



THESIS



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

DIFFERENCES IN NEEDS, WORK VALUES, ACCULTURATION AND  
JOB SATISFACTION IN MEXICAN-AMERICAN AND  
ANGLO-AMERICAN EMPLOYEES

presented by

Miquela Rivera

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

M.A. degree in Psychology

1979

Major professor

Date 2/22/79



MSU

OVERDUE FINES ARE 25¢ PER DAY  
PER ITEM

Return to book drop to remove  
this checkout from your record.

<del>F-10-81-12</del>	<del>193 R 86</del>
<del>S-141</del>	<del>75 R 206</del>
<del>36 R162</del>	<del>55 2220</del>
<del>T-777</del>	<del>94 R 235</del>
<del>74 R 87</del>	<del>8266</del>
<del>106 R 83</del>	<del>1339</del>
<del>127 R 83</del>	<del>1335</del>
<del>182 R 80</del>	<del>1335</del>
	AUG 01 2000
	MAR 5 9 2011

DIFFERENCES IN NEEDS, WORK VALUES, ACCULTURATION AND  
JOB SATISFACTION IN MEXICAN-AMERICAN AND  
ANGLO-AMERICAN EMPLOYEES

By

Miquela Rivera

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1979



## ABSTRACT

### DIFFERENCES IN NEEDS, WORK VALUES, ACCULTURATION AND JOB SATISFACTION IN MEXICAN-AMERICAN AND ANGLO-AMERICAN EMPLOYEES

By

Miquela Rivera

While investigations of worker motivation and job satisfaction in the United States have typically been based upon the Protestant Work Ethic, research has indicated that the frame of reference and values which an individual brings to the work situation will largely determine the satisfaction derived.

This study investigated the relationships between needs, work values, acculturation and job satisfaction in Mexican-American and Anglo-American employees. The subjects were 339 state government employees in New Mexico and Michigan. Subjects completed questionnaires comprised of Alderfer's Existence, Relatedness and Growth Need scales, the Survey of Work Values, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Mexican-American Identity Scale.

Results indicated that the lower socioeconomic groups, the Mexican-Americans, valued extrinsic work aspects more highly, with the Chicano group from Michigan reporting significantly higher job satisfaction. Other differences in needs, values and levels of acculturation and their implications for work motivation, management and employee relations were discussed.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to . . .

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Dr. Neal Schmitt                                      | - for untiring patience and excellent skill in guiding towards clearer understanding          |
| Dr. Norm Abeles and<br>Dr. Bob Zucker                 | - for helpful input into the final product  |
| Dr. Clarence Sánchez<br>and Ms. June Roybal           | - for encouragement, cooperation and friendship through the New Mexico State Personnel Office |
| Ernest Wallick,<br>Dorothy Brown and<br>Elaine Waters | - for continued cooperation through the Michigan Department of Civil Service                  |
| Mom and Dad   | - for unselfish love, prayers and support   |
| Sam   | - for a strong shoulder, a warm heart and a listening ear.                                    |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	6
Job Satisfaction . . . . .	6
A Theoretical Overview . . . . .	6
Causal Models of Job Satisfaction . . . . .	9
Process Theories . . . . .	9
Needs . . . . .	9
Values . . . . .	10
Content Theories . . . . .	11
Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs . . . . .	12
Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory . . . . .	13
Alderfer's Existence, Relatedness and Growth Theory . . . . .	14
Acculturation . . . . .	19
A Conceptual Overview . . . . .	19
Cross-Cultural Research in Needs, Values and Job Satisfaction . . . . .	22
Hypotheses . . . . .	29
METHODOLOGY . . . . .	31
Subjects . . . . .	31
Procedure . . . . .	31
Description of the Measures . . . . .	33
Demographic Information . . . . .	34
ERG Chronic Desire Measures . . . . .	34
Survey of Work Values (SWV) . . . . .	35
Mexican-American Identity Scale (MAIS) . . . . .	37
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) . . . . .	39
Data Analyses . . . . .	41

	Page
RESULTS . . . . .	46
Scale Reliabilities Check . . . . .	46
Hypotheses Testing . . . . .	46
Discriminant Analyses . . . . .	54
Demographic Variables: Total Sample . . . . .	55
Motivational Variables: Total Sample . . . . .	58
Demographic and Motivational Variables: Total Sample . . . . .	58
Demographic Variables: Mexican-American Groups . . . . .	62
Motivational Variables: Mexican-American Groups . . . . .	64
Demographic and Motivational Variables: Mexican-American Groups . . . . .	64
DISCUSSION . . . . .	68
REFERENCES . . . . .	79
APPENDIX A . . . . .	86
Cover Letter to Btoh New Mexico Groups . . . . .	86
Cover Letter to Both Michigan Groups . . . . .	87
Follow-Up Letter to All Groups . . . . .	88
Work Values, Need Desires and Job Satisfaction Questionnaire . . . . .	89

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Demographic Characteristics of Sample by Group . . . . .	32
2. Means, Standard Deviations and Reliabilities of Variables . . . . .	47
3. Pearson Correlations: Total Sample . . . . .	48
4. Pearson Correlations: Mexican-American Sample . . . . .	50
5. Univariate Analyses and Newman-Keuls Comparisons of Group Means . . . . .	53
6. Discriminant Analysis of Demographic Data: Total Sample . . . . .	56
7. Discriminant Analysis of Motivational Data: Total Sample . . . . .	59
8. Discriminant Analysis of Demographic and Motivational Data: Total Sample . . . . .	60
9. Discriminant Analysis of Demographic Data: Mexican- American Sample . . . . .	63
10. Discriminant Analysis of Motivational Data: Mexican- American Sample . . . . .	65
11. Discriminant Analysis of Demographic and Motivational Data: Mexican-American Sample . . . . .	66

## INTRODUCTION

At first glance one may not be able to fully recognize the underlying common thread between needs, values, acculturation and job satisfaction. In addition, one might question what would prompt an individual to conduct a study in this area in the first place. A closer look at the reasons for investigating this topic will make the final work more unified and meaningful.

In The Condition of the Working Class in England, Friedrich Engels (1844) wrote:

Man knows no greater happiness than that which is derived from productive work voluntarily undertaken. On the other hand, man knows no more degrading or unbearable misery than forced labour. No worse fate can befall a man than to have to work every day from morning till night against his will at a job that he abhors. The more the worker feels himself a man, the more must he detest work of this kind--the more acutely is he aware of the fact that such aimless labour gives rise to no inner spiritual satisfaction. Does he work from any natural impulse, or because he enjoys the tasks that he performs? Of course not. He works for money. He works for something which has nothing to do with the tasks that he has performed. He works because he must (p. 133).

Over one hundred and twenty-five years later it is probably safe to say that man still works because he must. Since Engel's writing, however, social scientists and work productivity advocates alike have studied work aspects, employee behavior and job satisfaction.

The study of job satisfaction has been deemed important for various reasons. Many have thought job satisfaction to be synonymous

with increased productivity. Accordingly, job satisfaction would directly influence industry through training, job enrichment, management, automation and policy-making decisions which affect masses of workers. Job satisfaction has also been considered an important component of mental health, for the gratifications and deprivations experienced in work have been thought to generalize to satisfaction with life in general (Kornhauser, 1965). In addition, improvement of satisfaction has been considered of humanitarian value, making job satisfaction a legitimate means and end in itself.

As the literature review in this thesis indicates, the study of worker motivation has evolved from a consideration of the physical components of the job to an investigation of the influence of the workers' needs and values upon work productivity and job satisfaction. A review of the research also reveals that, until recent years, social scientists and industrial advocates have generally investigated the world of work through the eyes of the majority of people in this country. For example, many researchers operated under some of the assumptions of the Protestant Work Ethic which holds that work is intrinsically good as a means and an end. These assumptions may not hold true for everyone, however, so the research conducted under these assumptions might be considered somewhat narrow in perspective.

Recent years have brought an increase in cross-cultural investigations in workers behavior and motivation. Many of these investigations have been international in scope. Of those investigating ethnic minorities and the area of work in the United States, most have dealt with the Black population. The second-largest minority group in the nation, the Mexican-American population, has largely

been ignored.

Study of the Mexican-American in the world of work is important for several reasons. Primarily it is important to note that, unlike other immigrant populations in the United States, the Mexican-American people originally became a part of the nation not through their own volition, but through annexation. Consequently, the people struggled hard to survive and succeed in the majority culture while maintaining strong cultural ties. That struggle continues today among contemporary Chicanos. While they are bound together by a sense of cultural pride and tradition, investigators have recognized that Mexican-Americans are not a homogeneous population but a diverse people within themselves. Mexican-Americans differ in historical development, educational attainment, economic stratification, religious affiliation, social mobility and geographic location (Acuña, 1972). Such diversity easily warrants further study.

The composition of the population in New Mexico is unique along with its geographic location and economic development. A geographic isolate, New Mexico is the only one of the primary Southwestern states who does not have an official port of entry to northern Mexico. As a result, the influx of new people from Mexico to the North is limited compared to the border states who experience more continual and direct immigration through legal access. New Mexico also has a large Indian population not as evident in Texas and California. Historically the state has depended upon mining, agriculture, and more recently tourism, for its economic security (Gonzalez, 1967). Only within the past thirty to forty years has there been a vast increase in the amount of government employment at all levels within



the state. While industrialization and extensive urbanization have historically been minimal, recent years have witnessed marked population and economic growth in the area. Within the past two decades the entire Southwest has experienced a great influx of people from across the nation. People seeking sunshine, fresh air and a slower pace of life are expected to continue settling in the Southwest, with a predicted growth rate of thirty percent over the next 25 years. With such a population increase, employment becomes a major concern. In addition, such growth hosts the transition of a population from a largely agrarian to a more urban society. The consequent social and psychological effects of such a transition merit investigation.

Studies of the Mexican-American people have typically been limited to residents of the Southwestern states. While most of the people originated from or have close ties with the region, the agricultural belt of the Midwest provided (and still provides) opportunity for employment. Since the 1940's, thousands of Mexican-Americans have left the Southwest to join the agricultural migrant stream, eventually settling largely in the Midwestern states of Illinois and Michigan. In Illinois alone there are currently more individuals of Mexican origin than either in New Mexico or Colorado, but with the difference in the population of each state, the Illinois figure represents only 1.5 percent of that state's total population. The 1970 U.S. Census figures also indicated that only 44 and 52 percent of the Mexican-origin individuals residing in Illinois and Michigan, respectively, were born in their state of residence (Briggs, Fogel and Schmidt, 1977). The extent (and inevitably the effect) of the migration of this population is an important factor which deems further

study.

In addition to other factors, racial and cultural differences must be considered in viewing the differences in employment between Chicanos and Anglos. Until the civil rights movement in the 1960's these factors had been largely ignored by researchers and policy-makers. With the extensive migration and settling of Mexican-Americans nationally, learning about these people is no longer simply a matter of regional concern.

Besides the study of employment status differences between Chicanos and Anglos, an investigation of job satisfaction differences between these two racial groups is important. While research has shown that needs and work values relate to the level of an individual's job satisfaction and that cultural differences in needs and work values exist, one might expect that cultural and regional differences in job satisfaction would occur accordingly. This study investigates the differences in needs, work values, acculturation and job satisfaction between Mexican-Americans and Anglo-Americans in New Mexico and Michigan. It is expected that Chicanos in Michigan and New Mexico will differ from each other and from their Anglo-American counterparts along the dimensions under investigation in this study.

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

### Job Satisfaction

#### A Theoretical Overview

Few areas of study in the social sciences are enmeshed with as much diversity and conflict of opinion, ambiguity and methodological nuance as that of job satisfaction. The massive amount of literature published on the subject since World War I indicates that a multidimensional, complex concept such as job satisfaction is not easily and comprehensively measured by a simple scheme. The questioning of the applicability of theories of job satisfaction across tasks and work settings continues within the field today. General overviews of these theoretical stances are presented briefly as the bases for the inquiry of cross-cultural applicability to the groups studied herein.

In reviewing the evolution of the study of job satisfaction, it is of primary importance that one begins with a basic (though certainly noncomprehensive) definition of the concept under investigation. Accordingly, "Job satisfaction may be defined (for the present) as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (Locke, 1976, p. 1300).

The publication of Frederick Taylor's Principles of Scientific Management (1947) began a movement towards increased concern over the roles which employee attitudes played in work itself. His

conceptualization of worker attitudes included the individual's philosophy towards relationships with the management and the views of one's own self-interest within the employment situation. Taylor's assumption that the highest possible earnings, decreased fatigue and direct relation of rewards to clearly delineated tasks would result in a satisfied, productive employee was frequently erroneously applied to actual work situations (Locke, 1976; Weir, 1976). The most extensive application of Taylor's formulations was that made by Henry Ford in automobile assembly lines. Such situations have since become synonymous with depersonalized, alienating and fragmented work (Weir, 1976).

Researchers in Great Britain and the United States subsequently investigated the effects of a multitude of variables on fatigue, monotony and boredom in employment situations (Vernon, 1921). The Hawthorne studies conducted by Elton Mayo and his colleagues at the Western Electric plant in the late 1920's began as an investigation of the effects of various incentives upon work productivity. When the anticipated employee responses toward situations changes did not occur, a study of employee attitudes began. The Hawthorne studies revealed that an employee's appraisal of his work situation directly affects his reactions to it. Accordingly, the concept of employee attitude came to encompass far more than job satisfaction (Mayo, 1960, 1970). With a greater understanding of the impact of work philosophy, economic situations, personality variables and a myriad of other factors, the Human Relations movement of the 1930's with its concern for leadership and interpersonal relations began. Lewin's (1963) studies of group dynamics and Likert's (1961) advocacy of

participative management mark great contributions in this era, which reached its height in the early 1960's.

In 1943 Abraham Maslow proposed a theory of motivation based upon human needs. Viewed as a five-level hierarchy ranging from physiological needs to those of human growth or "self actualization," the theory states that, as a lower level need is satisfied, higher order needs emerge and become behavioral motivators. While Maslow's theory has not undergone much successful rigorous methodological testing, it served as a theoretical base for the Job Enrichment movement developed by Herzberg and others in the early 1960's, immediately following the Human Relations proponents. Herzberg (1959) focused upon factors of the work situation itself and contended that job satisfaction could result only from allowing the worker to experience responsibility and mental growth. From the attitudes of 200 accountants and engineers, Herzberg concluded that factors resulting in job satisfaction are distinct and not dichotomous with those resulting in job dissatisfaction. The Hygiene factors are those concerned with external work factors and the Motivators encompass those aspects intrinsic to the work itself.

It can be seen, then, that three major schools of thought in the study of job satisfaction can be delineated (Locke, 1976). The "Physical-Economic" school concerns itself largely with the role of physical working conditions and wages. Proponents of this trend were Taylor, the researchers of the British Industrial Health Research Board and most investigators in the United States around the 1920's. The "Social or Human Relations School" emphasized the roles of leadership and interpersonal relations as factors in job satisfaction.

The Hawthorne studies, Michigan and Ohio State investigators are most noted for their contributions in this area. The "Work Itself or Growth School" of job satisfaction received strength from Herzberg and other proponents who emphasize the attainment of satisfaction through individual responsibility and personal growth.

The presentation of "schools" of thought is a drastic simplification of research trends since they are not mutually exclusive or chronologically discrete (Locke, 1976). However, such an historical overview lays the groundwork for understanding the causal models and content theories of job satisfaction.

#### Causal Models of Job Satisfaction

Causal models of job satisfaction attempt to delineate the types of variables considered relevant in determining overall job satisfaction. In addition, the models attempt to specify how variables such as needs, values, expectancies and perceptions combine and interact to determine job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970) distinguish "process" theories as described above from "content" theories which identify the values and needs most amenable to job satisfaction. A review of needs and values within the process and content theoretical frameworks is included herein.

