SELF INVESTMENT IN WORK: A STUDY IN A MEXICAN INDUSTRIAL COMMUNITY

By

Carlos F. Fernandez-Collado

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to

Michigan State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology

1984

ABSTRACT

Self Investment in Work: A Study in a Mexican Industrial Community

by

Carlos Fernandez-Collado

The social fabric of Mexican culture is being altered by the increasingly rapid introduction of industry into the country. The people of Mexico traditionally have been employed in agrarian pursuits, handicrafts, and light manufacturing. These traditional roles are quickly giving way to roles characteristic of industrialized countries. Although a considerable amount of attention has been focused upon the economic and ecological impact of industrialization upon the country, very little interest in the effects of this industrial impact upon the individual Mexican worker has been demonstrated.

Research findings have suggested that an employee's self-perception may be influenced by the nature of the work he or she is required to do while in the work environment. The precise nature of the impact of work upon an individual remains somewhat clouded, however. Moreover, the degree to which an individual is willing to become involved in his or her work role and the type of factors which influence the level of involvement are still unclear. This study was designed to help explain variation in the level of "self-investment" in work in a sample of Mexican workers.

The research reported in this dissertation was conducted in Santiago Tianguistenco, Mexico. Interviews were conducted with 228 employees representing all organizational levels in twelve

manufacturing firms. A variety of manufacturing technologies and organizational forms are represented in these firms.

Data from the study suggest the following relationships:

1. Individuals who found it difficult to compare the end products of their performance with that of co-workers were more intrinsically motivated than individuals who found it easy to make this comparison.
2. Respondents who believed that a consensually validated hierarchy was used by co-workers to evaluate their performance were more job-involved than were workers who did not believe such an evaluative hierarchy existed where they worked.
3. The relationship between perceived opportunity for upward mobility and job-involvement appears to be somewhat curvilinear with those who perceived it very difficult to move up in the organization being as involved in their jobs as those who found it a little difficult to achieve upward mobility. Those respondents who perceived upward mobility to be difficult, i.e., those in the middle of the continuum, were the most job-involved individuals.
4. Individuals who worked in environments in which there was a high degree of legitimation of the occupational status hierarchy were more intrinsically motivated than individuals who worked in environments where there was a medium amount of legitimation of the status hierarchy.
5. Some of the hypothesized relationships occur only in high-status occupations and some only in low-status occupations.

Theoretical, methodological, and heuristic implications of the study are discussed.

To Iñigo

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the members of my committee, Dr. William Bridgeland, Dr. William A. Faunce, Dr. Bradley S. Greenberg, Dr. Philip M. Marcus and Dr. Frederick B. Waisanen, for their constant help and guidance.

To Dr. William Faunce, the chairman of my committee, I extend my deep appreciation and friendship for his understanding, guidance, and friendship. He has been a constant source of intellectual inspiration and emotional support.

To Dr. Bradley Greenberg I extend my friendship and thanks for his help and understanding. I feel very honored to have had the opportunity to work with him and I hope that he will never feel that the years he spent on me were wasted.

To Dr. Philip Marcus I extend my appreciation and gratitude for his support and friendship. He has taught me many invaluable lessons about theory and research in sociology.

A special thanks to Dr. Norman E. Fontes, who has greatly contributed not only to this dissertation, but also to my personal and intellectual growth.

This dissertation was funded by a grant from The Ford Foundation of Mexico and Central America.

My parents and brothers played a crucial role throughout my career. They gave me always unusual support that I will never forget.

Finally, of course, I acknowledge the help of my wife, Pilar. My indebtedness to her goes beyond what is more usually owed to a spouse since she has also made very substantial contributions to this study.

I would also like to thank her for the love and patience which made this all worthwhile.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

Statement of the Problem

The social fabric of Mexican culture is being altered by the increasingly rapid introduction of industry into the country. The people of Mexico traditionally have been employed in agrarian pursuits, handicrafts, and light manufacturing. These traditional roles are quickly giving way to roles characteristic of industrialized countries. Although a considerable amount of attention has been focused upon the economic and ecological impact of industrialization upon the country, very little interest in the effect of this industrial impact upon the individual Mexican worker has been demonstrated.

Research findings have suggested that an employee's self-perception may be influenced by the nature of the work he or she is required to do while in the work environment. The precise nature of the impact of work upon an individual remains somewhat clouded, however. Moreover, the degree to which an individual is willing to become involved in his or her work role and the type of factors which influence the level of involvement are still unclear.

The uncertainty concerning this issue may be attributable to a number of problems including the use of disparate conceptual approaches by different researchers; the use of different methods of operationalizing variables germane to the level of work involvement; and the level of abstraction at which the conceptualizations have been cast. Indeed, organizing the relevant literature into a coherent set of knowledge claims is almost an unmanageable task.

A virtual laundry list of concepts has been introduced into the literature by various researchers who have investigated the issue of work commitment. These concepts include, but are not limited to the following: performance esteem; work role motivation; intrinsic motivation; job-involvement; self-esteem; central life interest; self-image; psychological identification; identification with one's job; the Puritan Ethic; and ego need gratification. Although these concepts traverse some of the same theoretical terrain, there is a substantial amount of variability in their ultimate conceptual foci. Because of this conceptual variability, there exists a considerable amount of variability in the operationalizations constructed to measure these concepts. These conceptual and operational differences have produced a series of research findings that are sometimes conflicting. An overview of the conceptual approaches utilized by different researchers will help define the parameters of the problem.

There are many alternatives available for organizing this type of review. It could be pursued within a chronological framework by examining conceptualizations offered during earlier decades and systematically working up to the present. A somewhat different approach would entail grouping together researchers who offered similar conceptualizations. While both of these strategies would impose some degree of organization upon literature relevant to this study, there is a more useful organizational method which provides more information that will be employed here.

As mentioned earlier, different conceptual frameworks have been developed by researchers to investigate work commitment. Some researchers have focused primarly upon individual workers while others

have concentrated upon the organizational environment. A few researchers have pursued an approach that focuses upon the interaction between individual workers and the organizational environments in which they function. Consequently, the relevant literature can be partitioned on the basis of three different types of foci: (1) an individual focus; (2) an environmental focus; and (3) a focus upon the interaction between the two. Adoption of this course of action provides some insight into the type of conceptual frameworks that have been pursued during the conduct of research in this area.

Individual Focus

Allport (1947) was one of the earlier researchers who imposed an individual perspective on work commitment, or job-involvement, as this behavior has been popularly labeled. He viewed it as a form of ego-involvement in which the individual becomes involved as he or she "engages the status-seeking motive" (p. 123.). Dubin (1956) embraced a similar conceptual strategy but relied upon the work-related values acquired by individuals in the process of socialization as his explanatory mechanism. Specifically, he refers to a basic drift in our society away from a central life interest in work, which suggests that he is treating job involvement as a general cultural variable.

Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960) maintained that there was a functional relationship between job-involvement and self-esteem. To the extent that employees' work provided affirmation of self-esteem, they would be job-involved. Vroom (1962) presented a conceptual framework cast at a somewhat higher level of generalization which subsumed Allport's position as well as Dubin's, and to some extent

Gurin, Veroff, and Feld's conceptualization. Vroom believed that an individual would be ego-involved in his or her work if the performance of those tasks satisfied aptitudes and abilities central to self-concept validation. He extended this framework by concluding that an individual's level of ego-involvement in work would be a function of the worker's level of self-esteem as determined by perceived level of task performance.

French and Kahn (1962) were in substantial agreement with Vroom (1962). They reasoned that self-esteem is an important dimension of human existence and, consequently, anything that influenced an individual's level of self-esteem would be given considerable attention. If job performance influenced an individual's level of self-esteem, then it would be a central activity. The more work satisfied an individual's need for self-esteem, the more ego-involved the individual would be in his or her work performance. Lodahl and Kejner (1965) increased the level of generalization of the approach offered by Vroom. They viewed job-involvement as "the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work, or the importance of work in his total self-image" (p. 24). Obviously, the job-involvement concept has been cast at a relatively high level of generalization since "self-image" encompasses such a broad range of psychological variables.

Hulin and Blood (1968) introduced a somewhat different perspective. They suggested that the socialization process itself would significantly influence how an individual responded to work. These investigators reasoned that blue collar workers functioning in urbanized industrial environments might perceive work solely as a means

of accruing monetary resources necessary to satisfy needs outside of the work environment. If that was the case, then work itself would not be a central dimension of their self-concepts and little ego gratification would be derived from the work environment itself. Consequently, they would not be likely to be job-involved individuals. This, of course, is the opposite end of the psychological continuum initiated by Dubin (1956) who proposed that individuals subscribing to the Protestant Ethic would be job-involved.

Siegel (1969) is in agreement with both Hulin and Blood (1968) and Dubin (1956). He suggested that the level of job-involvement is a function of the value orientations learned and internalized during the socialization process.

Some researchers associated the concept "motivation" with job-involvement. For example, Maurer (1969) introduced the phrase "work role motivation" to investigate job-involvement. He defined work role motivation to be the "degree to which an individual's work role is important in itself, as well as the extent to which it forms the basis of self-definition, self-evaluation, and success-definition" (p. 26). In the same conceptual vein, Lawler (1969) used the term "intrinsic motivation" to account for the level of job-involvement exhibited by different employees. Drawing upon Expectancy Theory, he conjectured that individuals become job-involved to various degrees as a function of the different rewards or feelings they expect to obtain as a consequence of doing their job well. A "general interest" in the job construct was introduced by Patchen (1970). This construct was operationalized using a number of different motivation indices.

Wanous (1974) developed a conceptual framework that encompassed both the psychological product of an individual's socialization process

and consideration of the type of job an individual possessed. He postulated that if an individual was socialized within a rural or urban white collar environment, he or she would more likely have a set of work norms that closely approximated the Protestant Ethic. Individuals having this type of orientation toward work activity would derive more intrinsic satisfaction from work than others who did not share in this orientation. Moreover, the self-esteem of individuals having work-oriented norms would be influenced by their job performance.

There are a number of constructs that seem to be integrated into many of these conceptual approaches focusing upon job-involvement even though there is a considerable amount of lexical variance in terms of what they are called. These constructs include intrinsic motivation; self-esteem; and the socialization process. There is a very obvious lack of concern with environmental variables associated with jobs themselves. As a matter of fact, it appears as though few theoreticians interested in the area of job-involvement have adopted an environmental focus.

Environmental Focus

The participative management theorists represented by McGregor (1960) and Argyris (1964) emphasize the role of environmental variables in the level of job-involvement exhibited by working individuals. This group of theorists maintains that the level of job-involvement is functionally related to organizational conditions under which the work is performed including the degree of participation in decision-making within the organization; the type of work performed; compensation factors; and relationships with co-workers to name but a few.

Participative management theorists are, however, not the only people who do this. There is also a sociological tradition with this emphasis exemplified by the work of Blauner (1964) and Seeman (1967). Blauner's basic hypothesis was that when the worker lacks freedom and control (powerlessness), when his role is so specialized that he becomes a "cog" in the organization (meaninglessness), and when he is isolated from a community or network of personal relations at work (isolation), the result is that the worker's activity becomes only a means rather than a fulfilling end (self-estrangement) (p. 33). Obviously, Blauner perceived the first three components as independent variables, and the last component (self-estrangement) as the dependent variable. Seeman (1967) embraced a similar conceptual strategy. He argued that conditions at lower levels of the hierarchy, such as lack of ownership (in some systems), routineness of work, lack of control over pace, and absence of opportunity to use fully one's skills, are alienating. His theoretical framework for analysis of work settings is a multi-dimensional conceptualization of alienation, the principal components of which are powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement (Seeman, 1959).

The quality of working life movement generally, emphasizes the effect of the work environment upon orientations to work. Examples of this emphasis are in Davis and Cherns (1975) and Tausky and Parke (1976). Specifically, case studies of the quality of working life for the most part report that increased autonomy and responsibility not only lead to more satisfaction with the content of the work but to improvements in the quality of the work and to higher productivity (Davis and Taylor, 1972; Davis and Cherns, 1975).

Interactionist Focus

A third group of researchers have explained job-involvement within a conceptual framework that has focused upon an interaction between individual and environmental variables. Lawler and Hall (1970) suggested that the most valid approach to job-involvement would conceptually encompass the interaction between individual differences and the conditions related to jobs themselves. This framework is decidedly at a higher level of generalization than conceptualizations offered by other researchers since it subsumes both the individual focus and the environmental focus. Farris (1971) also argued that an individual's level of job-involvement is a function of an interaction between the individual and the environment in which he or she works.

An important question merits attention at this juncture: What empirical findings have surfaced as a function of these different conceptualizations? Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) completed an excellent review of literature germane to this question. They reviewed 83 studies in an attempt to identify correlates of job-involvement. Twenty-two variables were reported to be positively correlated with levels of job involvement. They divided these correlates into three categories: (1) personal characteristics of individual workers; (2) situational characteristics of the job itself; and (3) a category labeled "outcomes" (Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977, p. 284). Correlates of job-involvement in the personal characteristics category included age; education; internal locus of control; tenure; company size; the Protestant Ethic; and higher order needs. Job-involvement correlates in the situational characteristics category were participation in decision-making; specific job characteristics; and social factors. In

the outcomes category job satisfaction, performance, turnover rates, absenteeism, and work success were found to be correlated with job-involvement.

The magnitude of the correlations between these variables and job involvement are generally quite modest ranging from .20 to .50 with an average of about .30. As Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) observe, "Much of the variance in job-involvement remains unexplained" (p. 285). Based upon their analysis, they formulated the following conclusion:

> Among the personal characteristics, the strongest correlates are age and Protestant Work Ethic values. In the job environment, participatory leadership and job stimulation are the best predictors. The work outcomes most strongly associated with involvement are satisfaction (especially satisfaction with the work itself, supervision, and people) and turnover. Performance and absenteeism are less consistently related to involvement. (p. 284)

While these empirical findings may be disappointing upon initial perusal, they do provide some very useful information. First, the findings suggest that job-involvement may be a multi-dimensional construct. Second, they point to the utility of a conceptual framework which incorporates both psychological and environmental focuses. Several recent studies provide evidence that occupational experiences do influence the personality. Most notable among these is Kohn and Schooler's (1978) ten-year panel study of work experience and psychological functioning. They concluded that the features of work which promote self-directed thought have the most central psychological importance. Consistent with this position (Mortimer and Lorence, 1979a; Mortimer and Lorence, 1979b) found that work autonomy has positive effects on intrinsic and people-oriented occupational values. Finally, these findings suggest the need for a conceptual framework

cast at a higher level of generalization that can subsume the various conceptual approaches reviewed here.

Theoretical Framework

If a theoretical framework could be developed that would enhance our understanding of the factors which influence job-involvement, serious economic problems confronting developing countries could be systematically explored. Mexico, a developing country, is currently confronting a major economic problem grounded in a lack of productivity. Because of increasing domestic demands without comparable increases in production, the rate of importation of goods is steadily rising. The Mexican government has become acutely aware of this problem and is currently spending substantial sums of money to increase domestic productivity. The government's strategy is multi-faceted and includes subsidizing small businesses; providing capital investment loans at reduced interest rates; providing funding for over ninety agricultural projects; and utilizing the mass media to increase worker's pride in Mexico's productive output.

The theme of the mass media campaign is interesting although pedestrian at best. The theme, "Mexico is Working," is presented on television with documentary captions displaying Mexicans at work. The objective of this campaign is to increase Mexican pride in work and to raise the self-esteem of the worker. It is hoped that increased self-esteem and pride in work will produce greater productivity. The success of this mass media campaign is, of course, contingent upon there being a relationship between a worker's self esteem and his productivity. This investigator is not aware of any research that has

been completed in Mexico which focuses upon this relationship. One potential problem inhibiting research in this area may be the sensitive area of productivity. It is sometimes difficult to obtain accurate production data.

A more modest, though less rigorous alternative, entails an investigation among a number of correlates of the amount of energy that workers invest in their jobs. If relationships were found among these correlates among Mexican workers, factory owners might be more willing to provide accurate production data if they could be persuaded that pro uctivity could be increased by manipulating these correlates of job-involvement. At this stage in the research, the scope of this investigation will be limited to examining the relationship between investment of self in work and a number of psychological and environmental variable with the hope of examining the effects of these variables upon productivity at some future time.

A primary variable of concern in this study is <u>self-investment.</u> Self-investment as conceptualized by Faunce (1972) is as follows:

> Self investment is conceived of here as a process through which the degree of effect of social encounters upon self esteem becomes differentially distributed among social roles. It seems clear that success or failure in performance of some social roles has much greater impact upon self esteem than success or failure in others. Self investment is seen as a selective process in which the extent of investment of self in any role is dependent upon the amount of return on such investments in the past and the anticipated amount of return in the future. (p. 2)

According to Faunce, an increase or decrease in the level of self-investment in work indicates a cognitive reorganization involving a change in the perceived importance of success or failure in the occupational role. Variation in the level of self-investment in work

therefore represents variation in the extent to which success or failure in the work place influence self-esteem (Faunce and Dubin, 1975).

Prior research has assumed that there is a universal need among humans for self-esteem and that work-related values are si nificant factors which influence self-perceptions including self-esteem. The research discussed, utilizing Faunce's self-investment theory, also assumes that there is a need for self-esteem. However, the need for self-esteem experienced by individuals is influenced by two specific factors in the work environment. First, the frequency of evaluations will influence the need for self-esteem. Second, the nature of the evaluations, whether they are positive or negative, will influence the level of self-esteem (Faunce, 1982).

