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Introduction

Over the past four and one-half decades, job satisfaction has been a topic of considerable interest to scholars, researchers, and practitioners. Locke (1976) estimated that approximately 3,350 articles, dissertations, and studies on the subject were published, and this estimate was considered conservative. In spite of this large proliferation of studies on job satisfaction, and the tremendous amount of interest it has generated, relatively little has been done to analyze the role that racial differences play on it.

According to recent data from the United States Department of Labor (Employment and Earnings, 1979) minority workers comprise slightly more than 12 percent of the total American labor force. Blacks represent approximately 90 percent of these minority workers (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970). In 1975, there were approximately 10.9 million minority workers in the total labor force of the United States, according to the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics (Employment and Earnings, 1975). This number increased to approximately 12.8 million by the end of 1979 (Employment and Earnings, 1979). As Blacks and other members of different ethnic groups become more integrated into the mainstream
of the American labor force, the implications of job satisfaction research become more important.

Historically, Blacks have been systematically denied entry into the more important, meaningful jobs in many organizations in the United States. Statistics often show that Blacks, as a group, overly represent low-paying, dead-end positions compared to the white majority, while they tend to underrepresent high-paying, responsible positions. Only recently, after the implementation and subsequent enforcement of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act as amended, have many organizations begun to take "affirmative action" to accommodate Blacks in meaningful jobs. In spite of this, Blacks are still overly unemployed; often have difficulty in obtaining employment; and are very often the first to be laid off when there is a moderated and temporary decline in the economic activities of this country. Confronted with these conditions, it is not difficult to understand why many opinion polls find Black workers to be less satisfied with their jobs and life than their White counterparts (Herrick, 1972; "Poll finds," 1971; Quinn, Staines & McCullough, 1974; Weaver, 1974b).

The concern for an employee's work attitudes (job satisfaction) and values, whether that individual is
Black, White, or Other is important for practical as well as theoretical reasons. As Quinn et al. (1974) noted, it depends on the perspective that is taken (i.e., whether its from the point of view of the worker, employer, or society at large). From the employee's perspective, a number of research studies have reported that work-related attitudes are related to the mental, as well as physical health of the employee (Burke, 1969-1970; Kasl, 1973; Kornhauser, 1965; McQuade, 1972; Sales & House, 1971). For the employer, work-related attitudes of the employee may be closely associated with his or her job performance. Negative work attitudes such as low job satisfaction, or high job dissatisfaction and discontent, may be expressed by means of excessive tardiness, absenteeism, turnover, and to some extent even work output (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Hulin, 1968; Katzell, 1964; Katzell, Barrett & Parker, 1961; Taylor & Weiss, 1972; U.S. Department of Labor, 1974; Vroom, 1964). Quinn et al. (1974) cite several reasons why the study of job satisfaction and other work-related attitudes is important for society. They stated that:

Dissatisfied workers may draw disproportionately on national resources. Workers whose jobs undermine their physical or mental health place an additional demand on the nation's already overburdened system of health-care delivery. An employee whose expression of dissatisfaction
takes the form of reactions that result in termination sometimes becomes a candidate for subsequent collection of unemployment compensation, and obvious drain on local resources. (p. 27)

They went further to state that:

[Dissatisfied] workers contribute less to [society] than they may want to or are capable of doing, since workers whose skills and education are underutilized constitute an obvious social waste. (p. 27)

Job satisfaction has been referred to by several theorists as the most direct consequence of the interaction between the worker's perceived job situation and his value system (Katzell, 1964; Locke, 1969; Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969). Moreover, job satisfaction has been thought of as being determined by the interaction of the employee's frame of reference, which includes values, needs, beliefs, interests, customs, personalities, and the characteristics of that person's job (e.g., the physical working conditions, task structures, supervision, co-workers, wage and salary administration, and promotional policies) (Ash, 1972; Locke, 1969; Smith et al., 1969). Specifically, different levels of job satisfaction can be expected to result from the different frames of reference individual employees bring to their jobs.

A large proportion of the comparative literature on Blacks and Whites tend to suggest that members of these two ethnic groups differ in terms of certain attitudes,
interests, and behaviors (Bloom & Glenn, 1966; Dreger & Miller, 1968; Miller & Dreger, 1973). Data from a number of research studies tend to indicate that children from Black families express high levels of aspiration, but often have little or no expectation of achieving their goals (Bowerman & Campbell, 1965; Kirkpatrick, 1973).

Among those reported research studies involving racial differences in work-related attitudes, much of the evidence is inconclusive. On the one hand, some of these studies indicate that Black workers in general have less favorable (negative) work attitudes than White workers (Herrick, 1972; Lefton, 1968; Mogul, 1977-1978; Murphy, 1973; Quinn et al., 1974). On the other hand, some of these studies tend to suggest that Black workers have the same or more favorable (positive) work attitudes than their White counterparts (Gavin & Ewen, 1974; Gendel, 1966; Katzell, Ewen & Korman, 1974; Penzer & Badin, 1971).

In an attempt to explain racial differences in work-related attitudes, a number of researchers have utilized Maslow's (1954) Need Hierarchy Theory. Briefly, Maslow postulated that all individuals have a set of priorities concerning the needs that direct or motivate them. He theorized that these needs are arranged in a hierarchical format. At the basic, lower levels are the survival needs (i.e., physiological and safety needs). When these needs
are relatively fulfilled, the social needs (i.e., need for love, belongingness and affiliation) and esteem needs (i.e., need for approval and respect from others, and for a stable, positive self-evaluation) become important. Once these needs are relatively satisfied, the need for the individual to utilize his particular skills and talents to the fullest (i.e., a tendency to self-actualize) comes into play.

It has been suggested that Blacks react to their work situation in terms of lower-order needs such as safety and security rather than in terms of high-order growth needs such as self-actualization (Lipsman, 1967). Black individuals are said to concentrate relatively more on their low-level needs (basic) mainly because these individuals are less likely to have had these needs fulfilled.

In a research study designed to investigate the extent to which Black and White working-class and hard-to-employ, unemployed males differed in terms of their evaluation of work, Feldman (1973) tested two hypotheses derived from Maslow's theory. He reported that neither Black nor hard-to-employ males clearly has preferences for lower-order, material job outcomes. Likewise, the White and working-class subjects did not value high-order job outcomes. Both Black and White working-class and hard-to-employ males rated highly the material, social and high-
order job outcomes. The author reported that his findings did not support previous evidence that suggested that Black workers have less favorable attitudes toward their work. He concluded that the pattern of outcome preference is too complex to apply to Maslow's theory. He further concluded that evidence from his study added little to the notion of a hierarchy of needs or to a definite preference by any one group for basic, lower-order job outcomes or high-order job outcomes.

Three published studies that compared Black and White workers on their preferences among job characteristics provide some evidence that Black workers may indeed be relatively more concerned with lower-order, material job factors. In an investigation designed to compare the job preferences of Black and White male respondents to 1973 and 1974 national opinion surveys, Weaver (1975a) reported that Black workers were more likely to prefer extrinsic factors of a job (e.g., high income) and less likely to prefer intrinsic factors (e.g., important work) than were White workers. Respondents to the surveys were asked to indicate which of five items (high income, job security, short working hours with lots of free time, good promotional opportunities, and work which is important and which gives a feeling of accomplishment) they would most prefer in a job. The Black workers were more than twice
as likely to prefer high income than were White workers, but only half as likely to value work that is important and gives a feeling of accomplishment. Weaver concluded that the preferences for high income (and job security) for Blacks as opposed to interesting and meaningful work may be partially explained in terms of a past history of considerable insecurity in jobs which were in the less desirable occupational categories (p. 441). He further stated that:

Knowing that having a job is at best tenuous, the Black worker may [concentrate more] on the tangible, immediate security of income and less [concerned with] the intrinsic satisfactions in his work, which are, in fact, comparatively few in the types of jobs Blacks have traditionally held. (p. 441)

Even though he did not make reference to Weaver's (1975a) study, Shapiro's (1977) investigation was almost identical. He was interested in not only determining whether Black and White workers differed in terms of the job rewards they valued, but also in the degree to which such differences were independent of the worker's educational, occupational, and income levels (i.e., socioeconomic class). Like Weaver, he utilized the data from the same 1973 and 1974 national opinion surveys. Likewise, he reported that Black workers were more likely than White workers to prefer extrinsic job rewards of high income and job security, and less likely to prefer an intrinsic
reward of feelings of accomplishment on the job. His investigation differed from Weaver's, in that he provided a quantitative comparison of the effects of race on preferences for job rewards with and without statistical controls for socioeconomic class. Even after controlling for the worker's education, occupation and income, Shapiro reported that race still had a significant effect on the importance the worker attached to high income, job security, and important work with a feeling of accomplishment. His data indicated that about half of the original racial effect was due to socioeconomic class and about half to the race of the worker alone. Shapiro concluded that the differences in preferences for job rewards of Black and White workers may be explained in terms of an overall difference in the values which reflect the different cultures of the two ethnic groups (p. 28).

