COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF JOB SATISFACTION BETWEEN KOREAN AND AMERICAN WORKERS

By

JUNSUH WON

Bachelor of Science
Seoul National University
Seoul, Republic of Korea
1982

Master of Business Administration
Adelphi University
Garden City, New York
1985

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partical fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
December, 1995

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF JOB

SATISFACTION BETWEEN

KOREAN AND AMERICAN

WORKERS

Thesis Approved:

Thomas H. [signature]
Thesis Advisor

[signature]

[signature]

Debra L Nelson

Steven Barr

Thomas C. Collins
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my chair advisor, Dr. Thomas Stone for his intelligent supervision, constructive guidance, inspiration, and friendship. My sincere appreciation extends to my other committee members Dr. Wayne Meinhart, Dr. Steven Barr, Dr. Debra Nelson, and Dr. Larry Hynson, whose guidance, assistance, encouragement, and friendship are also invaluable.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to those who provided suggestions and assistance for this study: Dr. Chuckraboti, Dr. Warde, Dr. Ji-Woong Chung, Dr. Chi-Ja Kim, Dr. Woong-Jae Shin, Dr. Yoon-Shik Kim, Mr. Won-Kyu Jang, Mr. Hyung-Jun Kim, and Mr. Il Lim. Also, I would like to thank to those who provided indirect assistance for my study: Mr. Jaecheon Lee and Dong-Sook Cha, Mr. Jee-Yoon Lee, and Mr. Jae-Cheol Park.

Special recognition must be accorded to Dr. Kwak. With his help, I can collect the data for the Korean sample. Furthermore, he encouraged me to finish this study when I was in a difficult time.

Special thanks is extended to my father, Yang-Sun Won, mother, Ok-Shim Song, father-in-law, Jeong-Sup Kim, and mother-in-law, Sam-Hwha Kim, who always provided never ending support. Also, I would like to thank to my sister, Myung-Suh Won, for her support and encouragement.

I would also like to give my special appreciation to my wife, Kanghee, for her strong encouragement at times of difficulty, love and understanding throughout this whole process. I want to thank my two little girls, Sang-Hee and Sang-Mee. Their presence always inspired me to work hard and yet maintain a degree of perspective regarding the important things in life.

Finally, I would like to thank the Department of Business Management for supporting during this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this introductory chapter, background information and the importance of comparative JS will be presented. Then, problems of previous comparative JS research between Japan and the U.S. will follow. Once the appropriate way of doing cross-cultural research is mentioned, purposes of this study will be discussed. After the hypotheses development, the researcher will explain assumptions and boundary scope of this research. Finally, the outline of this work will be presented.

1. **Background Information**

Throughout the 1960's, the Japanese enjoyed a high growth rate (approximately 10%) of real GNP. Several factors led to such a brisk growth. They were Japanese management style, high savings-rate, close cooperation of the Japanese government and business companies, and so on. Among them, Japanese management style has been considered a major force of such a great success. Thus, American researchers started to look at Japanese management.

Also, increased bilateral trade between the two countries resulted in a fast growth in the volume of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) to each other. Thus, international managers in each country had to deal with the host country's workers who think and behave differently from their own workers. To help them, researchers studied work attitudes of the other country's workers.

A similar trend exists between the U.S. and Korea (Republic of Korea). The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT, 1990) reported that the ranking of Korea in the world, based on the trade amount, improved dramatically from 35th (exports) and 29th (imports) in 1973 to 13th (exports and imports) in 1989. Especially, the bilateral trade between the U.S. and Korea has increased from $3.2 billion in 1975 to $36 billion in 1993 (Korea Economic Report, 1994). Korea became the third biggest trading partner in 1989 to the U.S. (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1991).

What is more important is that direct investment between the U.S. and Korea will grow. One reason for such an expectation is the increased bilateral trade between the two countries. As pointed out by the GATT (1985), FDI grows as the volume of trade increases. Another reason is Korean Government's efforts to induce foreign investment-- partial liberalization of FDI even to manufacturing industries (The Sae-Gae Times, June 7, 1988). Thus, the volume of FDI has grown from $575 million in 1980 to $1,018 million in 1987 and further grown to $2,392 million in 1990 (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1993). Also, the Government recently streamlined investment procedures and widened the scope of business eligible for foreign investment. Therefore, more capital transfer between the two countries is anticipated.

Increased business between Korea and the U.S. may increase research on work attitudes of workers in both countries. However, this fairly new trend between Korea and the U.S. is in the very early stages of cross-cultural studies. Therefore, by looking at previous studies between Japan and the U.S., we can learn valuable lessons.

2. **Importance of comparative JS**

Faced with such mutual needs, some cross-cultural studies between the U.S. and Japan have been done. Among them, job satisfaction (JS) was one area. Although no one ever mentioned why JS was a study topic, there are possibly several reasons for the cross-cultural study of JS. The first reason is its impact on various areas. Edwin Locke (1976) summarized, after reviewing hundreds of previous JS-studies, its impact on worker attitudes toward life, family, and him/herself (physical and mental health and longevity) as well as commitment, turnover, and productivity (for more details, refer to Locke's work). Recent studies also revealed JS's effect. JS might directly affect commitment (Mitchell, 1979; Steers, 1977; Stevens, Beyer, and Trice, 1978; Williams and Hazer, 1986) and/or reciprocally (Farkas and Tetrick, 1989) and thus productivity. JS might also influence turnover directly (Locke, 1975; Farkas and Tetrick, 1989) or indirectly (Bluedorn, 1982; Michaels and Spector, 1982; Williams and Hazer, 1986).

The second reason might be to test if JS theory can be applied to another

society. As mentioned by Davidson (1977), one purpose of cross-cultural studies is to establish the boundary conditions of a certain theory. That is, cross-cultural research on JS can provide a test for the generalizability of JS theory within the Japanese society.

The third reason is that research on JS can help international managers. Because JS influences various areas as mentioned, its measurement can suggest quality of individual work life, and provide monitoring and diagnostic aid for an early signal of organizational strategy, policy, or program failure. For instance, let's assume that an American manager who was transferred to a factory in Japan neglected one Japanese tradition, "Life-time employment." What would happen? First, Japanese workers might hate that American manager because he/she neglected their culture and thus they might not cooperate with him/her. Second, Japanese workers might not be satisfied and thus less commitment, high turnover, and low productivity would happen. Furthermore, Japanese workers might get highly stressed because they do not receive the standard treatment that similar others receive. That is, such negligence can cause a program failure. Therefore, the measurement of JS can provide international managers an early signal of organizational strategy, or program failure.

In short, cross-cultural research on JS can help researchers test the generalizability of JS theory. It also can help international managers diagnose the organizational strategy.

3. Problems of Previous Studies

As the increased FDI induced cross-cultural studies of JS between the U.S. and Japan, a similar trend can happen between the U.S. and Korea. That is, the increased FDI might result in cultural JS research between the U.S. and Korea. However, there has been no such research yet.

Because of this unavailability, the researcher examined previous cross-cultural studies of JS between the U.S. and Japan. Interestingly enough, every researcher (Azumi and McMillan, 1976; Lincoln, Hanada, and Olson, 1981; Lincoln and Kalleberg, 1985; Naoi and Schooler, 1985; Odaka, 1975, Pascale and Maguire, 1980) tested the assumption that Japanese workers are more satisfied than American counterparts. The reason for the assumption was that Japanese managers treat their employees as the heart of the firm. The common approach was to simply measure JS level of the sample by means or by percentage of the satisfied sample, and then compare each other (i.e., mean or percentage comparison methods). Contrary to that assumption, all found that American workers are more satisfied than Japanese counterparts.

These studies provided information about the relative JS level between U.S. and Japanese workers. However, the researcher suspect the results because the above researchers used means or percentage comparison methods without justification of scale equivalence. According to Poortinga (1975), both functional and scale equivalence should be necessary conditions to compare different cultural groups.

Functional equivalence refers to the measurement of the same meaning across societies. Scale equivalence refers to the measurement of the equivalence of quantitative scale. A method of careful translation and back-translation (Brislin et al., 1973) meets functional equivalence. However to achieve scale equivalence is extremely difficult and even if it is achieved, it is very hard to prove to or convince others (Poortinga, 1975; Triandis et al., 1973). It implies that without any justification of scale equivalence, it lacks validity to compare the relative level of certain attributes based on means or percentage between different cultural groups. Unfortunately, scale equivalence was neither justified nor mentioned at all. Therefore, their results lack validity.

In addition, the researcher doubted the value of those studies. The value of research is decided by its contribution to the theory and/or to practitioners. As Davidson (1977) mentioned, one purpose of cross-cultural studies is to establish the boundary conditions of a certain theory; that is, to test the generalizability of that theory, and to understand the effect of cultural factors on behavior. By the same token, comparative JS studies between the two countries should fit to these purposes: test whether JS theory also works in Japan; explain what is, if any, the cultural effect of JS factors. However, the simple measurement of JS for both countries' workers cannot help JS theorists test the generalizability and international managers understand the cultural effect of JS factors. That is, previous cross-cultural studies of JS between U.S. and Japanese workers neglected purposes of cross-cultural research. Therefore, their studies lack value.

In short, previous JS research between the U.S. and Japan did not consider its necessary conditions: purposes and research methods. Means or percentage comparison methods without justification of scale equivalence in the cross-cultural study raised questions regarding their results. Furthermore, a negligence of purposes of cross-cultural research made those studies lack value to both JS theorists and international managers.

4. **Method of Cross-Cultural Research**

Throughout the history of cultural studies, there has been a dispute between those stressing the culture-specific aspects (emic) and those emphasizing the culture-universal aspects (etic). According to Poortinga (1975), Pike modified the terms "emic" and "etic" from a distinction between phonemics and phonetics in linguistics. Phonemics emphasizes the sounds employed within a single linguistic system, whereas phonetics emphasizes more general aspects of language. Thus on the one hand, the emic approach applies in only a particular society. On the other hand, the etic approach is interested in culture-free or universal aspects of the world (or if not entirely universal, it operates in more than one society). In other words, emic-viewers seek the differences among societies, while etic-viewers look at the similarities among societies.

However, the similarities (differences) without considering the differences (similarities) among societies cannot be accurately described (Berry, 1969; Poortinga,

1975). They argue that any cross-cultural research should investigated both differences and similarities.

Thus, Berry (1969) suggested an "imposed etic-emic-derived etic" approach as a way of describing behaviors that is meaningful to the members of a particular culture (emic) and to another or all other cultures (etic). In simple terms, his three-step approach was as follows:

a. If certain descriptive categories do not exist within country B, those of country A can be treated as common for both countries;

b. Modify those categories if there are any specific categories that reflect the culture of country B; and

c. Shared categories between country A and B can be considered as universal.

Although no one ever commented on Berry's approach, Bond (1988) noticed that cross-cultural research has popularly used Berry's method. This might be because Berry's approach is so logical and simple.

5. **Purposes of The Study**

Purposes of cross-cultural research on JS should help JS theorists test the generalizability of JS theory and international managers build management policies or programs in a foreign country. However, previous JS researchers between Japan and the U.S. did not reflect such important issues to their studies; thus, they lack value. Also, they used comparison methods without justification; thus, it led one to question

the results.

The researcher tries to meet these two necessary conditions in this study. First, cross-cultural research on JS should reflect purposes of cross-cultural studies. Second, it must use appropriate research methods.

To meet the first condition, this research reflects purposes of comparative research: to test if JS theory is valid in Korea and also to test the cultural impact on JS factors between Korean and U.S. workers. Locke's (1976) work on JS will be briefly mentioned because his work suits the purpose. After reviewing hundreds of JS studies, Locke found that JS factors frequently used were such as work itself, job security, working conditions, co-workers, supervisors, pay, and benefits. He recommended the use of these factors in future JS studies. Following Locke's recommendation, the researcher will investigate that they significantly influence JS of Korean workers. Also, this study will examine whether there are cultural differences in effects of these seven facets between the two samples. Besides it will check whether there are JS factors other than them.

However, none of the existing questionnaires measures all these seven facet JS. Thus, a partial purpose of this study is to develop an appropriate questionnaire that measures seven facets: the job itself, supervisors, co-workers, salary, working conditions, benefits, and job security.

Even when the study meets the first condition, the purpose of cross-cultural research, the results cannot be valid if it does not meet the second condition, correct data analysis methods. As discussed earlier, researchers should justify scale

equivalence before using means or percentage comparison methods in cross-cultural research. Results without justification of scale equivalence can be meaningless though it is hard to justify it. Thus, the researcher will compare means of both groups after trying to achieve scale equivalence (will explain later). Also, this study will use a regression analysis for data analysis (X:facets, Y:general JS). More specifically, it will compare regression coefficients of JS factors, which reflect the importance of factors (Locke, 1976; Mottaz and Potts, 1986), for the Korean workers with those of the American workers.

6. **Hypotheses**

On the one hand, American researchers have studied on Facet Job Satisfaction (FJS) even since Locke reviewed hundreds of FJS studies in 1976. On the other hand, it was hard to find any research on FJS in Korea. For instance, there was no one dissertation thesis on FJS when the researcher checked the dissertation catalog (1945-1985) at the Seoul National University (By the way, this university is regarded as the most research-oriented school in Korea).

This situation leads the researcher to follow a natural or normal approach in cross-cultural research-- one concept or theory in one country is assumed to work in the other country. Most cross-cultural theorists tested the generalizability of the existing theory assuming that such a theory is universal (Berry, 1969; Davidson, 1977). Following this approach, it was assumed that JS theory in the U.S. is

universal. That is, JS theory works in Korea. A leading JS researcher in America, Locke (1976), found that JS of American workers is affected by work itself, job security, working conditions, co-workers, supervisors, pay, and benefits. Therefore, it was proposed that JS factors of Korean workers are work itself, job security, working conditions, co-workers, supervisors, pay, and benefits. Then, the following was hypothesized:

1) JS for Korean and American workers is affected by work itself, supervisors, co-workers, pay, working conditions, benefits, and job security.

Although the above similarity was assumed, it was also expected that cultural differences between Korea and the U.S. would value or consider things differently. On the one hand, the relationship between employer and employee in the U.S. is primarily conceived as a business transaction (buyers and sellers on a labor market). On the other hand, such a relationship in Korea resembles a family relationship with mutual obligations of protection in exchange for loyalty. For instance, an American worker, if his supervisor tries to interfere in his private life, will be angry because such behavior is considered a violation of privacy. However a Korean worker, if his supervisor does not try to interfere in his private life, will be angry because such behavior is considered a negligence of a family relationship. Therefore, it was proposed that Koreans would value certain factors more than American counterparts and vice versa. Thus, the following was hypothesized:

2) Korean workers value those seven JS factors differently than American counterparts.

Because of expected value differences between the two groups, the researcher assumed differences in the overall JS level. There has been no comparative research on JS between the U.S. and Korea. Following the natural approach suggested by Berry (1969) and Davidson (1977) the researcher looked at JS studies between the U.S. and Japan. The researcher investigated them not only because they were available but also because Confucianism influenced both Japan and Korea. Their results suggested that Americans were more satisfied than Japanese counterparts although they are dubious (will be discussed in more detail in the review chapter). Thus, the researcher assumed that Americans are more satisfied than Koreans. Therefore, the following was hypothesized:

3). American workers are more satisfied than Korean workers.

Hofstede (1991) identified that Europeans and Americans are active in nature. Thus, they believe that they can control environments if environments are analyzed. Under this rational approach, Americans have focused on research on job or task: the relationship among the job, individual characteristic and/or ability, and objectives (performance, turnover, job satisfaction, stress, commitment, etc.). Some examples are Taylorism, Goal-Setting theory, Job-Characteristics theory, and Task-Achievement theory (these will not be discussed in this paper). Especially, the vast amount of JS

research on the job itself shows that Americans regard jobs as a major factor of their JS and are satisfied with their jobs (Locke: 1975, 1976).

Contrary to the active nature of Americans, Koreans have the passive nature (Lee, 1983; Lee, 1988). A Korean thinks that one's life is predetermined. As a result, it is hard to change or control one's life and/or environments. This passive nature of Koreans influences the idea about one's job: the job is given by the Heaven (Lee, 1983; Lee, 1988). Therefore, one needs to fit to the job rather than to control and adjust it to one's characteristics or ability. Although Korean scholars and managers did not study systematically the impact of the job on JS, indirect evidence in the statistical data on labor-management conflicts suggested that Korean workers were fairly satisfied with the job. According to the Dong-A Daily News (July 4, 1988), the job itself did not cause labor disputes among 1,168 cases of reported disputes during January to July in 1988.

Both American researchers and managers have applied the importance of the job to the real world. Although indirect evidence indicated that Korean workers were fairly satisfied with their jobs, Korean scholars and managers have not studied the impact of the job. Furthermore, they did not apply it to the real world. Therefore, the following was hypothesized:

3-a. American workers are more satisfied with the job itself than Korean counterparts.

Americans have emphasized the role of supervisors. Generally speaking, the

supervisor's role is, as a linking person and a leader, to help employees do their job well. Thus, scholars have studied the leadership systematically. Also, managers have learned how to be good leaders and thus to get employees' job done well. Although Korean managers did not learn it systematically as Americans did, they have to do one more important role of an extended family. That is, a Korean manager should act like a father or a brother of employees (Lee, 1988; MISNU, 1985).

Such differences between two countries come from differences in their cultures. Individually-oriented Americans consider employer-employee relationships a pure business contract (Hofstede, 1991; Hynson, 1985). Family- and group-oriented Koreans consider such relationships an extended family (Hofstede, 1991; Lee, 1983; MISNU, 1985). So if an American supervisor tries to be involved in an employee's personal life, the worker will get angry because that violates his privacy. To the contrary, Korean employees expect such actions because one important role of a Korean supervisor is that he should act like a father or a brother of them.

On the one hand, Americans have emphasized the job-related role of supervisors and applied it to the real world. On the other hand, Koreans have emphasized the role of a father or a brother beyond the job-related role. However, Koreans did not apply such roles to the business world systematically as Americans did. Therefore, the researcher expects that Koreans are less satisfied with their supervisors than Americans. Janelli and Yim (1993) in their field study with one Korean conglomerate found such indication. Korean employees never expressed their dissatisfaction with their supervisors in front of their face. However, they showed

their true feelings when researchers interviewed them personally. The main reason was that managers use too strong top-down methods or orders. Therefore, the following was hypothesized:

3-b. American workers are more satisfied with supervisors than Korean workers.

