

THE WORKERS' SATISFACTION AND NATURE OF WORK
ENVIRONMENT.



THE WORKERS' SATISFACTION AND NATURE OF WORK ENVIRONMENT
AMONG ZAMBIAN WORKERS UNDER ZIMCO GROUP OF COMPANIES

by

PATRICK KAYUMBI SIAME

A Dissertation Submitted to the University of Zambia
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts in Sociology.

University of Zambia

Lusaka, August, 1983.

DECLARATION

I, PATRICK KAYUMBI SIAME, SOLEMNLY DECLARE THAT THIS
DISSERTATION HAS NOT PREVIOUSLY BEEN SUBMITTED FOR A
DEGREE IN THIS OR ANY OTHER UNIVERSITY.



.....
Signed

APPROVAL

THIS DISSERTATION OF PATRICK KAYUMBI SIAME IS APPROVED
AS FULFILLING PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN SOCIOLOGY.

EXAMINERS.

1. Thomas J. Mphahlele
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

To Lucy, my wife, best friend, Room-Mate and help-mate;
who shared this pilgrimage in victory and defeat, in
sadness and in Joy, with quiet strength and constant love;
who always believed in me,

I LOVE YOU.

in dealing
of the dissertation.

ABSTRACT

This study examined and assessed the sources of workers' satisfaction in relation to the factors in the work environment among Zambian workers who are under the ZIMCO group of companies.

A random sampling of organizations under ZIMCO was used. This is that names of all organizations under ZIMCO were written on small papers and put in a tin and then randomly picked with replacement. Only five organizations were picked. These were as follows: Postal and Telecommunication Corporation (PTC); Zambia Electricity and Supply Corporation (ZESCO); Refined Oil Products (ROP) (1975) Limited; Nitrogen Chemicals of Zambia (NCZ) and Chilanga Cement Limited.

The study used a weighted stratified sampling and interviewed 194 workers from the five organizations drawn as follows: 80 were unskilled workers, 70 were semi-skilled workers, 33 were skilled workers and 11 were professional workers.

The study found that the majority of workers regard material factors as sources of their satisfaction, while non-material factors were regarded as sources of satisfaction by the majority of the professional workers more than the other levels of occupation.

The objective of the study was to provide insights into how management can look at the needs of workers. The findings could be used by both parastatal and private organizations. It could be used also as a future reference because few related studies have been carried in Zambia.

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The dissertation is about the workers' satisfaction and nature of work environment in ZIMCO group of Companies. The interest to do this study stemmed from the observation that workers in Zambia have been demanding for better conditions of service through their unions. This in some cases has led to the disruption of production in some companies and dismissal of workers in others. This study has tried to explain what satisfies the workers most in the factors of the work environment. It has tried to provide some ways which can solve the tensions between workers and employers.

The outline of the study is as follows: the first chapter deals with the introduction to the study, that is, it explains the issues which are tackled in the study. The second chapter analyses material factors in the work environment, such as pay, job security and other fringe benefits. The third chapter deals with the non-material factors, such as working relations (with work-mates and supervisors) and achievement. The fourth chapter gives the concluding remarks of the study and suggestions to the various organizations and future researchers.

A number of people, both scholars and ordinary citizens, have helped me, in one way or another, in the process of writing this dissertation. The best I can do is to thank them all for having left me in their debt.

First and Foremost, I am very grateful to my supervisor Dr. Peter B. Hayward for his help, advice and indeed patience in dealing with my work at proposal level and during the writing of the dissertation.

I also thank Dr. T. Hopkins of Social Development Studies who willingly and sincerely read and edited my work during the writing of the dissertation.

I would like to thank the Director of Public Relations of INDECO Limited, for allowing me to carry out my research in the organizations under INDECO. This helped me to gain access to these organizations. I would like also to thank the workers and management of the following organizations: Postal and Tele-Communication Corporation; Zambia Electricity Supply Corporation; ROP (1975) Limited, Nitrogen Chemicals of Zambia and Chilanga Cement Limited, for the co-operation they gave me in answering my questions and allowing me access to most of their management records.

I wish to express my profound gratitude to the Staff Development Office of the University of Zambia which offered me a Staff Development Scholarship. I extend my gratitude to Mr. B. Nyangu and Ms. R. Mubanga who did the typing of the dissertation.

