OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, JOB SATISFACTION, AND SOCIAL REFERENCES

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
James Arthur Geschwender
1959

OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, JOB SATISFACTION, AND SOCIAL REFERENCES

By

James Arthur Geschwender

AN ABSTRACT

Submitted to the College of Science and Arts of Michigan State University of Agriculture and Applied Science in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

1959

Approved William H. Form

James Arthur Geschwender

ABSTRACT

This study attempted to analyze from the framework of reference group theory the relationship between vertical inter-generational occupational mobility and job satisfaction. Interview responses of 545 male manual workers were analyzed to test five major hypotheses:

1. There will be a low positive association between job satisfaction and occupational achievement relative to parent's occupational aspirations for the respondent, i.e., the higher the son's occupational achievement relative to his parents' aspirations for him, the higher will be his job satisfaction.

2. There will be a moderate positive relationship between job satisfaction and son's occupation relative to father's occupation, i.e., the higher the son's occupation relative to father's, the higher will be his job satisfaction.

3. There will be a positive relationship between job satisfaction and occupational level relative to brother's occupational level.

3a. In those cases where the respondent has two brothers, hypothesis three will be modified as follows: Job satisfaction will vary from low to high in the following order: The occupational level of both brothers being higher than that of the respondent; the occupational level of one brother being higher, and that of the second lower, than that of the respondent; and the occupational level of both brothers being lower than that of the respondent.

3b. The relative age of the brother will alter the relationship predicted in hypothesis three in the following manner: (1) job satisfaction will be greater when an older brother has achieved a higher occupational status than when a younger brother has done so, (2) job satisfaction will be less when a younger brother has achieved a lower occupational status than it will be when an older brother has done so.

4. There will be a positive relationship between Generational Occupational Mobility Score (GOMS) z scores and job satisfaction.

5. There will be a positive relationship between job satisfaction and such standard variables as (a) age, (b) marital status, (c) number of children, (d) occupational prestige level, (e) job tenure, (f) income, and (g) education.

It was found necessary in the testing of hypothesis four to make some minor revisions in the Generational Occupational Mobility Score (GOMS) as formulated by Tumin and Feldman.

The findings yielded some slight support for hypothesis one though it was noted that over four fifths of the respondents could not state their parents' occupational aspirations for them. Hypothesis two and three were supported while the two sub-hypotheses for hypothesis three were refuted. The findings also supported hypotheses four which was further analyzed by father's occupation and occupation of destination. Each of the groups classified according to father's occupation exhibited a positive relationship between job satisfaction

and vertical inter-generational occupational mobility while this was not the case when the sample was classified according to occupation of destination. Job satisfaction was found to be positively related to age, marital status, number of children, occupational prestige level, job tenure, and income and negatively related to education.

The above findings were analyzed as to their implications for reference group theory. It was concluded that working class males, lacking the middle class belief in opportunities for upward mobility, tend to evaluate their jobs by using as social references other male members of their family of orientation, their peers, or other members of their occupational situs. This selection of social references results in a positive association between vertical occupational mobility and job satisfaction. However, those members of the working class who come into sufficient contact with the middle class belief in opportunities for upward mobility tend to shift their social references to the middle class and thus exhibit a negative relationship between vertical occupational mobility and job satisfaction.

OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, JOB SATISFACTION, AND SOCIAL REFERENCES

By

James Arthur Geschwender

A THESIS

Submitted to the College of Science and Arts of Michigan State University of Agriculture and Applied Science in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

1959

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my indebtedness to my parents, Elmer and Susie Geschwender, whose moral and financial support made it possible for me to pursue my education on the undergraduate and graduate levels. I also want to express my gratitude to Professor William H. Form for allowing me to conduct a secondary analysis of data that he had collected and for the generous giving of his time and advice which made this thesis possible. Finally, I wish to indicate my indebtedness to the members of my guidance committee, Dr. Richard Adams, Dr. William Faunce, Dr. Charles R. Hoffer, and Dr. Charles P. Loomis, for the aid and advice which they have given me at various stages of my graduate training.

TABLES OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND THE REVIEW OF RELEVANT FINDINGS

The purpose of this thesis is to examine those relationships that may or may not exist between vertical occupational mobility and job satisfaction among working class males. Caplow says:

> Vertical mobility is a movement of the individual upward or downward, with a gain or loss in social rank. This may occur in several different ways:
>
> 1. The simplest kind of vertical mobility is a change of occupation which involves a change in social position; as when a waiter becomes a businessman, or an unsuccessful accountant goes to work in a factory.
>
> 2. A different form of mobility involves a promotion or demotion within an occupational group; as when a naval officer receives command of a ship, or a locomotive fireman becomes an engineer.
>
> 3. Another form of vertical mobility is incidental to ageing. Each occupational level displays a characteristic career curve; and in addition, the mere accumulation of seniority represents a significant change in status.
>
> 4. A fourth type of vertical mobility is the change in occupational assignment from one generation to another, usually studied as the correlation between the occupations of fathers and sons.
>
> There is still another kind of vertical mobility which is not included in this discussion. It involves the ascent or descent of an entire

> occupational group - the increasing dignity of nurses or the diminishing prestige of midwives may serve equally well as examples. [1]

This thesis will only be concerned with Caplow's fourth category of vertical mobility, that of vertical intergenerational occupational mobility. According to Lipset and Bendix, "The ultimate reason for our interest in this subject (social mobility) is the study of the consequences of social mobility."[2] This thesis is focussing on one of the possible consequences of social mobility, job satisfaction.

The examination of this relationship will be conducted among working class males. This limitation is justified because it is maintained that working class males constitute a seperate and distinct behavioral category from middle class males. This belief is supported by Lipset and Bendix when they list five differences between the two groups:

> 1. Most male nonmanual occupations have more prestige than most manual occupations, even skilled ones.
>
> 2. Among males, white collar positions generally lead to higher income than manual employment.
>
> 3. Nonmanual positions, in general, require more education than manual positions.
>
> 4. Holders of nonmanual positions, even low paid white collar jobs, are more likely than manual workers to think of themselves as members

---

[1] Theodore Caplow, The Sociology of Work (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954), pp. 59-60.

[2] Seymour Lipset, and Reinhard Bendix, Social Mobility In Industrial Societies (Berkly: University of California Press, 1959), p. 6.

of the middle class and to act out middle-class roles in their consumption patterns.

5. Low-level nonmanual workers are more likely to have political attitudes which resemble those of the upper middle class than those of the manual working class. [3]

They further state, "Consequently, we believe that using the break between manual and nonmanual occupations as an indicator of high and low occupational status is justified whenever a dichotomous division of males in urban occupations is used."[4]

Research Design

This study will consist of a secondary analysis of data collected by Professor William H. Form in 1953 as a study of workers in Lansing, Michigan. The respondents interviewed were distributed among the following occupational categories: 62 unskilled; 326 semi-skilled, 146 skilled and foremen; and 11 sales, clerical, and related occupations - a total of 545 respondents.

The sample was drawn from the POLKS DIRECTORY FOR LANSING. Every 10th name was drawn and any were rejected who were not working class males, i.e. defined as 'One who works with his hands'. Eleven cases were retained that are usually categorized as 'sales, clerical, and related occupations' as it was felt that their occupations did meet the criterion of the definition of 'working class male'.

---

[3] Ibid., pp. 14-16. [4] Ibid., p. 16.

Information was garnered in interviews from the respondents with respect to their occupation, job satisfaction, father's occupation, occupation of all brothers, age of all brothers, parents occupational aspirations for the respondent, number of brothers in the labor force, respondents age, education, marital status, number of children, job tenure, and income.

Theoretical Orientation

This thesis is developed from a framework of 'reference group theory' as suggested by Herbert Hyman and explicated by Robert K. Merton.[5] An underlying assumption is that there may not exist any universally agreed upon definition of the significance of any given social position. The incumbant of any position selects certain portions of the 'social reality' and uses these portions as reference points in defining his position. It is in terms of these reference points (reference groups) that he defines his expected behavior, his values, his attitudes, and his evaluation of his position and of himself.

It is assumed that this does not occur at random, but is influenced by at least two major factors. First, there are certain specifiable structural influences that lead an incumbant of a given position who possesses certain specifiable

---

[5]Robert K. Merton, and Alice S. Rossi, "Contributions To The Theory of Reference Group Behavior", printed in Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1949).

social attributes to select certain predictable reference groups. Secondly, this occurs within an institutional framework that provides us with a loosely defined ordinal ranking of positions in terms of prestige.

It is, therefore, the task of the sociologist to discover the significant reference groups that are associated with any given social position and set of social characteristics. This may be done entirely in structural terms without reference to individual motivations. In fact, it must so be done if we are to be able to predict to different situations in which different actors, having different individual motivations, are involved.

Assumptions

Merton states that, "Some similarity in status attributes must be perceived to hold bewteen the individual and the reference group for the comparison to occur at all".[6] These perceived similarities may be in terms of position of origin, present position, anticipated future position, and/or relational ties among other possibilities. Allison Davis[7] indicates that members of the working class are not motivated in terms of opportunities for 'social climbing'. Instead, they derive their satisfactions from immediate and present situations. He also indicates that the members of this class have relatively strong nuclear family ties.

---

[6] Ibid., p. 242.

[7] Allison Davis, "Work Habits and Class Position" Modern American Society, (New York: Rinehart and Co., 1951).

It may be inferred from this that the working class males involved in this study will use as their social references groups that are perceived to have some attribute in common with themselves. As a result of the lack of motivations for 'social climbing', it is unlikely that they will perceive themselves as having shared attributes with white collar groups. It is much more likely that they will use as reference groups others who share their position of origin, i.e. immediate kin, peers, or the occupational class of which they are a member.

It follows from reference group theory that there may not exist an absolute scale for evaluating the gratifications and deprivations associated with any given position. Instead, there are probably relative evaluations of gratifications and deprivations which are determined by the relationship that exists between those of a given position and those associated with the corresponding reference groups.

Merton indicated this when he said, "The degree of dissatisfaction with their lot is often less among people in severely depressed social strata in a relatively rigid social system, than among those strata that are apparantly better off in a more mobile social system".[8]

Evidence seems to indicate that, while there is considerable mobility within the working class, the line between it and the white collar stratum is rather rigidly drawn.

---

[8]Merton, op. cit., p. 268.

For example, Form and Miller have found that, "There is a tendency for the children of white-collar persons to inherit their father's occupation or climb above it. Children of manual workers inherit their father's occupation or fall below it."[9]

From this it may be inferred that adult-socialized working class males may not use white-collar workers as a reference group but would more likely use groups from within their own occupational stratum.

Hypotheses and Pertinent Findings in the Literature

1. There will be a low positive association between job satisfaction and occupational achievement relative to parent's occupational aspirations for the respondent, i.e., the higher the son's occupational achievement relative to his parents aspirations for that achievement, the higher the job satisfaction.

This is hypothesized because it is expected that the family will be a significant reference group for working class males thus making a person's occupational achievement relative to his parents occupational aspirations for him a determinant of his job satisfaction. This association is not expected to be strong due to the ambiguity of the concept

---

[9]William H. Form, and Delbert C. Miller, "Occupational Career Patterns As A Sociological Instrument", American Journal of Sociology, 54:328-29.

'parents aspirations'. This ambiguity can probably be best illustrated by a comment made by Howard Ehrlich in the course of a conversation bearing on this problem. It was felt that a parent was likely to say something to the effect of, "Gee, I'd like my son to be a doctor. I expect him to be a salesman. He'll probably work in a factory like his old man." The first alternative may be a form of desire, the second an expectation of low probability, and the third being more probable - an anticipation considering all circumstances.

The present researcher suspects that either the first or second alternative listed above would be reported by most respondents as their parents aspirations for them while the third alternative would have had the greatest amount of effect in determining the individuals own aspirations.

2. There will be a moderate positive relationship between job satisfaction and son's occupation relative to father's occupation, i.e., the higher the son's occupation relative to father's, the higher the job satisfaction.

In terms of the theoretical orientation of this study, it is expected that father's occupation would be an important reference point in determining the job satisfaction among working class males due to the strength of the nuclear family ties in this class. This relationship is not expected to be as strong as it might be due to the intrinsic weakness of the comparison of son's occupation to that of his father as

a measure of occupational mobility. This weakness results from the fact that the occupational structure itself is constantly changing.

3. There will be a positive relationship between job satisfaction and occupational level relative to brother's occupational level, i.e., those persons who have achieved an occupational level higher than that achieved by their brothers will be more satisfied with their jobs than will those whose occupational achievement is less than that of their brothers.

The same theoretical justifications that apply to hypothesis two also apply here. But the limitation that applied there does not apply here as the occupations of the respondents and those of their brothers come from the same occupational structure.

3a. In those cases where the respondents have two brothers, hypothesis three will be modified as follows: job satisfaction will vary from low to high in the following order: the occupational level of both brothers being higher than than of the respondent; the occupational level of one brother being higher, and that of the second being lower, than that of the respondent; and the occupational levels of both brothers being lower than that of the respondent.

All brothers, being members of the immediate family, are assumed to constitute important reference groups for working class males. Thus, it follows that the relationship hypothesized in hypothesis three will be reinforced when the direction of the differences in the occupational levels of the respondents and each of their brothers are the same and weakened when the directions are opposite to one another.

3b. The relative age of the brother in comparison to that of the respondent will alter the relationship predicted in the third hypothesis in the following manner: (1) job satisfaction will be greater when an older brother has achieved a higher occupational status than it will be when a younger brother has done so; (2) job satisfaction will be less when a younger brother has achieved a lower occupational status than it will be when an older brother has done so.

Age is expected to be a relatively important factor in this relationship because it is an important factor in career patterns. Status tends to increase with age simply because certain rewards tend to accrue to those with increased tenure, i.e., wage increases, longer paid vacations, more paid holidays, certain types of promotions. Younger brothers will tend to be less far along in their careers and older brothers correspondingly farther along in their careers. This might tend to alter the relationship resulting from a simple comparison of occupational levels.

4. There will be a positive relationship between Generational Occupational Mobility Score z scores and job satisfaction.

This would follow as a simple consequence of the fact that all of the groups whose occupational levels are used in computing the z scores are important as reference groups for working class males, i.e., nuclear family members, peers, and members of the same occupational stratum or origin.

The first four hypotheses deal, in one manner or another, with the relationship between occupational mobility and job satisfaction. An examination of the literature reveals an extreme dearth of studies relating these two variables. The only two that the present researcher could locate, Trier[10] and Eicher[11], both reported positive associations between inter-generational occupational mobility and job satisfaction.

5. In order to compare the predictive power of the GOMS with other previously used predictors of job satisfaction, it is hypothesized that there will be a positive relationship between job satisfaction and such standard variables as (a) age, (b) marital status, (c) number of children,

---

[10]H. E. Trier, "Job Satisfaction and Occupational Status" (unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1954), p. 33.

[11]Joann Eicher, "Job Satisfaction: Its Relation To Occupational, Stratification, And Community Variables" (unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1956), pp. 48-50.

(d) occupational skill level, (e) wages, (f) tenure, and (g) education.

All of the variables listed in hypothesis five have a long and hallowed tradition of use in job satisfaction studies as the review below will demonstrate. Herzberg and others[12] have published an excellent summary of all job attitude studies published prior to the summer of 1955. The present researcher selected and examined a small nonrandom sample of the studies reviewed by Herzberg and came to the conclusion that no major bias would result if the summaries by Herzberg and associates were relied upon rather than retreading ground previously covered. Consequently the summaries by Herzberg will form the basis of much of the review of the literature given below.

(a) Job satisfaction - marital status

Herzberg cited eight studies in this area, three which found that married employees liked their jobs more than single employees, one that found that married employees like their jobs less than single employees, and eight that found that job satisfaction was unrelated to marital status.[13] The three studies that reported a positive association were

---

[12]Frederick Herzberg, Bernard Mausner, Richard Peterson, Dora Capwell, Job Attitudes: Review Of Research And Opinions (Pittsburg: Psychological Service of Pittsberg, 1957).

