

**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**SOME MAJOR DETERMINANTS OF JOB
SATISFACTION AMONG EMPLOYEES OF OROMIA
HEAD AND ZONAL COOPERATIVE PROMOTION
OFFICES**

SEBSIBE YILMA

June, 2002

**SOME MAJOR DETERMINANTS OF JOB SATISFACTION
AMONG EMPLOYEES OF OROMIA HEAD AND ZONAL
COOPERATIVE PROMOTION OFFICES**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF ARTS
IN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY**

BY

SEBSIBE YILMA

June, 2002

**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**SOME MAJOR DETERMINANTS OF JOB SATISFACTION
AMONG EMPLOYEES OF OROMIA HEAD AND ZONAL
COOPERATIVE PROMOTION OFFICES**

**BY
SEBSIBE YILMA**

Approved by board of examiners:

Chairman, Department
Graduate Committee

Signature

Advisor

Signature

External Examiner

Signature

Internal Examiner

Signature

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgement	i.
Abstract	ii.
List of Tables	vii.
CHAPTER ONE - Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	2
1.3 Definition of Terms	4
1.4 Significance of the Study	6
1.5 Objectives of the Study	6
1.6 Delimitations	7
1.7 Limitation of the Study	7
CHAPTER TWO - Review of Related Literature	8
2.1 The Nature of Cooperatives	8
2.2 The Concept and Definition of Job Satisfaction	11
2.3 The Measurements of Job Satisfaction	13
2.3.1 Overall Job Satisfaction Scale	13
2.3.2 Specific Job Satisfaction Scale	15
2.4 Determinants of Job Satisfaction	17
2.4.1 Satisfaction with the Work Itself	17
2.4.2 Satisfaction with Payment	19
2.4.3 Satisfaction with Promotional Opportunities	20
2.5 Demographic Variables Associated with Job Satisfaction.....	21
2.5.1 Age	21
2.5.2 Gender	24

2.5.3 Marital Status	25
2.5.4 Occupational Status	26
2.5.5 Educational Attainment	26
2.6 Consequences of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction	27
2.6.1 Job Satisfaction and Job Performance	27
2.6.2 Employee Turnover and Job Satisfaction ...	29
2.6.3 Job Satisfaction and Absenteeism	30
2.6.4 Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction	31
2.7 What do People Seek in their Jobs?	33
CHAPTER THREE - Methods of the Study	35
3.1 Subjects	35
3.2 Instruments	37
3.3 Procedure and Data Collection	39
3.4 Variables Included in the Study	40
3.5 Methods of Data Analysis	42
CHAPTER FOUR - Results	44
4.1 Descriptive Statistics	44
4.2 Gender Difference on Overall Job Satisfaction, Satisfaction With the Work Itself.....	45
4.3 Marital Status Difference on Overall Job Satisfaction, Satisfaction with the Work Itself, Payment and Promotional Opportunities	46
4.4 Occupational Status of Group Difference on Overall Job Satisfaction, Satisfaction with the Work Itself, Payment and Promotional Opportunities	47
4.5 Comparison of Means on Monthly Salary of Employees With Overall Job Satisfaction.	49

4.6 Employees Age Group Differences on Overall Job Satisfaction.	50
4.7 Differences in Educational Level on Overall Job Satisfaction	51
4.8 The Combined and Independent Contributions of Satisfaction with the Work Itself, Payment and Promotional Opportunities for Overall Job Satisfaction.	52
CHAPTER FIVE - Discussion	56
5.1 Gender Difference on Overall Job Satisfaction, Satisfaction With the Work Itself, Payment and Promotional Opportunities.	56
5.2 Marital Status Difference on Job Satisfaction.....	57
5.3 Age Sub Group Difference on Job Satisfaction.....	58
5.4 Salary Difference on Job Satisfaction.....	59
5.5 Occupational Status/Group Difference on Overall Job Satisfaction	59
5.6 Educational Level Difference on Overall Job Satisfaction.	60
5.7 Combined and Independent Contributions of Satisfaction with the Work Itself, Payment and Promotional Opportunities for Overall Job Satisfaction.	61
CHAPTER SIX - Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations	63
6.1 Summary	63
6.2 Conclusions	67
6.3 Recommendations	68

References	70
Appendix I – The Questionnaire In English	75
Appendix II - The Questionnaire In Amharic	82

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Any organization, whether it is business organization or non-profit making organization, requires effective and efficient performance. To achieve these main objectives, employees are the most important part of the organization who play vital roles. Unless employees are satisfied by the job they are assigned to work, the output of the organization will be affected either directly or indirectly.

As *Lussier (1990)* indicated, job satisfaction can contribute substantially to the effectiveness of an organization. It contributes to productive output in the form of high quantity and quality products and services, as well as to maintenance objectives of low absenteeism and turnover. Supporting this idea, *Coon (1994)* stated that management that ignores or mishandles the human element could be devastatingly costly.

Several researches have been done locally on employee job satisfaction and work motivation. Among these (*Legesse 1992; Bonsa, 1996*) did research on secondary school teachers, a related research were done by *Kassahun (1996)* on employees of Ethiopian Insurance Corporation. A recent research was made by *Kumsa (2001)* on job satisfaction of Oromia Medical personnel. Moreover, *Habtamu (1983)* conducted a

research on agricultural cooperative peasants regarding factors affecting their motivation to work. But no research has been done locally on cooperative office employees regarding their job satisfaction.

Cooperative promotion offices, like all other types of organizations, are affected by employees job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Hence, this study is focused on determinants of job satisfaction of Oromia cooperative promotion office employees.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Cooperatives are some of the most important types of organizations, which play vital roles in the development of a nation, especially for developing countries such as Ethiopia. But, as a member of a research team of Yekatit 25 Cooperative Institute the researcher had observed that Ethiopian cooperatives haven't contributed as much as they have been expected to do due to many problems they have faced. Cooperatives and cooperative promotion offices have many problems that force them perform below their potentials. Some of these problems are shortage of skilled manpower, shortage of capital, employee turnover, etc. Just like all other types of organizations, employees are the most important assets of cooperative organizations. If they are not satisfied with the work they are assigned to perform, their product will be affected directly or indirectly. Based on this assumption, the study focused on some major determinants of employees' job satisfaction of Oromia head and zonal cooperative promotion offices.

In this study the researcher considered three specific job facets that affect overall job satisfaction. These are satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with payment, and satisfaction with promotional opportunities. Moreover, personal variables associated with job satisfaction are considered for further analysis. These personal variables are gender, marital status, age, education, occupational status, and monthly salary of employees. In light of these variables, the main purpose of the study is to investigate the following basic questions:

1. Is there sex difference with respect to overall and specific types of job satisfactions (the work itself, payment, and promotion)?
2. Does the marital status of employees show significant difference on overall and specific job satisfaction?
3. Does the difference in occupational status of employees have significant impact on their satisfaction on the overall and specific aspects of the job?
4. Is there significant difference among educational subgroups of employees on overall job satisfaction?
5. Is there a significant difference among age sub groups of employees regarding overall and specific job satisfaction?
6. Does the salary differential of employees have significant difference on overall job satisfaction, and the satisfaction with specific aspects of the job?
7. Do the predictor variables (payment, promotion, and the work itself independently and jointly) contribute to a significant extent on job satisfaction?

1.3 Definition of Terms

The words and phrases defined in this section are based on different sources. The definitions taken from these sources are according to their meaning referring to their usage in the study.

A cooperative/cooperative society – is a society established by individuals on voluntary basis to collectively solve their economic and social problems and to democratically manage the same (*Cooperative Society Proclamation No. 147/1998: 943*).

Cooperative Promotion Bureau/Office – is a government organization established at different levels such as at regional, zonal, and *woreda* levels to organize and register cooperatives and to give training, conduct research, and provide other assistances to cooperatives (*Cooperative Society Proclamation No. 147/1998: 943*).

Co-worker – someone that a person works with who is neither his superior nor a subordinate (*French & Seward, 1983:108*).

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Satisfaction –Intrinsic satisfaction refers to the nature of job tasks themselves and how people feel about the work they do. Extrinsic satisfaction covers other aspects of the work situation, such as, fringe benefits and pay (*Spector, 1996:219*).

Job facet satisfaction- refers to satisfaction with specific aspects of the job which determine overall job satisfaction. The three job facet satisfactions

considered in the study are satisfaction with the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities.

Job Satisfaction – is the degree of positive attitude of an employee towards the work role that he is at present occupying (*Banki, 1981:168*).

Job Security – Any form of promise to, or belief by, a person that there is a low probability that his employment in a particular job will be ended (*French & Saward, 1983:237*).

Organization – A rational, legitimate and ideally dynamic relationship of people, formally coordinated through specification, authority, hierarchy, division of labour, communication and standard procedures, toward the accomplishment of certain goals, objectives, or some common, mutually agreed purposes (*Banki, 1981:522*).

Promotion – is generally, any advancement in one's position that results in an increase in responsibility, pay, authority or even social status (*Banki, 1981:566*).

Salary- is a fixed payment, which is paid to an employee monthly.

Support and service giving staff – are employees who are working at Oromia cooperative promotion offices. They are not directly responsible for the objectives of the organization. They give support and services for technical staff. These include personnel, administrative employees, accountants, public relation service givers, secretarial and clerical workers, etc.

Technical Staff – are employees who are directly responsible for the objectives of the organization. These include cooperative organizers cooperative

registrar, cooperative auditors, marketing and credit department employees, etc.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Employees spend a substantial part of their time in the work place. Whether or not they spend their time in a satisfying and fulfilling manner has great importance. First, being satisfied or dissatisfied with work influences how they spend their leisure time, it even affects their feeling at home. Second, employee job satisfaction is important for an organization to achieve its objectives by increasing productivity and by decreasing employee absenteeism and turnover.

Therefore, a study of job satisfaction is very essential for owners of business organizations, for different level managers, for those with the responsibilities of personnel matters, and for others. Such a study helps the concerned bodies to identify possible solutions for factors affecting employees' job satisfaction; to retain the right people, and to motivate employees contribute more to the achievement organizational goals.

1.5. Objectives of the Study

1. To examine whether the three variables (satisfaction with the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities) significantly contribute to job satisfaction of cooperative employees.

2. To investigate personal variables such as sex, marital status, age, education, salary, and occupational status of cooperative promotion office employees whether or not they have significant impact on job satisfaction.
3. To identify group of employees who are affected the most by a given determinant of job satisfaction.

1.6. Delimitation

Cooperative promotion offices face many problems such as shortage of finance, shortage of skilled manpower, employee turnover, etc. But this study is delimited to some major factors affecting employees' job satisfaction. Three of the determinants of job satisfaction considered as major factors are: satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with payment, and satisfaction with promotional opportunities.

Moreover, it is difficult to include all cooperative promotion offices that are found at zonal level and *wereda* level, hence the study is delimited to the head office and to some selected zonal – offices. Out of 12 – zonal cooperative promotion offices, 7 were selected randomly to represent all zones found in Oromia.

1.7. Limitation of the Study

Employees of woreda level cooperative promotion offices were not considered due to finance and time constraints. Therefore, it was a problem to have a complete picture of employees working at Oromia cooperative promotion offices.

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this section, first the general features of cooperatives and cooperative promotion offices are presented. The remaining part covers the concept and definition of job satisfaction, the measurements of job satisfaction, determinants of job satisfaction, consequences of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and finally some points are summarized as to what workers need from their jobs. Each of them is presented below sequentially.

2.1 The Nature of Cooperatives

There are various ways of defining cooperatives/cooperative societies. For better understanding it is convenient to take the broadest definition given by the International Labor Office. It defines cooperatives as:

An association of persons who have voluntarily joined together to achieve a common end through the formation of a democratically controlled organization, making equitable contribution to the capital required and accepting a fair share of risks and benefits of the undertaking in which the members actively participate (ILO, 1966:3).

Moreover, *Hanel (1992)* indicated the distinguishing characteristics of cooperatives as dual identity (double quality), which means that members of cooperative organizations are the co-owners as well as clients/customers (or laborers in the case of productive cooperatives).