The theoretical perspective used to develop testable hypotheses was Faunce's self-investment theory. This conceptual framework is somewhat different than the theoretical approaches which have been used in previous research. First, it is cast at a high enough level of generalization to subsume both individual and environmental variables that may influence individuals investment in work. Second, although self-esteem is a central construct in this conceptual framework, the theoretical perspective includes other salient variables that may be germane to self-investment in work. Finally, it is conceptually rich and suggests many plausible testable hypotheses which indicates that it is not cast at too high a level of abstraction. Before discussing Faunce's theoretical perspective, it would be useful to discuss alternative conceptualizations and their assumptions in order to clearly understand how Faunce's approach differs from other approaches.

Previous Assumptions

Two assumptions have normally been made by previous researchers: (1) There is a universal and inherent need for self-esteem and (2) this need must be satisfied through the work role (Faunce, 1978). The assumption that there exists a generalized need for self-esteem is implicitly or explicitly articulated in the conceptual frameworks of a number of theorists (Adler, 1927; Allport, 1961; Becker, 1962; James, 1890; Kaplan, 1975; Mead, 1934; Rosenberg, 1979). Kaplan (1975) summarized this assumption in the following manner:

> ...the self-esteem motive is universally and characteristically (that is, under ordinary circumstances) a dominant motive in the individual's motivational system. (p. 10)

Given this assumption, it is reasonable to assume that an individual will behave in ways designed to promote positive evaluation by others and will avoid behaviors that result in negative evaluations. Positive evaluations will have the effect of increasing self-esteem while negative evaluations will decrease it. Unfortunately, there is considerable disagreement among social researchers concerning a valid explanation for this relationship. Kaplan (1975), for example maintains that the wish for positive self-attitudes is associated with a desire for certain pleasurable or satisfying experiences developed during childhood. But other scholars, such as James (1890), consider self-esteem to be a major determinant of human thought and behavior — a primary stimulus for self-actualization (for elaboration of this point, see Kaplan, 1975; Rosenberg, 1979).

Whether or not this assumption and its supporting explanation are valid, a large number of sociologists and social-psychologists assume

that work experience will exert a significant influence upon an individual's attitudes, values and perceptions of self. It logically follows from this assumption that successes and failures in the work environment will have important social and psychological consequences for the individual as well (Hughes, 1958; Moore, 1969; Mortimer and Lorence, 1979b; VanMaanen, 1976). These effects may be generalized by the individual beyond the work place. The "spillover from work" model, for example, suggests that deprivation of self-esteem in the work role will be extended by individuals into other dimensions of existence producing corresponding levels of non-work self-assessment (Kornhauser, 1965; see also the discussion in Dowell, 1978; Faunce and Dubin, 1975).

Whether or not these assumptions are valid, the idea that there is a generalized need for self-esteem and that this need must be satisfied in the work role, underlies most of the theoretical and empirical work focusing upon work-related attitudes and behaviors. Unfortunately, the widespread acceptance of these assumptions has occurred in spite of the fact that only a limited amount of research investigating the validity of these assumptions has been completed. Research in this area may have been retarded by the universal claims of the assumptions. Assumptions of this type are particularly problematic because they imply the existence of a covering law concerning the relationship between level of self-esteem and satisfaction derived through performance in the work role. Deterministic assumptions of this nature tend to ignore the effects of the socialization process and the influence it can exert upon the relationship between work activities and self-esteem. More specifically, these assumptions ignore the possibility that employees' levels of self-esteem may be differentially

influenced within different cultural contexts. For this reason, a less deterministically oriented conceptual framework was selected for this research.

Alternative Perspective

Self-investment theory, as developed by Faunce, offers a more utilitarian perspective from which the relationship between work and self-investment can be researched. First, Faunce challenges the conventional assumption that there is a generalized need for self-esteem. He argues instead that the 'need' for self-esteem exists only under conditions that focus attention upon the self in an evaluative context (Faunce, 1982). More specifically, Faunce does not assume that a universal need for self-esteem exists but that it is socially determined. Faunce suggests that individuals engage in selective self-investment and he assumes that the need for self-esteem is created in recurring social situations, depending, among other things, upon the frequency with which evaluation occurs in those situations (Faunce, 1982). Second, he admits the possibility that people may or may not be concerned with occupational achievement, challenging the conventional assumption that work experience will necessarily have broad impacts on the individual's self-esteem. Self-investment theory, then, does not make the deterministic assumption that work has a significant impact upon individual self-perception. Rather, it is assumed that the effects of work upon self-perception will be socially determined.

There is some research evidence that supports this assumption. Blauner (1964) found that even in the automobile industry some workers

find their jobs satisfying which may mean that workers accept the necessity of work but expect little fulfillment form their specific jobs. Several organizational researchers (Allport, 1962; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Tannenbaum, 1968) have joined debate on the question of how much a worker actually gives of himself or herself to the organization. While a person is admittedly hired to work a "full" day and that is the organization's expectation, there is some experimental data (Weick, 1969) and field data (Ford, 1969) to support the premise that employees have significantly reduced their commitment to the organization while maintaining employment. For example, Dubin (1956) found that for three out of every four industrial workers in his study, work and the work environment were not central life interests. Hulin and Blood's (1968) findings suggest that blue collar workers view their jobs as merely means to an end. That is, work to them is something which enables them to satisfy their primary needs off the job.

Self-investment theory then, as it applies to work, rejects the conventional assumption that there is a universal and inherent need for self-esteem and that this need must be satisfied through the work role. This theory assumes (1) that the need for self-esteem is generated, from among other things, by the frequency with which evaluation occurs in social situations, and (2) that work is not the only factor influencing self-perceptions.

The basic analytic proposition of self-investment theory that is most relevant to the research being pursued here is stated as follows:

> The level of self-investment in work will vary with the frequency of evaluation of occupational achievement by self and others (Faunce, n.d.).

According to this proposition, self-investment will be influenced by not only the performance evaluations given by others, but by

self-evaluation as well.

The validity of this assumption logically derives from the existence of dynamic social comparison processes that appear to be operative in most areas of social interaction. The validity of this proposition is therefore not unilaterally dependent upon the existence of a formal evaluation system for job performance. For the assumption to be valid, it is only necessary that social comparison processes be operative. Consequently, the scope of the generalizability of the proposition is potentially very broad.

There are other salient differences concerning job evaluation that merit attention. Some research evidence, for example, suggests that evaluations of occupational achievement occur more frequently in high than in low status jobs. Individuals in high status occupations devote more time communicating about their work while performing their jobs than persons in lower status occupations (Hinrichs, 1964; Klemmer and Snyder, 1972; Larsen, 1971; Thomason, 1966) which increases the probability of evaluative activity. Moreover, lower status individuals find it more desirable to associate with higher status persons (Garbin and Bates, 1966) which results in differential behavior.

Benoit-Smullyan (1944) considers prestige status to be one of the three hierarchies which can be used for status differentiation, and argues that differentiation can be analyzed in terms of admiration, deference, imitation, suggestion, and attraction. A number of job involvement studies (Mannheim, 1975; Orzack, 1959; Tannenbaum, 1966; Vroom, 1962) suggest that individuals in higher level occupations are generally more interested and more involved in their jobs than are persons employed in lower level occupations. In general, the higher a

person's occupational status, the greater the level of self-investment in work and the greater the amount of information received confirming status claims based on occupational achievement.

Relying on the preceding discussion, the next section presents the hypotheses that were tested during the course of the research to be reported here.

Hypotheses

In this section, a general proposition from self-investment theory will be presented. Next, specific hypotheses developed from the general proposition will be discussed. The general proposition is as follows:

> The greater the frequency of evaluation of occupational achievement, the greater will be the level of self-investment in work.

Within the framework of Faunce's theory, it is the evaluation of achievement rather than achievement itself that is essential to the self-investment process. Stated more specifically, the greater the frequency of evaluation, whether favorable or unfavorable, the greater the magnitude of self-investment in work activities. Lack of evaluation at times when it should be rendered in compliance with organizational rules will be taken as negative evaluation by workers. Consequently, lack of evaluation in these situations will be perceived as negative evaluation and will lead to greater self-investment. There are, however, jobs and life styles in which evaluation of occupational status or of work performance are not expected by workers and seldom occur.

Many studies have investigated the importance of social interaction on the job (e.g., Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; Korman, 1970)

and others (e.g., Wickesberg, 1968) have focused on the number of links that organization members must form to meet the demands of everyday situations. The assumption, however, that frequency of evaluation may increase the level of involvement in work, is unique to self-investment theory.

Faunce (n.d., p. 135) presents a set of job characteristics that are positively related to the evaluation of occupational achievement by self and others. These are:

(1) Interaction among persons of unequal status
(2) Competition
(3) Comparability of end products
(4) Consensual validation of status assignment system
(5) Opportunity for upward mobility
(6) Organizational legitimation of status differences.

Assuming that these variables positively influence the likelihood of self-evaluation, and that self-evaluation will make the occupational self-identity increasingly important for self-esteem maintenance, one would expect these job characteristics to positively influence the level of self-investment in work. Based upon this reasoning in conjunction with the general proposition, a number of hypotheses were developed. Each of these will be discussed in turn including the conceptual reasoning associated with each hypothesis.

Self-investment theory posits that interaction with persons of higher or lower occupational status will stimulate an evaluation of one's occupational self-identity. Faunce (n.d., p. 58) describes this behavioral phenomenon in the following manner:

> This (phenomenon) is especially likely to happen if the other person's status is higher than our own. In the former case, an evaluation by the other person has special significance because of his special competence as a status judge. In the latter case, the deference likely to be shown will produce self evaluation in a context which affirms or enhances self esteem.

Thus, interaction with individuals possessing different occupational statuses than our own will induce self-awareness and stimulate self-evaluations which in turn will increase the level of self-investment in work.

There is some limited research evidence which supports this reasoning. Lodahl and Kejner (1965) found that "the number of people contacted per day on the job (.30) and the interdependence of the job (necessity of working closely with others) (.34) are both associated with high involvement, at the .01 level" (p. 31). Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) also found a significant relationship between job-involvement and individuals' interpersonal contacts with their supervisors. Pelz and Andrews (1966) identified a similar relationship in their study. They concluded that there "seems to be a consistent trend for those who exchange information with many people to perform at high levels" (p.41). These findings combined with Faunce's reasoning suggest the following hypothesis:

H_1: The greater the frequency of interaction with persons of unequal occupational status, the greater will be the self-investment in work.

It is not uncommon for competition to develop among employees in a work environment especially if evaluations are used in the decision-making process for the dispensation of extrinsic rewards including wage increases and promotions. Self-investment theory maintains that a competitive work environment increases the frequency of self-evaluation. This is attributable to the increased frequency of evaluations by others. Consequently, the participation in a competitive occupational activity will make the occupational self-identity increasingly important for self-esteem maintenance, which

means greater self-investment in that activity. This relationship was tested with the following hypothesis:

H_2: The greater the amount of competition in an occupational activity, the greater will be the amount of self-investment in work.

One variable closely related to competition is "comparability of end products." Faunce (n.d., p. 61) maintains that when the comparability of products produced can be readily assessed either or both in terms of quantity and quality, self-evaluation of occupational performance will be stimulated. Given the relationship already discussed between self-evaluation and self-investment in work, it logically follows that comparability of end products and self-investment should be related in the following manner:

H_3: The greater the comparability of end products, the greater will be the self-investment in work.

Self-investment in work will also be influenced by the presence of a consensually validated occupational status hierarchy according to Faunce's theory. When Faunce (n.d.) uses this construct he means "that there is a clear definition of achievement in situations to which the values producing the status hierarchy are relevant" (p. 53). Where there is a clear and consistent status hierarchy in the work en ironment, the act of evaluation of subordinates by superiors is legitimized. Moreover, the opportunity, whether implicit or explicit, for status attainment manifests itself. Attainment of additional status should, of course, produce positive evaluations and a corresponding increase in self-esteem. Also, there is likely to be more frequent evaluation of lower status individuals by higher status employees under conditions in which the criteria to be used in such

evaluations are clearly identified and widely accepted as legitimate. In order to secure a promotion, an employee would have to demonstrate superior performance and the more clearly this is defined, the greater is the likelihood of performance evaluation and, therefore, of self-investment in work. The following hypothesis was derived given this conceptual framework:

H_4: Where there is a consensually validated hierarchy, there will be high self-investment in work.

An additional hypothesis is also suggested by this line of reasoning. There are numerous types of promotional procedures that may be utilized by an organization. One type of promotional procedure that is not uncommon in many different cultures is based on patronage either through political affiliation or familial connections. That is, some people are promoted because a political figure who they supported rises to power and secures a promotion for them. In the same vein, promotions are sometimes granted because a relative is employed by the same company and is able to promote a lower ranking relative.

A third type of promotional procedure is based primarily on merit. Upward mobility for an employee in a system of this nature is primarily determined by the performance evaluations rendered by the employee's supervisors. For an employee to achieve promotions in this type of system, he or she must have a desire to be promoted and be given positive performance evaluations. Equally important, the employee must accept the legitimacy of the status hierarchy. Since the opportunity to improve one's rank in the organization's hierarchy is contingent upon the approval of occupational superiors, active involvement with superiors is necessary. Increased visibility within the organizational

framework will stimulate more frequent evaluation by others, both formal and informal, simply because superiors will become more aware of an employee's desire to move up in the hierarchy (Caplow, 1954; Faunce, n.d.,; Tannenbaum, 1974). If the employee perceives the organization as structured in a manner that allows for promotion and is aware that superiors' decisions concerning promotions are based upon merit criteria, the employee will be motivated to self-invest in work.

Research evidence exists which supports this line of reasoning. Success has been treated as an important variable in a number of studies focusing upon job-involvement (French and Kahn, 1962; Gurin, Veroff, and Feld, 1960; Lawler, 1969; Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; Vroom, 1962). Results of these studies have generally supported the conclusion that a high level of job performance is associated with a high level of job-involvement. If recognition for achievement is an antecedent of job performance, then recognition for achievement is also an antecedent for self-investment in work. Mannheim's (1975) research suggests that an individual's self-investment in work "is strongly affected by the rewards that worker perceives on his job, i.e., the more reward he feels in all aspects of his job, the more will he think about it, prefer it above other roles, devote time and concern to it" (p. 101). Assuming that a promotion is both recognition for achievement and rewarding, it logically follows that an individual desiring the reward and recognition will self-invest in work if he or she perceives the existence of an opportunity for upward mobility. Also, in a setting in which there is little or no chance for promotion, a failure to advance is less likely to produce negative evaluation by self and others. This relationship was tested with the following hypothesis:

H_5: The greater the perceived opportunity for upward mobility, the greater the amount of self-investment in work.

This last hypothesis suggests an important contingency. If an employee perceives that the organizational structure is little more than a formality and does not govern the actual operation of the organization especially in the area of personnel promotions, the degree of self-investment made by the employee is likely to be adversely affected. To the extent that the organizational structure governs promotional decisions, the amount of self-investment in work made by an employee will be positively influenced. The extent to which an organization adheres to or legitimizes its own status hierarchy then will influence the amount of self-investment made by its employees in the work environment.

At this juncture, it might be useful to clarify to some degree the difference between status generally and organizationally legitimized status. Essentially, the primary distinction arises from the existence of different social and organizational systems. Recognition of status differences may vary from one social context to another. For example, doctors have higher status than farmers and also higher status than nurses in most social contexts. However, since doctors and nurses pursue their professions in the same work environments and farmers in another, only the status relationship between doctor and nurse can be organizationally legitimized. Specifically, organizational legitimation of status differences only transpires in environments where individuals are employed together. Obviously, status differences can exist in other contexts such as society as a whole and not be subject to organizational legitimation. Clearly doctors have more

status than farmers in most cultures and it is improbable that these types of individuals would be employed within the same organizational setting. Consequently, organizational legitimation of their status difference is an unlikely event.

One final point merits attention before proceeding to the presentation of the hypothesis concerning this relationship. It is possible to have an organization that does not recognize differences in status among its employees and hence, there would be no organizational legitimation of these differences which might exist in other societal contexts. This would most likely be the case in very small organizations or in organizations located in countries governed by political systems that discourage the development of social class and status differences. In summary, organizational legitimation of hierarchical ordering can range from no legitimation to a very high degree of legitimation. The hypothesis tested concerning the relationship between organizational legitimation of an occupational status hierarchy and self-investment in work is as follows:

H_6: The greater the organizational legitimation of the occupational status hierarchy, the greater the level of employee self-investment in work.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Definitions

In this section, conceptual and operational definitions will be presented for the following variables: (1) comparability of end products; (2) competition; (3) consensually validated hierarchy; (4) frequency of interaction with persons of unequal occupational status; (5) organizational legitimation of the occupational status hierarchy; (6) perceived opportunity of upward mobility; and (7) self-investment in work.

(1) Comparability of end products was conceptualized to be the ease with which a co-worker could evaluate his/her occupational output in terms of quality and quantity with the occupational output of other co-workers. Evaluations of this nature allow a worker to assess his/her organizational performance by utilizing the output of co-workers as an evaluative baseline.

This variable was operationalized using an item that directed research participants to rate how "easy" it is to assess whether or not they are doing a better or worse job than their fellow workers. Subjects provided their responses by checking one of the following response options: easy or difficult.

(2) Although there has been considerable research focusing upon the interrelationship between competition and a multitude of other variables, it is surprising that relatively speaking, there have been few explicity articulated conceptual explications of this variable. Stated simply, it comes very close to being treated as a primitive

variable in the literature. However, a few definitions have been developed including those offered by Newcomb (1950) and Church (1961).

