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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Rapid changes are taking place in many of today's business offices because of the impact of word processing technology. Many new approaches are being instituted in offices during this transitional period to modern automated word processing equipment. Since this is the age of automation, it is inevitable that word processing will eventually have an impact on the way many offices are run (Denich, 1979). The word processing revolution is making it possible for the office of the future to exist today. This new automated word processing technology will also enable well-managed offices to cut costs and improve office productivity. Because of the many rapid technological changes, and the opportunity to enter a new field, many companies are presently involved in the manufacture and marketing of automatic word processing equipment.

More than one hundred conceptual definitions of the word processing concept have evolved since the term 'word processing' first appeared in the 1960's. IBM describes word processing as being the concept of the systematic utilization of people, procedures, and equipment to facilitate the transformation of ideas into printed communication (A Handbook for Business Teachers, 1978). McCabe (1977) describes word processing as the handling of the word flow in an office in the most efficient and economical way possible. Dartnell's Glossary (1975)
broadly defines word processing as being the automatic production of typed documents or the automation of secretarial work. Kleinschrod (1980) describes word processing as being a different approach to putting information into readable form, generally as typewritten text on paper.

Anderson and Trotter (1974) offered the following definition of the word processing concept:

Word processing is the correct combination and specialization of people, procedures, and equipment that allows an organization (or individual) to transform its ideas into written communications at substantial savings over existing methods.

A recent glossary published by the Word Processing Society, Inc., (1979) defined word processing as "a way to transform ideas into written communications quickly and accurately through the use of automated equipment operated by skilled people using revised office procedures." Despite the lack of a single definition of word processing by suppliers and users, most of the definitions that have been offered include basic central or common elements (Kleinschrod, 1980). These common elements of a true word processing system seem to include the following:

1. a systems approach to work flow and management,
2. a standardized operating procedures and policies,
3. utilization of automated typing equipment and the use of machine dictation, and
4. specialization of office functions and tasks.

Businesses are calling for more economical ways of preparing
and handling correspondence, documents, and, in general, the everyday paperwork involved in offices today. Word processing seems to be the answer to the quest for increased work productivity while holding a lid on clerical and secretarial costs (A Handbook for Business Teachers, 1973). The use of automated word processing equipment and modern work methods by management promises to bring under control the ever-increasing flood of paperwork and the rising costs of the office (McCabe, 1977).

Whenever new technological innovations are implemented within the office structure, typical employee morale problems also arise. Penzer (1974) characterized the word processing specialist's tasks as being dull, boring, and monotonous. Many word processing specialists requested reassignment to their original positions (Eliassen, 1975). However, some secretaries stated that word processing is the exciting alternative to the traditional office syndrome. They prefer being a word processing specialist rather than being the generalist or "girl Friday-type" secretary. Bergerud (1978) states that specializing in word processing eliminated office boredom because the word processing specialist may have contact with several principals instead of just one principal exclusively.

Improving the utilization of word processing and increasing the productivity of executives are two major attempts to bring office costs under control (McCabe, 1977). A recent
survey among 278 organizations indicated that 50 percent reported a decrease in secretarial staff resulting from the introduction of word processing. Of the 30 percent who reported no change, many indicated that more work was being turned out by the same number of secretaries (Word Processing and Employment, 1975).

Sprialing office costs also play key roles in the office automation decision. Costs are less when automatic equipment is used because fewer documents have to be retyped if changes are necessary (Anderson and Trotter, 1974). To date, emphasis in the office has been in the area of improving clerical and secretarial productivity. Smith (1981) indicates the reason for stressing these areas is that routine repetitive operations such as typing are the easiest to automate and measure. The typing function in the United States was estimated to cost $4.4 billion a few years ago (McCabe, 1977). Attention has been focused on reducing these costs by increasing professional productivity.

Kutie (1977) noted in her study that word processing word can be satisfying. However, her findings indicated the traditional secretarial group experienced more job satisfaction than word processing specialists. Her recommendation was to do more research in the area of job satisfaction utilizing variables other than job dimensions and aptitudes to examine factors which might contribute to the job satisfaction of these office employees.
Davis (1980) contends that executives, as well as word processing specialists, should also become more productive. An inefficient boss results in poor use of word processing capabilities. Proper use of word processing equipment results in savings to management time plus the hard cost savings of productivity.

Bergerud (1981) states that the secretary experiences immediate benefits from using the word processing equipment because this automatic equipment reduces some of the daily annoyances secretaries face. Secretaries spend their days trying to produce error-free copies while typing at an even pace. Many hours are spent retyping long reports when only a few minor changes are needed. Word processing equipment enables managers to use their time more efficiently to become more productive (Bergerud, 1981). New automatic equipment installations have enabled managers and secretaries to resolve many production problems.

Much emphasis is being placed on measured productivity in the world of work, and nowhere is this more evident than in word processing occupations (Pibal, 1980).

Management has turned to implementing word processing within the office structure because of its cost savings and increased productivity, which could mean fewer high-salaried employees producing more work (McCabe, 1977). Because of the utilization of automatic word processing equipment in the modern office, many word processing specialists are experiencing employee morale problems.

Problems typical of industrial mass production are also
becoming typical in word processing centers—absenteeism, job dissatisfaction, and high turnover of personnel. These problems prove to be very costly for employers. Cassady's (1974) study of correspondence secretaries working in word processing centers attempted to measure job satisfaction from 74 participating companies. The short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was used. The results of her study indicated that compensation and the amount of work performed together with their relations of co-workers were of most satisfaction, and advancement and social service or opportunities to do things for others were of least satisfaction to the correspondence word processing secretaries.

Bjork's (1975) study of a word processing center located at Wright Patterson Air Force Base stated that job satisfaction and motivation were significant problem areas. There was also a great deal of employee absenteeism and requests for reassignment in the word processing area. Results of the study showed that when given the necessary latitude, the word processing operators became highly motivated to grow and solve increasingly difficult job problems on their own. Little (1975) contends that the most common fault in word processing managers is that they spend too much time evaluating equipment and not enough time in considering people.

**Need for the Study**

Businesses are very concerned about employee job satisfaction in the office related occupations because of many reasons. They are presently experiencing a shortage of
qualified workers; they are experiencing a high employee turnover rate; and they are finding it very expensive to retrain present employees and to train new employees. These problems are of particular concern in the area of word processing as business offices become more and more automated. Along with these concerns is the impact of automation and its relationship to job satisfaction.

Automation in the business office has taken the form of word processing—the production of paperwork with automated equipment, the utilization of standardized procedures, and the introduction of the systems concepts of workflow. But the introduction of this concept has created a great concern for job satisfaction, one of the most critical problems associated with the automated office.

Job satisfaction has been examined in numerous research studies. In the area of word processing, Reiff (1974) and Benjamin (1976) examined job satisfaction of corresponding and administrative secretaries. Sneed (1971) and Casady (1973) examined job satisfaction of operators of word processing equipment and its relationship to other variables. Mitchell (1978) examined the relationship of job satisfaction to supervision and other selected factors. However, little research has been done related to job satisfaction of employees in centralized word processing centers and the relationship of satisfaction to the variables examined in this study.

The word processing technology explosion seen in the
modern offices today represents a challenge to business administrators and managers in their attempts to bring high office costs under control. The employer emphasis on higher standards for the quantity and quality of work produced will be evident in the automated offices. There will also be a greater emphasis given to the measurement of office worker efficiency because of the implementation of automatic word processing equipment. Standardized policies and work procedures should govern the use of the office automatic word processing equipment (McCabe, 1977).

Management and business administrators should have high regards for the concern of their employees in preparing them for the automated office. Specialization could create a problem in regard to human relations, employee interaction, and decreasing positive motivation. The employers should involve their office workers in their plans to implement the use of automatic word processing equipment. This knowledge, in turn, could foster job satisfaction among employees who would enjoy their work during and following the transitional period.

This research on job satisfaction relating to word processing specialists will have implications for improving the quality of the working day for word processing specialists. It will also assist management in their decision-making processes regarding human relations in the centralized word processing center.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide data/information that would assist business educators, management in their decision-making activities regarding automated equipment, and individuals interested in the word processing field, and specifically, in the word processing specialist position. Data regarding job satisfaction in centralized word processing centers was collected. This data about job satisfaction can be utilized by all levels of management when they are contemplating the installation of a centralized word processing center or equipment which involves organizational or structural changes.

The information collected from this study on job satisfaction may also benefit the word processing industry, including textbook publishers. This study may also be of interest to the business educators because it provides an insight as to the likes and dislikes of word processing specialists working in a centralized word processing center.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to investigate job satisfaction and various demographic and structural job variables of word processing specialists in centralized word processing centers. The following problem was investigated:

What is the relationship among job satisfaction and various demographic and structural job variables of word processing specialists working in a centralized word processing center?
In order to address this major problem adequately, the following null hypotheses were investigated:

1. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the age of word processing specialists.

2. There will be no significant difference between job satisfaction scores of the male and female word processing specialists participating in the study.

3. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the formal educational background of word processing specialists participating in the study.

4. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and type of training received by word processing specialists.

5. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and length of time in the present position of word processing specialists.

6. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and length of time participants worked in an office related occupation, including the length of time in present position of word processing specialists.

7. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the salaries/pay received by word processing specialists.

8. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and incentives given by companies to word processing specialists.
9. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and job descriptions of word processing specialists.

10. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the physical arrangement of the word processing center for word processing specialists.

11. There will be no significant difference between job satisfaction of word processing specialists who have opportunities for career advancement compared to those who do not have opportunities for career advancement within their company.

12. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and planning responsibilities of word processing specialists.

13. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and schedules (i.e., flex-time) of word processing specialists.

The following null hypothesis will be used to test each of the above variables:

\[ H_0: \ U_1 - U_2 = 0 \]

**Limitations of the Study**

The job satisfaction of word processing specialists who participated in this study was measured by the Job Descriptive Index (APPENDIX D). Although many variables might be related to job satisfaction, the following variables, some derived from recommendations made in
previous research as well as some of special interest to this study, were selected for investigation:

Demographic variables
1. Age
2. Sex
3. Educational background

Structural job variables
1. Type of training received
2. Length of time in present position
3. Length of time in office related occupation
4. Salaries/pay received
5. Company incentives
6. Job descriptions
7. Physical arrangement/design of word processing center
8. Career paths provided
9. Planning responsibilities
10. Work schedules

All other variables which might be related to job satisfaction were specifically excluded from the study.