Koreans are human relations and group oriented people (Hofstede, 1991; Jang, 1988; Lee, 1983), while Americans are individual oriented (Hofstede, 1991; Hansen, 1985). Because of this difference, they think differently about fellow workers. One distinguishing characteristic is that Koreans emphasize "We," whereas Americans emphasize "I." Americans tend to consider their co-workers nothing more than a work-mate, while Koreans tend to consider co-workers a member of the family because Koreans think that a company is an extension of the family. On the one hand, Americans consider personal performance an important factor for the employee evaluation. On the other hand, Koreans consider group performance an important one. Therefore, Korean workers have emphasized relationships among co-workers even outside the workplace (Jang, 1988; MISNU, 1985), while Americans have fewer social meetings after work days (Dore, 1973; Hansen, 1985). Janelli and Yim (1993) also noticed such differences when they investigated a Korean large company.

In short, cultural differences resulted in differences in expectations. That is, Americans expect fellow workers as work-mates and thus have fewer social meetings. Koreans expect them as brothers and thus have many social meetings. Thus, the

following was hypothesized:

3-c. Both American and Korean workers are satisfied with co-workers.

On the one hand, Americans have valued pay highly not only because they want compensation in return for their work but also because pay influences employees' motivation (Klein, 1973; Locke, 1975; Schwab, 1973). Thus, Americans have applied wage matters to the real world to induce such effects. Locke (1975) noticed that American workers were satisfied with their salary.

On the other hand, Koreans, influenced by Confucianism, have believed that if one is guided by profit or money, one will incur much ill will. Therefore, Koreans traditionally value money very low and rarely mention it in a public place (Hong, 1988; Lee, 1983). Also, the Korean government has emphasized the accumulation of assets through exports and thus not allowed employees' actions on wage matters. That is, Korean workers have been forced to sacrifice their share of profits, while business owners have the largest share of profits. Therefore, they could not express their true feelings: they are not satisfied with their pay.

American culture has influenced such traditional ideas. Also, continuous economic growth helps to change them. For instance, GNP of Korea increased more than 10% every year except 1982 since 1980 (GATT, 1990). Thus, Koreans put more value on money than the past (Hong, 1988; MISNU, 1985). Besides them, the most important event that changed such ideas was the democratic denouement of Mr. Tae-Woo Ro on June 29, 1987. He allowed people a freedom of press and of public

expression, which had been prohibited during Chun's dictatorship (1980-1987). Since then, there have been drastic increases in labor disputes in Korea. According to the Dong-A Daily News (July 4, 1988), the reasons for 707 conflicts among 1,168 ones (Jan. - July) were pay related matters. That is, Korean workers started to show their dissatisfaction with salary. Therefore, the following was hypothesized:

3-d. Korean workers are less satisfied with pay than American counterparts.

Americans have emphasized the importance of working conditions because they affect workers physically and psychologically and thus influence job performance, safety, turnover, personal health, and so on. Also, recent studies found that working conditions affected workers' stress under the university setting (McMillen, 1987) and in blue-collar occupations (Henderson and Cohn, 1991).

Contrary to the Americans' emphasis on working conditions, Korean workers have accepted somewhat poor working conditions. There are two possible explanations. They might be the passive nature of Koreans and influences of Confucianism. The first reason is the passive nature of Koreans for controlling their environment. Cultural theorists (Hofstede, 1991; Hong, 1988) argue that the climate largely decides one nature. Because of abrupt changes in the climate of Korea, Koreans have believed the passive nature. They think that nature is given and cannot be controlled by the human and as a result, humans have to adapt to the nature (Lee, 1983; Lee, 1988). This passive nature enables Korean workers to work under poor

working conditions.

More direct reason for working under poor conditions is the combined influence of Confucianism and practices of the Korean government and business. The Korean government and business executives have tried to increase the size of economy at the expense of employees. However, such influence cannot stand without the willingness of sacrifice among Korean employees. Their sacrifice has been possible because of the influence of Confucianism on Koreans. Under the heavy influence of Confucianism, Korean civilians have paid respects and loyalty to the government. Also, Korean employees regard the business owner as a father (paternalistic view). These ideas of paying respects to and following orders of the government and business owners might make this sacrifice possible: Korean employees work under poor working conditions. The statistical figures of labor-management conflicts indirectly showed this willingness of sacrifice among Korean workers. Reported conflicts between employees and management were 1,168 cases during six months (Jan. - July) in 1988. Only 85 cases (about 7%) were related to working conditions (The Dong-A Daily News, July 4, 1988).

On the one hand, American managers have realized the importance of working conditions and thus provided good working conditions to employees. As a result, American workers are satisfied with working conditions. On the other hand, Korean workers showed the willingness of sacrifice. However, that does not mean they are satisfied with working conditions. Therefore, the following was hypothesized:

3-e. American workers are more satisfied with working conditions than Korean counterparts.

As pointed out by Locke (1975), American companies offer variable benefit plans (pension, vacation, etc.). However, Management Institute at Seoul National University (MISNU, 1985) found in a survey of over 500 Korean companies that Korean companies tended to emphasize only a few pay-related benefit plans such as retirement allowance and defrayment of meal expenses.

Such a difference between the two countries might be partially due to their cultural differences. On the one hand, Americans distinguish "labor" and "work." "Labor" refers to the work that is required to make a living, while "work" refers to the work that is enjoyable. On the other hand, Koreans do not distinguish them. They think that working is life. This difference leads to the different idea of leisure: Americans try to get out of labor and enjoy their off-hours, while Koreans are afraid of not-working (Lee, 1983). Partly because of this reason, Koreans work very hard and excessively. For instance, Korean employees in manufacturing sector worked 54.4 hours per week in 1986 and 48.9 hours per week in 1993 (The Korea Daily, May 13, 1995). Also, even with a formal vacation plan in some Korean companies, employees rarely use their vacation periods (Lee, 1983; MISNU, 1985). These suggest that now Koreans do not seek various benefits although they might need various benefits other than pay-related benefits in the future.

Americans seek various benefit plans and thus American companies provide

them to their employees. Koreans seek only pay-related benefit plans and thus Korean companies provide them to their employees. Therefore, the following was hypothesized:

3-f. Both American and Korean workers are satisfied with benefits.

On the one hand, Americans regard their job based on the business contract between an employer and an employee. Important criteria of promotion are one's ability and the past performance (Kanter, 1983; Locke, 1975). So, hiring executives from the outside is quite reasonable behavior. For instance, Kanter noticed that American executives whose backgrounds are legal and financial tended to be hired from the outside during the 1970s. Because this contract-idea of job and ability, the practice of providing Americans a life-time employment is considered unreasonable.

On the other hand, Koreans think that the job is an extended family relationship between an employer and an employee. A Korean employer provides employees protection (life-time employment), while they provide the employer loyalty and commitment. Therefore, the length of service affects promotion in Korea. MISNU (1985) found in a survey over 500 Korean companies that 28.5 percent of the sample considered the length of service one important basis for promotion. Also more than 50% of Korean companies did not hire an outside executive during 1981-1983.

This difference in the way of considering the relationship between an employer and an employee also led to the difference in the idea of job security. On the one

hand, Americans regard such a relationship as a business contract and thus they do not expect life-time employment. On the other hand, Korean workers consider it an extended family relationship and thus they expect life-time employment. That is, American companies do not provide life-time employment because employees do not expect it, while Korean companies provide it because employees expect it. Therefore, the following was hypothesized:

3-g. Both American and Korean workers are satisfied with job security.

7. **Assumptions**

The researcher assumed that the questionnaire used measures the same idea of JS in Korea and the U.S. This assumption will be justified using the methods of translation and back-translation by Brislin et al. (1973), at the development stage of the questionnaire.

8. **Boundary Scope of This Study**

The sample will be limited to white-collar full-time workers who also are currently seeking an MBA degree. Therefore, caution must be applied to the final interpretation of results.

9. **Outline of Work**

The rest of this paper will review the studies of JS between the Japanese and American workers and problems of those studies. Next, methodology will explain the instrument development and research methods. The statistical analysis of data and the findings of this study will be presented. After discussions of this study's contributions, the conclusion including future research direction will follow.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this review chapter, cross-cultural research between the Japanese and American workers will be discussed because there have been no comparative studies of JS between Korean and U.S. workers. After the background information, overview, problems of previous studies will be discussed. Finally, summary will close this chapter.

1. Background

Contrary to the high growth of Japan, the growth rate of the U.S. has continuously slipped since the 1960s. For instance, Japan's productivity growth in manufacturing was nearly three times the U.S. rate--the average annual growth rate between 1960 and 1978 was 7.8 percent. Thus, American researchers started to study the Japanese management. In the mean time, Japan's high growth stimulated substantial growth in FDI to the U.S. that in turn, led to the Japanese researchers' investigation of American workers.

These interests resulted in cross-cultural studies between Japan and the U.S. Among those studies, several dealt with JS (Azumi and McMillan, 1976; Lincoln, Hanada, and Olson, 1981; Lincoln and Kalleberg, 1985; Naoi and Schooler, 1985; Odaka, 1975; Pascale and Maguire, 1980). They tested the traditional assumption that Japanese workers are more satisfied than American counterparts. The finding was that to the contrary, American workers were more satisfied than the Japanese.

However, the researcher doubted their results because of various problems of construct validity, comparison methods, scale, comparability of questionnaires, pretest, and return rate. These problems will be discussed after brief overview of each study.

2. **Overview of Previous Studies**

In this overview section, the researcher will briefly review JS studies between Japan and the U.S. (Azumi and McMillan, 1976; Lincoln, Hanada, and Olson, 1981; Lincoln and Kalleberg, 1985; Naoi and Schooler, 1985; Odaka, 1975; Pascale and Maguire, 1980). After review of each study, its problem will be briefly discussed.

(1) Azumi and McMillan (1976)

Azumi and McMillan tested the idea of whether satisfaction is decided in part by contextual variables such as company size, technology, and dependence on other companies. They surveyed 40 factories from various industries in Tochigi prefecture

in Japan. The total sample size was 3,740. Managers, foremen, and production workers participated in this study. JS level was measured with respect to work role, job climate, managers, and the company in general (4-items) using evaluative judgment terms. An example was "The atmosphere of this place is quite good." A five-point Likert-type scale was used: "very well (5), well (4), undecided (3), poorly (2), very poorly (1)." Usable returned questionnaires were 2,473 (66% of return rate).

The result indicated that only 51% of the sample was satisfied with their jobs (other results will not be discussed here). Then, Azumi and McMillan compared their result (51%) with the result (75%) of Blauner (1960) who reviewed previous six JS studies for American workers. Based on this comparison (51% vs. 75%), they concluded that American workers were more satisfied than the Japanese.

However, this study includes various problems that make the result doubt. The researcher will point out these problems briefly here and explain later.

a. The research method without justification of scale equivalence is inappropriate in cross-cultural research.

b. A "Normal" scale including "undecided or neutral" is not suitable for the high central tendency of the Japanese.

c. The comparability of studies (Azumi and McMillan vs. Blauner) is somewhat questionable.

d. The soundness of the questionnaire is doubted because pre-test results were not reported.

(2) Lincoln, Hanada, and Olson (1981)

Lincoln et al. were interested in detecting whether American and Japanese workers react differently to the same organizational forms. They investigated the Japanese-owned companies (28) in Southern California, whose work forces were composed of native Japanese, Japanese-Americans, and Americans. Among 1,140 employees, 522 respondents (slightly over 50%) returned usable questionnaires. They hypothesized that the Japanese were more paternalistic, more personally related with co-workers, and less satisfied than Americans. JS was measured with a six-item index. They were superiors, subordinates, tasks, fellow workers, the local organization, and Japanese parent company. They were measured on a five-point scale from "strongly dissatisfied"(1) to "strongly satisfied"(5). α reliability coefficient was 0.80 for the total sample. The mean JS level of Americans (3.877) was higher than that of the Japanese (3.537) and the difference was significant at $p < 0.001$. Therefore, they concluded that Americans were more satisfied.

This research contains several problems. They are as follows:

a. The mean comparison method without justification of scale equivalence is inappropriate for cross-cultural research;

b. The "Normal" scale including "Undecided or Neutral" is not suitable for the high central tendency of the Japanese; and

c. The questionnaire is not based on the JS theory and thus, construct validity is dubious.

(3) Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985)

Dore (1973) argued that the popularity of Welfare Corporatism in Japan led to the superiority of JS and commitment level of Japanese workers. The characteristics of Welfare Corporatism are tall hierarchy of authority, high formalization, life-time employment, slow promotion, careful recruitment, job rotation, continuous training, complex appraisal system, open communication, and participative decision making.

In order to test Dore's arguments, Lincoln and Kalleberg hypothesized that Corporatist structure leads to higher JS and commitment of Japanese workers than their U.S. counterparts (only findings related to JS level will be discussed).

Over 8,000 employees in almost 100 firms in Atsugi (Japan) and in central Indiana (U.S.) were involved in this study. Four items of JS were: 1. "How satisfied are you with your job?" (0=not at all, 4=very); 2. "Would you take the same job again? (0=not take, 1=second thoughts, 2=would); 3. "Would you recommend the job to a friend?" (0=advise against, 1=second thoughts, 2=would); and 4. "Does this job measure up to your expectation?" (0=not what I wanted, 2=what I wanted). To test whether ideas of JS were similarly regarded in both countries, the LISREL goodness-of-fit index for JS was checked. The figure, 0.99, for each data set was enough to justify that both samples considered JS similarly.

Results seen in the table 1 were as follows:

Table 1. Results of Questions

	U.S.	Japan
question 1	2.95	2.12
question 2	1.61	0.837
question 3	1.52	0.909
question 4	1.20	0.427

The mean value of overall JS of Americans was 2.95, while that of the Japanese was 2.12. Differences between both countries were all significant at $p < 0.001$. Findings indicated that Americans were more satisfied than the Japanese.

However, this study includes following problems:

a. The research method without justification of scale equivalence is inappropriate for cross-cultural research;

b. The "Normal" scale including "Undecided or Neutral" is not suitable for central tendency of the Japanese;

c. Researchers measured whether JS ideas are similar in both countries or not. Still, their questionnaires are not based on the JS theory and thus, construct validity is questionable;

d. Because of unreported pre-test result, it is difficult to check the soundness of the questionnaire; and

e. The return-rate is not reported.

(4) Naoi and Schooler (1985)

Naoi and Schooler tested how work affects individual workers in Japan and the U.S. on their attitudes toward to self and society outside work-place. The sample (843 employees) was randomly selected from Kanto prefecture in Japan. As a part of their study, Naoi and Schooler measured overall JS. The questionnaire developed by Kohn (1969) was translated to measure JS level of the Japanese sample. Translation and back-translation methods (Brislin et al., 1973) were used to ensure that the same meaning is measured across societies. After a pre-test, one item of overall JS was measured with a four-point Likert type scale (1: very dissatisfied; 4: very satisfied). The response rate was 74.6%.

Mean of the Japanese's JS was 3.08. Then, mean of Americans' JS, 3.44, was borrowed from the work of Kohn and Schooler (1983). The difference between two samples was statistically significant at $p < 0.001$. Thus, Naoi and Schooler concluded that American workers were more satisfied than Japanese counterparts.

Several problems of their study are as follows:

a. The research method without justification of scale equivalence is inappropriate for cross-cultural research; and

b. The questionnaire is not based on the JS theory and thus construct validity is doubted.

(5) Odaka (1975)

In her book "Toward Industrial Democracy," Odaka measured JS level of Japanese workers in 5 companies (Matsuya Department Store, Tokyo Electric, Kokan Steel, Shikoku Electric, Okamura Manufacturing). A total of 16,806 employees responded to the survey. Two items of JS were asked: 1. "Do you like your present job?"; 2. "Is your job important for your company?" She reported the data for only question 1 and analyzed JS of the sample based on these figures. A three-point scale was used: 1. satisfied; 2. undecided; 3. dissatisfied.

Results in the table 2 show that 34-45 % of the sample was satisfied, 45-49 % were undecided, and 10-17 % were unsatisfied. Odaka compared the proportion of the satisfied Japanese samples with that in six countries of the West (U.S.A., West Germany, U.S.S.R., Sweden, Norway). The Western data were adapted from the study of Inkeles (1960) who asked an item of general JS. The proportion of the satisfied American samples were 72-84 %. Based on these figures, she concluded that Americans were more satisfied than the Japanese.

Table 2. Job Satisfaction in Five Companies (%)

Company	Satisfied	Undecided	Dissatisfied
Matsuya Dept. Store	34	48	17
Tokyo Electric	41	46	13
Kokan Steel	36	49	14
Shikoku Electric	45	45	10
Okamura Manufacturing	40	48	10

Odaka's research contains several problems. They are as follows:

a. The research method without justification of scale equivalence is inappropriate for cross-cultural research;

b. The "Normal" scale is not suitable for the Japanese's central tendency;

c. The construct validity is questioned because the questionnaire is not based on the supporting JS theory;

d. The comparability of studies (Odaka vs. Inkeles) is doubted;

e. The soundness of the questionnaire is questioned because pre-test results are not reported; and

f. The return-rate is not reported.

(6) Pascale and Maguire (1980)

There have been two competing ideas of industrial relations practices: "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Convergence." The former argue that industrialization and urbanization do not destroy the traditional values and culture of a society no matter how fast they may take place (Dore, 1973; Odaka, 1975), while the latter argue that they will destroy one's value system (Azumi and McMillan, 1975). The former view that cultural variables affect worker attitudes and behaviors, while the latter view that organizational variables do. To test the two competing ideas, Pascale and Maguire surveyed 37 companies in 10 industries: Japanese Co. in Japan (JJ), Japanese Co. in the U.S. (JU), American Co. in the U.S. (UU), and American Co. in Japan (UJ).

As a part of this research, they measured one item of general JS and an item of comparative JS: respondents were asked to check how they think their JS compared to people like themselves. A four-point Likert-type scale (1:very satisfied; 4:very dissatisfied) was used. However, only figures of comparative JS were reported. JS level for UU, UJ, JU, and JJ was 2.51, 2.39, 2.67, and 2.76, respectively. *T*-test results (α=0.01) showed that American workers working for the American owner (UU, 2.51) were more satisfied than Japanese workers working for the Japanese owner (JJ, 2.76). Even Americans working for the Japanese owner (JU, 2.39) were more satisfied than the Japanese working for the Japanese owner (JJ, 2.76). Thus, Pascale and Maguire concluded that Americans were more satisfied than Japanese workers.

