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Is it necessary to intensify basic research in job satisfaction?

- Literature is unmanageable
- Only a few concepts in organisational psychology have driven most of the long-lasting research efforts, such as the concept of job satisfaction
- Postulated coherences between economic factors and job satisfaction, such as effort, absenteeism, quality
- Most of these analyses did not find these coherences. Inconsistent results were found, which do not fit within the models.
Is it necessary to intensify basic research in job satisfaction?

- „... there are many inconsistencies in the results testing these models (and in the ways the models have been tested) ...“ (Judge et al. 2001)
- Coherence between job satisfaction and effort is between 0.03 and 0.57 – this result produces a new interest in job satisfaction.
Is it necessary to intensify basic research in job satisfaction?

- There is a lot of criticism of the empirical research
- The critics ask for comparable data collection:
  - Using *standardised techniques*
  - Based upon a *theoretical model* on which *hypotheses* have been built
- Not necessary to develop new models.
Zurich Model

- One of the most noted and discussed models in Europe
- Developed by Bruggemann in 1976, extended by Büssing in 1992
- It considers the whole *development process* of job satisfaction
- It can describe job satisfaction quantitatively AND qualitatively
- Bruggemann et al. developed a questionnaire to describe the job satisfaction types (*Arbeitszufriedenheits-Kurzfragebogen AZK / Job Satisfaction Short questionnaire*).
Zurich Model

- The Zurich Model is based upon the belief in **homoeostasis**.
- In the case of an imbalance, an organism tries to find a new balance. In this case, the organism will be activated to take action to reach a (new) balance.
- This basic idea was defined by Piaget (1976).
Zurich Model (MV = Major Variable)

Comparison: Actual Work Situation vs. Expectations

Congruent
- Perceived Control
  - Stabilising Satisfaction
    - Increased Level of Aspiration
      - Progressive Work Satisfaction
    - Constant Level of Aspiration
      - Stabilised Work Satisfaction

Discrepant
- Non-Perceived Control
  - Perceived Control
    - Decreased Level of Aspiration
      - Resigned Work Satisfaction
        - Pseudo Work Satisfaction
    - Non-Perceived Control
      - Perceived Control
        - Constant Level of Aspiration
          - Fixated Work Dissatisfaction
          - Constructive Work Dissatisfaction
        - Without New Problem Solving Attempts
          - New Problem Solving Attempts

Processing of satisfaction and frustration
Zurich Model – Where are the problems

- Factory manager
- Stabilized Job Satisfaction
  - Comparison: congruent
  - He perceives control
  - He has a constant level of aspirations.
Zurich Model – Where are the problems

- Then: World economic crisis
- Production has to be reduced / temporary workers must be laid off
- Feels a loss of control
- Changes the Job Satisfaction Type
- But: The Zurich Model does not allow such a type.
Zurich Model – Shortcomings of the model

- Major variables are not precisely defined
- Relations between the major variables are unclear
- How can the actual work situation with people’s expectations be compared
- No possibility to operationalize the type „Pseudo work satisfaction“
- Context to other relevant concepts such as „Sense of Coherence“ or „Subjective Well-Being“ is missing
- Connection between types of job satisfaction and aspects of job satisfaction are unclear.
Zurich Model – Shortcomings of the questionnaire

- The types aren’t operationalized enough
- The processual character isn’t considered
- Verbalized questions are too complex
- No explicit results.
Zurich Model

Aim of our research

- **Extend** the Zurich Model in a logical and systematic way
- **Define** the Major Variables precisely
- **Develop** a questionnaire
## Extension – Example for congruent types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MV1</th>
<th>MV2</th>
<th>MV3</th>
<th>MV4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Increased level of aspiration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Increased level of aspiration</strong></td>
<td>With new problem solving attempts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Decreased level of aspiration</strong></td>
<td>Without new problem solving attempts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Constant level of aspiration</strong></td>
<td>With new problem solving attempts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stabilised Work Satisfaction**

**Non Perceived Control**

**Increased level of aspiration**

**Decreased level of aspiration**

**Constant level of aspiration**

**Stabilised Passive Frustrated**
Extension

- 12 Job Satisfaction Types for the congruent comparison
- 24 Job Satisfaction Types for the discrepant comparison
  - 12 negative discrepant comparisons
  - 12 positive discrepant comparisons
- Each Job Satisfaction Type has a unique combination of values of the Major Variables

Example of our factory manager:
- \( MV_1 = 1 \) = congruent
- \( MV_2 = 0 \) = non perceived control
- \( MV_3 = 0 \) = constant level of aspiration
- \( MV_4 = 1 \) = with new problem solving attempts.
Definition of the Major Variables