#### Process Theories

Needs. "The concept of need refers to those conditions which are required to sustain the life and well-being of a living organism" (Locke, 1976, p. 1303). The requirements for the maintenance of healthy biological functioning constitute physical needs while those

necessities for adequate mental health constitute psychological needs. Both types of needs interact, with the latter serving as survival means for the former. It can be seen, therefore, that needs are objective requirements necessary for health and survival which exist regardless of the individual's conscious desire for these needs.

Theoretists (Lofquist & Dawis, 1969; Porter, 1962; Wofford, 1971) have stated that job satisfaction is determined by the degree to which work fulfills one's needs. While many studies have attempted to measure needs and the roles which they play in job satisfaction and other aspects of life, few have successfully defined the concept of need or differentiated it from that of values. The forthcoming distinction between these two concepts is essential, for both are important variables whose relationships to job satisfaction are investigated herein.

Values. "A value is what a person consciously or subconsciously desires, wants, or seeks to attain" (Locke, 1976, p. 1305). As opposed to needs, values are subjective standards in an individual's consciousness. Needs can be seen as innate and basic to all men; values are acquired and differ across individuals.

The congruence between a person's work situation and his values is seen by some theoretists as the prime determinant in overall job satisfaction (Katzell, 1964; Locke, 1969; Pelz and Andrews, 1966; Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969). Most need theorists have generally spoken of the concepts of need and value as synonymous. Issues of value importance, judgment and need conflict in relation to job satisfaction have been accounted for by several theoretical viewpoints.

Rand (1966) stated that two characteristics of a value interact to determine an individual's actions: value content and intensity. A value hierarchy represents the ranked importance (intensity) of what is valued (content). Rand further explains that the discrepancy between what the person wants and what he perceives himself receiving and the importance of what is wanted results in an emotional response. Accordingly, Rand illustrated that percept-value discrepancy and value importance could determine the degree of an affective response such as job satisfaction. Importance is thus seen to affect the range of emotional response (in this case, job satisfaction) which a value can produce. More important values will therefore lead to greater affect variability than will less important values. The correlation between satisfaction with more important values and overall satisfaction thus follows (Ewen, 1967) along with the relationship between desired job attributes and job satisfaction. An individual's satisfaction with the job should thus correlate with the degree to which the importance of values and job attribute desires is satisfied (Hackman & Lawler, 1971).

With these elaborations in mind, an appropriate revision of the conceptual definition of job satisfaction follows: "job satisfaction results from the perception that one's job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one's important job values, providing and to the degree that those values are congruent with one's needs" (Locke, 1976, p. 1307).

### Content Theories

While the interaction of needs, values and their importance has been discussed by process theorists, the nature of these needs and



their relationship to job satisfaction are elaborated by content theorists. Maslow's and Herzberg's theories have been most influential in this realm.

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. Maslow delineated five basic need categories which are hierarchical in structure and operate on an assumption of prepotency (Maslow, 1954, 1970). These needs, from the most to the least dominant, include those which are physiological (food, air, water, etc.), safety (economic security, lack of threats), belongingness and love, esteem (mastery and achievement, recognition, approval) and self-actualization (self-fulfillment). Within the hierarchy, a less prepotent or dominant need (e.g., esteem) will not be desired until lower order needs (e.g., physiological) are satisfied. While lower order needs do not always have to be fully satisfied before higher ones come to fore, those more prepotent needs will usually be more fulfilled than the higher order needs. While Maslow did not specifically delineate a theory of work motivation, his theory became the basis for many management systems subsequently designed.

While Maslow's theory has offered great appeal and has been used as the basis for hundreds of studies in various aspects of human behavior, it has been grounded with little (and usually poor) experimental support for its tenets. Lack of empirical proof of the existence of needs, ambiguous and unintelligible conceptual definitions and unclear distinctions between needs and values (Locke, 1976) have limited the applicability of the theory methodologically and across populations. Generally an individual's actions are

determined largely by values, not needs, and these two concepts may be in direct opposition. Self-actualization was viewed as the dominant, ultimate need and goal for every worker. The human need hierarchy was actually laden with value judgments, weighing heavily aspects of creativity, self-development and individual dignity. In addition, within Maslow's view the worker's group membership, social class membership and occupational status level were not considered relevant to an individual's work values and consequent job satisfaction. Yet it is this social class membership with which a worker identifies and partially forms a system of values (Friedlander, 1965).

Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory. From a study in which 200 engineers and accountants were asked to describe a time in which they were satisfied with their job and a time when they were not, Frederick Herzberg (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959) developed his two-factor theory of work motivation. "Motivators" which purported to involve only intrinsic aspects of the work itself (i.e., self-actualization, promotion, recognition, etc.) were viewed as sources of satisfaction. Alternatively, extrinsic work factors such as interpersonal relations, work conditions, pay and job security were classified as "Hygiene" factors and viewed primarily as sources of dissatisfaction with one's job. In Herzberg's view, then, only the presence of intrinsic or content motivators lead to job satisfaction; dissatisfaction results from Hygiene factors (Halpern, 1966; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1969; Wolf, 1970).

Herzberg later expanded upon his original theory and began to integrate his findings to form a description on the nature of man

(Herzberg, 1966). Dividing needs into physical and psychological categories, he concluded that the former motivated action in order to avoid pain while the latter motivates only to positively gain pleasure. Accordingly, the two-factor job satisfaction theory allegedly parallels his need theory in that Hygiene factors result only in dissatisfaction while Motivators produce only the opposite.

Criticisms of Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory stem largely from his adherence to a strict dichotomy between mind and body, the contention that needs operate unidirectionally, a weak attempted parallel between his need theory and the theory of job motivation, the apparent inconsistencies methodologically in the use of the incident classification system, the drawing of conclusions strictly from frequency data and the minimization of individual differences (Locke, 1976). While one might safely argue that all persons have the same basic needs, the same cannot be said for values. Locke (1969) has determined values to be the major determinants of affective responses to work. At the same time, Hulin and Blood (1968) and Hulin (1971) have shown that not all workers highly value jobs which promote psychological growth.

Alderfer's Existence, Relatedness and Growth Theory. The Existence, Relatedness and Growth (ERG) Theory proposed by Alderfer (1972) deals with two classes of variables: satisfactions and desires. It proposes three basic categories of needs which form the basis for identifying satisfactions and desires. Its propositions predict how satisfaction affects desire and how chronic desires relate to satisfaction.

Primary needs are innate tendencies which may be physiologically based. While ERG theory assumes that the three needs are primary and innate, they do not assume a biological basis to be true for all three. Learned tendencies to respond are known as secondary needs. While needs can be strengthened by learning, ERG theory does not view them to be the sole products of learned tendencies. The theory deals basically with the energizing and maintenance of satisfactions and desires, not their motivation (Alderfer, 1972).

Within ERG theory needs follow from the open-system personality structure described by Allport (1960, 1961). "Existence needs reflect a person's requirements for material and energy exchange and for the need to reach and maintain a homeostatic equilibrium with regard to the provision of certain material substances. Relatedness needs acknowledge that a person is not a self-contained unit but must engage in transactions with his human environment. Growth needs emerge from the tendency of open systems to increase in internal order and differentiation over time as a consequence of going beyond steady states and interacting with the environment" (Alderfer, 1972).

Existence needs encompass the physiological and material desires such as hunger, thirst, wages and fringe benefits. They are unique in that a shortage of materials will cause one person's loss to be another's gain. If two people are vying for a wage increase to be awarded to one employee, the money earned by one will not be available for the other. Existence need satisfaction, then, could be determined by a person's comparison between what he received in relation to what another gained in the same situation.

Interpersonal relations with significant-other people are the

main components which comprise Relatedness needs. Family members, coworkers, friends, superiors and enemies can serve as significant others within a person's framework. Any human unit with which another person has experienced an interaction can become a significant other for that person. Any relationship will therefore entail Relatedness needs (Alderfer, 1972). Satisfaction of Relatedness needs is dependent upon a sharing process or mutuality of thoughts and feelings between people. Understanding, acceptance and support are all units of the Relatedness need satisfaction process. This satisfaction is not, however, always the result of the expression of positive affect. The mutual expression of anger can be of utmost importance to growth in an interpersonal relationship. While not all relationships are capable of full sharing or mutuality of feelings, such a direction should be taken if a meaningful relationship is to develop with no defensiveness or lack of mutual commitment inhibiting the satisfaction process (Alderfer, 1972).

"Growth needs impel a person to make creative or productive effects on himself and the environment" (Alderfer, 1972). The full utilization and further development of one's capabilities enhance Growth need satisfaction. This satisfaction process, then, depends upon the individual expressing and developing himself most fully (Alderfer, 1972).

ERG Theory assumes that all three categories of needs are present and active within each individual. Unlike Maslow's assumption of equal need strength across individuals, Alderfer's theory considers that individuals possess all these needs to varying degrees. The theory's propositions relate lower-level need satisfaction to

higher-level desires (Alderfer, 1972).

Existence, Relatedness and Growth needs can be ordered along a continuum of concreteness: the presence or absence of Existence needs is most easily verified. The state of the relationship is the most important factor in discerning the presence or absence of Relatedness needs. Growth needs, the least concrete of the theory's three, are verifiable only by the individual experiencing that need.

Within Alderfer's theory, "satisfactions" refers to the internal state of a person who has obtained a sought-after goal; it is synonymous with being fulfilled. A state of satisfaction, then, depends upon the reality of a situation and the person's perception of that situation (Alderfer, 1972).

A person's internal state synonymous with preference, want, motive or need strength is referred to as desire. Desires are unique to each individual; there is no social consensus or absolute external reality with which to compare them. Episodic desires are situation-specific and change according to varying situations. Chronic desires are products of episodic desires and learning; they reflect a person's enduring state. Need is a concept which encompasses both desires and satisfactions (Alderfer, 1972).

The satisfiers of Existence needs are interchangeable, e.g. money and fringe benefits. These satisfiers could also be instrumental in gratifying Relatedness and Growth needs. The Existence need deficiency cycle illustrates that the lower the satisfaction, the greater the desire and vice versa; one could become fixated upon material goods. The Growth-need enrichment cycle, alternatively, demonstrates that, in challenging discretionary settings, the greater

the satisfaction the greater the desire and vice versa; a Growth-oriented person could become increasingly so since he is supported and stimulated by open relationships and significant others.

In brief, then, ERG theory does not assume that all people have the same need strength. The satisfaction of Existence needs depends upon obtaining enough of what one needs. With material scarcity, the higher the needs the lower the satisfaction. Relatedness needs satisfaction depends upon a mutual sharing of thoughts and feelings within an interpersonal relationship. The utilization of opportunities for self-development by an individual increases Growth need satisfaction. Environments will vary in the extent to which they permit development of one's potential (Alderfer, 1972).

ERG theory is based on and verified through systematic data collection. Its theoretical components have been tested, elaborated and modified; its measures have been viewed as more reliable than Maslow's (Alderfer, 1972).

This section has outlined briefly the conceptual frameworks and historical investigations in the areas of job satisfaction, needs and values. What is apparent is that all individuals experience needs and values. What is less obvious, especially when reviewing the job satisfaction research to date, is that each individual varies along several dimensions in terms of needs and values. Since needs and values are seen to influence job satisfaction, it can be expected that any variation in needs and values will result in a variation in job satisfaction.

One of the prime factors affecting the acquisition of values is the individual's cultural background. Variations in the cultural

influences may be seen to affect the development of value orientations. Taken a step further, it can be said that variations in cultural influences will affect values and, consequently, job satisfaction. Acculturation is one of the prime processes by which cultural schemas and values are influenced and vary. A general overview of acculturative frameworks and investigations follows. Determination of its relationship to value orientation and job satisfaction is one of the purposes of the present investigation.

### Acculturation

#### A Conceptual Overview

Gillin and Rainy (1940) refer to acculturation as "those processes whereby the culture of a society is modified as a result of contact with the culture of one or more other societies." Viewed as a dynamic process, acculturation is seen to manifest various levels or degrees. It is important to note that acculturation differs from diffusion, the spread of cultural traits, in that the former demands first-hand contact between at least two cultural groups while the latter does not. Acculturation is also different from assimilation in that assimilation consists of reciprocal relationships while acculturation can be unidirectional (Teske & Nelson, 1974).

Early studies of acculturation have concerned themselves with the process on a group level (Herskovits, 1973; Bogardus, 1949; Devereux and Loeb, 1943) but "individual acculturation has also been acknowledged" (Teske & Nelson, 1974). Investigators have viewed the phenomena as an individual process affecting group dynamics or vice versa. It is also important to recognize that the process of



acculturation may occur between subcultures as well as autonomous cultural groups. Such a view, then, makes the study of acculturation applicable to various ethnic groups in the United States (Broom & Kitsuse, 1955; Simirenko, 1966). Within the context of this study, the acculturative effect of Anglo-American contact upon Mexican-American values and job satisfaction will be investigated.

Research on the acculturation process reveal that ". . . many writers, while not arguing that acculturation is a unidirectional process, treat it as if it were such. In other words, in their research or theoretical discussions, especially in regard to immigrant groups, culture changes relevant to one group, as well as factors contributory to such changes, are identified and discussed with no attention given to changes, reciprocal or otherwise, in the other group or groups" (Teske & Nelson, 1974, p. 353). It can be seen, then, that acculturation is connotatively viewed as a bidirectional process with investigators treating it unidirectionally though not denying the process's true two-way nature. It is most important to note that, while the process may actually be reciprocal it is not necessarily egalitarian (Teske & Nelson, 1974).

The issue of the effect of dominance of one cultural group over another upon the degree and direction of both individual and group-level acculturation is one that is not perfectly clear. Research has shown, however (Spiro, 1955; Dohrenwend & Smith, 1962) that while dominance (political, normative and numerical) plays an important role in acculturation, it is not a necessary prerequisite for the process to occur.

Bogardus (1949) posited three types of acculturation. Primarily,

blind acculturation occurs when individuals of different cultures live in proximity and cultural patterns are adopted by change. The second classification, imposed acculturation, is the forcing of one culture's ideas and behavior patterns on another through cultural suppression. Lastly, democratic acculturation is seen to occur when one culture views other cultural patterns with respect. As such, no forced acculturation occurs. Bogardus thus views cultural pluralism as the simultaneous functioning of two or more cultural systems within the same segment of society. No definitive results concerning the actual effect of dominance upon the direction of acculturation have been delineated. On an individual level of analysis, Gillin and Raimy (1940) state that emphasis must be placed upon the interaction between culture and personality in order to gain a meaningful understanding of the acculturative process.

The question of the necessity of change in or acceptance of value structures arises in understanding acculturation. Linton (1940) noted that, in imposed acculturation, the adoption of cultural attitudes and values cannot be forced. While the elements of some dominant group may be adopted by a second cultural group, it has been noted that generally they are adapted to the group being acculturated. Devereux and Loeb (1943) delineated and analyzed aspects of resistances to cultural borrowing and lending.\* The desire to maintain cultural and/or ethnic identity and minimize contact with the dominant group were basic reasons given for a group's resistance to acculturation.\* It has also been noted that a group is able to adopt a means associated with the dominant culture while successfully resisting the adoption of the ends associated with a trait or complex.

As such, the group being acculturated is able to preserve existing goals and maintain cultural distance. Eaton (1952) further elaborated the above concept of antagonistic acculturation by introducing that of controlled acculturation. In this process one cultural group successfully accepts behavioral practices from another while integrating the same into its already existing value system. As such, autonomy and group identity are maintained with only slight modification of its degree.

It may be seen, then, that while the acculturative process is not contingent upon changes in or adoption of dominant group values, such value modifications are possible. This modification in values may facilitate acculturation but is not necessary for the process to occur.

