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This paper attempts to develop a theory of job satisfaction which incorporates differences in work values and perceived job characteristics as key explanatory variables. It empirically examines the relationship between job satisfaction and the work values and job rewards associated with six dimensions of work—intrinsic, convenience, financial, relations with co-workers, career opportunities and resource adequacy. It is found that work values have independent effects on job satisfaction. The extent to which workers are able to obtain perceived job rewards is conceptualized to be a function of their degree of control over their employment situations. The paper also seeks to develop a framework which links the variation in the job satisfactions of workers to the factors that influence the degree of their control over the attainment of job rewards in American society. The analyses in this paper are based on data from the 1972–73 Quality of Employment Survey.

The concept of job satisfaction traditionally has been of great interest to social scientists concerned with the problems of work in an industrial society. Many have been interested in job satisfaction, for example, as a result of a personal value system which assumes that work which enables satisfaction of one's needs furthers the dignity of the human individual, whereas work without these characteristics limits the development of personal potential and is, therefore, to be negatively valued. Thus, it is important to examine these issues in order, hopefully, to improve the work experiences of individuals as an end in itself. Other social scientists have been interested in this concept because of evidence that has linked the degree of satisfaction with work to the quality of one's life outside the work role—especially one's physical and mental health. Still others were motivated to study job satisfaction out of a desire to improve productivity and organizational functioning by improving the quality of work experiences of employees. While these concerns have their bases in different perspectives, they share the recognition of the importance of the job in the total life experience of the individual and the desirability of a positive work experience.

Three types of explanations historically have been suggested to account for the variation in the job satisfactions of workers. The first has sought to explain this variation solely in terms of the personalities of individual workers and has attempted to establish a relationship between measures of adjustment or neuroticism and job satisfaction (see Vroom, 1964, for a discussion of this line of reasoning). While personality variables undoubtedly have some effect on job satisfaction, such explanations are inadequate because they ignore the association of job satisfaction with characteristics of the job.

A second explanation views variation in job satisfaction solely as a function of differences in the nature of jobs people perform. In the past, this has been the numer-
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ically dominant view and studies employing this type of reasoning generally deal with two sets of variables—one a measure of a work role characteristic(s), the other a measure of job satisfaction—and attempt to establish a causal relation from the former to the latter. There is wide variation in the types of work role characteristics that have been used. Some common ones include characteristics of the organizational structure such as span of control and size (see the summary by Porter and Lawler, 1965), job content factors such as degree of specialization (e.g., Shepard, 1970), economic factors (e.g., see Massie, 1964), social factors, promotional opportunities and hours of work. (Excellent reviews of these types of studies are provided by Vroom [1964] and Herzberg et al. [1957].) Generally, these investigations have found that job satisfaction varies, often considerably, with one or more of these variables. A widely tested theory of the determinants of job satisfaction that utilizes this type of explanation is Herzberg's "two-factor" theory (Herzberg et al., 1959). This type of explanation of the variation in job satisfaction may be characterized as a "structural" one, in that the attitudes of workers are seen as a direct, one-to-one reflection of the structure of the work place. This line of reasoning has had great practical utility since it has suggested to employers ways in which they could increase the satisfactions of workers by manipulating job characteristics that are frequently under their control.

Despite the practical utility of this second type of reasoning, this view raises important theoretical problems that question its usefulness for a thorough understanding of job satisfaction. In particular, it does not consider individual differences in the satisfactions experienced by people with the same job characteristics. Such differences arise not only because people evaluate similar "objective" job characteristics differently, but also from differences in what people seek to obtain from their work.

The view that the satisfaction an individual obtains from a job is a function not only of the objective properties of that job but also of the motives of the individual was first suggested by Morse (1953). Since that time, the major line of development of this view in sociology has occurred through the writings of British industrial sociologists adhering to the "social action" approach. Leading exponents of this view are Goldthorpe and his associates (1968), who reacted against the attempts of organizational social scientists to study issues of worker satisfaction by adhering to a closed-system model wherein organizations are seen as the relevant context for explaining these issues. They argued that the question of satisfaction from work cannot be thoroughly considered without a knowledge of the meanings that individuals impute to their work activity. Studies within this perspective (e.g., Goldthorpe et al., 1968; Beynon and Blackburn, 1972; Russell, 1975) have contributed to our knowledge of job satisfaction by attempting to establish empirically the ways in which the wants and expectations that people attach to their work activity shape the attitudinal and behavioral patterns of their working lives as a whole.

A social action frame of reference which directs attention to the variety of meanings that individuals impute to their work has great potential for advancing our knowledge of job satisfaction and the quality of work experience of individuals in general. At present, however, this potential may be regarded as only a promise. There has been no successful attempt to systematically and empirically establish the way in which meanings and the various satisfactions that work provides combine to determine job

1 The classical origins of the social action approach may be traced to Max Weber. He rejected the assumption of any objective meaning attached to actions and wished to restrict the understanding and interpretation of meaning to the subjective intentions of the actor (Gerth and Mills, 1946:58). This approach starts from the principle that if people define situations as real, they are real in their consequences and thus it takes the actors' own definitions of the situations in which they are engaged as an initial basis for the explanation of their social behavior and relationships. Such an approach may be contrasted with those which start with some general and normative psychology (or philosophy) of individual needs.
satisfaction based on a heterogeneous and diverse sample of workers. Also, no adequate conceptualization exists which systematically links these considerations to the factors that affect the attainment of jobs. The present paper attempts to partially fill these gaps in our understanding of job satisfaction.

The objectives of this paper are to conceptualize and empirically examine: (1) the way work values and job rewards combine to influence job satisfaction and (2) the factors that determine the extent to which individuals are able to obtain job rewards. This paper thus seeks to develop a model which links the variation in the job satisfactions of individuals to the factors that influence their degree of control over the attainment of these rewards in American society.2

Data

The data that will form the empirical bases for the arguments to be developed in this paper come from the 1972–73 Quality of Employment Survey. This survey was conducted by the Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan and is representative of the national employed civilian labor force meeting certain sample eligibility criteria (see Quinn and Shepard, 1974, for a description of the survey and sampling procedures). These data were obtained through personal interviews with 1,496 persons living in housing units within the continental United States and the District of Columbia and consist of the perceptions of these individuals regarding characteristics of themselves, of their jobs, etc. The sample appears to be representative in its design and selection procedures and also in its representation of various subgroups (by sex, race, occupation, etc.) in the population (cf. Kalleberg, 1975: Appendix A).

