




UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS LIBRARY
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
STACKS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

<http://www.archive.org/details/racialdifference533moch>

H 1.9.5

Faculty Working Papers

RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN JOB SATISFACTION:
TESTING FOUR COMMON EXPLANATIONS

Michael K. Moch, Assistant Professor,
Department of Business Administration

#533

**College of Commerce and Business Administration
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign**



FACULTY WORKING PAPERS

College of Commerce and Business Administration

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

December 8, 1976

RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN JOB SATISFACTION:
TESTING FOUR COMMON EXPLANATIONS

Michael K. Moch, Assistant Professor,
Department of Business Administration

#533

Summary:

Several studies have documented differential job satisfaction by race. This paper combines structural, cultural, social and social psychological factors in an attempt to explain some of these differences. It was found that these factors account for a modest amount of the differences in satisfaction for black and white employees. Differential work assignments account for some of this difference. The importance employees place on interpersonal relations and the degree to which they are integrated into or isolated from friendship relationships also have an impact. Although there is a significant difference between races in their vertical position in the organization, this difference does not account for differential job satisfaction, net of the other factors. Although these factors help explain some of the differential job satisfaction between Blacks and Whites, they do not account for significantly higher levels of job satisfaction reported by Mexican Americans. To explain some of this difference, employees' perceived relative deprivation was considered. Controlling for other factors, however, relative deprivation was not significantly associated with job satisfaction. It is concluded that other explanations must be sought to explain differential job satisfaction by race and that there are different determinants for members of different races.

Draft: Do Not Cite or Quote

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

Since Slocum, Topichak, and Kuhn (1971) pointed out the relative lack of cross cultural studies of employees' levels of satisfaction, several researchers have documented differential job satisfaction by race. Slocum et. al. found that workers in an American plant reported lower levels of satisfaction with security, esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization needs than did employees in a comparable plant in Mexico. Slocum and Strawser (1972) found black CPA's were less satisfied than their white counterparts along a number of dimensions, including needs for esteem, autonomy, self-actualization, and compensation. Similar findings have been reported by O'Reilly and Roberts (1973), Smith, Smith, and Rollo (1974), Weaver (1974), and Milutinovich (1977).

As Jones et. al. have suggested, documenting these differences may be less important than explaining why they occur. Despite the relatively sparse research on the subject, recent Federal legislation and policy forces many employers to consider their treatment of minority employees and, often, to change established practices (Ledvinka & Schoenfeldt, 1978). Many of these changes concern individuals' access to employment, what Levitan, Quinn, and Staines (1971) have called "access discrimination." Differential treatment by race, what these authors call "treatment discrimination," also has been the object of considerable legislation and policy-making. It is generally believed that eliminating treatment discrimination in such areas as job assignments and promotions will better the lot of minority employees. However, there is very little empirical work documenting the causes for racial differences in employees' job satisfaction. There is even less which ties observed differences

specifically to differential treatment or to other factors amenable to manipulation by policy or by legislation.

Two categories of causes of racial differences in job satisfaction are frequently mentioned in the literature. They are cultural explanations and structural explanations. Slocum, Topichak and Kuhn (1971) appear to have been the first to make this distinction, but it subsequently has been used by others (Gavin & Ewen, 1974; Katzell, Ewen, and Korman, 1974; Ivancevich & McMahon, 1977). Cultural explanations attribute differential satisfaction by race to beliefs, values, or psychological states which predispose members of different races to respond differently to their experience in the organization. Structural explanations attribute differential levels of satisfaction to systematic differences in how employees of different races are treated by the organization or by their superiors. Researchers who hold that culture is the primary factor have found evidence to support their view. Likewise, researchers of a structuralist bent have presented evidence for their interpretation. The present paper, in contrast, attempts to consider both factors simultaneously. The research was designed to include cultural differences along with structural considerations in an attempt to explain differential satisfaction in a medium-sized assembly and processing plant. The research also was designed to include social factors--how employees of different races are treated by their co-workers--in order to determine whether they play a role in causing differential job satisfaction by race. Social factors have not been considered in previous research on this topic.

If it is found that structural factors account for at least some of the association between race and satisfaction, current legislation and

policy affecting job assignments and promotions will be supported. If, on the other hand, cultural or social factors play a dominant role, the effectiveness of current approaches will have been brought into question, at least with respect to their impact on employees' satisfaction at work.

Structural, Cultural, and Social Explanations of Racial Differences in Job Satisfaction

Structural explanations for racial differences in job satisfaction have been presented by several researchers. Smith, Smith, and Rollo (1974) attributed the lower satisfaction of black employees to fewer promotional opportunities available to this group. Brown and Ford (1977) make a similar argument and reference research showing the relative lack of promotional opportunities and upward mobility for blacks (Goode, 1970; Fields & Freeman, 1972). These authors also suggest that differential levels of satisfaction also may be attributed to supervisor bias in performance evaluation (Hamner, Kim, Baird and Bowers 1974; Katz & Greenbaum, 1963; Katz, Roberts, & Robinson, 1965).