#### Cross-Cultural Research in Needs, Values and Job Satisfaction

"What is valued in differing cultures affects motivation to work . . . as we move from one culture to another (is that) wide divergences appear in these kinds of values concerning work and the workplace" (Barrett & Bass, 1976). Concepts such as particularism or universalism, white-collar orientations, intrinsic or extrinsic reward systems, workplace- or home-centeredness, traditionalism or modernity and pragmatism or moralism are issues which present conflict and concern in studying work values and job satisfaction cross-culturally.

Orientations of institutionalized obligations to friendships or society describe the concepts of Particularism and Universalism. Particularism reflects an emphasized concern with interpersonal

relationships while Universalism downplays this aspect and stresses duties towards society (Parsons & Shils, 1959). In a study involving bank employees in Arizona, Zurcher (1968) found that Mexican workers were more particularistic than Mexican-Americans, and Mexican-Americans were significantly more particularistic than their Anglo-American counterparts. Universalism scores also increased as occupational status increased. Job satisfaction was found to correlate with higher universalism scores (Zurcher, Meadow & Zurcher, 1965).

In his investigations of attitude change and traditionalism, Dawson and colleagues (Dawson, Law, Leung and Whitney, 1971; Dawson, 1967, 1969) have found that cultures with strict socialization practices are actually more adaptive in resolving conflict which results from a traditionalism to modernism change. In addition, increased education relates positively to the acceptance of modernism to a point of reversal where semitradeitional points of view resume.

Within organizational settings differences in employee needs and expectations were found to vary according to occupational level (Doll & Gunderson, 1969). Friedlander's (1965) findings of systematic value structure variations among white-collar workers as a function of occupation and education further support the previous results. In other studies of work values it was again found that "blue-collar workers place significantly higher value upon security and upon peer-group relations while work that offers a sense of achievement, challenge, freedom and the use of one's abilities is of highly significant value to white-collar employees" (Friedlander, 1965). The greatest differences were noted between blue- and white-collar workers of high or middle status. As in the United States, this

white-collar orientation is seen to exist to a greater degree in Latin American countries. While individuals are being trained as skilled laborers, few care to join the blue-collar ranks (Whyte, 1963).

Herzberg's two-factor theory of job motivation stated that intrinsic job factors served as motivators and satisfiers while extrinsic factors contributed only to dissatisfaction with one's work. Work itself, then, would be viewed as a source of job satisfaction while interpersonal relationships with coworkers contributed only to dissatisfaction. Simonetti and Weitz (1972) conducted a study among employees in an American electronics firm situated in foreign countries and found that Herzberg's theory did not generalize across the three cultures investigated. While intrinsic factors contributed to job satisfaction, the relationship of extrinsic factors to job satisfaction was a function of country and occupational level. A study in India (Padaki & Dolke, 1970) further showed that individual personality and cultural variables interact and affect the degree of satisfaction one experiences. Several studies have shown that Herzberg's theory is not universal. Needs, values and motivators interplay differently in various countries resulting in varied levels of job satisfaction. "It is clear that work and the workplace mean quite different things to the Japanese, to the Mexican, and to the American today, just as it differed for the Inca, who saw it as a religious experience, and the Greek or Hebrew, who saw it as a burden" (Barrett & Bass, 1976).

Family life varies in degrees of importance among individuals of various cultures. Auclair (1968) found that family-centered

French Canadians experienced greater conflicting demands between work and family than did their English Canadian counterparts. Whitehill and Takezawa (1968) found that Japanese workers evaluate their work equal to personal life 57 percent of the time while only 22 percent of the Americans workers interviewed agree with such a statement.

Merton (1968) has explained the development of (and consequent differences in) value systems through his reference-group theory. A reference group is a group of persons whose norms an individual either accepts or rejects. This group serves as a frame of reference by which an individual can evaluate his own attitudes, feelings and behavior. Merton further demonstrated that, in social systems which provide an individual with many advancement opportunities an individual will evaluate himself against his peers. To individuals who highly value work itself, a job climate high in management thrust and low in intimacy will help maximize the individual's job satisfaction; individuals who do not value highly work itself find heightened satisfaction in job situations high in colleague morale (Friedlander & Margulies, 1969).

Davis (1946) once indicated that "underprivileged" workers lacked the desire for promotion or "achievement" and thus derived a frame of reference for value formation from coworkers and family members since they would have similar origins. Spielberg (1977), fortunately, has taken a more enlightened view of the differences between work values held by different groups. His Self-investment Theory of Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction tries to determine when a person evaluates himself as successful or unsuccessful in an

area of experience. For some people, work is not the major criterion by which self-worth is determined. If the assumption that self-esteem must be maintained is made, these people will fill that need in other ways. By the same token, status level implications and "benefits" are of less importance to these individuals. Within the Mexican cultural framework, self-esteem and the attribution of respect are determined by one's position within his group and the larger society, not by his achievements. An old man is respected because he is old, and a woman is respected because she is a woman. While respect in the United States is taken to mean admiration of another or the granting of an equal opportunity to another, in the Mexican culture it generally means to give and receive affection and protection from another person. The attribution of respect and status is determined largely by beliefs and traditions rather than by the accomplishments of that individual.

Spielberg (1977) noted that nonindustrial societies structurally have little division of labor, so high levels of self-investment (and consequently building and maintenance of self-esteem) are not likely to develop in the work setting. One's identity may well be enmeshed in complex familial and sex status structures. In agrarian societies, situations which bring attention to the self are less likely to occur. A threat to self-esteem due to pattern changes will result only if there is a division of labor and honors and recognition are given to individuals in relation to those divisions of labor. Such divisions and subsequent threats to self esteem will increase with industrialization. In addition, as industrialization increases there is also an increase in participation in extra-familial activities.

Historically, Mexican-Americans have been largely an agrarian-based family-centered population who have long suffered social and economic problems due to lower educational attainment, decreased income and larger family size. Since World War II, educational levels have increased somewhat and individuals have settled into nonagrarian industrial or governmental jobs. Moerk (1972) reported that the achievement orientation of Mexican-American students paralleled those of their Anglo-American counterparts, a marked change in the negative discrepancy noted earlier by various authors (Madsen, 1965; Ramirez, 1967, Rubel, 1966). In addition, attitudes towards marriage, children and birth control and financial, educational and occupational goals had changed from the traditional large family unit to ones of smaller size along with an increased aspiration toward socioeconomic success (Moerk, 1972). It is important to note that this general trend among Mexican-American students varied according to the location of the group.

Few studies investigating the needs, values and job satisfaction of Mexican-Americans have been conducted to date. The most noted finding of cross-cultural studies in general is that degrees of satisfaction with one's job increase as occupational status increases. Zurcher's findings (Zurcher, 1968; Zurcher, Meadow & Zurcher, 1965) in investigating Mexican, Mexican-American and Anglo-American bank employees' work orientations supported these findings.

A study by Slocum (1971) revealed that Mexican blue-collar workers expressed greater job satisfaction than their American counterparts at an identical plant in the United States. These findings were attributed largely to national differences in economic



opportunities and standards. No consideration was given to cultural differences in needs or values of the employees in both groups.

If one considers the research findings to date in light of Spielberg's Self-Investment Theory of Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction (1977), it could be anticipated that Mexican-Americans in non-industrialized areas would manifest lower self-investment in work than their Chicano counterparts in a highly industrialized area. Accordingly, self-esteem and other human growth needs of this first group would be satisfied by means other than intrinsic work factors. The aforementioned work orientation is one which closely parallels that of the Mexican national culture. Increased contact with the Anglo-American culture may result in a change in this value orientation, however, due to the acculturative process (Teske & Nelson, 1976).

Ramirez (1967) proposed that geographic location of upbringing may account for some differences in extent and speed of the acculturation process. A Mexican-American reared in the Southwest as compared with one reared in the Midwest would more closely identify with Mexican-American values because of his proximity to Mexico and because of his close association with people in his environment who would reinforce him for being "Mexican."

In light of the earlier information on dominant group exposure, value change and the acculturative process, it would thus appear that lessened degrees of acculturation into the Anglo culture will result from a) a Southwestern region place of origin, b) an extended period of Southwestern residence and c) an older age. Accordingly, greater degrees of acculturation into the Anglo culture will result from

a) a non-Southwestern place of origin, b) an extended period of non-Southwestern residence and c) a younger age. From these predicted patterns of acculturation, it may be further hypothesized that subjects with low degrees of acculturation into the Anglo culture will express a greater concern for the extrinsic aspects of work and report high overall job satisfaction. Conversely, subjects with high degrees of acculturation into the Anglo culture will express a greater concern for the intrinsic aspects of work and report increased job satisfaction as occupational levels increase.

This study investigates cross-cultural differences in needs, values and job satisfaction of Mexican-American and Anglo-American state government employees in the Midwest and Southwest regions of the United States. From the results of the scant research done to date and the theoretical tenets proposed by the various authors noted within this review, the following hypotheses are formulated.

#### Hypotheses

1. People holding high socioeconomic jobs will value more highly the intrinsic aspects of their job than employees of lower socioeconomic status; lower socioeconomic status workers, alternatively, will value more highly the extrinsic aspects of work.
2. There will be ethnic group differences in reported job satisfaction.
3. Due to factors of regional residence which are purported to affect the rate of acculturation into the Anglo culture, values expressed by Mexican-American employees in the Southwest will have greater orientations toward extrinsic work aspects than will the values expressed by their counterparts in the Midwest.
4. Increases of acculturation into the Anglo culture will be associated with decreases in job satisfaction.

Finally, the present study compares the Mexican-American and

Anglo-American groups with respect to demographic characteristics and affective reactions to jobs. For these additional variables, past research and theory provide no bases for hypotheses; consequently, the comparison is descriptive rather than experimental.

## METHODOLOGY

### Subjects

The final sample in this study consisted of 177 Southwest (New Mexico) and 162 Midwest (Michigan) state government employees drawn at random from computerized personnel record listings in each state. In the Southwest group, 83 respondents were Mexican-American and 94 were Anglo-Americans. Among the Midwest employees 59 were Mexican-American and 103 were Anglo-Americans. All subjects were employed by their respective state governments and were located in the Capital City areas and surrounding vicinities. Descriptive statistics of demographic information on the groups are presented in Table 1.

### Procedure

Initially, a total of 600 individuals were randomly selected from computerized personnel listings at both state capitals. The total sample was divided evenly into four groups consisting of Mexican-Americans and Anglo-Americans in New Mexico and Michigan.

Individuals were sent self-administered questionnaires and asked to complete and return them in pre-addressed manila envelopes which were provided. While the names of individuals were not requested on the questionnaires, a subject number was assigned to each person and placed on the back of the instrument sent them. Upon receipt of a completed questionnaire, the individual's subject number

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Sample by Group\*

Variable	NMMA** (n = 83)	NMAA (n = 94)	MIMA (n = 59)	MIAA (n = 103)
Population:				
Rural	16.9	6.4	17.0	19.4
1000-5000	9.6	5.3	6.8	10.7
5000-10,000	3.6	4.3	5.1	9.7
10,000-25,000	13.3	3.2	0.0	6.8
25,000-50,000	26.5	53.2	5.1	5.8
50,000-100,000	27.7	19.1	15.3	9.7
over 100,000	2.4	8.5	50.8	37.9
Residence: (years current)				
Under one year	2.4	11.7	6.8	10.7
1-5 years	9.8	39.4	33.9	26.2
5-10 years	6.0	22.3	16.9	18.4
10-20 years	14.5	17.0	22.0	18.4
over 20 years	67.5	9.6	20.3	26.2
Annual Salary:				
Under 3000	6.0	2.1	0.0	0.0
3000-6999	16.9	10.6	3.4	3.9
7000-9999	28.9	20.2	20.3	5.8
10,000-14,999	38.6	34.0	44.1	45.6
15,000-19,999	8.4	22.3	13.6	21.4
20,000-29,999	1.2	9.6	18.6	22.3
30,000-39,999	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.0
Education: (highest level)				
1-8	7.2	1.1	1.7	0.0
9-11	6.0	10.6	3.4	2.9
High School	28.9	33.0	28.8	25.2
Some college	39.8	12.8	39.0	33.0
Bachelor's degree	8.4	17.0	6.8	14.6
Some Graduate sch.	3.6	24.5	3.4	10.7
Graduate degree	6.0	1.1	15.3	13.6
Sex:				
Male	48.2	60.6	50.8	45.6
Female	57.8	38.3	49.2	54.4

Table 1. (Continued)

Variable	NMMA** (n = 83)	NMAA (n = 94)	MIMA (n = 59)	MIAA (n = 103)
Age: (in years)				
16-20	3.6	4.3	5.1	1.9
21-25	16.9	10.6	25.4	12.6
26-30	27.7	14.9	25.4	22.3
31-35	14.5	17.0	15.3	8.7
35-40	7.2	20.2	5.1	9.7
41-50	15.7	17.0	15.3	17.5
51-60	10.8	11.7	8.5	23.3
60 and older	3.6	4.3	0.0	3.9

\*Figures listed are percentages.

\*\*NMMA = NM Mexican-Americans; NMAA = NM Anglo-Americans;  
MIMA = Michigan Mexican-Americans; MIAA = Michigan Anglo-Americans.

was noted and removed from the mailing list to maintain confidentiality of responses. Two weeks after the initial mailing, copies of a second questionnaire identical to the first were sent to persons who had not yet returned the initial copy sent them. All distributions and collections of questionnaires were conducted through state government inter-departmental mailing systems under the direct sponsorship and supervision of the State Personnel Office in New Mexico and the Department of Civil Service in Michigan.

#### Description of the Measures

A paper-and-pencil questionnaire requesting information on demographic variables, needs, values, acculturation and job satisfaction was used in collecting data for this study. Each of these

measures is further described below. The full questionnaire package is contained in Appendix A.

### Demographic Information

Items regarding the respondent's place of birth, location where raised (Hometown), population of the community in which the respondent currently resides, the length of the respondent's current residence in the community, employment status, occupational title, monthly salary, race, age and sex were included in the questionnaire. A total of 10 items comprised this section and served as the initial items in the questionnaire.

Table 1 presents a breakdown of the subjects responding to some of the demographic items response categories. In the questionnaire Occupational Title was requested in the form of an open-ended question (Item 4, Appendix A). Data on this variable were coded for analytic use according to the categories of the Duncan Socioeconomic Index (Reiss, Duncan, Hatt and North, 1961).

### ERG Chronic Desire Measures

Thirteen items developed by Alderfer (1972) measuring Existence, Relatedness and Growth need desires were included in this study. For each item individuals scaled their responses along a 5-point Likert scale of desirability.

Alderfer (1972) obtained split-half reliability measures for the chronic desire scales by compiling two eleven-factor lists each containing six ERG Chronic needs. The first list contained different filler items from the second, and respondents were requested to rank and distribute the points. Spearman-Brown reliability estimates

based on the correlations between the rankings converted to "T" scores and point assignments from the two lists ranged from .63 to .88. Alderfer's Chronic Need Scales comprise Items 11-23 of the questionnaire used in this study.

### Survey of Work Values (SWV)

The Survey of Work Values (Wollack, Goodale, Wijting, and Smith, 1971) was constructed in an attempt to measure several areas of work values in general. A major difference between the SWV and previous scales of occupational and work value measurement is that the SWV is directed only towards the individual's general work values and is based upon the construct of the Protestant Work Ethic while others measure specific work values and aspects of job satisfaction.

Weber (1958) described the basic aspects of the Protestant Work Ethic as industriousness, individualism and asceticism. Industriousness, probably the most critical aspect within the philosophy, is the most widely used index of the concept in general. While the Protestant Ethic has been measured by indirect indices such as educational level, socioeconomic status and extent of industrialization, the SWV attempts to measure directly those work values in question.