These data permit the type of comparative analysis necessary for the elaboration of a theoretical model. In contrast to previous studies within the social action perspective (e.g., Goldthorpe et al., 1968; Beynon and Blackburn, 1972), which focus on a particular organizational setting, such data allow the consideration of a wide variety of occupational and organizational factors and thus permit the investigation of a large number of such conditions on workers' values, rewards and satisfactions.

Job Satisfaction

In order to empirically examine the process underlying the notion of job satisfaction, it is necessary first to state explicitly what is implied by this concept. Job satisfaction refers to an overall affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying. It must be distinguished from satisfaction with specific dimensions of those work roles. This conceptualization implies that job satisfaction is a unitary concept and that individuals may be characterized by some sort of vaguely defined attitude toward their total job situation. To say that job satisfaction is a unitary concept, however, does not imply that the causes of this overall attitude are not multidimensional. Obviously, a person may be satisfied with one dimension of the job and dissatisfied with another. The assumption underlying the present view is that it is possible for individuals to balance these specific satisfactions against the specific dissatisfactions and thus to arrive at a composite satisfaction with the job as a whole (cf. Hoppock, 1935). In line with these considerations, a measure of overall job satisfaction was developed based on the responses of workers to five questions concerning how satisfied they are with their jobs as a whole. These questions included such direct inquiries as "how satisfied are you with your job" as well as such indirect measures as whether the worker would recommend the job to a friend, whether the worker plans to look

2 It is, therefore, an attempt to develop a "theory" of job satisfaction, i.e., a set of generalizations that explains the variation in this phenomenon on the basis of the conditions and processes that produce this variation (cf. Blau, 1965). There are two parts to the theory: a "psychological" part, which explains the variation in job satisfaction produced by the interplay between work values and job rewards and a "sociological" part, which relates the variation in job satisfaction to factors that affect one's degree of control over the attainment of job rewards.
for a new job within the next year, whether the worker would take the same job again if given a choice, and how the job measures up to the sort of job the worker wanted when he took it. The resultant scale of job satisfaction was computed as the mean of a sum of the responses to these questions and had a reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha$) of .77. A detailed discussion of this measure, as well as of all the measures described in this paper, may be found in Kalleberg, 1975.) The use of a multiple-item indicator of this construct overcomes many of the problems associated with single-item measures of job satisfaction (see Kalleberg, 1974).

A worker's level of job satisfaction is a function of the range of specific satisfactions and dissatisfactions that he/she experiences with respect to the various dimensions of work. It is thus "the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values" (Locke, 1969). This view of the process underlying the variation in job satisfaction implies that two types of factors are operative: perceived job characteristics, which represent the amount of satisfaction available from particular dimensions of work, and work values, which represent the meanings that individuals attach to these perceived job characteristics. In order to examine this process empirically, it is necessary to develop measures of these factors.

Work Values

Work may have a variety of meanings for individuals in an industrial society. Work has no inherent meaning but, rather, individuals impute such meanings to their work activity. One way to understand the variety of these meanings is to specify the range of gratifications that are available from work in an industrial society and to assess the degree to which particular individuals value each of these dimensions. Information regarding the importance of each of 34 job characteristics to the worker was obtained from respondents in the Quality of Employment Survey. The intercorrelations among these items were factor-analyzed by means of a principal factor procedure, and the factor matrix produced by this analysis was rotated by means of a quartimax orthogonal rotation. Six dimensions of work that are differentially valued emerged from this analysis. These are:

---

3 Evidence for the unidimensionality of the job satisfaction scale is provided by: (1) a principal components factor analysis of the correlation matrix for the five items comprising the scale, which produced a single-factor solution accounting for 52.6% of the total variation among the items and (2) a principal factor analysis of the correlation matrix for the five general job satisfaction items and the 34 job reward items (to be discussed later). A quartimax orthogonal rotation of the factor matrix produced by this analysis revealed that the five general job satisfaction items factored out separately from the job reward items, suggesting that general job satisfaction is a unitary phenomenon and is distinct from the satisfactions associated with specific dimensions of work. These results provide no support for any "two-factor" notions of job satisfaction (cf. Herzberg et al., 1959). These factor analyses are presented in Kalleberg, 1975.

4 In contrast, Goldthorpe et al. (1968) classify workers on the basis of several ideal-type "orientations to work," sets of consciously experienced expectations or goals which represent the priorities one holds with respect to the work activity. Such categorizations do not appear very useful for a comparative analysis since identifying workers as motivated by a single type of reward tends to neglect their valuation and experience with respect to other dimensions. The present view is more general than that suggested by Goldthorpe et al. in that it does not assume the existence of a dominant orientation but treats this as an empirical question. If such an orientation should, in fact, empirically characterize a group of individuals, this would be reflected by their valuing highly certain dimensions of work and not valuing others.

5 The worker was asked: "People differ a lot in terms of which of these things are more important to them. We'd like to know how important each of these is to you." The respondent then sorted 34 cards containing names of job characteristics (e.g., the work is interesting, the hours are good, the pay is good, promotions are handled fairly) into four piles, each pile corresponding to a response category (very important, somewhat important, a little important, not at all important). See Quinn and Shepard, 1974, for a discussion.

6 The analysis produced 16 factors, accounting for 44.7% of the total variation among the items; only the first six factors, accounting for 85.9% of the total factor variance and 38.4% of the total variance, were interpreted. The factors explained from 6.3 to 44.7 percent of the total
An intrinsic dimension, which refers to those characteristics associated with the task itself—whether it is interesting, allows the worker to develop and use his/her abilities, allows the worker to be self-directive and whether the worker can see the results of the work. Valuation of this dimension thus reflects the worker's desire to be stimulated and challenged by the job and to be able to exercise acquired skills at work.

A convenience dimension, which refers to job characteristics that provide solid creature comforts, i.e., a "soft" job. These include: convenient travel to and from work, good hours, freedom from conflicting demands, pleasant physical surroundings, no excessive amounts of work, enough time to do the work and an opportunity to forget about personal problems. This dimension may be viewed in opposition conceptually to the intrinsic dimension as it represents a valuation of facets external to the task itself.

While the convenience dimension refers to those aspects of work that are "extrinsic" to the task itself, it does not exhaust the range of extrinsic characteristics that are differentially valued. A second extrinsic dimension refers to the financial dimension and includes such items as the pay, fringe benefits and job security. Valuation of this dimension reflects a worker's desire to obtain present and future monetary rewards from a job.