[13]Ibid., pp. 23-24.

those of Harris,[14] Chase,[15] and Inglow.[16] Only Eckerman[17] reported a negative association; and the eight reporting no association were an American Vocational Association Study,[18] Brown and Neitzal,[19] Cole,[20] Fryer,[21] Jurgenson,[22] Kolstad,[23] Kornhauser and Sharp,[24] and McClusky and Strayer.[25]

---

[14]Frank Harris, "The Quantification of an Industrial Employee Survey," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1949, 33:103-111.

[15]F. S. Chase, "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, 1951, 33:127-132.

[16]Gail Inglow, "Job Satisfaction of Liberal Arts Graduates," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1951, 35:175-181.

[17]A. C. Eckerman, "An Analysis of Grievances and Aggrieved Employees in a Machine Shop and Foundary," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1948, 32:255-69.

[18]American Vocational Association, Committee on Research Publications, "Factors the Satisfaction of Home Economics Teachers," AVA, Research Bulletin #3, Washington, D. C., 1948.

[19]C. G. Brown and Betty Neitzal, "Communication, Supervision, and Morale," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1952, 36:86-91.

[20]Remson Cole, "J. A. Survey of Employee Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, 1940, 4:497-206.

[21]Douglas Fryer, "Industrial Dissatisfaction," Industrial Psychology, 1926, 1:25-29.

[22]Clifford Jurgensen, "Selected Factors Which Influence Job Preferences," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1947, 31:553-564.

[23]Arthur Kolstad, "Employee Attitudes in a Department Store," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1938, 22:470-479.

[24]Arthur Kornhauser, and Agnes Sharp, "Employee Attitudes: Suggestions From a Study in a Factory," Personnel Journal, 1932, 10:393-404.

[25]H.Y.C. McClusky, and Floyd Strayer, "Reactions of

(b) Job satisfaction - number of children

Herzberg reported no studies that directly measured the relationship between job satisfaction and the number of children but he did report two on the relationship between job satisfaction and number of dependents.[26] These reported findings opposite to one another; Stagner and Britton[27] found that men with three or more dependents tend to be more satisfied with their jobs than men with smaller families, and Cason[28] found that married men with no children liked their jobs better than married men with children.

(c) Job Satisfaction - occupational prestige level

Of the eighteen studies that Herzberg reviewed[29] only one, that by Fryer,[30] failed to report a higher level of job satisfaction at higher occupational levels. Some of the representative studies reporting positive associations

---

Teachers to the Teaching Situation - A Study in Job Satisfactions," School Review, 1940, 48:612-23.

[26]Herzberg, op. cit., p. 24.

[27]Ross Stagner, J. W. Rich, and R. H. Britton, "Job Attitudes: Defense Workers," Personnel Journal, 1941, 20:90-97

[28]Hasly, Cason, "General Curves and Conditions of Feeling," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1931, 15:126-48.

[29]Herzberg, op. cit., p. 20.

[30]Fryer, op. cit.

are: Centers,[31] two Fortune surveys,[32] Katz,[33] and Mann.[34] One study not reported by Herzberg, that of Eicher,[35] also reported a positive association.

(d) Job satisfaction - job tenure

Herzberg reviewed seventeen studies in this area.[36] The seven which were wide range studies reported an early period of high morale dropping off to a low period followed by a resurgance to a period of rising job satisfaction. All of the others, except Ash[37] and Stott,[38] analysed short range periods that fit in with the general trend.

---

[31] D. H. Centers, "Motivational Aspects of Occupational Stratification," Journal of Social Psychology, 1948, 28: 187-217.

[32] Fortune Surveys, Fortune, 1938, 17:83-84, 86-88, 91-92 and 1947, 25: pp. 5-6, 10-11.

[33] Donald Katz, "Motivational and Morale in Industry," Current Trends in Industrial Psychology, (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1949), pp. 145-171.

[34] Floyd Mann, "A Study of Work Satisfactions as a Function of the Discrepency Between Inferred Aspirations and Achievement," Dissertation Abstracts, 1953, 13:902.

[35] Eicher, op. cit. pp. 35-42.

[36] Herzberg, op. cit. pp. 11-12.

[37] Phillip Ash, "The SRA Employee Inventory - A Statistical Analysis," Personnel Psychology, 1954, 7:337-364.

[38] M.B.A. Stott, "A Preliminary Examination In The Occupational Analysis of Secretarial Work," Hum. Fact., Lond., 1938, 9:249-258.

(e) Job satisfaction - income

Herzberg[39] reported four studies, Centers and Cantril,[40] Inlow,[41] Miller,[42] and Thomson,[43] which discovered that as income goes up job satisfaction goes up. One study reported a drop in satisfaction for the middle group of earners, Benge,[44] and one study (Survey Research Center)[45] reported that the amount of money earned was less important in determining a worker's morale than whether or not he thought his pay rate was fair.

(f) Job satisfaction - age

Herzberg summarized twenty-three studies in this area.[46] They all showed a consistent trend. In general, morale is high with young workers, it tends to go down until it reaches a low point in middle or late twenties or early thirties, and then it shows a steady rise with age.

---

[39]Herzberg, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

[40]Richard Centers, and Hardly Cantril, "Income Satisfaction and Income Aspiration," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1946, 41:64-69.

[41]Inlow, op. cit.

[42]Delbert C. Miller, "Economic Factors in the Morale of College-Trained Adults," American Journal of Sociology, 1947, 47:139-156.

[43]William Thomson, "Eleven Years After Graduation," Occupations, 1939, 17:709-714.

[44]Eugene Benge, "How to Learn What Workers Think of Job and Boss," Factory Management Maintenance, 1944, 102(5), 101-104.

[45]Survey Research Center, "Effective Morale," Part 3, Fortune, 2(8), 46-50.

[46]Herzberg, op. cit., pp. 5-8.

(g) Job satisfaction - education

Herzberg summarized thirteen studies in this area with conflicting results.[47] Five studies showed no difference in job satisfaction as education varied, three studies showed an increase in morale as education increased, and five studies showed a decrease in morale as education increased.

Both Eicher[48] and Trier[49] found a small, but insignificant, positive association between job satisfaction and education.

---

[47] Ibid., pp. 15-16.

[48] Eicher, op. cit., p. 73.

[49] Trier, op. cit., p. 34.

CHAPTER II

THE MEASUREMENT OF INTER-GENERATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and discuss some of the more important methods that have been used to measure inter-generational occupational mobility. No attempt will be made to review the findings of such studies nor to review all of the studies of inter-generational occupational mobility. Only enough studies will be included as is necessary to illustrate the major methods that have been used to measure inter-generational occupational mobility. This study is not concerned with intra-generational occupational mobility per se.

The first method is that used by Davidson and Anderson.[1] Using the Alba Edwards scale of occupations[2] as their classifying device, they constructed two basic charts in which they distributed the level of the son's occupation by

---

[1]Percy Davidson, and H. Dewey Anderson, Occupational Mobility In An American Community, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1937).

[2]Alba Edwards, "A Social-Economic Grouping of the Gainful Workers in the United States," Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1933, XXVIIX:377-87.

the level of father's occupation and the level of father's occupation by the level of son's occupation. Davidson and Anderson computed what they called the transmission of status from father to son by computing, for each occupational level of fathers, the percentage of sons on the same level or adjacent levels. They then reversed this procedure; for each level of sons they computed the percentage of fathers on the same or adjacent levels, in order to measure the occupational origins of the sample. This was carried one step farther in order to measure the three generational transmission of status; the occupational levels of the fathers were distributed by the occupational levels of the grandfathers. The direction and amount of vertical mobility were determined by computing the percentage of sons at each occupational level having fathers in each of the occupational levels ranked above or below that of the son in terms of prestige. Trends in occupational mobility were measured by comparing the amount of occupational inheritance from grandfather to father with that from father to son. There was also an attempt to describe career patterns at various levels but this will not be discussed because no attempt was made to control for the occupation of fathers and thus it is not relevant as a measure of inter-generational occupational mobility.

Centers analyzed the data in his study in a manner similar to that of Davidson and Anderson but used different occupational categories.[3] The categories he used were:

---

[3]Richard Centers, "Occupational Mobility of Urban

large business, professional, small business, white collar, skilled manual, semi-skilled manual, and unskilled.

Eicher also used a related technique of measuring inter-generational occupational mobility.[4] She also used the Alba Edwards Scale of Occupations but in measuring vertical mobility she compared the respondents present occupation to that of his father at age forty (an age at which Miller and Form state that a man is usually in his stable occupation).[5] Upward mobility is defined as those cases in which the respondent's occupation is on a higher level than that of his father at age forty and downward mobility as those cases in which the respondent's occupation is on a lower level.

Sorokin's study was concerned with a different problem but the technique he used to measure inter-generational occupational mobility is of interest here.[6] He was not concerned with measuring the entire range of inter-generational occupational mobility but simply with determining the social origins of American men of wealth and any trends in changes in these origins. He measured this simply by analyzing the principal occupations of the fathers of these men of wealth.

Occupational Strata," American Sociological Review, 1948, 13:197-203.

[4]Joann Eicher, "Job Satisfaction: Its Relation to Occupational, Community, and Stratification, Variables" (unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1956), pp. 49-50, 53-55.

[5]Delbert C. Miller, and William H. Form, Industrial Sociology, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 700.

[6]Pitirim, Sorokin, "American Millionaires and Multi-Millionaires," Social Forces, 1925, 3:627-40.

This is, again, a simple variant of the method used by Davidson and Anderson.

Form and Miller have used a more sophisticated variant of the career pattern analysis presented by Davidson and Anderson.[7] They analyzed a work career by breaking it down into segments according to the following classificatory scheme: initial work period, all part or full time jobs that an individual holds up to the time that he completes his formal education; trial work periods, those jobs that an individual holds while he is shopping around for his permanent job - classified in terms of jobs held for less than three years; and the stable work period, any job at which an individual remains for three years or more. The various modal combinations of the initial, trial, and stable work periods were plotted and classified as being either "secure" or "insecure" career patterns. The reason that this type of career analysis is discussed in a chapter dealing with intergenerational occupational mobility is that Form and Miller analyzed the various modal career patterns in terms of the occupational levels of the fathers of the respondents.

All of the above studies share the characteristics of measuring occupational mobility by comparing the occupational levels of fathers and sons without making any attempt to control for possible changes that might have taken place in the occupational structure itself during the course of a

---

[7]William H. Form, and Delbert C. Miller, "Occupational Career Patterns as a Sociological Instrument," American Journal of Sociology, 54:317-29.

generation. Many of the occupational shifts noted in the above studies may have been the result of the expansion of job opportunities at certain levels and the contraction of opportunities at other levels over the time span considered. The failure to control for these changes does not in any way negate the findings in any of the above cited studies - it merely suggests that their findings are partial. They could be more complete. All of the findings presented in these studies still hold - the controlling for shifts in the occupational structure would merely help to explain those findings.

Both the studies by Davidson and Anderson and by Centers indicated an awareness of this problem but did not directly deal with it.

In a discussion of their findings Davidson and Anderson state,

> In recent industrial history, fundamental changes have occured which force masses of workers from older occupations into expanding categories, probably without regard to fine individual differences in competency or skill and without essentially altering their relative status or economic well being.
>
> The older occupational situation was made up of a rather limited number of well established professions, some clerks and semi-skilled workers, and a preponderance of farmers and proprietors, skilled, and unskilled workers. From this older arrangement a heavy flow of workers has moved toward new professions and into expanding clerical and semi-skilled occupations, involving a sharp reduction particularly in the proportion of farmers and farm hands among the gainfully employed. The effect of these changes upon occupational status is not clear with respect either to gradations of competency or to their economic and social implications. [8]

[8] Davidson and Anderson, op. cit., pp. 162-3. Also

The present researcher would tend to disagree with the portion of the above statement that implies that historical occupational shifts were made without essentially altering the relative status or economic well being of workers. Occupational categories which have contracted have not completely died out, e.g., there are still farmers. As long as these categories remain and some of the sons of farmers are farmers and some are members of other expanding categories of occupations, such as the semi-skilled workers; if there is a difference in status and/or economic well being between farmers and semi-skilled workers today, then there has been an essential change.

Centers indicates his awareness of the problem with the following statement, "The determinants of these (mobility) relations can only be guessed at, of course, but the two main factors would probably be found in the changing requirements of the productive economy for workers at various levels, and in the differing numbers supplied to the population by the fathers of the various occupational strata, and from which the labor force can be ultimately drawn."[9]

Ginsberg used essentially the same method of measuring occupational mobility used by Davidson and Anderson, but at an earlier date, with a different classification of

---

partially quoted in Natalie Rogoff, Recent Trends in Occupational Mobility, (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953), p. 21.

[9]Centers, op. cit., also quoted in Rogoff, op. cit., p. 22.

occupations.[10] But he also presented data on the distribution of occupations which enabled one to allow for the demand factor mentioned by Rogoff. He limited himself to an impressionistic, rather than a statistical, treatment of this data.

Rogoff indicates that any procedures which simply compare occupations of fathers and sons without controlling for the changes in the occupational structure over time are inadequate and she further states that, "The source of the difficulty is that no account is taken of the total number of positions available in each occupational class. Movement into and out of each occupational class needs to be considered in relation to this availability or demand factor."[11]

Rogoff presented a sophisticated statistical technique for controlling for changes in the occupational structure in inter-generational occupational mobility studies. This technique, formulated by Herbert Goldhamer,[12] was designed to make it possible to measure social distance mobility when the variation in the demand factor is held constant or controlled for. Social distance mobility is defined as total mobility divided by the demand factor. The definition was expressed in standard notation as:[13]

---

[10]Morris Ginsberg, "Interchange Between Social Classes," Chapter IX of Studies in Sociology, (London: Methuen and Company, 1932), pp. 160-74.

[11]Rogoff, op. cit., p. 29.

[12]Rogoff, op. cit., pp. 28-33. [13]Ibid., pp. 31-32.

let X_{ij} = number of sons moving from father's occupational class i to occupational class j

R_i = number of fathers in occupational class i

C_j = number of positions (sons) in occupational class j

N = total number of positions (or sons or fathers)

Total mobility = $\frac{X_{ij}}{R_i}$, the proportion of sons with i fathers who move to j

Demand factor = $\frac{C_j}{N}$, the proportion of total positions available to class j

Social distance mobility of sons = $\frac{X_{ij}}{R_i} \quad \frac{C_j}{N} = \frac{X_{ij}N}{R_i C_j} = \frac{X_{ij}}{R_i C_j/N}$

Rogoff has this to say with regard to the above notational expression of the 'social distance mobility' measure:

> In the last form, the denominator of the definition of social distance mobility corresponds exactly to the definition of expected values in conventional contingency analysis. The whole expression is then seen as the ratio of the actual cell value to its expected value. In this form social distance mobility is defined as the ratio between actual mobility and the amount of mobility we would expect where there is no relation between the son's occupational class and the occupational class of his father. The expected mobility values represent the amount of movement that would occur if the social distance factors did not operate, in other words, if only availability factors influenced occupational movement.[14]

---

[14] Ibid., p. 32.

This measure has the advantage of enabling one to make valid comparisons between amounts of mobility in two different occupational sturucures, or within the same structure at two different points in time, without having to be concerned with the possibility that the differences observed are the product of differing amounts of availability of certain positions in the two different structures. It controls for both of the factors that Centers thought would be the major determinants of mobility, the demand for workers at the various occupational levels and the supply coming from each level.