Lastly, but not least, to all my brethren in Christ who so much prayed for me to succeed, I say: We are more than conquerors in our Lord Jesus Christ.

P.K. Siame

University of Zambia

Lusaka, August, 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Title	i
Declaration	ii
Approval	iii
Abstract	v
Preface and Acknowledgements	vi
List of tables	ix
<u>CHAPTER ONE</u>	
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
1.a Overview of the issues	1
1.b Review of Literature	3
1.c Statement of Hypotheses	10
1.d Operational Definitions	12
1.e Methods of Measurement	14
1.f Methodology	17
1.g Economic situation at the time of study	19
<u>CHAPTER TWO</u>	
<u>A WORKER AND HIS LIVELIHOOD</u>	27
2.a Pay in relation to workers' satisfaction	29
2.b Fringe Benefits in relation to workers' satisfaction	47
2.c Job security in relation to workers' satisfaction ..	54
<u>CHAPTER THREE</u>	
<u>A WORKER AND HIS NON-MATERIAL FACTORS</u>	64
3.a A worker and working relations	64
3.a1 A worker and his work-mates	65
3.a2 A worker and his supervisors	82
3.b The importance of Achievement Among Workers	93
<u>CHAPTER FOUR:</u>	
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	101
BIBLIOGRAPHY	108
SCHEDULE OF APPENDICES	112

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.1 Selected Economic indicators	21
1.2 Price increases for certain basic commodities	22
2.1a The responses of workers towards pay being essential	29
2.1b The responses of workers towards pay being catered.....	30
2.2a The importance of pay in relation to levels of satisfaction.....	31
2.2b The provision of Pay in relation to levels of satisfaction	32
2.3 Factors of Satisfaction in relation to levels of satisfaction	34
2.4 Reasons for satisfaction in relation to levels of satisfaction	35
2.5.a The importance of pay in relation to levels of occupation ...	37
2.5 ^b The provision of pay in relation to levels of occupation ...	38
2.5 ^c The levels of importance in relation to levels of provision	39
2.6a The importance of pay in relation to levels of occupation ...	40
2.6b The provision of pay in relation to levels of occupation	41
2.7 Factors of satisfaction in relation to levels of occupation when ranked.....	42
2.8 Levels of satisfaction in relation to levels of occupation	44
2.9 Reasons for satisfaction in relation to levels of occupation	46
2.10a The importance of accommodation to workers	48

2.10b	The levels of satisfaction in relation to happiness towards accommodation	49
2.10c	Accommodation in relation to levels of occupation	51
2.11a	Health facilities in relation to levels of Happiness	52
2.11b	The levels of happiness in relation to level of satisfaction	53
2.11c	Levels of happiness in relation to levels of occupation	53
2.12a	The importance of job security in relation to levels of occupation	55
2.12b	The attitudes of workers towards job security in relation to levels of occupation	57
2.12c	The levels of importance and the provision of job security in the working place	59
2.13a	Attitudes of workers towards job security in relation to reasons	60
2.13b	Attitudes of workers towards job security in relation to levels of satisfaction	62
3.1a	The levels of importance in working with friendly work-mates	66
3.1b	The levels of provision in having friendly work-mates in the working place	67
3.1c	The importance and provision of friendly work-mates	68
3.2	The levels of importance of having friendly work-mates in relation to levels of occupation	70
3.3	The levels of provision of having friendly work-mates in relation to levels of occupation	71
3.4	The need to work with workers of the same level of education	73
3.5	The need to work with workers of same level of education in relation to levels of occupation	74

3.6	The need to work with same ethnic group	76
3.7	Working with same ethnic group in relation to levels of occupation	77
3.8	Attitudes of working with same ethnic group in relation to reasons for the attitude	78
3.9 _a	The levels of provision of having friendly work-mates in relation to levels of satisfaction	80
3.9 _b	Workers' attitudes towards leaving their work-mates	81
3.10 _a	The levels of importance in working with understanding supervisors	83
3.10 _b	The attitudes of workers towards their supervisors	84
3.10 _c	The levels of importance in having understanding supervisors in relation to how they were provided among the workers	85
3.11 _a	The attitudes of workers in working with understanding supervisors in relation to the levels of occupation	86
3.11 _b	The attitudes of workers towards the supervisors they were working with in relation to levels of occupation	88
3.12	The attitudes of workers towards their supervisors in relation to levels of satisfaction	91
3.13	The importance of achievement in relation to levels of occupation	94
3.14 _a	Feelings of achievement in relation to levels of occupation	96
3.14 _b	Reasons for feelings of achievement in relation to the levels of occupation	97
3.15	Feelings of achievement in relation to levels of satisfaction.	99

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.a. Overview of the Issues

This study is an attempt to establish the source of workers' satisfaction in relation to the nature of work environment to which the worker is subjected. The study is aimed at finding out what kind of work environment a worker thinks gives him/her most satisfaction, or vice versa, what kind of satisfaction a worker gets from a given kind of work environment.