Because participation of insurance companies and employees was voluntary, the findings of the study will be limited to those insurance companies and employees who actually participated in the study.

In addition, findings are accurate within the range of reliability and validity of the data gathering instruments
and the honesty and accuracy of the participants in completing these instruments. In addition, the data collected related to questions 6, 7, 8, 9, and 13 on the Word Processing Questionnaire are the participants' perception of these variables.
Definition of Terms

Terms that are unique to this study, that are technical in nature, or that are subject to several different interpretations are defined as follows:

Administrative Secretary - an employee trained to handle a variety of nontyping office tasks (Ellis, 1980)

Automated Typewriter - a general term covering all types of word processing keyboard equipment designed for repetitive and revision work (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Automated Word Processing Equipment - equipment that is self-operating during some of its operations—for example, during the playback of materials previously typed by word processing specialists (Ellis, 1980)

Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) - a television-like screen attached to an automated piece of equipment; sometimes called a visual display (Ellis, 1980)

Centralization - all word/information processing equipment placed in a central location (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Centralized Word Processing Center - a large area where employees who produce the written communications needed by the firm are grouped together (Ellis, 1980)

Data - factual material, especially that used as a basis for discussion or decision (McCabe, 1977)

Data Processing - the operations performed to convert information into usable form, usually done by a computer (Ellis, 1980)

Flex-time - each employee schedules his or her own working hours (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Generalist - a person whose job description contains many varied duties (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Implementing Word Processing - the process of replacing the traditional office with a word/information processing system (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)
Job Enrichment - refers to a studied redesign of jobs and tasks with a goal to "enrich" work by adding greater challenge, responsibility, variety, and independence (Mills, 1975)

Job Satisfaction/Job Dissatisfaction - as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (Appendix D)

Logging - the process of entering incoming work on a log sheet in order to control work flow (McCabe, 1977)

Mini Correspondence Center - a small correspondence center that has its own supervisor and handles only the work of a specific field or department (Ellis, 1980)

Morale - the feeling or attitude a person has toward an organization (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Motivating Factors - factors that cause workers to work toward objectives (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Office of the Future - a work environment that uses ergonomics in planning and computer systems with powerful capabilities for handling information (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Operator - a person who keyboards information or handles equipment operating function (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Principal - an individual within an organization who originates paperwork and requires secretarial support, whether it be document preparation and/or administrative support services—an executive; a work originator; a user (Scriven, Holly, Wagoner, and Brown, 1981)

Procedure (word processing) - written guidelines or steps, usually containing examples, explaining how a task is to be done. Word processing procedures explain how to produce written communications and how to handle nontyping tasks (Ellis, 1980)

Processing - the handling of business information (Ellis, 1980)

Production/Productivity - as associated with the production of information in an information processing system; word processing production/productivity refers to the use of automated equipment to produce letters, reports, and other text materials (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)
Proofreader - a worker who reads typed material and checks it for accuracy and quality (Ellis, 1980)

Quality of Work - refers to the combined "quality" of jobs, work systems, and organizations assessed together and simultaneously from the perspective of workers, management, and society; expresses inseparable concerns for worker welfare, economic effectiveness, and social costs and benefits (Mills, 1975)

Revision Word or Revision Typing - the typing of corrections and editing changes at some point after the original keyboarding of a document. Typing that occurs as a result of authorship change or typographical errors; also refers (usually) to the final playout of a document (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Satellite Correspondence Center - an area away from the main correspondence center which locates some correspondence specialists near the individuals or departments they serve (Ellis, 1980)

Standard - any accepted or established rule or criterion against which comparisons are made (Merriam-Webster, 1980)

Supervisor - an employee who directs the work and activities of other workers (Ellis, 1980)

Systems Approach - companies use analysis of operations to try to increase efficiency at all levels. The result is referred to as a word processing system which, in essence, is an arrangement of elements (people, equipment, information, procedures) organized in a particular manner to carry out the activity involved in the document cycle (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Traditional Office - an office where a secretarial employee handles both typing and nontyping tasks, uses a standard electric typewriter to process written communications, and is usually assigned to one manager (Ellis, 1980)

Traditional Secretary - a pre-word processing secretary; one employed as a general-purpose servant to an executive, to handle his or her correspondence, phone calls, errands, and other random tasks, in contrast with an administrative or correspondence secretary (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)
Turnover - a reorganization with a view to shift in personnel; the number of persons hired within a period to replace those leaving or dropped from the working force (Kleinschrod, 1980)

Typing Pool - centralized office areas set aside for production typing where work is assigned to the typing staff under the close control of a typing supervisor (McCabe, 1977)

Word Processing - a system for handling office work where written communications are processed on automated equipment and all tasks are performed according to set procedures (Ellis, 1980)

Word Processing Center - the centralized location in which word processing functions/operations take place (Bergerud, 1978)

Word Processing Manager - someone who is responsible for the overall operation of a word processing center (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Word Processing Specialist - a word processing operator with a minimum amount of experience who can format, produce, and revise complicated documents (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Word Processing Supervisor - someone who is responsible for the operation of a center (or section within a large center) (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Work Measurement - a process of determining how much time is required to do a given amount of work (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)

Workflow - the steps in the flow of information in the document cycle including origination, production, reproduction, filing, storage and retrieval, and distribution (Bergerud and Gonzalez, 1981)
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This review of literature was conducted to examine the area of job satisfaction, specifically job satisfaction of word processing specialists. Articles, reports, and research studies relating to employee job satisfaction were examined to gain an insight into job satisfaction research and its implications for the occupation, word processing specialist. The literature examined provided the researcher with knowledge of and usefulness of job satisfaction instruments as well as the identification of variables which might be related to employee satisfaction.

The rapid growth and importance of word processing as an office system have created many problems for employers and employees (word processing specialists). One of the major problems associated with the automated office (word processing system) is job satisfaction of employees.

Word Processing, An Automated Business System

Word processing is a new term for a process that has been going on since the beginning of time. Only the equipment, procedures, and system for processing information have changed. During the Babylonian days, information was recorded on clay tablets using chisels to cut letters into
stone. This method of recording information was replaced by the quill pen and writing on paper. The invention of the printing press and the typewriter offered other methods of processing information (Bergerud, 1981). Although the early models of typewriters were somewhat clumsy to use compared to today's modern machines, they enabled the writer to produce typed copy quickly in a form that was easy to read (Cassady, 1980).

The first automatic word processing equipment appeared in the 1930's and was called the automatic paper-type typewriter. This typewriter could be programmed by a paper tape with punched holes which represented letters, numbers, or symbols and offered low cost, high speed playback (175 wpm), and easy operation (Cassady, 1980).

Word processing evolved through a series of improvements in these early crude machines. But the word processing system included more than equipment—it included equipment, standardized procedures, and a systems model. Equipment alone was not enough for word processing to replace the traditional business office. In the 1960's word processing began to make an impact on the organization of the traditional office. In 1964, the Magnetic Tape Selectric Typewriter (MT/ST) was introduced by IBM. This was a single-element machine with an attached console containing a magnetic tape which was used to record the typist's key
strokes. The MT/ST would later type or "play out"
automatically from the tape. This machine was instru-
mental in making word processing possible (Kleinschrod,
1980).

The concept of word processing originated when a
German engineer at IBM, Ulrich Steinhilper, conceived of
a different way to process communications. He theorized
that MT/STs should be placed in a central location, where
they could be fully utilized without general office inter-
ruptions. He also recommended channeling dictation to a
central point, where it would be typed on the magnetic-
tape automatic typewriters. His theory was that savings
of both time and money would result from this type of
organization. Steinhelper's ideas emerged gradually in
the United States gaining a degree of acceptance by 1968.
Today, highly sophisticated automatic word processing
equipment combined with standardized procedures and a new
office system are used in many businesses to record and
process information (Kleinschrod, 1980).

The Traditional Office

The traditional office situation is a one-to-one
model where one secretary works for one or two managers
and performs a variety of tasks to assist the principal(s).
The secretary's desk is usually located outside the office
of the principal(s). The secretary working in the one-to-one traditional model experiences uneven work loads and has many interruptions which cause a slow down in production and efficiency. The traditional one-to-one office model does not attempt to measure the production of the secretary (Casady, 1980).

Most businesses use the traditional or conventional office arrangement where most nonmanagerial tasks are handled by the secretary. The traditional secretary needs to be well acquainted with the work and with the operations of the whole office. This employee is also expected to be able to type, take dictation, and handle numerous other office tasks. All these requirements add up to make the traditional secretary's workday a maze of different tasks. At times, the secretary may be extremely busy, and at other times there will be little to do depending on how busy the principal(s) is for whom the secretary works. Thus, in the traditional office there may be times when some secretaries have too much work while others have too little. As shown in Chart 1, secretaries spend an average of 14 percent of their time waiting for work (Ellis, 1980).

The standard electric typewriter is the main office tool used by a traditional secretary. Documents are either typed in rough draft form or final copy and submitted to the manager or principal(s) requesting them. If many
corrections or changes are needed, the document may have to be retyped. While materials are being retyped, other tasks may be set aside or not performed at all (Ellis, 1980).

CHART 1. PIE CHART ILLUSTRATING THE TIME SPENT ON VARIOUS SECRETARIAL TASKS IN THE TRADITIONAL OFFICE

![Pie chart illustrating the time spent on various secretarial tasks in the traditional office.](image)

Although the traditional office does not have its secretarial services organized, there are some advantages to this one-to-one model environment. The advantages of this model depend on the personalities and abilities of both the secretary and the principal(s). Some secretaries have the ability and desire to perform a variety of tasks and to assist the principal(s) with all aspects of office work. The responsibilities of the principal(s) may be
so varied or technical that a multipurpose secretary would provide the most efficient assistance. However, problems would arise when the secretary is on vacation or is ill. It would be difficult for temporary help to step in and handle existing problems of an unfamiliar situation (Cassady, 1980).

Since many businesses still adhere to the traditional one-to-one office model environment, many secretaries find that their work can be interesting and rewarding in this setting. Among the factors that are most satisfying are: face-to-face contact with principal(s) and public, good salary, opportunity to perform a variety of tasks, and some positions often lead to supervisory or higher level positions in the office. There are also factors of job dissatisfaction among traditional secretaries including uneven work load, promotion tied to principal's advancement, not given enough responsibility, and principal(s) not organized and not trained to delegate work (Cassady, 1980).