Within the Protestant Ethic framework, work is valued as a means and an end. Not only is work a method for obtaining measurable reward but it is also a constructive use of one's time. The intrinsic aspects of work are therefore seen as central to the philosophy, for work is valued simply for the sake of work itself. Wollack and his colleagues (1971) speculated that an employee high in the Protestant



Ethic would have great involvement in his work, prefer work activity to being idle and derive personal satisfaction from competence on the job. Three dimensions in the scale measure intrinsic work aspects: pride in work, job involvement, and a preference for activity. Three subscales measuring attitudes towards earning, social status of the job, and upward striving measure tangible rewards which man values in relation to work.

The method of reallocation (Smith and Kendall, 1963) was used to delineate the six scales which comprise the SWV. Basically, the procedure consists of raters indicating, in their own terms, the types of behaviors which comprise the various levels of the characteristic being measured and the traits represented by the behaviors observed. Raters then submit examples of behavior of each characteristic being measured from which behavioral expectation categories are derived. After categories are developed from the raters' input, another set of judges will use those examples to describe extreme instances of the quality being measured in order to determine the discrimination value for each example. Items and definitions are then presented to another set of judges to be rated according to the desirability of the behavior illustrated. If the dispersion of judgments is large, items are eliminated. Items meeting the criteria are then assembled into scales with the mean scale positions assigned by each group of raters and intercorrelated to estimate scale reliabilities. Substantial rater agreement was noted using this procedure to delineate the SWV scales. Test-retest reliability coefficients ranged from .65 to .76. The coefficient alpha reliability indices for the scales were largely in the .60's. The authors account for

these slightly low indices on the bases of item spread along the continuum and factorial complexity of the subscales themselves. In addition, biographical factors and background variables such as race, occupational level and region of residence were related to work values held. Results supported findings from previous research which investigated work values and various background variables.

In general, the SWV is viewed as a useful research tool. In light of previous research findings, its use in this study may be helpful in delineating relationships between needs, acculturation level and job satisfaction.

#### Mexican-American Identity Scale (MAIS)

The Mexican-American Identity Scale (Teske & Nelson, 1973; Teske, Nelson & Villarreal, 1976) was developed as a part of a study investigating patterns of mobility among middle class Mexican-Americans in Texas. Three scales were originally developed to measure changes within a person's values and reference group along with the degree of acceptance by an out-group. The Mexican-American Identity Scale is comprised of attitudinal-type items which measure identification with the Mexican-American population. Based on the coefficient of internal consistency, the reliability index reported on the original scales was .83 (Teske & Nelson, 1973). Later a reliability index of .75 based upon the Kuder-Richardson formula for the coefficient of internal consistency was reported on a Huntsville, Texas sample (Teske, Nelson & Villarreal, 1976) in which a Spanish version of the questionnaire was used. Combined with the first sample, the overall reliability index was .81 (Teske, Nelson & Villarreal, 1976).

Early in the development and administration of the three scales of Mexican-American Identity, Teske Nelson and Villarreal (1976) realized that extreme limitations must be put on the data generated. A basic finding reinforced throughout the study was that "it is a grievous error to speak of the Mexican-American population. There are countless Mexican-American populations in the United States. Consequently, the quantity and quality of research necessary to establish valid generalizations concerning identity with specific Mexican-American populations would require vast numbers of research projects carried on for an infinite number of years" (Teske, Nelson & Villarreal, 1976, p. 1).

Along this line it is important to note that Hispanics in northern New Mexico look back upon a history of Spanish, Mexican, Indian and Anglo influence. Accordingly, they frequently refer to themselves as "Spanish Americans," "Hispanics," or members of "La Raza" ("The Race") (Gonzales, 1967). In light of the Teske, Nelson and Villarreal findings and other differences observed in various regions of New Mexico, the Mexican-American Identity Scale items used in this study have been modified to include parallel questions to the original items with the term "Spanish surnamed" used where applicable in lieu of "Mexican-American." The scale's original items are also included in the final version of the scale used in this study. In all, it consists of 20 items to be scored according to the system prescribed by Teske and Nelson (1973). This scale was administered only to the Mexican-American subjects in this study, resulting in a slightly longer questionnaire than those received by Anglo-American subjects. The scale comprises items 102 through 121 of the questionnaire used

in this study.

### Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

Research has shown that there are individual differences in the vocational needs of people. Research has also shown that there are individual differences in jobs with respect to the reinforcers available for the satisfaction of needs. It is, therefore, likely that people find different satisfactions in work, and to understand these differences, it is useful to measure satisfaction with the specific aspects of work and work environments" (Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist, 1967).

With this in mind, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was developed by Weiss et al. (1967) to account for individual differences in job satisfaction and its contributing factors.

The short form of the MSQ was used in this study. In general the Hoyt reliability coefficients for the short form MSQ were high. Indices from .84 to .91 were seen in various groups for the Intrinsic Satisfaction Scale. For the Extrinsic Satisfaction Scale reliability indices from .77 to .82 were noted. Coefficients of internal consistency on the General Satisfaction Scale ranged from .87 to .92. While no data were available on the stability of the short form over time (Weiss, et al., 1967), the authors noted that it could be inferred from test-retest correlations of the long form General Satisfaction Scale since both forms use the same scales. These reported indices ranged from .89 over a one-week interval to a .70 index over the period of a year.

Validity for the short-form MSQ is available from three basic sources: 1) inference from validity of the long form 2) studies of occupational group differences and 3) studies of the relationship between satisfactoriness as described in the Theory of Work Adjustment and Satisfaction itself (Weiss et al., 1967). While occupational

group differences were significant for each of the three aforementioned subscales, variability between them was not. These results supported findings of job satisfaction studies and paralleled those of the long-form MSQ concurrent validity measures.

Canonical and cross-correlations yielded the highest index of  $-.13$  between the Scale of Extrinsic Satisfaction and one of General Satisfactoriness. Such a correlation supports the contention that satisfaction and satisfactoriness are uncorrelated. The validity of the MSQ as a distinct measure of satisfaction was therefore indirectly supported.

Intercorrelations between the three short-form MSQ scales for the total group and seven occupational groups were also computed. A correlation of  $.60$  was found between Intrinsic and Extrinsic Satisfaction Scales for the total group. While these reported correlations are somewhat high, the authors felt that high scale reliabilities allowed for specific variance between the two Satisfaction Scales.

The significant results of the statistical tests of occupational group differences in means and variances on each of the three subscales lend strong support for the concurrent validity of the short-form MSQ. The canonical and cross-correlations between the short-form MSQ and scales of satisfactoriness support the instrument's construct validity.

In this study the short-form MSQ comprised items 81 through 100 of the questionnaire administered.

### Data Analyses

The hypotheses in this thesis were tested through the use of one-way analyses of variance. These analyses tested the equality of group means on the variables under investigation. The univariate F ratios derived in the analyses were used to determine the significance of the differences between these group means.

Newman-Keuls stepwise comparisons of group means were then conducted on those variables seen to have significant difference according to the univariate analyses. The Newman-Keuls test provides an adjustment of the size of the critical region according to the means spanned in the comparisons (Keppel, 1973). Groups with adjacent or distant means can thus be compared, with the critical region adjusted accordingly. Since the groups in this study were of unequal sizes, the harmonic mean ( $\tilde{s}$ ) was utilized in the comparisons. The appropriate average sample size, the harmonic mean, is derived by dividing the total number of treatment means,  $a$ , by the sum of the reciprocals of the various sample sizes  $s_i$ :

$$\tilde{s} = \frac{a}{\left(\frac{1}{s_1}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{s_2}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{s_i}\right)} = \frac{a}{\sum \left(\frac{1}{s_i}\right)}$$

In this study, for example, a harmonic mean based upon the total sample would be computed as follows:

$$\tilde{s} = \frac{4}{\left(\frac{1}{83}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{94}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{59}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{103}\right)} = \frac{4}{.0492} = 81.30$$

The Newman-Keuls formula adjusted to accomodate unequal sample sizes and used in this study takes the general form:

$$\overline{CR}_{N-K} = q(r, df_{S/A}) \sqrt{\frac{MS_{S/A}}{\tilde{s}}}$$

The critical range ( $\overline{CR}_{N-K}$ ) for each comparison is seen to be determined by calculating the quantity under the radical and multiplying it by the q values for the degrees of freedom error which are found in tables of the critical values of the studentized range statistics. After these computations have been completed, a row and column step-wise procedure comparing different pairs of group means is conducted with consideration of the appropriate Critical Range to determine where significant differences between group means exist. For a detailed demonstration of the general Newman-Keuls computations and procedures the reader is referred to Keppel (1973).

Discriminant analyses were also employed in this study as a multivariate test of the difference among groups. In discriminant analysis groups are defined a priori and a set of discriminating variables are selected which measure characteristics on which the groups are expected to differ. By weighting and linearly combining these variables, groups are forced to be as statistically distinct as possible. Through this analysis one is able to "discriminate" or differentiate between groups on the bases of the discriminant functions derived (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner & Bent, 1975).

"These discriminant functions are of the form:

$$D_i = d_{i1}Z_1 + d_{i2}Z_2 + d_{ip}Z_p$$

where  $D_i$  is the score on discriminant function i, the d's are weighting coefficients, and the Z's are the standardized values of the p discriminating variables used in the analysis" (Nie et al., 1975). The primary test for the analytic aspect of this technique is the degree to which the variables selected actually discriminate among groups when combined into discriminant functions.

Within the analysis the maximum number of discriminant functions which can be derived is one less than the total number of groups or equal to the number of discriminating variables employed in the analysis, whichever is less. Functions are derived through variable weightings and linear combinations such that the separation of groups is maximized. Accordingly, discriminant scores for cases within a group would ideally be fairly similar while varying considerably from those of another group (Nie et al., 1975). Since there were four groups in this study it could be possible to significantly discriminate among groups along three orthogonal dimensions.

Within the discriminant analysis, discriminant coefficients for the variables comprising the discriminant function are determined. The coefficients indicate the magnitude of the contribution made by each variable to the functions derived. The sign of the index denotes whether positive or negative contributions are being made by the coefficients. The coefficients are used as weights to be combined with their appropriate variables to compute discriminant scores. The resultant score places the case on the continuum which represents the function. The group centroids represent the mean discriminant scores for each group under consideration. In addition, the relative abilities of each function to discriminate among groups is represented by the eigenvalues and canonical correlations reported. The summation of the eigenvalues represents the amount of total variance existing in the discriminating variables. A single eigenvalue may be regarded as the percentage of the sums of all eigenvalues, thus reflecting the importance of the particular function under consideration.

Discriminant analysis is also useful in serving as a technique



for classification. Once the discriminant functions are derived successfully and used with cases of known membership, classification functions may be computed which enable new cases with unknown membership to be classified. If the variables employed are successful discriminators it is possible to predict group membership of other individuals not yet classified. The percent of correctly classified cases is determined and generally compared with the percent-correct classification figure which would have resulted from random assignment of individuals to groups. This chance percent figure is determined by the formula:

$$\text{Chance rate} = \left(\frac{n_1}{N}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{n_2}{N}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{n_i}{N}\right)^2 \times 100$$

The level of chance based on the entire sample in this study would be:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Chance rate} &= \left(\frac{83}{339}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{94}{339}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{59}{339}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{103}{339}\right)^2 \times 100 \\ &= .2591 \times 100 \\ &= 25.91\% \end{aligned}$$

In this study, the original set of group cases were classified according to the discriminant variables employed to check the adequacy of the discriminant functions derived. Accordingly, the extent to which the discriminant functions derived in this study were actually able to successfully predict group membership could be determined. These classification results are optimistic, however, since the same cases were used to derive the classification function and to check its accuracy.

While the overview of discriminant analysis presented herein is brief and general, it should be noted that the analysis is potentially

very useful. One obvious possibility in applied psychology is the assigning of individuals to jobs or other relevant groups for membership. More important, the analysis is helpful in understanding differences among groups. Within this study, then, the one-way analysis of variance provides tests of the specific a priori hypotheses, the Newman-Keuls provides a stepwise comparison of the group means and the discriminant analysis provides an overall multivariate test of the extent to which demographic information, needs, values, and job satisfaction, and their combination discriminate among the four groups of people in the study.

## RESULTS

### Scale Reliabilities Check

At the outset of the analyses a check on the scales was run to insure that the reliability levels were acceptable. Table 2 presents the scale means, standard deviations and reliabilities based upon the total sample. The three Alderfer Existence, Relatedness and Growth need scales (ERGE, ERGR and ERGG) reveal reliabilities of .73, .61 and .74, respectively. Indices ranging from .68 to .43 were computed for the Survey of Work Values (SWV) Scale reliabilities. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was shown to have high reliability with an index of .88. The Mexican-American Identity Scale (MAIS) was administered only to Chicanos in this study, with a computed reliability index of .88.

### Hypothesis Testing

The means and standard deviations for all variables are shown in Table 2. The data are presented according to ethnic and regional groupings with indices on the total sample also included. Correlations of all variables in the study based upon data from the total sample may be seen in Table 3. Table 4 presents the correlations of all variables based upon the two Mexican-American groups only.

One-way analyses of variance were initially employed to test the hypotheses in this study. Since these analyses only indicated

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations and Reliabilities of Variables

Variable	NMAA* (n = 63)			NMAA (n = 66)			MIMA (n = 41)			MIAA (n = 74)			Total (n = 244)			Reliability Index
	$\bar{X}$	SD		$\bar{X}$	SD		$\bar{X}$	SD		$\bar{X}$	SD		$\bar{X}$	SD		
Occupation	50.04	17.98		60.86	16.67		53.09	19.86		58.52	13.67		56.05	17.23		
Population	5.25	1.88		6.03	1.34		6.17	2.51		5.89	2.44		5.81	2.08		
Residence	4.28	1.15		2.83	1.17		3.14	1.29		3.18	1.33		3.36	1.35		
Hrs. Worked	3.19	.39		3.37	.48		3.17	.54		3.14	.48		3.22	.48		
Education	2.84	1.27		4.16	1.43		3.34	1.44		3.55	1.43		3.50	1.46		
Age	3.14	1.74		3.92	1.68		2.70	1.64		3.66	1.87		3.43	1.79		
ERGE**	2.82	2.37		3.18	1.68		2.85	2.38		2.85	1.67		2.93	2.00		.72
ERGE	2.79	1.97		3.46	1.63		3.36	2.14		3.21	1.43		3.20	1.77		.61
ERGE	3.34	2.32		3.24	1.81		3.64	3.55		3.45	2.19		3.40	2.40		.74
SWVSS	24.63	5.14		23.39	4.48		25.21	5.49		24.81	5.18		24.45	5.14		.55
SWVAP	39.96	4.66		40.71	3.79		39.80	4.13		40.90	3.21		40.42	3.94		.48
SWVJI	41.26	5.82		41.86	3.61		41.60	4.47		41.83	4.04		41.65	4.51		.68
SWVUS	36.23	4.64		34.48	3.00		36.39	3.68		35.45	4.26		35.55	4.02		.42
SWVAE	27.65	5.96		24.92	4.51		27.68	5.19		24.58	4.46		25.98	5.20		.63
SWVPW	47.15	5.40		46.19	4.25		46.29	4.12		46.63	3.51		46.59	4.35		.65
MSQ	43.68	9.94		41.72	8.00		49.14	11.14		45.52	10.94		44.63	10.24		.88
MAIS (n = 97)	52.78	11.16		-	-		27.95	11.92		-	-		50.79	11.67		.88

\*NMAA = New Mexico Mexican-Americans; NMAA = New Mexico Anglo-Americans; MIMA = Michigan Mexican-Americans; MIAA = Michigan Anglo-Americans.