The study is a survey of the Zambian workers under the Zambia Industrial and Mining Corporation (ZIMCO) group of Companies. The choice of the ZIMCO group of Companies was deliberate because all workers interviewed were more or less under the same conditions of service, except those under the Collective Agreement, that is members of the trade union in each company.

In this study, the emphasis is on workers' satisfaction and nature of work environment. Workers' satisfaction is used to mean a source or a cause of pleasure, fulfilment or gratification one gets from a job one is doing. The nature of work environment is used to mean the factors which a worker is subjected to. This includes material factors, such as pay, fringe benefits (accommodation and other benefits) and non-material factors, such as working relations (with work groups, supervisors), job security, achievement and tribal influence.

The purpose of this study is to find out if workers' satisfaction is related to the nature of work environment among workers in the ZIMCO group of Companies. This is looking at a worker in relation to the following: his livelihood, working relations, job security and, achievement.

A number of studies carried out on satisfaction have tried to link satisfaction with performance or performance with satisfaction, such as the studies of Ross and Zander (1975); Brayfield and Crockett (1955) and Vroom (1954). Some of these studies say that where there is satisfaction there is good performance, others say that where there is good performance there is satisfaction. Peil (1972), for example, found that studies have shown that a man's attitude toward his job and adjustment to it are important components of his performance on that job. This study is exploring sources of satisfaction, as seen by workers, trying to answer the following questions; why do people work? Why do they stay in their work? Are they happy with what their job offers? These questions relate to the nature of work environment which a worker works under.

Workers' satisfaction, here, is regarded as the end state and nature of work environment as a force to that end state among ZIMCO workers. This is to say that the work environment is the source of workers' satisfaction.

The study is significant in two ways; it is important both practically and theoretically in developing countries in general and in particular Zambia. It is important practically because satisfaction is said by several studies to be positively related to performance as well as to the happiness of workers. There is a need for workers to be happy if good mental health and performance is to be achieved, as other studies have shown (for example, Kornhauser; 1965). This study, therefore, has relevance to

Zambian situation in that Zambia is just developing her industries and the management can use the findings of this study to improve the situation among their workers in ZIMCO group of companies. If satisfaction is achieved, this would improve workers' performance and make it possible for a happy working life. Also by trying to create a good working environment which satisfies their workers most, long term performance and working relationship between the management and workers may both improve. This may in turn boost production and improve the economy of the country.

Theoretically, it is important because little has been carried out to date on workers' satisfaction and work environment in Zambia. It is, therefore, important to establish a theoretical point of reference for future purpose.

1.b. Review of Literature

At the time this study was being carried out there was very little research done on the subject of workers' satisfaction in relation to the work environment in Zambia. Only related studies have been carried out in Zambia, such as the study of Machungwa and Schmitt (1983) on "work motivation in a developing country." The studies on the subject reviewed here, have been carried out in other countries, especially in the Western countries.

When one talks about workers' satisfaction, one has in mind consciously or unconsciously the human needs. The studies of Maslow (1943 and 1954) give an outline of the basic needs of a human being. There is a list of five sets of needs which may be called basic needs. These briefly are: physiological, safety, love, esteem and self-respect, and self-actualization. These

basic needs are related to one another, being arranged in a hierarchy. This means that the lower needs on the hierarchy will monopolise the consciousness and will tend themselves to organise the recruitment of the various capacities of the organism. Any thwarting or possibility of thwarting these needs or danger to the defences which protect them or to the condition upon which they rest is considered to be a psychological threat. Albrecht (1972) agreed with Maslow's hierarchy of needs. He says human beings behave in ways which they calculate will result in a reduction of the inner appetite. So if employers are to have workers who will do the work happily, it is necessary to check the hierarchy of needs to see which is lacking in the workers. These five sets of needs are again emphasized in three categories by Fraser (1962) who says behind all human activity is some kind of some need. He says needs can roughly be classified into three categories: the material needs, on which the physical survival of the individual depends; social needs or companionship on which community life depends and ego or status needs on which higher standards of achievement and progress depend. This is in line with Maslow's hierarchy of needs. When one level of lower needs is not satisfied then the higher ones will not be referred to by the worker, whether there are met or not. Thus Davis (1962) compares a worker to a machine, saying when a machine has a fault, people recognise that it needs something, perhaps oil or some repair. The worker also malfunctions* when some of these basic needs are missing in the workers' life. This