Chart 2 illustrates the traditional one-to-one office model where the multipurpose secretary assists the principal(s) with all aspects of office work. The traditional secretarial setup existing in many offices has been an established and accepted part of offices for the better part of a century. However, management has
allowed the existing secretarial systems to remain as uncriticized, unstructured parts of the organizational overhead. Many executives began to realize that there were more effective ways of utilizing people than letting them wait for their next assignment. The secretarial tasks and organization of offices were being forced toward change even before the introduction of word processing. The demands of a fast-paced society required more efficiency in all facets of office operation, among them the production of written documents and communications, one of the most vital activities of a firm. A need for a more efficient way to handle increasing paperwork and costs caused management to look for new procedures and equipment to improve the traditional setup (Kleinschrod, 1980).

CHART 2. TRADITIONAL ONE-TO-ONE MODEL OFFICE
The Automated Office

The 1960's evidenced concern from many office managers regarding the rising costs of the flow of paperwork. Inefficient office practices and procedures were re-examined by management when the cost of running the business office became businesses' most costly expense. Many in-depth reviews of office practices indicated that a new office system was needed that could handle the tremendous volume of paperwork being generated. Automated equipment, alone, was not the answer. The response to the dilemmas of the traditional office was the invention of the text-editing word processing typewriter (MT/ST) which could make easy corrections and revisions, thus producing error-free letters in less time (Casady, 1980). Along with this equipment came the word processing concept which is a highly organized system of efficient and economical combinations of people, procedures, and equipment. Combined with modern management techniques, these elements serve to increase production, save time, and improve the overall quality of typewritten communication (Kutie, 1977).

The Move Toward Word Processing Systems

Many business organizations are moving away from the traditional manager-secretary arrangement toward a word processing system. This involves a reorganization of the tasks performed by the traditional secretary. When business
organizations change to a word processing system, it can help them to: Cut down on expenses by handling work in shorter periods of time, produce written communications that are error-free and uniform in appearance, produce high-quality work, both written and nonwritten, avoid duplication of work, increase employee efficiency in the form of specialization, assign even work loads so that all employees work to help the company meet its goals, and improve the total communications system (Ellis, 1980).

New automatic text-editing word processing equipment required trained people to operate it which, in turn, lead to the concept of work specialization. Manufacturers noted that the automatic typewriter did for office paperwork what data processing did for the accumulation of numeric data, and therefore called the new concept "word processing" (Bergerud, 1978).

The Impact of the Word Processing Systems on the Office Employee

The introduction and implementation of word processing into the business office has brought about many changes: First, structural changes are creating a new working environment—an environment which no longer reflects the older traditional "boss-secretary" structure. Large open spaces reflecting a modernistic working environment are now becoming
quite common in many businesses. This new environment
places the employee in a work setting which requires
daily interaction with many individuals, work flow pat-
terns, production measurement, interdependence of
employees, career paths, and a rigid managerial structure--
an environment quite different from the traditional business
office. Second, automation of the business office through
word processing has created a variety of specialized jobs.
Varied jobs have enabled businesses to develop definite
career paths within the office setting and have transformed
many office employees from generalists to specialists.
Third, productivity measurement has become part of the
office setting. For years, the business office was the
only part of the business organization which seemed immune
to precise productivity measures. Today, productivity has
become quite common and, many times, salary is based on
productivity.

This new office system, word processing, has not
evolved without problems; in fact, one of the major prob-
lems of this new approach is employee satisfaction.
Resistance to change, increased employee turnover, and
general job satisfaction are also some of the many problems
of the word processing approach (Kleinschrod, 1980). Job
satisfaction is but one of the many variables important
in making word processing a successful undertaking (Bergerud,
1978). But, it is probably the most important variable. Some secretaries may have fears of not fitting into the new office environment.

Centralized Correspondence Center

The centralized word processing center provides the ultimate in division of labor. Originators submit materials to the word processing centers for completion. Usually, work that is incoming for processing is picked up by company messengers and delivered to the center. Some companies use centralized dictating systems. Users can dictate any type of correspondence from their offices. The dictation is picked up on a recorder located in the word processing center and is transcribed by one of the word processing specialists. The completed materials are returned to the user by messenger. The centralized center approach has some advantages as follows: The word processing specialists who prepare the work can develop a high degree of skill in producing correspondence of various formats; the correspondence produced is uniform in appearance; and quality is assured because proofreaders review the materials for accuracy. Chart 3 shows the flow of work in an office system with a centralized word processing center. All work in the centralized word processing center is supervised to make sure that it is prepared according to the standards.
of the company. Although other word processing organization patterns are used by companies, the centralized center approach is the one that is most commonly found (Ellis, 1980).

CHART 3. CENTRALIZED CORRESPONDENCE CENTER

Satellite Correspondence Centers

The satellite correspondence centers are located away from the centralized correspondence center. The purpose of the satellite centers is to locate some of the word processing specialists near the principal(s) they serve.
The satellite centers are required to follow the same procedures and formats for setting up and typing materials as the word processing specialists in the centralized word processing center. Chart 4 shows an office system with a satellite center. Usually, routine correspondence is done by the centralized center, and statistical reports are handled by the satellite center (Ellis, 1980).

**MINI CORRESPONDENCE CENTERS**

Mini correspondence centers are usually found in large companies where the work performed is limited to the documents
and formats of a specific field or department. An example of this would be a minicenter which handles only legal or medical documents. Chart 5 shows an office system with minicenters. These minicenters receive work directly from the department(s) they are assigned to and usually are under the direction of those specific departments. Each minicenter has a supervisor to see that work loads are evenly distributed (Ellis, 1980).

CHART 5. MINI CORRESPONDENCE CENTER
Research Related to Job Satisfaction

Former attempts to define job satisfaction centered around several job aspects: intrinsic satisfaction, concomitant satisfaction, and extrinsic satisfaction. Ginzberg's et al. (1961) concept of job satisfaction included these three types of satisfaction. Intrinsic satisfaction included the pleasure associated with the actual work activity; concomitant satisfaction involved the worker's feelings about the physical and psychological aspects of his job; e.g., clean working conditions and flex-time and extrinsic satisfaction include a worker's feelings about tangible rewards such as pay and bonuses.

According to Smith et al. (1969), job satisfaction is not a cause in itself, but is a product of many variables. He defined job satisfaction as feelings or affective responses to facets of the job situation. Ewen (1967) studied and defined the sum total of different job facets as being job satisfaction. Smith used different job satisfaction scales, including the Job Descriptive Index to measure job satisfaction. Three separate samples showed a correlation between the sum of the facets and the overall satisfaction scale of .50 to .74.

One of the earliest studies completed relating to job satisfaction was Hoppock's (1935) research among teachers.
Many of the factors that contributed to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among teachers were similar, and sometimes identical, to those in industry. Hoppock's study involved the responses of teachers both in the urban and rural communities from the Northeast area of the country. The findings indicated that the satisfied teachers enjoyed their teaching relationships with students, administrators, and fellow teachers and felt more successful than those teachers less satisfied. Hoppock's study has been expanded upon by other researchers using different methods of measurement. McClusky and Strayer (1940) expanded upon Hoppock's (1935) investigation of factors relating to job satisfaction of teachers in general.

The morale of nearly four-hundred secondary teachers was investigated by Hand (1948). Teachers showing high levels of morale were compared with teachers showing low levels of morale. The teachers with high morale felt they were really involved with the decision-making activities of the school and worked well with administration. The teachers experiencing low morale did not feel a part of the group including their fellow teachers and administration.

More recent studies that tried to identify what variables contribute to satisfaction follow. A survey (Coughlan, 1970) was given to over one thousand teachers located in
specific areas and within the boundaries of forty-one schools of various sizes. The findings of this study indicated many job dimensions that caused job satisfaction/dissatisfaction including: buildings and facilities, relations of colleagues, community relations, relationship with principal, work loads, and student progress and development.

In 1968 the National Education Association conducted a study of factors relating to job satisfaction. Findings indicated that salary contributed to satisfaction but was not the most important factor. Other factors that contributed to job satisfaction were working conditions, relationship with co-workers, students, administration, and school supplies.

**Job Satisfaction in Word Processing**

Mitchell's (1980) investigation of job satisfaction among correspondence secretaries and the impact of supervision indicated that the underlying force controlling the factors that were identified as relating to the level of job satisfaction of correspondence secretaries was the supervision variable. Supervisory style, supervisory intensity, and supervisory personality were directly related to job satisfaction; supervisory policies and practices were indirectly related to job satisfaction. Mitchell concluded that improved supervisory techniques may help to optimize job satisfaction of
correspondence secretaries and lead to a decrease in employee turnover and other personnel problems in addition to improving worker morale.

Although word processing systems have been widely appraised by many who worked with them, some problems cannot be overlooked. Scriven (1981) indicates that if a system is incorrectly designed, there may be a regressive movement back to the one-to-one boss/secretary relationships or the typing pools because of job dissatisfaction.

Tepper's (1973) writing in Management Review cited studies conducted by Naremco Services, Inc., in thirteen client firms related to secretarial-related problems which proved to be extremely costly to business organizations in terms of wasted labor charges, low levels of service, and low job satisfaction motivation. Some managers had to borrow other private secretaries to satisfy the priority needs of the large-scale typing tasks. This practice resulted in hard feelings among the secretaries which, in turn, added to the problem of job dissatisfaction.

Most companies recognize the quality of secretaries' work by granting them pay increases. However, many secretaries found themselves at the top of the secretarial salary scale with little expectations of future raises. This practice has a negative effect for the secretaries on morale.
Deutsch, Shea & Evans (1975) conducted a survey of 278 members of IWP (International Word Processing) on the use of word processing equipment in their various organizations. The respondents represented a wide range of businesses such as legal firms, hospitals, federal, state, and local governments. Many of the respondents indicated their concern about the possibility of reducing the secretarial staff because of the supposed efficiency of word processing equipment. The tentative plans of the organization's actions to implement the use of word processing created a source of dissatisfaction among some of the employees in this study.

Walshe (1980) indicated that firms utilizing word processing equipment make a number of contributions to the overall efficiency of secretaries including reduced costs, improved productivity, and the possibility of reducing personnel.

The Bragg study (1976) compared the major tasks performed by word processing secretaries (administrative and/or correspondence secretaries) and major tasks performed by secretaries in traditional offices. One of Bragg's conclusions was that more emphasis should be placed on interpersonal relations skills by business teachers. She also stated that teachers should maintain close working relationships with managers, supervisors, and office workers involved.
The Sneed study (1971) identified two significant relationships between job satisfaction and productivity of transcribing machine operators. The relationships were as follows:

1. High producers tended to be dissatisfied with opportunities for promotion while low and lower-middle producers tended to be highly satisfied with them.