A third extrinsic dimension refers to relationships with co-workers and includes such items as whether the job permits chances to make friends, whether co-workers are friendly and helpful and whether one's co-workers take a personal interest in him/her. Valuation of this dimension reflects a worker's desire for the satisfaction of social needs from the work activity.

A fourth extrinsic dimension is the opportunities the job provides for a career, a dimension that includes such items as whether the chances for promotion are good, whether promotions are handled fairly and whether the employer is concerned about giving everyone a chance to get ahead. Valuation of this dimension represents a worker's desire for advancement and recognition.

The final dimension of work that is differentially valued may be labeled resource adequacy. This dimension represents workers' wishes for adequate resources with which to do their jobs well and includes such items as whether the help, equipment, authority and information required for job performance are adequate, whether co-workers are competent and helpful, and whether the supervision is conducive to task completion. This dimension of work may be viewed as being different from the previous ones in that it doesn't refer to what workers "ultimately" want from their jobs. Yet in order to obtain such rewards as money, intrinsic gratifications, advancement, etc., workers must perform adequately in their jobs. Successful role performance is not only contingent upon the demands of a role and the characteristics of the person occupying it, it also may be dependent upon the amount of resources or facilities that are supplied to the role occupant. Thus, a worker may be concerned with and value not only the ultimate rewards provided by the job, but may be equally concerned with the more immediate problem of securing resources sufficient for adequate performance in the work role (cf. Quinn, 1972).

After identifying the basic dimensions underlying the intercorrelations among the 34 importance ratings, scales measuring each of these six dimensions were developed. Scales were constructed by taking the mean of the unweighted scores on component items, thus each scale has a range from 1.0 (low valuation) to 4.0 (high valuation), despite the fact that scales have different numbers of items. Missing data on a particular item were assigned the mean of the cases present on that item. The reliability estimates for these scales, the num-

factor variance and from 2.8 to 20 percent of the total variance. Further, the factor analysis suggested dimensions that replicate those defined by Quinn and Shepard (1974) by means of a cluster analysis of the same items. They labeled their dimensions: challenge, comfort, financial, relations with co-workers, promotion and resource adequacy. The items included in each of the six scales in the present study are the same as those included in the corresponding scales utilized by Quinn and Shepard.
The concept of "work value" may be regarded as a special usage of the general concept of "value" and may be defined as the conceptions of what is desirable that individuals hold with respect to their work activity. Work values reflect the individual's awareness of the condition he seeks from the work situation, and they regulate his actions in pursuit of that condition. They thus refer to general attitudes regarding the meaning that an individual attaches to the work role as distinguished from his satisfaction with that role. The term should be distinguished further (but in common usage often is not) from related concepts that have been used previously in the literature for similar purposes. For example, values should be distinguished from expectations, which denote one's beliefs about what will occur in the future; but what is expected may not correspond to what is wanted and, conversely, what is valued may or may not correspond to what is expected. In addition, values should be distinguished from needs, which refer to the objective requirements of an organism's well-being. A value presupposes an awareness, at some level, of the object or condition sought while a need does not. The two concepts are closely related since individuals may value those factors associated with a job which satisfy their needs; but values also may be irrational and whether or not one's values correspond to his needs, it is his values which regulate his actions and determine his emotional responses. (For a

The intercorrelations among these six work-value scales were factor-analyzed (principal components factor analysis) in an attempt to discover any "higher-order" dimensions of work values that may account more parsimoniously for the covariation among them. A single factor solution was obtained, accounting for 49.2% of the total variation, suggesting that these dimensions are most usefully considered as constituting separate dimensions of work that are differentially valued.

The general definition of values from which this definition is adapted is discussed in Williams (1968). The present usage of the term "work values" corresponds to what Kohn (1969) has previously called "judgments about work" or "work orientations."

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 1496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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discussion of these and related issues, see Locke, 1969.)

**Job Rewards**

These dimensions of work that are differentially valued constitute potential sources of rewards to the worker. While valuation of particular job characteristics may, in certain cases, correspond to the availability of those characteristics, such correspondence is by no means certain in an industrial society. Given that the characteristics associated with jobs are determined relatively independently of individuals, the distribution of work values at a given point in time may not be assumed to match the distribution of opportunities for the satisfaction of these values. In order to understand the variation in workers' job satisfactions, it is necessary to consider not only the values that individuals have toward work but the types of rewards that are available as well.

Though a number of methods may be used to measure the types and amounts of rewards people receive from jobs, the relevant procedure in the present context is to ask the worker about the job. As Hackman and Lawler (1971) have argued, it is not the "objective" state of these characteristics that affects employee attitudes and behavior, but how they are experienced by the worker. Accordingly, information regarding "how true" each of the same 34 characteristics was for the respondent's job, which was also obtained in the Quality of Employment Survey, will be used to represent the perceived levels of the various job characteristics. The intercorrelations among these items were analyzed by means of a principal factor procedure, and the factor matrix produced by this analysis was rotated by means of a quartimax orthogonal rotation. The six dimensions discussed previously also were found to underly the correlations among the reward items. Scales measuring the rewards associated with each of these six dimensions were developed by taking the mean of the unweighted scores on component items; thus each scale has a range from 1.0 (low reward) to 4.0 (high reward), despite the fact that scales have different numbers of items. Missing data on a particular item were assigned the mean of the cases present on that item. The reliability estimates for these scales, the number of items included in each scale, the intercorrelations among the reward scales and the intercorrelations among the value and reward scales are presented in Table 1. It should be noted

---

9 Near the end of the interview, the respondent was asked: "Here are some cards that describe different aspects of a person's job. I'd like you to put each white card below the pink card which best reflects how true you feel each is of your job." The respondent then sorted 34 cards containing the names of the same 34 job characteristics into four piles, each pile corresponding to a response category (very true, somewhat true, a little true, not at all true). See Quinn and Shepard, 1974.

10 The analysis produced 15 factors, accounting for 47.7% of the total variation among the items; only the first six factors, accounting for 88.4% of the total factor variance and 42.2% of the total variance, were interpreted. The factors explained from 5.4 to 42 percent of the total factor variance and from 2.6 to 20 percent of the total variance. The results with respect to the reward items also replicated the results obtained by Quinn and Shepard (see footnote 6).

