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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to study a sample of the working poor, within the framework of motivator-hygiene theory, in order to ascertain those factors that contribute to the motivation of the poor worker, the worker's feelings about his job, and the influence of these feelings on turnover and productivity.

The Sample

A sample of the working poor was chosen for several reasons. The primary reason for a sample including only those who work is a methodological one. Since the interviews ask such questions as: "When did you feel extremely happy about your job?", and "Were you allowed to do interesting work?", it is more proper that the job under consideration be one that is held at the present time or in a recent time period. If the question were asked of a worker who had held a job sometime in the past, his memory might be less accurate and bias might also be involved. Second, since the motivator-hygiene theory is a theory concerned with factors motivating people to work, it was necessary to select a sample comprised
of workers.

A sample of poor workers was selected for other reasons. The unemployment rate among the poor is, of course, higher than any other group. (That is one reason they are poor.) There also tends to be more job turnover among the poor than among other classes of workers.

The sample in this study consisted of fifty black persons living in an urban setting. Among nonwhite workers "the absolute cyclical variability of unemployment rates has been greater...."¹ Black job-leavers rates are also consistently higher than those of their white counterparts.² The black population makes up a substantial proportion of the urban poor and a substantial proportion of the urban black population is poor.

This study attempts to isolate some of the factors contributing to this high rate of turnover (or, in economic terms, frictional unemployment).

It should be pointed out at this time that the choice of the "working poor" will not preclude inferences about


the "poor". It is now a well known fact that the population of the poor is not limited to unemployed persons. Many poor people are employed in occupations that do not provide adequate income, increases in income, or other types of upward mobility.\(^3\) Indeed, it should be noted that 70 percent of the nation's poor are in fact employed.\(^4\) They may be underpaid and/or underemployed but they are employed. Those poor who are unemployed are likely to be employed (when they can find work) in the same type of job as the working poor. It is also possible that if it can be shown that turnover among the working poor is influenced by a certain factor or set of factors, voluntary unemployment (if it exists) may be influenced by the same factors.

**The Problems**

The first question to be answered is: What motivates the poor worker? Is he motivated by the same things as other more advantaged workers, or is he a special case? There is some difference of opinion as to whether the poor worker is different from the rest of society. These differences will be discussed in more detail later. This survey will answer


at least part of this question for this sample; it will
tell us if the poor worker is motivationally normal with
regard to his work.

It is a common supposition that the poor, when they
are employed, work in dirty, menial, dead-end jobs that
offer little to the worker in the way of psychological
or material satisfaction. It is perhaps equally as often
supposed that the poor are not achievement oriented and
therefore do not require interesting and challenging
occupations that may, incidentally, pay better. The
second major objective of this study is to answer this
question from the worker's point of view. In effect the
interview will ask the worker if he sees his job as
interesting, challenging, well paying, etc. The worker
will be the judge as to which supposition is correct.

The third major objective is to attempt to relate
the worker's feelings about his job to productivity and
turnover.
CHAPTER II
FRAMEWORK FOR THE STUDY

As noted in the Introduction, the methodological framework for this study is the motivator-hygiene theory developed by Herzberg et al. and published in The Motivation to Work (1959). In this section the theory and its verification will be discussed.

Motivator-Hygiene Theory

The motivator-hygiene theory proposes that man has two separate and distinct need categories. First, man has an animalistic need to avoid pain. Second, man has a human mental need to achieve psychological growth. These two propositions provide the proper basis for motivator-hygiene theory.

The factors that satisfy the animalistic needs are called hygiene, and they refer to those factors which can prevent dissatisfaction but cannot cause satisfaction. In

\[\text{5Frederick Herzberg, Bernard Mausner and Barbara Bloch Snyderman, The Motivation To Work (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959).}\]
a job situation these factors are: company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status and security. These factors refer to the environment that surrounds the worker and not to the work itself.

The factors that satisfy the needs for psychological growth are called motivators and they refer to those factors that can produce satisfaction but cannot prevent dissatisfaction. These factors include: achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and growth or advancement. These factors are intrinsic to the job; that is, they pertain to the job itself.

Then on the basis of motivator-hygiene analysis, it is clear that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are caused by separate and distinct sets of factors. Because of the fact that different sets of factors are applicable, depending upon whether job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction is to be considered, it follows that the two are not opposites. That is, it is possible to have job satisfaction and dissatisfaction at the same time since they arise due to

7 Ibid.
different factors. In terms of continua, satisfaction and dissatisfaction are no longer at opposite ends as below:

\[ \text{dissatisfaction} \leftrightarrow \text{satisfaction} \]

In contrast, motivator-hygiene theory suggests two continua: the opposite of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction; it is no job satisfaction, and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is not job satisfaction, it is no job dissatisfaction. Thus the continua:

\[ \text{no satisfaction} \leftrightarrow \text{satisfaction} \]

and

\[ \text{dissatisfaction} \leftrightarrow \text{no dissatisfaction} \]

To re-emphasize, two continua are suggested because each feeling is caused by a totally different set of factors.

The motivator-hygiene theory was developed by Herzberg, et al., beginning in 1957 when a survey of the literature concerning job attitudes was conducted. The survey revealed that positive job attitudes were associated with one specific set of factors, whereas negative job attitudes were associated with a completely different set of factors.\(^9\)


In order to test this thesis empirically, Herzberg, et al. devised an interview that would test job attitudes (see Appendix A). The interviewer asked the subject to tell about a sequence of events that led to his feeling exceptionally happy about his job. In a second sequence of events the subject was asked to relate a time when he felt exceptionally unhappy about his job.

The criteria established by Herzberg et al. for an acceptable sequence of events were five:

1. The sequence must evolve around an actual event or sequence of events.
2. The sequence must be bounded by time.
3. The feelings of the respondent must have been affected in an exceptional way.
4. The event must be in a period of time relevant to the other participants in the sample.
5. The subject’s feelings must pertain to his job and not to something unrelated. 10

If the above criteria were met the sequence was then analyzed for three separate categories of factors: (1) the objective events of the sequence, called first level factors, (2) the subject’s reasons for his feelings, called second level factors; and (3) effects beyond the behavioral level such as performance, turnover, mental health, and interpersonal relations. 11

10 Herzberg, The Motivation to Work, pp. 40-41.
11 Karp, op. cit., p. 6.
The first level factors identified in the study were:

1. recognition
2. achievement
3. possibility of growth
4. advancement
5. salary
6. interpersonal relationships
7. supervision - technical
8. responsibility
9. company policy and administration
10. working conditions
11. the work itself
12. factors in personal life
13. status
14. job security

The second level factors identified were:

1. feelings of recognition
2. feelings of achievement
3. feelings of responsibility
4. group feelings
5. feelings of interest in the job
6. feelings of increased status
7. feelings of fairness
8. feelings about salary12

The results of this study, which involved interviews with accountants and engineers, were published in The Motivation to Work (1959). The research and analysis confirmed the thesis that positive and negative job attitudes are attributable to factors concerning the content of the job or the work itself. Job dissatisfaction was found to be due to factors concerning environment surrounding the job or job context, not the work itself.

12Ibid., pp. 6-7.
Since the original study was made, the theory has been tested frequently. In twelve different replications personnel such as lower level supervisors, professional women, agricultural administrators, men about to retire from management positions, hospital maintenance workers, manufacturing supervisors, food handlers, military officers, Finnish foremen, Hungarian engineers, nurses, teachers, scientists, female assemblers, and others were tested. Testing, as can be seen from the above list, crossed national boundaries.  

Figure I depicts the composite results of these studies. The results show that of all factors contributing to job satisfaction 81% were motivators, and of all factors contributing to dissatisfaction 69% were hygiene.

Thus the theory holds not only for diverse occupations but also for different cultures. The main thrust of the motivator-hygiene theory, i.e., that man has two basic need systems, being verified extensively, lends credibility to Herzberg's thesis that the two need categories reflect the basic nature of mankind. This idea is stated and expanded in Work and The Nature of Man (1966).