Newcomb defines competitive situations as "those in which two or more individuals are motivated toward the same limited goal. 'Limited' means simply that the more one of them achieves the goal the less of it there is for others" (p. 425). Church defines a competitive situation to be one in which "reinforcement is prescribed to S, not on the basis of its behavior alone, but on the basis of its behavior relative to that of other Ss" (p. 126).

Both of these definitions at least implicitly suggest that individuals compete, when pursuing attainment of a portion or all of a finite reward, with others in the system in which they are functioning. Moreover, the probability of one individual securing a given reward is increased when the probability of another individual securing the same reward is decreased. Consequently, conceptually it appears that competition between individuals is a stochastically interdependent phenomenon characterized by behaviors designed to increase the probability of securing a reward for a given actor while decreasing the probability that others in pursuit of the same reward will secure it.

Competition was operationalized using an item which required research participants to rate how competitive they perceived their jobs to be by responding to one of the following response alternatives: very competitive, somewhat competitive, not very competitive, and not competitive.

(3) consensually validated hierarchy is the collective agreement regarding the criteria to be used in assessing occupational status and regarding the placement of individuals or positions in the status

hierarchy. Where there is a clear and consistent status hierarchy in the work environment, the act of evaluation of subordinates by superiors is legitimized. Therefore, consensual validation is an organizational variable - an attribute of a collectivity.

This construct was operationalized using an item that measured the percent of people who agreed with the criteria and the percent of people who disagreed with the criteria. This information was solicited from both workers and supervisors to facilitate separate analyses of these two groups. Breaking the sample into these component parts allowed for independent assessments of the effect of agreement, or lack of agreement, with the criteria used in assessing occupational status, and placement of individuals or positions in the status hierarchy upon self-investment in work for both supervisors and workers.

(4) Frequency of interaction of persons of unequal occupational status was defined in the following manner. McKee (1969) defined interaction to be "action among several persons, namely, the situation in which two or more persons are acting toward, and responding to one another at the same time" (p. 59). Lundberg, et al. (1968) conceptualized interaction to be "the mutual and reciprocal influence exerted by two or more persons or groups, upon each other's expectations and behavior" (p. 8). Occupational status can be conceptually defined as the relative ranking of individuals in an organizational hierarchy based upon prestige.

Utilizing elements of these conceptual explications, frequency of interaction of persons of unequal status was considered to be the number of times within a specified time parameter reciprocal communicative exchanges between two or more individuals transpire who

possess differential levels of prestige. These interactions include communication designed to influence expectations and behavior; non-manipulative information exchanges; and social exchanges.

The operational definition encompassed the following procedures. Respondents were asked (1) to list the occupations of the five people with whom they talk most often while at work; (2) to list the occupations of the five people with whom they interact most often outside of the work environment; and (3) to complete two items that measured how often they generally talk (a) to people whom they regard as having high status jobs and (b) to people of different occupational status from their own, either higher or lower. These last two items employed the following response options: 5 or 6 times a month or more; around 3 or 4 times a month or more; once or twice a month; and less than once a month.

(5) Organizational legitimation of the occupational status hierarchy was defined to be the degree to which organizations have formally developed rules, standards, policy, job descriptions, and symbols to structure and control the functioning of organizational members. This imposition of structure produces levels of professional and occupational roles with differerntial amounts of prestige associated with them.

This construct was operationalized using each participating organization's chart, job descriptions, and general status symbols to assess the degree of departmentalization, hierarchy, specialization, and organizational control. Given this information, organizations were divided into three groups: high legitimation, moderate legitimation, and low legitimation. Those organizations having organizational

charts, well-developed job descriptions, and highly visible status symbols were assigned to the high legitimation category. Those with loosely defined job descriptions, organizational charts for administrators but not workers, and no visible status symbols below the upper management level were assigned to the moderate legitimation category. Those organizations lacking organizational charts, job descriptions, and status symbols were assigned to the low legitimation category.

(6) The conceptual definition for perceived opportunity for upward mobility was developed through the following reasoning. Being mobile generally means that a person or object has the ability to move or be moved. There are obviously different types of mobility that can be analyzed including physical and social mobility. McKee (1969) defined social mobility to be the "process of individuals either moving up or down the class hierarchy..." (p. 277).

A primary concern in this study was the perceptions of individual workers of the opportunities to achieve upward social mobility within the hierarchy of their respective organizations. The conceptualization developed for this study was the employees' assessments of the difficulty associated with the attainment of organized promotions with concomitant increases in status.

The variable was operationalized using three items in which subjects were asked to rate how difficult it was to obtain promotions: very difficult, difficult, and a little difficult.

(7) the last variable included in this study was self-investment in work. Faunce (1982) defined this construct to be "a commitment to an activity or attribute based upon the relevance of that activity or attribute for self-esteem" (p. 174).

The self-investment construct was operationalized using an "intrinsic motivation" scale developed by Lawler and Hall (1970). A measure of a closely related construct, job-involvement (Lodahl and Kejner, 1965), was also included so that results could be compared to those of other researchers using this scale. The instrument (see Appendix 1) contained twenty statements germane to self-investment in the work environment, including some additional items developed by Faunce. Respondents expressed their degree of agreement or disagreement with those statements by completing five-point Likert scales. When subjected to orthogonal factor analysis, the items would theoretically cluster into two known factors: (1) job-involvement; and (2) self-investment in work (including the intrinsic motivation items). Responses to items within these factors would be summed to obtain composite scores for each of the workers.

Selection of the Research Site

A number of potential sites were evaluated to assess both their suitability and accessibility for the execution of this research. The selection of the data collection site was guided by a number of practical and theoretical considerations:

1. The research had to be executed in a community setting. There are many advantages a community environment offers to a researcher. It has a set of established structural characteristics—clearly bounded status hierarchies, interactional status systems, geographically circumscribed networks—that are especially appropriate for studies such as the one we were conducting. In addition, the access to small communities is easier, since consent from the requisite authorities to conduct research is not linked to an inflexible bureaucracy.

2. Since we were interested in how occupationally differentiated relationships may influence class imagery; how self-investment in work varies across different occupational

groups; and how self-investment is related to jobs that demand different skills and offer different bases for evaluation, we needed to select a social context highly diverse in terms of occupations.

3. We also needed a community with different kinds of industries since the study required variability in the conditions and nature of the work place. for this reason, non-industrial and single industry communities were excluded from consideration.

4. The research site also had to be accessible to the research team.

After investigating numerous potential sites, Santiago Tianguistenco was selected because it satisfied the aforementioned criteria.

The city has a population of approximately 6,000 people of which 2,000 are employed by the 27 different industries located in the city. These factories range in size from very small to moderately large by Mexican industrial standards. The smallest operation employed 10 individuals and the largest 500 workers. A number of different production activities were represented in this sample including chemicals, plastic-related products, truck assembly, clothing manufacturing, mushroom production, metal products production, and magnetic tape production.

The community itself is located approximately 50 miles from Mexico City, and although it is very near a major urban area, it is not a hi hly urbanized city. Santiago Tianguistenco is an old town in the state of Mexico having been founded over 400 years ago as a trading center. As a matter of fact, in the Nahuatl language, "tianguis-ten-co" translates in English to mean "place at the edge of the market." The town still maintains its commercial heritage and every Tuesday people from surrounding towns journey to the city to

trade goods and interact with one another. The introduction of modern industry into the co -unity was a relatively recent phoneomenon. The Mexican government has adopted a policy of industrial decentralization intended to move industry out of Mexico City. As a part of this program, an industrial park was built in Santiago Tianguistenco which was eventually occupied by 27 different industries who found a stable labor force available for employment.

Design and Data Collection

The type of design selected to test the hypotheses central to this research was a survey design which relied upon face-to-face interviews with the participants included in the sample. This type of design was adopted for a number of reasons. One of the most salient problems confronting this research effort was the literacy level of the participants. It was quite probable that many of them could not read or write well. Consequently, a major threat to the validity of the data existed that would be circumvented by using an interview technique. Face-to-face interviews were used because telephone service in Mexico is quite expensive and it was quite probable that a substantial number of the research participants would not have telephones in their homes.

The problem remained concerning where the employees would be interviewed. Two locations were considered: (1) the employees' homes and (2) their respective places of employment. Home interviews were considered because they have the potential of reducing the likelihood of bias resulting from employee concern that their employers may find out how they responded during the interview. Unfortunately, this

procedure could not be utilized for practical reasons. Mexican employees generally work until at least 8:ØØ P.M. For security reasons, it wasn't advisable to have the interviewing team visiting the homes of workers during the evening hours.

The only other reasonable alternative was to conduct the interviews at the factories. Adoption of this course of action had the potential of introducing bias into the data. The possibility existed that respondents would not provide truthful responses because of fear their employers would have access to their responses. The workers might be concerned that truthful responses would jeopardize their jobs if the employers found the information provided objectionable. For this reason, a number of procedures intended to reduce the potential bias were instituted. First, employers instructed employees to answer truthfully. Second, the interviews were conducted in private rooms with only the respondent and an interviewer present. Third, respondents were told before the interview started that their answers to the interview protocol would be kept in the strictest of confidence and would be combined with other individuals' responses so that no one individual's responses could be distinguished from the information provided by other workers. Finally, no information was solicited from the respondents which could have been used to positively identify any individual respondent.

To ensure comparability of data from different participants, an interview protocol was developed utilizing a two-stage pilot study procedure. A sample of 9Ø students at Michigan State University was selected and subjected to in-depth interviews concerning the constructs contained in the hypotheses. These individuals were interviewed in a

conversational manner in a very relaxed environment in an attempt to maximize the veracity of their comments. Areas of theoretical interest pursued included issues germane to work, self-esteem, class structure, subordinate-superior communication, and status. These pilot interviews were then content-analyzed and commonalities in responses were isolated. This information was then utilized as an aid in the selection of appropriate conceptual and operational definitions already discussed. These results were also used to develop the interview protocol itself that was used in the actual data collection.

Once the interview protocol had been finalized, the English version was translated into Spanish. It should be noted that there are many different dialects of Spanish spoken in Mexico so it was important to ensure that the Spanish version of the interview protocol was linguistically appropriate for the sample that would participate in the study. Consequently, a linguistic pre-test was executed in Mexico utilizing 20 respondents representative of the sample that would actually participate in the study. During the pre-test, linguistic problems were noted and necessary modifications were made subsequently.

To further ensure that the semantic content of the Spanish version was very close to the semantic content of the English version, the Spanish version was translated back into English by a bilingual individual who had not been exposed to the English version. The back translation was then compared to the original English version and no significant semantic inconsistencies were noted. The Spanish version of the interview protocol, the English version, and the back translation are presented in Appendices A, B, and C respectively.

An interviewing team was then selected which consisted of five females and one male. Four members of this team had limited research

experience and consequently were given 12 hours of intensive interviewer training. Additionally, these individuals received 28 hours of instruction in survey research methods prior to data collection.

The data collection itself was completed over a period of thirty days. Arrangements were made with each participating industry in the study to provide a room removed from production activities in which to interview study participants. Each interviewer was limited to conducting not more than five interviews per day to reduce the probability that systematic bias would be introduced into the data as a function of interviewer fatigue. The interviewing team was also very cautious to avoid scheduling interviews that would disrupt the production schedules of the participating industries especially those employing chain-production techniques.

Each interview lasted approximately 45 minutes with a range of 30 to 60 minutes. This variance was a result of the respective educational levels of the interviewees themselves. The completed interviews were carefully scrutinized each day to ensure no systematic interviewer bias was being introduced into the data. No problems of this nature were encountered and consequently none of the interviews had to be replaced nor additional interviews, other than that number initially scheduled, conducted.

Sample

As mentioned earlier, the sample was drawn from industrial workers employed by industries in Santiago Tianguistenco. The primary basic unit of analysis in this study was the individual worker.

Unfortunately, at the time the data were collective, the municipal government did not have a list of names of the factory employees. The only information available was a list of factories in the area. Consideration was given to surveying the individual factories and obtaining the names of the workers to form a pool of subjects from which a sample could be drawn. Limited resources precluded adoption of this course of action. Consequently, an alternative strategy was developed and used.

A sub-sample of one-third of the industries was randomly selected. Only those industries with more than 100 employees were selected for this study. This criterion was imposed because the larger the industry, the greater the sub-occupational variation within each industry and the more representative the sample would be of industry in Mexico. The ten factories selected provided an excellent cross-section of the technologies utilized by the industries located in this town.

In each factory selected, a list of employees was obtained and partitioned into four occupational strata: managers and professionals; clerical personnel, skilled workers; and unskilled workers. This resulted in a potential sample of 300 individuals, 30 subjects in each factory, which included 10 skilled, 10 unskilled, 6 clerical, and 4 professional/managerial types. Unfortunately, not all of the industries initially selected would provide reasonable access to all of their employees which posed a threat to our projected sample size. In an effort to circumvent this problem, two more factories were included in this study. Although the first ten factories were selected randomly, these two additional factories were selected on the basis of whether of not they would cooperate. Pursuance of this course of

action did not entirely alleviate the problem of sample size. Even though it was desirable to have 300 subjects in the sample because of the power that it would add to our statistical tests, the final sample size was 228 which satisfies the assumptions of the statistical tests employed to analyze the data. All persons selected in the sample were eventually interviewed.

A number of demographic measures of the subjects were taken including age, sex, and education. These measures are particularly important since Saal (1978) found that job-involvement is correlated with these variables. These findings are reasonably consistent with the findings of previous research on job-involvement summarized by Rabinowitz and Hall (1977). The mean age of the participants was 26.50 years (N = 228; s.d. = 7.65). The sex breakdown (N = 226) of participants revealed that 68.58% (N = 155) of the participants were males and 31.42% (N = 71) were females. The average number of years of education was 9.10 years (N = 228; s.d. = 3.77). Within this sample (N = 228), 15.35% (N = 35) were professional/managerial types; 17.98% (N = 41) were clerical workers; 33.77% (N = 77) were skilled workers; and 32.89% (N = 75) were unskilled workers.

As mentioned earlier, the sample was drawn from 12 different industries. The number of subjects from each participating industry is presented in Table 1. An overview of the type of industry members of the sample were associated with is presented in Table 2. Information concerning the monthly income of interviewees is arrayed in Table 3. It should be noted, however, that these figures are based upon the value of the Mexican peso at the time the data were collected. The Mexican economy is currently confronting some rather trying uncertainty

and the peso has been allowed to "float" for some time on the International Monetary Market. It is inevitable that it will face a rather substantial devaluation within the near future.

TABLE 1

BREAKDOWN OF PARTICIPANTS BY INDUSTRY
(N = 228)

Industry	Number of Participants	Percentage of Total Sample
Famsa	87	38.16
Bayem	37	16.23
Fonsa	31	13.60
Mayware	13	5.70
Tekkomex	12	5.26
Sonox	12	5.26
Electrofondicion	9	3.95
Proplas	8	3.51
Tenidos y Acabados	7	3.07
Productora de Modas	6	2.63
Serva	6	2.63

TABLE 2

INDUSTRIAL AFFILIATION OF SAMPLE MEMBERS
(N = 228)

Type of Industry	Number of Participants	Percentage of Total Sample
Truck Assembly	86	37.72
Magnetic Tape Production	43	18.86
Chemicals	43	18.86
Textiles	16	7.02
Assembly Plant	13	5.70
Paper Products	12	5.26
Metal By-Products and Solder	9	3.95
Plastics and By-Products	6	2.63

TABLE 3

MONTHLY INCOME OF PARTICIPANTS
(N = 226)

Pesos	Dollars	Number of Participants	Percentage of Total Sample
51,000 or more	2,318 or more	2	.88
30,001 - 50,999	1,364 - 2,317	7	3.10
20,001 - 30,000	909 - 1,363	12	5.31
15,001 - 20,000	682 - 908	11	4.87
10,001 - 15,000	455 - 681	19	8.41
5,001 - 10,000	227 - 454	59	26.11
5,000 or less	226 or less	116	51.33

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Analyses of two types are reported in this section. First, factor analyses conducted on the dependent measure are presented in detail. Second, the individual tests for the hypotheses are systematically reviewed. Finally, additional analyses are reported.

Factor Analyses on the Dependent Measure

The self-investment measure employed in this study contained 20 items taken from a number of different sources. Six job-involvement items and four intrinsic motivation items were taken from research executed by Lawler and Hall (1970). It should be noted, however, that the job-involvement items used by Lawler and Hall were those developed by Lodahl and Kejner (1965) and the intrinsic motivation items were developed by Lawler (1969). Ten items were developed by Faunce.

Lawler and Hall's (1970) research was designed in part to determine if job-satisfaction, job-involvement, and intrinsic motivation were measures focusing upon the same conceptual domain or if they focused upon conceptually distinct psychological domains. Their study focused upon the potential interrelationships among these three variables as well as the relationship of these variables to other job characteristics in the work environment. Lawler and Hall concluded from their study that job-satisfaction, job-involvement, and intrinsic motivation were factorially independent and related differently to other job characteristics. Their results support this conclusion to a large degree although there are some specific problems in their results

that merit careful consideration. Their measurement instrument included sixteen items, six intended to measure job-satisfaction; six designed to tap job-involvement; and four items for measurement of intrinsic motivation. This instrument was completed by 291 subjects and then subjected to a Principal Components Factor Analysis with Varimax rotation. The results of the Lawler and Hall (1970, p. 309) factor analysis are presented in Table 4.