- To follow these theoretical considerations necessitates the collection of each Major Variable separately.
  - In this way 36 job satisfaction types can statistically be established.
- Further advantages:
  - The questions can be very simply phrased.
  - A change of a Job Satisfaction Type can lead back to the change of a Major Variable.
- To create such a questionnaire, we first defined the Major Variables precisely.
Questionnaire development

- **Major Variable 1**: Comparison between the actual work situation and the expectations
  - 22 facets to describe the actual work situation
  - 22 facets to describe the expectations
  - 22 questions about the importance of each facet
  - Altogether: 66 items
## Questionnaire development: Major variable 1

You want from your job ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>... that the work pleases you.</th>
<th>Absolutely not!</th>
<th>Absolutely!</th>
<th>... that your colleagues respect you.</th>
<th>Absolutely not!</th>
<th>Absolutely!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How important is this for you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does your actual work situation offer you this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completely unimportant!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not in the slightest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>... that your work challenges you.</td>
<td>Absolutely not!</td>
<td>Absolutely!</td>
<td>Does your actual work situation offer you this?</td>
<td>Absolutely not!</td>
<td>Absolutely!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How important is this for you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not in the slightest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completely unimportant!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not in the slightest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>... that you earn enough money.</td>
<td>Absolutely not!</td>
<td>Absolutely!</td>
<td>Does your actual work situation offer you this?</td>
<td>Absolutely not!</td>
<td>Absolutely!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Questionnaire development**

- **Major Variable 2: Perceived control**
  - 6 items about preservation and advancement of perceived control

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>If you have problems at your work station, do you attempt to find a solution yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Are you going to try to change something at your actual work situation in the near future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Did you actively change something at your actual work situation lately?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I radically changed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questionnaire development

- **Major Variable 3: level of aspiration**
  - 4 items about requirements, goals and their changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you set personal standards for the work you do (e.g. that your work should be completed especially well or rapid)?</td>
<td>No, never, Yes, always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you going to change these standards in the near future?</td>
<td>They are going to noticeably fall. Yes, always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you set personal goals for your work?</td>
<td>No, never, Yes, always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are you going to do once you have reached your goals?</td>
<td>I am not going to set new goals. No, never, Yes, always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Questionnaire development

- **Major Variable 4: problem solving**
  - 4 items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you have problems at your work station, do you attempt to find a solution yourself?</td>
<td>No, never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you going to try to change something at your actual work situation in the near future?</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you actively change something at your actual work situation lately?</td>
<td>No, I changed nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you use to your current knowledge to solve problems at your work station?</td>
<td>No, I don't use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Yes, always
- Definitely
- No, I changed nothing
- No, I don't use
Questionnaire development

- The questionnaire was completed by about 1000 people
- The results presented here are based on two samples
  - **Sample 1:**
    - 64 research assistants with one repeated measurement after four weeks
    - **Working conditions:** high level of responsibility, high variety and often time pressures
  - **Sample 2:**
    - 252 railway locomotive drivers with a single measurement
    - **Working conditions:** high level of responsibility, low variety of the task, very low room for task manoeuvre.
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Criteria</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Determined with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability (Cronbachs Alpha)</td>
<td>0.662 – 0.901</td>
<td>sample 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest-Reliability (Pearson correlation)</td>
<td>0.686** - 1.000**</td>
<td>sample 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selectivity</td>
<td>$r_{it}=.31 - r_{it}=.48$</td>
<td>sample 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

New Job Satisfaction Types:

- Sample 1: 16 Job Satisfaction Types
- Sample 2: 18 Job Satisfaction Types
  > Relevant in industry
  > Only partly consistent with the original Zurich Model.
Results: Example

**Sample 3:** 65 people

**Work task:** visual testing of electronic components used in cars

**Working conditions:** The work is highly repetitive, monotone and strenuous on the visual system

We compare regular staff with temporary staff

- “Constructive frustrated“ significantly more frequent within the temporary staff
- “Classic resigned“ significantly more frequent within the regular staff

Temporary staff: **increased** level of aspiration, attempt to problem solve

Regular staff: **decreased** level of aspiration, no longer make attempts at problem solving.
Discussion: Example

- People, who are working for a long time under working conditions without the hope of change, lose the feeling of homoeostasis, the feeling of balance
- People, who are working for a short time under those same working conditions still have the hope of change

**Important:** This does not mean, that the employer should only award temporary contracts. On the contrary, the working conditions must be made more humane in order to save the experience embodied in the regular staff
Discussion

- Connection between the working conditions and the Job Satisfaction Types
- If the Job Satisfaction Types depend on the working conditions, selective changes could bring improvements
Discussion

- More investigations are necessary to affirm the statistical characteristics
- Longitudinal analysis is mainly used
- Validity of the correlations must be shown
- Which of the 36 Job Satisfaction Types can be proven empirically
- The collection of data is possible in an objective and economic manner and each Major Variable can be separately collected.