---

13 Herzberg, "One More Time", pp. 57-58.

14 Ibid., p. 57.
There are at least two important implications of motivator-hygiene theory with which this paper is concerned. The first one is an extension of the basic thesis. Hygiene factors (dissatisfiers) can prevent job dissatisfaction but cannot cause satisfaction. In other words, these factors cannot motivate the worker; they cannot make him a better
worker. This can be achieved only by motivators, the factors concerning the content of the job. The second implication is the mental health theory. The adjusted individual is one who attempts to meet each set of needs on its respective continuum. The ideal position would be high on both continuum, but if a person seeks motivation on the motivator continuum and hygiene on the hygiene continuum, he is not mentally ill. That is, motivator-hygiene theory assumes a person to be adjusted if he seeks to avoid pain with hygiene factors and attempts to grow psychologically through motivator factors. The person who attempts to grow through hygiene or to avoid pain through motivators is maladjusted, in accordance with motivator-hygiene theory.

15 For further explanation see Herzberg "One More Time" (cited previously) or William J. Paul, Jr., Keith B. Robertson, and Frederick Herzberg, "Job Enrichment Pays Off", Harvard Business Review, March-April 1969, pp. 61-78.

CHAPTER III
PRESENT RESEARCH

Hypotheses and Rationale

The first question to be answered by this research is whether or not the sample participants are mentally adjusted to their work. In terms of motivator-hygiene theory: Are the poor workers "happy" due to motivational factors and "unhappy" due to hygiene factors? Stated more formally as hypotheses Ia and Ib:

Hypothesis Ia: The total sample of workers will mention sequences dealing with motivation significantly more often when relating a happy sequence than when relating an unhappy sequence.

Hypothesis Ib: The total sample of workers will mention sequences dealing with hygiene significantly more often when relating an unhappy sequence than when relating a happy sequence.

These primary hypotheses suggest, of course, that the sample is mentally adjusted; that is, that satisfaction is caused by motivators and dissatisfaction is caused by hygiene. (The interview which was used is contained in
The question as to whether or not the poor worker is well adjusted with regard to his occupation is important, alone and in its implications. Measures such as income maintenance and the like may be better administered if we first understand the poor. If the working poor are not motivated by the same things as other populations, then special measures should be employed because they have special needs. Society's efforts to confront some of the problems of the poor may be somewhat less difficult if an understanding of their motivational patterns is first attained.

The mental state of the poor is not a clear-cut issue. The chapter "The Twisted Spirit" in Michael Harrington's The Other America sets forth the thesis that the poor are in fact the class with not only the greatest incidence of mental illness but also the greatest intensity. That is, Harrington maintains that the poor have the greater incidence of psychosis as opposed to the neuroses of the upper and middle classes. Harrington also maintains that the weary frustration of poverty causes the poor to "...feel differently from the rest of the Nation". They are

hopeless, passive, lonely, isolated, and yet given to frequent outbursts of violence. This culture of poverty causes the poor to have more of the mentally ill among them, and because they are poor and isolated, they are different from the rest of society.\textsuperscript{18}

Herbert J. Gans quotes a Harvard Youth Study (HARYOU), "Youth in the Ghetto", as finding that although the incidence of social pathology correlated only .07 with unemployment, the correlation was .64 with the proportion of unskilled workers in the area. "Kenneth Clark concludes: 'Apparently the roots of pathology in Central Harlem lie not primarily in unemployment but in the low status of the jobs held by the residents of the community'.\textsuperscript{19}

Thus there is some evidence to support the idea that the poor worker has a greater than "normal" tendency to be mentally ill.

There is, on the other hand, the commonly held view that mental illness is a product of the upper classes brought on by the strains of the everyday business world.

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid.

In other words, this point of view would hold that the dangers of wealth and leisure bring about the higher incidence of mental illness.

This paper does not seek to end this controversy. It does seek to determine whether or not the poor worker of this sample is adjusted with regard to his work. If it is found that the poor worker is made happy by motivators and unhappy by hygiene, Harrington's thesis is yet undisturbed since there are many other factors that can cause mental illness at work in the culture of poverty.

The rationale for proposing mental health for this sample, as in Hypotheses Ia and Ib, is that the replications of motivator-hygiene theory have shown that the theory is not bound by cultural background or socio-economic status.

According to the mental health implications of motivator-hygiene theory, if the worker attempts to satisfy his motivational needs on the motivator scale and avoid pain on the hygiene scale, he is not mentally ill. If, on the other hand, the worker is absent from one scale or attempting to fulfill needs on the "wrong" scale, he is maladjusted. Hypotheses Ia and Ib will answer these questions about this sample of the working poor.

After answering the primary question of "What motivates
avoid pain?", and "How much motivation do I need in order to grow?". This section gives an idea of the respondent's orientation; i.e., whether he is a motivator seeker, a hygiene seeker, or both, and in what degree.

By subtracting the measure of the first part of the J.M.I. from the second, measures of the subject's deprivation of motivation and hygiene are obtained. These measures are important to the psychological well being of the worker and hence affect the way in which he goes about his job.

The raw scores of the first and second halves of the J.M.I. were corrected for response style. Twenty-four of the 144 items in the J.M.I. are included in the Response Style Control (RSC). These items are devised to measure the individual's tendency to answer "yea" or "nay" to the questions. The equations are then used to adjust the inventory value for spuriously high and low scores. The actual correction equations used in this study were devised by Kahoe and revised by Karp (1969).21

The following adjustment equations were used:

(1) \[ M'_1 = M_1 + .75 \left( \frac{25}{11} (\bar{X} - \text{RSC}) \right) \]
(2) \[ H'_1 = H_1 + .75 \left( \frac{27}{11} (\bar{X} - \text{RSC}) \right) \]

21Karp, "An Investigation of the Motivational Patterns in Industrial Salesmen".
(3) \[ M'_2 = M_2 + 0.75 \left( \frac{25}{13} (\bar{X} - RSC) \right) \]

(4) \[ H'_2 = H_2 + 0.75 \left( \frac{27}{13} (\bar{X} - RSC) \right) \]

where:

- \( M_1 \) = subject's raw score on motivator scale on part 1.
- \( M'_1 \) = subject's adjusted score on motivator scale on part 1.
- \( H_1 \) = subject's raw score on hygiene scale on part 1.
- \( H'_1 \) = subject's adjusted score on hygiene scale on part 1.
- \( M_2 \) = subject's raw score on motivator scale on part 2.
- \( M'_2 \) = subject's adjusted score on motivator scale on part 2.
- \( H_2 \) = subject's raw score on hygiene scale on part 2.
- \( H'_2 \) = subject's adjusted score on hygiene scale on part 2.
- \( \bar{X} \) = the mean of all sample scores on the appropriate scale (motivator or hygiene) on the appropriate part (1 or 2).

0.75 = an empirically determined constant.

25 = the number of responses contributing to the motivator scale on each part of the J.M.I.

27 = the number of responses contributing to the hygiene scale on each part of the J.M.I.

11 = number of responses contributing to the RSC on part 1.

13 = number of responses contributing to the RSC on part 2.

Thus, the subject's perception of hygiene and motivation, hygiene and motivation orientations, and
deprivation scores used in the pursuant regression equations are all corrected scores and are therefore considered to have increased validity.

The second major hypothesis has to do with the second half of the J.M.I. and turnover or frictional unemployment.

The original study done by Herzberg, et al. reported that one out of eight "unhappy" sequences led to quitting. Another eight percent of this group indicated that they took some steps toward quitting, and in an additional 20% of the "long range unhappiness" sequences respondents reported that they had thought of quitting. "Thus almost half of the long range low sequences resulted in some degree of physical or psychological withdrawal from the job." So it is evident that hygiene factors contribute greatly to physical and psychological withdrawal and hence unemployment through turnover.

It should be noted that psychological withdrawal as well as physical withdrawal may also contribute to turnover. The worker who has quit the company psychologically is more

---

22 A long range sequence lasts at least several weeks to a month during which the subject's feelings are consistently high or low.

23 Herzberg, The Motivation to Work, pp. 88-89.
likely to be fired as a result of his feelings, whether he expresses them openly or they become evident from his actions. The dissatisfied worker is more likely to lose his job.