However, this study contains following problems.

a. The percentage methods without justification of scale equivalence are inappropriate for cross-cultural research.

b. Construct validity is questioned because the questionnaire is not based on the supporting JS theory.

c. The soundness of the questionnaire is questioned because pre-test results are not reported.

The summary findings shown in table 3 indicated that American workers were more satisfied than Japanese workers.

Table 3. Summary of JS-Studies
Between Japan and the U.S.

Authors	Instrument		Pre Test	Return Rate	Research Method	Result[1]
	Item Measured[2]	Scale[3]				
Azumi & McMillan (1976)	4: work role, job climate, managers, company in general	[5]	NA[4]	NA (2473)	%	51% >75%[5]
Lincoln et al. (1981)	6: superiors, subordinates, tasks, fellow workers, local organization, Japanese parent company	(5)	Yes	50% (522)	Mean	3.537 3.877
Lincoln & Kalleberg (1985)	4: overall JS, repetition of the same job, willingness to recommend the job to your friend, expectation vs. reality	(3-5)	NA	NA (8000)	Mean	**
Naoi & Schooler (1985)	1: overall JS	(4)	Yes	74.6% (629)	Mean	3.08 3.44[6]
Odaka (1975)	1: likeness of present job	[3]	NA	NA	%	34-45% 72-84%[7]
Pascale & Maguire (1980)	1: comparative JS	[4]	Yes	NA	Mean	2.77 2.52

1. The first figure for Japan and the second for America.
2. One question per each item
3. []: the higher the number, the more dissatisfied
   (): the higher the number, the more satisfied.
4. Not available.
5. Quoted from Blauner (1960).
6. Quoted from Kohn and Schooler (1983).
7. Quoted from Inkeles (1960).

** Japan: 2.12, 0.837, 0.909, 0.427
U.S. : 2.95, 1.61, 1.52, 1.20

3. Problems of Previous Studies

All the researchers in the table 3 simply measured JS and compared the mean level of JS or the percentage of the samples who were satisfied. Interestingly, all found that Japanese workers are less satisfied than American counterparts.

Despite the similarity of findings, the researcher questioned them because of following problems:

1. Research questionnaires lack construct validity;
2. The questionnaire-scale does not reflect cultural differences in expressing emotions;
3. Means or percentage comparison methods are inappropriate if scale equivalence is not justified (Poortinga, 1975; Triandis et al., 1973);
4. Comparability of questionnaires used is questioned;
5. Unreported pretest result makes the researcher doubt the soundness of the questionnaire; and
6. Some do not report the return rate.

3-1. Construct Validity

How can one accept the soundness of conclusions without knowledge of what the questionnaire measures? Without such knowledge, the conclusion might stand on sand. Thus, construct validity, which tests whether the questionnaire measures

appropriate constructs or not, is important. According to American Psychological Association (1974), construct validity is justified if the questionnaire is based on a supportive theory. That is, JS theory provides information about how a JS-questionnaire should be built to meet construct validity.

Following this recommendation, let me first describe the JS theory that can provide information about how a JS-questionnaire should be built. Then based on this information, the problem of construct validity in these cross-cultural studies will be discussed.

3-1-1. Theories of JS

JS researchers investigated three areas: 1. what factors affect JS; 2. how JS is measured; and 3. how JS is related to other ideas such as turnover, productivity, commitment, etc. Considering my purpose, the first two matters will be discussed.

A. What Factors Affect JS. Mottaz and Potts (1986) noticed that most of the JS researchers accepted the nature of JS identified by Locke (1969, 1976). Locke (1969) considered JS as an emotional response from the evaluation of work rewards and work values and thus defined JS as "the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values (316)." He considered JS the sum of facet job satisfaction (FJS) across all facets of a job; that is, JS is a multi-facet construct. He also noticed that popular

environmental areas or facets were the job itself, working conditions, supervisors, co-workers, salary, benefits, and job security after reviewing hundreds of JS studies, and thus recommended these facets in the future JS study (1976).

Also Locke (1969, 1976) argued that several items for each facet should be used because small numbers of items make it difficult to verify construct validity. Other researchers supported this idea (Blood, 1971; Ewen, 1967; Mottaz and Potts, 1986; Mobley and Locke, 1970; Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969; Wanous and Lawler, 1972).

B. How JS Is Measured. Another area on which JS researchers have focused is how JS is measured. An excellent review by Wanous and Lawler (1972) indicated 9 different models of JS. All these models discuss about two dimensions. One dimension refers to whether discrepancy is included ("Is Now") or not ("Discrepancy"). Using Porter's (1961) term, JS is determined by a response to "How much is there now" ("Is Now") or by the difference between a response "How much should there be" item and a "How much is there now" item ("Discrepancy"). The other dimension refers to whether importance should be included ("Weighted") or not ("Unweighted"). Nine models can be categorized into four: Is Now (Alderfer, 1969; Ewen, 1967), Discrepancy (Morse, 1953; Porter, 1961; Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969), Weighted Is Now (Blood, 1969; Kalleberg, 1977; Vroom, 1964), Weighted Discrepancy (Evans, 1969) (for details, refer to the work of Wanous and Lawler). (For the researcher's purpose, discussions of the discrepancy dimension will be

handled in the Questionnaire Development section.)

"Weighted" viewers argued that value importance would significantly affect JS, whereas "Unweighted" viewers argued that importance is already included and thus inclusion of importance leads to a bias. In order to support their arguments, researchers investigated the influence of importance on JS. Results were mixed. Some researchers found a positive effect (Blood, 1969; Evans, 1969; Kalleberg, 1977; Vroom, 1964), while some did not (Blood, 1971; Ewen, 1967; Mobley and Locke, 1970; Mottaz and Potts, 1986; Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969; Wanous and Lawler, 1972).

Although results are mixed, the researcher supported the unweighted view because of Locke's logical explanations and supporting research results. Locke (1969) argued that JS as an emotional response reflects dual estimates: a. the judged discrepancy between what he wants and what he gets; and b. the importance of value to him. He also argued that importance decides not the intensity of but the range of effect. His argument is supported by several studies (Mobley and Locke, 1970; Ewen, 1967; Locke, 1969). For instance, Mobley and Locke conducted five experiments to test whether importance influences the range of effect. In the first study, they noticed higher correlations between mean discrepancy and overall JS among those involving higher importance values than among those involving lower importance values. In the second, third, and fourth experiments, regression coefficients were larger for those of higher value importance than those of lower value importance. And in the final study, they found that mean standard deviation of JS and job dissatisfaction ratings are a

function of value importance. Thus, all five experiments supported that importance influences the range of JS.

Locke (1969, 1976) also argued that because the JS measure already reflects value importance, including importance to the JS measure will distort the measure. Additional evidence supporting this argument includes: Blood (1971), Ewen (1967), Mobley and Locke (1970), Mottaz and Potts (1986), Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), and Wanous and Lawler (1972). For instance, Mottaz and Potts noticed that there was only 0.04 percent increase in explanation of JS variation when value importance was included in their JS model. In other words, it suggests that importance be redundant in measuring JS.

Later Mottaz and Potts (1986) argued that the measurements of perceived rewards are done by evaluative judgments. Although the reason was not clearly stated, Naylor, Prichard, and Ilgen (1980) provided a clue of why an evaluative judgment term is appropriate for the measurement of JS. They distinguished evaluative judgment from descriptive judgment which involves "ordering or locating stimuli on an affect-free continuum." Evaluative judgment involves "an indication of preference by the judge regarding the stimulus object. It is an affective response to the stimulus as contrasted with the purely cognitive response involved in descriptive judgment (75)." Because JS is considered an affective response (Locke, 1969) which can be reflected by evaluative terms (Naylor et al.), evaluative judgment terms are appropriate to measure JS.

C. Summary. The review of JS theory provided valuable information about what factors and how JS should be measured. They were as follows:

a. Utilize seven facets-- the job itself, supervisor, coworkers, salary, working conditions, benefits, and job security rather than overall JS;

b. Use several items for each facet;

c. Do not include weighted measure; and

d. Use evaluative judgment terms.

Let's look at how those researchers in the table 3 met these recommendations. Did they measure seven facets with multiple items? No. As seen in the overview, Naoi and Schooler (1985), Odaka (1975), and Pascale and Maguire (1980) measured overall JS with a single item, while Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985) checked overall JS with four items. Azumi and McMillan (1976) checked FJS about work role, job climate, managers, and the company in general, while Lincoln et al. (1981) measured FJS about superiors, subordinates, tasks, fellow workers, the local organization, and the Japanese parent company. Although only Azumi and McMillan and Lincoln et al. measured JS of several facets, they used only a single item for each facet. Did any researcher use evaluative judgment terms to measure JS? Yes. Did any researcher include importance? No. In short, the review indicated that although researchers met the condition c and d, they did not meet more important conditions a and b. Therefore, construct validity of the questionnaires used in their studies was questioned.

3-2. Scale

When a survey includes questions about respondents' emotions, the scale in the instrument should be carefully developed in a way of reflecting their culture. There are two kinds of Likert-type scale. One is a "Normal" scale which includes "Neutral or Undecided" scale. The other one is a "Forced" scale which does not include "Neutral or Undecided." In the American culture where the expression of true feelings is well accepted, the "Neutral or Undecided" scale helps Americans to answer the question. However, such scale helps Japanese, who have a high central tendency, choose the "Neutral" scale and thus hide their true feelings. Therefore, the normal scale suits Americans, while the forced scale suits Japanese.

Japanese have a high central tendency (Hynson, 1985) which forces them to choose the middle position. Central tendency is influenced by one main ideas of Confucianism, "Middle Way," in which only an experienced and/or intelligent one can stand on the middle. Also another social norm, "Modesty," intensifies this central tendency when the Japanese are asked to express their feelings. Under these influences in Japan, one's frank expression of feelings is regarded as a sign of one's impoliteness and/or inexperience. Therefore, Japanese tend to choose the neutral position when they express emotions.

As pointed out by Locke (1969), JS is a type of emotion. So, it is expected that if the Japanese are asked "Are you satisfied with your Job?," many will answer "Neutral" or "I don't know." That is, central tendency of the Japanese forces to hide

their true feelings. Studies of Azumi and McMillan (1976) and Odaka (1975) clearly show such tendency. When they asked the Japanese about their JS level, nearly one third and 45-49% of the sample, respectively, selected either "Neutral" or "Undecided" and thus hid their emotions. This suggests that the normal scale is not appropriate if Japanese are asked to express their emotions. In other words, the normal scale does not reflect the Japanese culture, central tendency. Therefore, the normal scale in studies of Azumi and McMillan, Lincoln et al., Lincoln and Kalleberg, and Odaka might lead to a biased conclusion: Japanese workers are less satisfied than American counterparts.

3-3. Comparison Methods

As seen in the overview, Azumi and McMillan (1976) and Odaka (1975) measured the percentage of Japanese respondents who are satisfied and compared it with that of Americans. They used a percentage comparison method. Lincoln et al. (1981), Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985), Naoi and Schooler (1985), and Pascale and Maguire (1980) compared the JS mean of the Japanese with that of American counterparts. These researchers used a mean comparison method.

Are these comparison methods appropriate? Yes but No. Why? As mentioned in the introductory section, cross-cultural studies require scale equivalence (i.e., equivalence of the quantitative scale between sample countries). If people in sample countries consider the scale differently, the mean or percentage comparison

methods based on that scale will lead to a significant bias. However, no one researcher in the table 3 tried to justify scale equivalence or to mention it. Therefore, such comparison methods without justification of scale equivalence were not suitable for cross-cultural research.

There are cultural differences in expressing feelings between Japan and the U.S. The Japanese, as discussed just before, are forced to hide their feelings, whereas Americans frankly express their feelings (Hofstede, 1991; Hynson, 1985). On the one hand, the Japanese are expected to choose either "Neutral" or "Undecided" when they are asked about their JS. Indications were seen in studies of Azumi and McMillan (about 33%) and Odaka (45-49%). However, Americans have learned to respect one's frankness and thus frankly express their feelings. On the other hand, Americans are expected to select "Neutral" or "Undecided" based on their true feelings when they are asked about their JS. This reflects that there is a significantly different meaning in "Neutral" or "Undecided" between the Japanese and Americans. In short, the scale is not equivalent in both countries. Therefore, both mean and percentage comparison methods used in those cross-cultural research on JS (Table 3) are inappropriate. As a result, the researcher questioned the conclusion: American workers are more satisfied than Japanese counterparts.

3-4. Comparability of Questionnaires Used

As seen in the overview, Azumi and McMillan (1976), Naoi and Schooler

(1985), and Odaka (1975) measured JS of the Japanese sample. Next, they quoted results of the American sample from the work of Blauner (1960), Kohn and Schooler (1983), and Inkeles (1960), respectively. Then, they compared their own results with those of others.

There are several necessary conditions to compare one's result with that of others. According to Warde (1985), they are sample characteristics, geographical characteristics, and time periods (for other details, refer to his work). In addition to them, the comparability of questionnaires used needs to be looked at. If different definitions and thus facets of a certain construct were used, the comparison might lead to a bias. Let's suppose that one measures JS based on salary and working conditions, whereas the other measures overall JS. Although both JS measures are related to each other, the comparison between these figures might be somewhat questioned. Thus, the comparability also needs to be checked before comparing one's result with that of others.

Do those studies meet this comparability condition? Azumi and McMillan measured JS based on work role, job climate, managers, and the company in general, while researchers in six studies reviewed by Blauner measured general JS. Because different facets are measured, the comparability is somewhat questioned. Odaka measured one item of general JS based on "likeness," while Inkeles measured one item of overall JS based on "satisfaction." The author, Odaka, also mentioned this problem of comparability in the conclusion section. Naoi and Schooler translated and back-translated the same questionnaire which Kohn and Schooler had used, and thus they

met the comparability condition. In sum, the comparability of questionnaires used are dubious in works of Azumi and McMillan and Odaka but not in the work of Naoi and Schooler.

3-5. Pretest and Return Rate

Other problems which lead to a question about the conclusion are the unreported pretest results of questionnaire and return rate. The purpose of a pretest is to check the soundness of the questionnaire. However, three studies (Azumi and McMillan, Lincoln and Kalleberg, and Odaka) did not include pretest results which made it difficult to check the soundness of questionnaires. For instance, Lincoln and Kalleberg asked four JS questions. Among them, one item was "Would you recommend the job to a friend?" Underlying assumption of this question might be that if one is not satisfied with one's job, one would not recommend such a job to one's friend. However even when one is not satisfied with the job, one can still recommend that job to one's friend if one believes that the friend's ability and/or personality fits that job. That is, asking one's recommendation of the same job to one's friend does not necessarily imply whether one is satisfied or not. This means that the soundness of the questionnaire used by Lincoln and Kalleberg might be suspect. Therefore, pretest results of the questionnaire should be reported for the soundness of the questionnaire used.

In addition to this problem, the response rate was reported in only two studies

(Lincoln et al., and Naoi and Schooler). The return rate should be reported because one major biases in any sample survey comes because of non-response (Warde, 1985)-- reliability and validity of the research result. The higher the non-response rate, the more unreliable the result. For instance, Finker (1950) measured the average number of peach trees in North Carolina to the farmers who had 100 or more. Through a hidden code and from the other source, Finker noticed that farmers who own larger number of peach trees tended to respond well. This caused the sample to be no longer a random sample from the survey population and therefore the result was distorted. What is more important is that low response rate will affect the validity of the result. Therefore, the return rate should be reported for reliable and valid results.

4. Summary

Comparative JS studies between Japanese and the U.S. workers revealed that, contrary to the traditional thought, American workers were more satisfied than Japanese counterparts. However, this result was questioned because of several problems. Major problems are:

a. Construct validity was not met;

b. The scale did not reflect cultural differences in expressing feelings between the U.S. and Japanese workers; and

c. Comparison methods were inappropriate for cross-cultural research.

Besides these major problems, other problem areas were:

d. Comparability of questionnaires used was questioned;

e. Pretest results were unreported; and

f. Return rate was not reported.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, questionnaire design and research methods will be discussed.

1. **Questionnaire Design**

In this section, discussions will include lessons from the literature review, development of the research instrument, and the pilot test of the instrument.

1-1. Lessons from the Literature Review

One important condition for a good questionnaire is to meet construct validity that tests whether the questionnaire measures appropriate constructs or not. The American Psychological Association (1974) argued that construct validity can be met if the questionnaire is developed under a supporting theory because the theory provides information about what to measure and how to measure. That is, the instrument based on JS theory is a prerequisite for a good questionnaire.

Several lessons from the review of JS theories were as follows:

a) Measure FJS rather than overall JS because JS is a multi-facet construct;

b) Use seven facets with several items for each facet. They are the job itself, supervisor, coworkers, salary, working conditions, benefits, and job security;

c) Do not include weighted measure (Importance); and

d) Use evaluative judgment terms.

Another valuable lesson comes from the discrepancy dimension of JS that was not discussed in the review chapter. As mentioned, JS theorists tended to investigate two dimensions of JS: discrepancy and importance. For the importance dimension, both theory and research results have shown the mixed viewpoints. The same is true for the discrepancy dimension. One group of researchers supported direct measures ("Is Now") (Alderfer, 1969; Blood, 1969; Ewen, 1967; Kalleberg, 1977; Vroom, 1964). The other group supported discrepancy measures ("Should be - Is Now") (Evans, 1969; Locke, 1969; Morse, 1953; Porter, 1961; Wanous and Lawler, 1972). Although Seashore and Taber (1975) investigated their arguments, they could not find any research evidence showing the superiority of direct scores over discrepancy ones. Also, Mottaz and Potts (1985) found that both discrepancy and direct models explained JS variation by 43.6 percent. Their results suggested the similar effect of both models in explaining JS.

Despite mixed results, the researcher supported the discrepancy model because of two reasons: popularity and logic. The one most popular instrument, Job

Descriptive Index (JDI: Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969), uses discrepancy scores. The JDI measures five aspects of the job: work itself, supervisor, co-workers, pay, and promotion. The reliability figures of the JDI (0.80 or higher) suggest that the JDI is a good instrument for measuring JS. Besides its popularity, the discrepancy model provides a plausible linkage to psychological theory. The logic of discrepancy scoring relies on a conception that JS is a result of fit between need (or value) and need (or value) fulfillment across job facets. Therefore, the researcher favors discrepancy measures over direct measures.

In addition, previous cross-cultural studies of JS between Japan and the U.S. provide another lesson: use the "Forced" scale when the sample has a strong central tendency in expressing feelings. The "Normal" scale helped the Japanese hide their true feelings by selecting either "undecided" or "neutral." One typical example can be found in the study of Odaka (1975). Near one half of the sample chose the neutral scale in a survey of Japanese workers' JS. Kerlinger (1986) recommended the forced scale, which can reduce the bias caused by the high central tendency.