Some studies have reported little or no difference in job satisfaction among members of different races. Usually, however, these studies are based upon data gathered from samples matched on such factors as job classification, occupational prestige, level in the organization, sex or pay. Gavin and Ewen (1974), for example, report that black airline employees were slightly more satisfied than their white co-workers. The same finding was reported by Katzell, Ewen, and Korman (1974). Jones et. al. (1977) reported similar results from a sample of Navy personnel. Weaver (1977) found that blacks reported less job satisfaction than whites but that this difference evaporated when differences in pay, sex,

occupational prestige, supervisory position, and work autonomy were introduced. He concluded that the association between race and satisfaction, therefore, was spurious.

There is another, equally plausible, alternative explanation for these findings. It is possible that employees of different races are assigned to different jobs and positions and that the nature of the jobs rather than race per se causes differential satisfaction. The effect of race, therefore, may be indirect--via its impact on job or position assignments--rather than spurious as Weaver claims. Likewise, the absence of substantial differences in satisfaction by race reported by Gavin and Ewen (1974) and by Jones et. al. (1977), may have been due to the fact that, to some extent at least, they were controlling those structural variables which may explain such differences. Gavin & Ewen (1974) restricted their subjects to blue collar workers. Jones et. al. (1977) sampled so as to select people from groups with similar working conditions.

The current research effort attempts to isolate structural factors which (1) may explain racial differences in job satisfaction, and (2) are amenable to policy manipulation by managers within the firm. While such factors as occupational prestige, for example, may play an important role in determining satisfaction levels and vary systematically by race, local managers cannot directly affect how the society allocates prestige across occupations. Managers can, however, affect how employees are allocated

across occupational groups. They also can affect how employees are distributed across work groups and across levels in the hierarchy. These factors--employee location in occupational or work groups and position in the hierarchy--therefore will be taken as the structural variables likely to moderate the race-satisfaction relationship. Specifically, it is hypothesized that:

H₁: Employee positions in work groups will be allocated by race.

H₂: Employee positions in work groups will be significantly associated with their levels of job satisfaction.

and that:

H₃: Employee positions in the organizational hierarchy will be differentially allocated by race.

H₄: Employee positions in the hierarchy will be associated with their levels of job satisfaction.

In addition to the work which focuses on structural bases for differential satisfaction by race, a good deal of research emphasizes cultural determinants. An abundance of evidence attests to differences between blacks and whites along numerous culturally-relevant dimensions (Dreger & Miller, 1968). For example, blacks tend to have higher occupational aspirations but lower expectations than whites (Stephenson, 1957; Bowerman & Campbell, 1965). This fact alone could account for a good deal of the racial differences in job satisfaction, since employees with high aspirations and low expectations are likely to be less satisfied with their jobs (Jones et. al., 1977). Ivancevich and McMahon review research documenting that blacks report less need for autonomy (Brazziel, 1964) and achievement (Minigioni, 1965), lower self-esteem (Hagstrom, 1963;

Clark, 1967), less internal control (Lefcourt & Ladwig, 1965), and less risk-taking propensity (Smith, 1975). Any one of these differences could account for differential satisfaction by race in organizations requiring personnel to be particularly high or low on risk-taking, self-esteem, concern with extrinsic or intrinsic rewards, etc.

Cultural factors have been identified as contributors to differential employee satisfaction by several researchers. Jonas et. al. (1977), for example, argue that differences found in a sample of Navy personnel could plausibly be attributed to blacks reporting lower levels of need strength for such things as social and autonomy needs and for needs to have a complete job, or job challenge or variety. Slocum and Strauser (1972) attribute differences in satisfaction to the fact that black subjects assigned more importance to lower order needs than did white subjects. Slocum, Topichak, and Kuhn (1971) argue that differences in the levels of satisfaction for American and Mexican workers could be traced to the fact that Mexicans place emphasis on informal and aesthetic values and are unlikely to be highly motivated so long as the needs of their families are met. Bloom and Barry (1967) report that hygiene factors were more important to blacks than to whites. Similar results have been reported by Alper (1975). Roberts and O'Reilly (1973) indicate that whites may be more satisfied to the extent they have promotion opportunities while blacks may respond more positively to the extent they see themselves as being well paid. They conclude that "...the frame of reference one brings from his culture or subculture influences the way he perceives his job and those facets of it which are satisfying and dissatisfying."

The present study identifies three domains likely to influence employees' responses to their life at work. In addition to placing differential importance on extrinsic and intrinsic factors, it was felt that some employees may place considerable importance on the social domain. The relative importance that employees of different races place upon each of these factors may reflect underlying cultural differences. In addition, employees who place differential importance on one factor or another may be differentially satisfied, because their employer or their organization may be more able to satisfy employees in some areas relative to others. Accordingly, the following relationships were hypothesized:

- H₅: Employees of different races will place different degrees of importance on extrinsic, intrinsic, and social factors at work.
- H₆: Employees who place differential importance on extrinsic, intrinsic, and social factors will be differentially satisfied at work.