Motivation also has a profound effect on turnover. The original study reported that in one tenth of the "happy" sequences the respondent reported an increased psychological commitment to his job. This point may have been underestimated since the question only arose when the respondent had had another job offer or had made a previous decision to quit. Also, if a worker is deprived of motivation on a job, another job offering better hygiene (salary, working conditions, etc.) becomes more attractive even if motivation is the same. The lack of motivational factors cause a worker to be "not satisfied" and this in turn causes him to be uninterested in his work, inducing him to seek other employment or causing him to be fired because he is not productive. It has also been pointed out that absence of motivators may increase sensitivity to lack of hygiene factors, thus causing jobs offering more hygiene to be more attractive.

Having established the fact that both motivation and hygiene are likely to contribute to turnover, attempts were

\[24\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 89.\]
made to measure this effect.

In the demographic section of the interview (see Appendix D) the subject was asked to give the number of different jobs he has held in the past five years. In this way a measure of his turnover was gained. The measures of motivation and hygiene orientation were then correlated with turnover employing multiple regression analysis. The rationale for this correlation is that individuals who are highly motivator or hygiene oriented are likely to find little satisfaction and much dissatisfaction in the terms of motivator-hygiene theory, in the type of job held by the poor. 25

Hypothesis IIa: There will exist a significant positive relationship, using multiple regression analysis, relating turnover as the dependent variable and motivator and hygiene orientation as the independent variables.

In addition two simple regressions were calculated in order to determine which orientation, motivator or hygiene, contributes most to turnover.

Hypothesis IIb: A significant positive relationship will exist between motivator orientation scores from the J.M.I. and turnover in the last five years.

25 It is fully expected that the scores on the first part of the J.M.I. (the workers perception of hygiene and motivators on the job) will be generally low.
Hypothesis IIC: A significant positive relationship will exist between hygiene orientation scores from the J.M.I. and turnover in the last five years.

A second method of measuring turnover was also employed. Each participant was asked the question: "How long have you been on your present job?". In this way a second measure of turnover, or the equivalent length of time on present job, was gained. As noted previously, subtraction of the first part of the J.M.I. from the second part yields measures of the subject's deprivation of motivation and hygiene. The effect of high deprivation scores would be to shorten the length of time that a worker stays on a given job. A person who feels he is being deprived of a great deal of hygiene and motivation is unlikely to continue in that employment for any appreciable length of time, given a minimum of alternative opportunities elsewhere.26 Also a person who feels he is being deprived of very little hygiene or motivation is likely to continue in that employment if it is within his power to do so.

Thus, an inverse relation should exist between deprivation scores and the "length of time on your present

26It is probable that the alternative opportunities do not always or even frequently exist.
This hypothesis will be tested using multiple correlations and regression analysis and simple correlation and regression analysis.

Hypothesis IIIa: There will exist a significant negative relationship, using multiple regression analysis, relating turnover (as measured by "length of time on the present job") as the dependent variable and motivator and hygiene deprivation as the independent variables.

Hypothesis IIIb: A significant negative relationship will exist between turnover and motivation deprivation.

Hypothesis IIIc: A significant negative relationship will exist between turnover and hygiene deprivation.

The latter hypotheses, of course, separate the effects of motivation deprivation and hygiene deprivation on turnover.

A third major area that was analyzed was productivity and motivation.

It is a basic tenet of motivator-hygiene theory that it is motivation that causes a worker to be more productive. That is, a worker will work better if his motivation possibilities are expanded. This process is known as "job enrichment" and is documented in articles such as "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" by Frederick Herzberg and "Job Enrichment Pays Off" by William J. Paul, Keith B. Robertson and Herzberg. Both were
published in the *Harvard Business Review*, January-February 1968 and March-April 1969 respectively. The alternative situation, an absence of motivators, will cause the worker to be less productive than he could be if his motivational needs were being met. The productiveness here does not depend on hygiene, in fact hygiene was held constant in the studies reported in the two articles.

In order to attempt to isolate productivity as a function of motivation, this inquiry depended on the responses of the workers. A question was included in the primary interview (Appendix B) asking the worker whether or not the happy or unhappy sequence that he was relating affected the way in which he did his job, or only affected the way he felt about his job. It was felt that this question would elicit answers pertaining to productivity or quality of work.

The result here obviously reflects the feeling of the worker; i.e., does he think he worked better, worse, or the same. But it is also logical that the worker who thinks he works better or worse will, in fact, work better or worse.

Finally, a correlation matrix relating all relevant demographic variables and including motivation and hygiene orientation and deprivation was analyzed. Although no
formal hypotheses were made in this area significant relationships were considered and reported.

**Summary of Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis Ia:** The total sample of workers will mention sequences dealing with motivation significantly more often when relating a happy sequence than when relating an unhappy sequence.

**Hypothesis Ib:** The total sample of workers will mention sequences dealing with hygiene significantly more often when relating an unhappy sequence than when relating a happy sequence.

**Hypothesis IIa:** There will exist a significant positive relationship, using multiple regression analysis, relating turnover as the dependent variable and motivator and hygiene orientation as the independent variables.

**Hypothesis IIb:** A significant positive relationship will exist between motivator orientation scores from the J.M.I. and turnover in the last five years.

**Hypothesis IIc:** A significant positive relationship will exist between hygiene orientation scores from the J.M.I. and turnover in the last five years.

**Hypothesis IIIa:** There will exist a significant negative relationship, using multiple regression analysis, relating turnover (as measured by "length of time on the present job") as the dependent variable and motivator and hygiene deprivation as the independent variables.

**Hypothesis IIIb:** A significant negative relationship will exist between turnover and motivation deprivation.

**Hypothesis IIIc:** A significant negative relationship will exist between turnover and hygiene deprivation.
Other Analysis

Using scores from the J.M.I. a motivational group identification was made. Four basic motivational groups were used in the classification. They were:

1. Adjusted: This classification pertains to the individual who recognizes the importance of both motivator or growth needs and hygiene or pain avoidance needs. He correspondingly attempts to fulfill both sets of needs.

2. Hygiene Oriented Hygiene Seeker: This individual desires to fulfill only his hygiene needs without a similar recognition of the need for growth or motivators. This classification seeks to find positive satisfaction through hygiene factors and, hence, maladjusted because this can only be achieved through motivators or growth factors.

3. Unbalanced Motivator Seeker: This type is maladjusted in the sense that he does not recognize the need for pain avoidance. He attempts to fulfill only his needs for growth without regard for pain avoidance or hygiene factors.

4. Non-oriented Hygiene Seeker: This type has minimal needs for motivator growth or hygiene pain avoidance. He is willing to suffer whatever life begets him.

These motivational type classifications were delineated by Stern (1968). 27

In order to classify individuals according to motivational types, an extreme score approach was used. The

second half scores of the Job Motivation Inventory, which measures hygiene orientation and motivation orientation, provided the numerical values used for the classifications. These scores were then analyzed for the proper category and were then classified. The cut-off scores in Table I defined the boundaries for the motivational groups.

### TABLE I

**CUT-OFF SCORES FOR MOTIVATIONAL GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIVATIONAL GROUP</th>
<th>MOTIVATOR</th>
<th>HYGIENE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>( \geq 92.5 )</td>
<td>( \geq 91.5 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>( \geq 94.0 )</td>
<td>( \geq 94.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hygiene Oriented Hygiene Seeker</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>( \leq 92 )</td>
<td>( \geq 101.5 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>( \leq 93.5 )</td>
<td>( \geq 103.5 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unbalanced Motivator Seeker</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>( \geq 102.5 )</td>
<td>( \leq 91 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>( \geq 104.5 )</td>
<td>( \leq 93.5 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-oriented Hygiene Seeker</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>( \leq 92 )</td>
<td>( \leq 91 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>( \leq 93.5 )</td>
<td>( \leq 93.5 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The table was adapted from Melvyn Lewis Stern, "An Investigation of Slippage in the Motivation-Hygiene Theory" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1968), p. 44.
Although no other formal hypotheses were made, the effects of motivation and hygiene sequences on the worker's perception of his productivity was analyzed through questions 7 and 16 in the Patterned Interview (Appendix B).

In addition the correlation matrix, mentioned above, was reviewed for significant relationships.

Actual Sample

The actual sample in this study consisted, as noted previously, of fifty black participants living in an urban setting.