There is one comment that must be made regarding the notational definition of social distance mobility, that is, with respect to the definition of R_1. Rogoff states that R_1 is to equal the number of fathers in occupational class i and this is used to indicate the amount of the labor supply available in that class. This is obviously a poor measure of potential labor supply as one father could easily have more than one son. It seems likely that this measure, if applied literally, would result in underestimating the potential labor supply. It would be much more precise to let R_1 equal the total number of sons of fathers in occupational class i. This change would not make any difference in studies conducted along the lines of Rogoff's where each son listed the occupation of his father and all fathers were treated as being separate and distinct persons regardless of whether or not the sample included any brothers or half brothers,

i.e. if two brothers were included in the sample each would name the occupation of his father and the resulting information was treated as if this represented two fathers. However, it is quite conceivable that this could make a difference in the results of a study that was designed differently.

Rogoff used the above described tool to compute the social distance rates from each father's occupational class to each of the son's occupational classes. This basic statistic was then used in order to compute the average mobility out of each class of origin, the average mobility into each class of destination, the ratio of the average mobility out of each class to the average mobility into that class, the amount of occupational inheritance for each occupational class, and the ratios of occupational inheritance to out-mobility and to in-mobility for each occupational class.

All of the above cited characteristics measured are characteristics of the occupational structure and not of individuals. The technique of measuring social distance mobility will not aid one in determining whether a particular individual is upwardly mobile, downwardly mobile or immobile.

Tumin and Feldman listed five major problems raised by the use of current measures of occupational mobility.[15]

> 1. Wide differences might occur between the occupational distributions of fathers and sons without a significant change in the distribution of power, prestige, or property.

---

[15] Melvin Tumin, and Arnold Feldman, "Theory and Measurement of Occupational Mobility," American Sociological Review, 1957, 22:281-288, pp. 282-3.

2. Certain 'goodness of fit' techniques, i.e. that presented by Rogoff, do not allow for the drawing of inferences regarding the extent to which groups that are alleged to be mobile perceive themselves as mobile. Inasmuch as peer groups are used as reference groups as well as parental groups an objectively upwardly mobile person may perceive himself as being downwardly mobile. They suggest that a measure of mobility might do well to include elements of both parental and peer position.

3. Most techniques do not allow for the measurement of mobility in such a manner that individuals can be scored and groups of respondents sorted on the basis of their mobility scores.

4. The occupational experiences of sons of the highest rated and of the lowest rated groups are not adequately handled by most measures as, by definition, it is not possible for the sons of the highest rated groups to be upwardly mobile or the sons of the lowest rated groups to be downwardly mobile.

5. Most measures fail to account for birth order, birth spacing, and number of siblings. This is relevant because the mobility experiences of younger and older sons could be different as a result of the possibility that the younger sons may be able to count on aid in educational achievements from an older working brother.

In order to compensate for the above problems they devised a measure of inter-generational occupational mobility which was called the 'Generational Occupational Mobility Score' and abbreviated 'GOMS'. A summary of the computational procedure is as follows:[16]

A. Raw Data

1. Occupation of ego

2. Occupation of ego's father

---

[16] Ibid., pp. 283-84.

3. Occupation of all of ego's brothers

B. Procedure

1. Divide the sample into the different father's occupational groups.
2. For each of the father's occupational groups in turn, compute:
   (a) The mean occupational score ($\bar{x}$) of all their sons, i.e., the mean occupational score of all respondents and brothers whose fathers share a common occupation.
   (b) The standard deviation (O^-) of this distribution, i.e., the O^- of the occupational distribution of all respondents and brothers whose fathers have the same occupation.
3. For each respondent compute the deviation of his occupational score from the $\bar{x}$ occupational score of all respondents and brothers whose fathers have the same occupation, i.e., the deviation of the respondents' occupational score from the mean computed in 2(a) above.
4. Divide the deviation computed in 3 above by the O^- (computed in 2(b) above) of that distribution. The resulting z score is the GOMS. Ten is added to make all scores positive.
5. The procedure may be stated as follows:

$$\text{GOMS} = \frac{\bar{x} - X + 10}{O^-} = z$$

where $\bar{x}$ = mean occupational score of all respondents and brothers of occupationally similar fathers.

x = respondent's individual occupational score.

σ = standard deviation of the distribution of occupational scores of all respondents and their brothers within the same fathers occupational group.

There are two problems with the above formulation as it now stands. The first is with regard to whether or not the GOMS measures that which it purports to measure and the second is whether ten is added prior to, or after the standard deviation is divided into the deviation of the respondents occupational score from the mean occupational score of all respondents and their brothers whose fathers have the same occupation.

The problem of whether or not the GOMS measures what it purports to measure is a rather serious one. The computation of the GOMS by the method suggested by Tumin and Feldman yields some rather unusual results. Those individuals who have experienced the greatest amount of occupational mobility, in the positive sense of rising in status, receive lower scores than do those who have experienced less mobility.

This can be illustrated by taking a hypothetical case of two brothers, one a professional and one an agricultural day laborer, whose father was a clerk or office worker and

computing their z scores. Inasmuch as they are brothers, the mean occupational score for all sons of occupationally similar fathers and the standard deviation of that distribution would be the same for both respondents, 6.19 and 2.72 respectively.[17] The only relevant bit of data that would differ for them would be their own occupational scores. The professional would receive an occupational score of 11 and the agricultural day laborer would receive a score of 1.[18] Thus, the formulae for computing their z scores would be GOMS professional = $\frac{6.19 - 11 + 10}{2.72}$, or $\frac{6.19 - 11}{2.72} + 10$ by the revision suggested in the second part of this paper, and GOMS agricultural day laborer = $\frac{6.19 - 1 + 10}{2.72}$, or $\frac{6.19 - 1}{2.72} + 10$. When evaluated this becomes GOMS professional = 1.91, or 8.23, and GOMS agricultural day laborer = 5.95, or 11.91.

With either method of computation, the professional would clearly receive a lower z score than would the agricultural day laborer. This means that those members of the group of all sons of occupationally similar fathers who have achieved the highest occupational positions would be receiving lower z scores than would those who have achieved lower occupational scores.

There is nothing intrinsically wrong with this result as long as one is aware of it when he does his analysis and consistantly interprets the lower scores as indicating greater upward mobility and the higher scores as indicating less

---

[17] Ibid., Table 1, p. 285. [18] Ibid., p. 285.

upward mobility. It does not appear that Tumin and Feldman are aware of this. They consistently interpret the higher scores as indicating greater upward mobility than the lower scores. They specifically state that, "All scores above ten represent over achievement; below ten under achievement", and they further define under achievement in the following manner, "...under achievers--i.e., men in those occupations are at present located in lower positions than the average position now held by those with whom they started."[19]

This problem is very easily resolved if the computational fromula of the GOMS is revised to read GOMS = $\frac{X - \bar{X} + 10}{\sigma}$ or $\frac{X - \bar{X}}{\sigma}$ + 10 if the change suggested in the second part of this paper is taken into account. This would then change the z scores of the above mentioned hypothetical brothers to GOMS professional = 5.44, or 11.77, and GOMS agricultural day laborer = 1.77, or 8.09. This would have the effect of giving the professional a higher z score than his brother who is an agricultural day laborer. In general, this proposed revision would have the effect of assigning a higher z score to those members of the group of all sons of occupationally similar fathers who have achieved higher occupations than it would to those who have achieved lower occupations.

There is one possibility that I have not yet accounted for, that is, that Tumin and Feldman did not assign values to the occupational categories in the manner that I have assumed,

---

[19] Ibid., p. 286

i.e., Professional, 11; Semi-professional, 10; ...Agricultural day laborers, 1; but instead assigned them in this order, Professionals, 1; Semi-professional, 2; ...Agricultural day laborers, 11. If this were the case then those individuals who achieved the greatest amount of upward mobility would be receiving the highest z scores. They do not clearly indicate which order of assignment of values they used. The only relevant statement that they made is, "All occupations were arbitrarily classified into eleven categories and assigned numerical ratings of one to eleven, starting with agricultural day laborers at the bottom and ending with professionals at the top."[20] This could possible be interpreted in either manner. Nevertheless, the data that they present in their article clearly indicates their order of assigning rankings. In Table 1,[21] they present the mean occupational scores of all sons of occupationally similar fathers for each of the eleven occupational categories of fathers' occupation. They are as follows: Professional, 8.06; Semi-professional, 6.71; Owners of business, 5.81; Managers and white collar sales, 5.25; Owners and managers of farms, 4.44; Clerks and office workers, 6.19; Skilled labor, 4.72; Semi-skilled labor, 4.36; Service workers, 4.50; Unskilled labor, 3.91; and Agricultural day laborers, 3.19.

In general, it can be seen that as one moves down the level of occupations from the most prestigeful to the least,

---

[20] Ibid., p. 285. [21] Ibid., p. 285.

the mean occupational score of all sons decreases. If Puerto Rico is like most other societies, in that the sons of men in the highest ranked occupations have the best opportunity of achieving high occupations, then the only manner that this result could be achieved is if the occupational categories were ranked from professional as 11 to agricultural day laborer as 1. Thus, the foregoing analysis is correct and the proposed revision is in order.

This proposed revision would have a dual advantage. First, it would bring the computation of the GOMS into line with the manner in which it was interpreted by Tumin and Feldman. Second, it would be heuristically valuable. Sociologists are accustomed to interpreting higher scores from an index designed to measure vertical occupational mobility as indicating greater upward mobility. It appears to be simpler to revise the formula than it would be to revise the thoughtways of sociologists.

The second problem with the computation of the GOMS is less serious but, nevertheless, important. This is the question of whether or not ten should be added prior to, or after, the division of the distribution of occupational scores into the deviation of the individuals occupational score from the mean occupational score of all sons of occupationally similar fathers. The verbal description of the computational procedure of the GOMS and its symbolic representation appear to contradict one another on this count. The verbal description (see step 4) seems to indicate that the

division takes place prior to the adding of ten to the scores. However, the symbolic representation clearly indicates that ten is added prior to the division.

It appears that the standardization process that this division represents is only meaningful if the division takes place prior to the adding of ten to the scores. If the ten is added first then z scores will not be comparable when taken from two different father's occupation categories. We would be adding ten divided by the standard deviation to each score. This would yield a different value everytime the standard deviation of the distribution involved was different. The z scores would be strictly comparable as standard deviation units above or below the mean if the division takes place prior to the adding of ten.

In a discussion of their Table 2 quoted above, comparing adjacent occupational classes with respect to occupational mobility scores, they stated that all scores above ten indicate over achievement and all scores under ten indicate under achievement. The only way in which it would be possible to use ten as the cutting point to distinquish between over achievement and under achievement is if ten were added to the scores after the standard deviation of the occupational distribution was divided into the deviation of the individual's occupational score from the mean occupational score of all sons of occupationally similar fathers.

This could be illustrated with the case of the two brothers mentioned in the hypothetical case earlier. The

mean occupational score of that distribution was 6.19, the distribution of all sons of clerks and office workers, the z score of the professional son would be 5.22, $\frac{11 - 6.19 + 10}{2.72}$, if ten is added prior to the devision. This would have to be interpreted as under achievement by Tumin and Feldman. But this would be an incorrect interpretation. The professionals are ranked at the top of the occupational hierarchy with a ranking of 11. This is clearly over achievement with respect to a mean of 6.19. If we make our devision prior to the adding of ten, the z score of the professional becomes 11.77, $\frac{11 - 6.19}{2.72} + 10$, a score correctly indicating over achievement. The z score of the agricultural day laborer would be 8.19, $\frac{1 - 6.19}{2.72} + 10$, correctly indicating under achievement.

It is thus evident that if one wishes the computation of the z score of the GOMS to be consistant with the discussion of findings that Tumin and Feldman present in their article that the standardization, i.e., the division of the standard deviation of the distribution of occupational scores into the deviation of the individuals occupational score from the mean occupational score of all sons having occupationally similar fathers, must take place prior to the adding on of ten in order to make all scores positive.

The fact that Tumin and Feldman interpreted their GOMS scores in a manner contrary to that which is indicated by the manner in which they said it should be computed <u>may</u> not invalidate their findings in the article under discussion.

There are certain indications that they actually computed their z scores in the manner indicated by revisions proposed here rather than the manner in which they said they had. In Table 2 they indicate that the mean mobility score for agricultural day laborers is 9.04, thus indicating under achievement.[22] This under achievement is quite possible. However, such a value, 9.04, could not be arrived at as the mean mobility score for agricultural day laborers by the formula that they present. It could be arrived at through the use of the revision suggested here. Not having the data that Tumin and Feldman used, it is not possible to determine if the proposed revision of their formula would actually yield a value 9.04, but it may be concluded that the formula that they suggest could not. It is possible that their actual computations were made in accord with the revised formulation suggested here.

In conclusion it is proposed that the GOMS should be symbolized as follows:

$$\text{GOMS} = \frac{X - \bar{X}}{\sigma} + 10 = Z$$

where X respondents individual occupational score

$\bar{X}$ = mean occupational score of all respondents and brothers whose fathers have the same occupation

σ = standard deviation of the distribution of occupational scores of all respondents and brothers whose fathers have the same occupation

---

[22] Ibid., p. 286.

The computational procedure would be same as that proposed by Tumin and Feldman except for step three, where the deviation of the individuals occupational score from the mean computed in step 2(a) would be arrived at by subtracting the mean from the individual score, and in step 4, where the division of the standard deviation computed in step 2(b) into the deviation computed in step 3 would take place prior to adding ten to the scores.

Tumin and Feldman listed five possible advantages and two possible disadvantages of the GOMS as a measure of intergenerational occupational mobility. They are:[23]

Advantages

1. Minor changes in occupational position that are inconsequential are less likely to bias the measurements as mobility is measured relative to the average achievement of all those whose fathers had the same occupational rank.

2. Both fathers' and peers' statuses are built into the measure.

3. Individuals can be assigned mobility scores and sorted in terms of them.

4. The full experience of the sons of the highest and the lowest ranked groups can be accounted for as they may be called upwardly or downwardly mobile if their achievement is greater or less than that of the average for the sons of their group.

5. Birth order, birth spacing, and number of siblings are controlled for by randomizing their effect by building their achievement into the GOMS.

---

[23] Ibid., p. 284-85.

Disadvantages

1. Concrete distances moved by the respondent and his actual career history can not be calculated due to the fact that the GOMS is calculated in standard scores.

2. Due to the fact that the GOMS is a standard score mobility scores computed from differently dispersed distributions may not be strictly comparable.

Tumin and Feldman's GOMS appears to have all of the advantages that Rogoff's social distance mobility measure has in controlling for the demand at various occupational levels and the supply of labor from each level due to the fact that it measures mobility relative to all peers who started out at the same point. The major difference is that it measures mobility as a characteristic of an individual while Rogoff's technique measures mobility as a characteristic of an occupational structure. It appears that they are mutually supplementary techniques for the measurement of inter-generational occupational mobility.

The final method of measuring inter-generational occupational mobility to be discussed in this chapter is the age cohort method of Gerhard Lenski.[24] He classified his respondents into three occupational classifications, white collar, blue collar, and farming; and then broke them

---

[24]Gerhard Lenski, "Trends in Inter-Generational Occupational Mobility in the United States," American Sociological Review, 1948, 23:514-23.

down into five age cohorts in terms of whether the date of birth of the respondent was between 1853 - 1892, 1893 - 1902, 1903 - 1912, 1913 - 1922, or 1923 - 1932. He further distributed each of the age cohorts in terms of the occupation of sons vis-a-vis that of fathers. The trends in vertical occupational mobility were then measured by comparing the differences between upward and downward mobility for each age cohort after the latter two cohorts had been corrected for the differential affect of intra-generational occupational mobility. Upward mobility was defined as movement from either blue collar or farmer occupational categories into that of white collar. Downward mobility was defined as movement from the white collar category to either blue collar or farmer. Movement from blue collar to farmer or from farmer to blue collar was not defined as being either upward or downward mobility.