As noted earlier, several studies have documented the impact of structural and cultural factors on employee satisfaction. None of the studies of the race-satisfaction relationship, however, has considered social factors as possible explanations for this relationship. Yet friendship relations may be important determinants of job satisfaction, and they may vary systematically by race. We therefore might expect that:

- H₇: Inclusion into or exclusion from networks of friendship relations will vary by race.

and that,

- H₈: Employees who are included into networks of friendship relationships will be more satisfied

with their jobs than will employees who are isolated from such relationships.

The Study

Hypotheses 1-8 were tested using data gathered from an assembly and packaging plant located in the South. Like other plants which had been operating in the area for several decades, the plant had at one time followed a policy of segregating employees by race. Prior to 1958 there had been separate eating and bathroom facilities for blacks and whites. While these and other remnants of an earlier time had been gone for 20 years, many employees in the plant recalled those days. Of 522 employees surveyed, 243 had worked in the plant before 1958.

Social norms directing interaction patterns, perhaps stemming from these earlier times, also remained in the plant. For example, while employees generally ate with members of their own department and supervisors generally ate together, blacks from all departments, including supervisors, ate together. Work groups also varied in the proportion of black and white members. Although racial constraints on work assignments had long since been lifted, employees often preferred to remain in their jobs rather than transfer to realize racial balance. The plant, therefore, offered an excellent opportunity to study the impact of work assignments on the race-satisfaction relationship. The plant also employed Mexican as well as black and white Americans. They were present in sufficient numbers to allow for simultaneous three-way comparisons, an opportunity unique in studies of this kind.

Measures of work group membership and integration into networks of friendship relationships were based upon an algorithm developed by

Richards (1975). This algorithm operates on matrices of sociometric choices and distinguishes between (1) isolates, those who named no one and who were named by no one or who have only one link attaching them to one or a few others who are themselves isolated, (2) individuals who have one link to others who are themselves richly interconnected, (3) individuals who have links to two or more others who would be isolates were it not for this link, (4) "others," individuals who are richly interconnected but do not have links to an identifiable cluster of linked employees, (5) liaisons, those who link individuals to two or more clusters but who themselves are not members of any cluster, and (6) individuals who are members of an identifiable cluster. Clusters are identified as follows:

1. There must be at least three members.
2. Members must have 50% or more of their links with other members of the cluster.
3. Each member must be linked to each other member by a path lying entirely within the group.
4. There can be no single link or individual which, if eliminated, would cause the cluster to fail to meet any of the above criteria.

Social integration into or isolation from friendship networks was assessed using Richards' definition of an isolate. Data input into the routine were employee choices of their closest friends in the plant. Employees identified as isolates were given a score of 1. All other employees were scored as 2. Work group identification as assessed by identifying employees classified as group members and then by giving

them a score reflecting their specific group. Thirty-one work groups were identified in this way.¹ The procedure, therefore, allowed for a much more refined approach to group identification than would have been possible using only departmental classifications. Groups having a disproportionate number of Mexicans, blacks or whites were identified and dummy variables reflecting membership (2) or non-membership (1) in these groups were generated.²

Employees' hierarchical level was assessed by scoring respondents on the basis of whether they were union members or members of supervision. The measures of the importance placed on extrinsic, intrinsic, and social factors and the measure of job satisfaction were adopted from scales developed by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center (Seashore & Mirvis, 1979). Average intercorrelations among scale items, means and standard deviations, and an intercorrelation matrix are presented in the Measurement Appendix. Demographic variables used as controls also are included in the matrix. Overall, 522 employees completed questionnaires. These represented a response rate of 68%.

Analyses and Results

Job satisfaction scores were adjusted for several demographic characteristics likely to be associated with satisfaction: age, sex, education, and background (extent urban). Regressions of satisfaction on these variables were performed separately for each race category, because the regression coefficients proved to be significantly different across categories.³ Residual scores, partialing out the demographic effects, were then calculated and their averages compared. These averages are presented in Table 1. The results conform to findings of previous studies. There

are significant differences in job satisfaction across races. Blacks are the least satisfied, followed by whites and Mexican Americans. As noted above, the theoretical challenge lies not so much in documenting these relationships as in explaining them. Subsequent analyses, therefore, were directed toward assessing relationships between race and structural, cultural, and social factors and then assessing relationships between these factors and job satisfaction.

Insert Table 1
about here

Race, Structural Factors, and Job Satisfaction. It was anticipated that race would be associated with organizational level and with work group assignment. Bivariate frequency distributions relating race and level are presented in Table 2. From this table it is clear that race and level are not independent. Whites are overrepresented among management. Interestingly, Mexican Americans are even more underrepresented than blacks.