In a relatively recent study of newly hired Black and White college graduates, Alper (1975) gave further support to the notion of a hierarchy of needs. In general, he found that when Black and White workers were asked to rate various work and company characteristics in terms of the importance they attached to them, both groups tended to have a high degree of similarity of responses. Black and White workers rated the high-order, growth-orientation
factor as most important. However, each of the lower-order, extrinsic job characteristics (e.g., employee benefits, job security, starting salary, and working facilities) was rated significantly higher by Black workers. Alper suggested that a simple interpretation of these findings be avoided since the possible contaminating effects of cultural and socioeconomic factors were not investigated.

In line with the findings of the three studies cited above, Slocum and Strawser (1972) investigated the need satisfactions of 87 Black and 131 White Certified Public Accountants (CPAs). Utilizing Porter's Need Satisfaction Questionnaire which was based on Maslow's theory, these researchers attempted to determine whether work-related attitudes toward intrinsic job characteristics such as feelings of accomplishment and opportunities for growth and development, and extrinsic job characteristics such as pay and job security, varied as a function of race. In analyzing the importance scores attached to each need item by the two ethnic groups, the authors reported Black CPAs to be more concerned with their lower-order needs than White CPAs. They also noted that of 13 need items comprising the Porter questionnaire, Black CPAs reported lower need satisfaction on 11 of them. Black CPAs reported significantly lower need satisfaction on six items:
opportunity to help people, opportunity for friendship, feeling of self-esteem, opportunity for independent thought and action, opportunity for growth and development, and compensation.

The theoretical and conceptual framework of Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman's (1959) Motivator-Hygiene Model has also been used by several researchers in an attempt to explain racial differences in work-related attitudes. Herzberg et al proposed that all individuals have two basic sets of needs; hygiene needs and motivator needs. In the work environment, hygiene needs would include such things as pay, security, general working conditions, and company policies. The authors postulated that these needs represent lower-order needs, which are not a part of the work itself. Motivator needs, on the other hand, represent higher-order growth needs. They seem to be related to the internal characteristics of individuals which require them to seek stimulation, challenge, and autonomy. In the work environment these needs tend to include such things as self-esteem, achievement, responsibility, recognition for accomplishing difficult tasks, and self-actualization. Herzberg et al. postulated that these needs tend to be satisfied by things which are part of the work itself.

In an investigation designed to compare motivational factors among underprivileged Black and White trainees
in a MDTA (Manpower Development and Training Administration) project, Champagne and King (1967) reported that Hygiene factors tended to be more important for Blacks than for Whites. In an analysis of the paired comparison ratings of 16 factors, the authors found that while "duty to do one's best" was rated first in importance across both groups, the White trainees were more concerned with "liking the job" than the Black trainees. Among the Black subsample however, "working conditions" and "providing that one can do the job" were of more importance. A closer look at the data will reveal that both ethnic groups tended to rate the factors similarly. The findings reported in this investigation must be approached with some caution. As O'Reilly and Roberts (1973) pointed out, there is concern as to whether the study has any external validity since other variables such as sex (male and female subjects were included in the racially divided subsamples), income level, educational level, occupation level, and job level were not controlled. It is possible that these variables, and may be some others not mentioned, covaried with the racially divided subsamples to produce erroneous results.

Gendel's (1966) study investigated whether Herzberg's et al. theory would be applicable to a low-level, unskilled group of Black employees (90% of Gendel's sample was Black).
In accordance with Herzberg's et al. methodology, 119 housekeeping workers at two Veterans Administration hospitals were asked to tell of a time when something happened to them which made them feel very good or very bad about their jobs. Content analyses of the interviews revealed that Gendel's results were consistent with the results of Herzberg's et al. The author reported that three intrinsic job factors (motivators) appeared with significantly more frequency than other factors (i.e., recognition, advancement, and responsibility). These factors appeared to be related to the workers' job satisfaction. On the other hand, five extrinsic job factors (hygienes) appeared with significantly greater frequency than other factors (i.e., company policy and administration, wages, supervision-technical, working conditions, and interpersonal relations with co-workers). Job dissatisfaction appeared to be generated by these factors.

Bloom and Barry (1967) used Herzberg's et al. theory to investigate possible racial differences in work-related attitudes of employees occupying blue-collar positions. Briefly, 180 Work Attitude Survey Questionnaires were administered to a sample of Black, male blue-collar workers. Eighty-five were completed and returned. Of 13 factors which were identified by a factor analytic technique, eight contained both motivator and hygiene items,
two contained only hygiene items, and three contained only motivator items. These data were compared with similar data from 117 White, male blue-collar workers. The authors' findings tend to suggest that hygiene factors are somewhat more important to Black blue-collar workers than motivator factors. However, they concluded that Herzberg's et al. theory is too simplistic to fully explain the work motivations of Black employees. A cautionary note on their study must be stated. Only 47% of their questionnaires were returned, and a few of these were not completed. Since no normative data existed for Blacks (i.e., the original questionnaire was used on a White population), it is quite possible that the 40 items on their questionnaire were perceived differently by these individuals. In addition, the Black subsample was comprised totally of unskilled workers, while 95% of the White subsample was either skilled or semi-skilled.

Even though the findings of many of the studies cited above are not very conclusive, most tend to suggest that Black employees are extrinsically oriented toward their jobs rather than intrinsically oriented. That is, a majority of these studies tend to suggest that Black workers focus their efforts toward satisfying lower-order needs (e.g., obtaining high pay, a safe and secure job) rather than toward satisfying high-order growth needs.
such as esteem, self-fulfillment and self-actualization.

From a practical point of view, the issue of job satisfaction is particularly important for Blacks because it may eliminate certain misgivings or stereotypes that many employers may have regarding this segment of the labor force. For example, some employers may believe that the employment of Blacks would result in an alienated work force. Others may believe that hiring Black individuals would result in special problems such as poor morale and no job involvement. Still others may believe that the employment of Blacks would mean problems of motivation. As noted earlier in this thesis, job satisfaction has been one of the most researched subjects in the psychological literature. Yet the research efforts dealing with Black-White differences in job satisfaction has been noticeably sparse.

In contrast to many of the studies previously cited, the research of Katzell, Ewen and Korman (1974) suggested that Black and White workers employed in similar jobs differed very little in terms of their job satisfaction. A 74-item attitude questionnaire was administered in six different companies to 188 Black and White male, blue-collar workers. These authors reported that the differences in work-related attitudes between the two ethnic groups were not great. In fact, where differences did
occur, the Black employees tended to be somewhat more satisfied. Although White employees at two of the companies in the study had significantly longer tenure (i.e., length of service) than Black employees, the White employees at all of the companies participating had longer tenure. According to the findings of Gibson and Klein (1970), job satisfaction and tenure tends to have an inverse relationship to each other. Thus, it seems possible that the White employees began their careers in these organizations with rather high expectations. As their length of service increased, they may have begun to realize that their expectations would not be fulfilled. Thus, this inverse relationship between job satisfaction and tenure may have accounted, at least in part, for the somewhat lower job satisfaction among the White employees compared to their Black counterparts.

In an investigation of semi-skilled workers in a major airline, Gavin and Ewen (1974) reported similar findings to those of Katzell et al. (1974). A 53-item job satisfaction questionnaire was administered to 471 Black and White male, blue-collar workers. After performing a factorial analysis of the data, these authors identified five interpretable categories (i.e., advancement, job and company, supervision, cooperation among co-workers and supervisors, and pay and working conditions) that they considered
important to job satisfaction. They reported that the Black employees were significantly more satisfied than the White employees on all but the "supervision" dimension. It should be mentioned that since the questionnaire was administered not anonymously in this study (i.e., all of the employees were identified in this investigation), the findings reported by these investigators should be viewed with caution. As the authors themselves noted (p. 463), Black employees may have responded in a more positive manner than the White employees because they were identified. It is possible that Black employees may have perceived and feared stronger reprimands against them than their White counterparts for expressing unfavorable (negative) work-related attitudes.