Lenski's age-cohort method of measuring occupational mobility is, like that of Rogoff, one which measures mobility as a characteristic of occupational structures rather than of individuals.

The problem that this thesis is concerned with is an analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and inter-generational occupational mobility. It is therefore desirable to select for use measures of mobility that will be both valid and compatible with reference group theory. The direct comparison of the occupational levels of sons and fathers in the manner of Davidson and Anderson was

selected for that very reason. Parents are often used as a reference group and this method of measuring occupational mobility has been used in the bulk of the earlier studies.

The revised GOMS was selected for a similar pair of reasons. It is a very sophisticated and fine device for measuring inter-generational occupational mobility and it does dovetail well with reference group theory as it includes as components in its construction two groups that are important as reference groups.

A third, but much more indirect method, was chosen more for its relevance to reference group theory than for its value in measuring occupational mobility. The comparison of occupational levels of brothers does yield some inferences regarding mobility vis-a-vis the immediate kin group but it fails to yield any information regarding achievements relative to non-kin groups. If a respondent reported an occupational level below that of his brother one would never know if the respondent was downwardly mobile, stationary and his brother upwardly mobile, or upwardly mobile at a slower rate than his brother.

The method of career pattern analysis presented by Form and Miller would have been quite appropriate and the results from such an analysis would have been very interesting but it could not be used in this study due to the lack of the requisite data. This is one drawback of secondary analyses. One often will find data missing that one would like to use in the secondary analysis that was simply not pertinent to the original study and thus not gathered.

The methods of Rogoff and Lenski were not used as they were not applicable to the problem of this study. They both treat inter-generational occupational mobility as a characteristic of the occupational structure rather than as a characteristic of the individual.

CHAPTER III

THE MEASUREMENT OF JOB SATISFACTION

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and to discuss some of the major methods that have been used to measure job satisfaction. It is not its intention to discuss the findings of the many job satisfaction studies, nor to describe all of the methods that have been used to measure job satisfaction at various times. The purpose rather is to select certain measurement devices that are deemed to be representative of the various types of techniques that have been used to measure job satisfaction and to discuss their relative merits.

For the purpose of this study we will accept Hoppock's definition of job satisfaction. "(Job satisfaction) is any combination of physical, physiological, and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say, 'I am satisfied with my job.'"[1] Hoppock goes on to state, with regard to this definition, that,

> Obviously a person may be satisfied with one aspect of his job and dissatisfied with another.

---

[1]Robert Hoppock, Job Satisfaction, (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1935), p. 47.

> Our definition assumes that it is possible for him to balance the specific satisfactions against the specific dissatisfactions and arrive at a composite satisfaction with the job as a whole. We do not mean that an unskilled laborer will sit down with a pencil and paper and analytically check the advantages of the job against the disadvantages until he strikes a logical balance. What, we do mean is that, through some psychological or physiological mechanism, most of us acquire a sort of vaguely defined attitude toward our total job situation. A multitude of satisfactions and dissatisfactions may, we assume, play upon each other to produce the composite attitude reflected in the statement, 'I am satisfied with my job.'[2]

The assumptions included in the above statement are acceptable to the present researcher. There are two basic types of approaches to the measurement of job satisfaction, the direct and the indirect. Eicher has this to say with regard to them,

> The measurement of job satisfaction may be further divided into 'direct' and 'indirect' measures of job satisfaction. The bulk of the studies have been patterned after Hoppock's direct method of measuring this variable. Thus, the respondent is directly questioned about how well he likes his job, whether he has ever thought of changing his job, and so on. The indirect method of assessing job satisfaction consists in asking the respondent what job he would choose if he could start his occupational life over. That is, he is not asked about how satisfied he is with his job, but his answer presumably will indicate present job satisfaction or job aspiration.[3]

In the above statement, she has summed up the difference between them. Her own choice was to use the indirect

---

[2]Ibid., p. 48.

[3]Joanne Eicher, "Job Satisfaction: Its Relation to Occupational, Stratification, and Community Variables" (Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1956), p. 3.

method in her Master's thesis. Eicher used a job satisfaction index which was constructed out of the following three questions:[4]

1. Which job would you most like to have at your present place of work?
2. Of all the jobs you know of, what job would you most like to have?
3. Which of all the jobs you have had, did you like best?

A response to any of these questions which indicated a choice of the respondent's present job was scored one, and a response indicating a choice of any other job was scored zero. This resulted in a four point scale ranging from zero to three.

It is doubtful whether these three questions may legitimately be assigned equal weights and added to yield a composite job satisfaction score. A respondent who has only had one or two jobs would have a limited range to select from in replying to Question 3 and might conceivably select his present job as the one he has liked best and still be quite dissatisfied with it. On the other hand an individual, having all the occupations in the world to select from, might easily express an unrealistic desire by answering Question 2 with an occupation other than his own while still being quite satisfied with his present job. In any event,

---

[4] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

the mere fact that a respondent would be more likely to select his present job in response to Question 3 than he would to Question 2 as a result of chance alone should cause one to doubt the advisability of assigning equal weights to the two questions and adding them together in order to get an index of job satisfaction.

Woods attempted to measure a concept that is closely related to job satisfaction, morale.[5] He defined morale as, "the liking or disliking, in some degree, the various situations that arise in the process of working with others".[6]

He indirectly measured morale with a scale covering seventeen areas. Each of these areas contained a number of possible responses of which the respondent was to select the one which best approximated his feelings. The responses had previously been given scale values from zero to ten in terms of the amount of morale they presumably represented. The categories covered by the scale were: the meaningfulness of instructions given to employees, the wisdom of employees making decisions and assuming responsibility, the utility of employees making constructive suggestions, capabilities of the supervisors, essentialness of the work done, employees willingness to do favors for employees, employee courtesy to employee, employee courtesy to the public, source and

---

[5]Walter Woods, "Employee Attitudes and Their Relation to Morale," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1944, 28:285-301.

[6]Ibid., p. 285.

opportunity for advancement, recognition of merit, and related type categories.

A much less complex indirect technique of measurement was that used by Fortune in two of its surveys.[7] In 1947 they asked two questions: "1. For a person in your trade or occupation do you think your company is about as good a place there is to work, or do you think there are other places that are better?" and "2. If you could go back to the age of fifteen and start life over again, would you choose a different trade or occupation?" In 1938 they asked simply, "If you could go back to the age eighteen and start life over again, would you choose a different career or occupation?"

Super used a three question indirect method of measuring job satisfaction.[8] His questions were: "1. What do you think you might like to be?", "2. Are you satisfied with your opportunity to express yourself in your work?" and "3. If not, why?"

Lyman used a much more complex indirect technique when she focused on the problem of job dissatisfaction rather than job satisfaction.[9] The three questions that she used

---

[7]Fortune Quarterly Survey XI: Fortune:17, January, 1938, p. 86 and The Fortune Survey: Fortune:35, May, 1947, p. 10.

[8]Donald Super, "Occupational Level and Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1939, 23:547-64.

[9]Elizabeth Lyman, "Occupational Differences in the Value Attached to Work," American Journal of Sociology, 1955, 61:138-150.

were: "1. If you could start over, would you go into the same kind of work again, or what would you like to do? (probe: this is 'are there any regrets' question.)", "2. Suppose you could get the same pay no matter what kind of work you did. Of all the kinds of work you can think of, what would you like best?" "3. How would you feel about a son of yours going into your kind of work?"

A respondent was classified as being satisfied if, and only if, he gave the following combination of responses:

"1. He would go into the same type of work again and he expressed no regrets.

2. He would like best the same type of work that he has at present.

3. He would approve of his son going into his present occupation or if he somehow indicates that everyone should follow his own interests."

Any other combination of responses was classified as indicating dissatisfaction.

Lyman's technique seems to suffer from the same pitfalls that most of the indirect measurement techniques do, plus a few more that are peculiar to hers. It seems quite likely that an American factory worker could and would say that he would be a little disappointed if his son also became a factory worker, and yet still be very satisfied with his present job for himself. Analytically, it would appear to be a mistake to lump together all of those who answer one, two, or three questions with a job other than their

own as being dissatisfied. Even if one were to grant that these questions validly measure job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, it would seem that such a lumping process would tend to obscure the relationships that go with the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction that one has with his job.

In general, this researcher would have to accept the conclusions that were drawn by Gonon in his review of the various techniques used to measure job satisfaction. They are as follows:[10]

> The review of the literature has lead this researcher to believe that: (1) the proper method of measuring job satisfaction is by directly asking such questions as 'Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with your present job?' (2) there are no conflicts between the findings of job aspiration and job satisfaction studies, because each of these studies is separate and distinct, using different questions that get at different variables and produce different results; (3) the incorporation of job aspiration questions in job satisfaction scales is methodologically unsound, because it is possible for a dissatisfied person to desire to remain on his present job, and it is also possible for a satisfied person to desire a job other than his present job; (4) attempts at imputing job satisfaction to present job responses and attempts at imputing job dissatisfaction to other than present job responses to job aspiration questions are methodologically unsound for the same reasons given in (3) above; (5) it is proper methodology to study job aspiration and job satisfaction separately; and (6) it is also proper methodology to attempt to relate job aspiration to job satisfaction for the same sample in a research effort as long as the variables are properly labeled and kept separate and distinct.

---

[10]Pierre Gonon, "The Relationship of Independence in the Work Situation to Job Acceptance: A Study of the Job Aspirations of Employed Adult Males" (Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1956) p. 45.

It is quite easy to visualize how a person could be satisfied with his present job and at the same time have aspirations for another job. This would especially be true if the jobs were heirarchically aligned in a normal career pattern; i.e., a medical intern who is satisfied with his position as an intern but aspires to be a doctor.

The fact that responses can differ to questions about job satisfaction and job aspiration within the same sample is well illustrated by a study conducted by William Form in Greenbelt, Maryland.[11] He found that, "When members of the sample were asked what occupations they had most aspired to enter over one quarter, 26.6 per cent, stated that they wanted to go into business for themselves. Most of the remaining mentioned independent or dependent professional occupations and none mentioned skilled labor or office work. Only 17.3 per cent said they would like to enter the occupations they were in."[12] He pointed out in a footnote, "Yet when asked directly how they felt about their present occupation, 45.8 per cent commented that they were happy in it, and 30.6 per cent were 'on the whole satisfied', 13.8 per cent were ambivalent, 11.8 per cent were dissatisfied."[13] This is a striking difference in response to two different types of questions that have at various times been used to measure job satisfaction. The question is, "Which is the more valid technique?"

---

[11] William Form, "Toward An Occupational Social Psychology," The Journal of Social Psychology, 1946, 25:85-99.

[12] Ibid., p. 86. [13] Ibid., footnote, p. 86.

Another major problem with the indirect technique is that when one asks a respondent a question like, "Of all the jobs in the world, what job would you like the most?" or "If you could get the same pay regardless of the type of work you did, what type of work would you most like to do?"; one might be asking the respondent about things outside of his world of experience. It is possible that these are questions about a dream world that does not exist. In the world of the respondent's experience there may be real limitations to the jobs available to him and different jobs may be paid different amounts of wages. It is likely that when a respondent is asked questions about a dream world that his responses would also reflect that dream world and not his world of experience. Thus his answers to the questions might not be relevant to inferences one might wish to draw with respect to his actual behavior or his definition of the job that he presently holds.

As a result of the reasons stated above this researcher is inclined to agree with Hoppock's conclusion that, "Pending the development of a measuring instrument which is independent of rationalization and falsification, we are inclined to accept the subject's own estimate of his satisfaction as the best available criterion, and to regard a dissatisfied workman (one who says he is dissatisfied) as a dissatisfied workman, whether his dissatisfaction is the result of rationalization, supervision, or indigestion."[14]

---

[14]Hoppock, op. cit., p. 49.

It was therefore decided to use a direct method of ascertaining job satisfaction in this study. There are two types of the direct method; the method of the 'whole' and the method of 'parts'. In the former method one asks a question regarding satisfaction with the job as a whole, such as "Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with your job?", while in the latter method one asks a series of questions regarding satisfaction with components of the total job situation, i.e. supervision, wages, promotion possibilities, etc., and from the responses to these one composes an index of total job satisfaction. It is worthwhile examining a few of these methods that have been used in studies.

Inasmuch as the job satisfaction index scales constructed by Hoppock and by Bullock have either been used directly or as a model in the majority of job satisfaction studies they will be discussed first. It is difficult to classify them as they each used a combination of the indirect, the direct whole, and the direct part methods.

Hoppock's scale consisted of ten questions as follows:[15]

> "1. Check ONE of the following statements which best tells how well you like your job." There were seven possible responses ranging from "I hate" to "I love it".
>
> "2. Check one of the following to show HOW MUCH OF THE TIME you feel satisfied with your job". There were seven possible responses ranging from "all of the time" to "never".
>
> "3. Check the ONE of the following which

---

[15] Ibid., p. 243.

best tells how you feel about changing your job". There were seven possible responses ranging from "I would quit this job at once if I could get anything else to do." to "I would not exchange my job for any other."

"4. If you could have your choice of all the jobs in the world which would you choose? (check one)" There were three possible responses: "your present job", "another job in the same occupation", and "a job in another occupation."

"5. Check one of the following to show how you think that you compare with other people" There were seven possible responses ranging from "No one likes his job better than I like mine" to "No one dislikes his job more than I dislike mine."

"6. Which gives you more satisfaction? (check one)" The two possible responses were "Your job" and "things you do in your spare time."

"7. Have you ever thought seriously about changing your present job?"

"8. Have you ever declined an opportunity to change your present job?"

"9. Are your feelings today a true sample of the way you usually feel about your job?"

"10. On the line below, place five check marks to show how well satisfied you were were with your last five jobs. Use a separate check mark for each job. Draw a circle around the check mark which indicates your present job." The line referred to was broken down into eleven divisions with five statements ranging from "completely dissatisfied" to "completely satisfied."

It is easy to see that questions 1, 2, 9, and 10 are direct attempts to measure job satisfaction, while questions 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 are indirect attempts. Question 5 is a direct but relative attempt. The indirect questions all suffer from the same weaknesses that were discussed earlier. Question 5 has a weakness all its own which will be discussed below.

Bullock modeled his scale after that of Hoppock. It consisted of the following ten items:[16]

> "1. Place a check mark in front of the statement which best tells how good a job you have." There were five possible responses ranging from "The job is an excellent one, very much above the average," to "The job is a very poor one, very much below the average."
>
> "2. Place a check mark in front of the statement which best describes your feelings about your job." There were five possible responses ranging from "I am very satisfied and happy on this job." to "I am very unhappy and dissatisfied on this job."
>
> "3. Check one of the following statements to show how much of the time you are satisfied with your job." There were five possible responses ranging from "most of the time" to "seldom."
>
> "4. Place a check mark in front of the statement which tells what kind of an organization it is to work for." There were five possible responses ranging from "It is an excellent organization to work for - one of the best I know of." to "It is probably one of the poorest organizations to work for that I know of."
>
> "5. Place a check mark in front of the statement which best tells how your feelings compare with those of other people you know." There were five possible responses ranging from "I dislike my job much more than most people dislike theirs" to "I like my job much better than most people like theirs."
>
> "6. Place a check mark in front of the statement which best tells how you feel about the work you do on your job." There were five possible responses ranging from "The work I do is very unpleasant. I dislike it." to "The work is very enjoyable. I very much like to do the work called for on this job."

---

[16]Robert Bullock, Social Factors Related to Job Satisfaction, Monograph Number 70, Bureau of Business Research, (Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1952), pp. 8-10.

"7. Check one of the following which best describes any general conditions which affect your work or comfort on this job." There were five possible responses ranging from "General working conditions are very bad." to "General working conditions are very good, much better than average for this kind of job."

"8. Check one of the following statements which best tells how you feel about changing your job." There were five possible responses ranging from "I would quit this job at once if I had anything else to do." to "I do not want to change jobs even for more money because this is a good one."