Insert Table 2
about here

There also was a substantial amount of association between race and work group assignment. Because of the small number of blacks, Mexican or white Americans in some groups, statistical tests for independence were not appropriate; however, considerable association was evident by inspection. Mexican Americans comprised 12% of the workforce, yet six work groups were identified which contained more than 33% Mexican Americans. One of these, group 5, was all Mexican Americans. Whites made up 63% of

the workforce yet six work groups had all white members. Twenty-five percent of the employees were black, yet four work groups had at least 50% black members. One of these groups was all black and another had 88% black members.⁴

To document that structural factors play a role in causing the race-satisfaction association, it was necessary not only to show that race is related to structural factors but also that structural factors are associated with satisfaction. The average satisfaction score for union employees was 8.28. The average for supervisors was 8.72. These averages are significantly different ($p < .05$).

To determine whether work group assignment was associated with differential satisfaction for black, Mexican, and white employees, the dummy variables identifying those employees in work groups with a disproportionate number of members of one race were used as predictors of satisfaction. Separate regression analyses were performed for variables reflecting disproportionate numbers of different races. Results of these regressions are presented in Tables 3a-c. These results indicate that membership in disproportionately black groups (in particular, groups 16 and 6) is associated with lower levels of satisfaction. Likewise, membership in disproportionately white groups is associated with higher levels of satisfaction.⁵ None of these relationships, however, accounts for a large amount of variance in satisfaction. Membership in groups with relatively more Mexican Americans does not appear to have a bearing on job satisfaction.

Insert Tables 3a-c
about here

In summary, the hypothesized relationships between race and structural factors--level and work group assignment--find support in the data. The results are consistent with the thesis that blacks are less satisfied than whites because they are less likely to be in supervisory roles or in groups which for reasons of task, physical location, etc. have more satisfied members. Horizontal and vertical positions, however, accounts for only a modest amount of variance in satisfaction. The results also give little in the way of explanation for why Mexican Americans are so satisfied at work. They are even less likely than blacks to be in supervisory roles, and their work group assignments are unrelated to satisfaction. Even the results for blacks and whites, however, may be premature. Before concluding that structural factors explain some of the black-white differences in satisfaction, it will be necessary to consider them in conjunction with cultural and social factors and with each other.

Race, Cultural Factors, and Job Satisfaction. The association between race and the importance employees attach to extrinsic, intrinsic, and social factors at work was assessed by comparing averages on the importance scale across races. These comparisons are presented in Table 4. From this table it appears that Mexican American employees place less importance on extrinsic rewards than do either their black or white co-workers. Whites, on the other hand, were more likely to stress the importance of interpersonal factors than were either blacks or Mexican Americans. The three race groups did not differ significantly in the importance their members placed on intrinsic factors.

Insert Table 4
about here

The impact of the cultural variables on employees' job satisfaction was assessed by regressing satisfaction on the three importance factors. The results of this regression are presented in Table 5. Although the overall regression is highly significant, it appears that only the importance placed on interpersonal relations is significantly associated with job satisfaction and this association is relatively small. However, employees who place a high degree of importance on how they are treated by others, are more likely to express job satisfaction than those who are not so concerned about interpersonal relations at work. Since white employees reported greater concern for interpersonal relations, and since they also scored higher than blacks on the satisfaction scale, this cultural variable may explain some of the black-white differences in satisfaction. It does not explain why Mexican American workers express high degrees of satisfaction, however. Mexican Americans in the sample were very similar to black employees in the importance they placed on interpersonal relations. Yet, as a group, they were very satisfied.

Insert Table 5
about here

Race, Social Factors, and Job Satisfaction. It was hypothesized that integration into or isolation ~~from~~ ~~from~~ networks of friendship relations would be associated with both race and with job satisfaction. To assess the relationship between social integration, isolation and race, bivariate frequencies for these variables were observed. These frequencies are

presented in Table 6. It is clear from this table that race and friendship integration are not independent. Only 33% of the whites are isolated, but 47% of the black workers and 54% of the Mexican American employees fall into this category.

Insert Table 6
about here

Average satisfaction scores for friendship isolates and their more integrated co-workers are presented in Table 7. Here it is clear that socially isolated employees are less satisfied than their more integrated counterparts. Since blacks were more likely to be isolated than whites, this factor should explain some of the difference in their levels of satisfaction. As in earlier analyses, however, Mexican American employees do not fit the pattern. They are more socially isolated yet more satisfied than either of the other two groups.

Insert Table 7
about here

Summary and Discussion. The above analyses document modest but significant effects of structural factors, cultural factors, and social factors on employee satisfaction. The fact that these factors also are associated with race suggests that they are likely to play a role in causing racial differences in satisfaction. To determine the extent to which this is so, an analysis of covariance was run using job satisfaction as the dependent variable, the seven variables associated with both race and satisfaction as covariates and racial groupings as factors. Should the seven variables explain all of the differences in satisfaction by race,

means adjusted for the impact of the covariates would not be significantly different. The impact of the seven factors considered simultaneously is presented in Table 8 (regression analysis). A comparison of means by race category adjusting for the impact of these factors (covariance analysis) is presented in Table 9.