In Ethiopia there are different types of cooperatives engaged in either production or service rendering activities or in both. Cooperatives which are established and registered in accordance with Cooperative Proclamation No. 147/1998 are the following:

- (a) Agricultural Cooperative Societies;**
- (b) Housing Cooperative Societies;**
- (c) Industrial and Artisans Producers' Cooperative Societies;**
- (d) Consumers' Cooperative Societies;**
- (e) Saving and Credit Cooperative Societies;**
- (f) Fishery Cooperative Societies;**
- (g) Mining Cooperative Societies. (Cooperative Society Proclamation No. 147/1998: 941)**

The above types of cooperatives are established by individuals to solve their common problems, to get social and economic benefits. These common objectives of individuals can be attained through cooperatives that could not be possible individually. For example, agricultural cooperatives are very important for members of the cooperatives in supplying them with agricultural inputs at a lower price or on credit, this protects producers from unnecessary expenses. These cooperatives also provide warehouse or storage services lest members should sell their products at the existing low prices. To solve their financial problems and to develop the trend of saving, members of the agricultural cooperatives themselves can establish saving and credit cooperatives.

There are different types of cooperatives depending up on the needs of their members and the characteristics of the activities accomplished. Generally, the objectives of the Ethiopian cooperatives are described below.

A cooperative that is established under proclamation No 147/1998 has one or more of the following objectives:

- 1. to solve problems collectively which members cannot individually achieve;**
- 2. to achieve a better result by coordinating their knowledge, wealth and labour;**
- 3. to promote self-reliance among members;**
- 4. to collectively protect, withstand and solve economic problems;**
- 5. to improve the living standards of members by reducing production and service costs and by providing input or service at a minimum cost or by finding a better price to their products or services;**
- 6. to expand the mechanism by which technical knowledge could be put in to practice;**
- 7. to develop and promote saving and credit services.**
- 8. To minimize and reduce the individual impact of risks and uncertainties; and**
- 9. To develop the social and economic culture of the members through education and training (*Cooperative Society Proclamation No. 147/1998: 943*)**

Cooperatives in Ethiopia are not self-sufficient in performing their activities. They need assistance from government and non-government organizations. The government assists cooperatives through cooperative promotion offices, which are established at federal, regional, zonal, and *woreda* levels. These cooperative promotion offices deal with organizing, promoting, and registering cooperatives. They also assist cooperatives by rendering auditing and accounting services, they also deal with financial institutions to get loan and allocate it among cooperatives, etc.

2.2 The Concept and Definition of Job Satisfaction

In the management literature published before 1950s, the most common word used to refer to job satisfaction was morale. This usage probably was derived from military tradition, as did much of the nomenclature of early management concepts (*Organ & Bateman, 1991*). And mistakenly the word morale was often used interchangeably with satisfaction (*French, 1990*). As indicated by Lussier (1990), morale frequently has more of a group or organizational connotation. Unlike morale, satisfaction can refer to a single employee, a group of employees or department, or an entire organization. Besides, the morale of a group could be high, but a person in a group could be dissatisfied, the opposite could also be true. Consequently, the term morale gradually fell into disuse in the scholarly literature (*Muchinsky, 1990*).

During the 1950s, the term morale no longer was used to represent job satisfaction as job attitude replaced it. The word came in to be used probably from the techniques of attitude scale construction as developed in psychology. And attitude scale was used to measure morale. Moreover, the prevailing view in the 1950s was considering job attitudes as a function of the extent to which persons' needs are satisfied by work experience. Thus, the phrases "job satisfaction" and "job attitude" have become roughly synonymous (Lussier, 1990; Muchinsky, 1990; Miner, 1992).

Even though job satisfaction is often thought to be synonymous with job attitudes, it is important to recognize that those with different theoretical orientations may use the

term somewhat differently (*Miner, 1992*). For instance, (Vroom, cited in Evans, 1969; *French, 1990; Organ & Bateman, 1991; & Spector, 1996*) consider job satisfaction as the attitude towards the job as a whole. According to them, job satisfaction is the sum total of satisfaction derived from different aspects of the job, such as supervision, pay, the work itself, promotion, the work group, etc. The attitude people have towards these aspects differed. They may have positive attitude towards some aspects of their work such as supervision, and they also may have negative attitude towards some other aspects of the job like pay. Thus, the sum total of these positive and negative attitudes constitutes job satisfaction.

Others see job satisfaction as the degree of discrepancy between what a person expects to receive from work and what that person perceives is actually *received* (*Bootzin & Bower, 1991; Miner, 1992; Lussier, 1990*) indicated that employees came to the organization with a set of desires, needs and past experiences that combine to form job expectation about work. If their expectations are met, they generally have high level of job satisfaction. If their expectations are not met, their level of job satisfaction may be low.

In yet another view, job satisfaction is considered as a purely emotional response to a job situation, as opposed to the view that takes job satisfaction as a combination of emotional, mental, and behavioral components (*Miner, 1992*). Although there are additional views, for the purpose of this study, it is desirable to maintain a broad perspective and treat job satisfaction as generally equivalent in meaning to job

attitudes. Therefore, the sum total of an employee's attitudes towards different aspects of a job is taken as his job satisfaction.

2.3 The Measurements of Job Satisfaction

The usual method of assessing job satisfaction is through a questionnaire. Sometimes, more often in practice than in research, employees are interviewed about their satisfaction on their job (Lussier, 1990). Moreover, according to Dewyer; Jex; & Glick, et al., as cited by Spector (1996), few cases can be found in which job satisfaction was assessed by asking supervisors where it has been possible to estimate another person's satisfaction by asking observers. In this study, four types of scales are used; one for measuring employees overall job satisfaction and the rest three for measuring satisfaction with specific aspects of the job.

Cook et al. (1981) categorized job satisfaction scales in to two groups: the overall job satisfaction scales and specific job satisfaction scales. The most often used types of scales from each category are included under the discussion. The researcher will try to describe about each below.

.

2.3.1 Overall Job Satisfaction Scale

To measure the overall job satisfaction of employees many types of scales are available. A number of studies have used single item measurement scales such as "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job". And the respondent is asked to indicate his level of satisfaction by choosing one among given alternatives.

On a five-point scale, for example, the alternatives may be: very satisfied, satisfied, undecided, dissatisfied, and very dissatisfied (*Mc Ghee & Tullar; Quinn, Stains & Mc Gullough; and Weaver as cited by Cook et al., 1981*).

Measuring overall job satisfaction using a single item has many problems. One problem is that in this methods job satisfaction is considered to be unitary. But, there are ample evidences that job satisfaction is not unitary. One may be satisfied or dissatisfied with the work itself, the place of work or working conditions, economic rewards, security or social prestige (*Herzberg et al., 1957; Kahn, 1960*). Some others also argued in favor of this discussion (*Wilensky; and Blaune, as cited in Kalleberg, 1974*) asking people how they feel about their job is untactful, since it expects one to provide a frank and simple answer to what may be a complex and vague concept. The other disadvantage for this, as discussed by (*Wilensky; Kahn as cited in Kalleberg, 1974*), is that in replying to a single item questionnaire, the workers form their own frame of reference. And this makes them report superficially some degree of satisfaction level.

Because of the above drawbacks, several studies have inclined to use multiple – item scales to measure overall job satisfaction. Among these type of scales, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is the second most often used type next to the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (*Muchinsky, 1990; Weiss et al., 1978; Spector, 1996*). The general feature of this scale is discussed below.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) comes in to two forms, a 100-Item long-version and a 20-Item short-version. Both versions have Items that refer to about 20 facets of job satisfaction, but the facet scores are computed only for the long form. The short form is used to assess either global job satisfaction or intrinsic or extrinsic satisfaction.

The 20-dimensions of the MSQ listed by Spector are the following:

Activity, Independence, Variety, Social Status, Supervision (Human Relations), Supervision (Technical), Moral Values, Security, Social Service, Authority, Ability Utilization, Company Policies and Practices, Compensation, Advancement, Responsibility, Creativity, Working Conditions, Coworkers, Recognition, and Achievement (1996:219)

Spector added that the MSQ had been shown to have good reliability and evidence for validity. But, several researchers have questioned how these twenty items have been classified in to intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction groups.

2.3.2 Specific Job Satisfaction Scale

The scales, which are categorized under this section, have been designed to measure employees' satisfaction on a specific feature or features of their job. Some of these scales are set out to measure only a single aspect of a job, for example, regarding payment only, social relationships, or ones trade union. Other specific measurement scales are designed to measure a number of different specific aspects of a job. That is, they contain sub scales for a range of specific features of a job. (*Cook et al., 1981*).

Among the scales used to measure satisfaction with specific aspects of a job, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) has been the most popular with researchers, it is the most often used and researched scale, it is the most thoroughly and carefully validated scale, and all JDI subscale have reliabilities of 0.80 or higher. The subscales are the work itself, payment, promotional opportunities, supervision and coworkers, (Schneider & Dshler, 1978; Landy, 1985; Muchinsky, 1990)

All items of each subscale has descriptive nature and an employee is supposed to indicate whether or not the item describes his job. The alternative responses are “yes,” “uncertain,” or “no”. The authors of this scale suggested that “uncertain” responses are more indicative of dissatisfaction than satisfaction, so “yes,” “uncertain,” and “no” responses receive weights 3, 1, and 0 respectively, and reverse score for negatively stated items (Cook et al., 1981; Muchinsky, 1990; Miner, 1992).

Many users of the scale have summed the sub scales in to an overall job satisfaction score. But, this practice is not recommended by one of the scales’ developers (*Ironson et al., as cited by Spector, 1996*). As they have suggested, the biggest limitation of the scale is that the five facets measured by it might not represent the overall job satisfaction.

However, *Balzar et al., cited in Spector (1996)*, indicated that Smith and her colleagues have updated the JDI and improved it by replacing some of its items, they also have added the sixth scale of overall job satisfaction called the Job in General Scale (JIG). This sub scale contains 18-items that are adjectives or short phrases

about the job in general. This scale has been proved to have good reliability and correlated well with other scales of overall job satisfaction. But, the scale relatively had not been used in many research studies (Landy, 1985; Spector, 1996).

2.4 Determinants of Job Satisfaction

There are great deals of job facets (variables) that determine job satisfaction. Depending upon the research goals and types of scale used, the number and types of variables considered to determine job satisfaction is various. If, for example, we take the two most often used types of scale, twenty factors are considered for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), but five factors for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Miner, 1992).

The degree of importance derived for job facet satisfaction in determining overall job satisfaction varies among studies. But, as several research findings indicate the three relatively most important determinants of job satisfaction are found to be satisfaction with the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities. Their rank is not of course consistent (*Sauser & York; Downey; Sheridan & Solocum; Seybold & Gruenfeld* as all cited in *Cook et al., 1981*). In this study also these three determinants of job satisfaction are considered and each of them discussed below.

2.4.1 Satisfaction with the Work Itself

Whether a person enjoys performing the work itself has a major effect on overall job satisfaction. People who view their jobs as boring, dull, or unchallenging tend to have

low levels of job satisfaction (*Lussier, 1990*). Supporting this Lock, as cited by *Muchinsky (1990)*, generalized the following: Tiresome work is dissatisfying, personally interesting work is satisfying, and mentally challenging work that the individual can successfully accomplish is satisfying.

Three of the most important aspects of the work itself, as considered by Feldman & Arnold (1983) as sources of job satisfaction were: workers who were permitted to decide how that job should be done found to be more satisfied than who were not given such chances. Workers who had chances to use valued skills and abilities were found to be more satisfied than others who didn't have such chances. And an employee who works on a "whole" piece of work or if his personal contribution to the whole is clear and visible, was found to be more satisfied.

Other studies emphasized that besides the work situation, personality of the individual contributes for job satisfaction. For example, Miner (1992) pointed out that some people continue to seek out situations where they will be satisfied, while others are drawn toward situations where they will not. Despite this difference, forces internal to the individual and external forces do operate to determine job satisfaction. Moreover, Spector (1996) stated that job satisfaction is partly caused by underlying personality of the individual. Some people are predisposed to like their jobs, whereas others are predisposed not to like their jobs.

2.4.2. Satisfaction with Payment

The importance of how payment determines job satisfaction varies among different studies. For example, Lawer & Porter, as cited in *Feldman & Arnold (1983)*, indicated that amount of payment in the form of wages and salaries was found to be very positively related to job satisfaction. Moreover, Dyer & Theriault (1976) revealed that keeping other things equal, level of payment correlate well with payment and job satisfaction.

Other researchers discuss the relationship between payment and job satisfaction in somewhat different ways. Organ & Bateman (1991) suggested that the most satisfied groups typically earn higher salaries than do other occupational groups. But, they noted that money is not the only source, or even the most important source of job satisfaction. Extending their explanation, they pointed out that insufficient pay or the perception of inequitable pay is a more decisive determinant of job dissatisfaction than sufficient or fair pay to determine job satisfaction. Moreover, *Deci & Rayon* as cited in *Devoretzky (1994)* stated that increasing a person's salary and reward doesn't always increase job satisfaction.