"9. Suppose you had a very good friend who is looking for a job in your line of work and you know of a vacancy in this organization which your friend is qualified to fill. Would you:" There were five possible responses ranging from "Recommend this job as a good one to apply for?" to "Try to discourage your friend from applying by telling the bad things about the job?"

"10. On the line below place a check mark to show how well satisfied you are with this job." The line had five divisions and three statements distributed on it. They were "completely dissatisfied," "about half and half," and "completely satisfied."

Questions 1, 2, 3, and 10 are attempting to ascertain job satisfaction through the direct whole method. Questions 4, 6, and 7 are attempting it through the direct part method. Questions 8 and 9 are attempting it through the indirect method. Question 5 is a direct relative question, i.e. it is asking the respondent to evaluate the amount of his job satisfaction relative to others that he knows.

Questions 8 and 9 are subject to all of the shortcomings of indirect questions that were discussed above.

Gloria Cheek conducted a study in which she compared Bullock's index of job satisfaction with the Science Associates

Employee Inventory, a test of 78 dichotomous items of the agree - disagree type designed to measure job satisfaction.[17] She discovered that Item 5 of Bullock, and consequently Item 5 of Hoppock, was neither valid nor reliable and that its removal improved the internal consistency of the scale. She therefore concluded that a person's satisfaction relative to others was not a good indication of his satisfaction. It is quite possible that a respondent may view himself as being more satisfied than his associates and still be dissatisfied or less satisfied than his associates and still be satisfied.[18]

Uhrbrock devised a direct part technique of measuring job satisfaction.[19] He used a fifty item scale in which each item was designed to express varying shades of attitudes towards the company policies and practices. Several statements ranged from being extremely laudatory to being extremely unfavorable towards the company policy or practice.

The Fortune survey of 1946[20] and a study by Centers[21] are typical examples of the direct-whole technique of measuring job satisfaction. The former asked the question, "Are

---

[17]Gloria Cheek, "A Psychometric Study of Two Indices of Job Satisfaction" (unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1955).

[18]Ibid., pp. 27-28.

[19]Richard Uhrbrock, "Attitudes of 4430 Employees," Journal of Social Psychology, 1934, 5:365-377.

[20]The Fortune Survey: Fortune, 1946, 34:Dec., p. 10.

[21]Richard Centers, "Motivational Aspects of Occupational Stratification," The Journal of Social Psychology, 1948, 28:187-217.

you reasonably well satisfied with your present job?" and the latter asked, "Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with your present job?"

Thorndike used a slightly different variant of the direct whole method of measuring job satisfaction.[22] He had skilled interviewers note the person's liking for his work on a seven point scale after a conversation designed to evoke a frank expression of his attitudes toward it.

Hoppock has summed up excellently the relative merits of the direct whole and the direct part methods of measuring job satisfaction.

> Questions and statements regarding the job as a whole place upon the subject the responsibility for weighing all of the factors involved, according to their relative importance to him, and reaching a summary conclusion. The advantage of this is that the relative importance of the different aspects of a job, as determinants of job satisfaction, may vary greatly from individual to individual. Consequently the summation of these in the hedonic tone of the subject, as he tries to express the degree of his satisfaction, may give to each a relative weight which is more accurate than the best regression equation that could possibly be computed from group data. The disadvantage is that temporary elevation or misery, occasioned by a single factor in the situation, may for the moment completely overshadow all other considerations and lead the subject to express a degree of satisfaction quite different from his average feelings....
>
> The approach by means of questions regarding specific aspects of the job has the advantage of the stability above noted, and relieves the individual of the necessity of reaching a composite

---

[22] Edward Thorndike, "Workers Satisfaction," Occupations, 1935, 13:704-6.

> opinion. In so doing, it places upon the investigator the responsibility for assigning proper weights to each of the many aspects involved. Because of the high probability that these weights differ greatly from one person to another; and the possibility that some single item may for one subject outweigh all of the others, while a different item may be the all-important one for another subject; it seems inevitable that any scoring key would be seriously misleading in some cases.[23]

It appears that Hoppock's analysis is essentially correct, except that it might be better to substitute the statement that "certain types of individuals would differ in the relative importance that they would give to the various items" for his statement "that individuals would differ."

As a result of the various conclusions discussed above, this researcher has decided to use the direct whole method of measuring job satisfaction in the present study.

Inasmuch as the focus of this study is on the relationship between job satisfaction and occupational mobility, a variable which can be quantified, and because other comparisons will be made with quantifiable variables, i.e. education, age, income, tenure; it was deemed desireable to use a question to measure job satisfaction that would discriminate between degrees of satisfaction and not merely between satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

The question selected to be used was, "How do you like your job?" and the five alternative responses were: "very much", "pretty good", "average", "not so good", and "not at all".

---

[23]Hoppock, op. cit., pp. 272-74.

CHAPTER IV

OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY, JOB SATISFACTION, AND SOCIAL REFERENCES: AN EMPIRICAL EXAMINATION

This chapter consists of an empirical examination of the data collected, the testing of the hypotheses presented in Chapter I, and the relating of the findings to reference group theory.

The mean job satisfaction scores presented in the findings below were arrived at by arbitrarily assigning weights to the response categories of the job satisfaction question, "How do you like your job?", in the following manner: "very good" = 5; "pretty good" = 4; "average" = 3; "not so good" = 2; and "not at all" = 1.

Hypothesis 1. There Will Be a Low Positive Association Between Job Satisfaction and Occupational Achievement Relative to Parents' Occupational Aspirations For the Respondent

The majority of the respondents in Table I reported no parental occupational aspirations for themselves. The number reporting parental aspirations was too small to permit any statistical analysis. It is worth noting, however, as an indication that might bear later study, that those who

had achieved an occupational level equal to their parents' occupational aspirations for them and those whose occupational achievement exceeded parents' aspirations had higher mean job satisfaction scores than those reporting no parental aspirations and those reporting parental aspirations higher than their present occupational levels. Those who were at the occupational levels which their parents aspired for them had higher mean job satisfaction scores than did those who exceeded parental aspirations. The number of cases in these cells were too small to be significant.

The most significant finding here is the large proportion of respondents who reported no parental aspirations. This could quite possibly indicate that parental occupational aspirations are not significant in determining the occupational aspirations of working class males and such parental aspirations are not remembered or reported.

TABLE I

MEAN JOB SATISFACTION SCORES FOR RESPONDENTS GROUPED ACCORDING TO THEIR OCCUPATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT RELATIVE TO THEIR PARENTS' OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATIONS FOR THEM

Occupational Achievement Relative To Parents' Occupational Aspirations For Respondents	Mean Job Satisfaction	Frequency
No aspirations	3.83	296
Occupational level lower than aspirations	3.88	66
Occupational level same as aspirations	4.50	8
Occupational level higher than aspirations	4.00	3

Hypothesis 2. There Will Be a Moderate Positive Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Sons' Occupational Level Relative to Fathers' Occupational Level

The hypothesis is confirmed. The relationship is strong and in the expected direction. Thus in Table II the difference in mean job satisfaction scores between those sons who were upwardly mobile, i.e., those sons whose occupational level was higher than that of their fathers, and that of those who were downwardly mobile, i.e., those sons whose occupational level was lower than that of their fathers, was significant at the .0005 level. The stationary or immobile sons, i.e., those sons whose occupational level was the same as that of their fathers, had mean job satisfaction scores that were much higher than the downwardly mobile sons, 4.01 to 3.39, but only slightly lower than the upwardly mobile sons, 4.01 to 4.03. This might mean that job satisfaction will be seriously impaired if a working class male fails to achieve an occupational level comparable to that of his father but that once he has reached this level rising above it does not significantly increase his job satisfaction.

TABLE II

JOB SATISFACTION AND OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF SONS RELATIVE TO OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF FATHERS[1]

Sons' Occupations Relative To Fathers' Occupations	Mean Job Satisfaction of Sons	Frequency
1. Sons' occupation lower than fathers' occupation	3.39	122
2. Sons' occupation the same as fathers' occupation	4.01	101
3. Sons' occupation higher than fathers' occupation	4.03	77

$t_{13} = 4.57$, $P < .0005$, df, 197

Hypothesis 3. There Will Be a Positive Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Occupational Level Of Respondent Relative to Respondents' Brothers' Occupational Level

Hypothesis three is confirmed. As is illustrated in Table III, the direction of the relationship between job satisfaction and the respondents' occupational level relative to that of their brothers' occupational level is as expected. The difference between the mean job satisfaction scores of those whose occupational level was lower than that of their brothers and the scores of those whose occupational levels

---

[1]Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, Statistical Inference, (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953), p. 154. The source of the formula used in computing the significance of the differences between means in this table and wherever used in this thesis.

were the same as their brothers was not statistically significant. However, the differences in mean job satisfaction scores between each of these categories and the category of respondents whose occupational levels were higher than the occupational levels of their brothers was statistically significant. It is on this basis in addition to the general trend that the conclusion is drawn that the hypothesis is confirmed and that occupational mobility relative to one's brother is a significant determinant of job satisfaction among working class males.

It is worth noting that the mean job satisfaction score of all those whose brother was in farming was 3.85 and that the mean job satisfaction score of all those whose brother was in a non-farming occupation considered to be non-comparable to that of the respondent was 3.90. Both of these scores closely approximate the mean job satisfaction score of those respondents whose brother was on the same occupational level as themselves, 3.88. These close rankings are quite consistant with reference group theory. If those that one would normally use as social references in judging one's occupational success are in occupational situses that are not comparable then it is difficult to imagine how a comparison could be made that would result in feelings of gratification or deprivation. This is directly analogous to the situation that occurs when one's social references are in the same occupational situs as oneself. No comparisons which result in feelings of gratification and deprivation can occur in either case.

TABLE III

JOB SATISFACTION AND OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL RELATIVE TO OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF BROTHERS*

Occupational Level Relative To That of Brother	Mean Job Satisfaction	Frequency
1. Occupational level lower than that of brother	3.67	42
2. Occupational level same as that of borther	3.88	42
3. Occupational level higher than that of brother	4.33	18

*t_{12} = .88, P> .10, df, 82; t_{23} = 2.05, P< .025, df, 58; t_{13} = 7.59, P< .0005, df, 58.

Only those cases were included who had one and only one brother in order to avoid the complicating effect that second or third brothers might have.

Hypothesis 3a. In Those Cases Where the Respondents Have Two Brothers, Hypothesis Three Will Be Modified In The Following Manner: Job Satisfaction Will Vary From Low To High In the Following Order: The Occupational Level Of One Brother Being Higher and That Of The Other Lower: And The Occupational Level Of Both Brothers Being Lower.

The various categories in Table IV are ordered in such a manner that if hypothesis 3a. were correct the mean job satisfaction scores for the various categories would be ordered from low to high. Instead no discernable order is present. While it is true that the numbers in each cell are too small to permit drawing definitive conclusions, the data do allow for the tentative rejection of hypothesis 3a.

When one considers this finding in conjunction with the acceptance of hypothesis 3, a positive relationship between job satisfaction and occupational level relative to that of one's brother, for those respondents having only one brother, one might wonder if manual workers might not continue to use only their older brother as their major social reference regardless of the number of brothers they have.

TABLE IV

JOB SATISFACTION AND OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL RELATIVE TO THAT OF TWO BROTHERS

Occupational Level Relative To That Of Two Brothers	Mean Job Satisfaction	Frequency
Occupational level lower than that of both brothers	4.30	10
Occupational level lower than one brother, same as that of second	3.71	7
Occupational level lower than that of one brother, higher than that of second; or same as that of both	4.25	12
Occupational level higher than that of one brother, same as that of second	3.20	10
Occupational level higher than that of both brothers	4.00	5

Hypothesis 3b. The Age of the Brother Relative to That of the Respondent Will Alter the Relationship Predicted in Hypothesis Three in the Following Manner: (1) Job Satisfaction Will Be Greater When an Older Brother Has Achieved a Higher Occupational Level Than it Will Be When a Younger Brother Has Done So; (2) Job Satisfaction Will Be Less When a Younger Brother Has Achieved a Lower Occupational Level Than it Will Be When an Older Brother Has Done So

Data in Table V call for the rejection of this hypothesis. Two out of the three categories of brothers' occupational

TABLE V

JOB SATISFACTION AND RELATIVE AGE OF BROTHER: CONTROLLING FOR RELATIVE OCCUPATIONAL LEVELS

Occupational Level Relative To That Of Brother	Age Relative To That Of Brother	Mean Job Satisfaction	Frequency
Brother's occupational level higher than that of respondent	brother older than respondent	3.67	12
	brother younger than respondent	3.53	15
Brother's occupational level lower than that of respondent	brother older than respondent	4.12	8
	brother younger than respondent	4.50	4
Brother's occupational level the same as that of respondent	brother older than respondent	3.50	12
	brother younger than respondent	3.91	22

level relative to that of the respondent (brother's occupational level being lower than, and brother's occupational level being the same as, the respondent's) produced differences in the direction opposite to that hypothesized. Only the category of brother's occupation being higher than that of the respondent produced a difference in the hypothesized direction. It would appear therefore that there is no consistent relationship between the relative ages of the brothers and job satisfaction as a resultant of the relative occupational levels of the brothers.

Hypothesis 4. There Will Be a Positive Relationship Between GOMS z Scores and Job Satisfaction

The revised form of the GOMS is used in computing the data presented in Table VI. The data exhibits a moderate positive relationship between vertical inter-generational occupational mobility and job satisfaction which leads to the acceptance of this hypothesis. This finding may be interpreted as indicating that male manual workers do use their peers from their position of origin as social references. When they achieve high upward mobility relative to these peers they tend to be more satisfied with their jobs than when they achieve less upward mobility relative to these peers.

In order to gain more insight into the exact nature of this relationship the respondents were sub-divided into categories according to their occupations of destination and the relationship reanalyzed. The results achieved from this breakdown are formulated in Table VII. There was a moderate

TABLE VI

JOB SATISFACTION AND VERTICAL OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AS MEASURED BY THE REVISED GENERATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY SCORE[2]

GOMS z Score	Job Satisfaction Frequencies 5	4	3	2	1
8.39	1	0	0	1	0
8.59	3	3	2	0	0
8.64	9	9	7	4	0
8.67	0	1	1	0	1
8.74	2	4	1	0	0
8.78	0	3	4	0	0
8.87	1	1	0	1	0
9.08	3	2	4	0	0
9.19	2	6	4	3	0
9.22	2	6	3	0	0
9.25	2	1	4	3	1
9.32	15	22	15	4	1
9.37	8	14	15	6	2
9.38	6	12	8	5	1
9.39	28	43	40	11	2
9.48	2	2	0	0	0
10.33	3	1	0	1	0
10.41	2	4	1	2	0
10.43	19	11	4	2	0
10.46	3	1	1	0	0
10.52	4	2	1	0	0
10.67	7	4	1	0	0
10.70	2	2	0	0	0
10.78	9	7	4	1	0
10.80	1	0	0	0	0
10.89	20	15	4	1	1
10.98	1	0	0	0	0
11.15	0	1	0	0	0
11.32	1	1	0	0	0
11.51	2	1	0	0	0
11.65	1	2	0	0	0

$r = .251$, $P < .0005$, df,538

[2]Ibid., p. 234. Source of the formula used in computing the coefficient of correlation in this table and wherever used in this thesis.