Items one through six measure job-satisfaction and load together quite clearly on Factor 1. Items 13 through 16 designed to measure intrinsic motivation load together on Factor 3 without problematic crossloadings on either Factors 1 or 2. The loadings for the job-involvement items are somewhat problematic, however. While items 7, 8, 9, and 10 load on Factor 2 without substantial cross-loadings on either Factors 1 and 3, items 11 and 12 do not. Not only are they only marginally correlated with the job-involvement factor, they are cross-loaded in the intrinsic motivation factor. A decision was made to use all of the job-involvement items in this research but to be alert to the possibility that these two items might create problems during the data analysis.

The self-investment scale used in this study consisted of twenty items. The items were randomly ordered in the measurement instrument to minimize potential threats to validity. The items and their respective item numbers as they appeared in the questionnaire and subsequent data analysis are presented in Table 5. Respondents in this study expressed their degree of agreement of disagreement with these items by responding to five-point, Likert-type scales ranging from 1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = neutral; 4 = disagree; to 5 = strongly

TABLE 4

RESULTS OF LAWLER AND HALL'S FACTOR ANALYSIS
OF THE SIXTEEN ATTITUDE ITEMS

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
1. The feeling of self-fulfillment a person gets from being in my position.	.81	.02	-.14
2. The opportunity, in my job, for participation in the setting of goals.	.77	.11	.11
3. The opportunity, in my job, for participation in the determination of methods and procedures.	.70	.10	.03
4. The opportunity for independent thought and action in my position.	.70	.03	.07
5. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment in my position.	.68	.02	-.11
6. The opportunities for personal growth and development in my position.	.64	.10	-.19
7. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.	.07	.84	-.06
8. The most important things that happen to me involve my job.	.10	.82	-.05
9. I live, eat, and breathe my job.	.07	.73	.03
10. I am not very much involved personally in my work.	.08	.55	-.31
11. I'm really a perfectionist about my work.	-.16	.28	-.30
12. Most things in life are more important than work.	-.05	-.30	.24
13. When I do my work well, it gives me a feeling of accomplishment.	.07	.03	-.75
14. When I perform my job well, it contributes to my personal growth and development.	.05	.13	-.70
15. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.	.40	.20	-.63
16. Doing my job well increases my feeling of self-esteem	-.01	-.02	-.63

Source: Lawler and Hall, 1970:309.

disagree. The information provided by the 228 respondents was then subjected to Principal Components Factor Analyses (unities in the diagonals and eigenvalue default of 1.0) with rotation to a varimax

TABLE 5

ITEMS COMPRISING THE SELF-INVESTMENT SCALE

Job-Involvement Items:

44. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.
48. I am very much involved personally in my work.
50. The most important things that happen to me involve my job.
52. I live, eat and breathe my job.
54. Most things in life are more important than work.
58. I'm really a perfectionist about my work.

Intrinsic-Motivation Items:

46. Doing my job well increases my feeling of self-esteem.
53. When I do my work well, it gives me a feeling of accomplishment.
56. I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.
62. When I perform my job well, it contributes to my personal growth and development.

Items Developed by Faunce:

45. When I am through work at the end of the day, I hardly ever think about whether I did a good or bad job.
47. I sometimes feel uncomfortable when talking to people whose jobs carry more prestige than mine.
49. The type of work I do is important to me when I think about how successful I am in life.
51. I think members of my family feel proud when they tell people what I do for a living.
55. I sometimes feel ashamed to tell people what kind of work I do.
57. I would be happy to have my children do the kind of work I do.
59. When I make a mistake or do something badly at work, it sometimes bothers me for days.
60. To me, my work in only a small part of what I do.
61. If I could not do my job well, I would feel that I was a failure as a person.
63. I feel depressed when I fail at something connected with my job.

criterion (Kaiser, 1958). Multi-factor solutions were then forced as necessary to discern appropriate factor structures. Three criteria were established a priori to determine optimal solutions; (1) items

must load at a minimum of .60 and crossload at a maximum of .40 to be retained on a given factor; (2) items associated with each factor must clearly exhibit common meaning; and (3) a maximum number of items meeting the prior criteria should be retained to minimize loss of information.

A three-factor solution was attempted first, since the self-investment measure employed in this study contained items taken from three different sources. The results of this analysis presented in Table 6 were not interpretable. There were extensive cross-loadings

TABLE 6

THREE-FACTOR SOLUTION FOR SELF-INVESTMENT

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
44	.35154	.00965	.56704
45	-.08385	-.07119	.49826
46	.38081	.02701	.00120
47	-.19848	.40354	.24631
48	.48875	.29208	.17159
49	.53442	-.30837	.01750
50	.41643	-.06358	.25701
51	.59215	-.20228	.12286
52	.34990	.03694	.63946*
53	.66835*	.18636	.00147
54	-.05481	-.24828	.51524
55	-.21447	.31727	.56856
56	.53716	.10514	-.08082
57	.16421	-.24699	.24810
58	.09611	.15248	.28827
59	-.04588	.67412*	-.00619
60	-.07427	-.11340	.43274
61	.61774*	-.00769	-.14009
62	.19224	.73045*	-.19854
63	.17000	.73562*	-.08406

*Indicates acceptable loadings.

across factors for many of the items. A two-factor and a four-factor

solution were attempted next. The results are presented in Tables 7 and 8. Once again, the results were not interpretable because of

TABLE 7

TWO-FACTOR SOLUTION FOR SELF-INVESTMENT

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2
44	.51426	-.27123
45	.07330	-.31899
46	.35936	.03447
47	-.03927	.21394
48	.55831	.17804
49	.45368	-.25691
50	.46155	-.17322
51	.55898	-.21803
52	.54047	-.28445
53	.65290*	.18008
54	.07734	-.47876
55	.03725	-.02569
56	.49076	.14843
57	.19420	-.33395
58	.20830	-.01382
59	.06392	.48029
60	.05400	-.32134
61	.52822	.08449
62	.23187	.73462*
63	.24941	.67971*

*Indicates acceptable loadings.

substantial cross-loadings of many of the items. Examination of the results suggested that the 10 items developed by Faunce were heavily cross-loading across all factors in the solutions attempted. This suggested that the items were intercorrelated with the job-involvement and intrinsic motivation items. This is not surprising. In fact, it was Faunce's intent to add some of them to the intrinsic motivation scale, tapping some other possible dimensions. However, this precluded identifying an acceptable factor solution and, for this reason, it was decided to drop the items from the analysis.

TABLE 8

FOUR-FACTOR SOLUTION FOR SELF-INVESTMENT

Items	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
44	.02938	.02884	.75006*	.15383
45	-.02490	-.03569	.08780	.56760
46	.52220	.03702	-.08062	.16951
47	-.12710	.41206	.16353	.09875
48	.46149	.30314	.23811	.11141
49	.53086	-.30458	.16948	.02422
50	.10722	-.06328	.63412*	-.13121
51	.40553	-.20242	.47071	-.10553
52	.06012	.06261	.73291*	.26242
53	.61124*	.18561	.26647	-.08861
54	.08734	-.20631	-.00658	.69720*
55	-.22828	.35175	.16915	.52543
56	.65098*	.10874	-.03110	.04826
57	.09922	-.23360	.23328	.17590
58	.04749	.16840	.20064	.21287
59	.06283	.67869*	-.17161	.08903
60	.03370	-.07912	.00029	.56619
61	.59361	-.01551	.15648	-.17481
62	.19095	.71700*	-.02959	-.24223
63	.13597	.72754*	.05161	-.17026

*Indicates acceptable loadings.

The remaining 10 items, four measuring intrinsic motivation and six measuring job-involvement, theoretically should have grouped together in a two-factor solution. A two-factor solution was imposed on the data and the results are presented in Table 9. This solution appeared to be quite interpretable save for the problems associated with items 46, 54 and 58. Items 46 and 58 did not load at the .6 level on either factor. Item 54 was equally cross-loaded on both factors. The first factor was a job-involvement dimension and the second factor was the intrinsic motivation dimension. A decision was made to delete the three problematic items. Recall that items 56 and 58 are the two

TABLE 9

TWO-FACTOR SOLUTION FOR SELF-INVESTMENT

Items	Factor 1	Factor 2
44	.75363*	.09604
46	.03139	.44111
48	.21967	.61158*
50	.57040	.12093
52	.80236*	.04936
53	.26966	.62052*
54	.38095	-.31044
56	.13907	.60580*
58	.22731	.14961
62	-.23051	.60457*

*Indicates Acceptable loadings.

items that were problematic in the Lawler and Hall (1970) analysis. Before deleting these items, a three factor and a four factor solution were attempted. The results of these two analyses, presented in Tables

TABLE 10

THREE-FACTOR SOLUTION FOR SELF-INVESTMENT

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
44	.77267*	.05081	-.08649
46	-.10606	.70769*	-.13739
48	.32402	.43485	.37004
50	.61060*	.04074	.00290
52	.79915*	.04278	-.15733
53	.32526	.53300	.26388
54	.10943	.17320	-.73314*
56	.06751	.75432*	.02869
58	.28462	.04433	.11855
62	.00813	.18815	.73355*

*Indicates acceptable loadings.

10 and 11, were not interpretable. It was quite clear from these

TABLE 11

FOUR-FACTOR SOLUTION FOR SELF-INVESTMENT

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
44	.77190*	.06021	-.04526	.11207
46	-.07736	.71512*	-.12676	-.11409
48	.27938	.43303	.37737	.15543
50	.69606*	.07393	.08265	-.25279
52	.77464*	.04465	-.12908	.21753
53	.26437	.52590	.26161	.22499
54	.06809	.15269	-.76763*	.28229
56	.06565	.75798*	.03803	-.00137
58	.06118	-.01405	.02091	.87440*
62	-.08796	.17216	.70526*	.25393

*Indicates acceptable loadings.

resuls that the most interpretable solution would be a two-factor solution with items 46, 54 and 58 deleted. Consequently, a two-factor solution excluding these three items was executed and is both interpretable and satisfies the criteria to determine optimal solutions. The results from this analysis are presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12

TWO-FACTOR SOLUTION FOR SELF-INVESTMENT

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2
44	.79088*	.06929
48	.21029	.64090*
50	.64052*	.09869
52	.80159*	.06916
53	.22566	.67489*
56	.08323	.63920*
62	-.22447	.62205*

*Indicates acceptable loadings.

Item 48 presented another minor problem because it loaded on

Factor 2 which is the intrinsic motivation dimension. It should be noted that this was also the case for the two-factor solution which included the three items which were deleted in this analysis. Given these results, it seems reasonable to conclude that this item, at least for this sample, is a more valid measure of intrinsic motivation than job-involvement. Consequently, the item was included in this measure of self-investment. The items that comprised the two dimensions of

TABLE 13

ITEMS COMPRISING THE SELF-INVESTMENT MEASURE FOR THIS STUDY

Factor 1: Job-Involvement Items

Item	
44	The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.
50	The most important things that happen to me involve my job.
52	I live, eat and breathe my job.*

Factor 2: Intrinsic-Motivation Items

Item	
48	I am very much involved personally in my work.
53	When I do my work well, it gives me a feeling of accomplishment.
56	I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.
62	When I perform my job well, it contributes to my personal growth and development.

*In the Spanish version of the interview schedule this item was "Yo vivo para mi trabajo," which translates as "I live for my job." The original Lodahl and Kejner item made no sense in Spanish but the substitute is conceptually equivalent.

self-investment for this study are presented in Table 13. Since these are orthogonal dimensions, they were treated independently in all subsequent analyses. Each respondent's score on each factor was

calculated by summing across the three items in the first factor and then summing across the four items in the second factor. The theoretic range on the first factor was 3 to 15 with lower scores representing higher levels of job involvement. The theoretic range of intrinsic motivation was 4 to 20 with lower scores representing high levels of intrinsic motivation.

A Cronback's Alpha was computed for each factor to assess the internal consistency of the items. The internal consistency coefficient for the job-involvement items was .63 and the coefficient for the intrinsic motivation items was .48. Neither of these coefficients is particularly high indicating some degree of heterogeneity among the items that increased the error variance associated with the measures. This obviously increases the difficulty of identifying relationships that may exist among the variables contained in the hypotheses.

TEST OF THE HYPOTHESES

The results of the analyses of the hypotheses tested in this study can now be presented. At the risk of being redundant, each hypothesis will be presented again in an effort to make it easier to digest the results of these analyses. The first hypothesis tested was:

> H_1: The greater the frequency of interaction with persons of unequal occupational status, the greater will be the self-investment in work.

Respondents were asked to indicate how often they interacted with individuals of higher or lower occupational status than themselves. This independent variable was coded in the following manner: 1= 5 or 6 times per month; 2= 3 or 4 times per month; 3= 1 or 2 times per month;

and 4 - less than one time per month. This hypothesis was treated using two bivariate regression tests, one for the job-involvement factor and one for the intrinsic motivation dimension of self-investment. The .05 level of significance was used for these tests as well as the tests for the other five hypothesis. The results presented in Tables 14 and 15 were not statistically significant.

TABLE 14

BIVARIATE REGRESSION FOR JOB-INVOLVEMENT AND FREQUENCY OF INTERACTION WITH INDIVIDUALS OF UNEQUAL OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

		Analysis of Variance				
Multiple R = .067		DF	SS	MS	F	P
R^2 = .004	Regression	1	5.854	5.854		
B = -.169	Residual	224	1305.283	5.827	1.005	.317

TABLE 15

BIVARIATE REGRESSION FOR INTRINSIC-MOTIVATION AND FREQUENCY OF INTERACTION WITH INDIVIDUALS OF UNEQUAL OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

		Analysis of Variance				
Multiple R = .002		DF	SS	MS	F	P
R^2 = .000	Regression	1	.003	.003		
B = -.004	Residual	224	1170.727	5.226	.001	.980

The second hypothesis posited the following relationship:

H_2: The greater the amount of competition in an occupational activity, the greater will be the amount of self-investment in work.

Participants in the study were asked to assess how competitive their respective work environments were by checking one of the following

response options: very competitive, competitive, and not competitive. This facilitated breaking the sample into three groups and executing a One-way ANOVA on each dimension of the dependent variable. Prior to executing the ANOVAs, Bartlett-Box F tests for homogeneity were computed to ensure that the F-test assumption of homogeneity of variance across treatment groups would not be violated. There were no significant differences across treatment group variances. Moreover, there were no statistically significant differences for either job-involvement or intrinsic motivation. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 16 and 17.

A relationship between comparability of end products and self-investment was proposed in the third hypothesis:

H_3: The greater the comparability of end products, the greater will be the self-investment in work.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether it was easy or difficult to compare the results of their work with the work results of other workers. Their responses were coded as follows: 1 - easy and 2 - difficult. Respondents divided themselves into two groups which facilitated execution of t-tests on both dimensions of the dependent variable. The results of the t-test for job-involvement were not statistically significant (Table 18). The t-test for intrinsic motivation, however, was significant and indicated that those respondents who found it easy to compare the end product of their work with the work results of other workers were less intrinsically motivated than those who found it difficult to make this comparison. This is the opposite of what was predicted. Consequently, Hypothesis 3 is not supported. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 19.

TABLE 16

ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR COMPETITION AND JOB-INVOLVEMENT

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Bartlett Box F Test
Very Competitive	53	6.434	2.333	F = 1.122
Competitive	68	6.779	2.198	p = .326
Not Competitive	102	6.823	2.588	

Source	df	ss	ms	F	p
Between	2	5.668	2.834	.486	.6159
Within	220	1283.533	5.834		

TABLE 17

ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR COMPETITION AND INTRINSIC-MOTIVATION

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Bartlett Box F Test
Very competitive	53	7.603	2.331	F = .030
Competitive	68	7.852	2.261	p = .970
Not Competitive	102	7.480	2.276	

TABLE 18

t-TEST FOR COMPARABILITY OF END PRODUCTS AND JOB-INVOLVEMENT

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	t	df	p
Easy to Compare	89	6.595	2.199	1.19	154	.118
Difficult to Compare	67	6.179	2.124			

TABLE 19

t-TEST FOR COMPARABILITY OF END PRODUCTS AND INTRINSIC-MOTIVATION

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	t	df	p
Easy to Compare	89	8.134	2.385	1.79	154	.Ø37
Difficult to Compare	67	7.462				

The fourth hypothesis made the following prediction:

H_4: Where there is a consensually validated hierarchy, there will be high self-investment in work.

Individuals participating in the study were asked if a consensually validated hierarchy existed in the firm which employed them. They either agreed that one existed or disagreed. By agreeing or disagreeing, the respondents divided themselves into two groups which facilitated executing t-tests on the measures of the dependent variable. The results of the t-tests for the evaluative criteria used by supervisors presented in Tables 2Ø and 21 were not statistically significant. The results of the analyses for the evaluative criteria used by co-workers identified a significant relationship between the perceived existence of a consensually validated hierarchy and job-involvement (Table 22). Specifically, those workers who agreed that such a hierarchy existed at their place of employment had more job-involvement than did those who perceived that a hierarchy of this kind didn't exist. The results of the analysis for intrinsic motivation (Table 23) were not significant. The results of these analyses provided partial support for Hypothesis 4.

The following relationship was posited in Hypothesis 5:

TABLE 20

t-TEST FOR CONSENSUALLY VALIDATED SUPERVISOR HIERARCHY AND JOB-INVOLVEMENT

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	t	df	p
Agree	194	6.608	2.299	.54	221	.293
Disagree	29	6.862	2.615			

TABLE 21

t-TEST FOR CONSENSUALLY VALIDATED SUPERVISOR HIERARCHY AND INTRINSIC-MOTIVATION

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	t	df	p
Agree	194	7.515	2.261	1.07	221	.143
Disagree	29	8.000	2.390			

H_5: The greater the perceived opportunity for upward mobility, the greater the amount of self-investment in work.

