychologists, or administrators in human service agencies.

The researcher feels that further exploration is required around the question of the influence which the storytelling method has on the two-factor theory. It is recommended that data be collected by the storytelling method and by a correlational study method from individuals randomly selected from the study sample. The results of
the data collected from those in the storytelling group could be compared against the data collected from those in the correlational study group. A ready comparison could be made as to which group provides the most support for the two-factor theory.

It seems likely that the relationships which the two-factor theory predict are actually more complicated than the theory suggests. Therefore, the researcher recommends that more attention be paid to the demographic variables and the possible complicating effects which these variables may exert on job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

These suggestions for further research are made in the interests of developing a greater understanding of how human service professionals function within the organizational settings through which the bulk of their services are delivered. A better understanding in this area will surely lead to increased effectiveness in the delivery of human services.

Conclusions

The study findings have provided material for speculation. The following discussion is based on inferences which the researcher has drawn from the study data.

The two-factor theory was not confirmed in this
correlational study. This is in accordance with the literature which points out that when the Herzberg story-telling method is used the theory tends to be confirmed, but when other methods are used the theory is not upheld. The researcher concludes that the two-factor theory has been dealt a severe blow, not because of the method used in the study, but because of the occupational composition of the sample.

The researcher feels that there is a quality in the nature of social work which tends to accentuate the importance of the intrinsic factors in determining job satisfaction. This may be seen in the altruistic reasons why people enter social work in the first place. On any random selection of application forms to schools of social work, it is virtually certain that there would be, on every application, some mention of the applicants liking for people, or his ability to relate to people or his desire to be part of a profession which is 'people-oriented'. One would expect that the intrinsic factor of 'work' would have been clearly related to general job satisfaction. However, in this study, the association was not confirmed.

This study showed a trend towards the acceptance of the B.S.W. degree as the standard qualification for a social work position in the Essex County C.A.S. The study also showed that when employees have some formal social
work education they are more satisfied with their work. The researcher concludes that the hiring of professionally trained social workers is a positive trend and that it will inevitably lead to higher levels of job satisfaction in social agencies. Presumably, social work education imparts a common core of knowledge, skills, and values, which help social workers to feel more positively towards their jobs.

The study findings that employees tend to be more satisfied with their jobs the longer they have worked with the agency suggests that familiarity with the job is an important determinant of job satisfaction. The researcher feels this implies that agency administrators should consciously work to keep employees on the job as long as possible. There are benefits in terms of on-going case management and the provision of a continuous high quality service to clients, and apparently these workers are more content with their jobs as well.

The researcher speculates that the most dissatisfaction with work in social service agencies occurs during the first two years of employment and that once these years have passed social workers tend to become more satisfied with their jobs. It may be that these first two years are a "critical period" and that the agency administration should focus time and resources on workers at this time. Such resources could include a comprehensive
orientation programme, good in-service training, and helpful supervision during the 'critical phase'.

Workers in this study expressed generally high levels of satisfaction with the agency's system of supervision. The researcher concludes that the findings endorse the team or peer system of supervision as one which contributes to the job satisfaction of the average agency worker. The study findings showed somewhat less support for this proposition among employees who had higher levels of education and higher salaries, and presumably more experience. It may be that these workers feel that they do not receive enough opportunity to develop their skills under this system because they are not receiving traditional one-to-one supervision.

The one obvious difficulty which arises with the peer group supervision system is that there are fewer opportunities for promotion in the agency. The researcher suggests that one of the reasons why there was considerable dissatisfaction expressed in the area of opportunities for promotion is that the peer supervision system tends to cut down on the number of avenues available for advancement within the Essex County Children's Aid Society. The absence of traditional supervisory positions virtually 'wipes out' the middle management section of the agency. There seems to be a trade-off between satisfaction with supervision versus satisfaction with opportunities for
promotion.

This seems to be reflected as well in the findings that team leaders with the most education and experience tended to be somewhat more dissatisfied on the overall satisfaction-dissatisfaction scale. The researcher thinks that this is another indication that workers with the ability and experience to 'move on' do not find that opportunity available within their agency.