TABLE VII

JOB SATISFACTION AND VERTICAL OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AS MEASURED BY THE REVISED OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY SCORE BY OCCUPATION OF DESTINATION

Occupation of Destination	GOMS z Score	Job Satisfaction Frequencies 5	4	3	2	1
Sales, clerical and related occupations	10.88	1	0	0	0	0
	10.98	1	0	0	0	0
	11.15	0	1	0	0	0
	11.32	1	1	0	0	0
	11.51	2	1	0	0	0
	11.65	1	2	0	0	0
$r = 0.292$, $P > .05$, df,9						
Skilled workers and foremen	10.33	3	1	0	1	0
	10.41	2	4	1	2	0
	10.43	19	11	4	2	0
	10.46	3	1	1	0	0
	10.52	4	2	1	0	0
	10.67	7	4	1	0	0
	10.70	2	2	0	0	0
	10.78	9	7	4	1	0
	10.89	20	15	4	1	1
$r = .024$, $P > .05$, df,138						
Semi-skilled	9.08	3	2	4	0	0
	9.19	2	6	4	3	0
	9.22	2	6	3	0	0
	9.24	2	1	4	3	1
	9.32	15	22	15	4	1
	9.33	8	14	15	6	2
	9.38	8	12	8	5	1
	9.39	28	43	40	11	2
	9.48	2	2	0	0	0
$r = .036$, $P > .05$, df,308						
Unskilled	8.39	1	0	0	1	0
	8.78	0	3	4	0	0
	8.59	3	3	2	0	0
	8.64	9	9	7	4	0
	8.67	0	1	1	0	1
	8.74	2	4	1	0	0
	8.87	1	1	0	1	0
$r = -.042$, $P > .05$, df,57						

negative association between vertical mobility and job satisfaction for the small group of sales, clerical, and related occupations, a relatively low and not statistically significant association for the skilled workers and foremen, a negligeable association for the unskilled workers, and a low negative association for the semi-skilled workers.

These results take on special significance when considered in relation to reference group theory. It was indicated earlier that the working class individual is not initially socialized into expecting mobility or in believing in the possibility for mobility. Thus he will be using other members of the working class as his reference group - not members of the white collar group as would one who expected to rise in the social structure.

The negligeable association between job satisfaction and occupational mobility found among the semi-skilled and unskilled workers may be the result of the fact that we are examining the relationship relative to their present peers rather than their peers with which they began life. The present group is composed of workers beginning life at many different points.

The respondents in the occupational category sales, clerical, and related occupations represent a different case. While they were classified as being manual workers during the drawing of the sample, they do represent the upper fringe of the manual working class. This means that in the course of their careers they undoubtedly have been

exposed to a different culture from that of the working class and may have been partially socialized into it. The process of socializing them into their present positions would have brought them into contact with the middle class belief in the reality of opportunities for social climbing for all those willing to make the necessary effort. They may come to partially accept this belief.

To the extent that they have been socialized into accepting this belief, their reference group would have become the middle class or the white collar occupations immediately above them. These would be the positions that they expected, or hope, to fill. Therefore these will be the positions with which they will compare their present positions.

Upward mobility could very easily become a self-defeating process for those people who have been exposed to the belief that any one may rise if he has the requisite abilities and if he makes a hard enough effort. The more one rises in the social structure, the more one believes in the reality of the opportunities for rising further, and the more strongly will he believe that he has the necessary ability to rise. Thus he will use more than ever before the occupants of the positions above him as social references and be even more dissatisfied, or less satisfied, with his present position. This especially is the case where real blocks occur as between manual and white collar occupations.

The occupational category of skilled workers and foremen includes a rather heterogeneous group. It would include within it the upper fringe of manual workers, who maintain their traditional identity to class as well as those who have had enough exposure to middle class beliefs to partially accept the idea that they too may rise into white collar occupations. The latter use the middle class workers as their social references. Job satisfaction and upward mobility would be positively associated for the former group and negatively associated for the latter group. The category as a whole would be mixed and the relationship between job satisfaction and occupational mobility would depend on the relative numbers of each type of worker that it contained.

No appreciable relationship was found in Table VII between job satisfaction and vertical mobility for the unskilled workers. If these workers were using their positions or origin as reference groups, then we should expect a positive association. If they were using people in positions above them as a reference group, then we would expect a negative association between job satisfaction and upward mobility. We found no association whatsoever. This would mean that job satisfaction is not in any way a function of upward mobility for unskilled workers. It could further indicate that they do not consider a job to be something to be satisfied with or dissatisfied with. Instead it may be merely a necessary condition in one's life and one's major satisfactions are derived from off-the-job situations.

All of the above is with reference to mobility into an occupation of destination. This raises certain questions with reference to the relationship between job satisfaction and upward mobility when occupation of origin, i.e., father's occupation, is controlled for. Data in Table VIII provide certain insights into this relationship.

When the respondents are classified in terms of father's occupation or position of origin, there is a moderate positive association between upward mobility and job satisfaction for levels of father's occupations. No matter where one starts out in life, upward mobility results in increased job satisfaction in comparison with the amount of job satisfaction of others who started life in the same position.

The conjunction of the findings regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and upward mobility when the respondents are classified according to position of origin and by position of destination leads the present researcher to conclude that working class males do use their peer groups, all peers who begin life in the same position, as social references in determining their satisfaction with their occupational achievement. If they have achieved more upward mobility than their peers their level of job satisfaction will be correspondingly higher. This relationship will be modified by the position of destination. If the position of destination is one in which the working class males are likely to come into contact with the middle class ideology and its belief in the reality of opportunities for social climbing,

JOB SATISFACTION AND OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AS MEASURED BY THE REVISED GENERATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY SCORE BY FATHER'S OCCUPATION

Father's Occupation	GOMS z Score	Job Satisfaction Frequencies 5	4	3	2	1
Professional, self employed, sales, clerical, and related occupations	8.39	1	0	0	1	0
	8.67	0	1	1	0	1
	9.08	3	2	4	0	0
	9.19	2	6	4	3	0
	9.22	2	6	3	0	0
	10.33	3	1	0	1	0
	10.41	2	4	1	2	0
	10.46	3	1	1	0	0
	10.88	1	0	0	0	0
	11.15	0	1	0	0	0
$r = .404$, $P < .005$, df,59						
Skilled and Supervisory	8.78	0	3	4	0	0
	9.24	2	1	4	3	1
	9.33	8	14	15	6	2
	10.43	19	11	4	2	0
	10.52	4	2	1	0	0
	10.98	1	0	0	0	0
$r = .476$, $P < .0005$, df,105						
Farmer	8.64	9	9	7	4	0
	9.39	28	43	40	11	2
	10.89	20	15	4	1	1
	11.65	1	2	0	0	0
$r = .212$, $.01 < P < .025$, df,195						
Semi-skilled	8.59	3	3	2	0	0
	9.32	15	22	15	4	1
	10.78	9	7	4	1	0
	11.51	2	1	0	0	0
$r = .153$, $P > .05$, df,87						
Unskilled and service	8.74	2	4	1	0	0
	8.87	1	1	0	1	0
	9.38	8	12	8	5	1
	9.48	2	2	0	0	0
	10.67	7	4	1	0	0
	10.70	2	2	0	0	0
	11.32	1	1	0	0	0
$r = .295$, $.005 < P < .01$, df,64						

then those who have come the farthest, i.e., experienced the greatest amount of upward mobility, will be most likely to have their reference group altered so that it becomes the white collar workers above them and thus they are most likely to be dissatisfied with their present job.

Hypothesis 5. It Is Hypothesized That There Will Be a Positive Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Such Standard Variables as: (a) Age, (b) Marital Status, (c) Number of Children, (d) Occupational Skill Level, (e) Wages, (f) Tenure, and (g) Education

There is a great deal of literature which supports the usage of these variables as predicters of job satisfaction (see literature cited in Chapter I) but few of the studies have been couched in terms of reference group theory. It is possible that these variables can be related to reference group theory through the use of a concept like "life adjustment" or "adult socialization." As has been indicated above, the level of job satisfaction is approximately equal to the ratio of gratifications received from the job relative to gratifications expected from the job. One method of determining the amount of gratifications expected is by comparison to the amount of gratifications received by those who are used as social references. However, there is no reason to assume that these reference groups will remain the same throughout life. On the contrary, much of the evidence presented in this thesis tends to suggest that the reference

groups will be changed as a result of changes in other aspects of one's life experiences. This shifting of reference groups could result in a changed level of job satisfaction without involving any change in the rewards received from the job. Any shift in reference groups that results in a lowering of expectations of rewards to be received from the job would result in an increase in the level of job satisfaction providing that the amount of rewards received remain constant. Similarly, when such a shift results in an increase in the amount of rewards expected without a concommitant increase in rewards received, the level of job satisfaction will be lowered. Likewise it is true that any change in the amount of rewards received without a concommitant change in rewards expected will result in a change in the level of job satisfaction. It seems probable that a change in any of the standard variables listed above in the hypothesized direction would result in an alteration of either the amount of rewards expected from the job or the amount received in such a manner that it would result in an increased level of job satisfaction.

A single person becoming married, or a married person having children, would result in that worker having stronger attractions in directions away from the job. This increase in the amount of interest focused on a non-job area would likely result in a decreased focus of interest on job centered activity. This means that there might be a tendency for married men to expect to receive more and more of their

satisfactions from their marriage and less and less from their job. This would cause a lowering of the level of satisfaction expected from their job and thus an increase in their level of job satisfaction without a concommitant increase in the amount of rewards that they receive. Similarly, as a married man's family increases in size it would draw even more of his attention away from his job and towards his family. This could result in a further increase in the amount of his satisfaction that he would expect from his family and a further reduction in the amount expected from his job. This lowering of expectations with regard to the job would result in a further increase in his level of job satisfaction.

Increases in both age and tenure could produce a similar result of lowering expectations with regard to the job. As a person grows older or remains on a job longer it is likely that he will become adult-socialized in his station in life. That is, he would come to expect little more from life than he is receiving. Thus, if a worker started out his work career by expecting more in the way of rewards than he was receiving this process of adult-socialization would result in bringing his expectations more into line with the rewards that he does receive and as a result increase his level of job satisfaction.

Both increases in income and occupational skill level would operate in the reverse manner. Each of these would result in an increase in the amount of rewards, material or

prestigeful. If the reference groups remain unchanged, and thus the expectations remain unchanged, this increase in the amount of rewards received would result in an increased level of job satisfaction.

The operation of the variable education is a little more difficult to predict. It could result in an increase in the degree of realism used in determining the amount of rewards to be expected from a given job and thus result in an increase in the level of job satisfaction as the educational level is raised. However, it might also result in a shift in the reference group to the more educated white collar workers and thus mean an increased level of rewards expected from the job. This raising of the amount of rewards expected without a concommitant increase in the amount of rewards received would result in a lowering of the level of job satisfaction. In which manner increases in the amount of education will actually effect job satisfaction must be left as problematical pending the analysis of the data.

(a) <u>There will be a positive relationship between age and job satisfaction</u>.

The data presented in Table IX leads to the acceptance of this hypothesis. There is a general increase in the mean job satisfaction scores as age increases. The relation is linear until the age categories of 55 and over are reached. This could indicate that workers become adult-socialized to their stations in life and thus become more satisfied with their positions (jobs) up to a certain age level where their

reference group is likely to shift to the older retired workers. This shift in reference group might result in a decrease in job satisfaction when they see older workers retired and living on a decent pension.

TABLE IX

JOB SATISFACTION AND AGE

Age	Mean Job Satisfaction	Frequencies 5	4	3	2	1
under 19	3.00	0	1	2	1	0
20 - 24	3.43	10	10	15	7	2
25 - 29	3.63	17	24	15	9	3
30 - 34	3.76	14	24	15	5	1
35 - 39	3.76	14	26	17	6	0
40 - 44	3.92	22	20	14	5	1
45 - 49	4.02	18	21	10	2	1
50 - 54	4.22	24	16	9	2	0
55 - 59	3.85	13	25	14	2	1
60 - 64	4.16	19	14	10	1	0
65 & over	3.82	13	12	9	4	1

$x^2 = 19.24$, $P < .005$, df,4, $\overline{C} = .245$, rows 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 collapsed for analysis.

(b) <u>There will be a positive relationship between job satisfaction and marital status, i.e., married workers will tend to be more satisfied with their jobs than will single workers.</u>

The hypothesis regarding marital status is supported by the data presented in Table X. Married men are significantly more satisfied with their jobs than single men. While the number of cases in each cell is small, it may be noted that the average satisfaction level of divorced men is between that of single and married men and the average satisfaction level of separated men is slightly higher than that

of married men, with the widowed being the most satisfied with their jobs of all. The higher satisfaction level of the widowed may be accounted for by the likelihood that they are also older than those workers in other categories of marital status. However, the findings relative to the divorced and separated are contrary to expectations. Further research is necessary to ascertain whether this is a chance finding due to the small numbers of cases or not.

TABLE X

JOB SATISFACTION AND MARITAL STATUS

Marital Status	Mean Job Satisfaction	Frequency
1. Single	3.41	39
2. Married	3.87	469
3. Divorced	3.76	13
4. Widowed	4.29	7
5. Separated	4.00	5

$t_{12} = 2.78$, $P < .005$, df,506

(c) Job satisfaction will be positively associated with number of children.

The hypothesis as stated is supported by the data presented in Table XI.

TABLE XI

JOB SATISFACTION AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN

Number of Children	Mean Job Satisfaction	Frequencies 5	4	3	2	1
0	3.62	19	27	35	6	2
1	3.81	30	52	18	4	2
2	3.91	49	42	34	9	3
3	4.03	32	35	14	6	1
4	4.10	14	16	10	0	1
5	3.89	5	8	3	2	0
6	4.18	6	1	4	0	0
7	4.60	3	2	0	0	0
8	4.00	0	1	0	0	0
9	3.50	0	1	1	0	0

$x^2 = 10.04$, $P < .05$, df,4, $\overline{C} = .184$, rows 1, 2 and 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 collapsed for analysis

(d) Job satisfaction will be positively associated with occupational prestige level.

Table XII demonstrates a moderate relationship between occupational prestige levels and amounts of job satisfaction. The only category of workers which departed

TABLE XII

JOB SATISFACTION AND OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE LEVEL

Occupational Prestige Level	Mean Job Satisfaction	Frequencies 5	4	3	2	1
Unskilled	3.77	17	22	16	6	1
Semi-skilled	3.67	71	115	100	32	8
Skilled and foremen	4.28	70	51	15	6	1
Sales, clerical, and related occupations	4.55	6	5	0	0	0

$x^2 = 51.80$, $P < .001$, df, 4, $\overline{C} = .392$, rows 1, 2, and 3, 4 collapsed for analysis.

from the straight linear relationship between prestige level and job satisfaction was the unskilled workers. This departure may lend support to the question raised earlier regarding the meaningfulness of the concept of "job satisfaction" when used with unskilled workers.

(e) <u>There will be a positive association between job satisfaction and income as measured by hourly wages.</u>

The data presented in Table XIII indicates a strong positive association between hourly wages and job satisfaction. Generally increased wages is accompanied by increased amounts of job satisfaction. With the exception of the lowest three hourly wage categories, each wage category has a lower mean job satisfaction score than does the group immediately above it. The three lowest wage classes all have mean job satisfaction scores that are higher than would be expected.

TABLE XIII

JOB SATISFACTION AND HOURLY WAGES

Hourly Wage	Mean Job Satisfaction	Frequencies 5	4	3	2	1
under $1.00	3.92	6	1	5	1	0
1.00 - 1.24	4.00	8	3	3	1	1
1.25 - 1.49	3.63	6	20	8	5	1
1.50 - 1.74	3.42	11	84	65	20	4
1.75 - 1.99	3.54	14	42	32	11	2
2.00 - 2.24	3.69	4	18	7	2	1
2.25 - 2.49	4.33	17	9	2	1	1
2.50 - 2.74	4.20	18	1	0	1	0
2.75 - 2.99	4.96	28	1	0	0	0
3.00 - up	4.98	52	1	0	0	0

$x^2 = 194.57$, $P < .001$, df,4, $\overline{C} = .693$.