Summary of Lessons. The review of cross-cultural research on JS between Japan and the U.S. provided the following lessons about developing a JS questionnaire.

a. Measure several FJSs rather than overall JS.

b. Use multiple items for each facet.

c. Do not include weighted measures.

d. Use evaluative judgment terms.

e. Use the discrepancy model.

f. Use the forced scale.

1-2. Questionnaire Development

Considering these lessons, the researcher developed the JS questionnaire. From now on, the questionnaire will be named Won Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (WJSQ). The WJSQ comprised two sections: demographic and JS question sections. Seven questions in the demographic section provide information about the respondent. Then, there were 68 questions related to JS. The WJSQ included , in total, 75 questions.

1-2-A. Demographic Information. Seven items in the demographic section were related to the personal information. The first item asked the nationality of the respondent. Following questions asked respondent about his/her sex, age, nature of the job, education level, work periods in the occupation, and work periods at the present company.

There were two questions, which were used only to check whether the respondent fits to the purpose of this research. The nationality question was to check whether the respondent is either Korean or an American. Another item was the nature of the job whose purpose was to check whether the respondent's job is the white collar job.

1-2-B. FJS Questions. Following questions of demographic information, there were questions of FJS. They were related to the job itself, supervisor, co-workers, salary, working conditions, benefits, and job security. Evaluative judgment terms were used. There were instructions before JS questions. Respondents were instructed to answer each question in the "Should Be" part based on what they want from it. Also, they were instructed to answer each in the "Is" part based on current situations judged by them. After an item of general FJS, specific aspects of each facet were asked. Each facet included three to six questions to increase construct validity.

Questions were selected or modified from leading JS questionnaires such as the JDI, the questionnaire by Scott (1967), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ: Dawis, 1967). The JDI was the source for items of the job itself, supervisors, co-workers, and wages. The number of items selected were five, six, four, and four, respectively. The questionnaire by Scott provided three items of both working conditions and benefits. Three items of job security were modified from the MSQ. The researcher added one item of competitiveness among co-workers in the co-workers section after the pretest (more details will be discussed in the pilot test section). The following questions were to rank the relative importance of JS facets and to answer an item of overall JS. The final question was to specify any other possible factors affecting their JS. The WJSQ had 68 questions related to JS.

1-2-C. Scale. One necessary condition for the cross-cultural research is scale equivalence that refers to the measurement of the equivalence of quantitative scale. It

is not only hard to achieve it but also hard to justify it (Poortinga, 1975; Triandis et al., 1973). Even with such difficulties, the researcher tried to achieve it by reducing and spreading out the effect of central tendency.

As explained earlier, when the sample showed a high central tendency in expressing emotions, the "Normal" scale could lead to a bias. Japanese's central tendency forced nearly half of the sample to respond "Neutral" when Odaka (1975) asked about their JS. Kerlinger (1986) recommended the "Forced" scale to reduce such a bias. As the Japanese, Korean workers also have a high central tendency because of influences of Confucianism and the social norm of "Modesty" (Lee, 1983). Thus, the researcher expected that if Koreans were asked about their JS, many of them would check the middle (neutral or undecided or do not know). As Kerlinger's recommendation, the WJSQ used the forced scale to reduce such a bias. Also, this instrument used a six-point scale instead of a four-point one to spread out the effect of central tendency. The scale was "Strongly Agree (STA), Moderately Agree (MA), Slightly Agree (SA), Slightly Disagree (SDA), Moderately Disagree (MDA), and Strongly Disagree (STDA)."

1-2-D. Functional Equivalence. Another necessary condition for the cross-cultural research is functional equivalence that refers to the measurement of the same meaning across societies. Most of cross-cultural scholars used the translation and back-translation methods of Brislin et al. (1973). First, the researcher translated the English into the Korean. Then to check whether the questionnaires measure the same

construct or not, I used the translation and back-translation methods. A Korean version of the WJSQ (KWJSQ) was translated and back-translated by two doctoral students in English major who had work experiences in Korea. Modifications were made until no differences were noticed.

1-3. Pretest

1-3-A. Pretest of KWJSQ. To check the soundness of the KWJSQ, a pretest was done. Forty-two Korean students at Oklahoma State University (OSU) participated in the pretest of the KWJSQ. The sample was limited to only those who had work experiences in Korea. The researcher delivered the instrument with the stamped return envelop. In the cover sheet (Appendix 2-A), there included the explanation of this study's purpose. To encourage participation and to increase the return rate, participating respondents were promised that their names would be kept anonymous. Also to increase the return rate, the researcher delivered and collected the KWJSQ.

1-3-B. Pretest of EWJSQ. One hundred and eighteen MBA students at the University Center at Tulsa (UCAT) participated in the pretest of the English version of WJSQ (EWJSQ). They were all full-time working students. The instructor briefly explained the purpose of this test and handed the instrument, EWJSQ, to them before the class. Students were asked to complete it at home and to bring it back to the next

class. The instructor collected it before the class. Also to increase the return rate, he/she asked students to bring it by the next class if one forgot to bring it.

2. **Research Methods**

In this section, analysis methods of each hypothesis will be discussed.

2-1. Test of Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1. JS for Korean and American workers is affected by work itself, supervisors, co-workers, pay, working conditions, benefits, and job security.

A regression model was used to find out the relationship between the dependent variable O (overall JS) and the independent variables. Independent variables were the job itself (J), supervisor (S), co-workers (C), salary (W), working conditions (WC), benefits (B), and job security (JS). The model was stated as follows:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1i} + \beta_2 X_{2i} + \beta_3 X_{3i} + \beta_4 X_{4i}$$
$$+ \beta_5 X_{5i} + \beta_6 X_{6i} + \beta_7 X_{7i} + e_i$$

where:

Y_i is the value of the response variable in the ith trial

β_0 to β_7 are parameters

X_{1i} to X_{7i} are the value of the independent variables (1-7) in the ith trial

e_i is a random error

$i = 1,...,n.$

The identity of the regression function was checked at α=.05 significance level by considering alternatives:

$$H_o: \beta_i = 0$$

$$H_a: \beta_i \neq 0.$$

When a high level of multicollinearity, which refers to intercorrelations among the independent variables, exists among the independent variables, estimates of regression coefficients tend to be unreliable (Hamburg, 1983; Pedhauzer, 1982). Although there is not a general agreement on the level of "high" multicollinearity, correlations greater than .80 might lead to the biased interpretation of the results (Seo, 1992). In order to check the level of multicollinearity, zero-order correlations and tolerance were measured. Tolerance can be obtained by the formula:

$$Tolerance = 1 - R_i^2$$

where:

R_i^2 : multiple correlation coefficient when the *i*th independent variable is predicted from the linear combination of the other independent variable.

The higher the tolerance figure, the lower multicollinearity.

Once the hypothesis 1 had been supported, FACTOR analysis was done to see if factor structures of both groups were similar to each other.

2-2. Test of Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2. Korean workers value those seven JS factors differently than American counterparts.

This hypothesis is a test if there are group differences in regression functions between Americans and Koreans. The researcher used another regression model including interaction terms without overall JS. Neter, Wasserman, and Kunter (1983) argued that regression models with indicator variables that contain interaction terms allow testing the equality of regression functions for different populations. The American sample was dummy (DUM) coded as "1" and the Korean sample was coded as "0." Since the researcher's purpose was to test whether two regression lines are the same, the simplified fitted model was:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \beta_3 X_{i1} X_{i2} + e_i$$

where:

X_{i1} = seven independent variables

$X_{i2} = 1$ if American sample, 0 if Korean sample.

Identity of the regression function was tested at α=.05 level by considering alternatives:

$$H_0: \beta_3 = 0$$

$$H_a: \beta_3 \neq 0$$

and the appropriate test statistic was the *t* statistic.

2-3. Test of Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3. American workers are more satisfied than Korean counterparts.

T-test was done to check the group difference in the overall JS level. Identity was tested at α=.05 level by considering alternatives:

$$H_0: \mu_{0i} = \mu_{1i}$$

$$H_a: \mu_{0i} \neq \mu_{1i}$$

where:

1: Americans *0*: Koreans

i: overall JS.

2-4. Test of Hypothesis 3-a to 3-g

Hypotheses	Satisfaction Level	
	Americans	Koreans
3-a. Job Itself	>	
3-b. Supervisors	>	
3-c. Co-workers	=	
3-d. Pay or Salary	>	
3-e. Working Conditions	>	
3-f. Benefits	=	
3-g. Job Security	=	

Next to test the individual hypotheses, MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) was used. As discussed in the problem section in Chapter 1, scale equivalence should be met to compare mean values of different two groups. Although it was hard to justify the equivalence of scale between the EWJSQ and KWJSQ, the forced scale, as suggested by Kerlinger (1986), was used to reduce central tendency of Koreans. Also, a six-point scale was used to spread out the effect of central tendency. Although it is hard to justify scale equivalence, the researcher assumed that the above efforts will approach to or meet the condition of scale equivalence. Therefore, MANOVA was performed to compare the mean values of those seven factors between American and Korean samples.

First, overall effects of multivariate tests were checked with Wilk's Lambda and Hotelling-Lawley Trace. Second, once a significant overall group effect had been noticed, the group effect on individual factors was checked. Third, *t*-test was done to see group differences in the FJS level. Identity was tested at α=.05 level by considering alternatives:

$$H_0: \mu_{0i} = \mu_{1i}$$

$$H_a: \mu_{0i} \neq \mu_{1i}$$

where:

1: Americans, *0*: Koreans

i: seven factors.

Fourth, to find out how individual items influenced general FJS, Univariate *F*-test and standardized discriminant function coefficients were checked. Finally, Discriminant analysis was done to see which factors affect in distinguishing Koreans and Americans.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

In this chapter, discussions will include preliminary findings and test results.

1. Preliminary Findings

In this section, the researcher will explain pretest results of the instrument, sample configurations, return rate, and data coding. Finally, discussions will include reliability results of the instrument and its improvement methods.

1-1. Pretest Results

1-1-A. Pretest of KWJSQ. Forty-two Korean students at OSU participated in the pilot-test of the KWJSQ. The researcher collected the instrument within two weeks period. Among 39 collected questionnaires, three were unusable and thus the return rate was 85.7 percent.

Pretest results showed that changes in the KWJSQ were not necessary except

one item: seven respondents pointed out the need for an item, competitiveness, among co-workers. Several factors might induce such response. They are the Korean culture, educational system, and business practices.

The Korean culture, influenced by Confucianism, encourages cooperation among co-workers. However, competition also exists among Korean co-workers. Lee (1983) suggested that the reason for such competition might be the combination of culture and the educational system. Koreans, influenced by Confucianism, highly value those who received a higher education that is believed to bring more money and the fame in the future. Therefore, Koreans have tried to get a higher education at any cost. However, the Korean Government allowed only a few schools. Thus, the educational system has encouraged competitions among students.

Furthermore, Korean large companies hire those who graduate from several prestigious schools such as Seoul National University, Yunsei University, and Korea University. These graduates get more salary and a better chance of promotion in the future than those of other schools. Therefore, everyone has severely competed to pass the entrance exams of such prestigious schools. As a result, many students took the exam for several years to become a member of those schools and some who failed the exams even committed suicide. Some even committed suicide before the exams because of too severe competition and burdens. Also if a family has a senior student, all family members should not disturb him or her.

Because of combined influences of the culture, educational system, and business practices, Koreans have lived with this dual situation: cooperation and severe

competition. Therefore, the researcher included the competitiveness among fellow workers in the co-worker facet.

After the modification, the researcher tested the KWJSQ with 25 working students and professors at Oklahoma University (OU). Returned responses from twenty suggested that additional change be not necessary. However, two Korean visiting professors at OU pointed out a minor problem of its format. In the questionnaire, respondents were asked the same questions in the "Should Be" part as in the "Is" part. Thus, they recommended a modification of the format: both parts are combined rather than separated. Following their advice, a final version of the KWJSQ (Appendix 2-C) came out.

1-1-B. Pretest of EWJSQ. One hundred and eighteen MBA students at the UCAT pretested the English version of the WJSQ (EWJSQ). They were full-time working students. Within three weeks period, ninety students returned usable questionnaires (return rate: 76.3 %). Results suggested that any change be not necessary. However, for the comparison purpose, the researcher changed the EWJSQ as the KWJSQ. The final version of the EWJSQ (Appendix 1-C) included an item, "Competitiveness," in the co-worker facet with the changed format as in the KWJSQ.

1-2. Sample Configuration

The researcher tried to reach to Samsung and Gold-Star in the U.S. for seven

months. However, they did not allow the researcher to study their employees because of possible bad reputations or images. Thus, students were used. The original plan was to use Korean students who had work experience in Korea and were studying in the U.S. However, the pretest with 42 Korean students at OSU suggests a possible bias. After the pretest, the researcher personally asked eight respondents how many years-old memories they used to respond to the KWJSQ. Seven out of eight respondents answered that their responses were based on more than two years-old memories. Warde (1985) argued that one's responses based on too-old memory lead to a significant bias. To reduce such a bias, the sample was changed to full-time working students.

1-2-A. Korean Sample. The Korean samples were MBA students in the Executive Program who were enrolled in the spring semester of 1993 at Seoul National University (SNU). They were full-time working students in white collar jobs. Professor Kwak who was in charge of the program helped to collect the data. Because Korean students, influenced by Confucianism, show full respects toward their teacher, the researcher expected a high return rate (more than 80 percent). Thus, the researcher mentioned to him that the appropriate sample size was around 150. Two hundred and five students participated in this survey.

1-2-B. American Sample. The American samples were 119 MBA students who were enrolled in the spring semester of 1993 at UCAT. Contrary to the return rate of

76.3 percent at the pilot test, only thirty-eight students returned usable questionnaires (return rae: 31.9 %). Additional surveys were done during the summer semester of 1993. Twenty students at the Educational Research Center at OU (ERCOU) and 94 MBA students in the Executive Conference Program at Oklahoma City University (OCU) participated in the survey. In total, the American sample size was 233. Among them, 117 respondents returned usable questionnaires (more details will be explained later). All respondents were full-time working students in white collar jobs.

1-2-C. Sample Comparison. As seen in the table 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, sample configurations show similarity except that the majority (98.2 %) of Koreans were male, while 60.7 percent of Americans were male. This suggested that Korea is a male-dominant country. Another distinguishing point is that Americans (86.7 %) have more undergraduate degree than Koreans (65.2 %), while Koreans (30.5 %) have more master or doctoral degree than Americans (12.8 %). It is because the Korean culture respects those who have a higher education.

Table 4. Sex Distribution of Both Samples

Country	U.S.		Korea	
Sex	Cases	Percent(%)	Cases	Percent
Male	71	60.7	161	98.2
Female	46	39.3	3	1.8
Total	117		164	

Table 5. Age Distribution of Both Samples

Country	U.S.		Korea	
Age	Cases	Percent(%)	Cases	Percent
21-25	16	13.7	7	4.3
26-30	30	25.6	59	36.0
31-35	37	31.6	51	31.1
36-40	12	10.3	25	15.2
41-45	13	11.1	8	4.9
over 45	9	7.7	14	8.5
Total	117		164	

Table 6. Educational Distribution of Both Samples

Country	U.S.		Korea	
Education Level	Cases	Percent(%)	Cases	Percent
High School	1	.9	7	4.3
Undergraduate	101	86.3	107	65.2
Master or Doctoral Degree	15	12.8	50	30.5
Total	117		164	

Table 7. Number of Years in Current Occupation of Both Samples

Country	U.S.		Korea	
Years	Cases	Percent(%)	Cases	Percent
Less than 1 year	5	4.3	14	8.5
1-2 years	18	15.4	55	33.5
3-4 years	25	21.4	31	18.9
5-10 years	38	32.5	33	20.1
10-20 years	24	20.5	25	15.2
over 20 years	7	6.0	6	3.7
Total	117		164	

Table 8. Number of Years in Current Company of Both Samples

Country	U.S.		Korea	
Years	Cases	Percent(%)	Cases	Percent
Less than 1 year	12	10.3	21	12.8
1-2 years	24	20.5	60	36.6
3-4 years	27	23.1	30	18.3
5-10 years	36	30.8	30	18.3
10-20 years	14	12.0	20	12.2
over 20 years	4	3.4	3	1.8
Total	117		164	

1-3. Return Rate

1-3-A. Return Rate of Korean Sample. Before the class, the instructor explained about the researcher and the purpose of this study as in the instruction sheet (Appendix 2-B). Then, the instructor handed the KWJSQ with the cover letter (Appendix 2-A) where information on the researcher and the purpose of this survey is included. Also to enhance the return rate, anonymity was fully guaranteed in the cover letter. Respondents received ten minutes to complete the questionnaire. Once the instructor had collected them, Professor Kwak mailed them to the researcher.

One hundred and ninety-nine out of 205 students returned questionnaires. Among them, sixteen were unusable and 19 were incomplete. One hundred and sixty-four questionnaires were used for the analysis. The return rate was 77.8 percent.

1-3-B. Return Rate of American Sample. To those 119 MBA students at UCAT, the instructor explained the study purpose and informed about the researcher as in the instruction sheet (Appendix 1-B). Then, he/she distributed questionnaires with the cover sheet. In the cover sheet (Appendix 1-A), the purpose of the survey, information on the researcher, and guarantee of anonymity were included. Once students filled out the EWJSQ at home, they returned it to the instructor within three weeks period. Whenever the instructor collected it, he/she asked them to bring it next time if anyone did not bring it then.

Fifty-five out of 119 respondents returned questionnaires. Among them, five were unusable and 12 were incomplete. Contrary to the high return rate (76%) at the pilot test, the return rate was only 31.9 percent.

Because of too small number of the American sample, additional surveys were necessary. At this time the researcher used two different methods to increase the return rate. The sample at the Education Research Center at OU (ERCOU) received the questionnaire, EWJSQ, during the field trip. One student collected it at the end of the trip. Eighteen out of 20 respondents returned the questionnaire. Among them, three were unusable and three were incomplete. Twelve questionnaires were usable.

To the OCU sample, the researcher was in the class to increase the return rate. Before the class, the instructor read the instruction sheet where the purpose of this research was included. Respondents were allowed 10 minutes to complete questionnaires. Then, the researcher collected them. Eighty-nine out of 94 respondents returned the questionnaires. Among them, two were unusable and 20

were incomplete.