Even though research findings vary how strong the relationship between payment and job satisfaction is, they support the idea that payment is one key determinant of job satisfaction. First, money is a means of satisfying several important needs of individuals such as food, shelter, clothing, and to pursue value - leisure interests outside of work. Secondly, pay serves as a symbol of achievement and as a source of

recognition. Employees often see pay as a reflection of management's concern for them (*Feldman & Arnold, 1983*). Supporting this idea, *Lussier (1990)*, *Organ & Bateman (1991)*, and *Spector (1996)* indicated that money has a rich and complex symbolic meaning to most people.

2.4.3. Satisfaction with Promotional Opportunities

There is substantial evidence that promotional opportunities do affect job satisfaction. Employees' desire for promotion is strong for different reasons. Lock, as cited by *Feldman & Arnold (1983)*, stated that the roots of desire for promotion include the desire for higher earnings, the desire for social status, the desire for psychological growth (made possible by greater responsibility), and the desire for justice (if one feels he or she has earned the promotion). As stated by *Lussier (1990)*, most of the employees working in a given organization want to be promoted to higher level jobs, if there is no room for growth and promotion, these employees may not be satisfied by their work.

Whether an employee is directly concerned with his promotion or not, he shows interest in what is happening in his organization as far as promotion is concerned. Regarding this, *Murthy (1996)* noted that promotion made on favoritism, political and other pressure, makes employees to distrust the organization and to be dissatisfied. On the contrary, an open promotion policy removes much doubt and misconception from the minds of employees. Moreover, a sound and fair promotion policy is a

powerful management tool not only to keep the existing employees happy but also to attract new employees.

2.5. Demographic Variables Associated with Job Satisfaction

Several studies dealt with the relationship between job satisfaction and such personal variables as age, sex, and marital status. The results of these studies were not in agreement. That is, in one study a given group were found to be more satisfied than another, but another study found the reverse to be true (*Spector, 1996*). In this section the relationship between job satisfaction and some of the personal variables such as age, gender, marital status, age, occupational status, salary level, and educational level will be discussed one by one.

2.5.1. Age

The results of some studies for example, (Gibson & Klein; Hoppck; as cited by Glenn, Tayler & Weaver, 1977; *Hulin & Smith; Gibson & Klein*, as cited by *Muchinsky, 1990*) suggested that overall job satisfaction increases with age, especially for males. Thus, according to them, the most dissatisfied workers are the youngest and the most satisfied are those nearing retirement. Spector (1996) also indicated that many studies show that older workers are more satisfied than younger workers.

The consistent trend in job attitude, in accordance with age and length of service, was described by Herzberg as cited by Bateman & Organ (1991). According to Herzberg, when people begin work (typically in their late teens or their early 20s), they appear to

perform with considerable enthusiasm. This enthusiasm soon fades out, giving way to steady decline in job attitude, and reaches its lowest depths in the late 20s or early 30s. Job attitude then becomes increasingly positive in correlating with age at least well into 50s. Herzberg also noted that the trend after this age was not certain, because some studies had proposed that the level of job satisfaction continues to climb or at least holds steady; some other studies had revealed that job satisfaction declines after age 50. In any case, the point seems well established that workers under age 30 are less satisfied than those of over age 30. On the contrary, *Santröck (1986)* concluded that job satisfaction increases throughout out life- at least until the age of 60. This is both for college educated and non-college-educated adults, and for both women and men.

Several possible reasons can be suggested as to why job satisfaction increases with age. According to Muchinsky (1990), younger dissatisfied workers eventually quit their job to find one that will satisfy them, and those who like their jobs stay longer hence the relationship between age and job satisfaction.

Some other researchers forward different explanation for how growing older promotes job satisfaction. For example, Miner (1992) stated that through time individuals become more realistic about what they can expect from a job, and this maturation brings about greatest satisfaction. Relating to this, *Organ & Batman (1991)* described people's expectation when they come to their first job. They anticipate life to be better in every respect - more freedom, continually improving financial positions, be involved in interesting activities, etc. In case when these expectations contradict to reality,

those individuals will spend much of their 20s adjusting their expectation to the reality. After some point, expectations are modified and become reasonable and the attitude toward the job will be more positive.

Still others explain that as workers get older, they get more advantage from their job (*Spector, 1996*). In this regard Santrock (1986) pointed out that as we get older, we move to higher status, perform more challenging tasks, get paid more, and have more job security. As a result we become more committed to a job, we take our jobs more seriously, have lower rate of absenteeism, and are more involved in our works, and we became more satisfied in our job.

Unlike the relation between overall job satisfaction and age the relationship between age and satisfaction with the specific aspects of the job is not uniform. A study conducted by *Hunt and Saul, as cited by Muchinsky (1990)*, indicated that satisfaction with the work itself, supervision, working conditions, and co-workers increase with age for males. But, the only significant relationship for females was for satisfaction with the work itself. Satisfaction with promotional opportunities was found to be negatively related to age for both sexes. Moreover, no relationship was found between age and pay satisfaction for males while a negative relationship was found for females.

The findings of later studies were different from the above discussion. For example, *Rhoder, as cited in Muchinsky (1990)*, reviewed many studies conducted on age and job satisfaction. And he found that the only facet showing a consistent positive relationship with age was satisfaction with the work itself; that is, older workers like

what they do more than younger workers. But, the relationship between age and the other job facets seems to be much more variable across studies.

2.5.2. Gender

Research findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and gender is inconsistent. In some studies males are found to be more satisfied than females; in another study the opposite was found to be true and still other studies report no gender difference (*Muchinsky, 1990*).

Published studies up until the mid – 1950s showed no clear-cut differences between males and females regarding job satisfaction (*Organ & Bateman, 1991*). On the contrary, Sheppard & Herrick's findings, as cited by *Organ & Bateman (1991)*, showed females to be less satisfied than males, the difference reaching its maximum extent among them under 30. They extend their explanation as: women, especially younger ones, are more sensitive than women workers of preceding generations about working under conditions inferior to those of males with the same qualifications as their own.

However, *Spector (1996)* stated that most studies that have compared men and women in their overall job satisfaction have found few or no differences. For example, (*Brush, et. al.; Witt & Nye; Greenhaus, Parasuraman & Wormley, as cited in Devoretzky, 1994*) found no significant gender differences in their studies. Substantiating this view, (*Hulin & Smith; Sauser & York, as cited by Landy (1985)*), and *Muchinsky, 1990*) pointed out that gender differences in job satisfaction is due to

differences in education, pay, tenure, etc. And that males and females are found to be equally satisfied in their jobs when these factors are controlled for. A local research made by Kassahun (1996) and Kumsa (2001) indicated that there was no statistically significant gender difference on job satisfaction. But, a study made by Bansa (1996) indicated that Female teachers were found to be more satisfied by their job than their male counterparts.

The other point worth mentioning is the role conflict faced by females. Females, especially married ones, exposed for dual responsibilities, responsibility at the work place and in the home. This has an adverse effect on their job satisfaction. Muchinsky discussed how these roles conflict influence their job satisfaction.

To reduce role conflict, some women have to take jobs that do not fully use their skills and abilities. They may also be forced to put less importance on work than do males, given the demands of their personal lives. Therefore, for at least some parts of the female labour force, feelings of satisfaction and importance of work must be weighted against responsibilities in other aspects of their lives. Most males, on the other hand, do not experience such conflicting role pressure (Muchinsky, 1990:321)

2.5.3. Marital Status

The relationship between marital status and job satisfaction is not clearly stated, because of the conclusion made by different studies were not uniform. For example, a study made by King et al. (1982) indicated that married employees were found to have greater job satisfaction than the unmarried one's. On the contrary, other studies such as Agarwal cited in Saiyda (1985), and Landy (1985) revealed that there was no significant difference between married and unmarried employees.

2.5.4. Occupational Status

Regarding the relationship between occupational status and job satisfaction, the literature is in substantial agreement. That is, as occupational status increases, so does job satisfaction (*Kalleberg, 1974*). In their comparative study of workers of higher and lower occupational levels, Organ & Bateman (1991) and Miner (1992) reported that managers and professionals to be more satisfied than other occupational groups. They further explained that the work of higher-level employees (such as managers and professionals) is more varied and stimulating. The work offers them challenge, gives them the chance to use valued skills and knowledge, and gives them opportunity for continual self-development and growth and as a result it gives them room for satisfaction.

2.5.5. Educational Attainment

The relationship between a worker's educational attainment and his overall job satisfaction is not clear. For example, Herzberg et al., as cited by Kalleberg (1974), conducted 13 studies regarding the relationship between these two variables. The results of the studies were varied. In three of them, they found a positive relationship; in five of them, a negative relationship; and in three of them no relationship at all between job satisfaction and educational attainment. As a result they concluded that there is no difference in attitude towards a job as a result of difference in educational level.

On the other hand *Bau & Duncan; Hauser, Sewell, & Lutterman, as cited by Kalleberg (1974)* pointed out that educational attainment serves as a means of getting one's occupational status and the income one receives. Therefore, it is a cause of one's job satisfaction.

Yet, several other studies such as *Brue, Bonjean, & Williams; Volmer & Kinney; as cited by Glenn, Tayler, & Weaver (1977)* pointed out that educational level is negatively related to job satisfaction. This is because education probably tends to raise expectations. Moreover, *Klyin & Masher, as cited by Berkowitz et al. (1987)*, stated that educational level is negatively correlated with pay satisfaction.

2.6. Consequences of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

There are a number of organizationally relevant behaviors, which are thought to be the results of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. But, the three behaviors that have been prominent in the literature are: job performance, employee turnover, and employee absence (*Spector, 1996*). Each of them will be discussed below.

2.6.1 Job Satisfaction and Job Performance

The satisfaction-performance relationship is not very strong and certainly not consistent across different samples of jobs (*Muchinsky, 1990*). *Organ & Bateman (1990)* indicated that when average work situation were considered, the relationship of job satisfaction to performance would be positively correlated. However, the relationship is not very strong, and there are numerous exceptions to the relationship.

For example, some people are very satisfied with their jobs, yet are low performance, some others are dissatisfied with their jobs but are high performance. Nevertheless, the overall positive association between job satisfaction and performance is expected to exist.

Although it is clear that performance and job satisfaction are related, there are two opposite explanation. First, satisfaction might lead to performance. That is, people who like their jobs work harder and therefore perform better. Second, performance might lead to satisfaction. People who perform well are likely to be benefited from that performance, and those benefits could enhance satisfaction (*Spector, 1996*).

It is not clear whether performance causes job satisfaction or job satisfaction causes performance (*Organ & Bateman, 1990*). Supporting this (*Petty, Mc Gee, & Cavender, as cited by Bootzin, 1991*) concluded that the relationship between job satisfaction and performance to be cyclic, but the cycle probably begins with performance. Once the individual worker perceives that they are doing a good job, they become more satisfied, and their satisfaction may further enhance their performance.

Two possible models were illustrated by *Spector (1996)* as to how job performance relates to job satisfaction. In the first model, job satisfaction leads to increase effort on the job, which leads to job performance. In the second model, job performance leads to rewards, then it leads to job satisfaction. There are several studies that support either proposal but most evidence favors the second model (*Muchinsky 1990, Bootzin et al., 1991, Spector, 1996*).

Yet, Miner (1992) noted that when performance and satisfaction are positively related, it is often difficult to discern whether job satisfaction causes better performance or performance causes job satisfaction. In this regard, Miner stated:

People may feel happy because they are doing well at work or unhappy because they are performing poorly. Conversely, satisfied employees who are free of stress may therefore be more productive, and certainly dissatisfied workers may take their displeasure out on the company and produce less. The arrow can point in either direction, or both at the same time (that is, satisfaction causes good performance and the latter in turn adds to the feelings of satisfaction (Miner, 1992:121).

2.6.2 Employee Turnover and Job Satisfaction

From several studies it has been observed that the more people dislike their jobs, the more likely they opt to quit the job (Muchinsky, 1990). A study done by Hulin, as cited by *Organ & Bateman (1990)*, indicated that the mean job satisfaction score for those who eventually did quit the job was significantly lower than for those who stayed in the organization.

Even though the relationship between employee turnover and job satisfaction is fairly substantial, the relationship is not direct. That is, people do not quit their job simply because they are dissatisfied. There are many factors, which intervene between satisfaction and turnover (Porter & Steers, cited by Mobley, 1977). For example, economic condition is one among these factors, mild dissatisfaction may lead to turnover when jobs are plentiful; feeling of strong dissatisfaction may be endured if the only other option is unemployment (*Muchinsky, 1990*).