Respondents were asked to note how difficult it was to move up in the organizations that employed them by responding to one of the following response options: very difficult, difficult, and a little difficult. Through their responses, respondents grouped themselves into three categories which facilitated the execution of One-way ANOVAs. Although the results for job-involvement approached statistical significance, neither test reached significance and consequently Hypothesis 5 was not supported. A Bartlett-Box F test for homogeneity of variance was calculated for each analysis and neither indicated significant differences across treatment groups. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 24 and 25.

The final hypothesis tested was as follows:

TABLE 22

t-TEST FOR CONSENSUALLY VALIDATED CO-WORKER HIERARCHY AND JOB-INVOLVEMENT

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	t	df	p
Agree	193	6.466	2.245	2.37	213	.009
Disagree	22	7.681	2.533			

TABLE 23

t-TEST FOR CONSENSUALLY VALIDATED CO-WORKER HIERARCHY AND INTRINSIC-MOTIVATION

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	t	df	p
Agree	193	7.580	2.322	.20	213	.422
Disagree	22	7.681	2.169			

H_6: The greater the organizational legitimation of the occupational status hierarchy, the greater the level of self-investment in work.

Based upon criteria discussed in Chapter II, organizations included in this study were classified as either high, medium or low in legitimation of the organizational status hierarchy. One-way ANOVAs were then computed for job-involvement and intrinsic motivation after Bartlett-Box F tests indicated no significant differences in variances across treatment groups. The analysis for job-involvement was not statistically significant while the test for intrinsic motivation approached significance. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 26 and 27 respectively

TABLE 24

ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR UPWARD MOBILITY AND JOB-INVOLVEMENT

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Bartlett Box F Test
Very Difficult	135	6.829	2.244	F = 2.Ø58
Difficult	52	5.961	1.97Ø	p = .128
A Little Difficult	35	6.828	2.695	

Source	df	ss	ms	F	p
Between	2	29.992	14.996	2.932	.Ø55
Within	219	1119.976	5.114		

TABLE 25

ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR UPWARD MOBILITY AND INTRINSIC-MOTIVATION

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Bartlett Box F Test
Very Difficult	135	7.666	2.259	F = .458
Difficult	52	7.442	2.219	p = .633
A Little Difficult	35	7.714	2.538	

Source	df	ss	ms	F	p
Between	2	2.246	1.123	.213	.8Ø8
Within	219	1153.969	5.264		

TABLE 26

ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR LEGITIMATION OF THE OCCUPATIONAL STATUS HIERARCHY AND JOB-INVOLVEMENT

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Bartlett Box F Test
High Legitimation	128	6.742	2.482	F = 1.754
Medium Legitimation	43	6.976	2.650	p = .174
Low Legitimation	55	6.436	2.052	

Source	df	ss	ms	F	p
Between	2	7.309	3.654	.624	.536
Within	223	1304.996	5.852		

TABLE 27

ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR LEGITIMATION OF THE OCCUPATIONAL STATUS HIERARCHY AND INTRINSIC-MOTIVATION

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	Bartlett Box F Test
High Legitimation	128	7.3281	2.1848	F = .322
Medium Legitimation	43	7.7674	2.3283	p = .725
Low Legitimation	55	8.1091	2.3779	

Source	df	ss	ms	F	p
Between	2	24.9207	12.4603	2.439	.0896
Within	223	1139.2386	5.1087		

Additional Analyses

Given the findings of the present study, additional analyses related to the objectives of this dissertation can be made. First, it may be useful to retest the hypotheses with the sample divided into two occupational categories (high-status and low-status occupations) since it is possible that occupational status level may influence the hypothesized relationships if, for example, most of the variation in the independent variables is in one or the other status category. Second, it is important to see if variables associated with the dependent measures - job-involvement and intrinsic motivation - in other studies, are also associated in this one.

The results of the analyses for the hypotheses with the sample divided into two occupational categories were not statistically significant for intrinsic motivation. However, the results of the additional analyses with the sample divided supported Hypotheses 3, 4, and 6 for job-involvement. At the risk of being redundant, these hypotheses will be presented again.

H_3: The greater the comparability of end products, the greater will be the self-investment in work.

This hypothesis was treated using two bivariate regression tests, one for the high status occupations (professional and clerical) and one for the low status occupations (skilled and unskilled workers). The .Ø5 level of significance was used for these tests. The results presented in Table 28 show that the greater is the comparability of end products in high-status occupations, the greater is the job-involvement in work.

The next hypothesis made the following prediction:

H_4: Where ther is a consensually validated status hierarchy, there will be high self investment in work.

TABLE 28

BIVARIATE REGRESSION FOR JOB-INVOLVEMENT AND COMPARABILITY OF END PRODUCTS IN HIGH-STATUS OCCUPATIONS

Analysis of Variance

		DF	SS	MS	F	P
Multiple R = .351						
R^2 = .123	Regression	1	24.787	24.787		
B =-.196	Residual	25	176.621	7.Ø65	3.51	.Ø53

TABLE 29

BIVARIATE REGRESSION FOR JOB-INVOLVEMENT AND CONSENSUALLY VALIDATED HIERARCHY IN LOW-STATUS OCCUPATIONS

Analysis of Variance

		DF	SS	MS	F	P
Multiple R = .26Ø						
R^2 = .Ø68	Regression	1	31.163	31.163		
B = .Ø97	Residual	114	429.ØØ9	3.763	8.281	.ØØ5

This hypothesis was tested in the same way as the previous one, and the results for the bivariate regression tests are presented in Table 29. The bivariate regression for job-involvement was significant for the respondents in the low status occupations, indicating that, where there is a clear and consistent agreement about the status hierarchy in the work environment, there is higher job-involvement. If a consensually validated hierarchy means that the act of evaluation of subordinates by superiors is legitimized, this might explain the association between consensual validation of a status hierarchy and job-involvement for persons with low status occupations.

The final hypothesis for job-involvement that was supported by the data was as follows:

H_6: The greater the organizational legitimation of the occupational status hierarchy, the greater the level of self-invesment in work.

The results of the analysis of this hypothesis are presented in Table

TABLE 30

BIVARIATE REGRESSION FOR JOB-INVOLVEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL LEGITIMATION OF THE OCCUPATIONAL STATUS HIERARCHY IN HIGH-STATUS OCCUPATIONS

	Analysis of Variance				
Multiple R = .402		DF	SS	MS	F	P
R^2 = .162	Regression	1	32.613	32.613		
B =-.308	Residual	25	168.794	6.752	4.380	.037

30. The results of the bivariate regression test for job-involvement and organizational legitimation of the occupational status hierarchy were significant for the high status occupations. So, to the extent that an organization adheres to or legitimizes its own status hierarchy, then it influences the amount of job-involvement of its high status employees in the work environment.

Although the implications of these findings are discussed in the next chapter, some comments about the retest of the hypotheses should be spelled out here. In the theoretical framework it was considered that a set of job characteristics are positively related to self-invesment. These are:

(1) Interaction among persons of unequal status

(2) Competition

(3) Comparability of end-products

(4) Consensual validation of status assignment systems

(5) Opportunity of upward mobility

(6) Organizational legitimation of status differences.

In the retest of the hypotheses, the sample was divided into two occupational categories, because of the possibility that occupational status level might influence the hypothesized relationships.

The additional analyses, support some of the initial predictions. In Hypothesis 3, there was a statistically significant finding for job-involvement and comparability of end products in high status occupations. In occupations of this kind there is usually an easily identified end product of individual effort that can be compared with that of others as evidence of skill. In hypothesis number four, there was a statistically significant finding for job-involvement and the consensual validation of status assignment systems in lower status occupations. This finding is not really an unexpected one, since there is likely to be more frequent evaluation of lower status individuals by higher status employees to determine who deserves certain rewards. In order to secure these rewards - in work environments where a status assignment system is clear - a worker would have to demonstrate a commitment to the job. In hypothesis number six, there was a statistically significant finding for job-involvement and organizational legitimation of the occupational status hierarchy in high-status occupations. A possible explanation is that individuals in these occupations deal more frequently with charts, job descriptions and general status symbols to assess the degree of departmentalization, hierarchy, specialization and organizational control.

Even dividing the sample into two occupational categories, there are not statistically significant findings for some job-involvement relationships and none for the intrinsic motivation dimension. For

this reason, it is interesting to examine the relations between job-involvement, intrinsic motivation and some demographic variables such as occupation, education, age and gender. Table 31 contains the correlations between job-involvement, intrinsic-motivation and a set of

TABLE 31

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN JOB-INVOLVEMENT, INTRINSIC-MOTIVATION AND A SET OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

	31 A			31 B		
	JI			IM		
	r	N	p	r	N	p
Occupation	.31	228	.001	-.12	228	.04
Education	.44	228	.001	-.12	228	.03
Age	.09	228	.08	-.13	228	.03
Gender	-.01	228	ns	-.02	228	ns

demographic variables. In Table 31a one can observe that the correlation for occupation and education were found to be statistically significant and not very high but in line with the coefficients typically encountered with this type of data. The correlations with age was found to be very low. The evidence from previous research is mixed between studies showing insignificant differences among age groups and those that found increases in job-involvement as individuals get older. The correlation with sex was found not to be statistically significant.

In Table 31b the reader finds that the correlations for occupation, education and age were statistically significant and unexpectedly low. It is peculiar when comparing Tables 31a and 31b

that in these three variables the sign is different for the correlations of job-involvement and intrinsic-motivation and the intrinsic-motivation correlations are much smaller. These are findings one could have not anticipated on the basis of previous research and some sort of explanation needs to be provided here, although additional implications of these findings are considered in the concluding chapter. Job-involvement and intrinsic-motivation do not necessarily have to be associated in the same direction with the demographic variables because as Moch (1980) pointed out, job-involvement is distinct from internal motivation in that it does not have necessary implications for performance. People may take their identity from their positions or roles without having to perform well on the job. Internally motivated employees on the other hand, reward themselves for successful performance. They feel a sense of personal satisfaction or self-esteem from performing well. It is possible, therefore, that the Mexican employees in our sample who have higher occupational status, more years of education and who are older, achieve a sense of self-esteem and identity from their positions or roles in the organization rather than by performing well, whatever the job. The emphasis on roles and positions over performance can be explained in cultural terms. In Mexico high performance is seldom the basis for social recognition while high positions and important roles are always rewarded with status and esteem. The data in Table 31 suggest an actual rejection of performance evaluation as a basis for self-esteem by some persons with high status.

The correlation found in the present study between job-involvement and intrinsic-motivation (.17) provides support for the argument that involvement and intrinsic-motivation are distinctly different - in some cases perhaps alternative - responses to organizational life.

CHAPTER IV

Discussion

The results of this research should be evaluated on at least three dimensions which include the theoretical implications, the methodological implications, and the heuristic implications. In order to accomplish this objective, a brief summary of the results will be presented followed by a more detailed discussion of the test(s) for each hypothesis. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not supported by the data. Hypothesis 3 was not supported although there was a statistically significant finding for intrinsic-motivation. This finding was contrary to that predicted by Hypothesis 3. When retesting this hypothesis with the sample divided into two occupational categories (high-status and low-status occupations) the hypothesis was statistically significant in the predicted direction for job-involvement in high status occupations. Hypothesis 4 was partially supported by a significant finding for job-involvement, and when dividing the sample, the hypothesis was statistically significant for job-involvement in low status occupations. The findings for Hypothesis 5 did not reach statistical significance. Similarly, Hypothesis 6 was not supported although the finding for intrinsic-motivation approached statistical significance. However, with the sample divided into two occupational categories, the hypothesis was statistically significant for job-involvement in high-status occupations.

Theoretical Implications

The pattern of findings in this study support the conceptual position that the self-investment measure employed is multidimensional.

Moreover, the findings in this research support Faunce's basic premise that there is not a universal need for self-esteem based on work related values. Self-investment in work, a construct that could be translated into higher levels of job-involvement and intrinsic-motivation at the work place, have in the light of these findings relatively low scores. As pointed out in Chapter I, Faunce suggests that self-investment is a selective activity: Individuals who suffer a deprivation of self-esteem in the work role might, but do not necessarily invest themselves in other dimensions of existence producing corresponding levels of non-work self-investment. In this study non-work activities were not considered, although it is interesting that when respondents were asked how much they agreed with the statement "most things in life are more important than work" almost 50% of the sample disagreed with this statement. The statistical tests for Hypotheses 3, 4 and 6 provided evidence demonstrating that the intrinsic motivation items have face validity as a measure of self-investment. These findings provide a degree of support for the conceptual framework that was presented in Chapter 1 for the self-investment construct. Obviously, the magnitude and credibility of this support would have been far greater if the research hypotheses had been more decisively supported. However, in the additional analyses, when the sample was divided into two occupational categories, Hypotheses 3, 4 and 6 were supported for the job-involvement factor. This adds support to self-investment theory in the sense that it demonstrated that the hypothesized relationships obtain for at least some segment of the sample. Also, it should be borne in mind that this was the first time that this theoretical framework was used in the

conduct of research in Mexico. We will return to this issue in a later section of this chapter.

Since the job-involvement and intrinsic motivation scales have a definite social-psychological focus, it might be useful to develop independent behaviorally oriented measures to include in instruments measuring self-investment. Measurements of this nature would include items that focused upon absenteeism from work; the number of suggestions made by a worker to superiors to improve the productivity of the organization; the number of times an employee is late for work; an employee's attendance at social functions sponsored by his/her organization; the number of times an employee has been formally reprimanded by the organization for failure to comply with an organization's operating policy; and the number of promotions an employee has been awarded by the organization to name but a few items. Certainly items of this type which are more behaviorally oriented might constitute indicants of the degree to which an employee is self-invested in his or her job. However, it should be considered that there is a more complex relationship between behavior and an attitudinal measure such as self-investment. For example, a person with high self-investment might attempt to change work routines in ways that would be upsetting to him or her supervisor. That is, these behavioral measures might not always be associated with self-investment in work. As a matter of fact it is frequently noted in job attitudes literature that there is little evidence that employees' attitudes are strongly related to performance at the job. However, the behavioral measures suggested here would provide broader ways for studying attitudes, since the knowledge of attitudes will help us to understand behaviors.

Finally, the examination of the relationships between job-involvement, intrinsic-motivation and some demographic variables such as education, occupation, age and gender, provided evidence that job-involvement is distinct from intrinsic-motivation, in that intrinsic-motivation unlike job-involvement, is inextricably tied to performance; in fact, job-involvement (Lodahl and Kejner items) almost all refer to the importance of work, and self-investment in work is only one reason why work might be seen as important. In this sense, job-involvement is a more inclusive variable than self-investment. Also, the intrinsic-motivation items might be a more valid measure of self-investment. In this sense, self-invested employees might feel a sense of personal satisfaction or self-esteem for performing well.

Methodological Implications

The methodological implications of this study must be divided into measurement issues and the tests for the research hypotheses included in the study. A number of single-item measures were used in this study including frequency of interaction with individuals of unequal occupational status; prescribed amount of competition in an occupational activity; comparability of end products; existence of a consensually validated hierarchy; and perceived opportunity for upward mobility. It is a well-documented methodological fact that single item measures are generally not reliable and can militate against the rigorous test of hypotheses in which they are used. An equally well-documented fact is that if an item has face validity, it will generally be a reliable measure. Given the nature of the population and subsequent sample employed in this study, it was desirable to

employ measures that were simple because the literacy rate for a good portion of the sample was very low. Consequently, simple measures having face validity were employed whenever possible. Unfortunately, it is quite probable that these measures did not have the degree of face validity they were assumed to have and may not have been very reliable. Assessing their reliability, of course, is problematic because they are single items. If some of these items had low validity and reliability as is suspected from looking at the pattern of subjects' responses, the research hypotheses were not subjected to the most rigorous tests possible. Future research in this area should take this into account and utilize multiple item measures for these variables. This will be a recurring observation as the results of tests for each hypothesis are discussed.

The results of the analyses for Hypothesis 1 failed to support the prediction for both job-involvement and intrinsic-motivation. Two observations merit consideration. First, the frequency of interaction with individuals of unequal occupational status was measured with a single item. Operationalizations of this nature should include multiple items to facilitate assessment of the reliability of the measure. Second, measuring a variable such as this by asking respondents to recall their communication behavior over a period of a month may be problematic. Since communicative interaction is such a common form of behavior, it might be extremely difficult for an individual not only to remember accurately who s/he talked to during a 30 day period, but how often interactions took place between specific individuals as well. In retrospect, it is conceivable that this measure of the independent variable was not very valid. If this is the

case, Hypothesis 1 did not receive a very rigorous test. Even though the null hypothesis must be accepted here, it must be accepted with caution. Future research should correct the problem identified and test the relationship again.

The data failed to support Hypothesis 2 as well. Only 24.09% of the sample thought they were in very competitive job environments, 30.19% thought they were in competitive environments, while 46.36% felt that they were not in competitive environments. It is interesting to note that nearly half of the respondents did not perceive that their respective organizational environments were competitive in nature. This is not surprising when evaluated within the context of data germane to Hypothesis 5 which focused upon the relationship between perceived opportunity for upward mobility and self-investment in work. The majority of the respondents, 60.18% of the sample, found it very difficult to move up in the organization suggesting the possibility that the work environments for these respondents were indeed competitive or, alternatively, indicating that the organizations surveyed were family-type companies where positions were given by close-tied relationships, either to friends or relatives. However, almost half of the sample did not perceive that their environments were competitive. It would appear that hopes for upward mobility are not very realistic and consequently employees become resigned to the positions they hold. If this is the case, it logically follows that the work environments would not be competitive because there is nothing to compete for. If this is indeed the case, acceptance of the null hypothesis given a Mexican organizational context would be warranted, since self-investment theory states that if an individual perceives

that his/her chances for upward mobility are very low, he/she might withdraw self-investment from a competitive activity, that is, he/she will not invest themselves in work. Also, we could expect that the hypothesis - as stated here - may be valid within other oganizational contexts which are more competitive.