2. A complex, significant relationship was found between satisfaction with supervision and productivity.

The younger workers (age 18-22) were most satisfied but least productive in the study. Those in the 23-30 age range were least satisfied but more productive.

Locke (1976) indicated that job satisfaction can have effect on employees' physical health, turnover, and other on-the-job human relations skills. Reiff's (1974) study on job satisfaction of word processing specialists indicated that they were dissatisfied with the way their work was measured and lack of worker appreciation from managers. However, they indicated job satisfaction with their overall job and individual task assignments. Lower job satisfaction was expressed in reference to promotional opportunities. According to Mitchell (1980), key factors relating to employee job satisfaction included supervision, background variables, and personality traits.
Weitz (1952) indicated that job satisfaction can be interpreted in the context of general satisfaction. He obtained a correlation of .39 between general satisfaction and job satisfaction after constructing a general satisfaction measure.

Giuliano (1978) maintains that there is no difference between a typing pool and the duties of word processing specialists. He claims that all organizations should be concerned with providing jobs that provide good human relations skills and job satisfaction. Some word processing installations experience high turnover rates because of dull and boring work and lack of promotional opportunities. Basil (1977) indicates that the morale of employees is much improved when traditional office jobs are replaced with positions in the centralized word processing centers.

The Casady study (1973) attempted to predict the degree of job satisfaction of operators of magnetic typewriters in word processing installations. She found no variable predictive of job satisfaction to a statistically significant degree. The operators were satisfied with the amount of pay, work produced, and how they got along with their fellow employees. They also seemed satisfied with producing large volumes of error-
free work in minimal time. These same operators experienced job dissatisfaction when they were pressured to produce work in less time and the typing of repetitious work. Casady (1973) concluded that it was very difficult to predict the job satisfaction of the magnetic typewriter operators even though some factors relating to job satisfaction were identified.

The Reiff study (1974) concluded that, in general, both correspondence and administrative secretaries were satisfied with their jobs and had a good attitude toward their supervisor(s). Having to keep a line count of their production was a source of dissatisfaction for the correspondence secretaries. They also felt that they were not appreciated by their principals. This study by Reiff (1974) involved thirty (30) word processing centers in the New York City area. Most of the word processing employees enjoyed a pleasant working relationship with their fellow workers.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs was considered in measuring the difference of job satisfaction between six levels of administrative and corresponding secretaries in the Benjamin study (1976). He concluded that the correspondence secretaries did not have the opportunity to experience job satisfaction in their specific roles as
did the administrative secretaries. The five needs considered were the need for autonomy, security, esteem, social need, and self-actualization. The first level of correspondence secretaries, which was the lowest level position, exhibited job dissatisfaction. The Benjamin study concluded that the correspondence secretaries should be motivated to build their esteem need.

The Kutie study (1977) examined the role and effect of word processing implementation in the offices. She found that the greatest job satisfaction was experienced by supervisors. Kutie (1977) compared job satisfaction for different levels of secretaries, including supervisory personnel. Kutie emphasized that job satisfaction can be experienced for word processing operators. Working conditions, job activities, variety, and the use of individual abilities were the job factors most satisfying to the word processing operators.

The Mitchell study (1980) focused on determining the contributions of supervisors and other factors relating to job satisfaction such as employee turnover, salaries, and fringe benefits. This study found that the correspondence secretaries, on the whole, felt their work was challenging because of the automatic equipment. However, the Mitchell study (1980) found that repetitive
and boring typing jobs and extremely heavy work loads added to employee job dissatisfaction. These correspondence secretaries disliked supervisors who were not familiar with the policies, procedures, and automatic equipment. Mitchell's study (1980) related the supervisory style as being a factor directly related to employees' job satisfaction. Other factors including promotional opportunities available and recognition received were recognized in this study as being related to job satisfaction for the word processing correspondence secretaries. Mitchell (1980) concluded that supervisory leadership should be improved to promote job satisfaction, better human relations skills, and other related problems.

Claffey (1979) indicated in his research findings that both the supervisory and the majority of word processing personnel in centralized word processing centers felt that the ability to get along with others—good personality and friendly attitude—was important for someone in those positions. Some word processing specialists were being paid, at least in part, under an incentive-pay system which was satisfactory to them because they could earn extra money. This study by Claffey encouraged business educators to offer inter-personal communication (human relations) skills. Business educators must offer their students every opportunity
to overcome potential problems in this area. Individuals should explore and work together with others on meaningful assignments as part of their classroom activities. The ability to cooperate and interact with others is essential for nearly all positions in business. Good relations skills could lead to job satisfaction in the real world of work.

Automation offers people the opportunity to accomplish more work with less human effort. Although automation should be applied to increase efficiency of operation, it should be viewed as a means of dignifying people's work. However, continual repetition of people-required tasks can become boring. Many word processing specialists who operate word processing equipment find it satisfying for a while, and then it becomes tedious (Cecil, 1980).

Some supervisors try to eliminate the possibility of boredom by applying job-enrichment techniques. Some of these techniques include task rotation, promotional opportunities, special recognition, more responsibility, career growth, and self-development. Most people assume they will experience job satisfaction once they attain the job they had been seeking. However, this does not always happen because sometimes the tasks themselves can affect attitudes and outlooks of office personnel. Word processing is especially advantageous to an organization in improving skills,
capabilities, and professional expertise of its employees. Employees are thus more satisfied in their positions, and the organization also benefits (Cecil, 1980).

Scriven (1981) described the likes and dislikes of the word processing operators/correspondence secretaries in their present position which related to their job satisfaction. They liked the variety of work they handled and the efficiency and capability of the automatic word processing equipment. They also enjoyed working with their fellow employees and the status of working in a center. The dislikes of these employees related to physical work facilities and arrangement and the time pressure at peak periods. Twenty-one percent of the word processing operators disliked tedious, boring work, and the inefficiency of management (Scriven, 1981).

Most job satisfaction research studies seemed to have focused on the role of word processing supervisors, background variables, various demographic variables, job levels, individual needs, human relations skills, and motivational factors.

It is evident that the United States has evolved from being primarily an industrial economy to basically an information economy. The main concerns of an information economy are the generation, handling, storage, and utilization of
information. Many challenging developments in terms of automatic word processing equipment, word processing concepts and procedures, and the handling of the processing of information are presently confronting many businesses, managers, educators, and equipment vendors (Giuliano, 1979). There is little doubt that the field of word processing is an expanding one. According to Walshe (1980), the future of word processing is bright and the standardization of word processing terms has grown, though still not universally used. Over 64 percent of word processing users had centralized facilities or locations in their organizations or companies and 17 percent of word processing operations were decentralized. Some organizational structures are using a combined operation.

These studies examined in the review of literature compared relationships of many variables to job satisfaction. Those variables which showed relationships to job satisfaction included the following:

1. compensation, repetitious work, work loads, relations with co-workers, face-to-face contact with principal(s) and public (Cassady, 1980)

2. work loads not evenly distributed (Ellis, 1980)

3. flex-time, working conditions, tangible rewards (Ginzberg, 1961)

4. decision-making activities, morale (Hand, 1948)
5. teaching relationships with students, teachers, and administrators (Hoppock, 1935);

6. facilities, working conditions, school supplies (National Education Association, 1968);

7. supervisory style, supervisory intensity, supervisory personality, fringe benefits, heavy work loads (Mitchell, 1980);

8. word processing system designed incorrectly, variety of work, relations with co-workers, inefficiency of management, pressure of peak work periods, plans to implement word processing system (Deutsch, Shea & Evans, 1975);

9. interpersonal skills (Bragg, 1976);

10. supervision, productivity (Sneed, 1971);

11. turnover (Locke, 1974);

12. work measurement, lack of appreciation (Ruff, 1974);

13. personality traits, supervision, background variables (Mitchell, 1980);

14. human relations skills, dull and boring work, promotional opportunities (Giuliano, 1978);

15. need for autonomy, security, esteem, social need, self-actualization (Benjamin, 1976);

16. good personality and friendly attitude, incentive pay system (Claffey, 1979); and

17. operating word processing equipment (Cecil, 1980).

Those variables which showed no significant relationships to job satisfaction included the following:

1. advancement, compensation, social service, opportunities to do things for others, promotional benefits, work produced (Cassady, 1980);

2. supervisory policies and practices (Mitchell, 1980); and

3. overall job and individual task assignments (Reiff, 1974).
CHAPTER THREE
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Since the automation of the business office, management has been faced with the problem of job satisfaction and the impact of this variable on the office environment. Numerous studies have examined job satisfaction and its relationship to other variables including promotional opportunities, supervision, and task assignments.

The automated business office represents businesses' attempt to reduce office costs and, at the same time, increase efficiency. Word processing, as an automated business system, presented business with new challenges—how to standardize office procedures, how to increase efficiency and reduce costs through the use of automated equipment, how to implement a systems approach to the business office with clearly defined career paths, and how to create an office environment which stimulates the individual office employee and complements the total business system. It is the last challenge which this proposed study examined.

Although numerous studies were located which address job satisfaction, little research has been conducted which examines the word processing business system and those variables which might contribute to the job satisfaction of word processing specialists working in centralized word processing centers. This study was designed to explore the relationship
among job satisfaction and various demographic and structural job variables. This chapter will describe the research methods used in conducting the study including (1) the sampling procedures, (2) the instrumentation, (3) the data collection, and (4) the methods of data analysis.

Population and Sampling Procedures

The population for this study was identified by securing a list of all those insurance companies located in Columbus, Ohio, who have centralized word processing centers. Each of these companies was assigned a number, and utilizing a table of random numbers, four companies were selected. Those companies selected were asked to participate in the study, and all agreed to participate.

Once approval to conduct the study was received from the management/supervisor(s) of each insurance company, the following criteria for participation were verified:

1. all word processing specialists had to be housed in a centralized word processing center;

2. the centralized word processing center had to have been in operation at least for a period of one year; and

3. the centralized word processing center had to employ at least ten (10) full-time word processing specialists who have been with the company for at least one-half (six months) year in their present position.

Those individuals who met the above criteria were the population for this study, but participation was on a voluntary basis.
The supervisors of the centralized word processing centers were asked to identify all the word processing specialists who met the criteria for participation in the study.

Each word processing specialist was informed that participation was voluntary and that the study was in no way related to their job and that all data would be confidential and would be presented in statistical or summary form. Those word processing specialists who met the criteria and agreed to participate represented the sample for the study.