\*\*ERGE = ERG Theory Existence Needs; ERGR = ERG Theory Relatedness Needs; ERGG = ERG Theory Growth Needs; SWVSS = SWV Social Status; SWVAP = SWV Activity Preference; SWVJI = SWV Job Involvement; SWVUS = SWV Upward Striving; SWVAE = SWV Attitude Towards Earnings; SWVPW = SWV Pride in Work; MSQ = Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire; MAIS = Mexican-American Identity Scale.

Table 3. Pearson Correlations: Total Sample

	OCCUP	POP	RESID	HMTWN	HRSWKD	ANSAL	EDUCAT	RACE	SEX	AGE
Occupation	1.000	.0894	-.1305	-.1642*	.1029	.5319	.4926	-.2069	-.0414	.1256
Population		1.0000	.1648	-.0201	-.0406	.0367	.1289	-.0416	.1189	-.0083
Residence			1.0000	.2630	-.1621	-.1759	-.3089	.3077	.0854	.2485
Hometown				1.0000	.0749	-.3218	-.1382	.3494	.0108	-.0980
Hrs Worked					1.0000	.3067	.1926	-.1017	-.1929	.0309
Annual Salary						1.0000	.4993	-.2211	-.2725	.2931
Education							1.0000	-.1897	-.3034	.0923
Race								1.0000	.0038	-.1843
Sex									1.0000	-.1190
Age										1.0000
ERGE										
ERGR										
ERGG										
SWVSS										
SWVAP										
SWVJI										
SWVUS										
SWVAE										
SWVPW										
MSQ										

\* $p < .001$  for positive or negative correlations with coefficients above .1642.

$p < .01$  for positive or negative correlations with coefficients above .1255.

$p < .05$  for positive or negative correlations with coefficients above .0908.



Table 4. Pearson Correlations: Mexican-American Sample

	OCCUP	POP	RESID	HMTWN	HRSWKD	ANSAL	EDUCAT	RACE	SEX	AGE	ERGE
Occupation	1.000	-.0482	-.1290	-.0498	.0937	.5391*	.5115	.1229	.0334	-.0389	.0997
Population		1.0000	.0891	-.1301	-.0375	-.0234	.0284	-.1507	.1425	-.0930	-.0021
Residence			1.0000	.4489	-.0996	-.2663	-.3121	.1174	.0672	.1252	-.0779
Hometown				1.0000	.0181	-.3194	-.1339	.0812	.0897	.1204	-.0728
Hrswkd					1.0000	.2706	.1987	-.1249	-.1284	.0192	-.0615
An. Salary						1.0000	.5590	.0341	-.2715	.1882	.0362
Education							1.0000	.0387	-.1320	-.0064	.0627
Race								1.0000	-.0290	-.0500	.0256
Sex									1.0000	-.0689	.0435
Age										1.0000	.1104
ERGE											1.0000
ERGR											
ERGG											
SWVSS											
SWVAP											
SWVJI											
SWVUS											
SWVAE											
SWVPL'											
MSQ											
MAIS											

\* $p < .001$  for positive or negative correlations with coefficients above .2705.

$p < .01$  for positive or negative correlations with coefficients above .1881.

$p < .05$  for positive or negative correlations with coefficients above .1338.

Table 4. (Continued)

[illegible]



that significant differences existed, Newman-Keuls stepwise comparisons of group means were conducted to note where these differences occurred specifically. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 5.

Hypothesis 1 states that employees of higher socioeconomic status will value more highly the intrinsic aspects of their jobs than employees of lower socioeconomic status. Alternatively, lower socioeconomic status workers will value more highly the extrinsic aspects of work. The univariate analyses indicate that significant differences exist between the groups in occupation and the Attitude Towards Earnings and Upward Striving extrinsic work values. A Newman-Keuls stepwise comparison of group means shows that both Anglo-American groups hold significantly higher socioeconomic positions than either of the two Mexican-American groups,  $p < .05$ . In the extrinsic work value Attitude Towards Earnings, both Mexican-American groups are seen to be significantly higher than both Anglo-American groups,  $p < .05$ . The Upward Striving extrinsic work value for the Mexican-American group from New Mexico is also significantly higher than for the Anglo-American group from that same area  $p < .05$ . While no significant differences are noted between groups on the intrinsic work values, it may be seen that the lower socioeconomic status level employees do, in fact, value significantly more highly the extrinsic aspects of work than do the higher status workers. Hypothesis 1 is partially supported.

Hypothesis 2 states that reported job satisfaction will be seen to differ among ethnic groups. An analysis of covariance was conducted with the Occupation variable (socioeconomic status) as a covariate

Table 5. Univariate Analyses and Newman-Keuls Comparison of Group Means

Variable	Univariate Analysis			Newman-Keuls Comparison of Means*		
	F	df	Alpha	Means Compared	$\overline{CR}_{N-K}$	Alpha
Length of current Residence	16.56	(3,240)	.001	(1,2)	.5535	.05
				(1,4)	.5074	.05
				(1,3)	.4224	.05
Age	5.05	(3,240)	.01	(2,3)	.8149	.05
				(2,4)	.7430	.05
				(2,1)	.7430	.05
Education	9.91	(3,240)	.001	(2,1)	.6370	.05
				(4,1)	.5809	.05
				(2,3)	.5809	.05
				(3,1)	.4861	.05
				(2,4)	.4861	.05
Occupation	5.45	(3,240)	.001	(2,1)	7.768	.05
				(2,4)	7.083	.05
				(2,3)	7.083	.05
				(4,3)	5.927	.05
Hours Worked	3.21	(3,240)	.05	(2,3)	.2087	.05
				(2,4)	.1903	.05
				(2,1)	.1592	.05
SWVAE	6.76	(3,240)	.001	(1,4)	2.2506	.05
				(3,4)	1.9406	.05
				(1,2)	1.9406	.05
				(3,2)	1.7174	.05
MSQ	5.02	(3,240)	.01	(3,2)	4.4720	.05
				(3,1)	3.8560	.05

\*Group 1 = New Mexico Mexican-Americans; Group 2 = New Mexico Anglo-Americans; Group 3 = Michigan Mexican-Americans; Group 4 = Michigan Anglo-Americans.

\*\*Group with significantly larger mean listed first; comparison group listed second.

to control for socioeconomic level in examining the four groups along the Job Satisfaction dimension. The analysis indicated a main effect for the ethnic group membership variable  $p < .001$ . A Newman-Keuls comparison of group means revealed that the Mexican-Americans from Michigan reported significantly higher Job Satisfaction than both groups from New Mexico,  $p < .05$ . Hypothesis 2 is partially supported.

Hypothesis 3 states that due to factors of regional residence which are purported to affect the rate of acculturation into the Anglo culture, values expressed by Mexican-American employees in the Southwest will have greater orientations toward extrinsic work aspects than will the values expressed by their counterparts in the Midwest. The univariate analysis revealed no significant difference between Mexican-American groups on the acculturation dimension. No significant differences were noted between the two groups on work value orientations, either. Hypothesis 3 is not supported.

Hypothesis 4 states that increases in acculturation into the Anglo culture will be associated with decreases in job satisfaction. The correlation between reported job satisfaction and acculturation (MAIS) is .0691. The correlation is not significant, therefore Hypothesis 4 is not supported.

#### Discriminant Analysis

While the univariate analyses and Newman-Keuls comparisons described above indicate there are significant differences among groups, many of these variables are highly correlated. The advantage of the discriminant analysis is that it provides a single overall multivariate

test of the differences among groups. In addition, it allows one to check the capability of the independent variables to correctly identify group membership.

Since the groups are defined a priori, variables such as subject identification and ethnic group membership were not included in the set of discriminating variables since they were criterion variables for the original group membership identification. Since Occupation, Annual Salary and Hometown variables were significantly correlated with ethnic group membership, they were also excluded from the discriminant analyses. Two basic types of variables were employed in the analyses: demographics and motivational factors. Accordingly, a discriminant analysis was performed for each set of variables, then in combination. Since MAIS scores were available for the Mexican-American groups only, separate discriminant analyses were conducted for these two groups.

#### Demographic Variables: Total Sample

The results of the discriminant analysis on the demographic variables of the entire sample are presented in Table 6. In the first of the three significant demographic functions derived,  $\chi^2(21) = 138.71$ ,  $p < .01$ , the Length of Current Residence variable has the highest loading with a standardized discriminant function coefficient of .9933. The group centroids indicate that the Mexican-Americans from New Mexico have lived the longest in their place of current residence while the New Mexico Anglo-Americans have lived there the shortest time. The Population of Current Residence variable had the highest loading ( $d = .74501$ ) on the second significant discriminant

Table 6. Discriminant Analysis of Demographic Data: Total Sample

Function 1		Function 2		Function 3	
Variables	Standardized Discrim. Function Coefficients	Variables	Standardized Discrim. Function Coefficients	Variables	Standardized Discrim. Function Coefficients
Occupation	-.18918	Occupation	.35683	Occupation	.37062
Population	-.30907	Population	-.74501	Population	.00844
Residence	.99334	Residence	.32170	Residence	-.34161
Hrs Worked	-.03546	Hrs worked	.22251	Hrs Worked	-.88694
Education	-.24869	Education	.17567	Education	-.47824
Sex	-.07400	Sex	.30588	Sex	.00422
Age	-.40970	Age	.50570	Age	.29427
Group Centroids		Group Centroids		Group Centroids	
Group No.		Group No.		Group No.	
1*	1.00174	1	.09929	1	-.13098
2	-.64586	2	.09653	2	-.24012
3	-.02485	3	-.62674	3	.05905
4	-.15026	4	.17674	4	.29690
$\chi^2 = 138.71$ ; df = 21, $p < .001$ Eigenvalue = .37004 Canonical r = .51971		$\chi^2 = 39.69$ ; df = 12; $p < .001$ Eigenvalue = .08167 Canonical r = .04887		$\chi^2 = 15.006$ ; df = 5, $p < .01$ Eigenvalue = .04887 Canonical r = .21586	

Table 6. (Continued)

Prediction Results					
Actual Group	No. of Cases	Predicted Group Membership			
		1	2	3	4
1	83	60	6	1	16
2	94	7	53	5	29
3	59	17	15	14	13
4	103	14	31	12	45
% Correctly Classified = 51.0; $\chi^2 = 122.52$					

\*1 = New Mexico Mexican-Americans; 2 = New Mexico Anglo-Americans; 3 = Michigan Mexican-Americans; 4 = Michigan Anglo-Americans.

function derived,  $\chi^2(12) = 39.69$ ,  $p < .01$ . A positive loading was noted for the Age variable ( $d = .50570$ ) on the same function. The group centroids show that the highest population and the lowest average age were reported by the Mexican-Americans from Michigan. The third significant discriminant function derived,  $\chi^2(5) = 15.006$ ,  $p < .01$ , revealed the highest loading on the Number of Hours Worked variable ( $d = -.88694$ ). The second highest loading, Level of Education, was also negative ( $d = -.47824$ ). The group centroids indicate that the Anglo-Americans from New Mexico work the greatest average number of hours and have the highest mean education of all groups in the study. All demographic variables included in this discriminant analysis were retained as contributors to the three functions derived.

All three functions were able to discriminate significantly between groups with the 51% prediction results greater than the 25.91% expected rate of chance.

#### Motivational Variables: Total Sample

Table 7 illustrates the variables which contributed to the two significant discriminant functions derived from the motivational variable set based on the total sample. The first significant discriminant function,  $\chi^2(30) = 69.135$ ,  $p < .05$ , indicated a high negative loading on the Activity Preference Work Value ( $d = -.45002$ ). The extrinsic Upward Striving Work Value was seen to also have a positive loading ( $d = .42506$ ). The group centroids reveal that the Mexican-American employees from Michigan rate the Upward Striving work value highest and the Activity Preference value lowest among all groups. The second significant discriminant function derived,  $\chi^2(18) = 31.854$ ,  $p < .05$ , has a very high positive loading on the Job Satisfaction variable ( $d = .76881$ ). The Attitude Towards Earnings value was seen to contribute negatively to this discriminant function ( $d = -.71313$ ). The group centroids indicate that the Midwestern Anglo-American group showed a low Attitude Towards Earnings work value and a high mean level of job satisfaction. The Midwestern Chicano group is seen to place highest on both these variables. The 41.9% correct prediction results are slightly higher than the 25.91% chance rate expected.

#### Demographic and Motivational Variables: Total Sample

The two significant discriminant functions shown in Table 8 were derived when demographic and motivational variables were

Table 7. Discriminant Analysis of Motivational Data: Total Sample

Variables	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients
ERGE	-.25917
ERGR	-.38924
ERGG	.36886
SWVSS	.20772
SWVAP	-.45002
SWVJI	-.17085
SWVUS	.42506
SWVAE	.42314
SWVPW	.42415
MSQ	.37580

<u>Group Centroids</u>	
Group No.	
1*	.32901
2	-.55632
3	.51399
4	-.10874

$\chi^2 = 69.135$ ,  $df = 30$ ,  $p < .001$   
Eigenvalue = .16082  
Canonical r = .09688

<u>Prediction Results</u>					
Actual Group	No. of Cases	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>			
		1	2	3	4
1	83	40	17	4	22
2	94	23	38	4	29
3	59	14	12	13	20
4	103	23	21	8	51

% Correctly Classified = 41.9,  $\chi^2 = 51.564$

\*1 = New Mexico Mexican-Americans; 2 = New Mexico Anglo-Americans;  
 3 = Michigan Mexican-Americans; 4 = Michigan Anglo-Americans.



Table 8. Discriminant Analysis of Demographic and Motivational Data:  
Total Sample

<u>Function 1</u>		<u>Function 2</u>	
Variables	Standardized Discrim. Function Coefficients	Variables	Standardized Discrim. Function Coefficients
Residence	.87811	Residence	-.37962
Age	-.47452	Age	-.13993
Population	-.40513	Population	.21205
Education	-.08788	Education	-.28643
Occupation	-.14625	Occupation	.12008
Hrs Worked	.06360	Hrs Worked	-.29167
Sex	.14245	Sex	.18382
ERGE	.03711	ERGE	-.35169
ERGR	-.25112	ERGR	-.03930
ERGG	.12473	ERGG	.28854
SWVSS	.14122	SWVSS	.36289
SWVAP	-.23646	SWVAP	.06172
SWVJI	-.25027	SWVJI	.22724
SWVUS	.22718	SWVUS	.17888
SWVAE	.11428	SWVAE	-.27741
SWVPW	.26071	SWVPW	-.21398
MSQ	.12217	MSQ	.69765
<u>Group Centroids</u>		<u>Group Centroids</u>	
Group No.		Group No.	
1*	1.09361	1	-.29783
2	-.86114	2	-.40514
3	.15960	3	.53015
4	-.25143	4	.32117
$\chi^2 = 153.783$ , $df = 51$ , $p < .001$		$\chi^2 = 53.136$ , $df = 32$ , $p < .01$	
Eigenvalue = .54172		Eigenvalue = .14824	
Canonical r = .59277		Canonical r = .35931	

Table 8. (Continued)

Actual Group	No. of Cases	<u>Prediction Results</u>			
		<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>			
		1	2	3	4
1*	83	56	9	2	16
2	94	9	52	5	28
3	59	15	9	18	17
4	103	12	25	8	58
% Correctly Classified = 54.3, $\chi^2 = 154.974$					

\*1 = New Mexico Mexican-Americans; 2 = New Mexico Anglo-Americans; 3 = Michigan Mexican-Americans; 4 = Michigan Anglo-Americans.

analyzed in combination based upon the entire sample. The Length of Current Residence variable received the highest loading on the first significant discriminant function,  $\chi^2(51) = 153.78$ ,  $p < .05$ , with a standardized discriminant function coefficient of .87811. The group centroids indicate that the Southwestern Chicano group has resided in their place of current residence longest with the Anglo-American employees in that same area having lived there the shortest time. The second significant discriminant function derived,  $\chi^2(32) = 53.135$ ,  $p < .05$ , weighed most highly upon the Job Satisfaction variable, with a standardized coefficient of .69765. From the group centroids, it may be seen that the Mexican-American group from Michigan reported the highest level of job satisfaction and the Anglo-American group from New Mexico the lowest. In the second stage of the analysis, the 54.3% prediction results are seen to be greater than the expected

25.91% rate of chance.