11 The intercorrelations among these six job reward scales were analyzed by means of a principal components factor analysis in an attempt to discover any "higher-order" dimensions of job rewards that may account more parsimoniously for the covariation among them. A single factor solution was obtained, accounting for 52.7% of the total variation, suggesting that these dimensions are most usefully considered as constituting separate dimensions of work that constitute sources of satisfaction.

12 It may be argued that some "rewards" (i.e., convenience and resource adequacy) are most usefully considered as representing "costs" (with signs reversed). That is, high convenience and adequate resources represent, in a very real sense, decreased costs rather than increased rewards. This conceptual distinction does not imply the acceptance of a "two-factor" theory of satisfaction. Herzberg et al. (1959), for example, argue that rewards (job content) lead to job satisfaction while costs (job context) lead to job dissatisfaction. Similarly, Bradburn (1969) argues that avowed happiness is a function of one's positive rewards less his costs. These frameworks are based on the assumption that rewards and costs are independent of each other and functions of different sets of variables. In the present study, no evidence was found to suggest that the six "reward" variables represent two distinct dimensions (see footnote 11).
further that the same job characteristics used in a particular valuation scale were used in the corresponding reward scale.

It should be clearly understood what these "job reward" measures do and do not represent. They are evaluative judgments on the part of respondents concerning features of their jobs (e.g., the pay is good, the work is interesting); in this sense, they may be regarded as representing measures of satisfaction with the various dimensions of jobs. They do not represent "objective" properties of jobs. The correspondence between actual and perceived properties of jobs constitutes a much-needed area of research, since it would shed light on the crucial policy-related question of how much of the variation in job satisfaction is produced by "objective" as opposed to "subjective" factors. While the present data preclude a serious examination of this issue, there is evidence to suggest that such ratings of job characteristics made by individuals do not appear unrealistic in light of our knowledge of occupational realities (see the discussion of this issue in Kalleberg, 1975: ch. 4).

One might argue that the value and reward dimensions are not independent, mainly because of instrument effect and weakness of measurement. Despite their spatial separation in the interview schedule, information regarding values and rewards was obtained from the same interview and these scales contain the same items with different questions. One might also argue that values and rewards do not represent independent dimensions because people typically do not make a distinction between them. In order to assess the validity of these arguments, the intercorrelations among the six work-value and the six job-reward scales were factor-analyzed. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 2. Factor I consists of similarities among the job-reward measures, while Factor II involves the relationships among the work-value scales. While the analysis suggested that there may be a "methods bias" in the relationship between the intrinsic value and reward scales (Factor III) and between the co-workers scales (Factor IV), the loadings of these scales on these factors are relatively small, as is the amount of variation explained by these factors. The general conclusions suggested by Table 2 are that the reward and value scales represent independent constructs and that the amount of instrument effect is small.

Effects of Values and Rewards on Job Satisfaction

It has been argued that job satisfaction is a function of both work values and job rewards. Such a statement does not, by itself, constitute a great advance toward an understanding of the nature of the process underlying the concept of job satisfaction. A theoretical understanding of the nature

Table 2. Quartimax Rotation of Factor Matrix Produced by Principal Factor Analysis of the Correlation Matrix for the Work Value and Job Reward Scales: 1972–73 Quality of Employment Survey, N = 1496

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Factor</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic valuation</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience valuation</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial valuation</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers valuation</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career valuation</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource adequacy valuation</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic rewards</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience rewards</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial rewards</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers rewards</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career rewards</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource adequacy rewards</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total Variance</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total Factor Variance</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Factor loadings less than .3 are arbitrarily ignored.
of this process requires a precise specification of the manner in which particular values and rewards combine to influence overall job satisfaction.

Clues regarding the interplay among values, rewards and job satisfaction are provided initially by an examination of their zero-order correlations. The correlations between job satisfaction and each value and reward are presented in the first column of Table 3. Rewards are positively and relatively highly correlated with job satisfaction, a result probably explained by the fact that the greater the perceived rewards one obtains from these specific dimensions of the job, the greater the satisfaction with the job in general. Values, on the other hand, are correlated near zero with job satisfaction. This might suggest that rewards may be "suppressing" the association between values and job satisfaction, which means it is necessary to control for one of these variables when examining the effects of the other.

The second column of Table 3 presents the standardized coefficients obtained from regressing job satisfaction on both the values and rewards associated with a particular dimension of work. The pattern of these results supports the interpretation of a suppressor effect—namely, that by removing the positive association of values and job satisfaction produced by the positive correlation of values and rewards, the negative net effect of values on job satisfaction is revealed. When each dimension is considered separately, rewards have a large and positive effect on job satisfaction while values have a smaller but statistically significant (beyond p = .001) negative effect on job satisfaction.

In order to examine the net effects of
these values and rewards on job satisfaction, the latter was regressed on all values and rewards simultaneously. The results of this regression are presented in the third column of Table 3. These findings suggest that rewards generally have greater effects on job satisfaction than do values; rewards, furthermore, have positive net effects on job satisfaction while values generally have negative net effects. While some values do not have significant net effects on job satisfaction, a consideration of these factors constitutes an empirical as well as a theoretical improvement over a model which includes only rewards.\(^\text{13}\)

The model underlying the coefficients in columns 2 and 3 is an additive one. The effect of an increase in the level of a perceived job characteristic is always positive and does not depend on the strength of one's desire for that reward, while the effect of an increase in valuation on job satisfaction is always negative and does not depend on the availability of the characteristic. Furthermore, it assumes that these effects are linear. This model (from Table 3, column 3) can be represented as:

\[
JS = a + \sum_{i=1}^{6} b_i R_i + \sum_{i=1}^{6} c_i V_i + e
\]

where JS is job satisfaction, R stands for a type of reward, V stands for the value or importance of that type of reward and i varies over the six types of rewards and values. In this model, the effects of rewards on job satisfaction (the \(b_i\)) are the same regardless of how important workers consider these rewards to be. However, for any given level of a reward, there will be variation in job satisfaction produced by the

\[\text{R}^2\] for the present model is .364; the \(R^2\) for a model containing only rewards as independent variables is .328. For some dimensions (i.e., financial and resource adequacy), rewards have a significant effect on job satisfaction while values do not. That is, workers who perceive they obtain greater financial rewards will tend to be more satisfied regardless of their values, and the absence of characteristics implied by resource adequacy such as role ambiguity, poor supervision and incompetent co-workers are oppressive job conditions for nearly everyone, regardless of their values.

variation in the valuation of that reward; these differences are represented by the \(c_i\). The \(c_i\) are negative because for a given level of rewards (i.e., holding rewards constant), the more one values those rewards the more likely it is that these values are not fulfilled.\(^\text{14}\) The model implies that, in the aggregate, the highest levels of job satisfaction will be experienced by those workers with high rewards and low values, while the lowest levels of job satisfaction will be experienced by those workers with low rewards and high values.