In a study designed to examine the job satisfaction of Black and White nursing, technical, and clerical personnel in two west coast hospitals, O'Reilly and Roberts (1973) reported consistent differences in the response patterns of the two ethnic groups to three difference measures of job satisfaction (the Job Descriptive Index, G-M Faces Scale, and the Brayfield-Rothe Index). The authors reported that the White employees were significantly more satisfied with their overall job, their work, their co-workers, their supervision, and their salaries than were Black employees. They suggested that the evidence from
their study tended to support the notion that the frame of reference an employee brings from his culture or subculture is an important determinant of the way that individual will perceive his work environment and those aspects of his job which are satisfying and dissatisfying.

Consistent with the findings of O'Reilly and Roberts, Ash (1972) compared differences in job satisfaction among female employees in two separate studies. In his first investigation, 47 Black, 112 White, and 63 Spanish-surnamed female production and clerical workers in an electrical components firm completed the 78-item Science Research Associates (SRA) Employee Attitude Survey. In his second investigation, 14 Black and 56 White female clerical workers in a state university completed the 72-item Job Descriptive Index (JDI). The author reported that in both studies Black employees were the most dissatisfied group with practically all aspects of their jobs. Of the fifteen scales comprising the SRA survey, Ash reported that the White employees scored highest on twelve of them (i.e., they were the most satisfied group), Spanish-surnamed employees scored highest on two of the scales, and the Black employees scored highest on only one of the scales. Likewise, the author reported that the mean scores for the Black clerical workers on each of the five JDI scales (the work itself, pay, promotion, supervision,
and co-workers) was lower than the mean scores for their White counterparts. Significant statistical differences occurred on three of these scales (the work itself, pay, and co-workers). Ash suggested two possible explanations for his findings: first, the possibility of a steady, continuous differential treatment of Black employees by their fellow White co-workers and supervisors, and second, the possibility that Black employees enter their jobs with expectations that are different from that of White employees, which are often not as well fulfilled. Like many of the other studies cited, Ash's findings should not be taken at face value. Since the author failed to mention whether he controlled for other variables such as the age level of his subjects, their tenure, their income level or their educational level, the effects of these variables on the results of his study are unknown. It should also be mentioned that in his first investigation, blue-collar production workers were pooled with white-collar clerical workers. There is some evidence to suggest that these two occupational groups approach their jobs from different perspectives (Centers & Bugental, 1966; Locke, 1973; Weaver, 1975b).

In a published study of differences in job satisfaction among 1037 blue-collar and white-collar workers from three different organizations, Milutinovich (1976) reported that
Black blue-collar employees tended to be somewhat more satisfied with their jobs than White blue-collar employees, while Black white-collar employees tended to be less satisfied with their jobs than their White counterparts. According to his data analyses, the overall (total) job satisfaction of Black blue-collar workers was significantly higher than that of White blue-collar workers. The Black blue-collar workers were also significantly more satisfied with their promotional opportunities than their White co-workers. On the other hand, the author reported that Black blue-collar workers were significantly less satisfied with supervision. No other significant differences were found among the blue-collar subsample in terms of their satisfactions with work, co-workers, and pay. In contrast, Milutinovich's data analyses of the white-collar subsample revealed that Black employees were significantly less satisfied than White employees with their work, their supervision, their co-workers, their opportunities for promotion, and with their total job satisfaction. The author found that race alone accounted for very little of the total variance in job satisfaction. He concluded that his findings suggested an extremely complex relationship existed between race and job satisfaction. He went on to comment that "no broad stereotypic assumption can be stated for all Blacks" (p. 152).
Other published investigations involving racial differences in job satisfaction have also shown results similar to those studies reported above (Hassan, 1968; Milutinovich, 1977; Smith, Smith, & Rollo, 1974; Weaver, 1974a; Weaver, 1977). In spite of the fact that many of these research studies have certain short-comings, most of them tend to suggest that differences exist between Black and White employees in terms of perceived job satisfaction. The review of the literature has tended to show that members of these ethnic groups react differently to various aspects of their work situation. It is interesting to note that in those comparative studies where Black employees expressed higher levels of job satisfaction than their White counterparts, these individuals occupied blue-collar positions. In those studies where Black employees expressed lower levels of job satisfaction than White employees, these employees occupied white-collar positions. It may be possible that Black workers in blue-collar jobs perceive a congruency between their needs (i.e., what they want from their job situation) and the demands and rewards of the job situation. These workers may perceive that they are doing quite well for themselves considering the possibility of limited skills, education, and other factors that comprise the individual's job qualifications. In other words, they may perceive that
their expectations are being far exceeded. On the other hand, Black workers in white-collar positions may perceive that they are not achieving those things from their jobs that they expect. For these workers, discrepancies may exist between what they want and what they actually receive from their job situation. They may perceive that their expectations are not being as fulfilled by their job situation as their White counterparts.

A final consideration in this study is the influence of the employee's work values on his levels of satisfaction with his job. As noted earlier, it has been suggested that the frame of reference an employee brings to his work is a major contributor to that person's job satisfaction (Ash, 1972; Locke, 1969; O'Reilly & Roberts, 1973; Smith et al., 1969). However, the literature on job satisfaction has shown that little has been done to analyze the significant role that the frame of reference has actually played on job satisfaction. The few studies that have been reported tended to be more descriptive rather than empirical. That is, a majority of these studies tend to be based more on intuitive feelings rather than on any definitive research evidence. The frame of reference that an employee brings to his work can be viewed as a structure of values, customs, concepts, interests, etc., by means of which the individual perceives, or
evaluates data, communicates ideas, and regulates behavior (Random House, 1967). Since the value system of the individual represents a major portion of that person's frame of reference, and since the frame of reference is thought to be influential in determining job satisfaction, the employee's work values (which may be thought of as representing a subset of the person's total value system) should be highly related to that person's level of job satisfaction. At present, research efforts examining the relationship between work values and perceived job satisfaction of employees in general is very sparse. In fact, no research effort has been reported to date that examined the effects of the race of the employee and his work values on his levels of job satisfaction. Of those studies reported involving work values and job satisfaction of employees in general, most tend to view the work values of employees solely as something that is consciously or subconsciously desired by the worker (Cook, 1971; Katzell, 1964; Locke, 1969; Rosen & Rosen, 1955; Shah, 1969; Smith et al., 1969). In other words, it appears that work values are somewhat analogous to the fulfillment of work-related needs or goals of an individual employee in a particular job. The concept (work values) will be used in this study to refer basically to an individual's general attitude towards the meaning that individual attaches to the work
role, rather than his attitude towards a specific job (Wollack, Goodale, Wijting & Smith, 1971). At present, no research effort has been reported that analyzed the relationship between the job satisfaction and work values of Black and White employees occupying similar white-collar type jobs.

Although somewhat indirectly related to studies involving work values of employees, Watson and Simpson (1978), and Watson and Barone (1976) examined the "personal value orientations" among Black and White managers, and owner-managers respectively. Contrary to many of the findings reported in the literature, the overall analyses of the results in their studies indicated that no significant differences existed between these two ethnic groups. That is, Black and White managers and/or owners were found to be very similar in terms of their personal value orientations. It should be stated that their samples were comprised of nonrandom groups of individuals occupying high-level jobs.

Investigating the effects of personal background characteristics and training on the work values of 110 disadvantaged, hard-to-employ persons (90% of this subsample was Black), Goodale (1973) found differences between the work values of the hard-to-employ group and a comparison group comprised of 180 semi-skilled and
unskilled workers. Although the mean score differences were not large, the author's data analysis revealed that the hard-to-employ trainees scored lower than the comparison group on five of the six subscales that comprised the measure used in his study (i.e., Social Status in Job, Activity Preference, Job Involvement, Upward Striving, and Pride in Work). The only subscale in which the hard-to-employ group scored higher than the comparison group was on "Attitude Towards Earnings". Goodale concluded that the hard-to-employ trainees tended to be more concerned with the extrinsic job characteristic of making money on the job than regular semi-skilled and unskilled workers. He also reported that the hard-to-employ trainees tended to be less concerned than regular employees with "avoiding being idle on the job (i.e., the tendency to keep active)", "taking pride in one's work", and "subscribing to ideals of the traditional intrinsic job characteristic of the Protestant Work Ethic".