- - - - -
Insert Table 8
about here
- - - - -

The regression results presented in Table 8 show that most of the structural, cultural, and social factors found to be significant earlier retain their significance under conditions of simultaneous controls. (Dummy variables were introduced for race to preclude the possibility of spuriousness.) None of the factors, other than race, accounts for much variance by itself; however, the entire model accounts for 55% of the variance in job satisfaction. Being in one of the disproportionately black groups (16) is significantly associated with satisfaction; however, assignment to the other one shown to be significant in earlier analysis (Table 3a) becomes insignificant when the impacts of race and the other factors are controlled. The importance placed on interpersonal relations, integration into friendship networks, and assignment to work groups with disproportionately white members also are significant. The impact of level, however, becomes insignificant when the other factors are controlled. It appears that job satisfaction may not be increased simply because one is promoted to a management position. Rather, the altered social relationships or work group assignments that accompany promotion appear to be the determining factors. It is also possible that promotions encourage employees to place greater importance on interpersonal relations and thereby increase

their job satisfaction. Porter and Lawler (1965), among others, have urged researchers to explain rather than simply document differential job satisfaction by level. It appears that these differences can be explained by other structural factors or by social or even cultural variables in these data. Further inquiry into these possibilities ought to be pursued in future research.

Insert Table 9
about here

The mean comparisons presented in Table 9 make it immediately clear that, while we may have accounted for some of the differences in job satisfaction by race, there is still much to be explained. Partialing out the effect of the structural, cultural, and social factors, blacks are still less satisfied than either whites or Mexican Americans. Mexican Americans also are more satisfied with their jobs than whites. All two-way comparisons were statistically significant ($p < .001$). Comparing Table 9 with Table 1 it appears that by taking structural, cultural, and social factors into account, we have closed the gap between black and white job satisfaction. We also have significantly reduced the variance around the race averages. The difference of .14 for blacks or .07 for whites, however, is not large. These adjustments do represent a change of approximately one standard deviation for each race category. Whereas blacks and whites were separated by 2.16 units on the satisfaction scale in Table 1, the difference is 1.95 in Table 9. This difference is greater than it might seem at first glance, because of the small standard deviations around the mean satisfaction scores. It is by no means all of the difference, however, and it is clear that additional work needs to be done to account for the remaining difference.

Relative Deprivation and Job Satisfaction:
The Case of Mexican Americans

While structural, cultural, and social factors account for a significant amount of the black-white differences in job satisfaction, they account for none of the differences involving the Mexican American workers. In fact, controlling for structural, cultural, and social factors, Mexican Americans are slightly even more satisfied than when these controls are not included (Table 1 versus Table 9). It was shown earlier that Mexican American employees were more underrepresented in management than either whites or blacks, that they were the least likely to feel interpersonal relationships were important, and that they were most likely to be excluded from friendship relations at work. Yet they are the most satisfied with their jobs.

It is possible that Mexican Americans, more than their black or white counterparts, feel that their jobs are much better than any others they might get. They might therefore be more satisfied with what they have. This is consistent with the relative deprivation hypotheses made by such people as Jones et. al. (1977), and Gavin and Ewen (1974). Mexican Americans may compare themselves with other Mexican Americans in the community (Festinger, 1954) and conclude that, relative to the jobs these people have, they have very good jobs. It was possible to conduct a preliminary test of this possibility using the present data.

Each employee was asked to estimate the likelihood that they could find a job with another employer with about the same pay and benefits they currently receive (7-point scale). Cross-race comparisons of mean differences in responses to this item indicate black Americans were the most likely to feel they could find a comparable job ($\bar{X} = 3.42$). Whites

were next, and Mexican Americans tended to feel they could not find other work with the same pay and benefits ($\bar{X} = 1.9$). Overall, the mean differences across races were statistically significant (ANOVA, $p \leq .0001$). In addition, the correlation between the likelihood of finding comparable job and job satisfaction was $-.18$ ($p < .01$). The impact of this variable, however, was reduced when race and structural, cultural, and social variables were controlled. Results of this regression are presented in Table 10.

Insert Table 10
about here

Means adjusted for the independent variables presented in Table 10 are compared in Table 11. By including the notion of relative deprivation, the gap between the job satisfaction levels of Mexican Americans and those of other employees is lessened somewhat (Table 9 vs. Table 11). However, the change is not substantial. All three means in Table 11 are significantly different from each other, and substantial differences in job satisfaction across races, therefore, remain to be accounted for.

Insert Table 11
about here

It is possible that Mexican American employees are treated better by supervisors than are their black or even white counterparts. However, there was only one Mexican American supervisor in the sample. It is unlikely that white or black supervisors treat Mexican American subordinates better than they treat other employees. A more plausible explanation is that Mexican Americans place greater importance on non-work activities such as family life and that they are satisfied with whatever work they have

so long as it allows them to further and maintain these other interests. Citing Woods (1956), Fayerweather (1959), Lauterback (1965), and McCann (1964 and 1970), Slocum et. al. (1971) put forth essentially the same argument. Pursuit of this sort of possibility, therefore, may help explain racial differences which must go unaccounted for in the present analysis.