The operationalization of the perceived competitiveness could be improved as well. The measurement technique employed in this research asked respondents to indicate whether their respective work environments were very competitive, competitive, or not competitive. This measure may have truncated the variance in perceptions of environmental competitiveness which potentially could mask the relationship between this variable and self-investment. Future research should employ a more continuous, multi-item measure for perceived competitiveness.

Although Hypothesis 3 was not supported, there was a statistically significant finding for the intrinsic-motivation dimension of self-investment, and when dividing the sample into two occupational categories - high and low status occupations - the hypothesis was statistically significant for the first sample category. The results of the first analysis indicated that the individuals who found it difficult to compare the end products of their work with that of other workers were more intrinsically motivated than were individuals who found it easy to make this comparison. This relationship was the opposite of that predicted. However, for high status occupations the relationship was positive. Additionally, the analysis for job-involvement approached statistical significance ($p = .1185$) and the same pattern of results emerged. Those individuals who found it

difficult to compare their work with that of others were more job-involved than individuals who found it easy to make this type of comparison.

While these findings were somewhat surprising initially, there is a plausible explanation for them. Individuals who can easily assess the work of others may regulate their work performance so that it is relatively congruent with that of co-workers. Adoption of this course of behavior would provide some degree of job security since everyone would be performing at relatively the same level. Stated differently, it would be difficult to terminate any one employee for unsatisfactory performance if most of the workers were performing at the same level. If this conclusion is valid, then the individuals would exhibit relatively the same degree of intrinsic-motivation and job-involvement. For example, in one plant, an informal rule for a worker might be don't produce more than X units per day despite a piece-rate system, because workers' fear that if they produce more management would raise standards. This type of behavior is quite generalized in Mexico. It has been noted by educational psychologists that even at an elementary level of school, pupils will adapt academic performance so that it is relatively congruent with the rest of the group.

Persons in higher status jobs, who were more likely to have high self-investment, obviously could not use co-workers' performance as a benchmark to guide their own output if they found it difficult to compare their work with that of others. As a consequence, they might feel the need to self-invest in their jobs more to ensure that not only would their jobs be secure, but that they share in the extrinsic rewards offered to productive employees by the organization. In other

words, these employees must perform as well as possible in an effort not to be out-produced by competitors seeking the same extrinsic rewards within the organization (economical, better positions, management recognition, etc.).

Mexico is currently experiencing serious production problems. If easy comparability of end products does influence the degree to which workers self-invest in their jobs, one potential avenue for increasing productivity suggests itself here. Role-models could be introduced, from upper management into the production system. Specifically, middle and upper managers could periodically work on production lines (a strategy employed by Japanese managers) to encourage subordinates to invest more of themselves in their jobs. This, of course, would only be effective in those contexts in which it is easy for workers to compare output.

Once again a comment concerning operationalization is merited here. If these two variables were curvilinearly related, the dichotomous measurement technique employed for the independent variable would preclude identifying it. Further, the variance associated with this variable may have been truncated as well. Studies executed in the future should employ a more continuous measure for this variable.

The findings for Hypothesis 4 partially supported it. This partial support emanates from the statistically significant finding for the relationship between job-involvement and the perceived agreement of a consensually validated hierarchy used by co-workers to evaluate one another. Respondents who believed that a consensually validated hierarchy was used by co-workers to evaluate their performance were more job-involved than were workers who did not agree that there was

such an evaluative hierarchy. This finding - when dividing the sample into two occupational categories - was significant for the low status occupations, indicating that where there is a clear and consistent agreement about the status hierarchy in the work environment, the act of evaluation of subordinates by superiors is legitimized and job-involvement is increased.

The intrinsic-motivation analysis for evaluative criteria employed by superiors approached statistical significance ($p = .143$). Those individuals who agreed that a consensually validated hierarchy existed where they worked were more intrinsically motivated than those individuals who did not agree on a hierarchy.

These two findings taken together suggest the importance of clearly articulated, consensually validated levels of an organization. It is quite conceivable that employee self-investment can be increased by making employees aware through training sessions of what types of criteria will be used during evaluation proceedings. Poorly articulated criteria might give employees the impression that management is not very concerned about employee productivity.

Without dwelling on the issue, the dichotomous measurement procedure used for the independent variable could be improved. It prohibits identification of a curvilinear relationship should one exist between the independent and dependent variable. Moreover, a continuous measure that assessed the degree of existence of a consensually validated hierarchy would facilitate a more precise test of this relationship.

Even though Hypothesis 5 was not supported, the One-way ANOVA for job-involvement approached statistical significance ($p > .05, < .06$).

The relationship between perceived opportunity for upward mobility and job-involvement appears to be somewhat curvilinear with those who perceived it very difficult to move up in the organization being as involved in their jobs as those who found it a lttle difficult to achieve upward mobility. Those respondents who perceived upward mobility to be difficult, i.e., those individuals in the middle category of the independent variable, were the most job-involved individuals. It is worth noting that 60.81% of the sample perceived it very difficult to move upward in their organizations while 23.42% found it to be difficult. Only 15.77% found it a little difficult to achieve upward mobility.

It may be the case that respondents who did not perceive upward mobility difficult to achieve felt that they "had it made" and consequently were not very self-invested in their jobs. Individuals who perceived it very difficult to achieve upward mobility may not be very self-invested because they don't think there are any realistic opportunities for promotion. Those respondents who found it difficult to move upward may perceive realistic opportunities for promotion which are contingent upon above average occupational performance. If this is indeed the case, these respondents would self-invest more in their respective jobs.

The apparent relationship between perceived opportunity for upward mobility and job-involvement suggests a rather obvious strategy for increasing employee self-investment in work. A hierarchy could be established that would facilitate the promotion of employees. This hierarchy could contain a considerable number of steps similar to those employed by military organizations. Employees could then be made aware

of the performance level required to obtain a promotion for each respective level in the hierarchy. The criteria for promotion would, of course, have to be realistic. Moreover, individuals would have to be promoted so other co-workers would perceive that promotions were indeed obtainable goals.

At the risk of being needlessly redundant, the operationalization for the independent variable merits a brief comment. While it was continuous enough to facilitate identification of what appears to be a curvilinear relationship, if it were more continuous and multi-item it would constitute a stronger measure of the independent variable for reasons already discussed.

The last hypothesis, Hypothesis 6, was not supported by the data. However, the analysis for intrinsic-motivation approached statistical significance ($p > .05, < .10$). Individuals who worked in environments in which there was a high degree of legitimation of the occupational status hierarchy were more intrinsically motivated than individuals who worked in environments where there was a medium amount of legitimation of the status hierarchy. Those individuals having the least intrinsic motivation worked in organizations in which there was a low degree of legitimation of the occupational status hierarchy. The results for job-involvement were signficant for the high status occupations. So to the extent to which an organization adheres to its own status hierarchy, then it influences the amount of job-involvement among its high status employees.

It is quite plausible that orgaznizations which legitmize their status hierarchy attract individuals who are intrinsically motivated and self-invested in work and therefore have a desire to increase their

own status. This could only be achieved in an organization having defined status hierarchies. It is equally likely that organizations not having well-defined status hierarchies would attract individuals who are not concerned about status and/or do not have the requisite skills that would enable them to secure high status positions within an organization. These types of individuals would be less intrinsically motivated than those concerned with status. A probable explanation for the fact that Hypothesis 6 was only partially supported by the data is that there was not a sufficient number of cases representing each organizational category (high, medium and low legitimation of the organizational status hierarchy). For comparison purposes it is worth noting that only 19% of the sample are in organizations with medium status hierarchies.

If this is a valid interpretation of these data, a strategy for influencing intrinsic-motivation and hence, self-investment in work, is obvious. Organizations should establish, at least in Mexico, a well-defined status hierarchy which employees and potential employees are made aware of. This strategy will attract employees who are intrinsically motivated and perhaps enhance the degree of intrinsic motivation possessed by employees who already work for the organization.

To summarize, although none of the hypotheses were clearly supported by the data, the findings did at least suggest the potential validity of the following relationships:

1. Individuals who found it difficult to compare the end products of their performance with that of co-workers were more intrinsically motivated than individuals who found it

easy to make this comparison. This appeared to be the case for job-involvement as well but only for persons with high status occupations.

2. Respondents who believed that a consensually validated hierarchy was used by co-workers to evaluate their performance were more job-involved than were workers who did not agree that such an evaluative hierarchy existed where they worked. Individuals in low status occupations in a consensually validated hierarchy were more job-involved than respondents who did not agree that such a hierarchy existed.

3. The relationship between perceived opportunity for upward mobility and job-involvement appears to be somewhat curvilinear with those who perceived it very difficult to move up in the organization being as involved in their job as those who found it a little difficult to achieve upward mobility. Those respondents who perceived upward mobility to be difficult, i.e., those in the middle of the continuum, were the most job-involved individuals.

4. Individuals who worked in environments in which there was a high degree of legitimation of the occupational status hierarchy were more intrinsically motivated than individuals who worked in environments where there was a medium amount of legitimation of the status hierarchy. This was especially the case for individuals working in high status occupations. Those respondents having the lowest intrinsic motivation worked in organizations in which there was a low degree of legitimation of the occupational status hierarchy.

This set of admittedly tentative findings warrant the following suggestions to organizations desiring to increase the self-investment of employees in their jobs:

1. Where comparability of end products can easily be made by workers, have middle and upper managers function as role models on production lines as a means of increasing self-investment.
2. Organizations should have clearly articulated performance criteria for evaluation of employee performance. Employees should be made thoroughly aware of these criteria.
3. Organizations should have a clearly defined hierarchy for promotions. The promotional hierarchy should encompass unskilled, skilled, and management employees. The criteria that govern promotional decisions should be clearly stated and the employees must be made aware of them. Most importantly, the possibility for promotion must be realistic and plausible.
4. Organizations should have well-legitimized status hierarchies that employees and potential employees are made aware of.

Heuristic Implications

These findings have to be discussed in more detail in this section. They clearly suggest the need for additional research in this area. One area of research that merits substantial attention is that of the measurement of the variables germane to this theory. The reliability coefficients for both job-involvement and intrinsic-motivation were somewhat low. It may be the case that the

items contained in these measures might have limited cross-cultural validity. Additionally, items that focus upon behavioral indicants of self-investment should be developed and included in the measure. In short, while it appears that self-investment is a very complex construct, the items used to measure it in the Mexican culture may need to be modified to increase their validity and reliability. Discussing cultural variables, it is clear that in the community under study, industrialization has had an impact on the occupational structure. Santiago Tianguistenco, now an industrial town, had been in the past a small city where the main occupations were related to agricultural activities and the commerce of handcrafted products (sweaters, baskets, blankets). However, in the last ten years the authorities of the State of Mexico decided it was an ideal place for an industrial development, since the town is between two major industrial cities: Mexico City and Toluca, the capital of the State of Mexico. In the community under study the development of an industrial work force has been slow, and, although the industrialization of this town has attracted past artisans and peasants to the factory, many continue to do some agricultural work. For instance, when the subjects under study were asked "Do you actually do agricultural work?" 33% of the sample answered "yes". This finding tells us that for many workers, their work in the factory is only one of their jobs, perhaps one that is perceived as less important than the other. Inkeles (1960) showed that industrial work, independent of cultural and national differences tends to produce similarities in experience, and values among those sharing a factory work experience, so he suggested that work values are determined by the industrial work situation. The dissertation presented here could be

seen as an attempt to explain the impact of industrialization on the individual worker. More specifically, it is an attempt to explain the frequently noted relationship between occupational status and job-involvement, intrinsic-motivation and self-investment measures. Having examined these relationships guided by the testing of several hypotheses, it seems that the degree to which an individual is willing to become invested in his job is unclear. Perhaps Inkeles (1960) underestimated the influence of some cultural and environmental variables upon the work values of the worker. Authors reviewed in the theoretical frame of this dissertation (Dubin, 1956; Hulin and Blood, 1968; Siegel, 1969) state that the level of job-involvement is a function of the value orientations learned and internalized during a socialization process that leads to a set of values similar to the "protestant ethic". These individuals, they argue, will be ego-involved in their work.

Another area that requires work is the operationalization of the independent variables. The effort made in this study to accomodate the restricted literacy level of many of the respondents by employing simple items that possessed face validity was not completely successful. It is painfully obvious that multi-item continuous measures would be more valid and reliable in this type of research and would do a more adequate job of capturing the behavioral variance being studied. The operationalizations employed for the independent variables in this study quite possibly militate against rigorous tests of the research hypotheses. Another problem could be related to the sample. The sample in this study consisted mostly of industrial workers and maybe a broader range of occupations is required for testing the theory.

The findings also suggest some alternative research designs for testing self-investment theory. For example, self-investment theory could be tested using different occupations as has been done in other studies analyzing job-involvement. It could be very useful to apply self-investment measures to scientists, engineers, nurses, physicians, middle managers, military employees, musicians, etc. This strategy would provide us with very interesting information about self-investment in work in this broader range of occupations, work environments, and job cultures. Another research strategy could consist of measuring self-investment in both work and non-work environments. Too many studies have been centered in the work setting, ignoring the fact that a greater part of an individuals' life is outside the work organization. In this study, some consideration was given to this non-work aspect of life (e.g., interaction with people outside work hours). However, future research might include variables related to leisure, family activities, and interactions with significant others. As Faunce's self-investment theory states, individuals who suffer a deprivation of self-esteem in these various roles, might invest themselves in other dimensions of existence, e.g., the work itself, the family, football, etc.

An additional strategy is the following: An organization could be selected that had the following characteristics:

1. Co-workers in the organization can easily compare the end products of their performance with one another.
2. No consensually validated hierarchy exists or at least it is poorly defined.
3. The perception of the opportunity for upward mobility among workers within the organization is that promotions are very

difficult to secure.

4. The organization has a status hierarchy which has not been highly legitimized.

Such organizations do exist in Mexico and could be accessed. A pretested measure of self-investment could be taken prior to implementing the four intervention strategies suggested earlier. After the strategies had been effectively implemented, a post-test measure of self-investment could be taken to ascertain if the degree of self-investment exhibited by employees had increased.

Other, perhaps less ambitious, research strategies are suggested as well. The strategies could be tested independently in different organizations using the same pre-test/post-test approach. The alternative research strategies available are only limited by the creativity of the researchers who pursue this area of human behavior. It can only be hoped that this study has made some small contribution to the continuing development of self-investment theory and will prove useful to the development and execution of future research in this area.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (SPANISH)

ENCUESTA SOBRE EL TRABAJO Y LA COMUNIDAD

Buenos días. Mi nombre es _____. Soy estudiante y estoy trabajando en un estudio que servirá para elaborar una tesis profesional. Estamos interesados en lo que los empleados de la industria piensan de su trabajo, su comunidad y la sociedad en general. Estudios como éste se han realizado en las industrias de otros países y de otras ciudades, y nosotros como estudiantes mexicanos estamos interesados en las opiniones de los empleados industriales en este país. Quisiéramos pedirle que nos ayude, contestando a unas preguntas. No llevarán mucho tiempo, y permítame decirle que sus respuestas serán confidenciales y anónimas, es decir, el cuestionario no llevará su nombre.

Las personas que serán entrevistadas, no fueron seleccionadas por su nombre sino por número. Mire usted, como no podemos entrevistar a todo aquél que trabaja en la industria, seleccionamos al azar a 30 empleados de esta fábrica que también previamente escogimos al azar. De esta manera obtendremos personas de todo tipo y clase de ocupaciones. Las opiniones de estas personas serán sumarizadas y reportadas en la tesis profesional. Nunca se reportarán ni industrias, ni personas particulares.

No hay respuestas correctas, ni incorrectas, simplemente estamos interesados en saber cómo la gente que trabaja en industria opina sobre ciertas cosas como lo son el trabajo, la comunidad y la sociedad, le rogamos pues su cooperación.

Primero quisiera hacerle algunas preguntas sobre su ocupación y experiencia de trabajo.

1.(1.)* ¿Cual es actualmente su ocupación?

[ ] Título del Trabajo

2.(1.b) ¿Qué es lo que hace en este trabajo? Es decir, ¿Cuáles son algunas de las labores que desempeña en este trabajo?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.(1.d) ¿Cuánto tiempo lleva en este puesto o trabajo?

[ ] Escribir numero de meses o años.

4.(2.) ¿En qué trabajaba antes de este empleo?

[ ] Título del Trabajo [1 / 2 / 3]

5. ¿En dónde tenía ese trabajo?

[ ]

1 Campo-Industria
2 Autoempleo-Ind.
3 Comercio-Ind.
4 Industria-Ind.
5 Servicios-Ind.

6.(2.d) ¿Cuanto tiempo estuvo en ese puesto o trabajo?

[ ] Escribir número de Meses o años

---

* Numbers in parentheses are the question numbers in the English interview schedule from which the question was translated. See Appendix B.

7. ¿Aparte de su trabajo actual en esta industria, hace usted labores agropecuarias en el campo?

1	5	9
☐	☐	☐

Quisiera ahora hacerle unas preguntas sobre su situación de trabajo.

8.(23.) En esta industria, ¿Hay otras personas haciendo exactamente la misma labor o actividad que usted hace?

SI	(ir a prehunta 9)	NO	(ir a pregunta 11)
1		5	

9.(23.b) En la clase de trabajo que usted y otros hacen, ¿Hay diferencias en el desempeño de ese trabajo, o todos le hacen igual?