*Malfunctions:- in a worker's life can be in form of a strike, working without morale - resulting in unhappiness and low performance.

shows why employers should satisfy their workers if they have to perform better without malfunctions.

Taylor (1950) says it is the frustrated worker who is most likely to strike or restrict output. Ross and Zander (1975) found that there is a relationship between satisfaction and employee turnover. Their findings show that the basic needs play a very important role in the workers' satisfaction. In their conclusion, they said that workers whose basic needs are satisfied at the job are more likely to remain in the organization. These studies point out why workers satisfaction is necessary in the work environment.

The studies which have been reviewed here present two views on what factors are the most important for workers satisfaction in the work environment. Some studies emphasize on the economic factors and others on working relations. In short material and non-material factors respectively.

Dufty (1960); Schneider (1957); Taylor (1947) and Tredgold (1949) have emphasized economic factors as the main source of workers' satisfaction, while Blauner (1960); Mayo (1949) and Herberg (1959) have emphasized the non-material factors. The latter say that the employer should look at a worker as a member of the organization not only as a producer. Workers should be made to feel part and parcel of the work they are doing for them to be satisfied.

Dufty (1960) interviewed fifty workers on job satisfaction factors. His findings showed that the following factors are given priority to most workers he interviewed: good pay, the sort of work one likes, job security, good working conditions, promotion to a

more highly paid job or to a supervisory position, having a good boss and interpersonal atmosphere. Economic security was seen to be the most important factor on this study. Schneider (1957) pointed out the following factors in his study as sources of satisfaction, in order of importance, to a worker: economic job security, recognition, interpersonal atmosphere, good working conditions, control of their affairs, promoting responsibility, achievement and understanding supervisors. He also gave another set of factors, such as routinization, monotony, reduction of skill and isolation, social conditions, such as insecurity and the absence of factors mentioned earlier, as causes of workers' dissatisfaction.

The study of Tredgold (1949) on why people work, shows, quite a number of things which are related to the nature of work environment. He outlines the following things: a search for material security, personal responsibility, the desire for pre-eminence, pride in skill and a sense of order. This study has tried to prove if these findings, are true to the Zambian situation as well.

Taylor (1947) in his outline of "principles of scientific management" pointed out that for a worker to perform according to the needs of the management, he needs a "large and permanent increase in his pay". Connected with this is McGregor's (1960) "Theory X" which says management is responsible for organising the elements of productive enterprise in the interest of economic ends. This theory says that without close supervision or active intervention by management, workers would be passive, even resistant to organizational needs. The workers must therefore be persuaded, rewarded, punished, controlled. In short all their activities must be directed.

Mayo and others (1949) in the Hawthorne studies found that

giving freedom to workers working together was necessary. This is called "informal organizations." They found out that work groups have their own norms and values which they follow to get at places of work. This in a way demands knowing the interpersonal atmosphere which exists in the work group so as to see how norms and values of the group control the working relations of the workers. In the informal organization supervision is not closed, rather it is open, that is every member of the work group is given the freedom to express his contribution. This study here is more concerned with how workers regard their work-mates and supervisors in relation to their satisfaction to see if the informal organization affected the workers' satisfaction in the work environment.

The study of Herberg, et al (1959) found out that satisfied workers stressed the following factors: achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and advancement, while dissatisfied workers complained about company policy, administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions.