The people who constitute the lowest three wage categories were analyzed separately. This group was first analyzed in terms of place of birth. It was discovered that Southern born, rural born, and foreign born workers were overrepresented among them. The Southern born workers constituted .203 of this category and only .125 of the total sample; rural born constituted .435 of the low wage earners and only .400 of the total sample; and foreign born workers were over represented .101 to .089. Negroes were also overrepresented constituting .101 of the low wage earners and .076 of the total sample.

An analysis in terms of age revealed that the young and the old were overrepresented in this low wage category. Workers under thirty represented .290 of this group and only .217 of tht total sample, and workers over sixty were overrepresented .212 to .153.

It was found that the least educated were overrepresented in this low wage earning category. Those with six years of schooling or less constituted .221 of this group and only .118 of the total sample.

These findings are theoretically predictable from reference group theory. In general this group of relatively well satisfied low wage earners is made up of groups who might not be using their contemporary working class peers as a reference group in evaluating their present jobs and earnings. The Southern born, foreign born, and rural born might all tend to use the standards prevailing in the areas of

their birth in evaluating their present jobs. These standards would generally be lower than those prevailing in urban centers of Northern United States. A high evaluation of their objectively low position would follow from such a comparison. A second possibility is that they may not have developed the expectations of native urban workers that satisfaction should be derived from work. Both possibilities need further exploration.

A similar explanation holds for Negroes, younger workers, and those with little education. Negroes might tend to evaluate their jobs in terms of standards of occupational achievement prevailing in the Negro community. These standards would tend to be lower than those in the White community. Workers with little education could very easily be evaluating their jobs with the realistic expectation in mind that they are not in a position to compete with their better educated co-workers for better jobs. The younger workers could possibly be evaluating their jobs with reference to their school days when they had little or no income at all. Thus the paycheck from any regular job would constitute an improvement. The older workers who are satisfied with low earnings may simply represent those who over time have become adult-socialized to their positions.

(f) Job satisfaction will be positively related to job tenure.

The data presented in Table XIV illustrates a general increase in job satisfaction accompanying an increase in job

tenure. It also illustrates the phenomena cited earlier (see Chapter I) of high initial job satisfaction increasing until the third year of work, declining from that point until the fifth year, and then, more or less, consistantly increasing thereafter. This could be explained as a result of high initial hopes or expectations regarding work, a gradual disillusionment as these expectations are confronted with reality and then a gradual alteration of expectations as well as increasing the amount of rewards that accrue to tenure. This is documented in Miller and Form.[3]

TABLE XIV

JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB TENURE

Tenure	Mean Job Satisfaction	Frequencies 5	4	3	2	1
under 1/2 yr.	3.50	6	11	10	3	2
1/2 - 1 yr.	3.59	8	8	8	3	2
1 - 2 yrs.	3.42	6	6	7	7	0
2 - 3 yrs.	3.81	11	13	10	1	2
3 - 5 yrs.	3.54	14	20	24	9	1
5 - 7 yrs.	3.76	4	24	7	3	0
7 - 10 yrs.	3.89	17	19	12	4	1
10 - 15 yrs.	3.86	18	26	17	5	0
15 - 20 yrs.	4.10	23	27	12	3	1
over 20 yrs.	4.14	52	38	22	5	1

$x^2 = 23.92$, $P < .001$, df,4, $\overline{C} = .274$, rows 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, 9, 10 collapsed for analysis.

[3]Delbert C. Miller, and William H. Form, Industrial Sociology, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), Part four "The Social Adjustment of the Worker", pp. 519-788.

(f) Job satisfaction will be positively related to education.

The data presented in Table XV totally refute the hypothesis as it reveals a mild negative relationship between education and job satisfaction. While this result is contrary to that hypothesized, it is still consistent with reference group theory. Our sample is largely limited to manual workers many of whom have some high school and college education. Those members of our sample who have more education have undoubtedly come into contact with the middle class ideology and its belief in the reality of opportunities for those with initiative and ability to climb the social ladder. This belief would have been presented to them by their teachers and their fellow students to the point where it would be difficult not to come to partially accept it.

TABLE XV

JOB SATISFACTION AND EDUCATION

Education	Mean Job Satisfaction	Job Satisfaction Frequencies 5	4	3	2	1
None	4.00	4	0	2	1	0
1 - 6 yrs.	3.93	16	21	16	2	0
7 - 8 yrs.	3.86	31	44	27	8	2
9 - 10 yrs.	3.85	40	45	32	11	2
11 - 12 yrs.	3.84	57	76	46	14	5
0 - 4 yrs. college	3.75	12	7	7	8	1

$x^2 = 2.27$, $P < .75$, $\overline{C} = .086$, df,4, rows 1, 2, 3 and 4, 5, 6 collapsed for purposes of analysis.

Once they come to accept this belief they would also realize that they have the most important tool for social

climbing namely education. They have the necessary education, believe that there are opportunities to climb and still are manual workers. It is not surprising to discover that the more educated manual workers are less satisfied with their jobs as manual workers.

There is a second factor that helps to account for the relationship that exists between education and job satisfaction. This is the relationship that was found to exist between age and education. Age and education were negatively associated among our sample of manual workers.

This negative association is to be expected with the expansion of free public education that has occured in our recent history. It is significant to note that age and job satisfaction are positively related as has been discussed above. Thus our less educated workers tend to be older and are more likely to have been adult-socialized and, as a result, more satisfied with their jobs.

This chapter has consisted of an analysis of each of several variables considered separately and as explained in terms of reference group theory. Chapter V will consist of a consideration of the implications that these results have for reference group theory when considered together.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

This research investigated the type and extent of the relationships which may exist between vertical occupational mobility and job satisfaction among urban working class males. The study was limited to working class (manual workers) males under the assumption that the working class has a culture of orientation which differs from that of the middle class (white collar workers) which results in a different relationship between occupational mobility and job satisfaction. No sample of white collar workers was included because this assumption was not under test. However, this assumption seems consistent with reference group theory, which was used as the theoretical basis for this study. One aspect of reference group theory includes the assumption that the incumbants of certain positions in the occupational structure would probably not evaluate their positions by comparing the satisfactions and dissatisfactions that they receive from it with an absolute scale but would more likely evaluate their positions by comparing their satisfactions with those received by the incumbants of other positions with whom they identify socially. It is maintained that these reference

groups will be the resultant of (i.e., predictable with the knowledge of) certain structural characteristics of the incumbants of the various positions in the occupational structure.

One of the important intervening variables involved in this relationship may be the ideology of the incumbants of the various occupational strata. The ideology of the working class does not include the strong belief in the reality of opportunities for upward social mobility which characterizes the white collar class. This difference in class ideologies is documented by Centers,[1] Chinoy,[2] Davis,[3] and Knupfer[4] among others. The result of this is the probability that the members of the working class will not tend to use the incumbants of the occupational positions above them in the occupational structure as their reference groups, but will more probably use the members of their occupational situs or members of their immediate family. Davis[5] indicated the fact that ties to the nuclear family of orientation tend

---

[1]Richard Centers, The Psychology of Social Classes, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1949), p. 147-48.

[2]Ely Chinoy, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1955), pp. 47-62.

[3]Allison Davis, "The Motivation of the Underpriviliged Worker," ETC: A Review of General Semantics, III:4:242-53.

[4]Genevieve Knupfer, "Portrait of the Underdog," The Public Opinion Quarterly, XI:103-114.

[5]Davis, Op. Cit., Passim.

to be stronger among working class people than they do among middle class persons. A different situation prevails among the members of the white collar class. Their belief in the existance of opportunities for upward mobility tends to result in the usage of the incumbants of the occupational positions above them as their major reference group. This differential selection of reference groups results in different relationships existing between vertical occupational mobility and job satisfaction among members of the white collar class and working class. In the light of this probable difference and as a result of a desire for clarity of analysis, the present researcher limited himself to an analysis of manual workers.

The sample was further limited to males. It was believed that a large enough proportion of the females in the labor force would be either married women or young women who intend to work only until they are married, and who consequently would be less involved in their occupational roles than males. The inclusion of females in the sample would tend to obscure the relationship under analysis.

The sample was drawn from Lansing, Michigan which is an industrial and political center which includes various types of industry. It was believed that the varied types of occupations available in the city would allow for the drawing of a sample of manual workers that would be representative of manual workers anywhere in America. This statement is limited to America because it is believed that manual workers in societies having different ideological beliefs

regarding opportunities for vertical mobility would exhibit a different relationship between vertical occupational mobility and job satisfaction.

As a result of the importance of the nuclear family of orientation among working class people, it was decided to use two measures of occupational mobility relative to members of the nuclear family, i.e. occupational status relative to that of father and occupational status relative to that of brothers in the labor force.

A survey of various measures of occupational mobility resulted in the conclusion that the Tumin-Feldman GOMS (after certain necessary revisions were made) represented the best single measure of inter-generational occupational mobility available for the purpose of this thesis. Thus, the revised form of the GOMS was used as a third measure of vertical occupational mobility.

It was deemed desirable to make a comparison between the efficacy of structural characteristics with non-structural characteristics as predictors of job satisfaction. For any such comparison to be meaningful they would both have to be related in some manner one-to-another. Inasmuch as all of the structural characteristics used were related to occupational achievement, it was decided that the non-structural characteristics should also be. The most obvious choice was occupational aspirations as related to occupational achievement. This was rejected because we felt that it would be unrealistic to ask the respondent to recall accurately his

occupational aspirations before he began his work career. It seemed likely that an adult worker would have had his original occupational aspirations modified by subsequent work experience to the point that he would no longer be able to state what they originally were. The use of his present occupational aspirations was rejected. We feel it would not be justifiable to compare a workers present occupational achievement with his desire for future achievement in an attempt to predict present job satisfaction. It was, therefore, decided to use parents' occupational aspirations for the respondent as the non-structural variable to be related to job satisfaction.

A summary of the various measures of job satisfaction led to the conclusion that the best measure of job satisfaction was a simple direct question about satisfaction with the job as a whole. Such a measure was used in this thesis. It was also deemed desirable to compare the efficacy of measures of occupational mobility and measures of the more traditional predictors of job satisfaction, i.e., education, occupational prestige level, income, marital status, number of children, age, job tenure, as predictors of job satisfaction.

It was not considered worthwhile to analyze statistically the results of relating occupational achievement to parents' occupational aspirations because over four-fifths of the respondents stated that their parents had no occupational aspirations for them. Although the number in the

remaining cells were too small to permit meaningful statistical analysis, it can be pointed out that those workers who reached or surpassed their parents' occupational aspirations for them were more satisfied with their jobs than where those who had not. It may also be noted that those who surpassed their parents' occupational aspirations for them were less satisfied with their jobs than were those who equalled their parents' occupational aspirations for them.

It was discovered that those sons who equalled or surpassed their fathers' occupational achievement were significantly more satisfied with their jobs than were those who failed to achieve an occupational level comparable to that of their fathers. It was also found that those sons who exceeded their father in occupational achievement were slightly more satisfied with their jobs than those who equaled the occupational achievement of their fathers. Moreover, respondents having only one brother who equaled that brother in occupational achievement were more satisfied with their jobs than were those who achieved a lower occupational status than their brothers; and that those who exceeded their brothers in occupational achievement were more satisfied than those who equaled their brothers' occupational achievement.

The responses of those who had two brothers were analyzed in order to determine if job satisfaction was related to the relative occupational achievement of the respondent vis-a-vis both of his brothers simultaneously and no predictable relationship was found to hold.

The relative ages of the brothers were analyzed in order to ascertain whether or not this would alter the relationship between occupational achievement relative to that of ones brother and job satisfaction. No such alteration was found.

Occupational mobility, as measured by the Tumin-Feldman GOMS (revised form), was found to be positively related ($r = .251$) to job satisfaction. This positive relationship was considerably altered when the sample was analyzed according to occupation of destination, i.e., respondent's present occupation. Among those in the "sales, clerical, and related occupations" occupational mobility and job satisfaction were moderately negatively related ($r = -.292$); negligeable relationships were found among "skilled workers and foremen", "semi-skilled", and "unskilled". A quite different result was achieved when the sample was broken down according to position of origin, i.e., fathers' occupation. With this breakdown the positive relationship between occupational mobility and job satisfaction was considerably strengthened, the correlations ranging up to .476.

The analysis of the standard variables listed above found job satisfaction to be positively related to marital status, number of children, occupational prestige level, hourly wages, job tenure, and age; and negatively related to

education. Further analysis revealed a negative relationship between age and education.

General Conclusions

The question now becomes, 'What does all of this mean in terms of theory?' An interpretation of our findings in terms of reference group theory requires the use of the concepts social class, ideology, and adult-socialization.

It was pointed out in Chapter I that the working class ideology does not emphasize belief in the existence of real opportunities for vertical social mobility. It was also indicated that this belief is a strong part of middle class ideology. The existence, or lack of existence, of such a belief would be expected to play a significant role in determining which reference group would be selected for purposes of making comparisons involving one's present position.

The belief that people with ability can through hard work rise in the social structure carries with it implicitly the belief in one's ability to control one's destiny. Correspondingly, the belief that ability and effort do not necessarily result in upward social mobility carries with it implicitly the belief that one cannot control his own destiny. The presence or absence of this belief will have a significant effect upon the selection of reference groups. The belief that one can control his own destiny and improve his occupational position, would tend to cause one consistantly to compare his position with those positions toward which

one is striving, i.e., higher positions in the occupational hierarchy. The lack of such beliefs would tend to cause one not to compare his position with higher groups in the occupational hierarchy. The selection of reference groups for those lacking such beliefs would then be determined by other factors.

Tying this together with the knowledge that middle class ideology includes the belief in opportunities for upward mobility and that working class ideology does not, leads one to the conclusion that middle class persons (white collar workers) tend to select as reference groups those who occupy the positions above them in the social structure and that working class persons (manual workers) tend to select their reference groups from people on their own occupational level.

The fact that the nuclear family of orientation is more important in the life of working class people would tend to result in working class people selecting their family members as a reference group. They would also tend to select the males who are perceived as being the usual bread winners as a reference group in evaluating their occupational positions. This is borne out by the findings which indicate that there is a positive association between job satisfaction and occupational position relative to that of one's father and to that of one's brothers in the labor force. The fact that one's peer group tends to become another important reference group in the evaluation of occupational position among manual workers is borne out by the finding of a

positive relationship between job satisfaction and occupational mobility as measured by the GOMS. This is further supported by the fact that the strength of this association is increased when the sample is broken down into groups classified in terms of specific fathers' occupations. This classification breaks down the sample into groups of peers who began life at approximately the same position and thus qualify as peer groups.

The findings with regard to occupation of destination, i.e., present occupation, lend support to the original statements regarding class ideologies. The occupational categories "sales, clerical, and related occupations," and "skilled workers" both exhibited a negative relationship between job satisfaction and occupational mobility. Since both occupational groupings are at the upper portion of the working class the members are more likely to have come into contact with the middle class belief in opportunities for upward mobility. The more upwardly mobile workers in these occupations have experienced enough upward mobility themselves so as to partially accept these beliefs. Once having accepted these beliefs, they tend to select as their reference groups the workers above them in the occupational hierarchy and thus become relatively less satisfied with their jobs. The less mobile incumbants of such positions would not have experienced as much upward mobility and thus would be less likely to accept the belief in opportunities for upward mobility and would be less likely to select as their reference group the

incumbants of the occupational positions above them. They will thus tend to use reference groups in the manner discussed above and be more satisfied with their present occupational positions than will their more upwardly mobile coworkers.