While additive models constitute a major way that the relationship of job satisfaction to its components has been operationalized (Vroom, 1964), researchers holding this view typically have described this process by means of a difference score (e.g., Kuhlen, 1963). These models differ from equation (1) in that the effects of rewards and values on job satisfaction are assumed to be equal (though opposite in sign). This assumption amounts to a constraint on the coefficients of R and V which forces them to be equal, a constraint which has little theoretical or empirical justification. As the results in columns 2 and 3 of Table 3 show, rewards tend to have greater effects on job satisfaction than do values. Thus, it is not the correspondence of values to rewards that produces job satisfaction (if by "correspondence" we mean similarities in absolute levels of the variables); rather, both values and rewards have independent (but unequal) effects on job satisfaction.

One might argue that equation (1) is not an appropriate representation of the manner in which values and perceived job characteristics combine to influence overall job satisfaction. In particular, one might dispute the assumption that values have independent effects on job satisfaction and argue that a model in which values interact with rewards is more appropriate.\(^\text{15}\) Inter-

\[\text{Morse (1953:28) also suggested an additive view of the interplay among values, rewards and job satisfaction when she argued: "the greater the amount the individual gets, the greater his satisfaction and, at the same time, the more the individual still desires, the less his satisfaction."\]}

\[\text{One might also accept the additive form of the model, but argue that the assumption of}\]
action models constitute the second major way that the relationship of job satisfaction to its components has been operationalized (e.g., Vroom, 1964; Schaffer, 1954; Hackman and Lawler, 1971; Wanous, 1974), although there has been no attempt in these studies to compare the explanatory power of the interaction models to that of additive models. While there are a large number of ways in which interactions between values and rewards in determining job satisfaction may be specified, a theoretically attractive version is represented by:

\[JS = \sum_{i=1}^{6} b_i R_i + \sum_{i=1}^{6} c_i V_i R_i + e.\] (2)

Here the \(b_i\) represent the effects of the six perceived job characteristics on job satisfaction when the worker considers them relatively unimportant, and the \(c_i\) represent the additional effects of the same rewards as the value of the rewards to the worker increases. In contrast to equation (1), this model implies that the effects of job rewards on job satisfaction depend on the levels of valuation of the rewards.

The fourth column of Table 3 reports the coefficients obtained from estimating equation (2). Three factors suggest that equation (2) is less appropriate than equation (1) for representing the relationships among values, rewards and job satisfaction. First, equation (1) explains more of the variance in job satisfaction than equation (2) (.364 versus .353). Second, the \(c_i\) in equation (2) are negative, whereas the reasoning underlying this model would have assumed the \(c_i\) to be positive. That is, an interaction model such as equation (2) assumes that highly valued rewards have greater effects on job satisfaction than rewards that are unimportant; equation (2) yields empirical results that contradict this assumption. Finally, equation (2) is also problematic in that the collinearity between the \(R_i\) and \(V\) terms for each dimension is very high (from .77 to .90); this makes it difficult to distinguish the respective effects of these terms. Therefore, equation (1) will be considered to be a more appropriate representation of the manner in which values and rewards combine to influence overall job satisfaction, at least in these data.\(^{16}\)

The above analysis has suggested that work values have independent effects on job satisfaction. One might conclude from this that characteristics of jobs do not interact with work values to produce satisfaction; this would be incorrect. It is important to remember that the "job-reward" measures discussed in this paper are perceptions of job characteristics. The relationship between actual and perceived job characteristics constitutes a source of individual differences in satisfaction with specific dimensions of jobs that are not considered in this paper. The possibility remains very plausible that values (or related concepts, such as needs) interact with the "objective" job characteristics to produce evaluative judgments about those characteristics. For example, individuals are likely to develop judgments about or even to merely notice characteristics of their jobs to the extent to which the individuals value these char-

---

\(^{16}\) Additive models of the form of equation (1) are compared with a number of alternate specifications of models incorporating interactions between values and rewards in Kalleberg (1975). One such model combined the features of equations (1) and (2); i.e., \(V R\) terms were added to equation (1). As was the case with equation (2), the very high collinearity between the \(R_i\) and \(V R_i\) terms made it impossible to isolate their respective effects on job satisfaction in any meaningful way.
characteristics. Thus, the actual responses to the "rewards" questions are quite possibly the product of the "true" scores on these questions and the extent to which the respondent values the reward in question. Under these conditions, the job-reward measures already represent the interactions between the true job characteristic scores and values. An examination of this argument is not possible here, since the relevant information to test it consists of perceptions of individuals in the same or very similar jobs. While the perceptions of job characteristics are the appropriate data for understanding job satisfaction, a knowledge of how these relate to actual job characteristics is necessary for the formation of policy and for answering such questions as why job satisfaction is unequally distributed among the population.

A limitation on the model whose coefficients are presented in column 3 is that while it allows a ranking of the relative effects of the various values and rewards on job satisfaction, it does not permit a ranking of dimensions. Since job satisfaction is a function of the range of specific satisfactions and dissatisfactions that one experiences with respect to the six dimensions of work and since these "specific satisfactions" (i.e., the contribution of that dimension to overall job satisfaction) are determined by the combinations of the value and reward variables for these dimensions, it is of interest to assess the relative contribution of the six combinations to overall job satisfaction. How does one obtain a rank-ordering of dimensions? This is possible by representing the data from this model in a slightly different manner.

The strategy of this analysis is to define a new variable, say "specific satisfaction," which is weighted by the unstandardized coefficients in column 3. Satisfaction with the intrinsic dimension, for example, would be defined as: .486 x reward — .245 x value. A high value on the combination implies high satisfaction with that dimension, a low value implies low satisfaction. (Note that in the cases where a reward has a significant effect on job satisfaction but the value does not—e.g., "financial," the specific satisfaction variable representing that dimension will be almost entirely a function of the level of reward associated with that dimension.) If overall job satisfaction is then regressed on the six specific satisfaction variables, the unstandardized coefficients will naturally be equal to 1.0 since these variables are just another way of combining the information from the value and reward variables. The relevant information from the regression of job satisfaction on the six new variables is contained in their standardized coefficients. These coefficients represent the standard deviations of the linear combination of values and rewards associated with each group divided by the standard deviation of the dependent variable; the relative sizes of these standardized coefficients thus indicate the relative effects of the values and rewards associated with the various dimensions on overall job satisfaction.