As indicated by (Crampton & Wayner; Hulin, Roznowski, & Haychiya), cited by Spector (1996), most studies on the relationship between employees turnover and job satisfaction explained that the two variables are positively related. The researchers first assessed job satisfaction in a sample of employees and then waiting for some periods of time to see who quit the job. The results of these studies led them to conclude that dissatisfaction is a factor that leads employees to quit their jobs.

2.6.3 Job Satisfaction and Absenteeism

Over the years it had been stated that employees with low job satisfaction are absent more often than employees with high job satisfaction (Kalleberg, 1974). Many studies support this conclusion, but not strongly. All that can be said with certainty is that job satisfaction tends to be associated with less absenteeism, especially when employees have some control over absences, that is, when they are not really sick or injured (*Organ & Bateman, 1991; Miner, 1992*).

Kochler & Mathieu, as cited by Spector (1996), put the reason why the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism is very low. There are several possible reasons for being absent from work; it includes employee's illness, family member illness (especially children), personal business, fatigue, as well as just not feeling like going to work. Whereas some of these reasons might be associated with job satisfaction, others probably are not. Thus, overall absence is not likely to have strong relationship with job satisfaction. If reasons for absence are considered, however, the

correlation between job satisfaction and absenteeism might be stronger (*Kohler & Mathiew as cited by Spector 1996*).

2.6.4. Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction

Three hypotheses have been put forth about how job and life satisfaction are related. The three hypotheses lead to contradictory predictions about the correlation between job and life satisfaction.

The first explanation is given as spill over. The spill over hypothesis suggests that satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) in one area of life will spill over into the other area (*Muchinsky, 1990*). Thus, problems and dissatisfactions at home can affect satisfaction with work, where as problems and dissatisfactions at work can affect satisfaction with home. Spill over predicts a positive correlation between job and life satisfaction (*Spector, 1996*).

The second explanation is given by compensation hypothesis. It states that high satisfaction in one domain (work) may compensate for less satisfaction in the other (non-work) (*Muchinsky, 1990*). Thus, a person with a dissatisfying job will seek satisfaction in other aspects of life. And a person with dissatisfying home life might seek satisfaction at work. This hypothesis predicts that life and job satisfaction are negatively related (*Spector, 1996*).

The third explanation is given by the segmentation hypothesis. This theory postulates that social experiences in life are segments or are kept separately by individuals, that is, the world of work and leisure are essentially psychologically separate. Thus, the amount of satisfaction a person feels with these two areas need not be related at all (*Muchinsky, 1990; Spector, 1996*). Segmentation predicts no correlation because people keep satisfaction with different areas of life differently.

As stated by *Spector (1996)*, studies have consistently reported a positive relationship between job and life satisfaction. Therefore, the spill over hypothesis is the only one supported by studies. *Judge & Watanabe* as cited by *Spector (1996)*, based on their longitudinal study over a 5-year span suggested that job satisfaction and life satisfaction affect one another. That is satisfaction or dissatisfaction in one will affect the other.

Several studies (*Dunnette; Kornhauser; Sris & Barrett; Mansfield; and London, Crandall, & Seals; as cited in Orpen, 1978*) reported positive correlation between measures of job satisfaction and life satisfaction, which they regarded as supporting a “spill over” rather than a “compensatory” relation between job attitudes and attitudes toward life away from work. A research by Orpen in (1978) entitled “work and no work satisfaction: a casual correlation analysis,” suggested that satisfaction with the work has a stronger effect on employees satisfaction with leisure-time activities than the effect of leisure-time satisfaction has on satisfaction with work.

The positive relationships found between work and leisure-time satisfaction are consistent with the spill over hypothesis, that the two variables affect each other in the same direction, and not with the compensatory hypothesis, in terms of which individuals offset feelings of job dissatisfaction by finding more fulfillment in aspects of life outside their jobs (*Orpen, 1978*).

2.6 What do People Seek in Their Jobs?

Human beings have many needs, all of which are continually competing. What workers need from their job varies among individuals. Some workers get satisfaction mainly by achievement, some others are concerned primarily with security, and still some others may give due consideration to financial benefits, and so on. Although there are individual differences, the concerned body such as managers and employers should know which motives are the most important for their employees (*Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson, 1998*).

There is no consensus as to the precise list of factors and their relative importance that are responsible for workers' or employees' job satisfaction. However, it is possible to summarize the most important factors listed in many research studies (such as *Rashid & Archer; Wood & Wood; Bootzin et al.*, as cited by *Coon, 1994*). According to them, the following are some of the most important things that workers need from their jobs.

Job security, social contacts with others, recognition for a job well done, relative freedom from close supervision, to be given the chance to apply their skills, bright future for promotion and advancement, good work groups, reasonably fair pay, good working conditions, etc.

In this study three variables were considered as a major factor in determining employee job satisfaction. These factors were the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities. Therefore, the above studies help to compare the results of this study with them, and to conclude whether the findings of this study support the findings of the previous studies or not.

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODS OF THE STUDY

This part describes the subjects of the study, instruments used, the variables considered, procedure followed, and methods of data analysis.

3.1 Subjects

The subjects of this study were employees who are working at Oromia head and zonal cooperative promotion offices. The total number of employees working at the head office and 12 zonal offices is 392. Out of this 280 (71%) are males and 112 (29%) are females. Moreover, considering the two broad occupational grouping, there are 169 (43.1%) technical staff and 223 (56.9%) service or support giving staff.

Out of the total population, 213 (54.34%) employees included for the study. The proportion of male respondents is 153 (70%) and female respondent is 60 (30%). This figure also represents 76 (35.7%) technical staff and 137 (64.3%) service and support giving staff. To decide on the sample size, the formula given by Krejcie & Morgan (1970) was referred. According to them, for a population of 392 a sample size of 167 is enough to represent the population. After deciding up on the number of employees to have been drawn for the study, seven zonal cooperative promotion offices were randomly selected. They were western Shoa (Ambo), Eastern Wellega (Nekemt), Western Wellega (Ghimbi), Eastern Shoa (Nazareth), Arsi-Zone (Assela), Bale-Zone

(Robe), and Northern Shoa zone (Fiche). It was intended to take all employees found at the head and the selected zonal – offices to represent the population. Since their number was manageable, questionnaires were intended to be distributed for all employees working at the indicated places. The general background information of the respondents is given below.

Table 1. Background Information of the Respondents

No	Variable	Subgroup	Number	Percent
1	Sex	Males	153	71.83%
		Female	60	28.17
		Total	213	100
2	Marital Status	Married	158	74.18
		Unmarried	55	25.82
		Total	213	1005
3	Age	18 – 24 years old	23	10.80%
		25 – 34 “ “	85	39.91%
		35 – 44 “ “	68	31.92%
		45 – 55 “ “	37	17.37%
		Total	213	100
4	Education	Below grade 12	15	7.04%
		Grade 12 complete	78	36.62%
		Technical & Vocational education	16	7.51%
		Some College	25	11.74%
		Diploma graduate	39	18.31%
		1 st degree & above	40	18.78%
		Total	213	100%
5	Occupational status/group	Technical Staff	76	35.68
		Service or Support giving staff	137	64.32
		Total	213	100%

3.2. Instruments

Four types of scales were used to collect data for the study. One was used to measure overall job satisfaction of employees, and the remaining three were used to measure satisfaction with specific aspects of a job (satisfaction with the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities).

The questionnaire used to measure overall job satisfaction were taken from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1967; cited by Cook et al., 1981) but they were modified and reconstructed to make them suitable for the study. Originally, the MSQ has 20 – items and each item has five alternative responses as “strongly agree,” “agree,” “undecided,” “disagree,” and “strongly disagree” and the value of the score is 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. In light of the facts stated above, each of the 20-items stated negatively and positively. Hence, the scale was made to have a total of 40 – items so that it could be tested in the pilot study.

The instruments used to measure satisfaction with the specific aspects of a job (the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities) were mostly derived from the Job Description Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, cited in Cook et al., 1981) and from other sources (Cross; Hackman & Oldham; Quinn & Stains, cited in Cook et al., 1981) The numbers of items presented for the pilot study were 24, 16, and 16, respectively for measurements of satisfaction with the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities. The alternative responses of each item of the three scales were “Yes,”

“undecided,” and “No” scored as 3, 1, and 0 respectively, the scoring is reversed for negatively stated items.

The reliability of the four types of questionnaire was computed by means of the split-half methods. That is, the odd numbered and even-numbered items were correlated to give us reliability of the half-length scale. To obtain an estimate value of the reliability of a full – length scale, the research used the Spearman Brown’s formula (Gronlund, 1976; Ebel, 1979). Based on that, the reliability of each scale was found to be 0.90, 0.88, 0.86, and 0.89 respectively for overall job satisfaction scale, satisfaction with the work itself scale, payment satisfaction scale, and satisfaction with promotional opportunities scale.

Moreover, to select good items for the main study, item discrimination index was computed for each item of the four scales. To calculate the discrimination power of an item, the questionnaires were arranged by means of the total scores on a given scale. The arrangement was done from the lowest to the highest score. Then, the weighted means of the top 25% of the respondents and the weighted mean of the bottom 25% respondents were compared for each item. And the difference of these weighted means of the top and the bottom groups gives us the discriminative power of an item (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1987). The discriminative Indices of all items were computed for all scales; and those items with the smallest discrimination power were discarded and others were reconstructed, and items with larger discrimination index were taken as they were. Consequently, the numbers of items selected for the main study were 20, 19, 12 and 12 respectively for overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with the work

itself, payment, and promotional opportunities. For all scales about half-of the total number of items were negatively stated.

3.3. Procedure of Data Collection

First, a questionnaire was developed which had about 96 items, 40 – items for overall job satisfaction, 24 – items for satisfaction with the work itself, 16 – items for payment satisfaction scale, and 16 – items for a scale of satisfaction with promotional opportunities. Then, it was translated into Amharic to minimize misunderstanding that might have occurred. The translation was made helped by two English language instructors. One was given the English version to translate into Amharic. The other one was given the Amharic version for backward translation from Amharic into English. Examining the translation made by those two individuals, the researcher reconstructed items those failed to provide common understanding. Then, the questionnaires were tested in the pilot study.

The respondents of the pilot study were employees of Region 14 cooperative promotion Bureau. 50 questionnaires were distributed for randomly selected employees. Out of this 40 were correctly filled in and returned. Based on forty questionnaires, reliability and item discrimination power were computed by the method mentioned above. Finally 63 items were selected for the main study 20, 19, 12, and 12 respectively for overall job satisfaction, the work itself, payment and promotion.

Employees were oriented how to fill in the questionnaire, how important their honest response is, and the secret of their response being kept. And assistant researchers were assigned to collect the filled in questionnaires for counting and scoring the responses. Then analysis of data was followed.

3.4. Variables Included in the Study

In this study the following dependent and independent variables were included.

1. **Dependent variable:** The dependent variable in the study was the overall job satisfaction.
2. **Independent variables:** The independent variables considered in this study can be categorized in to two: variables that are used to measure satisfaction with specific aspects of the job (job facet satisfaction scale), and the personal variables associated with job satisfaction.
 - I. Job facet satisfaction scales were:
 - a) Satisfaction with the work itself
 - b) Payment satisfaction scale
 - c) Satisfaction with Promotional opportunity
 - II. Personal variables (Demographic variables)
 - a) **Sex:** It represented male and female employees and were coded as “0” for males, and “1” for females.
 - b) **Marital status:** Married employees were coded as “0” and unmarried ones as “1”
- c) **Age:** Employees were categorized under four age sub groups:

- i. Age 18 up to 24, coded as “0”
 - ii. Age 25 up to 34, coded as “1”
 - iii. Age 35 up to 44, coded as “2”
 - iv. Age 45 up to 55, coded as “3”
- D. Educational level: in this case employees were categorized under 6 sub groups.
- i. Below grade 12 coded as “0”
 - ii. Grade 12 complete coded as “1”
 - iii. Technical and vocational education coded as “2”
 - iv. Some college coded as “3”
 - v. First degree and above coded as “4”
- E. **Occupational Status:** Based on two broad occupational category of Oromia cooperative promotion offices employees were categorized under two sub groups.
- i. Technical Staff - were coded as “0”
 - ii. Service and support giving staff – were coded as “1”
- F. Another way of occupational sub grouping was made as follows:
- i. Managerial workers, coded as "0"
 - ii. Experts, coded as "1"
 - iii. Accountants & auditors, coded as "2"
 - iv. Secretarial workers, coded as "3"
 - v. Others, coded as "4"

G. **Salary of the employees:** The monthly salaries of the employees were considered as they were without classifying them into sub groups.