Instrumentation

The Job Descriptive Index was selected as the instrument to measure job satisfaction in the study (APPENDIX D). The Job Descriptive Index was selected for the following reasons: (1) Established norms were available, (2) data related to internal consistency and reliability were available, (3) validity had been substantiated and, (4) the descriptive format provided a measure for six facets of job satisfaction in addition to an overall job satisfaction score. These six facets included work on present job, present pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision on present job, people on present job, and job in general.

Administration of the Instruments

For each facet of job satisfaction measured by the Job Descriptive Index, a list of words or phrases was provided which differentiated between perceptually good and bad jobs.
(APPENDIX D). For each word or phrase, the respondents marked "Y" if the word or phrase referred to that particular aspect of their job, "N" if the word or phrase did not apply, and "?" if undecided. All favorable responses "Y" were assigned three points; all unfavorable "N" responses were scored "0" and all omissions or "?" were scored 1 (Smith, et al, 1969). Appendix G shows standardized responses for the Job Descriptive Index. The JDI provides a satisfaction score for each of its six facets as well as an overall score for the entire instrument. The scores for the facets pay and promotion are doubled so that all facets are numerically equivalent.

Smith et al, (1969) reported an average reliability estimate of .79 and .80 for the Job Descriptive Index utilizing split-half estimates of internal consistency. Imperato (1972) substantiates the discriminant and convergent validity of the Job Descriptive Index. Gillet and Schwab (1975) concur with Imperato.

The demographic and job structural data were gathered using the Word Processing Questionnaire (APPENDIX E).

Data Collection

In order to facilitate data gathering and to reduce the threats of non-responses and testing, the researcher made personal visits to the selected organizations at which time standardized testing procedures were established for the
administering of the Job Descriptive Index and the Word Processing Questionnaire.

At this time the qualifications for participation were again verified and those word processing specialists meeting the criteria as well as their supervisor were assured of anonymity.

The day following this visitation, the Job Descriptive Index was administered and the Word Processing Questionnaire was completed simultaneously at the four (4) participating organizations. The completed instruments (2) were collected from the supervisors by the researcher the day following the administering of the instruments. The data collected utilizing the Job Descriptive Index and the Word Processing Questionnaire were the basis for analyses presented in this study.

**Data Analysis**

The data gathered using the Job Descriptive Index and the Word Processing Questionnaire were used for the analyses in this study. The data were analyzed using various descriptive and correlational statistics of the SAS (Statistical Analysis System) package. Specifically, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation and t-tests were utilized for analyses. The analyses procedures are described in detail as they relate to the findings presented in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The problem of this study was to investigate the relationship among job satisfaction and various demographic and structural job variables of word processing specialists working in centralized word processing centers. To address this problem, the following null hypotheses were formulated:

1. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the age of word processing specialists.

2. There will be no significant difference between job satisfaction scores of the male and female word processing specialists participating in the study.

3. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the formal educational background of word processing specialists participating in the study.

4. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and type of training received by word processing specialists.

5. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and length of time in the present position of word processing specialists.

6. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and length of time participants worked in
an office related occupation, including the length of time in present position of word processing specialists.

7. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the salaries/pay received by word processing specialists.

8. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and incentives given by companies to word processing specialists.

9. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and job descriptions of word processing specialists.

9. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and job descriptions of word processing specialists.

10. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the physical arrangement of the word processing center for word processing specialists.

11. There will be no significant difference between job satisfaction of word processing specialists who have opportunities for career advancement compared to those who do not have opportunities for career advancement within their companies.

12. There will be no significant difference between job satisfaction and planning responsibilities of word processing specialists.
Population and Sample

The insurance companies from which the population of this study was identified included all the insurance companies located in the Greater Columbus, Ohio, area who had centralized word processing centers. Because it was not possible to conduct this study in all qualifying companies, each company was assigned a number and by utilizing a table of random numbers, four insurance companies were randomly selected to participate in the study to eliminate a possible bias in selection. Each of the selected insurance companies was then contacted, and all four agreed to permit their employees to participate in the study.

The supervisors of the centralized word processing centers located in the four insurance companies were then contacted, and they all agreed to assist in the study. In addition, they verified the requirement that their word processing center had been in operation for at least one year and that ten or more full-time word processing specialists were employed. These supervisors then identified all the word processing specialists who had been in their present position for at least six months or more.

Of the 85 word processing specialists who met the established criteria and who agreed to participate in the study, 73 individuals completed the two data gathering instruments which provided the data used for analyses in
this study. Table 1 shows that the participants were overwhelmingly female; only 7 (10 percent) were male. Table 2 shows that one participant did not respond to the question of age. The median age of the word processing specialists was 24. The youngest participant in the study was 18 years old; 7 respondents were over 40 years old. All participants responded to the question regarding formal education. Table 3 shows that 14 (19.1 percent) of them had some post-secondary educational background.

Table 4 presents data related to the salary of the word processing specialists who participated in the study. The median weekly salary of the word processing specialists was $175. Eleven of the respondents did not respond to this question. Less than 4 percent of the respondents were in the highest income bracket--$307 to $320 weekly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS--SEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = male
1 = female
N = 73
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1.389</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 71

TABLE 3
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS—FORMAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>76.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = GED
2 = High school graduate
3 = Two-year college
4 = Bachelor's degree
5 = Master's degree
N = 73
Table 4 shows that most of the respondents (51 percent) received their specific training for their word processing position through on-the-job training. Some of them received their specific training for their position both in high school and on the job (22 percent). A small percentage (4 percent) of the respondents received their specific training for their word processing position in college or some form of post-secondary learning.
TABLE 5
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
SPECIFIC TRAINING FOR POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = On-the-job training
2 = High school training
3 = College training
4 = Both on job and high school training
5 = Both on-the-job and college training
6 = On-the-job, high school, and college training
N = 73

As shown in Table 6, 13 (18 percent) of the respondents did not answer the question of whether or not their company provided a "built-in career path" or promotional opportunities. Over one-half (58 percent) indicated that these options were made available to them. Table 7 shows
that most of the respondents (63 percent) worked in an office-related occupation between 1 to 5 years. The median number of years worked for this population was 3.5. The median years the word processing specialists worked in their present position was 1.5 years. Table 8 shows that most of the respondents worked in their present position from 1 to 3 years (81 percent); one respondent worked 13 years in the present position.

The typical word processing specialist participating in this study was found to be female, age 24, a high school graduate, and was trained on the job for her present word processing specialist position. Her weekly salary was $175 and she worked for a company that provided "built-in career paths" or promotional opportunities. She would have worked in an office-related occupation for 1 to 3 1/2 years and would have held her present position for 1 to 3 years.
### TABLE 6
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
CAREER PATHS OR PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57.534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- = No response

N = 73

### TABLE 7
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
LENGTH OF TIME IN OFFICE-RELATED OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 73
TABLE 8
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
LENGTH OF TIME IN PRESENT POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>80.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 7 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 13 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 73

**Job Descriptive Index Instrument**

The instrument used for this study was the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) which measured different facets of job satisfaction including work on present job, present pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision on present job, people on present job, and job in general as well as yielding an overall job satisfaction score. Each of these facets had a list of adjectives or short phrases that would or would not apply to the way the respondent felt about each particular facet. If a word or phrase applied to a specific aspect of his/her job, the respondent marked it with a "Y." If the adjective or phrase did not describe that particular facet,
the respondent marked it with "N." If the respondent could not decide if a word or statement was applicable, a "?" would be marked. In hand scoring the JDI, all favorable responses were scored 3 points; all unfavorable responses were scored 0, and all omissions of responses and "?s" were scored 1 (Smith, 1969). The pay and promotion scores were doubled for equivalence to the scores of the other facets because they had only 9 items, whereas all other facets had 18 items. This procedure is recommended by the authors of the JDI and has been tested for its reliability.

The JDI instrument and each of the six measurements are highly sensitive to differences in the situation and the nature of the work. Each facet (area) was scored separately and the six facets were combined to provide an overall JDI score for each participant. Based on relevant studies (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951), it was shown that the JDI possesses impressive psychometric properties, including substantial demonstrated convergent, discriminate, concurrent, and predictive validity. The JDI is frequently used to investigate the variables of job satisfaction (Schriesheim, 1982).

According to Vroom (1964), the JDI is the most carefully constructed measure of job satisfaction in existence. The JDI has established norms, content validity, and reliability (including an internal consistency coefficient in the high 80's; it also has test-retest reliabilities.
The intercorrelations of the JDI scales for various samples range from .10 to .70 with most of the r's in the .30's and .40's. The overall job satisfaction score is determined by summing the satisfaction scores from the six facets of the JDI.

The researcher contacted Dr. Patricia Cain Smith of the Psychology Department of Bowling Green State University by mail (APPENDIX A) requesting permission to use the JDI instrument. Written permission was granted by Dr. Smith (APPENDIX B) along with the necessary information on the purchasing of the complete JDI packet including hand scoring key cards and scoring instructions (APPENDIX F). A standardized score for each facet of the JDI was also included in the packet (APPENDIX G).

Administration of the Instruments

The Job Descriptive Index Instruments (APPENDIX D) and the Word Processing Questionnaires (APPENDIX E) were hand delivered on the same day to all supervisors of the centralized word processing centers who agreed to participate in the study. Each supervisor was given explicit instructions on the administering of the instruments to the word processing specialists who agreed to be participants in the study. A cover letter which provided a brief description of the instruments (APPENDIX C)
accompanied the instruments (JDI and Word Processing Questionnaire). The cover letter also assured anonymity of responses and gave instructions for completing the instruments. The instruments (2) were put into individual large manila envelopes for each participant.

All four supervisors agreed to administer the instruments (JDI and Word Processing Questionnaire) the next day simultaneously for completion by the word processing specialists. Each word processing specialist who participated put the completed instruments in the large manila envelope and sealed it. The sealed manila envelope was then given to the supervisor of the centralized word processing center. A total of 85 instruments were distributed by the researcher. All completed responses were collected by the researcher the day following the administering of the instruments. A total of 73 instruments was returned for a response rate of 85 percent.

Analysis of the Data

All completed responses to the Job Descriptive Index (APPENDIX D) and Word Processing Questionnaire (APPENDIX E) were keypunched on cards by the Statistical Computer Lab at The Ohio State University. All 73 responses to the JDI were hand scored prior to being key punched on cards by
using the hand scoring keys. (APPENDIX G). Utilizing programs from the SAS (Statistical Analysis System) package, correlations were run to determine significant relationships needed to reject the null hypotheses at the $p \leq .05$ level.