A study of Machungwa and Schmitt (1983) on "work motivation in a developing country," which is a study on Zambia, found the following factors to be the source of satisfaction; having a lot of work (sufficient or more but not too much), work itself (whether it is interesting; challenging, important and variant), work that is urgent, recognition, promotion or chance for promotion, chance to learn more about the job, pay (increments, bonus, incentive, merit rise), job security (to ensure being employed), achievement and responsibility. They also found the following factors to be sources

dissatisfaction: tribalism (favouratism, nepotism, corruption
 motion), had personal relation with supervisors, co-workers
ordinates, pay (low pay, no increments, no bonuses, no merit
d pay reduction), when the company supervisors and co-workers
are about the problems and welfare of employees, lazy or incompetent
ors and workers and lack of fringe benefits (housing, transport, loans
these findings are closely related to this study as it shall be seen.

The studies of Blauner (1960) and Katz (1954), show that
isfaction is roughly proportional to the prestige or
ne's occupation in his working place and in a wider society;

ol a worker has over his social environment at the place
decisions affecting his work. This is to say a workers'
can be increased if workers, as a group or individuals,
ter freedom to make decisions and take responsibility for
studies emphasize on working relations and the freedom
is given on the work environment to achieve the
his is related to the question, what makes a worker

n and Blackburn (1972) analysed the relationship
d the union. Their findings are that this type
very essential for workers because it is through
representatives, that the workers put up their
there is no union in an organization workers are
he employers. Goode and Foole (1949) have described
rale and productivity were negatively related but
high by the continuing threats to workers.

action

orkers

ual

and

1935)

n

among

; satisfy

hich

study

el of

; observation

his work

It was possible for the management to demand high productivity from the workers on threat of discharge. This meant that the workers, though most dissatisfied with their work, produced at a high rate because of the difficulty they would face in finding another job should they be discharged. In this organization there was no union and therefore the workers were very insecure in terms of their employment. On this basis, it is expected that organizations with unions, such as the ones sampled here, would have satisfaction in as far as worker's job security is concerned.

Parker, et al (1967) pointed out in their findings that proportions of satisfied workers in different occupations, seem to be separated for manual and non-manual groups, with more satisfaction found at the higher level of skill in each group. Professional workers are said to be the most satisfied, semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers the least satisfied workers. The reasons for this difference are said to be complex, but mainly it is the freedom and mastery the professional workers have on their job. Hoppock (1935) reported that more than 90 per cent of a group of 500 teachers liked their work. In another study he found that 309 people in Pennsylvania town were dissatisfied with work, this occurred among unskilled workers. This study has tried to see which factors satisfy which level of occupation more, that is to see the factors which are sources of satisfaction in each level of occupation.

The other part which has been considered in this study is the effect of working with people who have the same level of education. It has been asserted from the present author's observation and personal experience that one gets more satisfied with his work

when working with people of the same level of education. This is analysed in relation to each level of occupation.

When one looks at these studies on the subject, the following factors have been said to be the source of workers satisfaction; economic security; job security; good working conditions; interpersonal relations; control of their affairs (workers); doing the sort of work one likes, achievement; supervision; challenging assignments and promotion. Of these factors as it has been seen, the studies reviewed do not agree on which of these are the most important if ranked and have not mentioned which factors satisfy which level of occupation. This study has included a ranking of factors as seen by workers and tried to see which factors satisfy which levels of occupation as the statement of hypotheses points out.

1.c. Statement of Hypotheses:

The nature of work environment is a source of satisfaction for workers. This statement has been proved widely by several studies under the review of literature. In this study the major aim is to see if different levels of occupation have different factors in the work environment as sources of workers' satisfaction. This is analysed with the help of the following statements of hypotheses:

- i. Pay is the most essential factor for workers' satisfaction in all levels of occupation in ZIMCO.
- ii. Lack of fringe benefits (such as health facilities and accommodation) produce workers' dissatisfaction in all levels of occupation in ZIMCO.
- iii. Working with friendly work-mates is an essential factor for workers' satisfaction in all levels of occupation in ZIMCO.

- iv. Working with workers of the same level of education is an essential factor for workers' satisfaction in all levels of occupation in ZIMCO.
- v. Working with different ethnic groups is an essential factor for workers' satisfaction in all levels of occupation in ZIMCO.
- vi. Job security is an essential factor for workers' satisfaction among unskilled and semi-skilled workers in ZIMCO.
- vii. Achievement is an essential factor for workers' satisfaction among professional and skilled workers in ZIMCO.
- viii. Working with understanding supervisors is an essential factor for workers' satisfaction among semi-skilled and unskilled workers in ZIMCO.