3.5. Methods of Data Analysis

Comparison of means was applied to examine whether there was gender difference, marital status difference, and occupational group difference among employees with respect to overall or specific aspects of job satisfaction. The comparison was made by taking the mean scores of overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities of each sub groupings. And the t-test was used to detect as to whether there was statistically significant difference between males and females, between married and unmarried, between technical staff; and service or support giving staff regarding overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities.

The monthly salaries of the employees were also compared with overall job satisfaction whether the two variables had relationship. To do that employees' salary were put in ascending order. Then, taking the median salary as a cutting point, employees were categorized under two groups ('high salary group' and 'low salary group'). The mean salary of the two sub groups were taken and compared with their respective mean scores of the overall job satisfaction. And, the t- test was used to detect whether there was or not statistically significant difference between the two groups of employees with respect to overall job satisfaction.

To investigate the existence of age group differences and educational level group differences regarding job satisfaction, the Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed. And F-test was applied for checking whether there was or not a significance difference among age sub groups and educational sub groups of employees.

Multiple Regression Analysis (MRA) was computed to examine the independent and the combined effects of the three independent variables (satisfaction with the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities) on the variance of the predicted variable (overall job satisfaction). The coefficient of multiple determination between the three independent variables ($R^2_{y.123}$) was computed to investigate how much of the variability of job satisfaction was explained by the three independent variables. Moreover, from a linear multiple regression equation, the standardized regression coefficient (beta weight) was determined to compare the effect of each independent variable had on the variability of overall job satisfaction.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESULTS

In this section the results of the main study are presented by tracing the basic questions, which were posed under chapter one.

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 2: The Means, Standard Deviations and the Ranges of Scores of the Four Scales.

Variables	Statistics			
	Mean	SD	Ranges of Scores	
			Min.	Max.
Overall job satisfaction	71.79	11.10	29	98
Satisfaction with payment	12.53	7.09	0	33
Satisfaction with Promotional oppot.	21.80	8.00	2	37
Satisfaction with the work itself	36.92	13.60	6	57

4.2. Gender Difference on Overall Job Satisfaction, Satisfaction with the Work itself, Payment, and Promotional Opportunities

Table 3: Means and Standard Deviations for Male and Female Employees on Overall job Satisfaction, Satisfaction with the Work itself, Payment, and Promotional Opportunities.

Variables	Males (N=153)		Females (N=60)		t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Overall job satisfaction	72.16	10.71	70.83	12.07	0.786	0.433
The work itself	38.44	13.24	33.03	13.84	2.649	0.009
Payment	12.58	7.26	12.40	6.71	0.168	0.867
Promotional opportunities	22.02	7.83	21.25	8.46	0.630	0.529

As Table 3 indicates, there were no significant differences between male and female respondents with respect to overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with payment, and promotional opportunities at [$t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 0.786, P > 0.433$; $t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 0.168, P > 0.867$; and $t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 0.630, P > 0.529$ respectively]. However, there was statistically significant difference between male and female employees regarding satisfaction with the work itself at [$t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 2.649$ and $P < 0.009$]. That is, males were found to be more satisfied than females by the work they were assigned to do.

4.3. Marital Status Difference on Overall Job Satisfaction, Satisfaction with the Work itself, Payment, and Promotional Opportunities

Table 4: Means and Standard Deviations of Married and Unmarried Employees on Overall Job Satisfaction, Satisfaction with the Work itself, Payment and Promotional Opportunities

Variables	Married Employees (N = 158)		Unmarried Employees (N = 55)		t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Overall job satisfaction	72.02	10.89	71.13	11.74	0.512	0.609
The work itself	38.65	12.71	31.95	14.91	3.219	0.001
Payment	12.68	7.35	12.11	6.33	0.511	0.610
Promotional opportunities	21.43	8.32	22.87	6.97	-1.152	0.251

As Table 4 depicts, there was no statistically significant difference between married and unmarried employees with regard to overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with payment and satisfaction with promotional opportunities at $t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 0.512$, $P > 0.609$;

$t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 0.511$, $P > 0.610$; and $[t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = -1.152$, $P > 0.251$ respectively]. Whereas married employees were found to be more satisfied than the unmarried ones.

4.4. Occupational Status or Group Difference on Overall Job Satisfaction, Satisfaction with the Work itself, Payment, and Promotional Opportunities

Table 5: Means and Standard Deviations of Technical Staff and Service and Support Giving Staff on Overall Job Satisfaction, Satisfaction with the Work itself, Payment and Promotional Opportunities.

Variables	Technical Staff (N = (76))		Service and Support giving staff (N = 137)		t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Overall job satisfaction	70.79	12.25	72.34	10.41	-0.979	0.329
The work itself	37.14	13.93	36.80	13.46	0.179	0.858
Payment	13.42	7.91	12.04	6.53	1.367	0.173
Promotional opportunities	22.87	7.57	21.21	8.20	1.451	0.148

Table 5 shows that there was no statistically significant difference between technical staff, and service or support giving staff regarding overall job satisfaction, satisfaction

with the work itself, payment and promotional opportunities at [$t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = -0.979$; $P > 0.329$; [$t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 0.179$, $P > 0.858$; [$t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 1.367$, $P > 0.173$; and [$t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 1.451$, $P > 0.148$ respectively).

Table 6. ANOVA Summary for Five Occupational Subgroups

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between groups	628.489	4	157.122	1.283	0.278
Within groups	25475.004	208	122.478		
Total	26103.493	212			

Table 6 indicates that there was no significant difference at ($F_{4,208} = 1.283$, $p > 0.2781$) among five occupational groups (managerial workers, experts, accountants & auditors, secretarial workers, and others) on overall job satisfaction.

4.5. Comparison of Means on Monthly Salary of Employees with Overall Job Satisfaction

Table 7: Means and Standard Deviations for ‘High-Salary’ Group and ‘Low Salary Group, of Employees Taking the Median Salary Birr 600.

Variables	*High Salary group n = 106		*Low salary group n = 106		t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Overall job satisfaction	72.58	11.21	70.95	11.02	-1.069	0.286

Note

- High salary group refers to monthly salary 600 up to 1810 Birr.
- Low – salary group refers to monthly salary 105 Birr up to 600 Birr.
- The median salary is Birr 600, only two out of 20 employees whose monthly salary of Birr 600 were included under high salary group. The remaining were considered in the low salary group.

As indicated in Table 7, there was no significant difference between high and low salary group of employees on overall job satisfaction at $t = -1.069$, $p > 0.286$.

4.6. Employees Age Group Differences on Overall Job Satisfaction

Table 8: Means and Standard Deviations of Overall Job Satisfaction Scores for Different Age Groups of Employees

Variables (Age sub groups)	Number	Mean	SD	Range	
				Min.	Max.
18 – 24 years old	23	66.43	13.45	39	85
25 – 34 years old	85	72.07	10.64	29	91
35 – 44 years old	68	72.63	10.88	32	90
45 – 55 years old	37	72.92	10.45	44	98

Table 9. ANOVA Summary for Four Age Subgroups Of Employees

Source of variation	SS	df	MS	F	P
Between groups	761.699	3	253.900	2.094	0.102
Within groups	25341.794	209	121.253		
Total	26103.493	212			

Taking the mean scores of overall job satisfaction of these four age sub groups, one way Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed. The above ANOVA summary

Table indicated that there was no significant difference among the four age sub groups of employees at ($F_{(3,209)} = 2.094, P > 0.102$).

4.7. Difference in Educational Level on Overall Job Satisfaction

Table 10: The Means and Standard Deviations of overall Job Satisfaction scores among six Educational Subgroups

Variable (Educational level)	Number	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Below grade 12	15	69.60	6.13	62	82
Grade 12 complete	78	72.91	10.42	39	90
Technical & Vocational education	16	71.63	11.87	36	88
Some college	25	70.40	14.95	29	98
Diploma Graduate	39	71.92	11.53	32	91
First Degree & above	40	71.22	10.69	47	90

The mean scores of overall job satisfaction of the six educational subgroups of employees were taken to examine variations with overall job satisfaction. The summary of ANOVA was presented in Table 11, for comparing educational level with overall job satisfaction.

Table 11: ANOVA Summary for Six Educational Sub Groups of Employees

Source of variation	Sum of squares	df	MS	F	p
Between groups	232.027	5	46.405	0.371	0.868
Within groups	25871.466	207	124.983		
Total	26,103.493	212			

Table 9 shows that there was no statistically significant difference ($F_{(5,207)} = 0.371$, $P > 0.868$) among the six educational subgroups of employees with respect to overall job satisfaction. This also implies that there was no significant difference between any pair of educational subgroups on overall job satisfaction.

4.8. The Combined and Independent Contributions of Satisfaction with the Work itself, Payment, and Promotional Opportunities for Overall Job Satisfaction

To investigate the proportion of variance accounted for by the three independent variables taken together, the Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed. Accordingly a summary of regression of overall job satisfaction on the three independent variables is given in Table 12.

Table 12: The Proportion of Variance of Job Satisfaction Accounted for by the Three Independent Variables

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	p	$R^2_{y.123}$
Regression	7910.047	3	2636.682	30.289	.000	0.303
Residual	18193.446	209	87.050			
Total	26,103.493	212				

As indicated in Table 10, when overall job satisfaction was regressed on the three independent variables (the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities), they contribute to statistically significant level ($F_{(3,209)} = 30.289$, $P < 0.000$). And the coefficient of determination ($R^2_{y.123}$) was found to be 0.303. That is 30.3% of the variation of overall job satisfaction was accounted for by the three independent variables.

Furthermore, the net effect of each independent variables were computed and compared to denote their relative importance for variation of overall job satisfaction. The standardized equivalent of the b coefficient (beta weight) or β also computed to make the measurements of the three scales be comparable as they were measured on a different scales in different units.

Table 13: The Relative Contribution of Satisfaction with the Work itself, Payments, and Promotional Opportunities

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized coefficient (β)	t-value	p-value
	B	SE			
(Constant)	51.322	-	-	-	-
Payment	-0.005372	.099	-.003	0.067	.955
Promotion	0.307	.088	.304	4.839	.000
Work itself	0.422	.052	.376	6.191	.000

$$\hat{Y} = 51.322 - 0.003 x_1 + 0.304 x_2 + 0.376 x_3$$

Where: X_1 = Satisfaction with payment

X_2 = Satisfaction with promotional opportunities

X_3 = Satisfaction with the work itself

As Table 13 indicates, the relative importance of independent variables in contributing the variation of overall job satisfaction was found to be significant for satisfaction with the work itself and promotional opportunities at ($t_{(3,209)} = 6.191$, and $t_{(3,209)} = 4.839$ respectively at $P < .000$ level). From the two variables the effect of the work itself is greater than that of promotional opportunities. But, the effect of satisfaction with payment was not statistically significant at ($t_{(3,209)} = 0.067$, $P > .955$).

This shows that the contribution of variability of overall job satisfaction can be explained 30.3% solely by the two independent variables (satisfaction with the work itself & promotional opportunities). And, other variables that were not considered in this study contribute about 69.7% of the variability of job satisfaction.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. DISCUSSION

In this section the results of the study were discussed in relation to the previous studies on related issues.

5.1. Gender Difference on Overall Job Satisfaction, Satisfaction with the Work itself, Payment, and Promotional Opportunities.

The findings of several studies have shown that there is no gender difference on overall job satisfaction. For instance, Brush, et al.; Greenhaus, Parasurama, & Wormley; Witt & Nye, cited in Devodretzky (1994); Kassahun (1996); and Kumsa (2001) confirmed this. The results of the present study also indicated that there was no gender difference among Oromia Cooperative Promotion Office employees at ($t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 0.786, P > 0.433$) regarding overall job satisfaction.

In addition to this, it was indicated that there was no gender difference among employees with regard to satisfaction with payment and promotional opportunities at ($t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 0.168, P > 0.867$; ($t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 0.630, P > 0.529$ respectively, it agrees with the results of study made by Kumsa (2001). But, there was significant difference between male and female employees with respect to satisfaction with the work itself. Males were found to be more satisfied by the work itself than females. From the data,

it has been observed that most of the female employees working at the head office, and almost all the female employees working at zonal offices were found to be service or support giving staff specially they work at secretarial and other lower positions. This might be the case of their being less satisfied by the work than male employees.

5.2. Marital Status Difference on Job Satisfaction

The result of the study indicated that there was no significant difference between married and unmarried employees at ($t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 0.512, P > 0.609$) with respect to overall job satisfaction. In this regard, Landy (1985) had stated that marital status has no significant difference on employees overall job satisfaction, even the combined effects of all personal variables on variation of overall job satisfaction is very low. Moreover, Kassahun (1996) found that there was no marital status difference among employees of Ethiopian Insurance Corporation.