In comparing the three discriminant analyses conducted on the total sample, it may be seen that several variables have smaller standardized discriminant function coefficients when the demographic and motivational variables were analyzed in combination. When these variable sets were analyzed separately, several variables were seen to contribute to the discriminant functions derived that were not as highly loaded when the variable sets were analyzed together. In the discriminant analysis conducted on motivational variables only, for example, some work values were seen to contribute to the discriminant function with a moderate loading which decreased when the demographic and motivational variable sets were analyzed in combination. Throughout the analyses, the Length of Current Residence and Job Satisfaction variables were seen to contribute most highly to the explanation of variance and the prediction of group membership in the study. In addition, the prediction results in all three analyses were seen to be greater than the expected rate of chance.

#### Demographic Variables: Mexican-American Groups

Table 9 presents the results of the discriminant analysis conducted on the demographic variables for the Mexican-American groups. One significant discriminant function was derived,  $\chi^2(6) = 46.88$ ,  $p < .05$ , with the highest loading on the Length of Current Residence Variable ( $d = .98385$ ). The Population of Area where Currently Residing variable reported a standardized discriminant function coefficient of .69807. The group centroids indicate that the Mexican-American group from New Mexico has lived longer in a less densely

Table 9. Discriminant Analysis of Demographic Data: Mexican-American Sample

Variables	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients
Population	.69807
Residence	-.98385
Hrs Worked	-.28452
Education	.12146
Sex	-.17889
Age	-.07093

<u>Group Centroids</u>	
Group No.	
1*	-.56429
2	.79418
$\chi^2 = 46.88$ ; $df = 6$ ; $p < .001$ Eigenvalue = .45515 Canonical $r = .55927$	

<u>Prediction Results</u>			
Actual Group	No. of Cases	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>	
		1	2
1	83	67	16
2	59	24	35
% Correctly Classified = 71.8, $\chi^2 = 27.070$			

\*1 = New Mexico Mexican-Americans; 2 = Michigan Mexican-Americans

populated area than the Chicano group from Michigan. The prediction results reported a rate of correct classification at 71.8%, higher than the 51.41% expected level of chance for these two groups.

#### Motivational Variables: Mexican-American Groups

A discriminant analysis was conducted upon all motivational variables including the Acculturation variable (MAIS) for the Mexican-American groups. Table 10 illustrates that one significant discriminant function was derived,  $\chi^2(10) = 18.235$ ,  $p < .05$ . The prime variable in explaining variance is the Job Satisfaction Variable, with a standardized discriminant function coefficient of  $-.79491$ . The acculturation variable, as measured by the Mexican-American Identity Scale (MAIS), contributed positively with a discriminant function coefficient of  $.65820$ . The group centroids indicate that the Mexican-American group from Michigan report a higher degree of Mexican-American Identity (or a lesser degree of Anglo acculturation) and greater job satisfaction than the Chicano group from New Mexico. The 66.2% rate of correct classifications in the analysis exceeded the 51.41% rate of chance expected.

#### Demographic and Motivational Variables: Mexican-American Groups

Table 11 indicates that one significant discriminant function,  $\chi^2(14) = 36.3947$ , was derived when demographic and motivational variables were both included in a discriminant analysis. The Length of Current Residence variable received the highest loading, with a standardized discriminant function coefficient of  $.81877$ . The second greatest loading was noted on the demographic Population variable,

Table 10. Discriminant Analysis of Motivational Data: Mexican-American Sample

Variables		Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	
	ERGE		.15613
	ERGR		-.44456
	ERGG		.05472
	SWVSS		-.03295
	SWVAP		-.11747
	SWVJI		-.25915
	SWVUS		-.09944
	SWVPW		.39381
	MSQ		-.79491
	MAIS		.65820
<u>Group Centroids</u>			
Group No.			
	1*		.39289
	2		-.55987
$\chi^2 = 18.23531$ , df = 10, $p < .05$ Eigenvalue = .22460 Canonical $r = .42826$			
<u>Prediction Results</u>			
Actual Group Membership	No. of Cases	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>	
		1	2
1	83	69	14
2	59	34	25
% Correctly Classified = 66.2; $\chi^2 = 14.901$			

\*1 = New Mexico Mexican-Americans; 2 - Michigan Mexican-Americans.

Table 11. Discriminant Analysis of Demographic and Motivational  
Data: Mexican-American Sample

Variables		Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	
Population		-.50497	
Residence		.81877	
Hrs Worked		.29169	
Sex		.25792	
Age		.20815	
ERGE		.31428	
ERGR		-.47481	
ERGG		-.07436	
SWVSS		.12593	
SWVJI		-.21608	
SWVUS		-.18320	
SWVPW		.07007	
MSQ		-.36332	
MAIS		.26089	
<u>Group Centroids</u>			
Group No.			
1*		.63300	
2		-.88962	
$\chi^2 = 36.394$ , $df = 14$ , $p < .001$			
Eigenvalue = .57607			
Canonical $r = .60457$			
<u>Prediction Results</u>			
Actual Group Membership	No. of Cases	Predicted Group Membership	
		1	2
1	83	68	15
2	59	21	38
% Correctly Classified = 74.6; $\chi^2 = 34.507$			

\*1 = New Mexico Mexican-Americans; 2 = Michigan Mexican-Americans

with a coefficient of  $-.50497$ . The Relatedness need variable had a loading of  $-.47481$ . The group centroids indicate that the Mexican-American group from Michigan currently resides and has resided a shorter time in a more densely-populated area and report higher Relatedness needs than the group of Mexican-Americans from New Mexico. The 74.6% prediction results indicate a higher classification success rate than the 51.41% chance rate expected.

In comparing the three discriminant analyses conducted on the data from the Mexican-American groups, it may be seen that the demographic variable Length of Current Residence is the best explainer of variance and predictor of group membership for these two groups. When demographic and motivational variables were analyzed in combination, the Relatedness need variable was seen to contribute more strongly than it did in the analysis of motivational variables only. Alternatively, the contributions of the Job Satisfaction and Acculturation variables were seen to decrease when demographic and motivational variables were analyzed in combination. In addition, motivational variables added nothing to the prediction afforded by demographic variables.



## DISCUSSION

This study was designed to investigate differences in needs, work values, acculturation and job satisfaction between two ethnic groups in New Mexico and Michigan. The results of this study indicate that, as hypothesized, the lower socioeconomic groups of employees value significantly more highly the extrinsic work values concerning wages and upward striving. These results support similar findings in studies investigating work values among blue- and white-collar workers in various settings (Centers & Bugental, 1966; Friedlander, 1965; Harris & Locke, 1974; Pennings, 1970). While some theoreticians would argue that lower status individuals value more highly extrinsic work aspects because their lower-order needs are not fulfilled (Maslow, 1954), others would state that these individuals derive their values from their social class and groups with which they identify (Form & Geschwender, 1962; Inkeles, 1960; Merton & Rossi, 1949). Still, others would state that lower-class workers do not share the belief in opportunities for upward mobility that white-collar workers do (Center, 1948; Knupfer, 1947), consequently they derive satisfactions from the present rather than expectations of the future (Davis, 1946).

In Herzberg's framework (1966) hygiene factors such as pay and fringe benefits serve as dissatisfiers and motivators such as esteem and recognition serve as satisfiers. Studies of Black

employees in various settings in the United States (O'Reilly & Roberts, 1973; Bloom & Barry, 1967; Champagne & King, 1967) reveal that these employees generally hold lower-status work positions and also report lower levels of job satisfaction. According to Herzberg's theory and previous research conducted one would expect that the lower-status employees in this study, the Mexican-American groups, would report low levels of job satisfaction. Instead, the Mexican-Americans from Michigan reported the highest level of job satisfaction among all groups. Generally it has been noted (Haggstrom, 1963; O'Reilly & Roberts, 1973) that the frame of reference which an individual brings to a work situation will be a large determinant of the satisfaction which will be derived from it. "Hence, should a subculture in the United States provide its members with a different frame of reference from the majority viewpoint, it is anticipated that differences will be reflected in worker's perceptions of job satisfaction" (O'Reilly & Roberts, 1973, p. 295). In Spielberg's formulation of a theory of Self-Investment in Work it is stated that the values used to maintain self-esteem are the major values around which an individual's systematic orientation is organized. According to Spielberg, work may have little or nothing to do with what an individual thinks of himself. Self-esteem needs may be met in other ways. For many Mexican-Americans, self-esteem is derived from one's familial and interpersonal relationships. The results of this study indicate that, perhaps, this difference in orientation may account somewhat for the reported high level of job satisfaction by these individuals holding lower-status jobs.

The view that work is important for self-esteem maintenance and status assignment may be a bias resulting from the particular occupational experiences of those who write about work. These writers are, for the most part, middle-class professionals whose level of self-investment in work is reflected in the effort they expend in writing and reinforced by their successes in having their work published (Spielberg, 1977, p. 13).

Viewing the results of this study in Spielberg's framework, it may be that one's job is not the source of self-esteem for many Mexican-Americans, so perhaps one would be satisfied with a lower-level job if esteem needs were met by another means.

The acculturation dimension was included as a variable in this study to investigate the relationship between ethnic identity or level of acculturation into the Anglo culture and expressed needs, work values and job satisfaction. It was hypothesized that the Chicanos from the Southwest would report a greater degree of Mexican identity, i.e., be less acculturated into the Anglo culture, than those from the Midwest. The less acculturated individuals would also value more highly the extrinsic work aspects. It was also hypothesized that increases in levels of Acculturation would be inversely related to job satisfaction. Accordingly, the Southwestern Chicanos would report higher job satisfaction than the Mexican-American in the Midwest. The results of this study indicate no significant differences among groups on the extrinsic work values. In considering these findings, it should be remembered that the acculturative process is not contingent upon the adoption of the values of the majority group by the second group. It also does not require any modifications of existing second-group values (Teske & Nelson, 1974). In the sample in this study, such value adoption or adaptation may or may not have occurred among Mexican-Americans upon

increased contact with the Anglo culture. Further study of acculturation is necessary to determine the processes by which an individual's values do or do not change and how these values relate to work motivation and job satisfaction. Such investigations could promote understanding of employee behavior across various cultural settings and enhance the planning of work to be maximally beneficial to employer and employee.

The results of this study indicate no significant differences among groups on the degree of Mexican identity reported. An examination of group means indicates that, while not significant, the Mexican-Americans from the Midwest reported a higher degree of Mexican Identity than the Chicanos from the Southwest. This finding would not support Ramirez's original contention (1967) that proximity to the border and a high level of exposure to and support for "being Mexican" would result in a higher level of Mexican Identity. The findings do, however, support Teske's statement (Teske, Nelson & Villarreal, 1976) that one cannot speak of the Mexican-American population as a whole. Instead, there are many different groups of Mexican-Americans varying regionally and by social class yet similar in cultural background. Accordingly, the Chicano group from New Mexico may vary from the Michigan group of Mexican-Americans along several dimensions. The results of this study could also support Gonzalez's statement (Gonzalez, 1967) that Hispanics in New Mexico (particularly northern New Mexico) generally have descended from a different historical colonial settling pattern and have commonly referred to themselves as "Spanish" or "Hispanic" rather than "Mexican-American."

The results of this study could also lend support to Ramirez's

position (Ramirez, Castañeda, and Cox, 1977) that acculturation and the degree of cultural identity should be viewed as multi-faceted, superceding evaluations based largely upon an individual's spoken language and historical knowledge. An index of biculturalism based on many areas of cultural identity and sensitive to regional differences might be most appropriate for future research in this area. Such an instrument could measure aspects such as the bicultural development and functioning of an individual. Patterns of socialization, personality characteristics, interethnic skills, leadership abilities, flexibility of cognitive style, and biographic developmental histories were variables taken into account by Ramirez and his colleagues in their development of a biculturalism inventory for Mexican-American college students. Perhaps, then, it is important that the degree of bicultural or multicultural functioning become a prime consideration in research instead of the somewhat negative considerations of marginality, cultural conflicts and identity crises.

The discriminant analyses employed in this study were useful in allowing the author to examine, through a multivariate test of group differences, which variables alone or in combination were strongest in contributing to group membership classification. The results of the discriminant analyses based on the total sample indicated that the Length of Current Residence variable was the strongest contributor in explaining variance and predicting group membership when demographic variables were analyzed separately and second-highest when analyzed in combination with the motivational variables. When the Mexican-American data were analyzed alone, the

Length of Current Residence was the variable with the highest loading both when demographic variables were analyzed separately and later in combination with the motivational variables. The group means indicate that the Chicanos from New Mexico have resided in their place of current residence significantly longer than any of the other groups in the study. This variable is the primary contributor to distinguishing among groups and explaining the variance. The two work values of Activity Preference and Upward Striving were seen as the prime contributors to the discriminant function derived from the analysis of the motivational variables alone based on the total sample. The group means indicate that both Mexican-American groups are higher than the Anglo-American groups on the Upward Striving extrinsic work value. Alternatively, both Anglo-American groups are seen to have higher mean scores on the intrinsic work value of Activity Preference.

Based on the total sample, then, the Length of Current Residence variable was primary in distinguishing among the groups in this study. The groups are also most distinguishable on the work value dimensions, with the Anglo-Americans scoring higher intrinsically and the Mexican-Americans higher extrinsically. Such findings have implications for deriving appropriate rewards for the various groups of employees and for attempting to understand the level of an individual's self-investment in work. The satisfaction of work values by appropriate rewards (e.g. pay bonuses for the extrinsically-oriented worker) might affect worker productivity. With these findings in mind, a supervisor or other coworker could begin to understand what is important to the various groups so that agreements or

changes made in the work situation will be relevant and appropriate to the employees. General Management and Public Relations personnel could come to better understand and more effectively work with these people.

The Job Satisfaction and Acculturation variables received the highest loadings when the same analysis was conducted on the Mexican-American group data only. The data indicate that the Mexican-American group from Michigan reported significantly higher job satisfaction than their counterparts in New Mexico. In addition, the Midwestern Chicanos indicated a somewhat, though not significant, higher degree of Mexican-American Identity, i.e., a lower degree of acculturation into the Anglo culture. As discussed earlier in this thesis, perhaps the levels of expectations of the individuals in the Michigan Mexican-American group are being met, resulting in a high reported level of job satisfaction. Perhaps, too, self-esteem is not contingent upon the job situation for many Mexican-Americans so that one's self- investment in and job satisfaction derived from work may vary according to the way in which their esteem needs are addressed. The findings are important for managers, supervisors and work advocates to consider when designing management plans to enable the employer to relate to the employee in the most relevant and meaningful way. Incentives, rewards and benefits desired by some Mexican-Americans may actually be very different for another cultural group in a similar situation. With these findings under consideration, both the employer and employee may benefit.

In these analyses the work values were generally seen to contribute more highly to the discriminant functions than the Need

variables. Based on the total sample, the Job Satisfaction variable was seen to be a major contributor in both the analysis of motivational variables alone and in combination with the demographic variables. The significant differences among groups on this dimension provide a variable which enhances distinguishing among groups.