The sample was taken in the City of Norfolk, Virginia, from census tract number forty-two, as delineated in the 1960 Census. It would, of course, have been desirable to use 1970 Census data, but at the time of this study income data was not yet published from the more recent census.

Norfolk census tract number forty-two is a low income area. It was, in 1960, either the third or fourth lowest income area in Norfolk depending upon which average income measure is considered. The 1960 Census reported that the median income of families in census tract forty-two was $2,259, the fourth lowest among the Norfolk tracts. The median income measure including families and unrelated individuals was $1,702, the third lowest among Norfolk
tracts. The area is still, in 1971, a low income area and there is little doubt that the 1970 Census data will demonstrate this fact.

Tables II and III contain descriptive measures of the total collected sample, based on mean averages and percentage frequency.

**TABLE II**

**MEAN AVERAGE OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM COLLECTED SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SAMPLE MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dependents</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Per Month</td>
<td>$304.00a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time on Present Job</td>
<td>79.2 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Jobs held in past five years</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of education</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThe median income was $320 per month or $3,840 per year.

---

TABLE III

PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY OF RELEVANT DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>100% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>52% Female( ^a )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>60% Married</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a \)The high frequency of female participants is due primarily to a greater tendency to be at home rather than a greater willingness to participate.

Sampling Procedure

The actual sampling procedure used in this study was a personal interview. Each question, or item in the case of the J.M.I., was read aloud by the interviewer to the participants in this study. This was necessary due to the fact that the participants were often uneducated and the total interview is very complex. It should be pointed out at this time that it is recognized that the study is limited by the ability of the interviewed person to understand the procedures and to articulate his answer. Even so, it is felt that by administering the interviews personally, the former problem is somewhat mitigated.

A systematic sampling procedure was employed in this
study. The sample size of fifty\textsuperscript{29} was predetermined prior to the beginning of collection of data. The total number of housing units was obtained from the census data and was then divided by the sample size. It was thus determined to sample each twenty-seventh household. All street names and addresses applicable to tract forty-two were then assembled and picked at random to determine the order in which the residences would be sampled. A table of random numbers was employed to determine the starting point. Beginning with the thirteenth household, every twenty-seventh was to be sampled.

The above procedure was adhered to as closely as possible. There were, of course, many times when the selected household was either not at home or unwilling to participate in the study. In these cases, a sample household was selected as close as possible to the desired household. The collected sample thus should be a fairly random one.

\textbf{Analysis of Data}

Most of the data collected in this study required no technique other than a simple observation for organizing, manipulating, and reporting the data. The only noteable

\textsuperscript{29}A larger sample size was desirable for this study. Due to the length of the interview and in the interest of time and money the sample size was set at fifty.
exception was content analysis.

Content analysis\textsuperscript{30} is concerned with identifying the relevant first and second level factors reported by the participant in his answers to the patterned interview (Appendix B).

The basic criteria for an acceptable sequence were the same as the original criteria established by Herzberg (see page 8).

When an acceptable sequence was established the data was analyzed separately by three independent raters. When the coding was completed by the raters, a reconciliation meeting was held. The final coding acceptance was based on agreement of two of the three raters. Disagreements were reconciled by discussion of the sequence after it had been read aloud. Data that could not be reconciled was excluded from the study.

In the actual analysis a single first or second level factor could be rated only once in each sequence regardless of the number of times that factor may have been mentioned. Thus findings were based on the frequency of factors for the

\textsuperscript{30}The content analysis procedure used in this study was adapted from Karp, "An Investigation of the Motivational Patterns in Industrial Salesmen", pp. 61-62.
entire sample and not the frequency of a singular factor in a certain sequence. 31

31 Ibid., p. 61.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION

In this chapter the results of the tests of the various hypotheses are presented along with all other analysis of the data. This chapter is concerned only with presentation of the results, and thus no discussion is included. Discussion of the results is reserved for Chapter V.

The data here is presented in two sections. The first major section contains the results of the formal hypotheses set forth in Chapter III. The second major section contains the "Other Analysis" done in the study and is located under the latter heading.

Tests of Hypotheses

Primary Hypotheses. The primary hypotheses tested in this study were designed to test whether or not this sample conformed to the Motivator-Hygiene concept of an adjusted sample. That is, Hypotheses Ia and Ib propose that the worker of this sample is "happy" due to motivational factors
and "unhappy" due to hygiene factors:

Hypothesis Ia: The total sample of workers will mention sequences dealing with motivation significantly more often when relating a happy sequence than when relating an unhappy sequence.

Hypothesis Ib: The total sample of workers will mention sequences dealing with hygiene significantly more often when relating an unhappy sequence than when relating a happy sequence.

In order to test these hypotheses the data were content analyzed according to the procedure described in Chapter III. All separately analyzed motivator factors were collected and designated "motivators". Likewise, all separately analyzed hygiene factors were collected and designated as "hygiene". These two groups were then placed in a $2 \times 2$ contingency table segregated as to the type of sequence (happy or unhappy) in which they occurred. A chi-square test was then run on the data.\textsuperscript{32} The calculated value computed was 187.0. The calculated value is much in excess of the critical value and thus Hypotheses Ia and Ib may be accepted at the $p > .999$ significance level. Hypotheses Ia and Ib were confirmed by the test.

Table IV gives a breakdown of the percentage frequency of the content analyzed factors in satisfying and

dissatisfying sequences. The percentages were calculated by
accumulating all factors analyzed in satisfying sequences and
then taking the individual factors as a percent of that total.

TABLE IV
PERCENTAGES OF FACTORS APPEARING IN SATISFYING
AND DISSATISFYING SEQUENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Percent of Satisfying Sequences</th>
<th>Percent of Dissatisfying Sequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of Growth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Policy and Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision - technical</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor and Peer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same procedure was followed in the dissatisfying sequences. This table is designed merely to represent those factors which contributed most to the confirmation of Hypotheses Ia and Ib.

**Turnover Hypotheses.** In order to facilitate understanding of the turnover results, the hypotheses will be repeated and a summary of the regression equations is provided in Table V, (p. 40).

Hypothesis IIa: There will exist a significant positive relationship, using multiple regression analysis, relating turnover as the dependent variable and motivator and hygiene orientation as the independent variables.

Equation (1) in Table V corresponds to Hypothesis IIa. The equation does not meet the test for overall significance (F value of 2.2714). Hypothesis IIa is unconfirmed. The coefficient for motivation orientation is significant at the .05 significance level employing the appropriate one-tailed t test. The coefficient for hygiene orientation is positive as predicted but it is not statistically significant.

Hypothesis IIb: A significant positive relationship will exist between motivator orientation scores from the J.M.I. and turnover in the last five years.

---

33 For the justification of the one-tailed test used in this analysis see pp. 20–24 of this paper.
Equation (2) in Table V corresponds to Hypothesis IIb.
Equation (2) is statistically significant. The coefficient for motivator orientation is significant at the .05 level (one-tailed t test). Hypothesis IIb is confirmed. Motivation does have a statistically significant positive effect on the number of jobs held in the time period.

Hypothesis IIc: A significant positive relationship will exist between hygiene orientation scores from the J.M.I. and turnover in the last five years.

Equation (3) in Table V corresponds to Hypothesis IIc. This equation does not meet the test of significance. Hypothesis IIc is unconfirmed. Hygiene orientation does not have a statistically significant effect on turnover.

Hypothesis IIIa: There will exist a significant negative relationship, using multiple regression analysis, relating turnover (as measured by "length of time on the present job") as the dependent variable and motivator and hygiene deprivation as the independent variables.