The standardized coefficients obtained from regressing job satisfaction on the six specific satisfaction variables are presented in column 5 of Table 3. These coefficients represent the relative effects of these six components on job satisfaction over the entire sample of workers. Whether workers obtain intrinsic satisfaction, for example, will have the greatest single effect on their satisfaction with their jobs as a whole. This supports recent speculation that it is the failure of workers to achieve their values with respect to the content of the task itself that is a prime cause of their dissatisfaction with their jobs (e.g., Com-

---

17 I am indebted to an anonymous reviewer for this observation. To argue that the values and rewards measures may be "contaminated" by each other is not an argument against equation (1), however, since this model allows for correlations among the V, and R,.
committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 1972) and suggests the utility of recent attempts to "enlarge" and "enrich" jobs.

Whether or not workers obtain valued intrinsic rewards, however, they still may be relatively satisfied if they receive monetary compensation for their labors. The financial dimension has the second greatest effect on job satisfaction—a result which is not surprising since wages, fringe benefits and job security constitute the major sources of access to almost all goods and services as well as represent measures of the value of one's labor in a high consumption society such as the United States.

In contrast, convenience and relations with co-workers have relatively small net effects on job satisfaction for the total sample of workers. High satisfactions on these dimensions may be regarded as "bonuses" because having opportunities to attain their values with respect to these dimensions will increase workers' satisfactions with their jobs but are not the primary bases on which jobs are evaluated.

A possible alternative explanation for these results should be noted. It could be argued that the differences in the relative sizes of the coefficients reported in columns 3 and 5 of Table 3 are due to differences in the reliabilities of the various value and reward measures. It is unlikely that such an explanation is sufficient to account for these results. As a comparison of the reliabilities of these measures (Table 1) with their relative effects (column 3 of Table 3) shows, the relative effects of these measures do not correspond in any direct way to their relative reliabilities. 19

These results suggest that factors associated with the intrinsic dimension have the greatest relative effects for producing overall job satisfaction. One might be tempted to conclude from this that such characteristics are most "important" for job satisfaction and that policy should be directed at improving such factors. These kinds of inferences may be misleading. The relative effects of these values and rewards on job satisfaction depend on their relative population-specific variances and, thus, these comparisons are historically specific. For example, a policy designed to improve intrinsic aspects of work could reduce the variation in intrinsic rewards; a subsequent identical study then would find that financial satisfaction has larger apparent "importance" because its variance has increased relatively, even though the causal processes remain unchanged. In fact, it may be that intrinsic work factors have become most important in producing overall job satisfaction in this country in recent years because of previous efforts to reduce the variation in financial satisfactions.

This section has examined the relationship between overall job satisfaction and the work values and perceived job characteristics associated with the various dimensions of work. The remainder of the paper will focus on the factors which influence the degree of satisfaction workers obtain from the six specific dimensions of work. A complete examination of the determinants of these types of specific satisfactions requires both an explanation of why people have different levels of job rewards and an explanation of why people with the same levels of rewards have different work values. The latter question will not be treated in this paper for two reasons. First, since specific satisfaction is primarily a function of the perceived level of reward associated with that dimension, it is more important for present purposes to understand why these are unequally distributed. Second, an adequate understanding of the variation in work values is very difficult to obtain with cross-sectional data, since they will change considerably as the person moves through the life cycle. (A discussion of the problems involved in studying the variation in work values with cross-sec-

---

19 One could, of course, examine this question directly by simply correcting the correlations among the job satisfaction, value, and reward scales for attenuation and recalculating equation (1). The measurement model underlying this procedure assumes that the errors in the items composing the scales are uncorrelated. This is a rather restrictive assumption, and it is unlikely that there may be some correlation among these items due to invalidity since these attitudinal items were obtained from the same interview. If there is any reason to suspect such correlated error, disattenuated correlations will be unstable and must be viewed with considerable caution.
tional data may be found in Kalleberg, 1975:ch. 3.)

Degree of Control and Job Rewards

The extent to which workers in an industrial society are able to obtain valued job characteristics is highly problematic. Factors associated with the industrial production process separate individuals from the forces that determine characteristics of jobs and, furthermore, such jobs are assigned on the basis of personal characteristics and are achieved by individuals competing for them. This situation is intensified in American society with its stress on economic individualism and the prevailing view that individuals have “inalienable rights” to enjoy a wide range of choice and to compete for better jobs in a free market (Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965). Workers in such a society therefore may be assumed to seek jobs that conform to their values, though such jobs may not be available given the opportunity structure at a given point in time.

For Marx (1964), this problem of control over work was rooted in the fact that most people did not have control over the products and process of production and, thus, had little power to determine the rewards associated with their jobs. Variation in work experience was seen as a function of the economic and structural factors that determined the distribution of rewards to positions in the society, and it was assumed that rewards could be increased only by changes in these structural determinants. In line with this view, sociological theories of the quality of work experience have focused on comparative organizational and industrial contexts as the explanatory factors that account for the variation in such experience (e.g., Blauner, 1964).

While it is true that workers in an industrial society typically have little control over the distribution of rewards to positions, they do have a certain amount of control over their attainment of these positions. A sociological theory of the variation in the quality of work experienced by individuals should not only describe the structural factors that determine the distribution of rewards to positions; it should also explain the factors that determine the distribution of these rewards to individuals. The latter view differs from the Marxian position in that it takes the structure of job characteristics as given and is concerned with how individuals are distributed within that structure. While a full development of this theory is clearly beyond the scope of this paper, an attempt will be made to suggest the types of factors that are operative.