Again, the Mexican-American group from Michigan reported a level of job satisfaction significantly higher than both of the groups from New Mexico. As stated earlier, it would be useful to investigate the process by which job satisfaction is derived in various cultures so that individuals designing work management programs could make it maximally relevant and productive for both employer and employee.

It is important to note that, while certain variables are mentioned as high contributors to the discriminant functions derived from the analyses, a closer look at the standardized discriminant function coefficients reveals that many other variables also contributed to the functions. For example, based upon the Mexican-American group data, the discriminant analysis including both variable sets in combination indicated the Relatedness need variable had a high loading. This variable has emerged only when the Mexican-American group data were analyzed. Such a finding lends possible support to the previous work of Zurcher (1968) dealing with the affiliation variables of particularism and universalism. Particularism, the devotion of an individual employee to friends above the organization or company, was seen to be strongest among the Mexican and Mexican-American employees studied. Alternatively, Universalism, the devotion of an employee to the organization above friends or family, was seen to be strongest among Anglo-American employees (Zurcher, 1968).



In examining the sets of discriminant analyses conducted in this study, it may be seen that all variables entered in the analyses were retained in the discriminant functions derived. All results on the predictions of group membership were above the levels expected by chance. In addition, the group centroids were useful in showing the placement of the groups graphically in accordance with the discriminant functions derived. Overall, the analyses were most useful in showing the importance of the variables in explaining variance and differentiating among groups in this study.

The results of this study should also be considered in light of the methodology employed. Primarily the job situation in this study was fairly controlled while not being artificially induced. The subjects of this study also had highly comparable employers: the state governments in New Mexico and Michigan. Although random selection was employed, the state government employee composition contributed to a largely white-collar or a moderately high occupational status sample being drawn. While some lower status employees were selected, most employees held clerical, managerial or professional positions. In addition, it is important to note that the initial population of Mexican-American state employees to choose from is larger in New Mexico than it is in Michigan. One might speculate that the range of occupational positions would therefore be larger for these employees in New Mexico than in Michigan. The descriptive statistics reported in this study indicate that the professional occupations such as accountants, engineers and attorneys (noted by the Socioeconomic Index of 78 and above) total seven Mexican-American individuals in Michigan and 15 in the same categorical

range in New Mexico. Alternatively, the low end of the occupational range indicates 5 Mexican-Americans in Michigan employed as blue-collar level employees and 11 at the same level in New Mexico (Socio-economic index of 18 and below). The employee composition in state government systems overall and the different sizes of initial populations of Mexican-Americans randomly selected from may account for the fewer number of significant differences actually noted among groups on several variables that were previously hypothesized in this study.

The distribution of questionnaires through the states' inter-departmental delivery services increased procedural consistency and may have induced greater return rates. Since questionnaires were generally completed during working hours at the place of employment, however, individuals may have felt some hesitation about confidentiality and possible recriminations by supervisors. While the return rate may have been increased because of procedural consistency and the convenience of responding on the job, the possibility of the above-mentioned concerns by employees may have resulted in somewhat conservative data.

Many issues surrounding measurement itself must also be considered. Theoretically simplistic models of work motivation and job satisfaction have made way for more complex explanations of these concepts. Comprehensive models and multiple measures enhance the researcher's ability to investigate the quality of life, social mobility and other factors which affect employee behavior. Within this study a paper-and-pencil questionnaire was solely employed. The data collected was not verified by other measures tapping the same concepts. The response-choice format employed facilitated data

collection and analysis but may have limited the respondents' ability to openly respond with greater diversity. In addition, the degree of agreement between written responses and actual feelings of satisfaction remains known only to the respondents. While this is an issue common to individuals involved in attitude measurement, it must be considered when interpreting results.

As the results of this study indicate, work values and job satisfaction are significantly different among certain cultural groups. Such cultural differences also reflect the need for multiple measures of the variables in this study and support Locke's contention (1976) that the measures of job satisfaction should integrate relevant knowledge of the individual and the concept being measured.

The utility of the results in this study lies in the fact that correlations between the variables and significant differences among groups on several variables were noted. Perhaps one of the greatest questions left unanswered by this study involves the possible causal relationships between the variables being investigated. These and other differences among groups and the processes by which they occur could be further investigated longitudinally employing multiple measures.

With the issues delineated above considered, future investigations in cross-cultural differences in dimensions of work motivation and job satisfaction may enable an employer or supervisor to enhance understanding and interactions on individual and group levels on the job.

## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- Acuña, R. Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation. San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1972.
- Alderfer, C. P. Existence, Relatedness and Growth: Human Needs in Organizational Settings. New York: The Free Press, 1972.
- Allport, G. W. The Open System in Personality Theory. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 301-311.
- Allport, G. W. Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Auclair, G. Managerial role conflict: A cross-cultural comparison. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, San Francisco, September 1968.
- Barrett, G. V. and Bass, B. M. Cross Cultural Issues in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. In Dunnette, M. D. (Ed.) Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, 1639-1686.
- Bloom, R. and Barry, J. Determinants of work attitudes among Negroes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 287-292.
- Bogardus, E. S. Cultural pluralism and acculturation. Sociology and Social Research, 1949, 34, 125-129.
- Briggs, V. M., Fogel, W. and Schmidt, F. H. The Chicano Worker. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1977.
- Broom, L. and Kitsuse, J. I. The validation of acculturation: a condition to ethnic assimilation. American Anthropologist, 1955, 57, 44-48.
- Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., and Weick, K. E., Jr. Managerial Behavior, Performance and Effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill, 1970.
- Centers, R. Motivational aspects of occupational stratification. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1948, 28, 187-217.
- Centers, R. and Bugental, D. E. Intrinsic and extrinsic job motivations among different segments of the working population. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50, 193-197.

- Champagne, J. and King, D. Job satisfaction factors among underprivileged workers. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 429-434.
- Davis, A. The motivation of the underprivileged worker. In Whyte, W. F. (Ed.), Industry and Society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1946.
- Dawson, J. L. M. Attitudinal consistency and conflict in West Africa. International Journal of Psychology, 1969, 4, 39-53.
- Dawson, J. L. M., Law, H., Leung, A. and Whitney, R. E. Scaling Chinese traditional-modern attitudes and the GSR measurement of "important" versus "unimportant" Chinese concepts. Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 1971, 2, 1-27.
- Devereux, G. and Loeb, E. M. Antagonist acculturation. American Sociological Review, 1943, 8, 133-147.
- Dohrenwend, B. P. and Smith, R. J. Towards a theory of acculturation. Southwest Journal of Anthropology, 1962, 18, 30-39.
- Doll, R. E. and Gunderson, E. E. Occupational Group as a moderator of the job satisfaction-job performance relationship. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53(5), 359-361.
- Eaton, J. Controlled Acculturation: A survival technique of the Hutterites. American Sociological Review, 1952, 17, 331-340.
- Engels, F. (The Condition of the Working Class in England.) Historisch-Kritische Gesamtausgabe: Werke, Schriften, Briefe, 1932, 4 (Part I), 5-282. (Henderson, W. O. and Chaloner, W. H., New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958).
- Ewen, R. B. Weighing components of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 68-73.
- Form, W. H. and Geschwender, J. A. Social reference basis of job satisfaction: The case of manual workers. American Sociological Review, 1963, 27, 246-250.
- Friedlander, F. Comparative Work Value Systems. Personnel Psychology, 1965, 18, 1-20.
- Friedlander, F. and Margulies, N. Multiple impacts of organizational climate and individual value systems upon job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 1969, 22, 171-183.
- Gillin, J. and Raimy, V. Acculturation and personality. American Sociological Review, 1940, 5, 371-380.
- Gonzalez, N. L. The Spanish-Americans of New Mexico: A Distinctive Heritage. Los Angeles: Mexican-American Study Project Advance Report 9, Graduate School of Business Administration, UCLA, 1967.

- Hackman, J. R. and Lawler, E. E. Employee reactions to job characteristics (Monograph). Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 259-286.
- Haggstrom, W. Self-esteem and other characteristics of residentially desegregated Negroes. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1963, 23, 3007.
- Halpern, G. Relative contributions of motivator and hygiene factors to overall job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50(3), 198-200.
- Harris, T. C. and Locke, E. A. Replication of white-collar-blue-collar differences in sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59(3), 369-370.
- Herskovits, M. J. The significance of the study of acculturation for anthropology. American Anthropologist, 1937, 39, 259-264.
- Herzberg, F. Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1966.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B. B. The Motivation to Work. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Hulin, C. L. Individual differences and job enrichment: the case against general treatments. In Maher, J. R. (Ed.) New Perspectives in Job Enrichment. New York: Van Nostrand, 1971, 159-191.
- Hulin, C. L. and Blood, M. R. Job enlargement, individual differences and worker responses. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 69, 41-45.
- Inkeles, A. Industrial Man: The Relation of Status to Experience, Perception and Value. American Journal of Sociology, 1960, 46, 1-31.
- Katzell, R. A. Personal values, job satisfaction and job behavior. In Borow, H. (Ed.) Man in a World at Work, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964, 341-363.
- Keppel, G. Design and Analysis: A Researcher's Handbook. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Kornhauser, A. W. Mental Health of the Industrial Worker: A Detroit Study. New York: Wiley, 1965.
- Lewin, K. Psychology of success and failure. In Costello, T. W. and Zalkind, S. S. (Eds.) Psychology in Administration. Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Likert, R. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

- Linton, R. The distinctive aspects of acculturation. In Acculturation in Seven American Indian Tribes. New York: Appleton-Century, 1940.
- Locke, E. A. What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1969, 4, 309-336.
- Locke, E. A. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Dunnette, M.D. (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.
- Lofquist, L. H. and Dawis, R. V. Adjustment to Work. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1969.
- Madsen, W. The Mexican-Americans of South Texas. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1943, 1954, 1970.
- Mayo, E. The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization. New York: Viking Press, 1960 (originally published, 1933).
- Mayo, G. E. The first inquiry. In Merrill, H. F. (Ed.), Classics in Management (Revised edition), New York: American Management Association, 1970, 379-388.
- Merton, R. K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- Merton, R. K. and Rossi, A. S. Contributions to the theory of reference group behavior. In Merton, R. K. (Ed.), Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1949, 225-280.
- Moerk, E. The acculturation of the Mexican-American minority into the Anglo-American society in the United States. Journal of Human Relations, 1972, 20, 317-325.
- Nie, N., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., Bent, D. H. SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- O'Reilly, C. A. and Roberts, K. H. Job satisfaction among whites and nonwhites: A cross-cultural approach. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57(3), 295-299.
- Padaki, V. and Dolke, A. M. Two factors revisited. Experimental Publication System, 1970, 8 (Oct.), 272.
- Parsons, T. and Shils, E. A. (Eds.) Towards a General Theory of Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.



- Pelz, D. C. and Andrews, F. M. Scientists in Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Pennings, J. M. Work value systems of white-collar workers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1970, 15(4), 397-406.
- Porter, L. W. Job attitudes in management: I. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1962, 46, 375-384.
- Ramirez, M. Identification with Mexican family values and authoritarianism in Mexican-Americans. Journal of Social Psychology, 73(1), 1967, 3-11.
- Ramirez, M., Castañeda, and Cox, B. G. A Biculturalism Inventory for Mexican-American College Students. Arlington, Virginia: Organizational Effectiveness Research Programs, Office of Naval Research, 1977.
- Rand, A. Concepts of consciousness. The Objectivist, 1966, 5(9), 1-8.
- Reiss, A., Duncan, O., Hatt, P., and North, C. Occupations and Social Status. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
- Rubel, A. J. Across the Tracks: Mexican-Americans in a Texas City. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966.
- Simirenko, A. Mannheim's Generational Analysis and Acculturation. British Journal of Sociology, 1966, 17, 292-299.
- Simonetti, S. H. and Weitz, J. Job Satisfaction: Some cross-cultural effects. Personnel Psychology, 1972, 25, 107-118.
- Slocum, J. W. A comparative study of the satisfaction of American and Mexican operatives. Academy of Management Journal, 1971, 14, 89-97.
- Smith, P. C. & Kendall, L. M. Retranslation of expectations: An approach to the construction of unambiguous anchors for rating scales. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1963, 47, 149-155.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M. and Hulin, C. L. The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.
- Spielberg, J. Self-Investment Theory of Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1977.
- Spiro, M. E. The acculturation of American ethnic groups. American Anthropologist, 1955, 57, 1240-1252.

- Taylor, F. Scientific Management Comprising Shop Management: The Principles of Scientific Management and Testimony Before the Special House Committee. New York: Harper, 1947.
- Teske, R. H. C., Jr. and Nelson, B. H. Two Scales for the Measurement of Mexican-American Identity. International Review of Modern Sociology, 1973, 3(9), 192-203.
- Teske, R. H. C., Jr. and Nelson, B. H. Acculturation and assimilation: a clarification. American Ethnologist, 1974, 1(2), 351-367.
- Teske, R. H. C., Jr., Nelson, B. H., and Villarreal, M. B. (Revised) Mexican-American Identity: A Further Evaluation. Paper presented at the meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, New York, August 1976.
- Vernon, P. E. Intelligence and cultural environment. London: Methuen, 1921.
- Weber, M. The Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism. New York: Scribner, 1958.
- Weir, M. Job Satisfaction: Challenge and Response in Modern Britain. Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, 1976.
- Weiss, J. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W. and Lofquist, L. H. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation XXII: Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. University of Minnesota: Industrial Relations Center, 1967.
- Whitehill, A. M. and Takezawa, A. The other worker. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1968.
- Whyte, W. F. Culture, industrial relations and economic development: The case of Peru. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 1963, 16, 583-593.
- Wofford, J. C. The motivational basis of job satisfaction and job performance. Personnel Psychology, 1971, 24, 501-518.
- Wolf, M. L. Need gratification theory: A theoretical reformulation of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and job motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54(1), 87-94.
- Wollack, S., Goodale, J. G., Wijting, J. P. and Smith, P. C. Development of the Survey of Work Values. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55(4), 331-338.
- Zurcher, L. A. Particularism and organizational position: A cross-cultural analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 138-144.

Zurcher, L. A., Meadow, A. and Zurcher, S. L. Value orientation, role conflict and alienation from work: A cross-cultural study. American Sociological Review, 1965, 30, 539-548.

## APPENDIX A

## COVER LETTER TO BOTH NEW MEXICO GROUPS

Dear State Government Employee:

I am currently working with Dr. Neal Schmitt at Michigan State University and the New Mexico State Personnel Office on a project concerning job satisfaction among working people. As part of the completion of this project, I am asking you to cooperate by filling out the enclosed questionnaire. Your answers will help provide me with information concerning the work values, need desires and job satisfaction of people who work for State Government.

The first part of the questionnaire requests information concerning your background, job experience, and current work status. The second part assesses work values, need desires and job satisfaction. This questionnaire has been compiled from a number of other formalized work questionnaires. This particular instrument is being distributed to State Government workers in the states of New Mexico and Michigan. I hope you will be able to help me with this project by answering as completely as you can.

All answers will be reported in group form. No names of individuals will be used in the study. Later, the results of the study will be given to your agency director for your further information.

I hope you can take a few minutes of your time to fill out all parts of the questionnaire. It will be extremely helpful to me in completing our project. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to your personnel officer as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Miquela Rivera  
Michigan State University

WORK VALUES, NEED DESIRES AND JOB  
SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY.

This questionnaire contains three parts dealing with your background and employment status, work values, need desires and job satisfaction. Most of the questions are followed by several possible answers which are numbered below each question. Please pick the answer that best describes you or what you feel and write the choice-item number in the space provided next to the question.

For example:

- A. Are you a high school graduate? A.   1    
1. Yes  
2. No

Assuming you were a high school graduate, you would fill in the blank to the right of the question as shown above.

In some cases a set of answers applies to a group of questions. In this case the instructions will indicate to which questions the answers apply.