The summary of the American sample was in the table 9. The total number of questionnaires collected were 166. Among them, 117 questionnaires were usable. So the return rate was 50.2 %.

Table 9. Return Rate of American Sample

	Size	Returned	Unusable	Incomplete	Usable
UCAT	119	55	5	12	38
ERCOU	20	18	3	3	12
OCU	94	89	2	20	67
Total	233	162	10	35	117

1-3-C. Other Considerations. According to Erdors (1970), it is impossible to generalize about what is an adequate return rate. However, "no mail survey can be considered reliable unless it has a minimum of 50 percent responses, or unless it demonstrates with some form of verification that the non-respondents are similar to the respondents (p.144)." Both return rates of Koreans (77.8 %) and Americans (50.2 %) met this minimum condition.

Even with these successful return rates, there were unusually high number (35) of incomplete questionnaires among American respondents. Especially, 29 out of those 35 respondents answered all questions except some general FJS questions. One possible reason was that there was too small space between the question of the general FJS and those of the detailed FJS. In the future, more space between them might reduce this problem.

Due to many incomplete questionnaires, further investigation was necessary to check if I have to used those incomplete responses in the analysis. If there was a significant difference between the two groups (completed and incomplete), those incomplete questionnaires would be adjusted using the recovery technique for the missing data. Age, sex, and educational distributions were checked. No significant differences were found between the two groups as in shown the table 10. Therefore, the analysis did not include those incomplete responses.

Table 10. Distribution of Completed and Incomplete Responses by Age, Sex, and Education (%)

	Completed	Incomplete
Age		
21 - 29	13.4	6.1
30 - 39	58	48.5
40 - 49	21	39.4
50 and over	7.6	6.1
Sex	M(60.5) F(39.5)	M(66.7) F(37.3)
Education		
Undergraduate	86.6	78.8
Over	12.6	21.2

1-4. Data Coding

The completed data collection instruments obtained from 281 respondents were audited and the responses were extended to the right side of the questionnaire page. "Strongly Agree (STA)" was coded as "1." "Moderately Agree (MA), Slightly Agree

(SA), Slightly Disagree (SDA), Moderately Disagree (MDA), and Strongly Disagree (STDA)" were coded as "2, 3, 4, 5, and 6," respectively. Coded data responses were keypunched onto the computer in the SPSS data set. Using the dummy variable (DUM), the American sample was coded as "1," while the Korean sample was coded as "0." Also, the gap figures between "Should Be" and "Is Now" values were computed. For instance, G_J1 is a difference between the "Should Be" and "Is Now" values of the "routine" item of the job itself facet.

The researcher proofread the printout data to verify accuracy of the keypunching. Then, two MBA students double-checked it.

1-5. Reliability

As mentioned earlier, the reliability tests of the original items show Cronbach α higher than .8, suggesting very reliable ones. The reliability figures of the KWJSQ and EWJSQ were checked with the complete samples (Korea: 164, America: 117). The results were as in the table 11. Reliability figures of the job itself, supervisor, co-workers, salary, working conditions, benefits, and job security for the total sample were .7518, .7789, .5567, .7318, .7909, .8179, and .8218, respectively. Those results of the American sample were .7986, .7894, .5764, .7376, .7837, .7772, and .8485, respectively, while those for the Korean sample were .7291, .7395, .4688, .6301, 7128, .6395, and .7781, respectively.

Table 11. Reliability Test Results of Questionnaire

Item	Sample Total	U.S.	Korea
JOB ITSELF	.7518	.7986	.7291
SUPERVISORS	.7789	.7894	.7395
CO-WORKERS	.5567	.5764	.4688
SALARY	.7318	.7376	.6301
WORKING CONDITIONS	.7909	.7837	.7128
BENEFITS	.8179	.7772	.6395
JOB SECURITY	.8218	.8485	.7781

Results in the table 11 show a fairly high reliability of the EWJSQ and KWJSQ except the co-worker facet. One possible reason for such a reliability figure of Americans is that professional level employees might have different view from those of low level employees: co-workers might be more important to lower level employees than to professional level ones. The reason for such moderate reliability (.4688) for the Korean sample might be a strong influence of Confucianism. Korean Confucianism emphasizes the cooperative relationships among family members. Even when there are conflicts among members, each member is supposed to show endurance. Also, they have learned not to judge each other. Korean large companies have emphasized this cooperative relationship among co-workers. For instance, if one worker's family member dies, co-workers collect the condolence money for him/her. As a result, Koreans rarely judge co-workers and do not make an overt quarrel even of complaints about office mates. They had learned to conceal hostile relationships with co-workers (Janelli and Yim, 1993). Thus, the low reliability of the co-worker facet

might be the result of this attitude among Korean workers. One way of breaking this attitude might be an interview where more private atmosphere is provided. Caution must be made in the interpretation of co-workers because of moderate reliability figures.

Due to the moderate reliability figures of the co-worker facet, Cronbach α figures of individual items when item correlation is deleted were checked (refer to Appendix 3 for those figures of other factors). The results in the table 12 show that figures of the "Competitive" item, C10 ("Should Be") and C11 ("Is Now") were .6601, and .6826, respectively and were higher than .5567 in the table 11. This implies that the reliability figures of the co-worker facet can be enhanced if the "Competitive" item is not used.

One common phenomenon seen in the table 12 was that there were higher figures for American samples than Korean counterparts. One reason might be lack of experience of such a questionnaire method. For instance after collecting the questionnaires at the pretest stage, the researcher asked eight respondents if they had experiences on this type of questionnaire during their work periods in Korea. Among those eight, only one person gave the positive answer to the researcher. More explanations about items to the Korean sample might enhance the reliability of the KWJSQ.

Especially, reliability figures of salary and benefits for Koreans show substantially lower than those for Americans. Besides lack of experiences in the survey, another possible reason for such lower figures might be the Korean cultural

influence. In Confucianism, if one is guided to profit or money, one will incur much

Table 12. CRONBACH α of Co-Workers
If Item Correlation Is Deleted

	TOTAL	AMERICANS	KOREANS
CO-WORKERS			
C2	.5306	.5732	.4330
C3	.5163	.5505	.4122
C4	.5100	.5475	.3967
C5	.4046	.4568	.2446
C6	.4980	.5343	.3912
C7	.4384	.4762	.3181
C8	.5081	.5300	.4226
C9	.4364	.4542	.3229
C10	.6601	.6351	.6366
C11	.6826	.6780	.6283

ill will. Because of this influence, Korean traditions put little special status to the businesspeople though money has been considered important. Also, Koreans tend not to express frankly about money-related matters. Therefore if more explanations about items are given before the survey, and if the personal interview method is combined with it, the reliability of salary and benefit factors might be improved.

2. Test Results

2-1. Test of Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1. JS for Korean and American workers is affected by work itself, supervisors, co-workers, salary, working conditions, benefits, and job security.

To test this hypothesis, the regression model was stated as follows:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_i X_i + e_i$$

where:

β_0 : constant

β_i : parameters

X_i : independent variables

$i = 1,...,7.$

Identity of the regression function was checked at α=.05 level by considering alternatives:

$$H_o : \beta_i = 0$$

$$H_a : \beta_i \neq 0$$

The F value was 34.93212, it was significant at F=.0000 level, and the adjusted R^2 was .67188 for Americans. Also, the F value was 35.93280, it was significant at

F=.0000 level, and the adjusted R^2 was .60003 for Koreans. Thus, results indicated that both models were good.

A high level of multicollinearity among the independent variables might result in unreliable estimates of regression coefficients (Hamburg, 1983; Pedhauzer, 1982). Thus, zero-order correlations and tolerance were checked. Zero-order correlations among the independent variables in the table 14 and 15 showed a low to medium multicollinearity (.058-.590). A more direct indicator of multicollinearity, tolerance (Table 15) showed a low multicollinearity. That is, these figures suggested reliable estimation of the regression coefficients.

Table 13. Zero-Order Correlations for Americans

	JOB	SUP	COW	WAGE	WC	BEN	SEC
JOB	1	.263	.328	.210	.319	.169	.303
SUP		1	.227	.394	.414	.120	.485
COW			1	.167	.163	.058	.108
WAGE				1	.318	.479	.107
WC					1	.271	.334
BEN						1	.239
SEC							1

Table 14. Zero-Order Correlations for Koreans

	JOB	SUP	COW	WAGE	WC	BEN	SEC
JOB	1	.287	.204	.216	.314	.225	.388
SUP		1	.241	.205	.257	.254	.338
COW			1	.198	.455	.218	.256
WAGE				1	.369	.590	.273
WC					1	.354	.454
BEN						1	.308
SEC							1

Table 15. Tolerance for Americans and Koreans

	U.S.	KOREA
JOB	.795183	.686386
SUP	.633100	.773564
COW	.866794	.620180
WAGE	.772873	.822371
WC	.714583	.798409
BEN	.706516	.615305
SEC	.695129	.610910

Results (Table 16) of the significance test of estimated standardized beta values indicated that only the job itself, supervisors, salary, and co-workers were significant at α=.05 level for the American model, while only salary (α=.1023) and benefits (α=.0845) were not significant for the Korean model (Table 17).

Table 16. Significance Test Results
for American Model

	STANDARDIZED BETA	T-VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
JOB ITSELF	.450858	7.453	.0000
SUPERVISORS	.153034	2.399	.0181
CO-WORKERS	.180794	3.165	.0020
SALARY	.291643	4.363	.0000
WORKING CONDITIONS	.083320	1.324	.1882
BENEFITS	.068733	1.086	.2798
JOB SECURITY	.055663	.933	.3527

Table 17. Significance Test Results
for Korean Model

	STANDARDIZED BETA	T-VALUE	SIGNIFICANCE
JOB ITSELF	.288571	5.205	.0000
SUPERVISORS	.231709	4.242	.0000
CO-WORKERS	.132898	2.360	.0195
SALARY	.103384	1.644	.1023
WORKING CONDITIONS	.197510	3.128	.0021
BENEFITS	.110033	1.736	.0845
JOB SECURITY	.294127	4.919	.0000

Although working conditions, benefits, and job security factors were not significant for the American model, all the previous tests (refer to Locke, 1976) with the American sample suggested the significance of those factors. Thus, further research is needed in the future. Also considering that this was the first attempt to measure FJS level of Korean white-collar workers, figures of salary and benefit nearly approached statistical significance and furthermore, effects of salary and benefits on JS are theoretically plausible. Further research is needed for the Korean model.

Thus although the hypothesis 1 was rejected, the researcher assumed the appropriateness of the hypothesis 1. Thereafter, Factor Analysis was done to investigate if there are similarities in the factor structures of both models. Principal Component Analysis was done with the varimax rotation using the total sample.

The final factor analysis statistics shown in the table 18 indicated that two factors whose eigenvalues were greater than 1 explain 56.1 % of the total variance. The job itself, supervisors, co-workers, working conditions, and job security formed FAC1, while salary and benefits formed another FAC2. FAC2 was named "Monetary

Factor (MFAC)" and FAC1 was "Non-Monetary Factor (N-MFAC)."

Table 18. Total Factor Analysis Statistics

	Variables	Factoring	Eigenvalue	Cumulative Percent
FAC1 (Non-Monetary Factor)	Job Itself	.69583	2.92380	41.8
	Supervisors	.59652		
	Co-Workers	.67863		
	Working Conditions	.57096		
	Job Security	.61866		
FAC2 (Monetary Factor)	Salary	.86829	1.00285	56.1
	Benefits	.84939		

Using these factor scores of FAC1 and FAC2, the fitted regression model was stated as:

$$OSAT = a + \beta_1 FAC1 + \beta_2 FAC2 + \epsilon.$$

The model fitness was checked. Results of the adjusted R^2 and P-value were .61084 and 220.75039, respectively and the P-value was significant at P=.0000 level. These suggested that the model fitness be good.

The standardized beta values of FAC1 and FAC2 (Table 19) were .691636 and .044140, respectively and both were significant at t=.0000 level. This indicated that non-monetary factors influenced general JS far more than monetary factors.

Table 19. Variables in the Equation
with Total Sample

Variable	B	Standardized Beta	T	Significance T
FAC1	.818890	.691636	18.552	.0000
FAC2	.435445	.044140	9.865	.0000
Constant	2.736655		62.110	.0000

Two Principal Component analyses with the varimax rotation were done with both American and Korean samples separately. Results were in the table 20.

Table 20. Factor Analysis Statistics
for Americans and Koreans

	Variables	Factoring	Eigenvalue	Cumulative Percent
AFAC1 (Non-Monetary Factor)	Job Itself	.73659	2.53831	36.3
	Supervisors	.75672		
	Co-Workers	.68433		
	Working Conditions	.53258		
	Job Security	.51451		
AFAC2 (Monetary Factor)	Salary	.78938	1.12033	52.3
	Benefits	.83005		
KFAC1 (Non-Monetary Factor)	Job Itself	.66886	2.85313	40.8
	Supervisors	.61941		
	Co-Workers	.61320		
	Working Conditions	.65290		
	Job Security	.70720		
KFAC2 (Monetary Factor)	Salary	.87939	1.05097	55.8
	Benefits	.85544		

Using these factor scores of AFAC1 and AFAC2, the fitted regression model of Americans was stated as:

$$OSAT = a + \beta_1 AFAC1 + \beta_2 AFAC2 + \epsilon.$$

And with factor scores of KFAC1 and KFAC2, the fitted regression model of Koreans was stated as:

$$OSAT = a + \beta_1 KFAC1 + \beta_2 KFAC2 + \epsilon.$$

The model fitness of these models was checked. For the U.S. model, the adjusted R^2, P-value, and the significance of P were .61067, 91.97419, .0000, respectively. For the Korean model, those figures were .59113, 118.83196, .0000, respectively. These figures indicated that both models were also well fitted.

Findings of standardized beta values of FAC1 and FAC2 were .670422 and .409778, respectively for the U.S. model, while those for the Korean model were .748786 and .188335, respectively. These figures showed that both samples were

Table 21. Variables in the Equation
with Separated Sample

Variable	B	Standardized Beta	T	Significance T
AFAC1	.838497	.670422	11.572	.0000
AFAC2	.512509	.409778	7.073	.0000
KFAC1	.797706	.748786	14.951	.0000
KFAC2	.200639	.188335	3.760	.0002

more sensitive to non-money related factors. Within this similarity, results shown in

the table 21 indicated the difference. They suggested that Americans (.409778) were more sensitive to money-related factors than Koreans (.188335), whereas Koreans (.748786) were more sensitive to non-money-related factors than Americans (.670422).

Summary-Test of Hypothesis 1. This hypothesis 1 was rejected. However, considering that this was the first attempt to investigate JS factors, figures of salary and benefit factors nearly approached statistical significance. Furthermore, they are theoretically plausible. Therefore, although further research is needed, the researcher assumed that these seven factors were significant factors of the Koreans' JS, factor structures of both models were checked. The results of this ex-post analysis indicated a similar factor structure: "Monetary" (salary and benefits) and "Non-Monetary" (the job itself, supervisors, co-workers, working conditions, and job security) factors. Also general JS of both samples were more influenced by non-monetary factors than monetary ones. Within this similarity, difference also exists: Americans were more sensitive to monetary factors, while Koreans were more sensitive to non-monetary factors.

2-2. Test of Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2. Korean workers value seven factors differently than American counterparts.

This hypothesis was the test of group differences between the two groups. Neter, Wasserman, and Kutner (1983) argued that regression models with indicator variables that contain interaction terms allow testing the equality of regression functions for different populations. Therefore, the regression model including interaction terms without overall JS was used to test this hypothesis. The American sample was dummy (DUM) coded as "1" and the Korean sample was coded as "0." Since the researcher's purpose was to test whether two regression lines are the same, the simplified fitted model was:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \beta_3 X_{i1} X_{i2} + e_i$$

where:

X_{i1} = seven independent variables

X_{i2} = *1* if American sample, *0* if Korean sample.

Identity of the regression function was tested by considering the alternatives:

$$H_0: \beta_3 = 0$$

$$H_a: \beta_3 \neq 0$$

and the appropriate test statistic was the *t* statistic.

The adjusted R^2 was .65877, F-value was 37.03783, and the significance level was F=.0000. The results seen in the table 22 indicated that only the job itself, salary, benefits, and job security show interaction effects at α=.05 level and thus implied that

they explained most of the group differences. Therefore, the hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

Table 22. Variables in the Equation with Dummy Variable

Variable	B	Standardized Beta	T	Significance T
DUM	.492681	.205495	1.496	.1357
DUM*JOB	-.185141	-.236086	-2.207	.0281
DUM*SUP	.081026	.115616	1.143	.2542
DUM*COW	-.037768	-.045762	-.408	.6836
DUM*WC	.079694	.122785	.911	.3632
DUM*WAGE	-.157283	-.266488	-1.985	.0482
DUM*BEN	-.157952	-.308802	-1.995	.0471
DUM*SEC	.207681	.338851	3.071	.0024

2-3. Test of Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3. American workers are more satisfied than Korean counterparts.

The mean value for Americans was 2.3761 with the standard deviation of 1.251, while the mean value for Koreans was 2.9939 with the standard deviation of 1.065. P-value was -4.45 and its probability was P<.001. This means that American workers were more satisfied than Korean counterparts; that is, the hypothesis 3 was supported.

2-4. Test of Individual Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Job Satisfaction Level Americans	Koreans
3-a. Job Itself	>	
3-b. Supervisors	>	
3-c. Co-Workers	=	
3-d. Salary	>	
3-e. Working Conditions	>	
3-f. Benefits	=	
3-g. Job Security	=	

Next to test individual hypotheses (3-a through 3-g), MANOVA was used. First, Wilk's Lambda and Hotelling-Lawley Trace were checked to see the overall effect of multivariate tests. Wilk's lambda and Hotelling-Lawley trace were .59397 and .68358 and F-values were 26.65955 and both were significant at F=.0000 level. These figures indicated the overall group effects were significant.

Then, the group effects on individual factors were checked. The results seen in the table 23 indicated the group effects on these seven factors were all significant.

Individual t-tests were done to test hypothesis 3-a through 3-g. Identity was tested at the significance level α=.05 by considering the alternatives:

$$H_0: \mu_{0i} = \mu_{1i}$$

$$H_a: \mu_{0i} \neq \mu_{1i}$$

where *1*: Americans, *0*: Koreans

i: seven factors.

For the test of 3-a (Job Itself) through 3-g (Job Security), the gap-figures between "Should Be" value and "Is Now" value were used. By the way, the lower the value, the more satisfied.