At least two main sets of factors may be hypothesized to produce variation in the degree of control workers have over their attainment of job rewards in an industrial society. The first is the existing demand for the worker’s services in the labor market. Workers with a relatively wide range of opportunities should be able to find jobs that provide greater rewards than workers whose range of choice is relatively restricted. In the present paper, this factor is measured by the unemployment rate for a worker’s occupation at the time these data were collected (i.e., the first quarter of 1973).20

A second factor affecting degree of control is the amount of resources available to the worker. Workers with more resources should have greater power with respect to obtaining job rewards than workers with fewer resources. Resources will be operationalized by four indicators: (1) the length of time the worker has been in the labor force, a proxy for the age of the worker as well as the general skills the worker has accumulated through work experience; (2) the educational attainment

20 The rates for the first quarter of 1973 for the various occupational groups were: professional and technical, 2.2; managers and administrators, excluding farm, 1.5; sales workers, 3.6; clerical workers, 4.3; craftsmen and kindred workers, 3.8; operatives, 6.1; nonfarm laborers, 8.5; service workers, 5.9; farm workers, 2.4. (Source: Employment and Earnings, Vol. 20, January, 1974, Table A-45.) These rates are intended to measure a particular aspect of the occupational structure, namely, the structure of opportunities for employment in the various occupations. The unemployment rate is only a rough measure of this, since it includes such things as stability of employment and both voluntary and involuntary unemployment; ideally, one would want purer measures of involuntary unemployment.
of the worker, a measure of the credentials possessed by the worker and such cognitive and noncognitive characteristics related to job performance that are associated with education; (3) the worker’s race, a proxy for the likelihood that the worker experienced discrimination in the labor market; (4) whether or not the worker belongs to a union or employee’s association, a measure of the organizational resources available to workers to bargain for job rewards in their behalf.

The results of regressing each job-reward measure on the five degree of control measures are presented in Table 4. With respect to demand, the results in Table 4 indicate that the unemployment rate is negatively and significantly related to the attainment of intrinsic, financial and career rewards. The suggested interpretation for these negative relationships is that workers who have greater numbers of job opportunities (i.e., low unemployment) would be more likely than workers with fewer opportunities to have left jobs in which the rewards on these dimensions were perceived to be low.\(^2\)

The relationships of the measures of resources to rewards are more complex. Workers with more experience in the labor force perceive that they have greater rewards than workers with less experience. (Years worked has no relationship to the career dimension; older workers do not perceive their chances for a career to be greater than do younger workers.) Whites perceive that they attain higher rewards on all dimensions, except the convenience dimension, than nonwhites. Educational attainment, however, is significantly related to rewards only on the financial dimension, a result which might be explained in terms of returns on investment in human capital. That education does not increase workers’ attainment of intrinsic rewards may account for why highly educated workers tend to be “over-trained,” especially in the beginnings of their careers (cf. Kalleberg and Sørensen, 1973).

Workers who possess resources in the form of membership in a union or employee’s association perceive that they have greater rewards with respect to the financial dimension and lower rewards with respect to the intrinsic and resource adequacy dimensions of work. Unions regulate the supply of individuals to jobs and give members more job security. They also bargain with employers for such “bread and butter” issues as wages and fringe benefits. In obtaining such rewards for their membership, however, union leaders traditionally have yielded to employers’ control over certain areas of work. According to Salpukas (1974), these “management prerogatives” or nonnegotiable areas historically have included the manner in which the work is structured and the way the plant is run. These considerations may account for the lower rewards union members perceive they have on the intrinsic and resource adequacy dimensions.

The preceding is suggestive of the mechanisms involved in the relationship between degree of control and the attainment of job rewards. An elaboration of this type of reasoning may prove fruitful for the development of a sociological theory of the distribution of job rewards among various groups in the society. In the interest of the development of such a theory, it is instructive to point out the limitations of the preceding analysis. First, it has been assumed that people can maximize all six types of rewards. In reality, people do not attain rewards; they obtain jobs, which represent

\(^2\) A possible explanation for the lack of significant relationships between the unemployment rate and the convenience, relations with co-workers and resource adequacy dimensions may be that little information on these characteristics is available before the worker actually enters the job. Consequently, workers may not perceive that their chances for obtaining better relations with co-workers and avoiding the costs associated with inconvenience and inadequate resources are better elsewhere and would not be likely to take advantage of their alternatives for these characteristics. However, another interpretation is possible: given the way unemployment rates were assigned to occupations, it may be that the unemployment rate as utilized here simply reflects the relative availability of these rewards within the occupational structure. (The correlation between the unemployment rate and the Duncan SEI scores for the workers’ occupations, for example, is -.709.) Thus, one could plausibly argue that the relationships observed simply reflect the fact that some rewards vary more among some occupations than among others.
Table 4. Regression Coefficients for the Effects of the Degree of Control Measures on the Six Types of Job Reward Measures: 1972–73 Quality of Employment Survey, \( N = 1496 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Reward</th>
<th>Years Worked since 16</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Race (^b)</th>
<th>Union (^c)</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>3.5694</td>
<td>.178*</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.082*</td>
<td>-.072*</td>
<td>-.331*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.094*</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.1783*</td>
<td>-.1065*</td>
<td>-.1215*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.150*</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>2.9224</td>
<td>.0065*</td>
<td>-.0049</td>
<td>-.0694</td>
<td>-.0550</td>
<td>.0051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.110*</td>
<td>.106*</td>
<td>-.115*</td>
<td>.150*</td>
<td>.072*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>2.8192</td>
<td>.0066*</td>
<td>.0566*</td>
<td>-.2848*</td>
<td>.2511*</td>
<td>-.0296*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.077*</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.070*</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>3.3901</td>
<td>.0036*</td>
<td>-.0188</td>
<td>-.1330*</td>
<td>-.0407</td>
<td>-.0137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.116*</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.102*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>2.7543</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0263</td>
<td>-.3022*</td>
<td>-.0502</td>
<td>-.0449*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.066*</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.071*</td>
<td>-.093*</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Adequacy</td>
<td>3.4040</td>
<td>.0026*</td>
<td>-.0115</td>
<td>-.1170*</td>
<td>-.1034*</td>
<td>-.0056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) These values were obtained by regressing the reward measure for each dimension of work on the degree of control variables. The first row presents the standardized coefficients, and the second row presents the unstandardized coefficients (including the intercept) obtained from these regressions.

\(^b\) Coded: 0 = white; 1 = nonwhite.

\(^c\) Coded: 0 = not a union or employee's association member; 1 = member.

\(^*\) \( p < .01 \).
“bundles” of job characteristics and one must often “trade-off” certain satisfactions (e.g., convenience) in order to obtain others. Second, the distinction between job characteristics and how they are perceived has been largely ignored in the above analysis. While this may be defensible in that it makes more sense to assume that people attempt to maximize their satisfaction on each dimension rather than particular job characteristics, it is clear that people attain the characteristics when they obtain a job.