The present study also pointed out that there was no marital status difference on satisfaction with payment and promotional opportunities at ($t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 0.511, P > 0.610$ and ($t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = -1.152, P > 0.251$ respectively). But married employees were found to be more satisfied than unmarried employees ($t_{(\alpha/2, 211)} = 3.219, P < 0.001$) regarding their satisfaction with the work itself. To explain why such difference exists many factors should be considered that might contribute for the difference. Factors, such as years of experience, the age of employees, occupational status of employees, their salary level, the income of the partner, etc. If such variables were partial out, we

might not have the observed significant difference between the two groups of employees.

5.3. Age Sub Group Difference on Job Satisfaction

The employees of Oromia Cooperative Promotion Office were categorized under four sub groups of age. The age range categorization was done based on the method used by the previous related studies. Moreover, the minimum required age to be employed in the Ethiopian government organization is age 18 (the Public Servant Proclamation No. 209/1963 and Federal Civil Servant Proclamation No. 262/2002), and the age of retirement is 55 (Public Servant Pension (Amendment) Proclamation No. 5/1974). Taking those things into account, the employees were categorized under age subgroups of 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, and 45-55 years old. Then, comparison was made among the four sub groups of age using one-way ANOVA, and it was found that there was no significant difference among sub groups of age with respect to the overall job satisfaction.

However, several previous studies had indicated that there were significant differences among different sub groups of age, especially, between the youngest age group and the oldest age group (Santrock, 1986; Hulin and Smith cited in Muchinsky, 1990; Miner, 1992; Spector, 1996). According to those research findings, those employees in the youngest age group were found to be the least satisfied and those employees nearing retirement were found to be the most satisfied ones.

5.4. Salary Differential on Job Satisfaction

Regarding the relationship between the salary level and employees' overall job satisfaction, research findings indicated that employees of the higher salary groups were found to be more satisfied than those of the lower salary groups (Lawer & Porter cited in Arnold, 1983; Lussier, 1990; Organ & Bateman, 1991; Devoretzky, 1994). Moreover, Dyer & Theriault (1976) suggested that being other things are equal, pay level is a good predictor of pay and job satisfaction. But, the results of the present study indicated that there were no significant difference between employees of the 'high salary group' and the 'low salary group' with respect to overall job satisfaction.

The result of the present study goes with what was stated by Spector (1996) that the level of payment is positively related to overall job satisfaction, but their relationship is very weak. According to Spector, it is the fairness of distribution of pay that determined job satisfaction than the actual level of payment.

5.5. Occupational Status/Group Difference on Overall Job Satisfaction

First, the comparison was made between technical staff and service or support giving staff. The result of the study pointed out that there was no statistically significant difference between those two occupational groups of employees with respect to overall job satisfaction, the work itself, payment, and promotion. Moreover, to make classification of employees logically comparable with other studies conducted previously, the Oromia cooperative promotion office employees were further

categorized under five occupational groups: managerial workers, experts, accountants and auditors, secretarial workers, and others. Then comparison of means among five occupational subgroups was made by using one-way ANOVA. The result indicated that there was no significant difference among the five occupational groups on overall job satisfaction.

The results of the present study contradict the previous studies. As previous studies made by Lock & Whiting (1974), Kalleberg (1974), Organ & Bateman (1991), and Miner (1992) indicated that employees who were working at top level in an organization such as managers and professionals were found to be more satisfied than employees who were working at the bottom level in an organization.

5.6. Educational Level Difference on Overall Job Satisfaction

Different studies derived different findings concerned with the relationship between educational level and employee overall job satisfaction. For example, Herzberg as cited in Kalleberg (1974) conducted many research on this regard but he didn't get the same result. And he concluded that there was no relationship between educational levels of employees and their level of job satisfaction. On the contrary, others (Bau & Duncan; Hauser, Sewell, & Lutterman as all cited in Kalleberg (1974) reported that there was direct relationship between educational level of employees and their level of overall job satisfaction. On the contrary, (Brue, Bonjean, & Williams; Volmer & Kinney, as cited in Glenn, Tyler & Weaver (1977) indicated that education level is negatively related to job satisfaction.

In the present study, employees were categorized under the educational level sub groups such as below grade 12, grade 12 complete, technical and vocational education, some college, college diploma, first degree and above. And it was found that there was no statistically significant difference among employees of these educational subgroups regarding overall job satisfaction.

5.7. Combined and Independent Contributions of Satisfaction with the Work itself, Payment, and Promotional Opportunities for Overall Job Satisfaction

There are so many factors that affect employees' job satisfaction. But, frequent studies were made only on some of those factors. The degrees of importance of such variables in determining job satisfaction differ from study to study. For example, Feldman & Arnold (1983) pointed out that pay and the work itself are the most important, promotional opportunities and supervision are moderately important, work group and working conditions are relatively minor sources of overall job satisfaction. Moreover, Kumsa (2001) showed that payment and promotion had strong contribution to the variance of job satisfaction in his study of Oromia medical personnel.

Other studies made by Sauser, York & Downey; Sheridan & Solosum; Seybold & Gruenfeld, as all cited in Cook et al. (1981), stated that satisfaction with the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities were considered to be major determinants of overall job satisfaction. For the present study also those three independent variables

were considered to investigate to what extent the employees overall job satisfaction was explained by them.

First, entering all of the nine independent variables considered under the study used the stepwise regression procedure. And the coefficient of determination (R^2) was found to be 0.333. That is about 33.3% of the variability of overall job satisfaction was explained by those nine independent variables. When backward elimination procedure was used, two variables were selected as they contribute to statistically significant level. They were satisfaction with the work itself and promotional opportunities.

The Beta Weights (β) for work itself, promotion, and payment were 0.376, 0.304, and -0.003 , respectively. And their combined R^2 (coefficient of determination) was 0.303. Since the effect of independent variable payment was not significant ($P > 0.947$), we can say that about 30.3 percent of the variability of overall job satisfaction was explained by the two independent variables, the work itself and promotional opportunities. Whereas, the effect of the former is relatively greater than the later one.

CHAPTER SIX

6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the summary of the study, the conclusions made, and the recommendations forwarded.

6.1. Summary

The study was conducted on employees of Oromia cooperative promotion offices, and it was delimited to the head and zonal offices. Based on the literature, three variables (the work itself, payment, and promotion) were considered as major determinants of job satisfaction. And the main purpose of the study was to examine whether or not these variables contribute to a significant extent in explaining employees' job satisfaction. Moreover the relationship between demographic variables and overall and specific job satisfaction were investigated.

To examine the basic questions mentioned in chapter one, questionnaires were developed. Before such questionnaires were administered for the main study, a pilot study had been conducted on employees of Region 14 cooperative promotion bureau. Through the pilot study, the reliability coefficients of the instruments were computed by the split-half method, and discrimination power of every item was calculated. Then, based on the feedback, some reconstructions were made on some items to improve

clarity. Some items were modified and retained while less effective ones were discarded.

After testing the questionnaire in the pilot study, a six-page questionnaire was developed for the main study and distributed to the employees working at the head office and selected zonal offices.

Based on the data collected, each basic question was examined. A comparison of means was applied to investigate gender difference, marital status difference, occupational status difference and salary level difference with respect to overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with specific aspects of a job (the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities) and the t-test was used to check whether or not the differences were significant.

Moreover, to examine age subgroups difference and educational level subgroups differences on overall job satisfaction, one-way ANOVA was utilized.

Finally, multiple regression analysis was computed to examine the combined and independent contributions of the three-predictor variables (the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities) on overall job satisfaction.

Applying the above statistical methods, the data were analyzed and the following results were obtained:

1. There was no significant difference on gender regarding overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with payment, and promotional opportunities. But, there was gender difference with respect to satisfaction with the work itself. That is, males were found to be more satisfied by the work itself than female employees.
2. There was no significant difference between married and unmarried employees with respect to overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with payment, and promotional opportunities. But married employees were found to be more satisfied by the work itself than unmarried ones.
3. There was no significant difference among age sub groups of employees (18-24, 25-34, 35-44, and 45-55 years old) concerned with overall job satisfaction.
4. There was no significant difference between 'low salary group' of employees and 'High salary group' of employees regarding their overall job satisfaction.
5. Employees were categorized under two occupational groups (technical staff and service or support giving staff). Then the mean scores of these two groups were compared. And it was found that there was no

significant difference on overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with the work itself, payment, and promotion.

6. Another way of occupational grouping was considered. And the mean scores of five occupational subgroups (managerial workers, experts, accountants and auditors, secretarial workers, and others) were compared and found that there was no statistically significant difference among them on overall job satisfaction.
7. There was no significant difference among educational sub groups of employees (below grade 12, 12 grade complete, technical and vocational education, some college, diploma graduate, and first degree and above) with respect to overall job satisfaction.
8. Among the three predictors (the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities), only two of them (the work itself and promotional opportunities) found to contribute significantly for the variability of the predicted variable (over job satisfaction).
9. The coefficient of determination ($R^2_{y.123}$) of the work itself, payment, and promotion was found to be 0.303. That is, about 30.3% of the variability of the overall job satisfaction can be explained by the two independent variables (the work itself and promotional opportunities), as the

contribution of payment for the variability of job satisfaction was not significant.

10. The Beta weights of the work itself, payment, and promotional opportunities were 0.376, -0.003, and 0.304 respectively. This shows that the effect of the work itself is greater than that of opportunity for promotion in explaining the variability of overall job satisfaction. The effect of payment is almost negligible at ($t = 0.067$, and $P > 0.947$).

6.2. Conclusion

Based on the summarized points of the study, the following conclusions were made

1. Demographic characteristics of employees of Oromia Cooperative promotion offices such as gender, marital status, age, occupational status, monthly salary level, and educational level didn't have relationship with overall job satisfaction.
2. Among the demographic characteristics of employees indicated in number one, males were found to be more satisfied than females and married employees were more satisfied than unmarried ones with respect to satisfaction with the work itself.

3. The variability of employees overall job satisfaction of Oromia head and zonal cooperative promotion offices can be explained to the extent of 30.3% only by the two independent variables (the work itself and promotional opportunities). Relatively, the variable the work itself is most important, promotional opportunity follows, and payment has almost negligible effect on the variability of overall job satisfaction.

6.3. Recommendations

1. Considering the labor forces of Oromia head and zonal cooperative promotion offices, females were found to be only 21% the total number of employees, most of them were found to work secretarial works and on other lower positions; moreover, they were found to be less satisfied with the work itself than their male counter parts. Therefore, the concerned body should take appropriate measures to encourage female employees be satisfied with the work itself. To indicate some of these methods:
 - When there are vacancies especially for higher positions the organization should give priority for females when they have equally qualifications and experiences with male candidates.
 - Female staff employees should be given special consideration for training, education and promotion opportunities on the basis of their work efficiency.

2. The payment policy of the organization should be made clear to employees through seminars, workshops, and conferences. This makes employees pre informed about the base salary, the maximum possible salary level and the periodic salary increments of a given position. These things have great contribution for employees to have realistic expectation and perceive their salary being reasonable.

3. The previous trend of salary increment was made in every two years with out differentiating employees' performance level. This makes the hard worker be dissatisfied. Therefore, performance evaluation should be objective and open to employees to make them know their strengths and weaknesses. And it should also be given great value for differentiating employees on amount of salary increment.

4. The promotion policy of the organization should be implemented objectively and openly so that employees could develop trust in the organization. And they also develop the feeling of being part of the organization.

References

- Adams, G. A., King, L. A. & King, D. W. (1996). Relationships of job and family involvement, family social support, and work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, (4), 411-420.
- Banki, I. S. (1981). *A Dictionary of administration and management*. Los Angeles: Pub. System Research.
- Berkowitz, L. et al., (1987). Pay, equity, job gratification, and comparison in pay satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, (4), 544-555.
- Bonsa Bayisa (1996). *Factors affecting teachers job satisfaction in Addis Ababa*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. AAU.
- Bootzin, R.R., Bower, G.H., Crocker, J., and Hall, E. (1991). *Psychology today*. (7th ed). New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Cook, J.D., Hepworth, S.J., Wall, T.D., & Warr, P.B. (1981). *The experience of work: a compendium and review of 249 measures and their use*. London: Academic Press Inc.
- Coon, D. (1994). *Essentials of Psychology: Exploration and application*. (6th ed). New York: West Publishing Company.
- Cooperative Society Proclamation No. 147/1998, Federal Negarit Gazeta, 5th year, No. 27 Addis Ababa; Berhanina Selam Printing Enterprise.
- Devoretzky, J. P. (1994). *Psychology fifth edition*. USA: West Publishing Company.
- Dyer, L. & Theriault, R. (1976). The determinants of pay satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, (5), 596-604.