The word processing specialists were given the opportunity to respond to several general work-related questions about their occupations utilizing a five point scale with one (1) being low to five (5) being high. Table 9 indicated that 36 (49 percent) word processing specialists felt that they had quite a bit to very much input in determining their work day schedule. However, 24, (32 percent) word processing specialists indicated that they had little to no input in determining their work day schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 very little</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 very much</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 73
Table 10 reports data related to how satisfied the word processing specialists were with company incentives. Eleven (15 percent) of the workers responded that they were very satisfied with company incentives while 9 (12 percent) indicated that they were very dissatisfied with company incentives.

**TABLE 10**

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS—SATISFACTION WITH COMPANY INCENTIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 very dissatisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 very satisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 73

Two participants did not respond to the question of dealing with the extent to which their actual job duties match those which were described to them when they were first employed. Table 11 shows that 38 (53 percent)
seemed to feel that the job duties did match (over one-half of the total respondents) while 17 (24 percent) indicated the duties were not similar. Seven (9.8 percent) word processing specialists responded that their job duties did not match those described when first employed.

TABLE 11
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS—JOB DUTIES MATCHING JOB DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 not identical</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 identical</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 73

Table 12 shows that 14 (19 percent) of the respondents felt that they worked in a pleasing to very pleasing physical arrangement of the centralized word processing center. Only 4 (5 percent) indicated that the center was not pleasing.
### TABLE 12

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS--CENTRALIZED WORD PROCESSING CENTER PHYSICAL ARRANGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 not pleasing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 very pleasing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 73

Only 19 (26 percent) of the respondents indicated that they were involved in the planning responsibilities of the word processing center such as decisions relating to changes in present automatic equipment, developing standards and procedures, or just seeing to the needs of the word processing center. However, as shown in Table 13, 30 (41 percent) indicated that they had no involvement in any of the planning responsibilities as described relating to the word processing center. Approximately 24 (33 percent) respondents indicated that they were somewhat involved in the planning responsibilities of the word processing center.
TABLE 13
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS--
INVOLVEMENT IN PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Not involved</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Very involved</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 73

Findings Related to Hypotheses
This section provides the analysis of each of the thirteen hypotheses presented in Chapter One. The total JDI (Job Descriptive Index) score was used as the basis for accepting or rejecting each null hypothesis at the \( p \leq 0.05 \) level of significance. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to identify significant relationships between the JDI instrument including its six facets and the demographic and structural job variables presented in the hypotheses. When the data fell into
two distinct responses such as yes and no responses or male and female responses, t-tests were used to determine if the two groups were significantly different in reference to the variable being analyzed.

**Hypothesis Number 1.** Hypothesis 1 was: There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the age of word processing specialists.

Seventy-two of the 73 participants provided data relating to age. In analyzing these data as shown in Table 14, no significant relationship was found between age and the total job satisfaction score on the JDI. In addition, there was no significant relationship between age and any of the six facets which make up the total JDI instrument. On the basis of these findings, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis. It is interesting to note, however, that a negative relationship, although not significant, was found between age and all facets as well as the total score of the JDI instrument. It may indicate that the older word processing specialists seem to be more dissatisfied.

**Hypothesis Number 2.** Hypothesis 2 was: There will be no significant difference between job satisfaction scores of the male and female word processing specialists participating in the study.
Of the 73 participants providing data, 66 were female and 7 were male. Based on the results of the t-test, there was no significant difference between male and female participants on any of the six facets as well as the total JDI score. The possibility exists that no significant differences were obvious because of the small sample for males (7). On the basis of these findings, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

TABLE 14

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND AGE OF WORD PROCESSING SPECIALISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Degree of Correlation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on present job</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present pay</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor on present job</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on present job</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JDI score</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05  
** p ≤ .01
Hypothesis Number 3. Hypothesis 3 was: There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the formal educational background of word processing specialists.

Seventy-three respondents provided data relating to the above hypothesis. Table 15 shows no significant relationship exists between these two variables as shown by the scores on each of the six facets of the JDI as well as the overall total score. Since no significant relationship was found between the total JDI score and the educational background of participating word processing specialists, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis Number 4. Hypothesis 4 was: There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and type of training received by word processing specialists.

Table 16 shows that no significant relationships were found between job satisfaction and the type of training received by word processing specialists. None of the six facets nor the overall score of the JDI showed a significant relationship to training. On the basis of these findings, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis Number 5. Hypothesis 5 was: There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and length of time in the present position of word processing specialists.
Seventy-three participants provided data relating to this hypothesis regarding length of time in their present positions as word processing specialists. As shown on Table 17, no significant relationship was found between length of employment and any of the scores of the six facets as well as the total JDI score. On the basis of these findings, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

### TABLE 15

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND FORMAL EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF WORD PROCESSING SPECIALISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Degree of Correlation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on present job</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present pay</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor on present job</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on present job</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JDI score</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p ≤ .05

** **p ≤ .01
### TABLE 16

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND TYPE OF TRAINING RECEIVED BY WORD PROCESSING SPECIALISTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Degree of Correlation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on present job</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present pay</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor on present job</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on present job</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JDI score</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p \leq .05 \)

** \( p \leq .01 \)

### TABLE 17

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND LENGTH OF TIME IN PRESENT POSITION OF WORD PROCESSING SPECIALISTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Degree of Correlation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on present job</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present pay</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 17 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities for promotion</th>
<th>-.080</th>
<th>73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor on present job</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on present job</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JDI score</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p \( \leq .05 

** p \( \leq .01 

**Hypothesis Number 6.** Hypothesis 6 was: There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and length of time participants worked in an office related occupation, including the length of time in present position as word processing specialists.

Seventy-three participants responded to the above hypothesis regarding length of time worked in an office related occupation. It seemed as though the longer the respondents worked in office related occupations, the more unsatisfied they became. Although some negative correlations were discovered as shown in Table 18, no significant relationships were found between the length of office employment and the overall JDI score as well
as between the length of office employment and any of the six facets of the JDI. Based on these findings, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

TABLE 18
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND LENGTH OF TIME WORKED IN AN OFFICE RELATED OCCUPATION INCLUDING PRESENT POSITION OF WORD PROCESSING SPECIALISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Degree of Correlation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on present job</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present pay</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor on present job</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on present job</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JDI score</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05
** p ≤ .01

Hypothesis Number 7. Hypothesis 7 was: There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the salaries/pay received by word processing specialists.
Only 62 of the participants responded to this question on salaries/pay received. As shown in Table 19, no significant relationship was found between job satisfaction and salaries/pay earned by word processing specialists. On the basis of these findings, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

TABLE 19

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND SALARIES/PAY RECEIVED BY WORD PROCESSING SPECIALISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Degree of Correlation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on present job</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present pay</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor on present job</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on present job</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JDI score</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p \leq .05 \)

** \( p \leq .01 \)
Hypothesis Number 8. Hypothesis 8 was: There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and incentives provided by participating companies.

Table 20 shows significant relationships between job satisfaction and company incentives in all facets plus the total JDI score. The relationship between incentives and five facets of the JDI was significant at the $p \leq .01$ level. These facets include work on present job, present pay, opportunities for promotion, people on present job, and job in general. One facet of the JDI, supervisor on present job, was significant at the $p \leq .05$ level. In addition, the total JDI score showed a significant relationship at the $p \leq .01$ level between the degree of satisfaction and incentives provided by the participating companies. On the basis of this data, the null hypothesis is rejected at the $p \leq .01$ level.

**TABLE 20**

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND COMPANY INCENTIVES GIVEN WORD PROCESSING SPECIALISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Degree of Correlation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on present job</td>
<td>**.390</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present pay</td>
<td>**.437</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 20 (continued)

| Opportunities for promotion | **.438 | 73 |
| Supervisor on present job   | *.250  | 73 |
| People on present job       | **.381 | 73 |
| Job in general              | **.454 | 73 |
| Total JDI score             | **.536 | 73 |

* p < .05  
** p < .01

Hypothesis Number 9. Hypothesis 9 was: There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the job descriptions of word processing specialists.

Seventy-one participants provided data related to the above hypothesis regarding job descriptions of word processing specialists. Table 21 shows a significant relationship between job description and six facets of the JDI. Four facets of the JDI were significant at the p < .01 level including work on present job, supervision on present job, people on present job, and job in general. Two facets of the JDI were significant at the p < .05 level including present pay and opportunities for promotion. There was a significant relationship at the p < .01 level between the
degree of satisfaction of the job descriptions of word processing specialists and the total score on the JDI. Based on this data, the null hypothesis is rejected at the $p \leq .01$ level.

**TABLE 21**

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB DESCRIPTIONS GIVEN WORD PROCESSING SPECIALISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Degree of Correlation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on present job</td>
<td>**.351</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present pay</td>
<td>*.283</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>*.251</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor on present job</td>
<td>**.361</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on present job</td>
<td>**.347</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td>**.305</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JDI score</td>
<td>**.411</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

Hypothesis Number 10. Hypothesis 10 was: There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and
the physical arrangement of the word processing center for word processing specialists.

Table 22 shows a significant relationship exists between the physical arrangement of the word processing center and four of the six JDI facets plus the overall JDI score. The four facets that showed significant relationships at the $p \leq .01$ level were: work on present job, supervisor on present job, people on present job, and job in general. In addition, there was a significant relationship at the $p \leq .01$ level between the degree of satisfaction of the physical arrangement and the total score on the JDI. On the basis of this data, the null hypothesis is rejected at the $p \leq .01$ level.

TABLE 22
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND THE PHYSICAL ARRANGEMENT OF CENTRALIZED WORD PROCESSING CENTERS IN WHICH PARTICIPANTS WORKED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Degree of Correlation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on present job</td>
<td>**.395</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present pay</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor on present job</td>
<td>**.390</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 22 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People on present job</th>
<th>**.320</th>
<th>73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td>**.385</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JDI score</td>
<td>**.383</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05
** p ≤ .01

**Hypothesis Number 11.** Hypothesis 11 was: There will be no significant difference between job satisfaction of word processing specialists who have opportunities provided for career advancement compared to those who do not have opportunities for career advancement within their company.