Conclusion

Results of the analyses presented above indicate that some of the racial differences in job satisfaction may be attributed to a variety of causes. Structural factors--specifically, work group assignment--cultural factors, and social factors play a small but significant role. In addition, the extent to which employees feel deprived relative to others of the same race may be important. This factor, however, was not significant under conditions of simultaneous controls. Supervisors seeking to erase racial differences in job satisfaction, therefore, may have an impact by manipulating work group assignments or, at least, by working toward work groups which have proportional representation by race. Such efforts, however, are not likely to alter the values employees bring with them to the workplace. They also may have little impact on friendship patterns. They are likely to have little impact on who employees take as a relevant comparison group. They surely will have little effect on how comparable others fare, because these people are likely to be linked to the employees outside of the work setting. For example, they may be neighbors, relatives, or members of the same voluntary organizations. Moreover, the effect that such manipulations has is likely to vary across races. It may reduce differences between blacks and whites while leaving those involving Mexican Americans unaffected.

Management, then, can have an impact; however, it is likely to be a modest one. Current legislation and recent court decisions, however, focus on structural factors and ignore the cultural, social and social-psychological ones. It may be that these factors are no more tractable through legislation than they are through management policy. If so, it may be a long time before people of different races report relatively equal degrees of satisfaction. In the meantime, managers might well continue to work in areas over which they can exercise some control. To the extent that they do, however, they might be well advised to expect only marginal results.

Footnotes

¹Weighting schemes generally do not improve the accuracy of group identification (Lindzey and Byrne, 1968). In the current research, however, weights were inferred from the order in which names were listed. The first person named was given maximum weight, the second person named was given the second most weight, etc. This procedure resulted in a much more detailed identification of group structure than was obtained when no weights were used. There were significantly more groups and more group members identified. For a more detailed discussion of the procedure see

²The work force consisted of 12% Mexican Americans, 63% White Americans, and 25% Black Americans. Groups consisting of 33% Mexican Americans, 100% Whites, and 50% Blacks were taken as having a disproportionate number of representatives from that race. Using this definition, 16 of 31 work groups had a disproportionate representation from one race. No group had disproportionate representation from two races.

³Older or less well educated black and white employees were more satisfied; however, there was no age or education effect for Mexican Americans. In addition, male Mexican Americans appeared to be less satisfied than their female counterparts. There was no sex effect for whites or for blacks.

⁴All groups discussed had at least five members.

⁵It may be argued that the results of these regressions reflect previously established differences in satisfaction across races, since work groups were selected on the basis of racial composition. That it is group membership rather than race that accounts for at least the bulk of the results is evidenced by the fact that black members of work group 16 (disproportionately black) were significantly less satisfied than other blacks in the plant ($p < .03$). White members of work groups 2 and 13 (disproportionately white) were significantly more satisfied than other whites ($p < .03$). Members of work group 6 (disproportionately black), however, did not appear to be less satisfied than other blacks. The impact of being in group 6 was not significant when race was controlled (Table 8).

References

- Alper, William S. "Racial Differences in Job and Work Environment Priorities Among Newly Hired College Graduates," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 132-134.
- Bloom, R. and Barry, J. "Determinants of Work Attitudes Among Negroes," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 287-292.
- Bowerman, C. and Campbell, E. "Aspirations of Southern Youth: A Look at Racial Comparisons," Transaction, 1965, 2, 24.
- Brazziel, W. F. "Correlations of Southern Negro Personality," Journal of Social Issues, 1964, 20, 45-53.
- Brown, Harold A. and Ford, David L. "An Exploratory Analysis of Discrimination in the Employment of Black MBA Graduates," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 50-56.
- Clark, K. B. "Explosion in the Ghetto," Psychology Today, 1967, 1, 30-39.
- Dreger, R. and Miller, K. "Comparative Psychological Studies of Negroes and Whites: 1959-1965," Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, 1-32.
- Fayerweather, J. "The Executives Overseas," Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1959.
- Festinger, L. A. "A Theory of Social Comparison Processes," Human Relations, 1954, 7, 117-140.
- Fields, C. L. and Freeman, E. S. "Black Professionals: The Gap is Not Closing," MBA Magazine, January 1972, 73; 78; 82; 84.
- Gavin, James F. and Ewen, Robert B. "Racial Differences in Job Attitudes and Performance: Some Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Findings," Personnel Psychology, 1974, 27, 455-464.
- Goode, K. G. "Query: Can the Afro-American Be an Effective Executive?," California Management Review, 1970, 13, 22-26.
- Greenhaus, J. F. and Gavin, J. F. "The Relationship Between Expectancies and Job Behavior For White and Black Employees," Personnel Psychology, 1972, 25, 449-455.
- Hagstrom, W. "Self-Esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Segregated Negroes," Dissemination Abstracts, 1963, 23, 3007.
- Hammer, Clay W., Kim, Jay S., Baird, Lloyd and Bigoness, William J. "Race and Sex As Determinants of Ratings by Potential Employers in a Simulated Work-Sampling Task," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 705-711.