- Ebel, R. L. (1979). *Essentials of educational measurement*. (3rd ed.) New Jersey: Prentice – Hall Inc.
- Evans, M. G. (1969). Conceptual and operational problems in the measurement of various aspects of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 53, (2), 93-101.
- Federal Civil Servants Proclamation No. 262/2002, Negarit Gazeta, 8th year, No. 8, Addis Ababa; Berhanina Selam Printing Enterprise.
- Feldman, D. C. & Arnold, H. J. (1983). *Managing individual and group behavior in an organization*. Auckland: McGraw-Hill Co.
- Fisher, M. (1996). *How to reward your staff: a guide to obtaining the reward system*. New Delhi: Kogan page India Private Limited.
- French, D.; & Seward, H. (1983). *A dictionary of management*. London: Cox & Wyman Ltd.
- French, W. L. (1990). *Human resource management*. (2nd ed). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Glenn, N. D., Tyler, P. A., & Weaver, C. N. (1977). Age and job satisfaction among males and females: A multivariate, multisurvey study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, (2), 189-193.
- Gronlund, N. E. (1981). *Measurement and evaluation in teaching*. (5th ed.) New York: Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc.
- Habtamu Wondimu (1983). *Some factors which affect peasant motivation to work in the Ethiopian agricultural producers cooperatives*. Unpublished IDR Research Data Report. AAU.

- Hanel, A. (1992). *Basic aspects of cooperative organizations and cooperative self – help promotion in developing countries*. Marburg: Marburg Consult for Self-Help Promotion.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson (1998). *Management of organizational behavior*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R., & Capwell, D. (1957). *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion*. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Services.
- ILO (International Labour Office), (1966). *Recommendation No. 127, recommendations concerning the role of cooperatives in the economic and social development of developing countries*. Geneva.
- Kahn, R. L. (1960). Productivity and job satisfaction. *Journal of applied psychology*, 63, 533-547.
- Kalleberg, (1974) A. causal approach to measure to the measurement of job satisfaction. *Social Science Research*, 1974, 3, 299-322.
- Kassahun Wasihun (1996). *Job satisfaction among employees of the Ethiopian insurance corporation*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, AAU.
- King, M., Murray, M. A., & Atkinson, T. (1982). Background, personality, job characteristics, and satisfaction work in national sample. *Human relations*. 35(2),119-133.
- Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Measurement* 30, 607-610.
- Kumsa Donis (2001). *Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness of pay, promotion and job satisfaction: The case of Oromia medical personnel*. Unpublished MA thesis.

- Landy, F. J. (1985). *Psychology of work behavior*. (3rd ed). USA: The Dorsey Press.
- Lock, E. A. & Whiting, R. J. (1974). Sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among solid waste management employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 2, 145 – 146.
- Lusser, R. N. (1990). *Human relations in organizations: A skill – building approach*. Boston: Richard D. Irwin Inc.
- Marshal, A. (1981). *Concise encyclopedia of industrial relations*. West Mead: Cower Publishing Company.
- Miner, J. B. (1992). *Industrial and organizational psychology*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Inc.
- Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkage in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, (2), 237-240.
- Muchinsky, P. M. (1990). *Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. (3rd ed). California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Murthy, D. B. (1996). *Of man and management*. New Delhi: UBS Publishers' Ltd.
- Nachmias, D., & Nachmias, C. (1987). *Research methods in the social sciences*. (3rd ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Organ, D. W. & Bateman, T. S. (1991). *Organizational behavior*. Boston: Richard D. Irwin Inc.
- Orpen, C. (1978). Work and non work satisfaction: A causal – correlation analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 530 – 532.
- Public Servants' Pension (Amendment) Proclamation No. 5/1974 Addis Ababa; Berhanina Selam Printing Enterprise.

Public Servants' Proclamation No. 209/1963 Addis Ababa; Berhanina Selam Printing Enterprise.

Saiydain, M. S. (1985). Personal characteristics and job satisfaction: Indian - Nigerian companies. *International Journal of psychology*. 20 (2), 143-153.

Santrock, J. W. (1986). *Psychology: the science of mind and behavior*. (3rd ed). USA: WM. C. Brown Publishers.

Schneider, B. & Dachler, H. P. (1978). A note on the stability of the job descriptive index. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, (5), 650-653.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969) The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Spector, P. E. (1996). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Weiss, H. (1978). Social learning of work values in organizations. *Journal of applied psychology*, 63, 711-718.

Appendix 1: Questionnaire in English

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

General Direction

The main purpose of this questionnaire is to identify factors that affect job satisfaction of Oromiya cooperative office employees. The information obtained will help to recommend plausible solutions for the observed problems.

To obtain reliable and valid information for the research, your open and genuine response is highly appreciated. ***THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS*** and what is required is to show the level of your personal opinion to each item. ***DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE.***

The questionnaire has four parts: Part one is about your personal information, part two – is about overall job satisfaction and part three – deals with specific aspect of job satisfaction /the work itself, payment and promotional opportunities/. Each part has its own instruction. Please read each item carefully and give your honest response to each item. If you overlook any item without giving response, it will invalidate the study. So, please check that you have given your response to all items.

Thank you for your cooperation

PART ONE

Please fill in the blanks. And put this mark (✓) to indicate your choice for those items that have alternative responses.

1. Title of your job _____
2. Sex A) Male B) Female
3. Marital Status A) Married B) Unmarried
4. Age _____
5. Your educational level
 - A) below grade 12
 - B) grade 12 complete
 - C) graduated from technical and vocational institutes
 - D) some college
 - E) Diploma graduate
 - F) First degree holder
 - G) MA or M.Sc
 - H) Ph.D
6. Employment status A) Permanent B) Contractual C) Daily laborer
7. Before January 9, 2002 (before the improved and new salary scale was implemented) what was your monthly salary _____.
8. Your present salary is _____
9. Number of dependents _____
10. How many years you have served in cooperatives _____
11. How many years have you worked in your present position _____.

PART TWO

There are 20 statements about overall job satisfaction. And each statement has five alternatives. Read each item carefully and put this mark “✓” under the alternative that best expresses your feeling about the statement.

My feeling towards overall aspects of my job can be expressed by the following statements	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Disagree
1. The work allows me not to feel the working time length					
2. Most of the time I face problem since no one shows me how to work.					
3. I have the chance to do different things at different time.					
4. I know that my work gives me a chance to be “some body” in the society					
5. The way my boss handles his men is good as he is laissez-faire leader.					
6. I believe that my supervisor has good competence in decision making.					
7. I am not forced to do things that don't go against my conscience.					

8. I am doubtful in continuity and steady employment at the organization.					
9. I feel that my work is not important to the society					
10. I have the chance to lead people how the work be done					
11. I have the chance to do something that makes use of my abilities					
12. The policy and regulations of the organization are implemented in wrong ways					
13. My income is proportional to the amount of work I do in the organization					
14. I don't believe that I have a chance to promote or advance on this job					
15. I don't have freedom to use my own judgment					
16. I don't have the chance to try my own methods of doing the job.					
17. Working conditions such as cleanliness of the work place, healthy environmental condition, enough tools and supplies. This things encourages me to work.					
18. My co-workers are not friendly and cooperatives, this creates problems of working in coordination.					
19. My accomplishments recognized by the people I work with.					
20. I don't get the feeling of accomplishment from the job since I work for the sake of working.					

PART THREE

This part has three sections. The first one deals with satisfaction with the work itself, the second one is about payment satisfaction, and the third one satisfaction with promotional opportunities.

Every item of the three sections has three alternative responses. Please read each item carefully then respond “Yes” if the statement describes your feeling, and respond “No” if it doesn’t describe your feeling. If you don’t want to choose either of the two, respond “undecided”. To indicate your choice put this mark “✓” under your choice.

A) My attitude towards the work itself	Yes	Undecided	No
1. Fascinating			
2. Routine			
3. Satisfying			
4. Boring			
5. Good			
6. Creative			
7. Respected			
8. Hot			
9. Pleasant			
10. Useful			
11. Healthful			
12. Challenging			
13. Self supporting			
14. Frustrating			
15. Simple			
16. Endless			
17. Gives sense of accomplishment			
18. Wrong sort of job for me			
19. Encouraging			

B) Attitude Towards your payment you used to get before a new salary scale was implemented	Yes	Undecided	No
1. My income is adequate for my normal expense			
2. I barely live on my income			
3. I can say the payment is bad			
4. My income provides me luxuries			
5. The payment is insecure			
6. I get less than I deserve			
7. I can say I am highly paid			
8. I am under paid			
9. The payment is fair			
10. The payment is adequate only to acquire basic needs			
11. The payment is too low to satisfy me with basic needs			
12. Considering what it costs to live in this area, my pay is adequate			

C) Attitude towards the opportunity for promotion	Yes	Undecided	No
1. I have good opportunity for promotion			
2. In my job opportunity for promotion is somewhat limited			
3. In the organization promotion is based on ability			
4. Regarding promotion it is a dead-end job			
5. I think the promotion policy of the organization is not fair			
6. In my sort of job promotion is infrequent			
7. In my sort of job promotion is regular			
8. I have fair good chance for promotion.			
9. In the organization promotion is in favoritism.			
10. I believe that my educational qualification and training increase my prospects.			
11. I feel that I have stayed at present level for too long.			
12. Working many years in the organization doesn't contribute for promotion.			

Appendix 2: The Questionnaire in Amharic

አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ

የድህረ ምረቃ ትምህርት ፕሮግራም

የሳይኮሎጂ ትምህርት ክፍል

አጠቃላይ መመሪያ

የዚህ መጠይቅ ዋና ዓላማ በአሮሚያ የተባረኩት ሥራ ማስፋፊያ ቢሮ ጽ/ቤት ወስጥ የሚሰሩ ሠራተኞችን የሥራ እርካታ ደረጃ ወይም መጠን ለመመዘን ሲሆን በሥራቸው እንዳይረኩ የሚያደርጋቸው ችግሮች ካሉ ተገንዝቦ ከመጠይቁ በሚገኘው መረጃ መሠረት ለችግሮቹ መፍትሄ ይሆናሉ ተብለው የሚታመንባቸውን የመፍትሄ ሃሳቦችን ለመስጠት ነው።

ለጥናቱ የሚፈለገውን ትክክለኛ መረጃ ለማግኘት የእርስዎ ግልፅና እውነተኛ ምላሽ ከፍተኛ ዋጋ አለው። ዋና የሚፈለገው በእያንዳንዱ ጥያቄ ላይ እርስዎ የሚያምኑበትንና የሚሰማዎትን እንዲገልፁ ሲሆን ለመጠይቆቹ ትክክለኛ ወይም የተሳሳተ መልስ የለም ከእርስዎ የሚገኘውም መረጃ ምሥጢሩ የሚጠበቅ ሲሆን ማንንም በምንም ዓይነት መልኩ አይጎዱም። ለሌሎችም በየትኛውም ቦታ ላይ አይገፍ።

መጠይቁ ሦስት ክፍሎች አሉት፡- ክፍል አንድ የእርስዎን የግል ሁኔታ በተመለከተ ክፍል ሁለት ባጠቃላይ በሥራዎ ያለዎትን እርካታ በተመለከተ እና ክፍል ሦስት ደግሞ ስለሚሰሩት ሥራ ስለሚያገኙት ክፍያ እና ስለ ሥራዎ የእድገት ሁኔታ በተመለከተ ያለዎትን አስተያየት የሚጠይቁ ናቸው።

እያንዳንዱ ክፍል የራሱ መመሪያ አለው። እባክዎን እያንዳንዱን ጥያቄ በጥንቃቄ ካነበቡ በ ላ የኔ እውነተኛ አመለካከት እና የሚሰማኝ ነው ብለው የሚያምኑበትን መልስ ይስጡ። በመጠይቁ መልስ ሳይሰጡ የተወጡ ጥያቄ ካለ ጥናቱን ያልተረጎመ ስለሚያደርገው ሁሉንም ጥያቄዎችን መመለስዎን ያረጋግጡ።

ስለትብብርዎ በቅድሚያ አመሠግናለሁ፡፡

ክፍል አንድ

እባክዎን ባዶ ቦታዎችን ይሙሉ ከዚያም አማራጭ ለተሰጣቸው ጥያቄዎች

የሚስማሙበትን ምርጫ ይህንን ምልክት (✓) በማድረግ ያሳዩ ፡፡

1. ሥራዎ /የሥራ ድርሻዎ/ _____
2. የታዎ ሀ) ወንድ ሴት
3. የጋብቻዎ ሁኔታ ሀ) ያገባች/ ያላገባች/
4. ዕድሜዎ _____
5. የትምህርትዎ ደረጃ
 - ሀ.) ከ 12 ኛ ክፍል በታች
 - ለ) 12ኛ ክፍልን የጨረሰች/
 - ሐ) ከቴክኒክና ሙያ ማሰልጠኛ የተመረቀች/
 - መ) ቢያንስ የዓንደኛ ዓመት የኮሌጅ ወይም የተህም ትምህርት የተማረ /ች/
 - ሠ) የኮሌጅ ዲፕሎማ ያለው /ያላት/
 - ረ) በዲግሪ የተመረቀ /ች/
 - ሰ) የማስትሬት ዲግሪ ያለው /ያላት /
 - ሸ) የዶክትሬት ዲግሪ ያለው /ያላት/
6. የቅጥርዎ ሁኔታ ሀ) ህሟ ለ) ኮንትራት
 - ሐ) የቀን ሠራተኛ
7. ከጥር 1 ቀን 1994 ዓ.ም ከተደረገው የደመወዝ ማሻሻያ በፊት ይከፈለዎ የነበረው ደመወዝ ስንት ነበር ? _____
8. አሁን የሚከፈልዎ ደመወዝ ስንት ነው ? _____
9. በእርስዎ ሥር ያሉ የቤተሰብ ብዛት ስንት ናቸው? _____
10. በኅብረት ሥራ ማስፋፊያ ቢሮ ጽ/ቤት በጠቅላላ ለምን ያህል ጊዜ አገልግለዋል? _____
11. አሁን እየሠሩ ባሉበት ቦታ/ደረጃ/ ላይ ለምን ያህል ጊዜ አገልግለዋል?