Sixty of the 73 respondents provided data relating to the above hypothesis. As indicated in Table 23, there was a significant difference between job satisfaction of those word processing specialists having opportunities for career advancement compared to those who do not have opportunities for career advancement at the p ≤ .01 level based on the total JDI score. T-tests were used to determine differences between the two groups for this hypothesis. The two groups were significantly different on three facets of the JDI as well as the total score at the p ≤ .01 level. These facets included promotional opportunities, people on present
job, and job in general. One facet of the JDI, present pay, was significant at the $p \leq .05$ level. On the basis of the significant differences between the total JDI scores of those individuals having opportunities for career advancement compared to those who did not, the null hypothesis is rejected at the $p \leq .01$ level.

**TABLE 23**

T-TESTS COMPARING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE JOB SATISFACTION SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS HAVING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT AND INDIVIDUALS NOT HAVING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>156.3333</td>
<td>59.5246</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>215.8095</td>
<td>65.2576</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>*-3.3179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p \leq .01$

Tables 24, 25, 26, and 27 indicate the facets of the JDI that showed where the two groups were significantly different as related to hypothesis 11. These facets included promotional opportunities, people on present job, job in general, and present pay of the two groups.
### TABLE 24

T-TESTS COMPARING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE JOB SATISFACTION SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS HAVING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT AND INDIVIDUALS NOT HAVING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT—FACET, PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.0000</td>
<td>15.0919</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29.3809</td>
<td>18.3648</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>-3.1253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .01

### TABLE 25

T-TESTS COMPARING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE JOB SATISFACTION SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS HAVING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT AND INDIVIDUALS NOT HAVING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT—FACET, PEOPLE ON PRESENT JOB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.1111</td>
<td>15.3427</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37.4286</td>
<td>13.0741</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>-3.1734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .01
TABLE 26
T-TESTS COMPARING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE JOB SATISFACTION SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS HAVING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT AND INDIVIDUALS NOT HAVING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT--FACET, JOB IN GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.5000</td>
<td>23.5553</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55.2619</td>
<td>15.4715</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>*-2.6816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p \(\leq\) .01

TABLE 27
T-TESTS COMPARING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE JOB SATISFACTION SCORES OF INDIVIDUALS HAVING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT AND INDIVIDUALS NOT HAVING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER ADVANCEMENT--FACET, PRESENT PAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.6667</td>
<td>10.9759</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24.5714</td>
<td>14.8047</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>*-2.5490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p \(\leq\) .05
Hypothesis Number 12. Hypothesis 12 was: There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and planning responsibilities of word processing specialists.

Table 28 shows that 73 participants provided data relating to the above hypothesis regarding their involvement in the planning responsibilities of the word processing center. There was a significant relationship at the $p \leq 0.01$ level between the total job satisfaction score and the involvement in the planning responsibilities of the word processing specialists. Three of the six facets of the JDI showing a significant relationship at the $p \leq 0.01$ level to planning responsibilities were opportunities for promotion, people on present job, and job in general. The facets work on present job, present pay, and supervisor on present job did not show significant relationships to planning responsibilities. In addition, there was a significant relationship at the $p \leq 0.01$ level between the degree of satisfaction of the planning responsibilities of word processing specialists and the total score on the JDI. Based on this data, the null hypothesis is rejected at the $p \leq 0.01$ level.

Hypothesis Number 13. Hypothesis 13 was: There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and schedules (i.e., flex-time) of word processing specialists.
Seventy-three participants provided data relating to the above hypothesis regarding input in determining their workday schedules. Table 29 shows a significant relationship between the total job satisfaction score and the input of the word processing specialists in determining their workday schedule. Of the six facets contained in the JDI, four showed a significant relationship to the degree of input word processing specialists had in determining their workday schedules at the $p \leq .01$ level. These four facets were: work on present job, opportunities for promotion, people on present job, and job in general. Based on the significant relationship between the total JDI score and degree of satisfaction of the schedules (i.e., flex-time) of word processing specialists, the null hypothesis is rejected at the $p \leq .01$ level.

**TABLE 28**

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES OF WORD PROCESSING SPECIALISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Degree of Correlation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on present job</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present pay</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td><strong>.429</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor on present job</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 28 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People on present job</th>
<th>**.341</th>
<th>73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td>**.305</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JDI score</td>
<td>**.380</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05
** p ≤ .01

TABLE 29

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND INPUT IN DETERMINING WORKDAY SCHEDULES OF WORD PROCESSING SPECIALISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JDI Facets</th>
<th>Degree of Correlation</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on present job</td>
<td>*.252</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present pay</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>**.345</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor on present job</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on present job</td>
<td>*.254</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td>**.274</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total JDI score</td>
<td>**.306</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05
** p ≤ .01
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the research problem, the procedures and findings, the conclusions, recommendations, and the implications of the findings and conclusions. This study will be of interest to business educators, to management, to individuals interested in the word processing field, word processing specialists, and to various other groups interested in the field of word processing.

Background of the Problem

Many business organizations are moving away from the traditional manager-secretary office arrangement toward a word processing system in order to produce high-quality work in shorter periods of time. This, in turn, should cut business costs while increasing employee efficiency. This word processing system is helping business, industry, government, and professional offices accomplish one of their most important goals, communications (Ellis, 1980).

The impact of technological change on office workers is frequently subjected to close scrutiny through job satisfaction research. Historically, the factory assembly line has been examined. Developments in the office have produced similar concerns because office technology is accelerating
at an unprecedented rate. The concept word processing is one innovation that has achieved notoriety throughout the business community because it involves changes in organizational structure, office procedures, and worker roles. Some criticisms pertaining to job satisfaction have been leveled at the concept of word processing. These criticisms have inspired studies designed to investigate the job satisfaction of word processing specialists (Wheatley, 1981).

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to investigate job satisfaction and various demographic and structural job variables of word processing specialists working in centralized word processing centers. The following problem was investigated: What is the relationship among job satisfaction and various demographic and structural job variables of word processing specialists working in a centralized word processing center?

This research study was completed using a descriptive research design. Thirteen null hypotheses were developed and investigated concerning the relationships between job satisfaction and various demographic and structural job variables as well as differences between groups of individuals. Seven of these null hypotheses were accepted and six null hypotheses were rejected at the p < .01 level. Specifically, the following hypotheses were investigated:
1. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the age of word processing specialists.

2. There will be no significant difference between job satisfaction scores of the male and female word processing specialists participating in the study.

3. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the formal educational background of word processing specialists participating in the study.

4. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and type of training received by word processing specialists.

5. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and length of time in the present position of word processing specialists.

6. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and length of time participants worked in an office related occupation, including the length of time in present position of word processing specialists.

7. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the salaries/pay received by word processing specialists.

8. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and incentives given by companies to word processing specialists.
9. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and job descriptions of word processing specialists.

10. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and the physical arrangement of the word processing center for word processing specialists.

11. There will be no significant difference between job satisfaction of word processing specialists who have opportunities for career advancement compared to those who do not have opportunities for career advancement within their companies.

12. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and planning responsibilities of word processing specialists.

13. There will be no significant relationship between job satisfaction and schedules (i.e., flex-time) of word processing specialists.

The following null hypothesis was used to test each of the above variables:

\[ H_0: \ U_1 - U_2 = 0 \]

Procedures

The following procedures were implemented:

1. Identification of the population. The population for this study was composed of 73 word processing specialists
working in centralized word processing centers from four randomly selected insurance companies located in the Greater Columbus, Ohio, area.

2. Two instruments were used for the collection of data. The Word Processing Questionnaire (APPENDIX E) was constructed to solicit demographic and structural data. The Job Descriptive Index or JDI (APPENDIX D) which addressed six facets of job satisfaction was used to measure job satisfaction. The six facets of the JDI included work on present job, present pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision on present job, people on present job, and job in general. For each facet of job satisfaction, there was a list of adjectives or short phrases describing that particular facet. The respondent indicated whether or not the adjective or phrase described that particular aspect of his/her job. All favorable responses were scored "3," all unfavorable "N" responses were scored "0," and all omissions or "?s" were scored 1 (Smith et al., 1969).

3. All instruments were personally delivered by the investigator to the supervisors of the word processing centers. A cover letter accompanied both instruments which provided a description of the instruments, assurance of anonymity of responses, and instructions on how to complete the instruments (APPENDIX C). Each participant put his/her completed instruments in a large manila envelope, sealed it, and gave
it to his/her immediate supervisor as directed by the investigator.

Of those individuals who agreed to participate in this study (85), 73 actually participated for a response rate of 85 percent generated from the word processing specialists. All completed instruments were collected by the investigator the day following the administering of the instruments by the word processing supervisors.

4. All data were transferred to computer cards by The Ohio State University Statistical Lab and analyzed using the Statistical Analysis (SAS) package. Relationships and differences were considered significant at the p ≤ .05 level. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to identify relationships and t-tests were used to identify significant differences between groups. The total JDI (Job Descriptive Index) score which was a combination of each of the six facets was used as the basis for accepting or rejecting each null hypothesis.

Findings of the Study

Significant Findings. The job satisfaction of the word processing specialists participating in this study was found to be significantly and positively related at the p ≤ .01 level to several facets: company incentives, job descriptions, physical arrangement of the word processing center, opportunities for career advancement, planning responsibilities, and work
schedules.

Those individuals who worked for companies with the most incentives were most satisfied. In addition, the more closely the present job responsibilities of the word processing specialists matched those described to them when they were initially hired, the more satisfied they were with their positions.

The physical arrangement of the word processing center was also very important to the word processing specialists who participated in the study. Those individuals most satisfied with the physical arrangement of the word processing center obtained the highest scores on the JDI instrument.

Planning responsibilities and career advancement were also very important to these word processing specialists. The word processing specialists who were most involved in the planning responsibilities of the center were most satisfied. Also, those word processing specialists who saw opportunities for advancement within the center were more satisfied with their jobs than those individuals who saw little or no opportunity for advancement from their present position. Finally, those word processing specialists who were most satisfied with their work schedules scored highest on the JDI instrument.

**Nonsignificant Findings.** No significant relationships were discovered between the variables age, sex, formal
education, training received, length of time in present position, salaries/pay, and length of time in an office related occupation when compared to job satisfaction.

Although not significant, a negative relationship was found between age and job satisfaction. In this study the older word processing specialists were less satisfied with their positions than the younger employees. Very few male word processing specialists were found in the word processing centers; consequently, it was not possible to examine differences between the job satisfaction of male and female employees.