A key question for future research concerns the kinds of job characteristics that produce variation in these six dimensions of job rewards. The direct measurement of these characteristics will permit an assessment of how much of the variation in the relationship between job rewards and various social groups (defined by education, age, sex, race, etc.) is due to differences in the attainment of particular job characteristics and how much is due to differences in how these job characteristics are evaluated. Third, the results presented in Table 4 are only suggestive of the labor market and individual characteristics involved in the attainment of jobs. For example, labor market characteristics are only partly reflected in the level of unemployment. Such factors as the mechanisms by which jobs are distributed in various labor markets, rates of growth in particular occupations and industries, economic and business cycles, etc. are also important. Moreover, resources also include such factors as specific skills, membership in professional societies, level of information regarding job opportunities, occupational inheritance and familial factors involved in the transmission of status, etc. Such factors will be incorporated in future research designed to develop a comprehensive theory of the mechanisms which govern the matching of individuals to jobs in an industrial society.

The argument in this section has implied that rewards are intervening variables between workers’ degree of control and their job satisfaction. To examine this argument empirically, job satisfaction was regressed first on the degree of control measures. The results of this regression are presented in the first column of Table 5. Next, job satisfaction was regressed on the degree of control measures and the value and reward measures. These results are presented in column 2 of Table 5.

These results suggest that the direct effects of the degree of control measures on job satisfaction are substantially mediated by the reward variables. For example, while race, the unemployment rate and years in the labor force have significant effects on job satisfaction in column 1, only the latter has a significant direct effect on job satisfaction when values and rewards are controlled. It should be noted, moreover, that the coefficient for years in the labor force is sharply reduced when values and rewards are entered into the equation. That years in the labor force has a significant direct effect on job satisfaction after controlling for values and rewards may be explained by noting that this measure is highly correlated with age ($r = .90$). Older workers tend to be more satisfied with their lives in general (cf. Sheppard and Herrick, 1972) and since satisfaction with the job may reflect satisfactions experienced in other spheres of life as well, this would account for this direct effect of age.

---

22 The causal model implied in this paper views job satisfaction as a function of values, rewards and degree of control, and rewards as functions of degree of control. While values and control may be correlated, their causal relationship is not examined here. The reduction in the effects of degree of control on job satisfaction when values and rewards are entered into the equation can best be interpreted as suggesting that rewards mediate the effects of degree of control on job satisfaction. While a portion of this reduction might also be attributed to the presence of values in the equation, the reduction due to values is minimal because: (1) values have relatively small effects on job satisfaction and (2) values and the degree of control measures are not substantially correlated (see Kalleberg, 1975).

23 It needs to be mentioned that job satisfaction also may be a function of a whole set of nonwork-related factors unique to particular individuals, e.g., family relationships, health, etc. The present model is an attempt to explain as much of the variation in job satisfaction as can be attributed to work-related factors and is based on the assumption that one can understand the true nature of this attitude most effectively by examining such characteristics (cf. Hoppock, 1935). This focus also is useful from a policy stand-
Table 5. Coefficients Obtained from Regressions of Job Satisfaction on Degree of Control Measures and on All Work Values, Job Rewards and Degree of Control Measures Simultaneously: 1972–73 Quality of Employment Survey, N = 1496

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>1 *</th>
<th>2 b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>-.244**</td>
<td>.435**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.080**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.252**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>-.077*</td>
<td>.086**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Adequacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Degree of Control Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1 *</th>
<th>2 b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years worked since 16</td>
<td>.199(.0145)**</td>
<td>.0073**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.025(.0161)</td>
<td>-.0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>-.003(-.0061)</td>
<td>.0078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.075(-.2254)**</td>
<td>-.0470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>-.146(-.0738)**</td>
<td>-.0150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Degree of control measures as independent variables. Standardized coefficients are presented with unstandardized coefficients in parentheses (intercept = 4.070).

* Degree of control measures, work values and job rewards as independent variables. Unstandardized coefficients are presented (intercept = 1.725).

* p < .05.

** p ≤ .01.

Conclusions

This paper had two major objectives. First, it examined the variation in job satisfaction in terms of both perceived job characteristics and differences in work values. It has been demonstrated that work values have independent and significant effects on job satisfaction. Second, it suggested a framework that links the variation in job satisfaction to the factors that influence workers' attainment of job rewards.

Two major lines of research are necessary to increase our understanding of the determinants of job satisfaction. First, it is important to address the question of what kinds of people have different values toward work. Variation in work values may be hypothesized to result from three major sets of social factors: (1) socialization and other types of life experiences which occur prior to the individual's entry into the labor force and which shape one's view of the importance of the various dimensions of work; (2) nonwork social roles which impose constraints and contingencies on the types of meanings that the individual can seek from the work activity; (3) work experiences which affect the mature worker's valuation of the potential rewards associ-
ated with work. For example, workers with greater numbers of dependents are more likely to value financial aspects of work, men place greater valuation on the intrinsic dimension of work than women do, etc. (see Kalleberg, 1975:ch. 3). It should be noted that an understanding of the relative effects of these determinants on the various types of work values ideally requires longitudinal panel data, since the values and their determinants may change considerably over time.

Second, it is important to understand the mechanisms by which job rewards are distributed among various social groups. This requires not only an explanation of the factors which govern the distribution of "objective" characteristics to positions, but also an understanding of the ways in which individuals attain these positions and evaluate these job characteristics. One focus of research on this issue that is needed to supplement the present analysis is a series of studies carried out within particular organizations, since the investigation of a fully elaborated theoretical model ideally should be comparative both within and between fully distinct employment situations. Data collected in this way may provide useful information on the role of individual differences in the evaluation of job characteristics, since it would be possible to compare the perceptions of workers in identical jobs. Finally, the relationship of job characteristics, job rewards and job satisfaction to occupational categories and occupational ranking systems (e.g., prestige and socioeconomic scales) needs to be examined. An understanding of why occupations are related to job satisfaction would link the study of the variation in job satisfaction to the vast literature on occupational achievement.

In conclusion, it should be noted that an understanding of the relationship of people to their work can never be accomplished using only the conceptual tools provided by sociological thought. Sociology needs to be supplemented by psychological theory in order to understand the reactions of individuals to their jobs and by economic theory to understand the structural labor market factors that govern the matching process. Disciplinary barriers historically have constituted major barriers to a comprehensive understanding of these issues; they need to be lowered before the relationship of the individual to the job can be fully understood.
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