Table 23. Group Effect on Individual Factors

Variable	Test Name	Value	Sig. of F
Job Itself	Wilks	.96994	.009
	Hotellings	.03100	.009
Supervisor	Wilks	.89406	.000
	Hotellings	.11849	.000
Co-Workers	Wilks	.93139	.001
	Hotellings	.07366	.001
Salary	Wilks	.92617	.000
	Hotellings	.07972	.000
Working	Wilks	.89079	.000
Conditions	Hotellings	.12260	.000
Benefits	Wilks	.81050	.000
	Hotellings	.23381	.000
Job	Wilks	.94741	.002
Security	Hotellings	.05551	.002

2-4-A. Test of Hypothesis 3-a. The mean value of the job itself for Americans was 2.1368 with the standard deviation of 1.188, while that for Koreans was 2.5793 with the standard deviation of 1.062. P-value was -3.28 and its probability was P<.005. This means that Korean workers were less satisfied with the job itself than American counterparts; that is, the hypothesis 3-a was supported.

2-4-B. Test of Hypothesis 3-b. The mean value of supervisors for Americans was 2.5299 with the standard deviation of 1.529, while the mean value for Koreans was 2.8780 with the standard deviation of 1.197. P-value was -2.05 and its probability

was P<.05. This means that Korean workers were less satisfied with supervisors than American counterparts; that is, the hypothesis 3-b was supported.

2-4-C. Test of Hypothesis 3-c. The mean value of co-workers for Americans was 2.3419 with the standard deviation of 1.138, while that for Koreans was 2.5671 with the standard deviation of .880. P-value was -1.79 and its probability was P>.05. This means that Korean workers were neither more nor less satisfied with co-workers than American counterparts; that is, the hypothesis 3-c was supported. However, due to the low reliability (co-workers: α=.5567), the interpretation must be made with caution.

2-4-D. Test of Hypothesis 3-d. The mean value of the wage for Americans was 2.7179 with the standard deviation of 1.467, while that for Koreans was 3.6098 with the standard deviation of 1.206. P-value was -5.40 and its probability was P<.001. This means that Korean workers were less satisfied with salary than American counterparts; that is, the hypothesis 3-d was supported.

2-4-E. Test of Hypothesis 3-e. The mean value of working conditions for Americans was 2.3162 with the standard deviation of 1.134, while that for Koreans was 3.1707 with the standard deviation of 1.227. P-value was -5.94 and its probability was P<.001. This means that Korean workers were less satisfied with working conditions than American counterparts; that is, the hypothesis 3-e was supported.

2-4-F. Test of Hypothesis 3-f. The mean value of benefits for Americans was 2.1880 with the standard deviation of 1.377, while that of Koreans was 4.2866 with the standard deviation of 1.227. P-value was -13.43 and its probability was P<.001. This means that Korean workers were less satisfied with benefits than American counterparts; that is, the hypothesis 3-f was rejected.

2-4-G. Test of Hypothesis 3-g. The mean value of job security for Americans was 2.8291 with the standard deviation of 1.668, while that for Koreans was 3.3963 with the standard deviation of 1.256. P-value was -3.10 and its probability was P<.005. This means that Korean workers were less satisfied with job security than American counterparts; that is, the hypothesis 3-g was rejected.

Summary-Test of Individual Hypotheses. Summary results (Table 24) show that only hypothesis 2-g was supported. Although similarity in co-workers was noticed, caution must be given due to the low reliability.

Table 24. Summary Results of Individual Hypotheses

	Hypothesis U.S. Korea	Results U.S. Korea	Comment
3-a. Job Itself	>	>	Supported
3-b. Supervisors	>	>	Supported
3-c. Co-Workers	=	=	Supported
3-d. Salary	>	>	Supported
3-e. Working Conditions	>	>	Supported
3-f. Benefits	=	>	Rejected
3-g. Job Security	=	>	Rejected

2-5. Further Tests and Findings

Univariate F-test was done to find out which individual items significantly affect the group differences at the significance level α=.05. The gap-figures between "Should Be" value and "Is Now" value were used. Results in Appendix 4 showed that the routine (.022) and accomplishing (.039) aspects of the job itself factor had a significant effect at α=.05 level. Following items had significant effects: g_S2 (Be influential:.011), g_S5 (Intelligent:.034), and g_S13 (Be around when needed:.011) of the supervisor factor; no significant effect of co-workers items; g_W1 (Adequate for normal expenses) and g_W3 (I can barely live on income); and all items of working conditions, benefits, and job security factors.

Also, standardized discriminant function coefficients were measured to learn which individual item affected the group differences most significantly. The higher the absolute value of the coefficient, the stronger effect. As seen in Appendix 5, g_J1 (routine: .80752) for the job itself, g_S5 (intelligent: .82744) for supervisors, g_C1 (ambitious: .89617) for co-workers, g_W1 (adequate for normal expenses: .91104) for salary, g_WC2 (adequate lighting: .73394) for working conditions, g_B1 (sufficient: .79350) for benefits, and g_JS1 (secure future: 1.03357) show the strongest effect of each factor on the group differences.

Finally Discriminant Analysis was done to figure out which factors explained more of the group differences. Classification function coefficients (i.e., Fisher's Linear

Discriminant functions) shown in the table 25 indicated the significant impact of three factors: salary, working conditions, and benefits. The standardized Canonical Discriminant Function coefficients were -.20581, .17529, 1.03148 for salary, working conditions, benefits, respectively. The classification results showed that 81.2 percent of predicted American-group members were in the actual American group, while 77.4 percent of the predicted Korean-group members were in the actual Korean group. In total, the percentage of grouped cases correctly classified was 79.00 %; that is, using salary, working condition, and benefits factors, 79 percent of the sample could be identified to the correct group members.

Table 25. Fisher's Linear Discriminant Functions

	AMERICAN	KOREAN
Salary	.9789136	.7197857
Working Conditions	1.109039	1.354183
Benefits	.4521608	1.780309
(constant)	-3.802537	-7.954871

The researcher asked respondents to rank those seven factors based on their importance. Results in the table 26 show that 70.1 percent (82/117) of Americans and 67.1 percent (110/164) of Koreans chose "the job itself" as the most important factor. Also, 13.7 percent of Americans chose "benefits" as the most important one, while 17.7 percent of Koreans chose "salary" as the most important one.

Table 26. Frequency by Rank

Country	U.S.		Korea	
Variable	Cases	Percent(%)	Cases	Percent
Job Itself	82	70.1	110	67.1
Supervisors	6	5.1	8	4.9
Co-Workers	2	1.7	1	.6
Salary	7	6.0	29	17.7
Working Conditions	4	3.4	8	4.9
Benefits	16	13.7	8	4.9

Finally, the WJSQ included an item to find out whether there are any factors other than seven factors affecting their JS. Americans pointed out possible factors as follows (numbers are number of respondents): promotion (10), working hours (5), job retraining (1), performance evaluation (1), team-work (1), and social recognition (1). Koreans responded as follows: social recognition (8), company vision or future (6), working hours (1), commute-time (2), and job retraining (3).

Summary Findings. Findings were as follows:

a. The job itself, supervisors, co-workers, working conditions, and job security factors significantly influenced overall JS, while salary and benefit factors approached statistical significance. The ex-post analysis indicated a similar factor structure between the two groups: both were more sensitive to non-monetary factors than to monetary ones. Also, the difference was noticed: Americans (Koreans) were more sensitive to monetary (non-monetary) factors;

b. The job itself, salary, benefits, and job security factors explained most of the group

differences;

c. Americans' overall JS was higher than their Korean counterparts;

d. Americans were more satisfied with the job itself, supervisors, salary, working conditions, benefits, and job security than Korean counterparts. There was no difference between the two groups in the JS level of the co-worker factor;

e. Following items influenced the group difference.

Job Itself: Routine, Accomplishing.

Supervisors: Be influential, Intelligent, Be around when needed.

Salary: Adequate for normal expenses, I can barely live on income.

Working conditions, Benefits, Job Security: All items

Among them, the following items show the strongest effect on the group difference: Routine (Job itself); Be influential (Supervisors); Adequate for normal expenses (Salary); Adequate lighting (Working conditions); Sufficient (Benefits); and Secure future (Job security);

f. Majority of both respondents chose the job itself as the most important factor. The next important one was benefit for Americans and salary for Koreans; and

g. The respondents differently pointed out JS factors other than seven ones. Ten and five Americans, on the one hand, selected the importance of promotion and working hours, respectively. On the other hand, eight and six Koreans pointed out the importance of social recognition and company vision, respectively.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, discussions including contributions of this study will be followed by the conclusion of this research.

1. Discussions

In this section, brief discussions of problems of previous research will be followed by contributions of this study.

1-1. Problems of Previous Research

Azumi and McMillan (1976), Lincoln, Hanada, and Olson (1981), Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985), Naoi and Schooler (1985), Odaka (1975), and Pascale and Maguire (1980) measured the JS level of both the Japanese and American workers and tested who were more satisfied. Traditional assumption was that Japanese workers are more satisfied than American counterparts because Japanese employees are treated as the

heart of the firm. Interestingly enough, the assumption was wrong; that is, American workers were more satisfied than Japanese counterparts.

However, their results were questioned because of methodological and theoretical problems. These problems included lack of construct validity because questionnaires were not developed based on JS theories also the scale did not consider the Japanese culture's high central tendency. In addition, scale equivalence was neither justified nor mentioned at all which lead this researcher to suspect the mean or percentage comparison methods. The comparability of questionnaires used in the study of Azumi and McMillan (1976) and Odaka (1975) was questioned. Furthermore, lack of consideration of JS theory made them less valuable to JS theorists because they did not contribute to testing the generalizability of JS theory in Japan and to international managers because they did not contribute to understanding the cultural effect on behavior.

1-2. Contributions of This Research

1-2-1. First Attempt. As the bilateral trade between the two countries increases, the amount of FDI increases (GATT, 1985) and thus for the successful business, research on workers' attitudes between the two countries might be increased. The bilateral trade between the U.S. and Korea has increased dramatically from $3.2 billion in 1975 to $16.3 billion in 1986 (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1988) and further to $36 billion in 1993 (Korea Economic Report, 1994). Thus, Korea became the third

biggest trading partner to the U.S. Also, Korean Government's continuous efforts of FDI-liberalization resulted in a steady increase in FDI. As a result, the amount of FDI of the U.S. to Korea reached to $2,392 million in 1990 (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1993). However, there has been no one comparative JS research between these two countries. Thus, this study is a first attempt to measure and compare JS levels of both countries.

1-2-2. Instrument Design. Research on JS has shown direct and indirect influences on various important factors such as turnover, commitment, productivity, and so on. However, no one JS instrument has been developed to use in cross-cultural studies. Without a sound JS instrument, above important influences might not be detected or correctly measured.

As a first attempt to measure and compare the JS level of Korean and American workers, the researcher designed an appropriate instrument, WJSQ, applying valuable lessons from previous research on the comparative JS level between the Japanese and American workers. An English version of WJSQ was developed considering recommendation of a leading JS theorist, Locke: a. measure FJS rather than simple overall JS and facets recommended were the job itself, supervisors, co-workers, salary or wage, working conditions, benefits, and job security; b. measure each facet with several items to enhance construct validity; c. use unweighted measure; and d. utilize evaluative judgment terms. Also, discrepancy measures ("Should Be" - "Is Now") were used.

In addition though it is hard to justify scale equivalence, this research used a

six Likert-type scale and a forced scale to reduce the effect of a high central tendency of Koreans (Kerlinger, 1986). A translation-back-translation method (Brislin et al., 1973) was used to enhance functional equivalence between the EWJSQ and KWJSQ.

Two pilot-test results suggested both questionnaires were appropriate to measure the JS level of both samples. Also, high reliability figures (.7518 - .8218) of items suggested the soundness of this instrument, WJSQ.

However, the WJSQ Also needs some modifications. First, the format needs to be adjusted. Twenty-nine out of 35 respondents who returned incomplete questionnaire did not answer some general FJS items, while filling out all the detailed items. More space between the general FJS question and the detailed FJS questions might reduce such a problem.

Secondly, the promotion facet needs to be included in the future. Although Locke noticed the effect of promotion on JS, the researcher decided not to use the promotion factor in this study because Korean MBA students are expected to be promoted soon and also because one's promotion is largely decided by the length of service in the company. However, as pointed out by ten American respondents, the promotion factor was selected as an important one for JS. Thus for the general purpose, it is recommended to include the promotion factor in the future.

If the "Competitive" item is not used in the future, the reliability of the co-worker facet can be increased. However, there exists severe competition besides cooperation among Korean co-workers. Also, the reliability can be enhanced if more item explanations are given before the survey, and if it is combined with personal

interview method. Thus, the decision on this competitive item needs further research.

Because of its soundness, this instrument, WJSQ, can be used in future comparative studies on JS and thus help international managers. The correct measurement of JS can provide international managers information about how JS can be improved. Furthermore, they can expect positive influences because of improved JS. JS can directly or indirectly affect turnover, commitment, productivity as well as worker attitudes toward life, family, his/her physical and mental health. That is, international managers can learn ways of increasing JS through the correct measurement of JS and can expect positive effects on turnover rate, commitment, productivity and so on. As a result, they can achieve more successful business.

Furthermore, this instrument can be used if the interested country is influenced by Confucianism. Asia is the fastest growing region in the world and thus the Western world has shown strong interests to take the advantage of business opportunities in this region. Most of theses countries such as China, Hong-Kong, Indonesia, Korea, Thailand are influenced by Confucianism. Therefore, this instrument can help international managers who work in this region to measure workers' JS and thus to respond correctly. As a result, their successful business opportunities can be increased in the fast growing region, Asia.

1-2-3. Generalizability Test of JS Theory. Besides this researcher's contribution to developing a sound questionnaire for cross-cultural research on JS, this study provides a test if such factors as the job itself, supervisors, co-workers, salary,

working conditions, benefits, and job security affect Koreans' JS. In other words, this research tests the generalizability of JS theory in Korea.

The results showed that there are significant effects of the job itself, supervisors, co-workers, working conditions, job security on JS of Korean workers. Salary (.1023) and benefit (.0845) factors had no significant effect. That is, this study suggested that JS theory is not applied in Korea.

However, these two facets nearly approached statistical significance. More importantly the effect of salary and benefits factors on JS was theoretically plausible. Therefore although future research is needed, the researcher assumed that JS theory can be applied in Korea.

1-2-4. Applications. One important purpose of management research is its application to the real world. That is, cross-cultural studies on JS theory must provide valuable information to international managers. This study provides useful information to them.

With the above researcher's assumption of the generalizability of JS theory in Korea, an ex-post analysis indicated that both American and Korean white-collar workers are more sensitive to non-monetary factors such as the job itself, supervisors, co-workers, working conditions, and job security than to monetary factors such as salary and benefits. Also, the result of rank analysis suggested that both sample considered the job itself the most important one. These results can provide a lesson to international managers: utilize, if possible, more non-monetary factors, especially the

job itself, than monetary factors to increase overall JS of both American and Korean white-collar workers.

Within such a similarity, there are also differences: Americans were more sensitive to monetary factors than Koreans, while Koreans were more sensitive to non-monetary factors. International managers should consider these differences in their management practices. On the one hand if an American international manager at the Korea-branch company wants to increase JS of Korean white-collar workers, he/she has to put more focus on human-relations factors than as he/she does in the U.S. On the other hand if a Korean international manager at an America-branch company wants to increase JS of American white-collar workers, he/she has to put more focus on money factors than as he/she does in Korea.

The results of this study indicated that the job itself, salary, benefits, and job security explained most of the group differences. Also, it provides information about which individual items affected group differences most significantly. "Routine" and "accomplishing" items of the job itself show significant effects. Significant effects appeared in the following areas: adequateness as normal expenses and live-on-income; and all the items of benefits, and job security. Especially the strongest influential item in each factor was the routine aspect of the job itself, salary as a means for normal expenses, sufficiency of benefits, and secure future aspect of job security.

The researcher further investigated whether there is a difference in the expected value between the two groups. According to Cole (1979), Japanese workers' higher expectation might lead to such lower JS than expected. Thus, the "Should Be" value

of the above items were checked. The results in the table 27 showed that Americans, compared to Koreans, have lower values in each item except the "Routine" item. Findings suggested the followings:

> Americans expect less routine job, more intelligent supervisor, and more ambitious fellow-worker than Koreans. Also, Americans expect more that salary should cover normal expenses, lighting should be adequate, benefits should be sufficient, and the company should provide secure future than Koreans do.

Table 27. Mean of "Should Be" and "Is Now" for Both Samples

	U.S.				Korea			
	Should Be		Is Now		Should Be		Is Now	
	Mean	STD*	Mean	STD	Mean	STD	Mean	STD
Routine	3.15	1.48	3.76	1.47	2.20	1.29	3.21	1.32
Intelligent	1.41	.62	2.04	1.09	1.82	.84	2.75	1.14
Ambitious	1.75	.76	2.91	1.21	2.32	1.01	3.20	.96
Adequate for normal expenses	1.79	1.21	2.26	1.19	2.35	1.11	3.65	1.27
Adequate lighting	1.32	.67	1.84	1.06	3.06	1.23	1.96	1.01
Sufficient	1.31	.55	2.23	1.36	1.91	.86	4.32	1.21
Secure future	1.70	.90	3.05	1.65	1.79	1.00	3.85	1.30

* : standard deviation

Among the above findings, the result that Americans (1.70) expected slightly more that the company should provide employees secure future than Koreans (1.79) needs to get attention. In the U.S., a traditional belief is that the relationship between an employer and employee is a business contract (Hofstede, 1991; Hynson, 1985).

Thus, to provide employees life-time employment is unnecessary (Hynson, 1985; Kanter, 1983). However, this result might come because there has been an economic recession during the early 1990's and thus employees worried their job future very seriously. It needs further research.

2. CONCLUSION

In this section, first background information will be briefly explained and then findings will be summarized. After the future directions of research are presented, concluding remarks will follow.

2-1. Background

The bilateral trade between the U.S. and Korea grows drastically from $3.2 billion in 1975 to $36 billion in 1993. Although increased business between Korea and the U.S. may increase studies on work attitudes in both countries, this fairly new trend between the two countries is in the very early stages of cross-cultural research between both countries.

The researcher was interested in JS studies because of its impact. According to Locke (1976), JS either directly or indirectly influences worker attitudes toward life, family, and him/herself (physical and mental health and longevity) as well as commitment, turnover, and productivity. Because there was no research on

comparative JS between Korea and the U.S., the researcher looked at previous studies between Japan and the U.S.