Equation (4) in Table V corresponds to Hypothesis IIIa.
Equation (4) meets the test for overall significance (F value of 4.1420). The coefficient for motivator deprivation has the predicted negative sign and is statistically significant at the .01 level in the one-tailed t test. The coefficient for hygiene deprivation also has the predicted

---

34 Equation (2) does not, although, pass the F test at the .05 level due to the fact that the F test is non-directional.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Number and Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>$R^2$ (r$^2$)</th>
<th>$R$ (r)</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M_0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) $J$</td>
<td>.06884 (1.928)</td>
<td>.0917</td>
<td>.3029</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05684 (1.186)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) $J$</td>
<td>.06251 (1.762)</td>
<td>.0633</td>
<td>.2516</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.04305 (.8829)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) $J$</td>
<td>.04305 (.8829)</td>
<td>.0167</td>
<td>.1291</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) $L$</td>
<td>-4.398 (-2.581)</td>
<td>.1555</td>
<td>.3943</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.1248 (-.090)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) $L$</td>
<td>-4.462 (-2.908)</td>
<td>.1553</td>
<td>.3941</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) $L$</td>
<td>-1.606 (-1.202)</td>
<td>.0305</td>
<td>.1745</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(values in brackets are t values)

Symbols:
- $J$ = the number of jobs held in the past five years
- $L$ = the length of time on present job
- $M_0$ = Motivator orientation (score on motivator portion second half of J.M.I.)
- $M_d$ = Motivator deprivation (motivator score on 2nd half J.M.I. minus 1st half like score)
- $H_0$ = Hygiene orientation (score on hygiene portion second half of J.M.I.)
- $H_d$ = Hygiene deprivation (hygiene score 2nd half J.M.I. minus 1st half like score)
negative sign but does not meet the t test. Nevertheless, Hypothesis IIIa is confirmed at the .05 level of significance employing the F test.

Hypothesis IIIb: A significant negative relationship will exist between turnover and motivation deprivation.

Equation (5) in Table V corresponds to Hypothesis IIIb.
Equation (5) is significant at the .01 level. The coefficient for motivator deprivation has the predicted sign and significance is established by use of the one-tailed t test. Motivation deprivation does have a statistically significant effect on the length of time the sample workers have been on their present jobs. Hypothesis IIIb is confirmed.

Hypothesis IIIc: A significant negative relationship will exist between turnover and hygiene deprivation.

Equation (6) in Table V corresponds to Hypothesis IIIc.
Equation (6) does not meet the statistical test of significance. The coefficient of hygiene deprivation has the predicted sign but it is not sufficiently large enough to reach significance at a reasonable level. Hypothesis IIIc is unconfirmed.

To summarize the above: Motivation orientation has a statistically significant effect on turnover as measured by the number of jobs held in the past five years whereas hygiene orientation does not. Motivation deprivation has
a statistically significant effect on turnover as measured by the length of time on the present job whereas hygiene deprivation does not.

Other Analysis

Motivational Classifications. As noted earlier the second half scores of the J.M.I. were used to provide motivational classifications. The distribution of the classifications were as follows: Sixteen persons were classified as "Adjusted" individuals; Fourteen were considered "Hygiene-oriented hygiene seekers"; Two were "Unbalanced Motivation Seekers" and three were "Non-oriented Hygiene Seekers". In addition the remaining sixteen fell into the "not classifiable" group.

Productivity. In order to collect information regarding productivity two questions were added to the patterned interview. After each sequence of events the participants were asked the questions: "Did what happened affect the way in which you did your job or did it only affect the way in which you felt about your job?" and "How long did the change last; was it permanent or short run?".

Out of 100 sequences (happy and unhappy) only nineteen reported changes in the quantity or quality of work. Of
those nineteen, fourteen were reported in "happy" sequences while five were reported in "unhappy" sequences. Of the fourteen, thirteen were reported in motivator sequences. Of the five reported in "unhappy" sequences, four were associated with hygiene factors.

**Correlation Matrix.** The correlation matrix was, as noted previously, reviewed for significant relationships between variables. In this section, those correlations reaching a level of statistical significance at the .05 level or better are reported. Significant relationships previously reported are not reiterated. Also correlations which arise because of overlapping and the like are omitted. (e.g. There is a significant correlation between motivator orientation and motivator deprivation because a high orientation will naturally yield a high deprivation since the motivator orientation less perception of motivation equals the deprivation score.)

The correlation matrix consisted of the following items:

1. number of jobs held in the past five years
2. length of time on present job
3. motivation orientation (scores on motivator portion second half J.M.I.)
4. hygiene orientation (scores on hygiene portion second half J.M.I.)
5. perception of motivators on job (scores on motivator portion first half J.M.I.)
6. perception of hygiene on job (scores on hygiene portion first half J.M.I.)
7. motivation deprivation (3-5)
8. hygiene deprivation (4-6)
9. age
10. dependents
11. salary (monthly)
12. years of education

Each item on the list was correlated with all other items.

Table VI contains the results of examination of the matrix. The variables correlated with each other are listed on the same line under items A and B. Significance is established on the basis of two-tailed correlation tests.
TABLE VI
SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS RELATING ALL DEMOGRAPHIC AND MOTIVATOR–HYGIENE FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM A</th>
<th>ITEM B</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs held</td>
<td>Length of time on job</td>
<td>-.4521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs held</td>
<td>Motivator deprivation</td>
<td>.3712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs held</td>
<td>Hygiene deprivation</td>
<td>.2753^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivator orientation</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.3821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivator orientation</td>
<td>Perception of motivators</td>
<td>.4652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of motivators</td>
<td>Hygiene deprivation</td>
<td>-.4301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of motivators</td>
<td>Perception of hygiene</td>
<td>.3844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of hygiene</td>
<td>Motivator deprivation</td>
<td>-.4894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of hygiene</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.3921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivator deprivation</td>
<td>Hygiene deprivation</td>
<td>.4143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivator deprivation</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.3929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene deprivation</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.4056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Number of dependents</td>
<td>.3119^a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aThese correlation coefficients are significant at the .05 level. All other coefficients are significant at the .01 level or better. (Significance is established by the use of the two-tailed correlation test).
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Primary Hypotheses

The primary Hypotheses Ia and Ib in this paper, sought to determine whether or not this sample of the working poor is, as a whole, well adjusted with regard to their work. The confirmation of these hypotheses demonstrates that this sample of poor workers do associate satisfaction with motivators and dissatisfaction with hygiene. Thus, in terms of motivator-hygiene theory, the sample conforms to the established norm and is accordingly well adjusted.

The fact that this sample of the poor is, in terms of motivator-hygiene theory, well adjusted with regard to their work has important implications. It points up the fact that this sample has the same psychological needs as other groups. It is obvious that in many cases the needs are not being met. The frustration caused by having needs that are being neglected could itself be a cause of mental illness, lending support
to theses such as Harrington's. The workers may be adjusted with regard to their work (that is they try to grow on the motivator scale and to avoid pain on the hygiene scale) and yet the denial of pain avoidance and psychological growth may produce mental illness as adjudged by some external criterion. Examples are not difficult to think of: The man who is frustrated on his job may release his frustrations in an irrational way upon his family. The worker who is deprived of a decent wage may become a compulsive thief. And so on. This approach would also lend support to Clarke's thesis. Those workers he cites may not be mentally ill as they regard their work, yet the job could be a factor in mental illness of the individual.

Needless to say, this area warrants further study so that more concrete conclusions can be reached.

In the distribution of the factors (Table IV), several comments are appropriate.

Achievement, recognition and responsibility are the most frequent motivators in the satisfying sequences. These percentage frequencies, nineteen, fifteen and twelve.

35 Harrington, The Other America. See pages 14-15 of this study for discussion of Harrington's thesis.

36 Gans, "Income Grants and 'Dirty Work'", this thesis is discussed on page 15 of this study.
respectively, indicate that the sample is somewhat achievement oriented, enjoys recognition for its efforts and finds satisfaction in responsibility. These findings represent nothing extraordinary in terms of motivator-hygiene theory.

The motivator advancement occurred in only 5% of the satisfaction sequences. It is possible that this low frequency is due to the fact that the jobs generally held by the poor are dead-end types where advancement is not possible.

The inversion of the hygiene factor "salary" is a significant finding. Salary acted as a motivator in 24% of the satisfying sequences and as a hygiene factor in only 2% of the sequences. At least two possible explanations are evident. Perhaps the fact that the people are low income workers dictates that they have to react to salary. This explanation seems less plausible, though, because salary occurred as a dissatisfier with only 2% frequency. A more likely explanation is that the jobs may be lacking in motivators and salary is simply an easy answer.  