- Ivancevich, John M. and McMahon, Timothy J. "Black-White Differences in a Goal-Setting Program," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1977, 20, 287-300.
- James, Allan P., James, Lawrence R., Bruni, John R. and Sells, S. B. "Black-White Differences in Work Environment perceptions and Job Satisfaction and Its Correlates," Personnel Psychology, 1977, 30, 5-16.
- Katz, I. and Greenbaum, C. "Effects of Anxiety, Threat, and Racial Environment on Task Performance of Negro College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 562-567.
- Katz, I. and Roberts, S. O. and Robinson, J. E. "Effects of Task Difficulty, Race of Administration, and Instructions on Digit and Symbol Performance of Negroes," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2 53-59.
- Katzell, Raymond A., Ewen, Robert and Korman, Abraham K. "Job Attitudes of Black and White Workers: Male Blue-Collar Workers in Six Companies," Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 4, 365-376.
- Kirkpatrick, James J. "Occupational Aspirations, Opportunities, and Barriers," in K. Miller and R. Dreger (eds.), Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in the United States, New York: Seminar Press, 1973.
- Lauterback, A. "Management Aims and Development Needs in Latin America," Business History Review, 1965, 39, 557-588.
- Ledvinka, James and Schoenfeldt, Lyle F. "Legal Developments in Employment Testing: Albemarle and Beyond," Personnel Psychology, 1978, 31, 1-13.
- Lefcourt, H. M. and Ladwig, G. W. "The American Negro: Problem in Expectancies," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 337-380.
- Levitan, T. R., Quinn, R. P., and Stains, G. L. "Sex Discrimination Against American Working Women," American Behavioral Scientist, 1971, 15, 238-254.
- McCann, Eugene. "An Aspect of Management Philosophy in the United States and Latin America," Academy of Management Journal, 1964, 7, 149-152.
- McCann, Eugene. "Anglo-American and Mexican Management Philosophies," MSU Business Topics, 1970, 18, 28-38.
- Milutinovich, Jugoslav S. "Black-White Differences in Job Satisfaction, Group Cohesiveness and Leadership Style," Human Relations, 1977, 30 1079-1087.
- Minigioni, A. D. "Need for Achievement in Negro and White Children," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 108-111.

- O'Reilly, Charles A. III and Roberts, Karlene, H. "Job Satisfaction Among Whites and Non-Whites: A Cross-Cultural Approach," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 295-299.
- Richards, A. S. and Jaffe, C. C. "Blacks Supervising Whites: A Study of Interracial Difficulties in Working Together in a Simulated Organization," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 234-240.
- Seashore, Stanley and Mirvis, Philip. The Michigan Organization Assessment Package. New York: John Wiley, 1979.
- Slocum, John W. and Strawser, Robert H. "Racial Differences in Job Attitudes," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 28-32.
- Slocum, John W., Topichak, Paul M. and Kuhn, David G. "A Cross Cultural Study of Need Satisfaction and Need Importance for Operative Employees," Personnel Psychology, 1971, 24, 435-445.
- Smith, E. J. "Profile of the Black Individual in Vocational Literature," Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1975, 6, 41-59.
- Smith, Patricia C., Smith, Olin W., and Rolo, James. "Factor Structure for Blacks and Whites of the Job Descriptive Index and Its Discrimination of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 99-100.
- Stephenson, R. "Mobility Orientation and Stratification of 1,000 Ninth Graders," American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 204-212.
- Weaver, Charles N. "Black-White Correlates of Job Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 255-258.
- Weaver, Charles N. "Negro-White Differences in Job Satisfaction," Business Horizons, 1974, 17, 67-72.
- Weaver, Charles N. "Relationships Among Pay, Race, Sex, Occupational Prestige, Supervision, Work Autonomy, and Job Satisfaction in a National Sample," Personnel Psychology, 1977, 437-445.
- Woods, Sister Francis Jerome, C.D.P. "Cultural Values of American Ethnic Groups," New York: Harper and Bros., 1956.

Table 1

Analysis of Variance: Job Satisfaction by
Race, Controlling for Demographic Characteristics*

	Black Americans	Mexican Americans	White Americans
Job Satisfaction			
Mean	6.63	9.33	8.79
Standard Deviation	0.93	0.98	0.97
N	99	49	259

F = 209.06 (2,404)
p < .0001

*Variances not unequal across cells (p = .88).