They were: Azumi and McMillan (1976), Lincoln, Hanada, and Olson (1981), Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985), Naoi and Schooler (1985), Odaka (1975), and Pascale and Maguire (1980). However, none of them used the appropriate instrument that is developed based on JS theory and where cultural difference is reflected. Furthermore, they lack value because they did not meet the purposes of cross-cultural research: a. test the generalizability of JS theory; and b. test the cultural impact of JS factors and thus international managers can get valuable information.

2-2. Summary Findings

Considering JS theory and cultural differences, the researcher developed the instrument, WJSQ. Although the soundness of this instrument was good, it still needs some adjustment. It needs more space between the question of the general FJS and the questions of the detailed FJS. The reliability of co-workers, salary, and benefit facets might be improved if more explanations on items are given to Koreans who have lack of experiences in this kind of survey, and if it is combined with the interview method. In addition, it needs the promotion facet.

This study tested the generalizability of JS theory in Korea. Although it was rejected, the effect of salary and benefits on JS is theoretically plausible and as a first attempt, both salary and benefits approached statistical significance. Thus, the

researcher assumed the generalizability of JS theory in Korea although it needs further research.

This study also investigated cultural differences in JS. Results indicated that Americans were more satisfied than Korean counterparts. Both samples were more sensitive to non-monetary factors, especially the job itself, than to monetary factors. Within such a similarity, Koreans were more sensitive to non-monetary factors, while Americans were more sensitive to monetary factors.

Group differences were explained most by the job itself, salary, benefits, and job security. The strongest influence on group differences appeared in the routine aspect of the job itself, salary as a means for normal expenses, sufficiency of benefits, and secure future of job security.

Further investigations showed cultural differences between the two groups. Americans expect less routine job, more intelligent supervisors, and more ambitious fellow-workers than Korean counterparts. Also, Americans expect more in the following aspects: salary as a means for normal expenses; adequate lighting; sufficient benefits; and secure future. Other findings suggested that as one gets older, Koreans tend to expect more sufficient benefits and job security. However, Americans over 45 years-old show a strong need for job security. One possible reason is that continuous economic recessions from late 1980's to early 1990's forced companies to reduce management positions through restructuring processes.

2-3. Future Direction

As discussed, some areas which need to be studied in the future are as follows:

a. The format of the instrument needs modification;

b. The promotion factor needs to be included;

c. The survey method needs to be combined with the personal interview method;

d. The finding that Americans expect a stronger job security needs further study; and

e. The generalizability of JS theory in Korea needs to be tested more.

In addition, this study used only sample with white-collar jobs. Especially, Koreans were those who expect promotion in the near future. Thus for the purpose of generalizability, future samples need to be those who have more diversified jobs including blue-collar jobs.

Traditionally cross-cultural research has been focused on differences or similarities between the Western countries (Hofstede, 1991). However due to the fast growth of communication methods and trade, the world has been increasingly interdependent. Also, a fast growth in Asian countries has provided more business opportunities. In order to grab such opportunities, cross-cultural research needs to be focused on also cultural differences and similarities between the Eastern and Western countries.

In this research, the author tried to study the cultural effect on JS between the U.S. (West) and Korea (East). However, there are also differences within the same cultural groups. For example, Hofstede (1991) noticed differences between the British and the U.S. although both have originated from the same culture. Also, there are some differences between Japan and Korea although both were influenced by

Confucianism. Therefore, the researcher will try to investigate both between cultural and within cultural differences and similarities by expanding the sample countries to England and the U.S. for the West and Korea and Japan for the East.

Another area that needs to be focused in the future is to test the relationships between JS and important variables such as commitment, turnover, productivity, and so on. Although cross-cultural research on JS can help international managers to diagnose the program progress and to increase JS by understanding cultural differences. Including such variables can help them to find the relationship between JS and such variables and thus to promote more successful business in a foreign country.

2-4. Concluding Remark

As a first attempt of cross-cultural study on JS between Korea and the U.S., the researcher developed an appropriate instrument, WJSQ reflecting leading JS theory and cultural difference. Although this research did not support the generalizability of JS theory in Korea, it needs further research because beyond their theoretical soundness, salary and benefit factors approached statistical significance. This study also shows cultural similarities and differences in effects of seven factors on JS and effect of individual items on the group differences.

However, the results cannot be generalized until further research is done with both white-collar and blue-collar workers. Also, the instrument, WJSQ, needs minor

modifications and inclusion of the promotion factor. In addition, future study should include commitment and/or productivity and thus investigate whether or not there are any cultural differences in their relationships between the two countries. Furthermore, the researcher will investigate not only between cultural similarities and differences but also within cultural similarities and differences by including Japan and England. Therefore, future cross-cultural research on JS can help JS theorists to test the generalizability of JS theory in foreign countries and international managers to get valuable information about how employees in different countries think and behave differently and as a result to do a more successful business in a foreign country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alderfer, C.P. "An Experimental Test of a New Theory of Human Needs." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 4 (1969): 142-175.

American Psychological Association. Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, Inc., 1974.

Azumi, K. and C.J. McMillan. "Worker Sentiment in the Japanese Factory: Its Organizational Determinants." Ed. Austin, L. Japan: The Paradox of Progress. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976. 215-229.

Berry, J.W. "On Cross-Cultural Comparability." International Journal of Psychology 4 (1969): 119-128.

Blauner, R. "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern Society." Ed. Galenson, M.W. and S.M. Kipset. Labor and Trade Unionism. N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1960. 339-360.

Blood, M.R. "The Validity of Importance." Journal of Applied Psychology 55 (1971): 487-488.

Bluedorn, A.C. "A Unified Model of Turnover from Organizations." Human Relations 35 (1982): 135-153.

Brayfield, A.H. and H.F. Rothe. "An Index of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 35 (1951): 307-311.

Brislin, R.W., W.J. Lonner, and R.M. Thorndike. Cross-cultural Research Methods. N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1973.

Carmines, E.G. and R.A. Zeller. Reliability and Validity Assessment. Sage University paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, No. 07-017, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1979.

Cole, R.E. Work, Mobility, and Participation. Berkely: University of California Press, 1979.

Cook, J.D., S.J. Hepworth, T.D. Wall, and P.B. Warr. The Experience of Work, New York: Academic Press, 1981.

Davidson, A.R. "The Etic-Emic Dilemma: Can Methodology Provide a Solution in the Absence of Theory?" Ed. Poortinga, Y.H. Basic Problems in Cross-Cultural Psychology. Lisse, Netherland: Swets and Zeitlinger B.V., 1977. 49-54.

Dawis, R.V. and L.H. Lofquist. A Psychological Theory of Work Adjustment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Dore, R. British Factory-Japanese Factory. L.A.: University of California Press, 1973.

Erdors, P.L. Professional Mail Surveys. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Evans, M.G. "Conceptual and Operational Problems in the Measurement of Various Aspects of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 53 (1969): 93-101.

Ewen, R.B. "Weighting Components of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 51 (1967): 68-73.

Farkas, A.J. and L.E. Tetrick. "A Three-Wave Longitudinal Analysis of the Causal Ordering of Satisfaction and Commitment on Turnover Decisions." Journal of Applied Psychology 74 (1989): 855-868.

Fucini J.J. and S. Fucini. Working for the Japanese. New York: The Free Press, 1990.

Finker, A.L. Methods of Sampling for Estimating Commercial Peach Production in North Carolina. Methods of Sampling for Estimating Commercial Experiment Station Technical Belletin No.91., 1950.

"Free Investment of Foreigners to Manufacturing Industries." Sae-Gae Times, 7 June 1988: 6.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, International Trade 1984/1985. 1985.

---. International Trade 1989/1990. 1990.

---. International Trade 1993. 1993.

Gibaldi, J. and W.S. Achtert. "MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers." 2nd ed., New York: The Modern Language Association of America., 1984.

Guilford, J.P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 2nd ed., 1954.

Hamburg, M. Statistical Analysis for Decision Making. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc., 3rd ed., 1983.

Henderson, J. and M. Cohn. "The Job Climate for Women in Traditionally Male Blue-Collar Occupations." Sex-Roles: A Journal of Research 25 (1991): 63-79.

"High-Level Economy, Low-Level Social Norms." Korea Times. Chicago ed., 13 May 1995: 7.

Hill, R.C. "Component Selection Norms for Principal Components Regression." Communications in Statistics-Theory & Methods. (1977): 309-334.

Hofstede, G. Cultures and Organizations. London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1991.

Hong, K. et al. ed. "Trends of Korean Social Morals." Seoul, Korea: Han-Ul Publishing Co., 1988.

Hynson, L.M. Organizing with Style: Patterns in Japan and America. Tokyo: Mainich Daily News, 1985.

Inkeles, A. "Industrial Man: The Relation of Status to Experience, Perception, and Value." American Journal of Sociology 66 (1960): 1-31.

Janelli, R.L and D. Yim. Making Capitalism. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.

Jang, S.H. The Key to Successful Business in Korea. Seoul: Yong Ahn Publishing Co., 1988.

Joliffe, I.T. Principal Component Analysis. N.Y.: Springer Verlag, 1986.

Kalleberg, A.L. "Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction." American Sociological Review 42 (1977): 124-143.

Kanter, R.S. The Change Masters. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983.

Kerlinger,F.N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New ork: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 3rd ed., 1986.

Klein, S.M. "Pay Factors as Predictors to Satisfaction:A Comparion of Reinforcement, Equity, and Expectancy. Academy of Management Journal 16 (1973): 598-610.

Kohn, M.L. and C. Schooler. Work and Personality: An Inquiry into the Impact of Social Stratification. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 1983.

Lee, D. Commonality of Koreans. Seoul, Korea: Bub-Moon Sa, 1988.

Lee, G. Consciousness of Koreans 1-4. Seoul, Korea: Shin-Won Mun-Wha Sa, 1983.

Lincoln, J.R., M. Hanade, and J. Olson. "Cultural Orientations and Individual Reactions to Organizations: A Study of Employees of Japanese-Owned Firms." Administrative Science Quarterly 26 (1981): 93-115.

Lincoln, J.R. and A.L. Kalleberg. "Work Organization and Workforce Commitment: A Study of Plants and Employees in the U.S. and Japan." American Sociological Review 50 (1985): 738-760.

Locke, E.A. "What Is Job Satisfaction?" Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 4 (1969): 309-336.

---. "Personnel Attitudes and Motivation." Annual Review of Psychology. 26 (1975): 457-480.

---. "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction." Ed. Dunnette, M.D. Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1976. 1297-1349.

Management Institute at Seoul National University. Current Situations and Problems of Korean Companies. Seoul: Seoul National University Publishing Department, 1985.

McMillen, L. "Job-Related Tension and Anxiety Taking a Toll among Employees in Academe's 'Stress Factories.'" Chronicle of Higher Education 33 (1987): 1+.

Michaels, C.E. and P.E. Spector. "Causes of Employee Turnover: A Test of the Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino Model." Journal of Applied Psychology 67 (1982): 53-59.

Mitchell, T.R. "Organizational Behavior." Annual Review of Psychology 30 (1979): 243-281.

Mobley, W.H. and E.A. Locke. "The Relationship of Value Importance to Satisfaction." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 5 (1970): 463-483.

Morse, N.C. Satisfactions in the White-Collar Job. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, 1953.

Mottaz, C. and G. Potts. "An Empirical Evaluation of Models of Work Satisfaction." Social Science Research 15 (1986): 153-173.

Naoi, A. and C. Schooler. "Occupational Conditions and Psychological Functioning in Japan." American Journal of Sociology 90 (1985): 729-751.

Naylor, J.C., R.D. Prichard, and D.R. Ilgen. A theory of Behavior in Organizations. N.Y.: Academic Press, 1980.

Neter, J., W. Wasserman, and M.H. Kunter. "Applied Linear Regression Models." Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1983.

Odaka, K. Toward Industrial Democracy. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Pascale, R.T. and M.A. Maguire. "Comparison of Selected Work Factors in Japan and the United States." Human Relations 33 (1980): 433-455.

Pedhazur, E.J. Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research. New York: CBS College Publishing, 1982.

Poortinga, Y.H. "Limitations on Intercultural Comparison of Psychological Data." Netherlands Tijdschrift voor de Psychologie en haar Grensgebieden. 1975. 23-39.

Porter, L.W. "A Study of Perceived Need Satisfaction in Bottom and Middle Management Jobs." Journal of Applied Psychology 45 (1961): 1-10.

"Resolved Labor-Managment Conflicts: Normal Production." Dong-A Daily News 4 July 1988, Los Angels ed.: 9.

Schwab, D.P. "Impact of Alternative Compensation Systems on Pay Valence and Instrumentality Perceptions." Journal of Applied Psychology 58 (1973): 308-312.

Scott, W.E. Jr. "The Development of Semantic Differential Scales As Measures of 'Morale'." Personnel Psychology 20 (1967): 179-198.

Seashore, S.E. and T.D. Taber. "Job Satisfaction Indicators and Their Correlattes." American Behavioral Scientist (1975): 333-368.

Seo, Y. Job Satisfaction of Hospital Employees: An Empirical Test of a Causal Model in South Korea. Diss. The University of Iowa: UMI, 1992. 9318493.

Smith, P.C., L.M. Kendall, and C.L. Hulin. The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally & Company, 1969.

"South Korea Shifts Gears to Promote Retail Sectors and Lure Foreign Firms." Wall Street Journal 26 May 1994: A11.

Steers, R.M. "Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Commitment." Administrative Science Quarterly 22 (1977): 46-56.

"Trade Figures." Korea Economic Report. Dec. 1994: 73-74.

Triandis, H.C., R. Malpass, and A. Davidson. "Psychology and Cultures." Annual Review of Psychology 24 (1973): page missing.

United Nations. Trends and Issues in Foreign Direct Investment and Related Flows. N.Y.: Center on Transnational Corporations, 1985.

U.S. Bureau of Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1988. Washington, D.C., 1988.

---. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1991. Washington, D.C., 1991.

---. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1993. Washington, D.C., 1993.

U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. "U.S. Business Enterprises Aquired or Established by Foreign Direct Investors in 1987." Survey of Current Business. Wahsington, D.C. 68 5 (1988): 50-58.

Vickroy, S.C., J.B. Shaw, and C.D. Fisher. "Effects of Temperature, Clothing, and Task Complexity on Task Performance and Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology 67 (1982): 97-102.

Vroom, V.H. Work and Motivation. N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.

Wanous, J.P. and E.E. Lawler III. "Measurement and Meaning of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 56 (1972): 95-105.

Warde, W.D. Sample Survey Methods. Stillwater, O.K.: Statistics Department of Oklahoma State University, 1985.

Williams, L.J. and J.T. Hazer. "Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction and Commitment in Turnover Methods: A Reanalysis Using Latent Variable Structural Equation Methods." Journal of Applied Psychology 71 (1986): 219-231.

APPENDIXIES

APPENDIX 1-A

COVER LETTER FOR ENGLISH VERSION

OF WON JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a doctoral candidate at Oklahoma State University. I am working on a cross-cultural job attitudes study as a dissertation project. Previous job satisfaction research between Japan and the U.S. did not consider cultural differences. However, this study will reflect such differences between America and the Republic of Korea.

It is necessary for this study to have responses from currently employed persons. Responses to this questionnaire are completely voluntary. Yet I hope you will choose to record your feelings on the enclosed form because your response will be used for future comparative research on the job attitude among various countries. It will take **less than 25 minutes of your time**. Also, if you have any comments or suggestions, please **feel free to comment**.

Your responses will be held in the **strictest anonymity**. Only collective responses will be used. Therefore, you don't have to put your name on the survey form. Please return it before you leave this class or bring it back by the next class.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Cordially Yours,

Junsuh Won

1709 E. Lindsey #1
Norman, OK 73071

Enclosures

APPENDIX 1-B

ENGLISH VERSION OF INSTRUCTION SHEET

Would you please pass out this questionnaire?

(After questionnaires have been distributed, please briefly explain about the researcher and the purpose of the research as follows)

Junsuh Won, who is a doctoral student at OSU, is working on "cross-cultural study on job satisfaction between American and Korean workers" as a dissertation.

(while showing the questionnaire)

This questionnaire is to collect data for his research. Because only a small sample is involved in this study, your response is very important. Therefore if you are currently employed, I would like you to fill out this questionnaire and return it before you leave this class. Or please bring it back by the next class.

Thank you very much.

APPENDIX 1-C

ENGLISH VERSION

OF WON JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

WON JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions.