Saleh and Singh (1973), though investigating the outcome and reward preferences (work values) of white-collar workers, reported findings somewhat in line with those reported in the previous study by Goodale. These authors analyzed the rank-ordering of 12 job-related factors (six extrinsic and six intrinsic) among 3,000 employees. They
categorized these employees according to their salary level, education, sex, father's occupation, and community size in which they were employed. The authors reported that among the low-salaried group (i.e., employees earning less than $10,000), mean intrinsic scores increased significantly as father's occupation went from unskilled, to technical, to professional. No significant differences were found in the high-salaried group (i.e., employees earning $10,000 or more) except for male university subjects. Similar results were found for community size. Among the low-salaried group, mean intrinsic scores increased as the size of the community went from rural (i.e., towns with less than 10,000 people), to urban (cities with 10,000-300,000 people), to metropolitan (cities with over 300,000 people). The only significant difference for the high-salaried group again was among male university subjects. The authors concluded that early socialization processes and socioeconomic class (income level, education level, and father's occupation) are influential factors affecting work values only among those individuals occupying lower level jobs. They went on to suggest that among those individuals occupying high-level jobs, the emphasis tends to be more on intrinsic job characteristics rather than extrinsic job characteristics regardless of their previous life experiences.
In a study designed to explore the job satisfaction and work values of students (aircraft maintenance) and persons in permanent assignments in the United States Air Force, Blood (1969) elicited responses from these individuals to items on three separate measures: the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), and two faces scales which measured satisfaction with the job in general (i.e., overall satisfaction; JGI) and satisfaction with life in general (LIG). He also obtained responses to an eight-item work value scale designed to measure the amount of agreement with the Protestant Ethic (e.g., how well a person does one's job is a good indication of that person's worth; being idle and wasting time is as bad as wasting money; and work is a moral good in itself). The author reported that individuals who subscribed to Protestant Ethic ideals tended to be somewhat more satisfied with their jobs in general and with life in general than those who did not subscribe to Protestant Ethic ideals. As part of the author's overall analysis, a multiple correlation was computed for each of the satisfaction measures using age, education, length of service, father's occupation, and Protestant Ethic dimensions as independent variable. The data analysis revealed that work values (i.e., the Protestant Ethic dimensions) accounted for a unique proportion of the variance in job satisfaction which was
independent of that accounted for by other variables. It should be mentioned that Blood failed to state whether his sample was comprised of Black subjects, White subjects, or Other. As a result, his final analyses could be in error because of the possible influence of ethnic group membership. In view of Blood's research findings though, employees who are oriented towards ideals of the Protestant Ethic (i.e., those employees who are strong work value oriented) should be somewhat more satisfied with different aspects of their job situation when compared to those employees who do not subscribe highly to ideals of the Protestant Ethic (i.e., those employees who are considered weak work value oriented). An interaction effect of racial background and work value orientation may result, at least in part, from differences in socialization patterns of different ethnic groups. Blacks, as youths, may have had fewer opportunities to associate positive meanings with the value of work, presumably because of a lack of identification with their parent(s), who probably occupied low level, nonchallenging jobs. The Protestant Work Ethic simply may not have been a part of their upbringing. Consequently, the work value orientation of these individuals may tend not to have as much of an effect on their levels of job satisfaction as on their White counterparts' levels of job satisfaction.
As a result of the literature review, it appears that more empirical research studies are needed in order to more fully understand the similarities and differences in job satisfaction among Black and White employees. The major objective of this research endeavor then, is to re-examine the complex relationship between race and job satisfaction. In addition, this study is to provide data on the effects that work value orientation have on an employee's levels of job satisfaction. More specifically, this study was conceived in order to test the following hypotheses:

1. Black employees occupying white-collar positions will experience lower levels of job satisfaction than White employees occupying similar types of positions. This may result, at least in part, from differences in perceived expectations on the job.

2. Regardless of the race of the employee, those employees who are considered strong work value oriented will experience higher levels of job satisfaction than those employees who are considered weak work value oriented.

3. The work value orientation of White employees will have a stronger influence on their levels of job satisfaction than the work value orientation of Black employees on their levels of job satisfaction.
Methodology

Subjects

Fifty-seven males occupying similar types of white-collar positions from various organizations located in the Central Florida area participated in the study. All subjects were employed in exempt (i.e., not subject to overtime pay), nonmanagerial white-collar positions. They were employed in either Professional, Technical, or Administrative jobs. Since it was believed that only a limited number of Black males occupied these positions in organizations in the Central Florida area, it was decided beforehand that for all participating organizations, all Black males in these positions would receive a questionnaire. Since a larger number of White males occupied these positions only a random selection would receive the questionnaire.

All employees that participated in the study received written instructions that explicitly stressed that participation was strictly voluntary. It was also stressed that company officials would never know individual results. In order to assure confidentiality, subjects were instructed not to place their names on any parts of the questionnaire.
Research Instruments

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI; see Appendix A), developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), was used as the instrument to measure job satisfaction. The JDI is an adjective checklist, work attitude scale. It was developed to measure an employee's perceived satisfaction with five separate facets of his job: satisfaction with the work itself, with pay, with promotional opportunities, with supervision, and with co-workers.

Basically, an employee is asked to describe his job by means of a "yes", "no", or "?" response to each of the adjectives that comprise the separate scales of the JDI. Every response to each of the adjectives in the final form of the JDI has been item analyzed against the total scale score to determine the proper scoring direction. Smith et al. (1969) have reported very impressive reliability and validity data for the JDI, demonstrating both high convergent and discriminant validity as defined by Campbell and Fiske (1959).

This research instrument has been stated to be "without doubt the most carefully constructed measure of job satisfaction in existence today" (Vroom, 1964; p. 100). Smith, Smith, and Rollo (1974) have shown, by means of factor analyzing the 72 items which comprise the measure, that Black and White clerical workers perceive the items
in a similar way. That is, the items in the instrument are interpreted the same way by members of both ethnic groups.

The Survey of Work Value (SWV; see Appendix B), developed by Wollack, Goodale, Wijting, and Smith (1971), was used as the research instrument to measure work values and classify subjects into strong or weak work value oriented groups. The SWV is comprised of fifty-four statements. It was based on a secularized interpretation of the Protestant Ethic which specifically dealt with aspects of work. The SWV can be scored on either six subscales: Pride in Work, Job Involvement, Activity Preference, Attitude Toward Earnings, Social Status of Job, and Upward Striving, or on six clusters: Intrinsic Work Values, Organization-Man Ethic, Upward Striving, Social Status on Job, Conventional Ethic, and Attitude Toward Earnings (for definitions, see Wollack et al., 1971).

The content validity of the items of the SWV was established by having industrial employees and undergraduate students assign items to their respective subscales. This was done with high reliability.

When using the instrument, an employee is instructed to indicate the degree to which he agrees or disagrees with each of the 54 statements. Scores obtained from the instrument have been shown to discriminate among
occupational groups (Wollack, Note 1) and correlate with background characteristics of employees and disadvantaged persons (Wijting, Note 2).

**Demographic Questionnaire.** Sixteen demographic questions relating to the subject's ethnic group, age, education, father's education, mother's education, father's age, mother's age, length of service with the company, length of service in present position, income, father's income, father's occupational group, size of community while growing up, marital status, and number of dependents were utilized in the study (see Appendix C). Confidentiality of the individual responses was assured.

**Procedure**

To obtain as many subjects as possible, the researcher found it necessary to contact a total of 42 organizations in the Central Florida area. Of those 42 companies which were contacted only ten agreed to participate. It must be noted that there was a tremendous reluctance on the part of private industry to participate in this study. Some of the reasons cited for not participating included: no Black males in Professional, Technical, or Administrative jobs; no time to invest or waste; imposing on the employees; bad timing (i.e., in conflict with on-going in-house surveys, evaluations, etc.); too much going on internally to get involved with any outside research.
projects; company policy not to participate in any "outside" research projects; and business risk too high (i.e., research project results may cause a loss in federal contracts, or an EEOC lawsuit).

Personnel officials who had the authority to grant permission to use employees at their organization were contacted over the telephone. A formal letter requesting the cooperation of the organization to allow some of their employees to participate in the study was also sent to these individuals (see Appendix D). Each was told the general nature and purpose of the study. Personnel officials who agreed to participate were requested to send a list of names of Black and White male employees occupying exempt, nonmanagerial white-collar positions. All Black employees from the list were used as subjects because only a small number of these individuals held these types of jobs. A random selection of White employees from the list were used as subjects. Personnel officials received the job attitude questionnaires to distribute to the employees. A written introduction (see Appendix E) accompanied the questionnaire explaining the general purpose and explicitly assuring the employee's anonymity. All subjects were informed that their participation in the study was completely voluntary. In order to reduce any potential feelings of threat that might have occurred
because company officials distributed the questionnaires, and to reassure subjects that the confidentiality of their responses was guaranteed, subjects were instructed to seal the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope upon completion, and mail it anonymously to the researcher. A total of 95 questionnaires were distributed and 60 were returned. Three questionnaires had to be discarded because they were incomplete, resulting in a total return of 57. Of these fifty-seven, twenty-seven were Black employees and thirty were White employees.