The positive relationship between job satisfaction and upward mobility among semi-skilled workers would then be a product of the working class ideology among workers who have not been overly exposed to the middle class ideology. The lack of a relationship between upward mobility and job satisfaction among unskilled workers requires further analysis. This result leads one to suspect that job satisfaction might not be a very meaningful concept for use with unskilled workers. William A. Faunce[6] has suggested some ideas that may be relavent here. He suggests that persons in low status positions may not evaluate themselves in that position or, if they do, they may regard such evaluations as inconsequential. He suggests that it is more likely that such persons will tend to test their self esteem in other areas where they might evaluate themselves as successes. It follows from such considerations than unskilled workers, who are at the bottom of the occupational hierarchy, would be unlikely to test their self esteem in their occupational role. The testing of self esteem in an occupational role and job satisfaction

---

[6]William Faunce, "Occupational Involvement and the Selective Testing of Self Esteem," paper delivered before the American Sociological Society meetings, Chicago, September, 1959.

are not the same thing, but they may be related. It is quite possible that unskilled workers tend to test their self esteem in areas other than their occupational role and thus become much less involved in their jobs. They might come to define their job as a necessary part of their lives, i.e., as something that they must do in order to live but not as something that gives them satisfactions or dissatisfactions. A job is not something good or bad, it merely is. This would explain the lack of a relationship between job satisfaction and upward mobility among unskilled workers.

The positive relationship that was found to hold between job satisfaction and such variables as marital status, number of children, age, job tenure, and wages could possibly be explained in terms of a concept such as life adjustment or adult-socialization. All of these variables tend to be related to one another. Married workers tend to be older than single workers. People with large numbers of children tend to be older than those with fewer children. Older workers tend to have longer job tenure than younger workers. Workers with more tenure tend to earn higher wages than workers with less tenure. All of these variables are related to one another and possibly to another variable that we might call "life adjustment".

The manual workers that we are concerned with in this study begin their adult working life not expecting much in the way of upward mobility. Over the course of years those who do not experience much mobility would gradually tend to

become adult-socialized into their way of living and into their occupational roles and thus tend to be more satisfied with them than would be younger workers, who have not yet gone through this process of adult-socialization or life-adjustment.

The negative relationship that was found to hold between education and job satisfaction is also consistent with our earlier statements regarding class ideologies. The more educated workers would have been more exposed to the middle class beliefs in the opportunity for upward mobility than would their less educated co-workers. This exposure would have come from their teachers and classmates throughout high school and college until they may have come to partially accept it. The more that this group of manual workers has come to believe that "they too may rise in the social structure if they only work hard enough" the more will they be dissatisfied at their failure to break out of the manual working class into the white collar class.

In summary, it might be stated that the working class person is socialized not to expect much upward mobility during the course of his lifetime and that he will tend to use his peer group and the male members of his family as a reference group in evaluating his occupational achievement. Thus the greater the amount of his occupational achievement relative to these reference groups, the greater will be his satisfaction with his job. This relationship will continue to hold as long as he does not come into sufficient contact

with the middle class ideology so as to imbue him with the belief in the existance of opportunities for upward mobility. When the working class male accepts the middle class ideology, either through mobility into a higher occupation or through more formal education, this relationship will be reversed. His social references will be shifted to the incumbants of the white collar occupational positions above him and he will tend to be less satisfied with his job. The greater the amount of mobility that he has experienced, the more firmly will he believe in the existance of opportunities for further social climbing and the more will he be dissatisfied with his present position.

A second purpose of this thesis was to compare the efficacy of the GOMS and various standard variables as predictors of job satisfaction. It might be concluded that if the GOMS is used without controlling for the position of origin, i.e., fathers' occupation of the respondents then the standard variables such as income, occupational prestige level, age, job tenure, marital status, number of children, and education (as a negative association) would all be superior to the GOMS. It may also be concluded that when the occupational origin, i.e., fathers' occupation, is controlled for the GOMS is as good a predictor as any of the other variables.

It might also be suggested that the predictive power of the GOMS could probably be improved if more precise measure of occupational prestige levels were used than the rather

simple one that was decided upon. Perhaps the North-Hatt occupational ranking scale would be the best system to use.

Scope, Validity, and Limitations

The scope, validity, and limitations of this study are so intertwined that they must be discussed together. The first consideration is whether we have a valid measure of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was defined in Chapter III as "...any combination of physical, physiological, and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say, 'I am satisfied with my job'". It is contended by the present researcher than the question asked of the respondents, "How do you like your job?", is equivalent in meaning to the question, "How satisfied are you with your job?" Although we can not gauge the validity of this measure on purely logical grounds, we can consider the fact that all of the respondents were manual workers and all were asked the same question in the same manner. Lacking knowledge of any factor that would differentiate our respondents in terms of the degree of truthfulness with which they answered the question, it may be tentatively concluded that the question is a valid measure of job satisfaction. It may also be concluded that the five response categories do reflect a hierarchical ranking of degrees of job satisfaction. The purpose of asking this question was not to determine the exact amount of job satisfaction felt by each respondent, but to differentiate the sample into groups exhibiting different

amounts of job satisfaction. It was necessary during the course of the analysis of data to assume that the five response categories represented equal interval distances. The validity of this assumption can not be maintained in terms of any characteristic intrinsic to these response categories. The present researcher justifies this assumption by claiming that the respondents would psychologically perceive the alternatives as representing equal intervals along a continuum of job satisfaction.

The construction of the GOMS required the use of a number of occupational categories that were assigned weights with the same assumption of equal intervals between weights as was made in the case of the weights used in the measurement of job satisfaction.

No case for the validity of the weighting will be attempted. It is frankly admitted that this assumption of equal intervals is not valid. The question may then be asked, "Well, why was it made?" The answer is simply, "It had to be made." If this assumption were not made then the entire investigation could not have taken place. There is little doubt that the rankings used do accurately indicate a hierarchy of occupational categories in terms of prestige. What may be doubted is the assumption of equal intervals.

The contention of the present researcher is that it is better to conduct a rather imprecise investigation that results in some useful hypotheses than it is to conduct no investigation at all simply because the proposed investigation

would not meet a certain level of precision. Inasmuch as no known method of occupational ranking validly meets the assumption of equal intervals, and that the rankings used herein do indicate increasing amounts of prestige, it was decided to make the assumption and to treat the results as tentative rather than have no results at all.

In addition to this restriction upon the validity of the findings of this study, there are certain other limitations that must be considered. One major limitation is that the measures of occupational mobility used are rather gross measures. They only measure mobility from one occupational class to another. They fail to measure mobility from one occupation to another within a class, intra-occupational mobility, i.e., from grade B machinist to grade A machinist, and mobility in terms of skill levels within an occupation, i.e., from a rough carpenter to a master carpenter. This limitation is recognized and accepted with the rationale that this is one of the earlier studies to specifically focus on the relationship between occupational mobility and job satisfaction and the belief that all such early studies may focus on the grosser froms of relationships. Later studies may then use more refined tools and further explicate the exact nature of such a relationship.

It might further be contended that this study is limited in that it only focuses on the rather gross concept of job satisfaction without regard for the various different conceptions of job satisfaction or criteria for determining

job satisfaction that various groups of respondents may be using. This is not seen as a limitation. It might be so interpreted if the study were undertaken with different purposes in mind. The major purpose of this study was to ascertain the relationship between inter-generational occupational mobility and job satisfaction regardless of the criteria by which a worker decided whether or not he was satisfied with his job. Therefore, for the purpose of this study the lack of specification of a criteria for evaluating job satisfaction does not constitute a limitation upon the findings.

With the above restrictions upon the validity of the findings and the possible limitations kept in mind, the present researcher believes that these findings may be generalized to working class males everywhere in America. This belief is a result of the fact that the sample was randomly drawn from a middle-sized industrial and political center having a diversity of occupations. The scope to which the findings may be generalized is limited to the United States because of the key role that ideology plays in the relationship under analysis. It is believed that the relationship would be altered in societies where the manual workers had different ideological beliefs than do the American workers.

Implications For Further Research

Several subsequent studies are needed to further explicate the ramifications of these findings. The more

obvious of these is a simple replication with a more refined, and if possible an equal interval, classification of occupations.

The key role that ideology plays in the present researcher's interpretation of the findings suggests two related studies. One would be a similar type of study which included in its sample middle class, i.e., white collar, workers. It would be expected that these white collar workers would exhibit a negative relationship between upward mobility and job satisfaction. The second related study should be one in which a sample of various racial and ethnic minorities was systematically matched and compared with the majority group workers. It would be expected that the manual workers within the minority groups would possess even less of a belief in the reality of opportunities for upward mobility than the workers belonging to the majority group. This should result in a stronger relationship between occupational mobility and job satisfaction for the minority group workers than for the majority group workers.

Related to the above suggestion for further research, is the suggestion that a study should be made in order to ascertain the actual extent to which manual workers differ from white collar workers, and the extent to which the manual workers differed among themselves in terms of origin groups, in their belief in the existance of opportunities for upward mobility.

A necessary corollary to the above described study would be a study which measured the extent to which each of

these origin groups differed in their actual opportunities for mobility. This type of study would require the use of several different measures of occupational mobility, both inter-generational and intra-generational, and would therefore provide the opportunity for a controlled comparison of the utility of these various measures.

It seems possible that all of these proposals could be carried out in one rather large study of the Lansing workers. It would be possible to draw a sample in such a way that it would include white collar workers as well as manual workers. The sample could also be drawn so as to include comparable groups of Whites, Negroes, and Mexicans thus allowing for majority-minority group comparisons. These comparisons could be carried further by breaking down the sample of Whites into southern born, foreign born, and northern born. Data could be gathered from these potential respondents in such a manner as to ascertain their perceptions of mobility opportunities and their actual mobility experiences. Their present job satisfactions could also be ascertained. It would also be possible to gather enough data to allow the use of a variety of measures of occupational mobility and the comparison of the utility of each. This type of master study would pretty much exhaust the implications of the present study except for necessary replications in other parts of the country and in other societies.

LITERATURE CITED

American Vocational Association, Committee on Research Publications, "Factors in the Satisfaction of Home Economics Teachers," Washington, D. C., American Vocational Association, 1948, Research Bulletin #3.

Ash, P. "The SRA Employee Inventory - A Statistical Analysis," Personnel Psychology, 7:337-64, 1954.

Benge, E. "How To Learn What The Workers Think of Job and Boss," Factory Management Maintenance, 102(5), 101-104, 1944.

Brown, C. G., and B. Neitzel. "Communication, Supervision, and Morale," Journal of Applied Psychology, 36:86-91, 1952.

Bullock, R. Social Factors Related to Job Satisfaction, Monograph Number 70, Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 1952.

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

Cason, H. "General Curves and Conditions of Feeling," Journal of Applied Psychology, 15:126-48, 1931.

Centers, R. "Motivational Aspects of Occupational Stratification," The Journal of Social Psychology, 28:187-217, 1948.

_____. "Occupational Mobility of Urban Occupational Strata," American Sociological Review, 13:179-203, 1948.

_____. The Psychology of Social Classes. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949.

_____, and H. Cantril. "Income Satisfaction and Income Aspiration," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 41:64-69, 1946.

Chase, F. S. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, 33:127-32, 1951.

Cheek, G. "A Psychometric Study of Two Indices of Job Satisfaction." Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1955.

Chinoy, E. Automobile Workers and the American Dream, Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1955.

Cole, R. "J. A. Survey of Employee Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, 4:497-506, 1940.

Davidson, P., and H. D. Anderson. Occupational Mobility in an American Community, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1937.

Davis, A. "The Motivation of the Underprivileged Worker," ETC: A Review of General Semantics, 3:4:243-53.

Eckerman, A. C. "An Analysis of Grievances and Aggrieved Employees in a Machine Shop and Foundary," Journal of Applied Psychology, 32:255-69, 1948.

Edwards, A. "A Socio-Economic Grouping of the Gainful Workers in the United States," Journal of the American Statistical Association, XXVII:377-87.

Eicher, J. "Job Satisfaction: Its Relation to Occupational, Stratification, and Community Variables," unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1956.

Faunce, W. "Occupational Involvement and the Selective Testing of Self Esteem," paper delivered before the American Sociological Society meetings, Chicago, Sept. 1959.

Form, W. H. "Toward an Occupational Social Psychology," The Journal of Social Psychology, 24:85-99, 1946.

_____, and D. Miller. "Occupational Career Patterns as A Sociological Instrument," American Journal of Sociology, 54:328.

"The Fortune Quarterly Survey: XI," Fortune, 17, January, 1938, p. 86.

"The Fortune Survey," Fortune, 34, December, 1946, p. 14.

"The Fortune Survey," Fortune, 35, June, 1947, pp. 5-6.

Fryer, D. "Industrial Dissatisfaction," Industrial Psychology, 1:25-29, 1926.

Ginsberg, M. "Interchange Between Social Classes," Chapter IX of Studies in Sociology, London: Methuen and Co., 1932.

Gonon, P. "The Relationship of Independence in the Work Situation to Job Acceptance: A Study of the Job Aspirations of Employed Adult Males," unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1956.

Harris, F. "The Quantification of an Industrial Employee Survey," Journal of Applied Psychology, 33:103-111, 1949.

Herzberg, F., et. al. Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion, Psychological Services of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, 1957.

Hoppock, R. Job Satisfaction, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935.

Inlow, G. "Job Satisfaction of Liberal Arts Graduates," Journal of Applied Psychology, 35:175-181, 1951.

Jurgenson, C. "Selected Factors Which Influence Job Preferences," Journal of Applied Psychology, 31:553-564, 1947.

Katz, D. "Motivation and Morale in Industry," Current Trends In Industrial Psychology, Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, pp. 145-171, 1949.

Knupfer, G. "Portrait of the Underdog," The Public Opinion Quarterly, XI:103-114, 1947.

Kornhauser, A., and A. Sharp. "Employee Attitudes: Suggestions From a Study in a Factory," Personnel Journal, 10:393-404, 1932.

Kolstad, A. "Employee Attitudes in a Department Store," Journal of Applied Psychology, 22:470-479, 1938.

Lenski, G. "Trends in Inter-Generational Occupational Mobility in the United States," American Sociological Review, 23:514-23, 1948.

Lipset, S., and R. Bendix. Social Mobility in Industrial Societies, Berkley: University of California Press, 1959.

Lyman, E. "Occupational Differences in the Value Attached to Work," American Journal of Sociology, 61:138-50, 1955.

Mann, F. "A Study of Work Satisfactions as a Function of the Discrepency Between Inferred Aspirations and Achievement," Dissertation Abstracts, 13:902, 1953.

McClusky, H.Y.C., and F. Strayer. "Reactions of Teachers to the Teaching Situation - A Study in Job Satisfactions," School Review, 48:612-23, 1940.

Merton, R. K., and A. S. Rossi. "Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior," in Merton, R. K., Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1949.

Miller, D. C. "Economic Factors in the Morale of College-Trained Adults," American Journal of Sociology, 47: 139-56, 1947.

Miller, D. C., and W. H. Form. Industrial Sociology, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Rogoff, N. Recent Trends in Occupational Mobility, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953.

Sorokin, P. J. "American Millionaires and Multi-Millionaires," Social Forces, 3:627-40, 1925.

Stagner, R., and J. W. Rich, and R. H. Britton, "Job Attitudes: Defense Workers," Personnel Journal, 20:90-97, 1941.

Stott, M.B.A. "A Preliminary Examination in the Occupational Analysis of Secretarial Work," Hum. Fact. Lond., 9:249-258, 1938.

Super, D. "Occupational Level and Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, 23:547-64, 1939.

Survey Research Center, "Effective Morale," Fortune, July, 42:46-50.

Thomson, W. "Eleven Years After Graduation," Occupations, 17:709-14, 1939.

Thorndike, E. "Workers Satisfaction," Occupations, 13:704-706, 1935.

Trier, H. E. "Job Satisfaction and Occupational Status," unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1954.

Tumin, M., and A. Feldman. "Theory and Measurement of Occupational Mobility," American Sociological Review, 22:281-88, 1957.

Uhrbrock, R. "Attitudes of 4430 Employees," Journal of Social Psychology, 5:365-77, 1934.

Walker, H. M., and J. Lev. Statistical Inference, New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1953.

Woods, W. "Employee Attitudes and Their Relation to Morale," Journal of Applied Psychology, 28:285-301, 1944.