1. Are you a permanent resident or a citizen of the U.S.?

Yes ..... ( ) No ..... ( ) **

** If no, please indicate your own nationality.

..... ( )

2. I am a Male..... ( ) Female..... ( ).

3. What is your age? ..... ( ) years old

4. What is your highest completed education level (Circle the number) ?

No formal education ..... (1)

Elementary school (1-6) ..... (2)

Junior high (or middle) school (7-9) ..... (3)

Senior high school (10-12) ..... (4)

Undergraduate degree ..... (5)

Master or doctoral degree ..... (6)

5. What is your job title? ..... ( )

6. How long have you worked in your occupation/industry?

..... ( ) years, ( ) months

7. How long have you been employed with your present company?

..... ( ) years, ( ) months

For the following questions, please circle the number which best describes your feelings about your current work and supervisor. (Answer the *"should be"* part based on ideal condition, then answer the *"is"* part based on your current condition.) (*Circle one answer code number for each question.*)

WORK

1. I am satisfied with the work itself that I perform.

Strongly Agree (STA).....(1)
Slightly Disagree (SDA).....(4)
Moderately Agree (MA).....(2)
Moderately Disagree (MDA)...(5)
Slightly Agree (SA).....(3)
Strongly Disagree (STDA).....(6)

	SHOULD BE						IS					
	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA
2. Routine	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Challenging	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Creative	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Accomplishing	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Simple	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

SUPERVISOR

7. I am satisfied with my immediate supervisor.

Strongly Agree (STA).....(1)
Slightly Disagree (SDA).....(4)
Moderately Agree (MA).....(2)
Moderately Disagree (MDA).....(5)
Slightly Agree (SA).....(3)
Strongly Disagree (STDA).....(6)

	SHOULD BE						IS					
	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA
8. Ask my advice	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Be influential	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Be quick-tempered	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Know job very well	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Be around when needed	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

For the following questions, please circle the number which best describes your feelings about your co-workers and wage. (Answer the *"should be"* part based on ideal condition, then answer the *"is"* part based on your current condition.) (*Circle one answer code number for each question.*)

Co-Workers

14. I am satisfied with co-workers in my work group.

Strongly Agree (STA).....(1)
Moderately Agree (MA).....(2)
Slightly Agree (SA).....(3)
Slightly Disagree (SDA).....(4)
Moderately Disagree (MDA).....(5)
Strongly Disagree (STDA).....(6)

	SHOULD BE						IS					
	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA
15. Ambitious	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Responsible	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Competitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Salary

20. I am satisfied with my wage or salary that I receive.

Strongly Agree (STA).....(1)
Moderately Agree (MA).....(2)
Slightly Agree (SA).....(3)
Slightly Disagree (SD).....(4)
Moderately Disagree (MDA).....(5)
Strongly Disagree (STDA).....(6)

	SHOULD BE						IS					
	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA
21. Adequate for normal expenses	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Less than I deserve	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. I can barely live on income	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Motivating	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

For the following questions, please circle the number which best describes your feelings about working conditions and benefits. (Answer the *"should be"* part based on ideal condition, then answer the *"is"* part based on your current condition.) (*Circle one answer code number for each question.*)

Working Conditions

25. I am satisfied with working conditions in my job.

Strongly Agree (STA).....(1)
Moderately Agree (MA).....(2)
Slightly Agree (SA).....(3)
Slightly Disagree (SDA).....(4)
Moderately Disagree (MDA)...(5)
Strongly Disagree (STDA..)....(6)

	SHOULD BE						IS					
	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA
26. Comfortable Temperature/Climate	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. Adequate lighting	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. Reasonable noise level	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Benefits

29. I am satisfied with benefits provided by the company.

Strongly Agree (STA) .....(1)
Moderately Agree (MA) .....(2)
Slightly Agree (SA) .....(3)
Slightly Disagree (SDA) .....(4)
Moderately Disagree (MDA) .....(5)
Strongly Disagree (STDA) .....(6)

	SHOULD BE						IS					
	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA
30. Sufficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. Consistent	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. Fairly Administered	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

For the following questions, please circle the number which best describes your feelings about job security. (Answer the *"should be"* part based on ideal condition, then answer the *"is"* part based on your current condition.) (*Circle one answer code number for each question.*)

Job Security

33. I am satisfied with the security presented in my job.

Strongly Agree (STA).....(1)
Moderately Agree (MA).....(2)
Slightly Agree (SA).....(3)
Slightly Disagree (SDA).....(4)
Moderately Disagree (MDA).....(5)
Strongly Disagree (STDA).....(6)

	SHOULD BE						IS					
	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA	STA	MA	SA	SDA	MDA	STDA
34. Secure future	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. Steady	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. Stable employment	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

37. Please rank order the factors which affect your job satisfaction.
(1=first-most important to 7=last-least important)

Work Itself .....( )
Co-workers .....( )
Working Conditions .....( )
Job Security .....( )
Supervisor .....( )
Salary .....( )
Benefits .....( )

38. Overall, I am satisfied with my job (*Circle the number*).

Strongly Agree (STA).....(1)
Moderately Agree (MA).....(2)
Slightly Agree (SA).....(3)
Slightly Disagree (SDA).....(4)
Moderately Disagree (MDA).....(5)
Strongly Disagree (STDA).....(6)

39. There may be other factors that affect your job satisfaction in addition to those presented in this questionnaire. Please, if any, specify such factors in the space below.

APPENDIX 2-A

COVER LETTER FOR KOREAN VERSION

안녕하십니까?

저는 O.S.U. (오클라호마 주립대학교) 에서 경영학 박사 과정을 이수하고 있는 원준서 입니다. 한국과 미국 근로자들 간의 직업만족도에 관한 비교 연구를 주제로 논문을 쓰고 있습니다. 그 중의 일부 작업으로 한글설문지에 대한 타당성 여부를 조사하려고 합니다.

학기 말이라 무척 바쁘시겠지만, 잠시 시간을 내셔서 동봉된 설문지에 응답해 주시면 대단히 고맙겠습니다. 하시는 도중에 문구가 이상하거나, 혹시 귀하의 의견이 있으시면 지적해 주시면 더욱 감사하겠습니다.

오직 집단적인 반응만이 쓰여질 것이므로, 귀하의 이름을 설문지 위에 쓰실 필요가 없습니다. 동봉된 반송 봉투에 넣어 보내주시면 감사하겠습니다.

다시 한번 귀하의 협조를 부탁드립니다.

원 준 서

1709 E. Lindsey, # 1
Norman, OK 73071
321-0419

설문지 동봉.

APPENDIX 2-B

INSTRUCTION SHEET FOR KOREAN VERSION

협조의 말씀

이 설문지를 모든 응답자에게 돌려주시겠습니까?

(설문지의 배분이 끝난 뒤, 간단히 본 연구자와 연구의 목적에 대하여 다음과 같이 설명해 주십시오.)

오클라호마 주립대학에서 박사 과정을 이수하고 있는 원 준서씨가 미국 근로자들과 한국 근로자들 간의 직업만족도에 관한 비교 연구로 논문을 쓰고 있습니다. 본 설문지는 원 준서씨의 연구 자료를 수집하기 위한 것입니다.

(설문지를 보여 주면서)

본 연구는 현재 직업을 가지고 있는 사람들을 대상으로 하는 것이며, 특히 적은 인원만이 이 연구에 참여하기 때문에 여러분들의 솔직한 응답은 대단히 귀중한 자료가 될 것입니다. 귀하께서 현재 직업을 가지고 계시면, 설문지의 한 문항도 빠짐없이 답하여 주십시오. 그리고 교실을 나가시기 전에 저에게 돌려주십시오.

다시 한 번 여러분의 협조를 부탁 드리겠습니다.

대단히 감사합니다.

APPENDIX 2-C

KOREAN VERSION OF

WON JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

직업 만족도 설문지

다음 질문들에 대하여 응답해 주십시오.

1. 귀하의 성별은? 남자 ( ) 여자 ( )

2. 귀하의 연세는? .....만 ( ) 세

3. 귀하의 최종 학력은 무엇입니까 ? (해당되는 란에 0표를 하십시오)

무 학 ..... ( )
국 졸 ..... ( )
중 졸 ..... ( )
고 졸 ..... ( )
대 졸 ..... ( )
대졸 이상 ..... ( )

4. 귀하의 직책은 무엇입니까 ? ...( )

5. 귀하는 몇년동안 현 직종(또는 산업)에 종사하고 계십니까 ?

( ) 년 ( ) 개월

6. 귀하는 몇년동안 현재 직장에 근무하고 계십니까 ?

( ) 년 ( ) 개월

다음 질문들에 대하여, 귀하의 일이나 직속 상관에 대한 귀하의 감정을 가장 잘 나타낸 숫자에 0표를 해 주십시오. ("당위성" 부분은 이상적이나 바람직한 상태에 근거하여 대답하여 주시고, "현실" 부분은 현재의 상태에 근거하여 대답하여 주시기 바랍니다.)
(각 질문에 대해 빠짐없이 0표 해 주십시오.)

"일"

1. 나는 내가 하고 있는 일 자체에 만족한다.
   매우 찬성 ... (1)　　약간 반대 ... (4)
   보통 찬성 ... (2)　　보통 반대 ... (5)
   약간 찬성 ... (3)　　매우 반대 ... (6)

	당 위 성						현 실					
	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대
2. 판에 박힌	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. 도전적	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. 창의적	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. 성취감	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. 단순함	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

"직속 상관"

7. 나는 내 직속 상관에 만족한다.
   매우 찬성 ... (1)　　약간 반대 ... (4)
   보통 찬성 ... (2)　　보통 반대 ... (5)
   약간 찬성 ... (3)　　매우 반대 ... (6)

	당 위 성						현 실					
	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대
8. 나의 조언을 구해옴	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. 영향력이 있음	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. 급한 성격임	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. 업무에 밝음	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. 지성적임	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. 필요시 항상 있음	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

다음 질문들에 대하여, 귀하의 직장 동료들이나 봉급에 대한 귀하의 감정을 가장 잘 나타낸 숫자에 0표를 해 주십시오. ("당위성" 부분은 이상적이나 바람직한 상태에 근거하여 대답하여 주시고, "현실" 부분은 현재의 상태에 근거하여 대답하여 주시기 바랍니다.)
(각 질문에 대해 빠짐없이 0표 해 주십시오.)

"직장 동료들"

14. 나는 내가 일하는 그룹의 동료 직원들에 만족한다.
매우 찬성 ... (1)　　약간 반대 ... (4)
보통 찬성 ... (2)　　보통 반대 ... (5)
약간 찬성 ... (3)　　매우 반대 ... (6)

	당 위 성						현 실					
	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대
15. 야심적	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. 책임적	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. 지적	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. 도움이 됨	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. 경쟁적	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

"봉급"

20. 나는 내가 받는 봉급에 만족한다.
매우 찬성 ... (1)　　약간 반대 ... (4)
보통 찬성 ... (2)　　보통 반대 ... (5)
약간 찬성 ... (3)　　매우 반대 ... (6)

	당 위 성						현 실					
	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대
21. 일상적인 지출에 적합함	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. 받아야 할 만큼 안 됨	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. 생계가 곤란함	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. 의욕을 줌	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

다음 질문들에 대하여, 귀하의 작업 환경이나 근무외 수당에 대한 귀하의 감정을 가장 잘 나타낸 숫자에 0표를 해 주십시오. ("당위성" 부분은 이상적이나 바람직한 상태에 근거하여 대답하여 주시고, "현실" 부분은 현재의 상태에 근거하여 대답하여 주시기 바랍니다.)
(각 질문에 대해 빠짐없이 0표 해 주십시오.)

"작업 환경"

25. 나는 내 직장의 작업 환경에 만족한다.

매우 찬성 ... (1)　　약간 반대 ... (4)
보통 찬성 ... (2)　　보통 반대 ... (5)
약간 찬성 ... (3)　　매우 반대 ... (6)

	당 위 성						현 실					
	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대
26. 쾌적함 (온도나 기후)	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. 적절한 조명	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. 적정 소음도	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

"근무외 수당"

29. 나는 회사가 제공하는 근무외 수당에 만족한다.

매우 찬성 ... (1)　　약간 반대 ... (4)
보통 찬성 ... (2)　　보통 반대 ... (5)
약간 찬성 ... (3)　　매우 반대 ... (6)

	당 위 성						현 실					
	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대
30. 충분함	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. 꾸준함	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. 잘 관리됨	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

다음 질문들에 대하여, 직업 보장에 관한 귀하의 감정을 가장 잘 나타낸 숫자에 0표를 해 주십시오. ("당위성" 부분은 이상적이나 바람직한 상태에 근거하여 대답하여 주시고, "현실" 부분은 현재의 상태에 근거하여 대답하여 주시기 바랍니다.)
(각 질문에 대해 빠짐없이 0표 해 주십시오.)

"직업 보장"

33. 나는 내 직업의 보장에 만족한다.

매우 찬성 ... (1)　　약간 반대 ... (4)
보통 찬성 ... (2)　　보통 반대 ... (5)
약간 찬성 ... (3)　　매우 반대 ... (6)

	당 위 성						현 실					
	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대	매우 찬성	보통 찬성	약간 찬성	약간 반대	보통 반대	매우 반대
34. 확실한 미래	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. 안정적	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. 지속적인 근무	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

37. 귀하가 생각하시기에 귀하의 직업 만족도에 가장 크게 영향을 미치는 사항부터 순서대로 적으십시오. (가장 중요한 것 --- 1, 가장 덜 중요한 것 --- 7)

일 자체 .....(　　)　　직속 상관 .....(　　)
직장 동료 .....(　　)　　봉급 .....(　　)
작업 환경 .....(　　)　　근무외 수당 .....(　　)
직업 안정성 ....(　　)

38. 전반적으로 나는 내 직업에 만족한다. (해당되는 란에 0표를 해 주십시오.)

매우 찬성 ... (1)　　약간 반대 ... (4)
보통 찬성 ... (2)　　보통 반대 ... (5)
약간 찬성 ... (3)　　매우 반대 ... (6)

39. 만약에 위의 사항들 외에 귀하의 직업 만족도에 영향을 미치는 다른 점들이 있으면 밑의 공란에 적어 주시기 바랍니다.

APPENDIX 3

RELIABILITY TEST RESULTS

IF ITEM CORRELATION IS DELETED

	CRONBACH α IF ITEM CORRELATION IS DELETED		
	TOTAL SAMPLE	AMERICANS	KOREANS
JOB ITSELF			
J2	.7513	.8013	.7087
J3	.7256	.7809	.6923
J4	.7345	.7800	.7149
J5	.7232	.7639	.7097
J6	.7399	.7928	.7121
J7	.7139	.7725	.6844
J8	.7313	.7806	.7106
J9	.7298	.7741	.7145
J10	.7347	.7819	.7164
J11	.7299	.7808	.7106
SUPERVIOSRS			
S2	.7746	.7869	.7310
S3	.7588	.7567	.7204
S4	.7654	.7745	.7250
S5	.7586	.7532	.7116
S6	.7809	.7943	.7529
S7	.7888	.7980	.7671
S8	.7670	.7804	.7177
S9	.7474	.7540	.6951
S10	.7656	.7834	.7218
S11	.7354	.7515	.6891
S12	.7627	.7833	.7218
S13	.7517	.7666	.7031
CO-WORKERS			
C2	.5306	.5732	.4330
C3	.5163	.5505	.4122
C4	.5100	.5475	.3967
C5	.4046	.4568	.2446
C6	.4980	.5343	.3912
C7	.4384	.4762	.3181
C8	.5081	.5300	.4226
C9	.4364	.4542	.3229
C10	.6601	.6351	.6366
C11	.6826	.6780	.6283

	CRONBACH α IF ITEM CORRELATION IS DELETED		
	TOTAL SAMPLE	AMERICANS	KOREANS
SALARY OR WAGE			
W2	.7417	.7454	.6633
W3	.6887	.6800	.6186
W4	.7116	.7404	.5738
W5	.7065	.7098	.5992
W6	.6985	.7063	.5700
W7	.6758	.6737	.5639
W8	.7100	.7235	.5842
W9	.6978	.6953	.5988
WORKING CONDITIONS			
WC2	.7803	.7430	.7004
WC3	.7519	.7763	.6510
WC4	.7696	.7343	.6954
WC5	.7129	.7336	.5968
WC6	.7780	.7365	.7289
WC7	.7459	.7864	.6378
BENEFITS			
B2	.8228	.7919	.6466
B3	.7482	.6872	.5582
B4	.8128	.7817	.6209
B5	.7391	.6587	.5167
B6	.8188	.7836	.6343
B7	.7511	.6756	.5654
JOB SECURITY			
JS2	.8257	.8583	.7674
JS3	.7738	.7902	.7468
JS4	.8115	.8455	.7525
JS5	.7594	.7843	.7207
JS6	.8120	.8448	.7602
JS7	.7546	.7825	.7123

APPENDIX 4

RESULTS OF UNIVARIATE F-TEST

	F	Sig. of F
Work (Job) itself		
g_J1:Routine	5.00373	.022
g_J2:Challenging	1.02824	.311
g_J3:Creative	2.61528	.107
g_J4:Accomplishing	4.32162	.039
g_J5:Simple	.15029	.699
Supervisors		
g_S1:Ask my advice	.00651	.936
g_S2:Be influential	6.54579	.011
g_S3:Be quick-tempered	1.20452	.273
g_S4:Know job very well	.09787	.755
g_S5:Intelligent	4.53081	.034
g_S6:Be around when needed	6.51946	.011
Co-Workers		
g_C1:Ambitious	3.60157	.059
g_C2:Responsible	1.77483	.184
g_C3:Intelligent	.79253	.374
g_C4:Helpful	.28014	.597
g_C5:Competitive	3.74283	.054
Salary		
g_W1:Adequate for normal expenses	17.63306	.000
g_W2:Less than I deserve	.03174	.859
g_W3:I can barely live on income	5.08055	.025
g_W4:Motivating	.56182	.454
Working Conditions		
g_WC1:Comfortable temperature/climate	22.59069	.000
g_WC2:Adequate lighting	32.27012	.000
g_WC3:Reasonable noise level	12.68516	.000
Benefits		
g_B1:Sufficient	60.62448	.000
g_B2:Consistent	37.54573	.000
g_B3:Fairly administered	50.77251	.000
Job Security		
g_JS1:Secure future	12.85879	.000
g_JS2:Steady	9.38743	.002
g_JS3:Stable employment	4.58111	.003

APPENDIX 5

STANDARDIED DISCRIMINANT

FUNCTION COEFFICIENT (SDFC)

	SDFC
Work (Job) itself	
g_J1:Routine	-.80752
g_J2:Challenging	.22149
g_J3:Creative	-.06262
g_J4:Accomplishing	-.64595
g_J5:Simple	-.35911
Supervisor	
g_S1:Ask my advice	-.16695
g_S2:Be influential	.64289
g_S3:Be quick-tempered	.35622
g_S4:Know job very well	-.18092
g_S5:Intelligent	-.82744
g_S6:Be around when needed	.73732
Co-Workers	
g_C1:Ambitious	-.89617
g_C2:Responsible	.65773
g_C3:Intelligent	.28804
g_C4:Helpful	-.44323
g_C5:Competitive	-.75746
Salary	
g_W1:Adequate for normal expenses	-.91104
g_W2:Less than I deserve	.38805
g_W3:I can barely live on income	-.42026
g_W4:Motivating	.16795
Working Conditions	
g_WC1:Comfortable temperature	-.28001
g_WC2:Adequate lighting	-.73394
g_WC3:Reasonable noise level	-.09778
Benefits	
g_B1:Sufficient	-.79350
g_B2:Consistent	.23865
g_B3:Fairly administered	-.47165
Job Security	
g_JS1:Secure future	-1.03317
g_JS2:Steady	-.63233
g_JS3:Stable employment	.79752

2

VITA

JUNSUH WON

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

THESIS: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF JOB SATISFACTION BETWEEN KOREAN AND AMERICAN WORKERS

Major Field: Business Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Seoul, Korea, On February 11, 1956, the son of Yang-Sun Won and Ok-Shim Song.

Education: Graduated from Choong-Ang High School, Seoul, Korea in February 1975; received Bachelor of Science degree in Agricultural Education from Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea in February 1982; received the Master of Business Administration degree at Adelphi University in May 1985. Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in December 1995.

Experience: Employed as a farm labor during summer 1981; employed as a Korean language teacher by Nassau Korean Language School between June 1983 to December 1984; employed as a general manager by Taco Maker in Hempstead, New York between May 1985 and July 1985.