1	Hay diferencias, unos hacen el trabajo mejor que otros	5	No hay diferencia, todos hacen el trabajo igual

10.(23.a) ¿Qué tan fácil es comparar el trabajo que ud. hace, con el que otros en su misma posición están haciendo en el lugar de trabajo?

1	Es fácil hacer comparaciones	5	Es difícil hacer comparaciones

11.(24.) ¿Qué tan a menudo le checa su trabajo la persona que supervisa su trabajo?

1 Muy a menudo

2 A menudo

3 A veces

4 Rara Vez

5 Muy rara vez

12.(25.) Y entre compañeros de trabajo, ¿qué tan a menudo se evalúan y comparan su trabajo entre ustedes mismos?

__1__ Muy a menudo

__2__ A menudo

__3__ A veces

__4__ Rara vez

__5__ Muy rara vez

13.(26.) Cuando el supervisor o jefe inmediato checa su trabajo, ¿cree usted que lo evalúa justamente?

1 [SI] ir a pregunta 15

5 [NO] ir a pregunta 14

9 [NA] ir a pregunta 15

14.

a.(26.b) ¿Qué es lo que toma en cuenta el supervisor o jefe inmediato para evaluar su trabajo?

_____

_____

_____

b.(26.a) ¿Qué cree usted que debería de tomar en cuenta su supervisor o jefe inmediato para evaluar su trabajo justamente?

_____

_____

_____

c.(26.c) ¿Qué tan difícil sería lograr que el supervisor o jefe inmediato cambiara de criterio para evaluar su trabajo justamente?

__1__ Sería muy difícil lograrlo

__2__ Sería difícil lograrlo

__3__ Sería algo difícil de lograr

15.(27.) Y las personas con las que usted trabaja, ¿cree usted que evalúan justamente su trabajo?

1 [SI] ir a pregunta 17

5 [NO] ir a pregunta 16

9 [NA] ir a pregunta 17

16.

a.(27.a) ¿Qué es lo que toman en cuenta sus compañeros de trabajo para evaluar su trabajo?

_____

_____

_____

b.(27.a) ¿Qué cree usted que ellos deberían de tomar en cuenta para evaluar justamente su trabajo?

_____

_____

_____

c.(27.b) ¿Qué tan difícil sería lograr que sus compañeros de trabajo se guiaran de un justo criterio para evaluar su trabajo?

__1__ Sería muy difícil lograrlo

__2__ Sería difícil lograrlo

__3__ Sería algo difícil de lograr

17. ¿Qué tan satisfecho está usted con su trabajo? Por ejemplo, diría usted que en su presente empleo está:

__1__ Muy satisfecho

__2__ Satisfecho

__3__ No está satisfecho

18.(28.) ¿Qué tan competitivo considera usted su actual trabajo? (Lo describiría usted como "a ver quien gana y lo hace mejor")

__1__ Muy competitivo

__2__ Competitivo

_____ No competitivo

19.(29.) ¿Piensa usted quedarse en su actual puesto o trabajo hasta que se retire?

SI	(ir a la pregunta 22)	NO	(ir a la pregunta 20)
1		5	

20.(29.a) ¿A qué puesto o trabajo piensa cambiarse?

	Título del trabajo

21.(29.b) ¿Por qué piensa usted hacer este cambio?

_____

_____

_____

22.(30.) ¿Diría usted que el trabajo que <u>actualmente</u> tiene es el mejor que ha tenido en su vida?

SI	(ir a pregunta 25)	NO	(ir a la pregunta 23)	NA
1		5		9

23.(30.) ¿Qué puesto o trabajo fue mejor?

	Título del trabajo

24.(30.) ¿Qué era lo que hacía que ese trabajo fuera mejor?

_____

_____

_____

25.(31.) ¿Qué tendría que pasarle, para que usted se sintiera más exitoso (o para que triunfara) en su trabajo?

_____

_____

_____

26.(32.a) ¿Qué tan difícil es que usted sea promovido (escendido) en esta organización donde trabaja?

__3__ Muy difícil

__2__ Difícil

__1__ Algo difícil

27.(32.b) Si fuese promovido a un puesto o trabajo más arriba del que ahora tiene, ¿que trabajo sería este?

	Título del trabajo

28.(32.c) ¿Qué tan seguro está usted de las oportunidades que tiene de ser promovido o de subir en su trabajo?

__1__ Muy seguro

__2__ Seguro

__3__ Algo seguro

__4__ Inseguro

__5__ Muy inseguro

29.(32.d) ¿Qué tan importante es para usted subir de posición en el trabajo?

__1__ Muy importante

__2__ Es importante

__3__ Es medianamente importante

__4__ No es importante

30.(38.) ¿Qué tan satisfecho se encuentra usted con la experiencia de trabajo que durante su vida ha tenido? ¿Ha realizado lo que se proponía? ¿Hay cosas que aun le gustarían hacer? ¿En fin, qué tan satisfecho se siente?

__1__ Me siento muy satisfecho

__2__ Me siento satisfecho

__3__ Me siento disatisfecho

__4__ Me siento muy disatisfecho

31.(34.) Ahora voy a leerle unas opiniones acerca de lo que algunas personas sienten por el trabajo. Trate por favor de pensar como si usted estuviera dando estas opiniones y dígame que tan de acuerdo o que tan en desacuerdo está con ellas. Yo leere las opiniones y usted me dice el numero que su opinión representa. Para el número básese en esta tarjeta que le voy a dar la tarjeta dice: el uno quiere decir "estoy muy de acuerdo con esta opinión", el dos significa "estoy de acuerdo", el tres es "ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo" y el cuatro significa "estoy en desacuerdo" y, por último, el cinco significa "estoy muy en desacuerdo." Ahora le leere cada una de estas opiniones. Por favor piense cuidadosamente en ellas antes de responder.

		1	2	3	4	5
		Muy de acuerdo	De acuerdo	Ni acuerdo ni desacuerdo	Desacuerdo	Muy en desacuerdo
a.(34.a)	La mayor satisfacción en mi vida proviene de mi trabajo	____	____	____	____	____
b.(34.b)	Al final de un día, yo nunca me pongo a pensar si hice bien o mal mi trabajo	____	____	____	____	____
c.(34.c)	Cuando yo hago mi trabajo bien mi autoestima (lo que pienso de mí mismo) aumenta	____	____	____	____	____
d.(34.d)	Algunas veces cuando hablo con gentes que tienen trabajos de mayor prestigio que el mío, me siento muy incomodo	____	____	____	____	____
e.(34.e)	Yo personalmente estoy muy involucrado (metido) in mi trabajo	____	____	____	____	____
f.(34.f)	Cuando me pongo a pensar en el éxito que tengo, el tipo de trabajo que yo hago es muy importante para mí	____	____	____	____	____
g.(34.g)	Las cosas más importantes que me suceden a mí, están relacionadas con mi trabajo	____	____	____	____	____
h.(34.h)	Creo que muchos miembros de mi familia se sienten orgullosos cuando le dicen a le gente lo que yo hago para ganarme la vida	____	____	____	____	____
i.(34.i)	Yo vivo para mi trabajo	____	____	____	____	____
j.(34.j)	Cuando hago bien mi trabajo siento que he cumplido con algo importante	____	____	____	____	____

	1 Muy de acuerdo	2 De acuerdo	3 Ni acuerdo ni desacuerdo	4 Desacuerdo	5 Muy en desacuerdo
k.(34.k) La mayoría de las cosas en la vida son más importantes que el trabajo	____	____	____	____	____
l.(34.l) Algunas veces siento verguenza de decirle a la gente la clase de trabajo que yo hago	____	____	____	____	____
m.(34.m) Cuando desempeño bien mi trabajo siento una gran satisfacción personal	____	____	____	____	____
n.(34.n) Yo estaría contento de tener a mis hijos haciendo el mismo trabajo que yo hago	____	____	____	____	____
o.(34.o) Con respeto a mi trabajo yo soy un perfeccionista	____	____	____	____	____
p.(34.p) Cuando cometo un error o hago algo mal en el trabajo estoy molesto por días enteros	____	____	____	____	____
q.(34.q) Para mí el trabajo, es tan sólo una pequeña parte de las cosas que hago en la vida	____	____	____	____	____
r.(34.r) Si no pudiera desempeñar bien mi trabajo me sentiría que como persona soy un fracaso	____	____	____	____	____
s.(34.s) Cuando yo desempeño bien mi trabajo siento que yo contribuyo a mi crecimiento y desarrollo personal	____	____	____	____	____
t.(34.t) Cuando fracaso en algo relacionado con mi trabajo me siento deprimido	____	____	____	____	____

Las siguentes opiniones no son necesariamente sobre el trabajo.

	1 Muy de acuerdo	2 De acuerdo	3 Ni acuerdo ni desacuerdo	4 Desacuerdo	5 Muy en desacuerdo
1.(34.1) Yo siento que soy una persona de valer, por lo menos comparándome con otros desde un mismo ángulo	____	____	____	____	____
2.(34.2) Yo siento que tengo un cierto número de buenas cualidades	____	____	____	____	____
3.(34.3) Hoy por hoy, me siento inclinado a decir que soy un fracaso	____	____	____	____	____
4.(34.4) Como muchas otras personas, yo puedo hacer las cosas muy bien hechas	____	____	____	____	____
5.(34.5) Creo que no he hecho muchas cosas por las que pueda sentirme orgulloso	____	____	____	____	____
6.(34.6) Yo tengo una actitud positiva hacia mí mismo	____	____	____	____	____
7.(34.7) En general me siento satisfecho conmigo mismo	____	____	____	____	____
8.(34.8) Desearía tener mas respeto por mí mismo	____	____	____	____	____
9.(34.10) A veces pienso que soy un bueno para nada	____	____	____	____	____

Hemos terminado las preguntas que se refieren a experiencias de trabajo.

Quisiera preguntarle ahora sobre personas con las que usted trabaja. Por ejemplo, quisiera preguntarle:

32.(8.) ¿Qué ocupaciones tienen las cinco personas con las que usted habla más seguido en el trabajo? No quiero saber sus nombres sino sus ocupaciones.

TITULO DEL TRABAJO

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

(5) _____

33. En un tipico dia de trabajo, ¿qué tan a menudo habla usted con sus compañeros de trabajo?

__1__ 5 o 6 veces al día

__2__ 3 o 4 veces al día

__3__ 1 o 2 veces al día

__4__ menos de una vez al día

34.(9.) En un típico día de trabajo, ¿qué tan a menudo habla usted con su supervisor o jefe inmediato?

__1__ 5 o 6 veces al día

__2__ 3 o 4 veces al día

__3__ 1 o 2 veces al día

__4__ menos de una vez a la semana

35.(10.) En una típica semana de trabajo, ¿cómo cuantas veces habla usted con una persona o personas de puestos mas altos que su supervisor o jefe inmediato?

__1__ 5 o 6 veces a la semana

__2__ 3 o 4 veces a la semana

__3__ 1 o 2 veces a la semana

__4__ menos de una vez a la semana

36. Para todos nosotros hay personas con las que nos sentimos muy a gusto; personas que nos caen bien y que respetamos. En fin, personas que influyen en nuestras actitudes porque a nosotros nos importan sus opiniones. ¿Que tanto le importan las opiniones de sus compañeros de trabajo?

__1__ Son muy importantes

__2__ Son importantes

__3__ Son poco importantes

__4__ no me importan

37. ¿Que tanta confianza tiene usted en la labor que realiza su jefe dentro de esta empresa?

__1__ Tengo mucha confianza

__2__ Tengo algo de confianza

__3__ Tengo poca confianza

__4__ Nada de confianza

Muy bien. Hemos terminado con la sección de preguntas que se refieren a su experiencia en el trabajo. Quisiera ahora hacerle algunas preguntas sobre su comunidad.

38. ¿En que comunidad o localidad vive?

	1 Rural 2 Ciudad pequeña 3 Ciudad grande

39. ¿Cual es su lugar de origen?

	1 Rural 2 Ciudad pequeña 3 Ciudad grande

40. ¿Cuantos años ha vivido en _____?

	Escribir numero de años

41. Y en la comunidad donde viva (nombre que dio el entrevistado a la comunidad donde actualmente vive), ¿qué tan bien se lleva con sus habitantes?

__1__ Me llevo bastante bien con todos.

__2__ Me llevo solamente con algunos

__3__ Me llevo con muy pocos habitantes de esta comunidad

__4__ Casi no me llevo con nadie en la comunidad donde vivo

Ahora quisiera preguntarle las ocupaciones de las cinco personas con las que mas frecuentemente se reune fuera del trabajo.

42.(11.)

a. ¿Cuáles son las ocupaciones de aquellas cinco personas con las que usted mas frecuentemente se reune en sus horas de descanso? (fuera de su familia)

TITULO DEL TRABAJO

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

(5) _____

b. ¿Cuál es o cuál fue la principal ocupación de su padre durante la mayor parte de su vida?

	Titulo de ocupacion

c.(6.a) ¿Cuál es la principal ocupación de su esposa?

	Título de ocupacion

d.(7.a.b) ¿Cuáles son las ocupaciones de sus hermanos o hermanas que trabajan?

TITULO DEL TRABAJO

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

(5) _____

(6) _____

43. En general, ¿qué tan a menudo se reúne con sus compañeros de trabajo, fuera de las horas de trabajo? Es decir durante los fines de semana, en las tardes y días de fiesta.

__1__ 5 o 6 veces al mes

__2__ 3 o 4 veces al mes

__3__ 1 o 2 veces al mes

__4__ menos de una vez al mes

44.(16.) En general, ¿que tan a menudo habla usted con personas que tienem ocupaciones de mucho prestigio? (Que tienen ocupaciones importantes, que desempeñan trabajos que en esta comunidad se consideran de gran prestigio y importancia)

__1__ 5 o 6 veces al mes

__2__ 3 o 4 veces al mes

__3__ 1 o 2 veces al mes

__4__ menos de una vez al mes

45.(17.) En general, ¿qué tan a menudo habla o platica con personas cuya ocupacion es diferente de la de usted? Y, sea de mas prestigio o de menos prestigio que la ocupación que usted tiene?

__1__ 5 o 6 veces al mes

__2__ 3 o 4 veces al mes

__3__ 1 o 2 veces al mes

__4__ menos de una vez al mes

Por último quisiera preguntarle algunos datos personales

52.(35.) ¿Cuál es su edad? _____

53. Sexo M F

54.(36.) ¿Cuantos años de escuela terminó usted?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 MA

57. Dígame usted si pertenece a alguna de las siguientes organizaciones

	1 Si (ir a pregunta 58)	5 No
Religiosas		
Profesionales		
De la comunidad		
Del vecindario		
Sindicales		
PARTIDOS POLITICOS		

58. Sindicato

(1) CTM (2) Compañia (3) otro _____

Partido politico

(1) PPS (2) PRI (3) PARM (4) PAN

(5) otro _____

59. Aproximadamente, ¿Cuánto dinero gana al mes? _____

60. INDUSTRIA: (1) CAPITAL NACIONAL (2) CAPITAL MIXTO

61. Grado de Legitimización Organizacional

_____

_____

_____

_____

62. Categoría Ocupacional

(1) Profesional/Administrativo

(2) Secretarial

(3) Obrero Calificado

(4) Obrero no Calificado

63. Número de empleados en esta industria _____

64. Tipo de tecnología

_____

_____

_____

_____

65. Comentarios.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE (ENGLISH)

M.S.U. Occupational Survey

Hello, my name is _____. I am working on a survey being done by the Department of Sociology at Michigan State. The survey is part of a study of occupations in which people all over the United States will be interviewed. You are one of the people here in Lansing who have been selected to be interviewed. The procedure for selecting people is a scientific one designed to produce a representative sample so we really need your cooperation. It wil not take much of your time. Your answers will be strictly confidential and, in fact, you name won't even be put on the answer sheet.

1.(1)* First of all, we would like some information about your job and work experience. What is your present job? (GET SPECIFIC JOB TITLE)

a. _____
(Job Title)

b.(2) What do you do on that job? What are some of your duties?

_____

_____

d.(3) How long have you been in that job? (GET YEAR AT WHICH CONTINUOUS EMPLOYMENT ON THIS JOB BEGAN)

_____
Year

2.(4) What was the full-time job you had just before the one you have now?

a. _____
(Job Title)

d.(6) During what years were you in that job?

_____
Years

* Numbers in parentheses are question numbers in the Spanish translation of the interview schedule. See Appendix A.

6.a.(42c) Is your wife employed?

(1) Yes

(1) What kind of job does she have?

_____
(Job Title)

7.(42d) How about the other members of your family? Do you have any (ASK ABOUT EACH RELATIVE BELOW) who are employed full time?

(IF YES)

a. What kind of job does he (she) work at most of the time?

_____
(Job Title)

b. (ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL PROBE)

_____

A. Brothers who are employed?

(1) Yes

(2) No (Go to B.)

	Job Title	Probe
(1)		
(2)		
(3)		
(4)		
(5)		

B.(42d) Sisters who are employed?

(1) Yes

(2) No

	Job Title	Probe
(1)		
(2)		
(3)		
(4)		
(5)		

8.(32) Now I would like to have you think about the five people with whom you talk most often while you are at work. I don't want to know their names, but I would like to know their occupations. What jobs do they have?

	Job Title	Probe
(1)		
(2)		
(3)		
(4)		
(5)		

9.(34) During a typical day on the job how often do you talk to your immediate supervisor? (READ AND CIRCLE ANSWER)

(1) 5 or 6 times a day or more.

(2) around 3 or 4 times a day.