If no possible answer is correct, you may write your own answer directly on the questionnaire form.

In some cases you are to write your answer in the blank space provided in the questionnaire. In all other cases, enter your answer in the space provided to the right of the question.

PART I.

1. What is the population of the community where you now reside? 1. \_\_\_\_\_  
1. rural  
2. less than 1000  
3. 1000-5000  
4. 5000-10,000  
5. 10,000-25,000

6. 25,000-50,000
  7. 50,000-100,000
  8. Over 100,000
2. How long have you lived in your present community? 2. \_\_\_\_\_
    1. less than a year
    2. 1 to 5 years
    3. 5 to 10 years
    4. 10 to 20 years
    5. more than 20 years
  3. Where were you raised? (Name City and State)
 

---
  4. What is your occupation?
 

---
  5. On the average, how many hours a week do you work? 5. \_\_\_\_\_
  6. What is your annual salary? 6. \_\_\_\_\_
    1. less than \$3,000/year
    2. \$3,000-\$6,999/year
    3. \$7,000-\$9,000/year
    4. \$10,000-\$14,999/year
    5. \$15,000-\$19,999/year
    6. \$20,000-\$29,999/year
    7. \$30,000-\$39,999/year
    8. \$40,000-\$49,999/year
    9. \$50,000 or more
  7. What is your highest level of formal education? 7. \_\_\_\_\_
    1. 1-8 years
    2. 9-11 years
    3. High school graduate
    4. Some college
    5. College graduate (Bachelor's degree)
    6. Some graduate hours
    7. Graduate Degree
  8. Your are: 8. \_\_\_\_\_
    1. White
    2. Black
    3. Chicano(a)/Mexican-Merican
    4. Latino(a)/Spanish-surnamed
    5. Other \_\_\_\_\_
  9. You are: 9. \_\_\_\_\_
    1. Male
    2. Female

10. Your age: 10. \_\_\_\_\_
- |                |                |
|----------------|----------------|
| 1. 16-20 years | 5. 35-40 years |
| 2. 21-25 years | 6. 41-50 years |
| 3. 26-30 years | 7. 51-60 years |
| 4. 31-35 years | 8. 60 and over |

## PART II.

Using the scale below rate the desirability of each of the following items in terms of the job you would like to get. Use the following scale:

1. Very Desirable
2. Desirable
3. Neither desirable nor undesirable
4. Undesirable
5. Very Undesirable

- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 11. Coworkers who will cooperate with me.              | 11. _____ |
| 12. Opportunities for personal growth and development  | 12. _____ |
| 13. Good pay for my work                               | 13. _____ |
| 14. Chance to develop friendships at work              | 14. _____ |
| 15. Chance to develop new skills and knowledge at work | 15. _____ |
| 16. Chance to think and act on my own                  | 16. _____ |
| 17. A feeling of prestige                              | 17. _____ |
| 18. A sense of security                                | 18. _____ |
| 19. Trust among me and my coworkers                    | 19. _____ |
| 20. Self-esteem  | 20. _____ |
| 21. Frequent raises in pay                             | 21. _____ |
| 22. Complete fringe benefit program                    | 22. _____ |
| 23. Acceptance by others                               | 23. _____ |

Indicate your agreement with each of the following statements according to the scale below:

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Mildly Disagree
4. Mildly Agree
5. Agree
6. Strongly Agree



24. One of the reasons that I work is to make my family respect me. 24. \_\_\_\_\_
25. A person does not desire respect just because he/she has a good job. 25. \_\_\_\_\_
26. A job with prestige is not necessarily a better job than one which does not have prestige. 26. \_\_\_\_\_
27. My friends would not think much of me if I did not have a good job. 27. \_\_\_\_\_
28. A job which requires the employee to be busy during the day is better than a job which allows a lot of loafing. 28. \_\_\_\_\_
29. Most companies have suggestion boxes for their workers, but I doubt that the companies take these suggestions seriously. 29. \_\_\_\_\_
30. A good worker cares about finding ways to improve the job, and when a person has an idea, he/she should pass it on to the supervisor. 30. \_\_\_\_\_
31. Even if one has a good job, one should always be looking for a better job. 31. \_\_\_\_\_
32. If a person can get away with it, he/she should try to work just a little slower than the boss expects. 32. \_\_\_\_\_
33. One should hold a second job to bring in extra money if one can get it. 33. \_\_\_\_\_
34. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job. 34. \_\_\_\_\_
35. In choosing a job, a person must consider his/her chances for advancement as well as other factors. 35. \_\_\_\_\_
36. A worker who does a sloppy job should feel a little ashamed of himself/herself. 36. \_\_\_\_\_
37. A worker should feel some responsibility to do a decent job whether or not his/her supervisor is around. 37. \_\_\_\_\_
38. A worker who has an idea about how to improve his/her job should drop a note in the company suggestion box. 38. \_\_\_\_\_
39. A person should choose the job which pays the most. 39. \_\_\_\_\_
40. There is nothing wrong with doing a poor job at work if one can get away with it. 40. \_\_\_\_\_
41. A good worker is interested in helping a new worker learn his/her job. 41. \_\_\_\_\_

42. Prestige should not be a factor in choosing a job. 42. \_\_\_\_\_
43. A person should always be thinking about pulling him- 43. \_\_\_\_\_  
self/herself up in the world and should work hard with  
the hope of being promoted to a higher-level job.
44. The best job that a worker can get is one which permits 44. \_\_\_\_\_  
him/her to do almost nothing during the work day.
45. If I were paid by the hour, I would probably turn down 45. \_\_\_\_\_  
most offers to make extra money by working overtime.
46. If one likes one's job, one should be satisfied with 46. \_\_\_\_\_  
it and should not push for a promotion to another job.
47. A person should take the job which offers the most 47. \_\_\_\_\_  
overtime if the regular pay on the job is about the  
same.
48. If a worker has a choice between going to the company 48. \_\_\_\_\_  
picnic or staying home, he/she would probably be better  
off at home.
49. I live, eat and breathe my job. 49. \_\_\_\_\_
50. Even if a worker has a very low-level job in a company, 50. \_\_\_\_\_  
it is still possible for him/her to make suggestions  
which will affect company policy.
51. The person who holds down a good job is the most re- 51. \_\_\_\_\_  
spected person in the neighborhood.
52. When he/she can get away with it, an employee should 52. \_\_\_\_\_  
take it easy.
53. The trouble with too many people is that when they find 53. \_\_\_\_\_  
a job in which they are interested, they don't try to  
get a better job.
54. A worker who takes long rest pauses is probably a poor 54. \_\_\_\_\_  
worker.
55. A person should choose one job over another mostly be- 55. \_\_\_\_\_  
cause of the higher wages.
56. A worker who turns down a promotion is probably making 56. \_\_\_\_\_  
a mistake.
57. There is nothing as satisfying as doing the best job 57. \_\_\_\_\_  
possible.
58. Once a week, after the workday is over, a company may 58. \_\_\_\_\_  
have its workers get together in groups for the purpose

of discussing possible job changes. A good worker should remain after quitting time to participate in these discussions.

59. The only good part of most jobs is the paycheck. 59. \_\_\_\_\_
60. A promotion to a higher-level job usually means more worries and should be avoided for that reason. 60. \_\_\_\_\_
61. A person who feels no sense of pride in his/her work is probably unhappy. 61. \_\_\_\_\_
62. If something is wrong with a job, a smart worker will mind his/her own business and let somebody else complain about it. 62. \_\_\_\_\_
63. Having a good job makes a person more worthy of praise from friends and family. 63. \_\_\_\_\_
64. I am very much involved personally in my work. 64. \_\_\_\_\_
65. A person would soon grow tired of loafing on a job and would probably be happier if he/she worked hard. 65. \_\_\_\_\_
66. A well paying job that offers little opportunity for advancement is not a good job for me. 66. \_\_\_\_\_
67. When a person is looking for a job, money should not be the most important consideration. 67. \_\_\_\_\_
68. A worker is better off if he/she is satisfied with his/her job and is not concerned about being promoted to another job. 68. \_\_\_\_\_
69. Only a fool worries about doing the job well, since it is important only that you do your job well enough not to get fired. 69. \_\_\_\_\_
70. A worker should do the job and forget about such things as company meetings or company activities. 70. \_\_\_\_\_
71. As far as my friends are concerned, it would not make any difference if I worked regularly or only once in a while. 71. \_\_\_\_\_
72. If a person is given a choice between jobs which pay the same money, she/he should choose the one which allows her/him to do as little work as possible. 72. \_\_\_\_\_
73. A good job is a well paying job. 73. \_\_\_\_\_
74. A person should feel a sense of pride in his/her work. 74. \_\_\_\_\_

75. Even though they make the same amount of money, the person who works in an office has a more impressive job than does a person working as a sales clerk. 75. \_\_\_\_\_
76. A person should try to stay busy all day rather than try to find ways to get out of doing work. 76. \_\_\_\_\_
77. One should take a job that pays more than some other job one could get even if one cannot stand the people one works with. 77. \_\_\_\_\_
78. The most important things that happen to me involve my work. 78. \_\_\_\_\_
79. The most important thing a person should feel about the job is that he/she enjoys working at it. 79. \_\_\_\_\_
80. Doing a good job should mean as much to a worker as a good paycheck. 80. \_\_\_\_\_
81. If a worker keeps himself busy on the job, the working day passes more quickly than if he/she were loafing. 81. \_\_\_\_\_

The following questions ask you to describe your job or how you feel about your job. Please answer in respect to the job you now hold. Indicate your feelings according to the scale below:

1. Very Satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Neutral (means I can't decide whether I'm satisfied or not with this aspect of my job)
4. Dissatisfied
5. Very Dissatisfied

On my present job, this is how I feel about:

82. Being able to keep busy all the time. 82. \_\_\_\_\_
83. The chance to work alone on the job. 83. \_\_\_\_\_
84. The chance to do different things from time to time. 84. \_\_\_\_\_
85. The chance to be "somebody" in the community. 85. \_\_\_\_\_
86. The way my boss handles his employees. 86. \_\_\_\_\_
87. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions. 87. \_\_\_\_\_
88. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience. 88. \_\_\_\_\_
89. The way my job provides for steady employment. 89. \_\_\_\_\_

90. The chance to do things for other people. 90. \_\_\_\_\_
91. The chance to tell people what to do. 91. \_\_\_\_\_
92. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities. 92. \_\_\_\_\_
93. The way company policies are put into practice. 93. \_\_\_\_\_
94. My pay and the amount of work I do. 94. \_\_\_\_\_
95. The chances for advancement on this job. 95. \_\_\_\_\_
96. The freedom to use my own judgment. 96. \_\_\_\_\_
97. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job. 97. \_\_\_\_\_
98. The working conditions. 98. \_\_\_\_\_
99. The way my coworkers get along with each other. 99. \_\_\_\_\_
100. The praise I get for doing a good job. 100. \_\_\_\_\_
101. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job. 101. \_\_\_\_\_

## PART III.

102. Have (did, will) you taught (teach) your children to speak Spanish? 102. \_\_\_\_\_  
 1. Yes  
 2. No  
 Why/why not? \_\_\_\_\_
- 
103. Indicate one response listed below which best describes your feelings about visiting in Mexico. 103. \_\_\_\_\_  
 1. I have no desire to visit Mexico.  
 2. I would like to visit Mexico because they have some nice tourist attractions.  
 3. I would not mind visiting in Mexico, but it really does not matter to me one way or the other.  
 4. I would like to visit Mexico because that is where my ancestors came from.  
 5. Every Spanish-surnamed American should want to visit Mexico as the place of his heritage.
104. Indicate one response listed below which best describes your feelings about visiting in Spain. 104. \_\_\_\_\_  
 1. I have no desire to visit Spain.  
 2. I would like to visit Spain because they have some nice tourist attractions.

3. I would not mind visiting in Spain, but it really does not matter to me one way or the other.
4. I would like to visit Spain because that is where my ancestors came from.
5. Every Spanish-surnamed American should want to visit Spain as the place of his heritage.

105. How important do you feel that it is for your children 105. \_\_\_\_  
to have the opportunity to visit Mexico?

1. I feel that it is very important for my children to have the opportunity to visit in Mexico.
2. I feel that it is important, but not necessary that my children have the opportunity to visit in Mexico.
3. Undecided.
4. I do not feel that it is really very important that my children have the opportunity to visit in Mexico.
5. I definitely do not feel that it is at all important for my children to visit in Mexico.

106. How important do you feel that it is for your children 106. \_\_\_\_  
to have the opportunity to visit in Spain?

1. I feel that it is very important for my children to have the opportunity to visit in Spain.
2. I feel that it is important, but not necessary that my children have the opportunity to visit in Spain.
3. Undecided.
4. I do not feel that it is really very important that my children have the opportunity to visit in Spain.
5. I definitely do not feel that it is at all important for my children to visit in Spain.

107. Indicate that response which best represents your 107. \_\_\_\_  
reaction should someone refer to you by the term  
"Chicano(a)":

1. Definitely do not object to being referred to by this term.
2. Do not object to being referred to by this term.
3. Uncertain.
4. Object to being referred to by this term.
5. Definitely object to being referred to by this term.

108. Indicate that response which best represents your 108. \_\_\_\_  
reaction should someone refer to you by the term  
"Mexicano(a)":

1. Definitely do not object to being referred to by this term.
2. Do not object to being referred to by this term.
3. Uncertain.
4. Object to being referred to by this term.
5. Definitely object to being referred to by this term.

For numbers 109-114, circle the number which best represents your attitudes about the following questions:

- |   | Very<br>Important<br>(1) | Important<br>(2) | Uncertain<br>(3) | Not<br>Important<br>(4) | Definitely<br>Not Important<br>(5) |
|---|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 109. How important do you feel that it is for your children to be acquainted with Mexican history?                            |                          |                  |                  |                         | 109. ____                          |
| 110. How important do you feel that it is for your children to be acquainted with Spanish history?                            |                          |                  |                  |                         | 110. ____                          |
| 111. How important do you feel that it is for your children to be acquainted with Mexican culture?                            |                          |                  |                  |                         | 111. ____                          |
| 112. How important do you feel that it is for your children to be acquainted with Spanish culture?                            |                          |                  |                  |                         | 112. ____                          |
| 113. How important do you feel that it is for your children to be acquainted with the history of Spanish-surnamed people?     |                          |                  |                  |                         | 113. ____                          |
| 114. How important do you feel that it is for your children to be acquainted with the culture of the Spanish-surnamed people? |                          |                  |                  |                         | 114. ____                          |

For numbers 115-117, in your own words briefly express your attitude towards each of the following organizations. If you are not acquainted with an organization, place "NA" by the name. If you are a member, please indicate so by writing in "MEMBER" in addition to your attitude towards the group.

115. LULAC (League of United Latin American Citizens): \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
116. La Raza Unida \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
117. American G.I. Forum: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

For numbers 118-120, indicate that response which best describes your probable response if you were asked to contribute to each of the following organizations:

- | Would definitely<br>contribute some-<br>thing<br>(1) | Would probably<br>contribute<br>something<br>(2) | Uncertain<br>(3) | Probably would<br><u>not</u> contribute<br>something<br>(4) | Definitely<br>would <u>not</u><br>contribute<br>something<br>(5) |
|--|--|------------------|---|--|
|--|--|------------------|---|--|

118. LULAC (League of United Latin American Citizens) 118. \_\_\_\_
119. American G.I. Forum 119. \_\_\_\_
120. La Raza Unida 120. \_\_\_\_
121. Which of the following reference groups do you 121. \_\_\_\_  
identify with most?
1. The Mexican-American population
  2. The Spanish-surnamed population
  3. The non-Spanish-surnamed population.