ክፍል ሁለት

በሥራዎ ያለዎትን እርካታ አስመልክቶ 20 ዓረፍት ነገሮች ተዘርዝረዋል።

ለእያንዳንዱ ዓረፍተ ነገር አምሥት አማራጮች ተሰጥተዋል። እያንዳንዱን ዓረፍተ ነገር ካነበቡ በኋላ ሥራዎን አስመልክቶ ዓረፈተ ነገሩ የእርስዎን አመለካከት ምን ያህል እንዳሚገልፅ ለማሳያት ከተሰጡት አምሥት አማራጮች አንዱን ይምረጡ። ምርጫዎን ለማሳየት ከመረጡት ምርጫ ሥር ይህንን ምልክት(✓) ያድርጉ

ባጠቃላይ በሥራዬና ከሥራዬ ጋር ለተያያዙ ሁኔታዎች የሚስማኝ በሚከተሉት ዐረፍተ ነገሮች የገለጻል።	በጣም አልሰማምም	አልሰማምም	መልስ ለመስጠት እችላለሁ	እስማማለሁ	በጣም እስማማለሁ
1. ሥራወ ተመስጫ እንደሠራ ስለሚያደርገኝ ከሥራ የመወጫያ ሰዓት ሳይታወቀኝ ይደርሳል።					
2. ሥራዬን ስሠራ እንዴት መሥራት እንዳለብኝ የሚያሳየኝ ሳይኖር አብዛኛወን ጊዜ በራሴ ብቻ ስለምሠራ እችላለሁ።					
3. በሥራዬ ወስጥ በተለያዩ ጊዜያት የተለያዩ ነገሮችን ስለምሠራ እረካለሁ።					
4. በሥራዬ ለጎብረተሰቡ አንድ ጠቃሚና በጣም አስፈላጊ ሰው እንደሆንኩኝ ይሰማኛል።					
5. አለቃዬ በሥሩ ያለነውን ሠራተኞች የሚያሠራበት መንገድ መልካም ነው። ምክንያቱም አይቆጣጠረንም ሥራወ ተሰራ አልተሰራ ክትትል አያበዛብንም።					
6. አለቃዬ በወሳኔ አሰጣጥ ላይ ጥሩ ብቃት አለው ብዬ አምናለሁ።					
7. ጎሊናዬ የማየፈቅደውን ሥራ እንደሠራ ስለማልገደድ እረካለሁ።					
8. የሥራዬ ቀጣይነትና አስተማማኝነት አጠራጣሪ ነው።					
9. በሥራዬ ለሌሎች ሰዎች የማበረክተው አስተወፅኦ ወይም ጥቅም እንደሌለ ይሰማኛል።					
10. ሰዎችን የመምራትና የማሠራት ዕድል ስለማገኝ እረካለሁ።					
11. ችሎታዬንና ብቃቴን እንደጠቀምበት የሚያደረጉ ነገሮችን ለመሥራት እድሉን ስለማገኝ እረካለሁ።					
12. የመሥሪያ ቤቱ መርሆች ተግባራዊ የሚደረጉት ትክክለኛ በሆነ መንገድ አይደለም።					
13. የምሠራው ሥራ ከሚከፈለኝ ደመወዝ ጋር ይመጣጠናል።					

14. በሥራዬ ላይ የማደግ ዕድል ይኖራል ብዬ አልገምትም					
15 ኅላጊነቴን ተጠቅሜ የራሴን ፍርድ/ወጣጤ ለመስጠት ነፃነት ስለሌለኝ እቸገራለሁ					
16 የራሴን ሃሳብ የአሠራር መንገድ ወይም የራሴን ፈጠራ ተጠቅሜ ሥራዬን የመሥራተ ዕድል የለኝም					
17 ባጠቃላይ ከሥራዬ ጋር የተያያዙ ሁኔታዎች ማለትም የሥራ ቦታዬ ንፅህና ለጤንነት ተስማሚ የሆነ ዓየር መኖር ለሥራ የመጠቀምባቸው መሣሪያዎች የተማሉ መሆናቸው ወዘተ ለሥራ እንደነሳሳ ያደርገኛል					
18 አብረወኝ የሚሠሩ ሠራተኞች ስምምነትና የገደብነት ስሜት ስለሌላቸው አብራ ተረዳድቼ ለመስራት እቸገራለሁ					
19 መልካም ሥራ በምሠራት ጊዜ ተገቢውን አድናቆትና ምሥጋና ስለማገኝ እረካለሁ					
20 ሥራዬን የምሠራው መሥራት ስላለብኝ ብቻ በመሆኑ የሚፈጥርልኝ የተለየ የስኬታማነት ስሜት የለም					

ክፍል ሦስት

ይህ ክፍል ሦስት ንዑስ ክፍሎች አሉት እነሆም(ሀ) አሁን ስለሚሠሩት ሥራዎን ብቻ በተመለከተ(ለ) ስለሚከፈልዎ ክፍያ እና(ሐ) በሥራዎ ለመደግ ያለዎትን እድል በሚመለከት ያለዎትን አመለካከት የሚጠይቁ ናቸው

በሦስቱም ክፍሎች ለተዘረዘሩት ዐረፍተ ነገሮች ለእያንዳንዳቸው ሦስት ሦስት አማራጮች ተሰጥተዋል ለዐረፍተ ነገሮቹን ካነበቡ በኋላ እርስዎ የሚሰማዎትን በትክክል ይገልጻሉ በለወ ካመኑ “አዎን” የሚለውን ይምረጡ ለማይስማሙበት ከሆነ ደግሞ “አይደለም” የሚለውን ይመርጡ ለከነዚህ አንዱን ለመመረጥ የሚቸገሩ ወይም የሚጠራጠሩ ከሆነ “መልስ ለመስጠት እቸገራለሁ” የሚለውን ይምረጡ ምርጫዎን ለማመልከት ከመረጡት ምርጫ ሥር ይህንን ምልክት(✓) ያድርጉ

(ሀ) አሁን የምሠራው ሥራዬን ብቻ አስመልክቶ ያለኝ አመለካከት	አዎን	መልስ ለመስጠት እቸገራለሁ	አይደለም
1. ሥራዬ ሙሉ ትኩረቴን የሚሰጥ በመሆኑ ለመሥራት እጠብቃለሁ			

2. ሁል ጊዜ የምሠራው ምንም ሣይቀየር አንድ ዓይነትና ተደጋጋሚ ነው.			
3. ሥራዬ የሚያረካኝ ዓይነት ሥራ ነው.			
4 አሰልጅ ሥራ ነው.			
5 ደህና ስራ ነው.			
6 ፈጠራን የሚያበረታታ ሥራ ነው.			
7 የሚከበር ሥራ ነው.			
8 የሚያበሳጭ ሥራ ነው.			
9 የምደሰትበት ሥራ ነው.			
10 ጠቃሚ ሥራ ነው.			
11 ለጤንነት ተስማሚ የሆነ ሥራ ነው.			
12 ሥራው ፈታኝ በመሆኑ ችሎታዬን እንደጠቀምበት ያበረታታኛል			
13 ሥራዬን የምሠራው ለመኖር ብቻ ስል ነው.			
14 ሥራው ለወደፊት አስተማማኝ ባለመሆኑ ተጨንቄ እንድናር ያደርገኛል			
15 በቀላሉ የሚሠራ ሥራ ነው.			
16 ሥራው ማለቂያ ስለሌለው የሥራዬን ወጤት አላይም			
17 በሥራዬ የሥነ-ታማኝነት ስሜት ይሰማኛል			
18 ሥራው ለኔ የሚሆነኝ ዓይነት ሥራ አይደለም			
19 ፍላጎትን የሚያነሳሳ ሥራ ነው.			

(ለ) አዲሱ የደመወዝ ማሻሻያ ከመደረጉ በፊት ይከፈለኝ ስለነበረው ደመወዝ ያለኝ አመለካከት	አዎን	መልስ ለመስጠት እቸገራለሁ	አይደለም
1. የማገኘው ገቢ አስፈላጊ ለሆኑ ወጪዎች በቂ ነው።			
2 በሚከፈለኝ ክፍያ የምኖረው በአስቸጋሪ ሁኔታ ነው።			
3 ክፍያው የሚያስከፋ አይነት ነው።			
4 የሚከፈለኝ ክፍያ ህሚ ዕቃዎችን ለመግዛት ያስችለኛል			
5 ክፍያው አስተማማኝነትና ቀጣይነት የለውም			
6 የሚከፈለኝ ክፍያ ማግኘት ከሚገባኝ በታች ነው።			
7 የማገኘው ክፍያ ከፍተኛ ነው።			
8 የማገኘው ክፍያ አነስተኛ ነው።			
9 ለምሠራው ሥራ የሚከፈለኝ ጥሩ ነው።			
10 በሕይወት ለመኖር አስፈላጊ የሆኑ ነገሮችን ብቻ ማግኘት የሚያስችል ክፍያ ነው።			
11 የሚከፈለኝ ደመወዝ እጅግ በጣም ዝቅተኛ ነው።			
12 በቦታው ለመኖር ከሚያስፈልገው ወጪ አንፃር የሚከፈለን ክፍያ በቂ ነው።			

(ሐ) አሁን እየሠራሁ ባለሁበት ሥራ የደረጃ ዕድገት የማግኘት እድልን አስመልክቶ ያለኝ አስተያየት	አዎን	መልስ ለመስጠት እቸገራለሁ	አይደለም
1. በሥራዬ ላይ ለማድግ ጥሩ ዕድል አለኝ			
2. ለዕድገት ያለኝ ዕድል የተገደበ ነዉ			
3. በመሥሪያ ቤቱ የደረጃ ዕድገት የሚሠራው ችሎታንና ብቃትን መሠረት በማድረግ ነዉ			
4 የእኔ የሥራ መደብ ምንም ዕድገት የማይገኝበት ነዉ			
5 የደረጃ ዕድገት መመሪያዉ ትክክለኛ አይደለም			
6 በእኔ የሥራ መደብ የደረጃ ዕድገት ያልተለመደ ነዉ			
7 ጊዜዉን እያጠበቀ የሚሆን የተለመደ የደረጃ ዕድገት አለ			
8 በሥራዬ ለማድግ ያለኝ ዕድል መልካም ነዉ			
9 በመሥሪያ ቤቱ የደረጃ ዕድገት የሚሠራው በአድሎ በ[]ደኝነት ወይም በዝምድና ነዉ			
10 ያለኝ የትምህርት ዝግጅትና ሥልጠና በሥራዬ የደረጃ ዕድገት እንዳገኝ በጣም ይረዳኛል			
11 አሁን እየሠራሁ ባለሁበት ቦታ /ደረጃ/ ያለ ዕድገት በጣም ለረጅም ጊዜ እንደቆየሁበት ይሰማኛል			
12 በመሥሪያ ቤቱ ዉስጥ ለረጅም ጊዜ ማገልገል ለደረጃ ዕድገት ምንም ያህል አይጠቅምም			