**Statistical Analysis**

The independent variables in this study were: a) the race of the employee (i.e., whether he was Black or White), and b) the work value orientation of the employee (i.e., whether he was considered strong or weak work value oriented). The dependent variables in this study were the participant's scores on the five subscales of the JDI. In order to investigate the effects that race and work value orientation have on the levels of job satisfaction experienced by the employee, five two-way (random effects) analyses of variance for an unequal number of subjects were calculated utilizing a least-squares estimate procedure for each of the JDI subscales (Myers, 1966).

The median work value scores for each of the six SWV subscales were calculated in order to categorize subjects
into strong or weak work value oriented groups. The median work value for Social Status, Activity Preference, Upward Striving, Attitude Toward Earnings, Pride in Work, and Job Involvement were 25, 37, 34, 24, 40, and 36 respectively. Subjects considered strong work value oriented were arbitrarily defined by the researcher as those employees who scored above the median on at least four of the SWV subscales. Subjects defined as weak work value oriented were those employees who scored below the median on at least four of the SWV subscales. Those subjects who failed to score above or below the median on at least four of the SWV subscales were discarded. Out of the twenty-seven subjects who were Black, 7 were categorized into the strong work value oriented group and 10 were categorized into the weak work value oriented group. The remaining 10 subjects had to be discarded because they failed to meet the above mentioned criterion. Of the thirty subjects who were White, 10 were categorized into the strong work value oriented group and 7 were categorized into the weak work value oriented group. The remaining 13 subjects had to be discarded because they failed to meet the criterion.

T-test analyses were performed in order to investigate whether differences existed between the group's age, education, tenure, father's education, and mother's
education. (For a schematic representation of the research design, see Figure 1.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNIC GROUP</th>
<th>WORK VALUE ORIENTATION</th>
<th>WORK VALUE ORIENTATION</th>
<th>WORK VALUE ORIENTATION</th>
<th>WORK VALUE ORIENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(BLACK)</td>
<td>(STRONG)</td>
<td>(WEAK)</td>
<td>(STRONG)</td>
<td>(WEAK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 17</td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>N = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WHITE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Research Design For Two-Way Analysis of Variance
Results

In order to investigate the effects that race and work value orientation may have on the employee's job satisfaction, a 2 x 2 (random effects) ANOVA for an unequal number of subjects was calculated using the method of expected cell frequencies for each of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) subscales (see, Myers, 1966). The mean JDI subscale scores for each of the groups are presented in Table 1. As can be seen, many of the overall mean responses were very similar.

Dependent Measure: Work

Table 2 summarizes the results for the dependent measure of work. The analysis of variance for the JDI work subscale revealed no main effect for race, F (1,30) = .0136, p > .05, failing to support the hypothesis that Black employees will experience lower work satisfaction than White employees occupying similar types of positions. The Black employees tended to be somewhat less satisfied with their work than the White employees, but the mean difference in work satisfaction was not significant.

The analysis revealed no main effect for work value orientation, thus failing to support the hypothesis that strong work value oriented employees will be more
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Value Orientation</th>
<th>Overall Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JDI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>39.57 (7.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>20.29 (19.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>16.29 (15.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>46.89 (6.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>48.71 (6.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Standard Deviations are in parentheses

*a* The higher the mean value the higher the job satisfaction. The highest possible value is 54.
Table 2
Analysis of Variance for JDI Work Subscale For Race and Work Value Orientation of Employee Using the Method of Expected Cell Frequencies For Unequal and Disproportionate Cell Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race of Employee</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Value Orientation of Employee</td>
<td>179.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>179.86</td>
<td>1.7984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>236.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236.12</td>
<td>2.3610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error$_w$</td>
<td>3000.42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
satisfied with work than weak work value oriented employ­ees, \( F (1,30) = 1.798, p > .05 \). The strong work value oriented group tended to be somewhat more satisfied with their work than the weak work value oriented group, however the mean difference in work satisfaction was not significant.

No interaction effect was revealed between race and work value orientation, failing to support the hypothesis that the work value orientation of White employees will have a stronger influence on their work satisfaction than the work value orientation of Black employees on their work satisfaction, \( F (1,30) = 2.3610, p > .05 \). It appears that only the work value orientation of Black employees had an influence on their work satisfaction, even though no one particular group was significantly more or less satisfied than any other group.

**Dependent Measure: Pay**

The summarized results for the dependent measure of pay are presented in Table 3. The analysis of variance for the JDI pay subscale yielded no main effect for race, \( F (1,30) = .047, p > .05 \). Even though the mean difference in pay satisfaction was not significant, the mean results tended to indicate that Black employees were less satisfied with their pay than White employees.

No main effect was found for work value orientation,
Table 3
Analysis of Variance For JDI Pay Subscale For Race and Work Value Orientation of Employees Using the Method of Expected Cell Frequencies For Unequal And Disproportionate Cell Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race of Employee</td>
<td>113.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113.54</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Value Orientation of Employees</td>
<td>139.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139.75</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error_{w}</td>
<td>7201.83</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>240.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The strong work value oriented group tended to be somewhat less satisfied with their pay even though the mean difference in pay satisfaction was not significant.

No significant interaction effect was found between race and work value orientation, $F(1, 30) = .004, p > .05$. Neither the pay satisfaction of Black or White employees was strongly influenced by their work value orientation.

Dependent Measure: Promotion

Table 4 presents the summarized results for the dependent measure of promotion. The analysis of variance for the JDI promotion subscale revealed no main effect for race, $F(1, 30) = .674, p > .05$. Again, Black employees tended to express less satisfaction with their promotional opportunities than White employees even though the mean difference in the satisfaction with promotional opportunities was not significant.

The ANOVA yielded no significant main effect for work value orientation, $F(1, 30) = .864, p > .05$. The strong work value oriented group tended to express less satisfaction with their promotional opportunities even though the mean difference in promotional satisfaction was not significant.

No race by work value orientation effect was found in the analysis, $F(1, 30) = .002, p > .05$. The work value
Table 4

Analysis of Variance for JDI Promotion Subscale For Race and Work Value Orientation of Employee Using the Method of Expected Cell Frequencies For Unequal and Disproportionate Cell Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race of Employee</td>
<td>176.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176.34</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Value Orientation of Employee</td>
<td>225.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>225.85</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error_w</td>
<td>7845.43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>261.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
orientation of Black and White employees tended to have no influence on their satisfaction with promotional opportunities.

Dependent Measure: Supervision

The summarized results for the dependent measure of supervision are presented in Table 5. The analysis of variance for the JDI supervision subscale revealed no main effect for race, $F(1,30) = .685, p > .05$. The mean results tended to indicate that Black employees were somewhat more satisfied with their supervision than the White employees. The mean difference in supervision satisfaction was not significant.

The ANOVA revealed no significant main effect for work value orientation, $F(1,30) = 3.10, p > .05$. The mean results tended to be in the predicted direction even though the difference was not significant. The strong work value oriented group tended to be somewhat more satisfied with their supervision than the weak work value oriented group.

No significant interaction effect between race and work value orientation was revealed in the analysis, $F(1,30) = .086, p > .05$.

Dependent Measure: Co-Workers

Table 6 presents the summarized results for the
Table 5
Analysis of Variance for JDI Supervision Subscale For Race and Work Value Orientation of Employee Using the Method of Expected Cell Frequencies For Unequal and Disproportionate Cell Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race of Employee</td>
<td>72.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.70</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Value Orientation of Employee</td>
<td>329.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>329.34</td>
<td>3.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error_w</td>
<td>3183.59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>106.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Analysis of Variance for JDI Co-Worker Subscale
For Race and Work Value Orientation of Employee
Using the Method of Expected Cell Frequencies
For Unequal and Disproportionate Cell Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race of Employee</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Value Orientation of Employee</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>332.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>332.59</td>
<td>3.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (_{w})</td>
<td>2840.03</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dependent measure of co-workers. The analysis of variance for the JDI co-worker subscale yielded no significant main effect for race, $F(1,30) = .051, p > .05$. No significant main effect for work value orientation was revealed, $F(1,30) = .343, p > .05$.

Although no significant race by work value orientation interaction effect was found, $F(1,30) = 3.513, p > .05$, the mean results tended to approach the significance level. The work value orientation of Black employees appeared to have a somewhat different influence on their satisfaction with co-workers than the work value orientation of White employees on their satisfaction with co-workers. Black employees in the strong work value oriented group tended to be more satisfied with their co-workers than Black employees in the weak work value oriented group. White employees on the other hand, in the strong work value oriented group tended to be less satisfied with their co-workers than White employees in the weak work value oriented group.