37 By this I mean that a salary sequence is much easier to relate, less time consuming, and therefore represents an attractive answer to one who is getting tired of the interview. This part of the interview was given near the end in each case.
In the dissatisfying sequences one item deserves mention. "Working condition" had a frequency of 27% in the dissatisfying sequences. Many of these were cases where the surroundings were criticized as being dirty and unhealthy. This somewhat substantiates the idea that the poor do the "dirty work". In comparison Karp's study of industrial salesmen revealed that working conditions acted as a dissatisfier with a frequency of only one percent. Thus on the basis of these two studies it is evident that the poor of this sample do, as would be expected, have poorer working conditions.

Turnover

The results of the tests of the hypotheses concerning turnover revealed that motivation was a statistically significant factor in turnover.

Theoretically, both hygiene and motivation should contribute significantly to turnover. (The actual expectation was that hygiene would be the greater contributor of the two.) Analysis of the sample offers at least one possible explanation as to why motivation was the more significant factor. The participants were black, poor and generally had little education. A person who is black, poor and uneducated is not likely to find a job with favorable
working conditions, supervision, salary, status or other hygiene factors. Thus the worker who changes jobs due to hygiene factors is likely to find that hygiene factors on another job would be similar. Since hygiene is possibly somewhat constant, reaction to poor hygiene may be difficult or impossible. Thus it may be easier to respond to motivation. In this case a lack of motivation may result in turnover. The worker may be bored with a routine uninteresting job and this may cause him to change jobs. Even many routine, boring jobs can be challenging while the difficult aspects of the job are not yet fully learned. Separations likely often arise for this reason. Separations can result when the worker decides that he cannot take the daily grind of a motivatorless job any longer. Thus, if hygiene reaction is blocked, motivation reaction may be the only possible response.

A second explanation is simply that motivation is a more important criterion to the worker for changing jobs than is hygiene. It has been pointed out that motivator factors satisfy the worker and this increases his commitment and attachment to his job. The worker being deprived of motivation has no such similar attachment.

Finally, Herzberg has been paraphrased to have said
that the absence of motivators may increase sensitivity to a lack of hygiene factors.\textsuperscript{38} Thus the highly motivated individual who perceives a lack of motivators may change jobs for hygiene reasons.

The effect of hygiene on turnover should be considered more carefully. The fact that the t value is not "statistically significant" does not prove that there is no relation between hygiene and turnover. There are strong theoretical grounds for believing that hygiene is related to turnover and the coefficients did have the predicted signs. To accept the null hypothesis would be to reverse a prior belief even though the statistical evidence weakly confirmed it.\textsuperscript{39} Thus there are some grounds for including the hygiene coefficients in the models. At any rate, mere mechanical rejection of the hygiene variables should be avoided.

It is evident that motivation is a significant determinant in turnover whether measured by the number of jobs held or the length of time on the present job. The t value associated with motivator deprivation is greater than that


associated with motivator orientation. The explanation for this appears to be simple. Relating the number of jobs held to motivator orientation assigns the same significance to those who have high motivator orientation whose needs are being met (low deprivation scores) as it assigns to those with high orientations whose needs are not being met. This problem is eliminated with deprivation scores.

It has been established that motivation (orientation and deprivation) was a significant contributor to turnover among this sample. Thus, if job leaver rates are affected by these factors, it is highly possible that the overall unemployment rate is also affected. For example the high rate of unemployment among the poor may be partly due to the fact that they are a group that is deprived of large amounts of motivation on the job. Following this reasoning, differential unemployment rates cited in comparative studies are quite possibly due in part to motivational differences (orientations and deprivations) among the groups. Yet there are problems in this analysis: first, these data are not readily available as are the data traditionally used from

40It is of course realized that motivation orientation or deprivation is not the prime determinant of the excess unemployment rate among the poor. They are also victims of meager education, concentration in jobs with high unemployment rates, discrimination and the like.
census tracts and the like; and second, it would be difficult to measure these motivational differences for large groups of people. Yet it is possible that this type of study has omitted an important variable in analyzing these differentials.

**Motivational Classifications**

On the surface it would seem that the results of the motivational classifications are inconsistent with the primary Hypotheses Ia and Ib. Hypotheses Ia and Ib confirmed that as a whole the sample was motivationally adjusted with regard to their work. The motivational classifications, on the other hand, yielded fifteen adjusted persons and nineteen maladjusted individuals. Sixteen persons were not classifiable.

The bulk of the maladjusted persons were hygiene oriented hygiene seekers. As noted previously, these individuals recognize only the need to avoid pain. They do not have a corresponding recognition of the importance of growth needs. Thus, this motivational category is considered maladjusted because it is assumed that they try to attain psychological growth through hygiene factors.

Two explanations of this result are possible. Perhaps the large number of persons in the hygiene oriented hygiene seeker category is due to the cut-off score technique. That is, some persons classified in that category may not actually
belong there. Stern hypothesized that the hygiene oriented hygiene seekers would produce a significantly greater slippage into happy sequences than would any of the three other motivational groups.\textsuperscript{41} That is, because this group attempts to achieve growth through hygiene factors, he felt that they would mention hygiene factors more often in happy sequences than would the other three classifications. Stern was unable to confirm this hypothesis.\textsuperscript{42} Yet it is logical that the individual who attempts to grow through hygiene would mention hygiene more often in his happy sequences.

The second possible explanation pertains to the sample itself. Perhaps the reason that fourteen persons scored above the cut-off score for the hygiene oriented hygiene seeker reflected something about their jobs. The participants could have been trying to say that they realized that hygiene on their jobs was low and they would like it to be better (high hygiene orientation). These explanations are at best conjectural but also somewhat plausible.

\textbf{Productivity}

The question "Did what happened affect the way in which

\textsuperscript{41}Stern, "An Investigation of Slippage in the Motivation Hygiene Theory", p. 63.

\textsuperscript{42}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 64.
you did your job or did it only affect the way in which you felt about your job?" was designed to allow the participant a realistic choice so that more reliable data could be gained. It was felt that a loaded question such as "How did this affect your work?" would tend to bias the data, i.e., answers might be given when there was actually no change.

Even so, the answers to the productivity questions should be viewed with mild skepticism. Some of the answers were vague and requests for elucidation proved unproductive. Despite this qualification, the data will be reported and considered.

The fact that thirteen participants cited positive work changes in "happy" sequences associated with motivator factors and only four reported changes in "unhappy" sequences associated with hygiene factors lends at least mild support to some of the tenets of motivator-hygiene theory. Motivator-hygiene theory holds that it is motivation that causes a worker to be more productive. The use of hygiene to motivate the worker will produce only short-run increases in productivity or perhaps none at all. Only one hygiene sequence was reported to have increased the workers productivity.
In contrast, hygiene acted to reduce productivity in only four of the "unhappy sequences". This of course does not imply that removing hygiene will not impair overall performance. The fact that these incidents were normal situations on the jobs is likely the reason that they did not change productivity very often. A systematic removal of hygiene would cause problems in almost all personnel areas and of course would do definite harm to productivity.

Also, the fact that only thirteen motivator sequences caused increased productivity should not be construed as meaning that job enrichment does not work.\textsuperscript{43} Again these responses are likely not due to a systematic attempt to expand the motivational possibilities of the worker. The productivity effects of job enrichment is a well documented fact.

**Correlation Matrix**

The significant relationships arising from the correlation matrix will now be discussed.

The number of jobs held in the time period correlated negatively with the length of time on the present job, as would be expected.

There was a significant positive relationship between

\textsuperscript{43}See pp. 24-25 of this study.
motivator deprivation on the present job and the number of jobs held. This would seem to say that because the worker is deprived of motivation on his present job, he was likely to have been likewise deprived on his last job and therefore he changes jobs often. Hygiene deprivation was also significantly related to the number of jobs held. The reasoning for this follows the same lines as did motivator deprivation. Note that this is a statistically significant relationship for hygiene causing turnover. This is somewhat surprising since it would seem that Hypotheses IIc and IIIc would measure this effect more accurately.

Motivator orientation was negatively related to age. This points out that the younger blacks in this study tended to have higher motivational aspirations than did their older counterparts.