(3) once or twice a day.

(4) less than once a day.

10.(35) During a typical week on the job how often do you talk to persons above your immediate supervisor? (READ AND CIRCLE ANSWER)

(1) 5 or 6 times a week or more.

(2) around 3 or 4 times a week.

(3) once or twice a week.

(4) less than once a week.

11.(42) Now please think about the five people outside your family with whom you most often get together socially during evenings or weekends.

a. What are their jobs? If any are not employed, I would like to know that, too.

16.(44) In general, how often do you talk to people whom you regard as having high status jobs? (ACCEPTABLE SYNONYMS FOR HIGH STATUS JOBS ARE "HIGH PRESTIGE JOBS" OR "JOBS GIVEN HIGH STANDING IN THE COMMUNITY"). Would you say it was?

(READ RESPONSE CODE AND CIRCLE ANSWER)

(1) 5 or 6 times a month or more

(2) around 3 or 4 times a month

(3) once or twice a month

(4) less than once a month

17.(45) How often do you talk to people whose occupational status is any different from yours - either higher or lower? Would you say it was:

(READ RESPONSE CODE AND CIRCLE ANSWER)

(1) 5 or 6 times a month or more

(2) around 3 or 4 times a month

(3) once or twice a month

(4) less than once a month

Now we have a few more questions about your experiences at work.

23.(8) Are there others where you work who have more or less the same job as yours?

(1) Yes

(2) No (Go to B.)

(IF YES)

a.(10) Is it easy to tell whether or not you are doing a better or worse job than they do? That is, is it easy or hard to compare your work and the work of others? CIRCLE RESPONSE)

(1) Easy

(2) Hard

b.(9) Are there differences in how well people do your job or is everyone's performance about the same? (CIRCLE RESPONSE)

(1) Differences

(2) About the same

24.(11) How often are evaluations of how well you do your job made by the person who supervises your work? Would you say that happens: (READ AND CIRCLE)

(1) Very often

(2) Often

(3) Sometimes

(4) Seldom

(5) Very seldom

25.(12) How about the people you work with? How often do you compare or evaluate each other's work? Would you say that happens: (READ AND CIRCLE)

(1) Very often

(2) Often

(3) Sometimes

(4) Seldom

(5) Very seldom

26.(13) Do you think your supervisor uses the right criteria or the right basis when he evaluates your work? That is, does he evaluate you on the right things? (CIRCLE RESPONSE)

(1) Yes (Go to 27)

(2) No

(IF NO)

a.(14b) What criteria or basis should he use?

_____

_____

_____

b.(14a) What criteria or basis does he use?

_____

_____

_____

c.(14c) How hard would it be to get him to use the right criteria? Would you say it would be: (READ AND CIRCLE)

(1) Very hard to do

(2) Hard to do

(3) Somewhat hard to do

27.(15) How about the people you work with? Do they use the right criteria or the right basis when they evaluate your work? (CIRCLE RESPONSE)

(1) Yes (Go to 28)

(2) No

(IF NO)

a.(16ab) What is wrong with the criteria or basis they use?

_____

_____

_____

b.(16c) How hard would it be to get them to use the right criteria? Would you say it would be: (READ AND CIRCLE)

(1) Very hard to do

(2) Hard to do

(3) Somewhat hard to do

28.(18) Would you describe your job as a competitive one? That is, would you say it was: (READ AND CIRCLE)

(1) Very competitive

(2) Somewhat competitive

(3) Not very competitive

(4) Not at all competitive

29.(19) Do you plan to stay in the job you have now until you retire? (CIRCLE RESPONSE)

(1) Yes (Go to 30)

(2) No

(IF NO)

a.(20) What job do you plan to change to? _____ (Job Title)

b.(21) Why do you want to make this change?

30.(22) Would you say the job you have now is the best job you ever had? (CIRCLE RESPONSE)

(1) Yes (Go to 31)

(2) No

(IF NO)

(23)
What job was better? _____
(Job Title)

What made it better?

31.(25) What would have to happen for you to feel that you were more successful at work? PROBE: Anything else?

_____

_____

_____

_____

32.(26) How hard would you say it would be for you to get promoted or to move up in the organization where you work? Would you say it would be: (READ AND CIRCLE)

a. 1. Very hard to do

2. Hard to do

3. Somewhat hard to do

b.(27) What would the next step be?

_____
(Job Title)

(NOTE: FOR PERSONS ALREADY AT TOP OF ORGANIZATION, ASK, "IS THERE ANYTHING THAT WOULD REPRESENT A STEP UP TO YOU?")

c.(28) How certain do you feel about your chances of moving up? Would you say you were: (READ AND CIRCLE)

(1) Very certain

(2) Certain

(3) Somewhat certain

(4) Uncertain

(5) Very uncertain

d.(29) How important is it to you to move up? Would you say it was: (READ AND CIRCLE)

(1) Very important

(2) Somewhat important

(3) Slightly important

(4) Not at all important

33.(30) In general would you say you have already achieved most of the goals you set for yourself in your work life or are there still things you feel it is important for you to accomplish? How satisfied are you with what you have accomplished? Would you say you were: (READ AND CIRCLE)

(1) Very satisfied

(2) Satisfied

(3) Dissatisfied

(4) Very dissatisfied

34.(31) Now we would like to know how much you agree or disagree with some statements about work. Please try to think about your responses as though you were giving them yourself rather than to me or to anyone else.

Here is a card with numbered responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. I will read the statement and you tell me which number on the card represents your response. While all of the statements are somewhat similar, each contains something different. Please think about the statements carefully before responding. (PUT CHECKS IN SPACES)

		1 Strongly Agree	2 Agree	3 Neither Agree nor Disagree	4 Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree
a.(31a)	The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.	____	____	____	____	____
b.(31b)	When I am through work at the end of the day, I hardly ever think about whether I did a good or a bad job.	____	____	____	____	____
c.(31c)	Doing my job well increases my feeling of self esteem.	____	____	____	____	____
d.(31d)	I sometimes feel uncomfortable when talking to people whose jobs carry more prestige than mine.	____	____	____	____	____
e.(31e)	I am very much involved personally in my work.	____	____	____	____	____
f.(31f)	The type of work I do is important to me when I think about how successful I am in life.	____	____	____	____	____
g.(31g)	The most important things that happen to me involve my job.	____	____	____	____	____
h.(31h)	I think members of my family feel proud when they tell people what I do for a living.	____	____	____	____	____
i.(31i)	I live, eat and breathe my job.	____	____	____	____	____
j.(31j)	When I do my work well, it gives me a feeling of accomplishment.	____	____	____	____	____
k.(31k)	Most things in life are more important than work.	____	____	____	____	____
l.(31l)	I sometimes feel ashamed to tell people what kind of work I do.	____	____	____	____	____
m.(31m)	I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do my job well.	____	____	____	____	____

		1 Strongly Agree	2 Agree	3 Neither Agree nor Disagree	4 Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree
n.(31n)	I would be happy to have my children do the kind of work I do.	____	____	____	____	____
o.(31o)	I'm really a perfectionist about my work.	____	____	____	____	____
p.(31p)	When I make a mistake or do somethink badly at work, it sometimes bothers me for days.	____	____	____	____	____
q.(31q)	To me, my work is only a small part of what I do.	____	____	____	____	____
r.(31r)	If I could not do my job well, I would feel that I was a failure as a person.	____	____	____	____	____
s.(31s)	When I perform my job well, it contributes to my personal growth and development.	____	____	____	____	____
t.(31t)	I feel depressed when I fail at something connected with my job.	____	____	____	____	____
The following statements do not necessarily refer to work.						
1.(31.1)	I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.	____	____	____	____	____
2.(31.2)	I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	____	____	____	____	____
3.(31.3)	All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	____	____	____	____	____
4.(31.4)	I am able to do things as well as most other people.	____	____	____	____	____
5.(31.5)	I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	____	____	____	____	____
6.(31.6)	I take a positive attitude toward myself.	____	____	____	____	____

		1 Strongly Agree	2 Agree	3 Neither Agree nor Disagree	4 Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree
7.(31.7)	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	____	____	____	____	____
8.(31.8)	I wish I could have more respect for myself.	____	____	____	____	____
9.	I certainly feel useless at times.	____	____	____	____	____
10.(31.9)	At times I think I am no good at all.	____	____	____	____	____

Now, to finish up, we need a little more information about you.

35.(52) How old were you on your last birthday? (WRITE IN YEARS)

_____
Years

36.(54) How many years of school did you have? (CIRCLE)

6 7 8 9 1Ø 11 12 1 2 3 4 M.A. Ph.D.

APPENDIX C

BACK TRANSLATION OF ATTITUDE ITEMS
(Item 31. in Spanish version, Item 34. in English version)

31. (Spanish version) 34. (English version)

a. The greatest satisfaction in my life comes from my job.

b. At the end of a work day, I never stop to think if I did my work well or badly.

c. When I do my (job) work well, my self esteem increases.

d. Sometimes, when I talk with people with better jobs than mine, I feel very uncomfortable.

e. I am personally very involved in my job.

f. When I stop to think of how successful I am in life, the kind of job I do is very important to me.

g. The most interesting things that happen to me are related to my work.

h. I believe that many of my family members are proud when they tell people what I do to earn my living.

i. I live through my job.

j. When I do my work well I feel I have accomplished.

k. Most of the things in life are more important than the job.

l. Sometimes I am ashamed to tell people the kind of job I do.

m. When I perform my work well I feel a great personal satisfaction.

n. I would be happy to have my children doing the work I do.

o. I am a perfectionist in everything related to my job.

p. When I make a mistake or I do something wrong at work, I remain angry for several days.

q. For me, the job is only a small part of the things I do in life.

r. If I could not perform well in my job I would feel I am a failure as a person.

s. When I perform my job well this helps my growing and personal development.

t. When I fail in something related to my work, I feel depressed.

1. I feel I am a worthy person, at least comparing myself to others from a same angle.

2. I feel I have a certain number of good qualities.

3. I feel the need to say that I am a failure.

4. I can do things as well as many other persons.

5. I feel like I do not have too much to be proud of.

6. I have a positive attitude towards myself.

7. I feel satisfied about myself in all senses.

8. I wish I had more respect for myself.

9. At times I feel I'm a good for nothing.

LIST OF REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Adler, A. 1927 The Practice and Theory of Individual Psychology. New York: Harcourt.

Allport, F.H. 1962 A Structuronic Conception of Behavior; Individual and Collective. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 64:3-30.

Allport, G.W. 1947 The Psychology of Participation. Psychological Review, 52:117-132.

1961 Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Argyris, C. 1964 Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: Wiley.

Becker, E. 1962 The Birth and Death of Meaning: A Perspective in Psychiatry and Anthropology. New York: Free Press.

Benoit-Smullyan, E. 1944 Status, Status Types and Status Interrelations. American Sociological Review, 9:151-161.

Blauner, R. 1964 Alienation and Freedom. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Caplow, T. 1954 The Sociology of Work. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Church, R.M. 1961 Effects of a Competitive Situation on the Speed of Response. Journal of Comparative Physiological Psychology, 54:162-166.

Davis, L.E., and A.B. Cherns. 1975 The Quality of Working Life. New York: Free Press.

Davis, L.E., and J.C. Taylor. 1972 Design of Jobs. Baltimore: Penquin.

Dowell, B.E. 1978 Contributions of Work Satisfaction and Nonwork Satisfaction to Life Satisfaction. In A.R. Negandhi, and B. Wilpert (eds.), Work Organization Research: American and European Perspectives. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press.

Dubin, R. 1956 Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the "Central Life Interests" of Industrial Workers. Social Problems, 3:131-142.

Farris, G.F. 1971 A Predictive Study of Turnover. Personnel Psychology, 24:311-328.

Faunce, W.A. 1972 Self Investment in the Occupational Role. Paper presented at meetings of the Southern Sociological Association.

Faunce, W.A., and R. Dubin. 1975 Individual Investment in Work and Living. In L.E. Davis and A.B. Cherns (eds.), The Quality of Working Life. New York: Free Press, 299-316.

Faunce, W.A. 1978 Self Investment in Work- and Non-Work Related Roles. Paper presented at meetings of the North Central Sociological Association.

1982 The Relations of Status to Self Esteem: Chain Saw Sociology at the Cutting Edge. Sociological Focus, 15:163-177.

n.d. Work, Status and Self Esteem. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Sociology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

Ford, R. 1969 Motivation Through Work Itself. New York: American Management Association.

French, J., and R. Kahn. 1962 A Programmatic Approach to Studying the Industrial Environment and Mental Health. Journal of Social Issues, 18:1-47.

Garbin, A.D., and F.L. Bates. 1966 Occupational Prestige and Its Correlates: A Re-Examination. Social Forces, 44: 295-302.

Gurin, G., J. Veroff, and S. Feld. 1960 Americans View Their Mental Health. New York: Basic Books.

Hinrichs, J.R. 1964 Communications Activity of Industrial Research Personnel. Personnel Psychology, 17:193-204.

Hughes, E.C. 1958 Men and Their Work. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Hulin, C.L., and M.R. Blood. 1968 Job Enlargement, Individual Differences, and Worker Responses. Psychological Bulletin, 69: 41-65.

Inkeles, A. 1960 Industrial Man: The Relation of Status to Experience, Perception, and Value. American Journal of Sociology, 66:1-31.

James, W. 1890 Principles of Psychology. New York: Henry Holt.

Kaiser, H.F. 1958 The Varimax Criterion for Analytic Rotation in Factor Analysis. Psychometrika, 23:187-200.

Kaplan, H.B. 1975 Self Attitudes and Deviant Behavior. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing.

Katz, D. and R. Kahn. 1966 The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Klemmer, E., and F. Snyder. 1972 Measurement of Time Spent Communicating. Journal of Communication, 22:142-158.

Kohn, M.L., and C. Schooler. 1978 The Reciprocal Effects of the Substantive Complexity of Work and Intellectual Flexibility: A Longitudinal Assessment. American Journal of Sociology, 84:24-52.

Korman, A.K. 1970 Toward an Hypothesis of Work Behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54:31-41.

Kornhauser, A.W. 1965 Mental Health of the Industrial Worker: A Detroit Study. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Larsen, K.S. 1971 Dogmatism and Sociometric Status as Determinants of Interaction in a Small Group. Psychological Records, 29:449-450.

Lawler, E.E. III. 1969 Job Design and Employee Motivation. Personnel Psychology, 22:426-435.

Lawler, E.E. III, and D.T. Hall. 1970 Relationship of Job Characteristics to Job Involvement, Satisfaction, and Intrinsic Motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54: 305-312.

Lodahl, T.M. and M. Kejner. 1965 The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49: 24-33.

Lundberg, G., C., Shrag, O. Larsen, and W. Catton, Jr. 1968 Sociology. New York: Harper and Row.

Mannheim, B. 1975 A Comparative Study of Work Centrality, Job Rewards and Satisfaction. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 2:79-102.

Maurer, J.G. 1969 Work Role Involvement of Industrial Supervisors. East Lansing, MI: MSU Business Studies.

McGregor, D. 1960 The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McKee, J. 1969 Introduction to Sociology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Mead, G.H. 1934 Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Moore, W.E. 1969 Occupational Socialization. In D.A. Goslin (ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 861-883.

Mortimer, J.L., and J. Lorence. 1979a Work Experience and Occupational Value Socialization: A Longitudinal Study. American Journal of Sociology, 84:1361-1385.

1979b Occupational Experience and the Self-Concept: A Longitudinal Study. Social Psychology Quarterly, 42: 307-323.

Newcomb, J.M. 1950 Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Patchen, M. 1970 Participation, Achievement and Involvement on the Job. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Pelz, D.C., and F.M. Andrews. 1966 Scientists in Organizations. New York: Wiley.

Orzack, L.H. 1959 Work as a Central Life Interest of Professionals. Social Problems, 7:73-84.

Rabinowitz, S., and D.T. Hall. 1977 Organizational Research on Job Involvement. Psychological Bulletin, 84:265-288.

Rosenberg, M. 1979 Conceiving the Self. New York: Basic Books.

Saal, F.W. 1978 Job Involvement: A Multivariate Approach. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63:53-61.

Seeman, M. 1959 On the Meaning of Alienation. American Sociological Review, 24:783-791.

1967 On the Personal Consequences of Alienation from Work. American Sociological Review, 32:273-285.

Siegel, L. 1969 Industrial Psychology. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Tannenbaum, A.S. 1966 Social Psychology of the Work Organization. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole.

1968 Control in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill.

1974 Hierarchy in Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Tausky, C., and E.L. Parke. 1976 Job Enrichment, Need Theory and Reinforcement Theory. In Dubin, R. (ed.) Handbook of Work, Organization, and Society. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Thomason, G.F. Managerial Work Roles and Relationships—Part I.
1966 Journal of Management Studies, 3:270-284.

VanMaanen, J. Breaking-In: Socialization to Work. In R. Dubin (ed.),
1976 Handbook of Work, Organization and Society.
Chicago: Rand McNally.

Vroom, V.H. Ego-Involvement, Job Satisfaction and Job Performance.
1962 Personnel Psychology, 152:159-177.

Wanous, J.P. Individual Differences and Reactions to Job
1974 Characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology,
59:616-622.

Weick, K. The Social Psychology of Organizing. Reading, Mass.:
1969 Addison Wesley.

Weissenberg, P., and L.W. Gruenfeld. Relationship Between Job
1968 Satisfaction and Job Involvement. Journal of Applied
Psychology, 52:469-473.

Wickesberg, A.D. Communications Networks in the Business Organization
1968 Structure. Academy of Management Journal, 11:253-262.