In order to determine whether differences existed between the groups' age, education, tenure, father's education, and mother's education, t-test analyses were calculated to compare the means of each group. The means of the variables are presented in Table 7. The t-test analyses revealed four significant differences: (a) the
Table 7
Mean Age, Education, Tenure, Father's Education, And Mother's Education Among Black, White, Strong, And Weak Work Value Oriented Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Work Value Orientation</th>
<th>Overall Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age (Years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.80)</td>
<td>(9.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Education (Years)</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>15.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.63)</td>
<td>(2.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Tenure (Years)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.93)</td>
<td>(5.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Father's Education (Years)</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>12.80a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.17)</td>
<td>(3.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Mother's Education (Years)</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>14.10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.48)</td>
<td>(2.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Standard Deviations are in parentheses

ap < .05, t(13) = 2.160
bp < .05, t(14) = 2.145
cp < .05, t(27) = 2.771
mean father's education of Black employees who were in the strong work value oriented group was significantly lower than the mean father's education of White employees who were in the strong work value oriented group, 
\[ t(13) = 2.160, \ p < .05; \]
(b) the mean mother's education of Black employees who were in the strong work value oriented group was significantly lower than the mean mother's education of White employees in the same group,  
\[ t(14) = 2.145, \ p < .05; \]
(c) the mean mother's education of Black employees was significantly lower than the mean mother's education of White employees,  
\[ t(27) = 2.771, \ p < .01; \]
and (d) the mean mother's education of employees in the strong work value oriented group was significantly higher than the mean mother's education of employees in the weak work value oriented group,  
\[ t(27) = 2.771, \ p < .01. \]

The groups tended to be somewhat similar on the other demographic variables except father's occupational group. The fathers of the Black employees tended to be concentrated in the laborers' (blue-collar level) occupational category whereas the fathers of the White employees tended to be concentrated in the Professional, Technical, or related group (white-collar level) category. Tables 8-12 present these demographic data for the groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Value Orientation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fathers' Occupational Group</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black (N = 16)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (N = 17)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = Other (e.g., Minister); 2 = Laborers (Nonfarm); 3 = Operatives (e.g., Heavy-Duty Equipment, Transportation); 4 = Service Workers; 5 = Craftsmen, Foremen, related; 6 = Clerical; 7 = Sales Workers; 8 = Managers, Administrators, Proprietors; 9 = Professionals, Technicals, and related.
### Table 9

Group Percentages of Areas in Which Subjects Were Raised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Areas</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (N = 16)</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (N = 17)</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Value Orientation</th>
<th>Areas</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong (N = 17)</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak (N = 16)</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 = Rural Communities (e.g., Towns with less than 10,000 people); 2 = Urban Communities (e.g., cities with 10,000 to 300,000); 3 = Metropolitan Communities (e.g., cities with over 300,000 people).
Table 10

Group Percentages of Size of Family Household in Which Subjects Were Raised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Family Household</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Value Orientation</th>
<th>Family Household</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 = 2-3 Members; 2 = 4-5 Members; 3 = 6-7 Members; 4 = 8-9 Members; 5 = 10 Members and above.
### Table 11

**Group Percentages of Subjects' Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black (N = 16)</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (N = 17)</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Value Orientation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong (N = 16)</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak (N = 17)</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 1 = Single; 2 = Married; 3 = Divorced
Table 12

Group Percentages of Number of Dependents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Number of Dependents</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black (N = 16)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (N = 17)</td>
<td>24.24 24.24</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Value Orientation</th>
<th>Number of Dependents</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong (N = 17)</td>
<td>21.21 24.24 3.03 0 3.03 0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak (N = 16)</td>
<td>24.24 18.18 6.06 0 0 0</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 = 0-1 Dependents; 2 = 2-3 Dependents; 3 = 4-5 Dependents; 4 = 6-7 Dependents; 5 = 8-9 Dependents; 6 = 10 Dependents and above.
Discussion

The major focus of this study was to test the following hypotheses: (a) Black employees occupying white-collar positions will experience lower levels of job satisfaction than white employees occupying similar types of positions; (b) those employees who are considered strong work value oriented (i.e., those individuals who tended to subscribe to the Protestant Work Ethic ideal) will experience higher levels of job satisfaction than those employees considered weak work value oriented (i.e., those individuals who did not tend to subscribe to the Protestant Work Ethic ideal); and (c) the work value orientation of White employees will have a greater influence on their levels of job satisfaction than the work value orientation of Black employees on their levels of job satisfaction.

The findings of this research endeavor failed to support the above mentioned hypotheses. Black and White employees occupying similar types of white-collar positions did not differ significantly on their levels of job satisfaction. Also, employees who tended to subscribe to certain ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic (i.e., those employees who were considered strong work value oriented) as measured by the SWV, did not differ significantly on their levels of job satisfaction from those employees who tended not to
subscribe to certain ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic (i.e., weak work value oriented employees). These findings were somewhat surprising in light of previous research findings. Ash (1972), Milutinovich (1976), Milutinovich (1977), Milutinovich and Tsaklanguanos (1976), O'Reilly and Roberts (1973), and Smith, Smith and Rollo (1974) all found some significant racial differences in job satisfaction among Black and White employees holding white-collar jobs. Also, Blood (1969) found significant differences in the job satisfaction between those individuals who tended to adhere to certain ideals of the Protestant Ethic and those individuals who did not subscribe to certain ideals of the Protestant Ethic. The research effort of Lopez (1977), and Slocum and Strawser (1972) have suggested that job satisfaction is influenced by a worker's perception that his needs are being fulfilled by his job situation. In light of this, it has been suggested that Black employees (especially Black employees who hold white-collar jobs) may perceive that they have achieved far less than their expectations, resulting in lower job satisfaction than their White counterparts (Ash, 1972; Milutinovich, 1976). Black employees may perceive discrepancies between the fulfillment of their needs and goals, and the demands, requirements, and rewards of the job situation. In this study, this does not appear to be evident.
At first glance, there appear to be several possible reasons why no significant differences occurred between the groups. First, the lack of significant differences may have been due to the small sample sizes used in this study. As noted earlier, it was necessary to contact 42 different organizations in the Central Florida area of which only ten agreed to allow their employees to participate. From these companies, a very small number of employees were used as subjects. Also, since it was necessary to categorize all employees into strong and weak work value oriented groups (i.e., those employees who scored above or below the median on at least four of the six SWV scales respectively), over 40% of the original sample had to be discarded because they could not be categorized. However, since the F ratios in the results' section were consistently low across the five dependent variables, the possible influences of the small sample sizes on the results appears to be negligible.

A lack of significant differences may have been due in part, to the heterogeneity of jobs held by the Black and White individuals who were used as subjects in this study. Although it was stipulated that only Black and White male employees who occupied Professional, Technical, or Administrative positions would be used as subjects, the
variability of jobs held by these individuals was quite large. Inspection of the standard deviations among the groups in Table 1 indicates that there is a high degree of variability in the responses of both Black and White employees. This demonstrates that within each group, employees were not homogeneous in terms of their job satisfaction.

Another potential reason why no significant differences occurred between the groups may have been the lack of variability in work values of the Black and White employees who occupied Professional, Technical, or Administrative jobs. These individuals had very similar work values. The work values of Black and White individuals at the lower levels within the organization (particularly entry-level blue-collar positions) may indeed be influenced by differences in socialization patterns for the two ethnic groups. However, it appears that Black and White individuals who occupy the Professional, Technical, or Administrative level jobs differ little in terms of the meaning they attach to their work role. Perhaps, if differences do exist between these individuals' in terms of their work values, they disappear after a short period of time within organization as a result of adapting (or conforming) to the norms and/or specifics of the organization.
The independent variables race and work value orientation had little or no influence on the dependent variable of job satisfaction. In other words, the two groups in the present investigation simply did not differ in terms of their perceptions of their job satisfaction.