Motivator orientation was positively related to the perception of motivators on the job. This likely says that the higher the motivation orientation of the individual, the more likely he is to get the better job (assuming "better" means the one with more motivators).

Perception of motivators on the job was negatively related to hygiene deprivation. Perhaps this points out the next correlation, i.e., the job with more motivators also
tends to offer more hygiene (perception of motivators and perception of hygiene). Perception of hygiene and motivator deprivation follow similar reasoning as does hygiene deprivation and motivator deprivation.

Perception of hygiene is positively related to age. This may reflect the institutional "Uncle-Tomism" suffered by the older blacks in society. They have grown accustomed to thinking that they are being treated better than they actually are. The same reasoning applies to the negative relationships between age versus motivator deprivation and age versus hygiene deprivation.

Age and number of dependents were positively related, as would be expected.

One other point arising from the correlation matrix should be emphasized. The correlation coefficient between years of education and salary per month was negative. The coefficient was not significantly different from zero and therefore it cannot be said that they are negatively related, but it can be said that for the fifty participants in this study there was no relation between education and salary. Closer analysis reveals at least a partial explanation.

44I am indebted to Dr. Jack Nickson for pointing this out.
The females in the study had an average of 10.2 years of education and earned an average of $218 per month. The males averaged 8.8 years of school and earned an average of $398 per month.
CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The present research has produced significant conclusions in several areas. It was found that the sample of this study was, as a whole, motivationally well adjusted with regard to their work, according to motivator-hygiene theory in its mental health implications. The sample was oriented toward achievement, recognition, and responsibility as motivators. The prime causes of dissatisfaction were company policy and administration, interpersonal relations, and working conditions.

It was found that motivation orientation had a significant effect on the number of jobs held, and motivation deprivation had a similar effect on the length of time on the present job.

The Job Motivation Inventory can be judged to be a valid instrument for measuring the worker's perception of motivators and hygiene on the job and also his motivation and hygiene orientations. This judgment is based on the
calculations above and the fact that there was not a significant correlation between motivation orientation and hygiene orientation. This criterion is that motivation and hygiene are independent sets of factors and thus the correlation between them should be zero.

No concrete conclusions could be reached in examining the data on productivity.

The correlation matrix yielded quite a few significant relationships.

It should be pointed out that there were at least two factors which could have produced bias in the sample interview.

First, all of the participants in the study were black. The interviewer was white. In a situation of this sort, there always exists the possibility that some of the subjects may try to describe events as he wishes the interviewer to see them. In other words, answers to some of the questions may have been intended for the interviewer, rather than as an objective answer to the question.

Second, it became apparent soon after the beginning of the study that there was a certain unwillingness of young people to participate in the study. This fact may have given the sample an upward bias in age. There will be no
attempt to explain the reasons for this problem.

**Implications of the Study**

It is widely known that the poor work in jobs where there is a decided lack of hygiene. The poor are low paid, work often in dirty surroundings, have low status, and are often subjected to poor interpersonal relations (in the case of the black poor racism is often a factor in interpersonal relations). These facts are at once evident and commonly supposed to exist.

Yet, there is another area where the poor of this study are deficient. They are starving for motivation. This deprivation has a profound effect on the worker's mental well-being. Indeed, it is also a significant factor in his rate of turnover.

It is true that we do not care very well for the hygiene needs of the poor, but it is also true that the motivational needs have been neglected. Perhaps, it is true that it is more difficult to enforce or legislate remedies to motivational needs. That is to say, a minimum wage can be enforced, safety measures can be maintained and discriminatory hiring and firing can be, in some cases, alleviated. But it is a larger problem to add motivation to a worker's job even when he may atrophy from its absence. It is difficult to
envision how recognition, achievement, advancement and the like can be provided for, especially in the case of the poor worker. Job enrichment does work, but it would be pure fantasy to suggest that the process could or would be implemented on a wide scale basis particularly where it is needed most: the poor worker. Thus the prospects for the poor worker are not bright concerning increasing his psychological growth through his work. Yet the process would not only benefit the worker by helping him grow, it would also give the company or institution a better worker.

Certainly, further research is needed in this area. First, study is needed on a much wider scale so that more concrete and far-reaching conclusions can be made and supported. Second, study is warranted to consider alternatives to expand the hygiene and motivational possibilities of the poor worker, assuming that the composite poor worker conforms to that of this study.

45 See pages 24-25 of this study.
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PATTERNED INTERVIEW

Think of a time when you felt exceptionally good or exceptionally bad about your job, either your present job or any other job you have had. This can be either the "long-range" or the "short-range" kind of situation, as I have just described it. Tell me what happened.

1. How long ago did this happen?
2. How long did the feeling last? Can you describe specifically what made the change of feelings begin? When did it end?
3. (For obviously Sr sequences) Was what happened typical of what was going on at the time?
4. Can you tell me more precisely why you felt the way you did at the time?
5. What did these events mean to you?
6. Did these feelings affect the way you did your job? How? How long did this go on?
7. Can you give me a specific example of the way in which your performance on the job was affected? (For productivity effects, when the effect information was vague) How long?
8. Did what happened affect you personally in any way? How long? Did it change the way you got along with people in general or your family? Did it affect your sleep, appetite, digestion, general health?
9. Did what happened basically affect the way you felt about working at that company or did it merely make you feel good or bad about the occurrence itself?
10. Did the consequences of what happened at this time affect your career? How?
11. Did what happened change the way you felt about your profession? How?
12. How seriously were your feelings (good or bad) about your job affected by what happened? Pick a spot on the line below to indicate how
Patterned Interview

strong you think the good or bad feelings were.
Circle that position on the line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Greatest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 should be used for a sequence that hardly affected your feelings at all; 21 should be used for a sequence that affected your feelings as seriously as the most important events in your working experience.

13. Could the situation you described happen again for the same reasons and with the same effect? If not, describe the changes that have taken place which would make your feelings and actions different today than they were then.

14. Is there anything else you would like to say about the sequence of events you have described?

What did you think of the interview?

Have you any other comments on the interview or on the research?

Notes:

For second sequences:

Now that you described a time when you felt ________ about your job, please think of another time, one during which you felt exceptionally ____________ about your job, preferably a _________ range sequence of events.
PATTERNED INTERVIEW

Part I

1. Think of a time when you felt exceptionally good about your job, your present job. Describe the event, or sequence of events, that made you feel exceptionally good. I would like the occurrence to be an objective event or sequence of events, bounded by time. By this I mean that it have a beginning, a middle, and an end. Be sure that what you tell me occurred to you and directly affected the way you felt.

(a) When did it begin? _______ When did it end? _______

2. Can you tell me, more precisely what it was about the situation that made you feel the way you did at the time?

3. How long ago did this happen?

4. It is important for us to know what these events meant to you, that is, how they made you feel. I would like you to begin your description of what this meant to you with the phrase "I felt..." or "I felt that ...".

__________________________________________
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5. How long did this good feeling last?

6. How seriously were your good feelings about your job affected by what happened? Pick a spot on the line below to indicate how strong you think the feelings were. Circle that position on the line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Greatest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "1" should be used for an occurrence that hardly affected your feelings at all; "21" should be used for an occurrence that affected your feelings as seriously as the most important events in your working experience.

7. Did what happened affect the way in which you did your job or did it only affect the way in which you felt about your job?

8. If the answer to question 7 is yes, how long did the change last, i.e., was it permanent or short run?

9. Is there anything else you would like to say about the events that you just described?
Patterned Interview

Part II

10. Now that you have described a time when you felt good about your job, please think of another time (only this time be sure that the events you describe occurred at a different time than the events you just described in the preceding section) when you felt exceptionally bad about your job, your present job. Describe the event, or sequence of events that made you feel exceptionally bad. I would like the occurrence to be an objective event, or sequence of events, bounded in time. This, of course, means that it should have a beginning, a middle and an end. Be sure that what you tell me occurred to you and directly affected the way you felt.

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

(a) When did it begin? (b) When did it end?

11. Can you tell me, more precisely, what it was about the situation that made you feel the way you did at the time?

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

12. How long ago did this happen?

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

13. It is important for us to know what these events meant to you, that is, how they made you feel. I would like you to begin your description of what this meant to you with the phrase, "I felt ..." or, "I felt that ...",
14. How long did this bad feeling last?