No significant relationships were found between the level of formal education of employees and job satisfaction. In addition, no significant relationships were found between specific word processing training and job satisfaction. Likewise, no significant relationships were found between length of office experience and job satisfaction. Finally, no significant relationships were found between salaries/pay and job satisfaction.

Conclusions

The conclusions that follow are based on the findings of this study:

1. The job satisfaction of word processing specialists participating in this study as measured by the JDI instrument
show significant relationships to the variables incentives, physical arrangement, career advancement, planning responsibilities, and work schedules. These relationships support the findings of prior research in other occupational areas and indicated that the relationship these variables have to job satisfaction crosses many occupational areas including word processing.

2. The job satisfaction of the word processing specialists in this study as measured by the JDI showed a significant relationship to job descriptions of the positions employees held. No prior research was located which examined the relationship between these two variables.

3. Previous research has shown significant relationships between job satisfaction and the variables age and salary. This premise was not substantiated by the findings of this study for this group of individuals.

Recommendations Based on Findings of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare job satisfaction with various demographic and structural job variables of word processing specialists working in centralized word processing centers. In view of the findings and conclusions of this study and within the limitations of the study presented in chapter one, the following recommendations are presented:
1. Because of the significant relationship between job satisfaction and company incentives, management should consider the impact of company incentives and the contribution such incentives make to job satisfaction. In the centralized word processing centers where job satisfaction has become a crucial problem, management might investigate the possibility of instituting incentives which might help alleviate this problem.

2. Employers should be careful when constructing job descriptions so that such descriptions clearly describe the duties the employees will be expected to perform on the job.

3. Because of the significant relationship between job satisfaction and the physical arrangement of the word processing center, management should be concerned with the impact the physical environment the word processing center has on worker satisfaction. This finding could indicate that a pleasant, comfortable physical environment would markedly contribute to worker satisfaction.

4. Employers should consider the impact of career paths on employee job satisfaction. They should try to maintain close contact with word processing installations to keep abreast of the changes in career paths for word processing specialists.

5. The contribution that employee involvement makes toward job satisfaction should be considered by management
of centralized word processing centers because it might contribute to increasing the job satisfaction of those employees involved in these activities.

6. Because of the relationship between job satisfaction and work schedules, management should consider the impact the flexibility that work schedules has to job satisfaction. It might be that offering a variety of work schedules would be one way of improving job satisfaction.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. Variables that were not examined in this study might be investigated in future word processing research such as in-house training, type of equipment, or production measurement.

2. Centralized word processing centers in different industries other than insurance companies such as legal offices, education offices, medical offices, and government offices might be investigated in future research.

3. Future research could also include looking into different organizational plans for word processing such as mini correspondence centers or satellite correspondence centers.

4. This study could be replicated using another instrument to measure job satisfaction such as the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.
5. A comparison of job satisfaction aspects between the traditional secretaries and word processing specialists could be conducted using the same job satisfaction instrument (Job Descriptive Index) for measuring job satisfaction.

6. Research should be conducted to determine if a significant relationship exists in the level of job satisfaction between word processing specialists in other states and regions, especially those with larger urban and rural areas.

7. Further research studies should be conducted using other techniques of sampling the population. The findings could then be compared to the findings of this study for more generalization results.

8. Further studies might investigate job satisfaction and its relationship to nonwork activities of word processing specialists to gain an insight into the impact of nonwork activities to job satisfaction.
January 2, 1982

Dr. Patricia Cain Smith
Psychology Building
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH  43402

Dear Dr. Smith:

At the present time, I am in the process of writing my three­chapter proposal for my dissertation which involves an investigation of the relationship among job satisfaction and various demographic and structural job variables for word processing specialists employed in centralized word processing centers.

Although there are different instruments to measure job satisfaction, the Job Descriptive Index seems to be the one most suitable for my study and the one that I have selected to use with your permission. I know that your consent to use this instrument for my study will enhance it.

I would appreciate any other assistance or suggestions that you could give me in using The Job Descriptive Index for my study. For example, has anyone else used it for similar studies that I could examine?

Thank you for any assistance you can give me regarding the use of The Job Descriptive Index for my study and for any other information that would be helpful to me at this time.

Sincerely,

Rose F. Cost
Doctoral Candidate

cc Dr. Anthony A. Olinzock
The Ohio State University
Arps Hall, Room 288
1945 North High Street
Columbus, OH  43210
Phone (614)422-5431
To Prospective Users of the Test Measures
from Bowling Green State University:

Thank you for your inquiry concerning use of one of our scales. They are now being published through the University, and the copyright is being enforced. The tests themselves, or written permission to reproduce them, can be purchased from the Department of Psychology at Bowling Green State University.

For purchasers of the JDI in quantities of 200 or greater, a cost rebate will be made if individual test data are returned to Bowling Green State University. Individual test scores and relevant demographic data will be used in establishing occupational norms and furthering our validation of the scales. If you are interested in such an arrangement, at the time of purchase we will send you a simple contract stating the terms of the agreement including specifics about the form in which the data should be sent. The monetary rebate will be sent to you upon our receipt of the test data.

The book covering the development, rationale, scales and norms of the JDI and RDI (Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., and Hulin, C. L. The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969) is out of print. Because of the continued demand for the book among researchers, we have recently decided to photocopy it. A spiral bound copy of the book, a copy of the present form of the JDI, and hand scoring keys are available for the cost of $18.00 plus a $5.00 fee for postage and handling.

A price sheet and description of other BGSU work related scales are enclosed for your information. Also, technical personnel can be contracted through the Bowling Green Industrial Relations Center to score and summarize your data. Additional research services are available to meet particular organizational needs: for example, analyses such as profiling of employee satisfaction scores, breakdowns of satisfaction by relevant demographic and organizational categories, analysis of the relationships among the individual satisfaction scales and general satisfaction, and the relationship of job satisfaction to absences, turnover, sales, and productivity measures. Employee attitude questionnaires can be designed for your company's specific needs as well. Requests for information concerning the services available from the Bowling Green Industrial Relations Center should be addressed to Dr. Patricia C. Smith, Box 711, Bowling Green, OH 43402.

We intend to continue to accumulate information about the scales, and to report the results through publications.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to write or call: (419) 372-0247 or (419) 352-5514.

Sincerely yours,

Patricia C. Smith
APPENDIX C

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO WORD PROCESSING SPECIALISTS
December 2, 1981

Dear Word Processing Specialist:

Have you ever been given the opportunity to express your true feelings about your present position as an employee in a centralized word processing center? How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with certain aspects of your work and working conditions? Perhaps my Word Processing Questionnaire and Job Descriptive Index questions will provide you with the opportunity to express some of the things that you are satisfied with and some of the things that you are dissatisfied with as a word processing specialist.

Because I realize that you are a very busy person, my questionnaires are designed to be very brief and should take a minimum amount of your time to complete. The Word Processing Questionnaire should take approximately ten minutes of your time and the Job Descriptive Index should be completed in approximately twenty minutes. You will discover that both instruments can be answered quickly and easily.

Your responses to my instruments/questionnaires will be confidential and no individual responses will be communicated to anyone for any reason. All responses will be in statistical or summary form in my study.

Once you have completed the questionnaires, please put them in the envelope which I have provided for you, seal it, and give it to the designated person as instructed.

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete these questionnaires for my study of job satisfaction of word processing specialists working in centralized word processing centers. Again, your cooperation is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Rose F. Cost
Rose F. Cost, Instructor
and Doctoral Candidate
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

108-115

University Microfilms International
300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700
WORD PROCESSING QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: Please check, circle, or respond to the following questions:

1. Age: ______  2. Sex: _____ Male _____ Female

3. Weekly Salary (Gross/before taxes): ____________

4. Formal Education: _____ GED _____ High School _____ Two-year College
   _____ Bachelor’s _____ Master’s

5. Where did you receive your specific training for your word processing specialist position (on-the-job, high school, etc.)?

6. How much input did you have in determining your work day schedule?
   Very Much  4  3  2  1
   Very Little

7. How satisfied are you with company incentives?
   Very Satisfied  5  4  3  2  1
   Very Dissatisfied

8. To what extent do your actual job duties match those which were described to you when you were first employed?
   Identical  5  4  3  2  1
   Not Identical

9. Does the word processing center provide a physical arrangement that is pleasing to work in?
   Very Pleased  5  4  3  2  1
   Not Pleased

10. How long have you worked in an office related occupation, including your present position?

11. How long have you been employed as a word processing specialist in your present position?

12. Does your company provide a "built-in" career path or promotional opportunities?

13. Are you involved in the planning responsibilities of the word processing center (i.e., needs of word processing center, conversion or changes in automated equipment, developing standards and procedures)?
   Very Involved  5  4  3  2  1
   Not Involved
APPENDIX F

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCORING THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX (JDI)
SCORING THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX (JDI)

General Instructions:

All favorable answers are scored 3, all unfavorable are scored 0, and all omissions or ?s are scored 1. The favorable Y answers are given in Column 1, and the favorable N answers in Column 2 of the scoring keys (blue cards).

The Pay and Promotions scores are doubled in order to make them numerically equivalent to the scores on the other scales.

Total JDI scores (not recommended):

We do not recommend computing a total JDI score, although numerous investigators have done so. The subscales are discriminably different, have loaded on separate group factors with no general factor in repeated factor analytic studies, and do not intercorrelate highly despite their high reliabilities. Different aspects of, and changes in, the situation also affect the five subscales differently. Adding sub-scores is like adding apples and oranges.

If, however, for some compelling reason a summary score is desired, the grand total of the five subscale totals of the JDI will give a measure which is at least as psychometrically sound as other available summary measures. Until additional research evidence is accumulated, a simple sum is as good as any more complicated weighting. (Do not attempt to weight by importance.)
APPENDIX G

STANDARDIZED RESPONSE FOR EACH SCALE OF THE JDI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>PAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fascinating</td>
<td>Income adequate for normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying</td>
<td>Satisfactory profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Barely live on income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respected</td>
<td>Income provides luxuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>Less than I deserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>Highly paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiresome</td>
<td>Underpaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On your feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives sense of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks my advice</td>
<td>Good opportunity for advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to please</td>
<td>Opportunity somewhat limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impolite</td>
<td>Promotion on ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praises good work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactful</td>
<td>Dead-end job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential</td>
<td>Good chance for promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-to-date</td>
<td>Unfair promotion policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't supervise enough</td>
<td>Infrequent promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick tempered</td>
<td>Regular promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells me where I stand</td>
<td>Fairly good chance for promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows job well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves me on my own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around when needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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