Table 2

Bivariate Frequencies: Race by Level

	Labor	Management	
Black Americans	123/95%	6/5%	100%
Mexican Americans	60/98%	1/2%	100%
White Americans	281/87%	41/13%	100%

$$\chi^2 = 11.96$$

$$p \leq .003$$

Table 3a

Regressions: Job Satisfaction on Work Group Membership
(Work Groups with a Disproportionate Percentage of Black Americans)
(N = 407)

	β	
Group 16	-.22**	
Group 6	-.20**	MR = .30
Group 5	-.06	F = 7.75
Group 21	-.01	p \leq .0001
Group 23	-.01	

**p \leq .0001

Table 3b

Regressions: Job Satisfaction on Work Group Memberships
(Work Groups with a Disproportionate Percentage of Mexican Americans)
(N = 407)

	β	
Group 9	.07	MR = .13
Group 19	-.06	F = 1.28
Group 20	.06	p \leq .28
Group 27	.05	
Group 30	.01	

*p \leq .08

Table 3c

Regressions: Job Satisfaction on Work Group Membership
 (Work Groups with a Disproportionate Percentage--100%--of White Americans)
 (N = 407)

	β	
Group 1	.02	MR = .22
Group 2	.09*	F = 3.40
Group 13	.08*	p \leq .003
Group 14	.04	
Group 18	.04	
Group 28	-.01	

*p \leq .08

Table 4

Importance of Extrinsic Factors, Interpersonal Relations, and Intrinsic Factors by Race

	Black Americans		Mexican Americans		White Americans		F	p _{<}
	\bar{X}	s.d.	\bar{X}	s.d.	\bar{X}	s.d.		
Importance of...								
Extrinsic Factors (N = 505)	7.64	1.54	7.04	1.44	7.73	1.32	6.02	.003
Interpersonal Relations (N = 506)	7.06	1.61	7.02	1.41	7.39	1.40	3.27	.04
Intrinsic Factors (N = 503)	7.08	1.63	6.79	1.30	7.18	1.38	1.88	.15

Table 5

Regression: Job Satisfaction on the Importance of
Extrinsic Rewards, Interpersonal Relations, and Intrinsic Rewards

	β	
Importance of...		
Extrinsic Rewards	-.07	MR = .18
Interpersonal Relations	.21*	F = 4.68
Intrinsic Rewards	.00	P \leq .004
		N = 404

*p \leq .002

Table 6

Race by Degree of Integration Into
 Networks of Work Relationships

	Friendship Network		
	Isolated	Integrated	
Black American	61/47%	68/53%	100%
Mexican American	33/54%	28/46%	100%
White American	105/33%	217/67%	100%

$\chi^2 = 15.11$

$p \leq .0005$

Table 7

Integration into and Isolation from Networks of
Friendship Relationships and Job Satisfaction

	Friendship Network Status	
	Isolated	Integrated
Job Satisfaction		
Mean	8.05	8.49
s.d.	1.43	1.30
N	153	254

t = 3.16
p < .002

Table 8

Regression of Job Satisfaction on Structural, Cultural, and Social Factors Found to be Significant in Earlier Analyses

Independent Variable	B	t	p _{<}
Structural Factors -			
membership in work group 16	-.07	2.06	.0398
membership in work group 6	-.03	0.99	.3221
membership in work group 2	.07	1.99	.0475
membership in work group 13	.07	2.12	.0345
level	.01	0.38	.7059
Cultural Factor -			
the importance of interpersonal relations	.11	3.11	.0020
Social Factor -			
integration into networks of friendship relations	.08	2.30	.0221
Race			
Black American (1=No; 2=Yes)	-.61	16.40	.0001
Mexican American (1=No; 2=Yes)	.17	4.64	.0001

$$R^2 = .55$$

$$F = 53.05$$

$$p < .0001$$

$$N = 406$$

Table 9

Analysis of Covariance: Race and Job
Satisfaction Controlling for Significant Structural,
Cultural, and Social Moderators

	Black Americans	Mexican Americans	White Americans	F	<u>p</u>
Adjusted Average	6.77	9.41	8.72	174.19	.0001
Standard Deviation	.10	.14	.06		
N	99	49	258		

Table 10

Job Satisfaction Regressed on Structural, Cultural, and
Social Factors and on Employee Perceptions of the Likelihood that
They Could Find Comparable Work Elsewhere

Independent Variable	β	t	$p \leq$
Structural Factors -			
membership in work group 16	-.07	1.97	.0501
membership in work group 6	-.03	0.93	.3513
membership in work group 2	.08	2.16	.0315
membership in work group 13	.07	2.14	.0329
level	.01	0.31	.7539
Cultural Factor -			
the importance of interpersonal relations	.11	3.14	.0018
Social Factor -			
integration into networks of friendship relations	.09	2.40	.0169
Relative Deprivation -			
perceived likelihood that comparable work could be found elsewhere	-.05	1.41	.1587
Race			
Black American (1=No; 2=Yes)	-.61	16.27	.0001
Mexican American (1=No; 2=Yes)	.15	4.09	.0001

$R^2 = .55$
 $F = 48.36$
 $p \leq .0001$
 $N = 400$

Table 11

Analyses of Covariance: Race and Job Satisfaction
Controlling for Significant Structural, Cultural,
Social, and Social Psychological Moderators

	Black Americans	Mexican Americans	White Americans	F	p _≤
Adjusted Average	6.78	9.36	8.73	162.92	.0001
Standard Deviation	.10	.14	.06		
N	98	47	255		



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 060296396