Future endeavors to examine the differences in levels of job satisfaction between Black and White male employees occupying exempt, nonmanagerial white-collar positions should obtain larger numbers of Black employees from these occupational categories. Since Black males are relatively few in numbers in these jobs, efforts should be made to gain the full cooperation of the larger organizations in participating in future research studies. Presumably, more Black employees may work at these levels for these organizations. Equal Employment Opportunities and voluntary affirmative action programs will help alleviate this problem in the future. Perhaps when more Blacks (and other minorities) are recruited and/or promoted into these positions, there will be a large enough number to permit adequate comparisons. In line with this, more stringent controls are needed over the samples before any definitive conclusions and generalizations can be made. Future research investigations should examine the differences in job satisfaction among Black and White male employees in the same occupations at approximately the same levels across
different companies. It may also be worthwhile to examine the differences in job satisfaction among Black and White males in the same types of blue-collar jobs. In addition, future research endeavors should examine the effects that different perceptions of need-fulfillment have on the job satisfaction of blue-collar and white-collar employees (both Black and White). As previously noted in this study, it is possible that blue-collar and white-collar workers differ in terms of the degree to which they perceive that their needs and expectations are being fulfilled by their job situation. As a result, these employees may experience different levels of job satisfaction. Future research efforts should also examine the differences in job satisfaction among Black and White female employees holding the same types of white-collar and blue-collar jobs. This may prove very beneficial since women are entering the labor market at increasing numbers.

It appears, at least in this research investigation, that the work value orientation of Black and White employees occupying white-collar positions has little effect on their levels of job satisfaction. This is contrary to the findings of Blood's (1969) study. Since his measure of work values was somewhat more global than the SWV, it may be worthwhile to examine the various methods of assessing an employee's work values and what effects these different
measures have on the job satisfaction scores. Future research studies should also examine whether the work values of Black and White blue-collar and white-collar employees are influenced by differences in socialization patterns between the two groups.

It is clear from the research findings of this study that race and work value orientation had little or no influence on the worker's job satisfaction. However, it appears evident that more research should be undertaken with highly comparable samples in terms of occupational groupings in order to draw more definitive conclusions and generalizations.
INSTRUCTIONS:

This section of the Job Attitude Questionnaire consists of five separate scales designed to measure attitudes toward your work, pay, promotional opportunities, supervision, and co-workers respectively. At the top of each scale there is a statement. PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS CAREFULLY. Beside each word or phrase below each statement place a:

- **Y** for "yes" if the word or phrase describes your work.
- **N** for "no" if the word or phrase does not describe your work.
- **?** for "undecided" if you can not decide if the word or phrase describes or does not describe your work.

Be sure not to skip any pages or any items on each page. Remember, there is no right or wrong answer, and all individual answers are kept in strictest confidence.
Think of your present work. What is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word given below, write

- for "Yes" if it describes your work
- for "No" if it does NOT describe it
- if you cannot decide

...........................................

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

Fascinating
Routine
Satisfying
Boring
Good
Creative
Respected
Hot
Pleasant
Useful
Tiresome
Healthful
Challenging
On your feet
Frustrating
Simple
Endless
Gives sense of accomplishment

Go on to the next page
Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words describe your present pay? In the blank beside each word, put

\[ \text{Y} \] if it describes your pay

\[ \text{N} \] if it does NOT describe it

\[ ? \] if you cannot decide

\[ \text{PRESENT PAY} \]

- Income adequate for normal expenses
- Satisfactory profit sharing
- Barely live on income
- Bad
- Income provides luxuries
- Insecure
- Less than I deserve
- Highly paid
- Underpaid

Now please turn to the next page...
Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words describe these? In the blank beside each word put

\( \frac{Y}{Y} \) for “Yes” if it describes your opportunities for promotion

\( \frac{N}{N} \) for “No” if it does NOT describe them

？？ if you cannot decide

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION} \\
\hline
\hline
\text{_____ Good opportunities for promotion} \\
\text{_____ Opportunity somewhat limited} \\
\text{_____ Promotion on ability} \\
\text{_____ Dead-end job} \\
\text{_____ Good chance for promotion} \\
\text{_____ Unfair promotion policy} \\
\text{_____ Infrequent promotions} \\
\text{_____ Regular promotions} \\
\text{_____ Fairly good chance for promotion} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Go on to the next page
Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words describe this supervision? In the blank beside each word below, put Y if it describes the supervision you get on your job, N if it does NOT describe it, ? if you cannot decide.

SUPERVISION ON PRESENT JOB

Y. Asks my advice
N. Hard to please
Y. Impolite
N. Praises good work
Y. Tactful
N. Influential
Y. Up-to-date
N. Doesn’t supervise enough
Y. Quick tempered
N. Tells me where I stand
N. Annoying
N. Stubborn
N. Knows job well
N. Bad
N. Intelligent
Y. Leaves me on my own
Y. Around when needed
N. Lazy

Please go on to the next page . . . .
Think of the majority of the people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words describe these people? In the blank beside each word below, put

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\Box & \text{if it describes the people you work with} \\
\X & \text{if it does NOT describe them} \\
? & \text{if you cannot decide}
\end{array}
\]

---

**PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB**

- Stimulating
- Boring
- Slow
- Ambitious
- Stupid
- Responsible
- Fast
- Intelligent
- Easy to make enemies
- Talk too much
- Smart
- Lazy
- Unpleasant
- No privacy
- Active
- Narrow interests
- Loyal
- Hard to meet
APPENDIX B

THE SURVEY OF WORK VALUES
Bowling Green University
Survey of Work Values

Revised, Form U

CONFIDENTIAL
These answers will be used only for analysis by groups. Individual answers will not be revealed.

INSTRUCTIONS
This is a questionnaire concerning the way people feel about work. It is a measure of your opinions. There are no right or wrong answers. Read each statement carefully and indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement. Please do not omit any statements.

On the answer sheet, there are five letters for each statement. These letters refer to your feelings about the statement.

A = Strongly Disagree
B = Moderately Disagree
C = Neither Agree or Disagree
D = Moderately Agree
E = Strongly Agree

For example, if you strongly agree with a particular statement, you will mark space E. If you moderately agree, you will mark D, and so on.

Be sure to give only one answer to each of the statements in the booklet. Make no marks on the answer sheet except as specially instructed.

© Bowling Green State University, 1975, 1976
Reprinted with permission from the publisher
1. One of the reasons that I work is to make my family respect me.
2. A person does not deserve respect just because the person has a good job.
3. A job with prestige is not necessarily a better job than one which does not have prestige.
4. My friends would not think much of me if I did not have a good job.
5. A job which requires the employee to be busy during the day is better than a job which allows a lot of loafing.
6. Most companies have suggestion boxes for their workers, but I doubt that the companies take these suggestions seriously.
7. A good worker cares about finding ways to improve the job, and when one has an idea, one should pass it on to the supervisor.
8. Even if a person has a good job, the person should always be looking for a better job.
9. If a person can get away with it, that person should try to work just a little slower than the boss expects.
10. A person should hold a second job to bring in extra money if the person can get it.
11. In choosing a job, a person ought to consider chances for advancement as well as other factors.
12. One who does a sloppy job at work should feel a little ashamed of oneself.
13. A worker should feel some responsibility to do a decent job, whether or not the supervisor is around.
14. One who has an idea about how to improve one's own job should drop a note in the company suggestion box.
15. A person should choose the job which pays the most.
16. There is nothing wrong with doing a poor job at work if one can get away with it.
17. A good worker is interested in helping a new worker learn the job.
18. Prestige should not be a factor in choosing a job.
19. One should always be thinking about pulling oneself up in the world and should work hard with the hope of being promoted to a higher-level job.
20. The best job that a worker can get is one which permits the worker to do almost nothing during the work day.
21. If I were paid by the hour, I would probably turn down most offers to make extra money by working overtime.
22. If a person likes his job, the person should be satisfied with it and should not push for a promotion to another job.
23. A person should take the job which offers the most overtime if the regular pay on the job is about the same.
24. If a worker has a choice between going to the company picnic or staying home, the worker would probably be better off at home.
25. Even if a worker has a very low-level job in a company, it is still possible for the worker to make suggestions which will affect company policy.
26. The person who holds down a good job is the most respected person in the neighborhood.
27. When an employee can get away with it, the employee should take it easy.
28. The trouble with too many people is that when they find a job in which they are interested, they don’t try to get a better job.

29. A worker who takes long rest pauses is probably a poor worker.

30. A person should choose one job over another mostly because of the higher wages.

31. - A worker who turns down a promotion is probably making a mistake.

32. There is nothing as satisfying as doing the best job possible.

33. Once a week, after the work day is over, a company may have their workers get together in groups for the purpose of discussing possible job changes. A good worker should remain after quitting time to participate in these discussions.

34. The only good part of most jobs is the paycheck.

35. A promotion to a higher-level job usually means more worries and should be avoided for that reason.

36. One who feels no sense of pride in one’s work is probably unhappy.

37. If something is wrong with a job, a smart worker will mind his or her own business and let somebody else complain about it.