It was stated at the beginning of this section that these conclusions are speculative in nature and are based on the researcher's personal inferences. However, they do provide some clues as to which variables bearing on job satisfaction may prove amenable to insightful research in the future.
Dear

In our telephone conversation earlier this week, you indicated that it would not be convenient for your team to complete the enclosed questionnaire, at a team meeting, for perhaps several weeks. As I would like to have the questionnaires completed as soon as possible I have decided to distribute them to all team members and ask that they be returned in the stamped, self-addressed envelopes as soon as they can be completed.

The questionnaires are part of an M.S.W. thesis study at the University of Windsor on the job attitudes of social workers. The questionnaire tests a theory of job satisfaction (Herzberg two-factor theory) which has been tested with a variety of occupations – for example, engineers and accountants, but not with human service workers. This study should provide information on whether the theory is applicable to social workers.

The questionnaire has one section on supervision which, strictly speaking, does not apply in a team supervision set-up. However, when discussing this with Mr. Peter McCabe he suggested that respondents answer the question so as to evaluate their colleagues in the context of the peer supervision they receive from them.

As the other teams in the agency have been able to complete the questionnaire I would appreciate it if you would complete and return the attached questionnaire as soon as possible. Section 1 requests demographic information, Section 11 asks for "yes" or "no" or "?" responses to five adjective checklists, and Section 111 requires marking one of six faces in response to the question at the top of the scale. The questionnaire should not take more than 15-20 minutes to complete.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation in this matter.

Yours truly,

Brian Brewer.
PART 1

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your present job title? ____________________________

2. How many years of formal education have you had? (For example, 13 years of elementary & high school + a 3 year degree = 16 years total.)

3. What degrees and/or certificates do you now hold?

4. How long have you been employed by this agency? Please answer in months.

5. How long have you been in your present position? Please answer in months.

6. What is your present salary level?

   _______ under 10,000

   _______ 10,000 - 14,999

   _______ 15,000 - 19,999

   _______ 20,000 - 24,999

   _______ over 25,000

7. Please list your last five full-time social work positions. Begin with your most recent employment. Do not include summer employment held between years of education.

   starting date  ending date  position  organization

   ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________  ____________

   ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________  ____________

   ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________  ____________

   ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________  ____________

   ____________________________  ____________________________  ____________  ____________
8. What is your age? ___20-29, ___30-39, ___40-49, 
     ___50-59, ___60&over
9. What is your sex? ___M ___F
THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words describe your present pay? Put a check in the blank beside each word put.

Y if it describes your pay
N if it does NOT describe it
Q if you cannot decide

PRESENT PAY

Income adequate for normal expenses
Satisfactory profit sharing
Slightly low on income
Bad
Income provides luxuries
Insured
Less than I deserve
Highly paid
Undeserved

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words describe your present opportunities? Put a check in the blank beside each word.

Y if it describes your opportunities
N if it does NOT describe them
Q if you cannot decide

OCCUPATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Good opportunities for promotion
Opportunity somewhat limited
Promotion on ability
Dead end job
Good chance for promotion
Unfavorable promotion policy
Infringement promotions
Regular promotions
Fairly good chance for promotion

THINK OF THE KIND OF SUPERVISION THAT YOU GET ON YOUR JOB. HOW WELL DOES EACH OF THE FOLLOWING WORDS DESCRIBE YOUR SUPERVISION? PUT A CHECK IN THE BLANK BESIDE EACH WORD.

Y if it describes your supervision
N if it does NOT describe it
Q if you cannot decide

SUPERVISION ON PRESENT JOB

Asks my advice
Hard to please
Impeccable
Praises good work
Tactful
Influential
Up-to-date
Doesn't supervise enough
Quick tempered
Tells me where I stand
Annoying
Stubborn
Knows job well
Bad
Intelligent
Leaves me on my own
Around when needed
Nice?
Think of the people that you work with. Do the people you work on projects with your work. How well do each of these people communicate with each other? The people they work with? If it describes the people you work with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inteligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to make friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On your feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes some of accomplishment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Think of your present work. What is the most of the type in the blank bar each word given below, write?

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ON PRESENTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fascinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On your feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes some of accomplishment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note: next page
PART III

On the scale below please indicate the feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction you have with your job in general.

On the scale below please indicate the feelings of satisfaction you have with your job in general.

On the scale below please indicate the feelings of dissatisfaction you have with your job in general.
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