15. How seriously were your bad feelings about your job affected by what happened? Pick a spot on the line below to indicate how strong you think the feelings were. Circle that position on the line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Greatest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "1" should be used for an occurrence that hardly affected your feelings at all; "21" should be used for an occurrence that affected your feelings as seriously as the most important events in your working experience.

16. Did what happened affect the way in which you did your job or did it only affect the way in which you felt about your job?

17. If the answer to question 16 is yes, how long did the change last, i.e., was it permanent or short run?

18. Is there anything else you would like to say about the events that you just described?
JOB MOTIVATION INVENTORY

Part I

Key:
"1" - There is very little of this thing on my present job.
"2" - There is some but not much of this thing on my present job.
"3" - There is a fair amount of this thing on my present job.
"4" - There is a large amount of this thing on my present job.
"5" - There is an extremely large amount of this thing on my present job.

1. Chance to advance in my organization
2. Doing work I am already able to do
3. Chance to travel
4. To get along well with my boss
5. Receiving praise for my work
6. Physical safety
7. Doing the kind of work I feel is really important
8. Working in a small town or rural area
9. To be placed in charge of a job and see that it is done right
10. Having plenty of time to get a job done
11. Doing something I am already familiar with
12. Good salary
13. Acquire further knowledge and skills
14. Opportunity to think up new ways of doing things
15. Changing around from one place to another
16. Being kept informed about company policies
17. Chance to apply myself to something worthwhile
18. Working for a supervisor who is fair to those who work under him
Job Motivation Inventory

Part I

19. Keep out of bad weather
20. Opportunity for leadership
21. To have lots of room to do my work in
22. Chance to apply all my knowledge and experience to a problem
23. Working in a small organization
24. Chance for learning something new

25. Having a position of high prestige or status
26. Chance to plan and construct things or procedures
27. Having power and authority over others
28. Chance to read or hear about new developments in my occupation
29. Working in an effectively organized company
30. Plenty of chances to develop my work competence

31. Having a feeling of security in my job
32. Educational opportunities associated with my job
33. Knowing exactly to whom I am responsible on the job
34. Able to see the results of my work so that I know I have accomplished something
35. To work for a company with good policies toward their employees
36. Kind of work I am interested in

37. Steady or regular employment
38. To have a boss who backs me up or supports me
39. Wearing a uniform at work
40. Doing something I really enjoy
41. Work involving few details
42. Chance to stick with a task in spite of any difficulties I may meet

43. Belonging to a friendly group of workers
44. Freedom from danger of pain or injury
45. Being a member of a group who stick together well in their work
46. Chance to add to the body of knowledge in my occupation
47. Freedom to make decisions on my own
48. Working in a large city

49. Clean and neat surroundings
50. Having a position where I know people place complete confidence in me
Job Motivation Inventory

Part I

51. Working for an organization that people think well of
52. Opportunity to take on a difficult job and do it well
53. Comfortable working conditions
54. Being responsible for the performance of others
   working under me
55. Opportunity to work outdoors
56. Doing my fair share of work on the job
57. Being with a company or organization long enough that
   I cannot be laid off
58. A lot of physical activity
59. Working with people who feel and believe as I do about
   such things as politics or religion
60. Chance to be creative
61. Liking my fellow workers
62. Challenging work
63. To work under the supervision of a good manager
64. Having a boss who gives credit where credit is due
65. For my supervisor to listen to my suggestions
66. Working for an organization that is fair to its workers
67. Taking responsibility
68. Working in a large company or institution
69. Working indoors
70. Having a supervisor who really knows his job
71. Opportunity for high income
72. Do a lot of interesting things

Part II

Key:
"1" - This thing would have very little importance to me
   in a job.
"2" - This thing would have some but not much importance
   to me in a job.
"3" - This thing would be rather important to me in a job.
"4" - This thing would be very important to me in a job.
"5" - This thing would be extremely important to me in a job.
Job Motivation Inventory

73. Having at least one close friend with whom I work
74. Chance to advance in my organization
75. Acquire further knowledge and skills
76. Chance to travel
77. Challenging work
78. Chance to add to the body of knowledge in my occupation

79. Working in a small town or rural area
80. Opportunity to take on a difficult job and do it well
81. To have lots of room to do my work in
82. Belonging to a friendly group of workers
83. Working in an effectively organized company
84. Clean and neat surroundings

85. Working in a large city
86. Having a position of high prestige or status
87. Freedom to make decisions on my own
88. To work for a company with good policies and practices toward their employees
89. Doing something I really enjoy
90. Changing around from one place to another

91. Having a supervisor who really knows his job
92. To have a boss who backs me up or supports me
93. Being kept informed about company policies
94. Opportunity for leadership
95. Chance to read or hear about new developments in my occupation
96. Having a position where I know people place complete confidence in me

97. Keep out of bad weather
98. Steady or regular employment
99. Doing something I am already familiar with
100. Doing my fair share of work on the job
101. Chance to plan and construct things or procedures
102. Wearing a uniform

103. Knowing exactly to whom I am responsible
104. Liking my fellow workers
105. Plenty of chances to develop my work competence
106. Freedom from danger of pain or injury
107. To be placed in charge of a job and see that it is done right
108. Work involving few details
109. Being a member of a group who stick together well in their work
110. Doing the kind of work I feel is really important
111. Being with one company or organization long enough that I cannot be laid off
112. A lot of physical activity
113. Receiving praise for my work
114. Chance to be creative

115. Physical safety
116. Chance to apply all my knowledge and experience to a problem
117. Good salary
118. Working with people who feel and believe as I do about things as politics or religion
119. To work under the supervision of a good manager
120. For my supervisor to listen to my suggestions

121. Chance to stick with a task in spite of any difficulties I may meet
122. Educational opportunities associated with my job
123. Taking responsibility
124. Having plenty of time to get a job done
125. Opportunity for high income
126. Working for an organization that is fair to its workers

127. Kind of work I am interested in
128. Opportunity to think up new ways of doing things
129. Chance to apply myself to something worthwhile
130. Opportunity to work outdoors
131. Working for a supervisor who is fair to those who work under him
132. Able to see the results of my work so that I know I have accomplished something

133. Comfortable working conditions
134. Being responsible for the performance of others working under me
135. Working in a large company or institution
136. Having a feeling of security in my job
137. Chance for learning something new
138. Working for an organization that people think well of
Job Motivation Inventory

139. Working indoors
140. Having power or authority over others
141. Working in a small organization
142. Having a boss who gives credit where credit is due
143. To get along well with my boss
144. Healthful surroundings
### JOB MOTIVATION INVENTORY—ANSWER SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>0. 12345</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 12345</td>
<td>30. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 12345</td>
<td>31. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 12345</td>
<td>32. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 12345</td>
<td>33. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 12345</td>
<td>34. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 12345</td>
<td>35. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 12345</td>
<td>36. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 12345</td>
<td>37. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 12345</td>
<td>38. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 12345</td>
<td>39. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 12345</td>
<td>40. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 12345</td>
<td>41. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 12345</td>
<td>42. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 12345</td>
<td>43. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 12345</td>
<td>44. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 12345</td>
<td>45. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 12345</td>
<td>46. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 12345</td>
<td>47. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 12345</td>
<td>48. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 12345</td>
<td>49. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 12345</td>
<td>50. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 12345</td>
<td>51. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 12345</td>
<td>52. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 12345</td>
<td>53. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 12345</td>
<td>54. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 12345</td>
<td>55. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. 12345</td>
<td>56. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 12345</td>
<td>57. 12345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. 12345</td>
<td>58. 12345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONAL DATA

Date: ________________

1. Interview number: ______________________________________

2. Occupation: _____________________________________________

3. Age: ____________________________________________________

4. Sex: _____________________________________________________

5. Marital status:  Single ______
                  Married ______
                  Separated ______
                  Divorced ______

6. Number of dependents: ________________________________

7. Salary: _______________________________________________

8. Length of time on present job: ___________________________

9. Number of jobs held in past five years: ________________

10. Years of education: ____________________________________

11. Race: ________________________________________________

83