38. Having a good job makes a person more worthy of praise from friends and family.

39. A person would soon grow tired of loafing on a job and would probably be happier if he or she worked hard.

40. A well paying job that offers little opportunity for advancement is not a good job for me.

41. When someone is looking for a job, money should not be the most important consideration.

42. One is better off if one is satisfied with one’s own job and is not concerned about being promoted to another job.

43. Only a fool worries about doing a job well, since it is important only that you do your job well enough not to get fired.

44. One should do one’s own job and forget about such things as company meetings or company activities.

45. As far as my friends are concerned, it could not make any difference if I worked regularly or only once in a while.

46. If a person is given a choice between jobs which pay the same money, the person should choose the one which requires as little work as possible.

47. A good job is a well paying job.

48. One should feel a sense of pride in one’s work.

49. Even though they make the same amount of money, the person who works in an office has a more impressive job than the person working as a sales clerk.

50. A person should try to stay busy all day rather than try to find ways to get out of doing work.

51. A person should take a job that pays more than some other job even if that person cannot stand other workers on the job.

52. The most important thing about a job is liking the work.

53. Doing a good job should mean as much to a worker as a good paycheck.

54. If a worker keeps himself busy on the job, the working day passes more quickly than if the worker were loafing.
APPENDIX C

THE DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION III

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: In order to further understand the similarities and differences in the work attitudes of different segments of the labor force, and to aid us in analyzing your answers, it will help to know something about your background. Please answer each of the questions presented below as honestly as possible. ALL ANSWERS WILL BE KEPT IN STRICTEST CONFIDENCE.

1. What is your ethnic group membership?
   - White; Caucasian
   - Black; Afro-American; Negro
   - Hispanic
   - Asiatic
   - American Indian
   - Other (Specify: ____________)

2. When were you born? Month: _____ Year: _____

3. What is the highest level of school you have completed?
   (Please circle the highest grade level you have completed.)
   - Elementary School: 1 2 3 4 5 6
   - Middle or Junior High School: 7 8
   - High School: 9 10 11 12
   - College: 13 14 15 16
   - Graduate School: 17 18 19 20

4. What is the highest level of school achieved by your father?
   (Please circle the highest grade level that he completed.)
   - Elementary School: 1 2 3 4 5 6
   - Middle or Junior High School: 7 8
   - High School: 9 10 11 12
   - College: 13 14 15 16
   - Graduate School: 17 18 19 20
   - Not Known: _____
5. What is the highest level of school achieved by your mother?  
(Please circle the highest grade level that she completed.)

- Elementary School: 1 2 3 4 5 6
- Middle or Junior High School: 7 8
- High School: 9 10 11 12
- College: 13 14 15 16
- Graduate School: 17 18 19 20
- Not Known: ______

6. When was your father born?  
   Month: ______  Year: ______

7. When was your mother born?  
   Month: ______  Year: ______

8. When did you begin work for this company?  
   Month: ______  Year: ______

9. When did you begin work in your present position in this company?  
   Month: ______  Year: ______

10. What is your annual income from this company before taxes are withdrawn?  
    ______ less than $4,999.
    ______ 5,000. to 6,999.
    ______ 7,000. to 8,999.
    ______ 9,000. to 10,999.
    ______ 11,000. to 12,999.
    ______ 13,000. to 14,999.
    ______ 15,000. and above.

11. As a child growing up, what was your father's average annual income when you were 15 years old?  
    ______ less than $4,999.
    ______ 5,000. to 6,999.
    ______ 7,000. to 8,999.
    ______ 9,000. to 10,999.
    ______ 11,000. to 12,999.
    ______ 13,000. to 14,999.
    ______ 15,000. and above.
    ______ Not Known

12. As a child growing up, what was your father's occupation?  
    (Please indicate your father's occupational group.)  
    ______ Professionals; Technicals; and related positions.
    ______ Managers; Administrators; and Proprietors.
    ______ Sales workers.
    ______ Clerical and related positions.
Craftsmen; Foremen; and related positions.

Service Workers.

Operatives (e.g., heavy-duty equipment operators, transportation vehicle operators, etc.)

Laborers (Nonfarm).

Others (Specify: __________).

13. As a child while growing up, where did you live the majority of the time?

- a rural community (i.e., towns with less than 10,000 people)
- an urban community (i.e., cities with 10,000 to 300,000 people.)
- a metropolitan community (i.e., cities with over 300,000 people.)

14. As a child while growing up, what was the size of your family household?

(Please indicate the number of family members in your immediate household while you were growing up, which may include father, mother, siblings, or others.)

- 2 - 3
- 4 - 5
- 6 - 7
- 8 - 9
- 10 and above.

15. What is your marital status?

- Single
- Married
- Divorced
- Other (Specify: __________)

16. How many dependents do you have?

- 0 - 1
- 2 - 3
- 4 - 5
- 6 - 7
- 8 - 9
- 10 and above.

Thank you for your time and cooperation. Be sure that all the questions have been answered. Now please enclose all the materials in the stamped envelope and mail it out promptly.
APPENDIX D

LETTER TO ORGANIZATIONS
This letter is in reference to a job attitude study that I am currently conducting in connection with a master's thesis. I am seeking the cooperation of various organizations within the Central Florida area to allow some of their employees to participate in the study. The primary purpose of this research is to compare the similarities and/or differences in the expressed levels of job satisfaction between Black and White employees occupying similar positions.

Only Black and White males in exempt, white-collar (nonmanagerial) positions will be used as subjects. I am requesting a list of these employees having the same job descriptions. Once received, the Black employees and a random selection of the White employees will receive a job attitude questionnaire comprised of three major sections to complete.

Section I of the questionnaire is designed to measure the employee's perceived job satisfaction with work, pay, promotional opportunities, supervision, and co-workers respectively. It is a short 72-item section which should take 5-10 minutes to complete. Section II consist of the Survey of Work Values (SWV), developed by a group of researchers from Bowling Green State University. The SWV is a 54-item instrument designed to measure how an employee feels about work in general. It should take 15-20 minutes to complete. Section III of the questionnaire consist of 16 demographic items which should take 5 minutes to complete. The names and identities of all participation organizations and employees will be kept in strictest confidence. All individual results will be confidential. Both the overall results and/or the results for the organization will be available to that organization.

The overall results will be used in a comparative analysis to exam if any major differences exist in the levels of job satisfaction expressed by Black and White employees performing the same work tasks. As noted, the results will be used to complete a master's thesis requirement and may be submitted to scholarly journals for possible future publication. If the study is submitted to journals for publication, anonymity of the organizations and all employees will be guaranteed.

The results from this study may be of some practical importance to the participating organizations. These results may be used as a diagnostic aid in identifying potential problems that may arise as a result of negative work-related attitudes among different segments of the organization's labor force. An employee's dissatisfaction or discontent with the work itself, the pay structure, supervision, or some other area may well lead to poor job performance.
Negative work-related attitudes of an employee could be expressed by means of excessive tardiness, absenteeism, or high turnover rates. Hence, the results of this study could be used to identify potential trouble areas and direct or aid the organization in developing programs to overcome the potential problems.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire that will be used in this study. Any employees you can provide to participate in this research effort will be deeply appreciated. If you have any questions pertaining to the nature of the study or if you would like to arrange to meet with me, please do not hesitate to contact me at (305) 646-5130 or (305) 671-9273.

Sincerely,

Antonio F. Noble
Graduate Student
Industrial Psychology
University of Central Florida
APPENDIX E

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO EMPLOYEES
Dear Participant,

This is a request for your participation in a job attitude study being conducted by a graduate student for the Psychology Department of the University of Central Florida in Orlando, in connection with a master's thesis.

In an effort to gain further scientific knowledge on how different segments of the labor force feel about their jobs, you along with other employees in similar positions have been asked to complete the enclosed, three-part job attitude survey. The questions in the survey are being asked of a large number of employees in companies in the Central Florida area. The primary objective is to find out what people like and do not like about their jobs so that we can do whatever is possible to make jobs more satisfying and pleasant.

Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary. No one at your company will ever see your individual answers, so please feel free to express yourself frankly. All of the information obtained in this survey will be combined into a total picture. So again, let me assure you that all of the information obtained in this survey will be strictly confidential and no individual will be identified by name (NO NAMES SHOULD BE PLACED ON ANY PARTS OF THE JOB ATTITUDE SURVEY).

We want you to realize that the information obtained in this survey is very important to us, and your full cooperation in completing it and returning it promptly is deeply appreciated.

If you have any questions regarding the survey or our study, please do not hesitate to contact me at (305) 646-5130 or (305) 671-9273; or Dr. Wayne Burroughs at (305) 275-2216.

Thank you again for your time and cooperation in aiding in this research effort.

Sincerely,

Antonio F. Noble
Graduate Student
Industrial Psychology
University of Central Florida
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