Here there are factors analysed which are regarded as sources of workers' satisfaction. These factors form the work environment which is being referred to here. The factors can be divided in two groups, the material and non-material factors. Material factors in this study are: pay, accommodation, health facilities, job security and objective conditions of service, these relate to material needs of a worker. While non-material factors are: relationship with work-mates and supervisors; ethnicity; feelings of working with people who have same level of education; and achievement, these relate to non-material needs of a worker.

The hypotheses aim to prove that each level of occupation has it's own source of satisfaction which is regarded as the most

essential factor for the workers' satisfaction. This relates to the view that those in higher ranks (such as skilled and professional workers) emphasize more on non-material factors as their source of satisfaction, working on the assumption that their material needs are already satisfied so that they try to satisfy the non-material needs which are not easily satisfied in the hierarchy of needs. While those in the lower ranks are said to emphasize material factors as their source of satisfaction. This is working on an assumption that their material needs are not satisfied since their Pay is assumed to be low, the majority are not accommodated and lack most of the fringe benefits. All this is ~~trying~~ to prove the hierarchy of needs, according to Maslow (1954). The ranking of the factors in each level of occupation will help to see which is emphasized as the source of satisfaction.

1.d. Operational Definition

(i) Workers' Satisfaction:

This referred to workers who said they were satisfied with their working life; that is they were generally happy with the factors in the work environment. This also referred to workers who said the following factors were either most essential, more essential or essential and said these factors were also either most catered, more catered or catered in their work environment: Pay; understanding supervisors; friendly work-mates; working conditions; trade unions; working hours, job security and social facilities.

(ii) Workers' Dissatisfaction:

This referred to workers who said they were dissatisfied with their working life, that is they were not happy with their work environment. This also referred to workers who said the following factors were either most essential, more essential or essential but complained that the factors were either less catered, lesser catered or least catered in the work environment; Pay; understanding supervisors; friendly work-mates; working conditions; trade union; working hours; job security and social facilities.

(iii) Nature of work environment

This referred to the benefits (material or non-material rewards), services and other conditions of service which a worker works under. Reference was made mainly to the following factors.

- levels of occupation referred to professional, skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers.
- Same level of education referred to workers who had either the same training or reached the same standard, that is either in grade 7 to Form 5 or post-secondary.
- understanding supervisors referred to supervisors whom workers said to be getting along with, such as very well and pretty well. Who were ranked as most catered.

- Friendly work-mates referred to those who worked in the same section and who said they were either very friendly or friendly.
- Job security referred to workers who said there were sure about their employment, that is they could not be declared redundant easily.
- Achievement referred to workers who said doing something worthwhile was the most essential factor for their satisfaction. Those who said they had feelings of achievement or accomplishment.

In short it referred to conditions such as pay and other economic benefits; housing; health facilities and other subjective aspects of work experience, such as supervision and interpersonal atmosphere. This is an independent variable.

1.e. Methods of Measurements:

(i) Workers' Satisfaction:

There was use of subjective measure for this variable.

1. Workers were asked specifically whether they were either satisfied or dissatisfied in their working life.
2. Workers were given a list of factors and asked to rank the factors they regarded as the most essential, more essential, essential, less essential, lesser essential and least essential for their satisfaction. The following factors were given: Pay, friendly work-mates, understanding supervisors, working conditions, trade union, working hours, job security, chance to do

something worthwhile (achievement) and social facilities. They were also asked to say if they had feelings of achievement or frustration. Then some of these factors were compared with responses on how these factors were provided in their work environment. This was done by asking workers if the factors were either most catered, more catered, catered, less catered, lesser catered or least catered.

(ii) Nature of Work Environment:

There was use of both subjective and objective measures for this variable.

1. The objective measures was to use management records on conditions of service provided in the Collective Agreement (attached on Appendices) and ZIMCO contract.
2. Inquired in the working relationship of workers with co-workers, the immediate supervisors and management. This was a subjective measure.
3. Another subjective measure was to ask for opinions on factors of satisfaction from different levels of occupation.

Briefly these are some of the conditions of service which were under ZIMCO group of companies at the time of this research. There were two types of condition of service, firstly there was the ZIMCO group contract and conditions of employment for permanent and pensionable workers; Secondly there were those who were under the "Collective Agreement" who were under the trade union in Companies and were also permanent workers.

The ZIMCO contract (which is in full, in Appendix II) had the same contents for all ZIMCO group of Companies. These had same terms for employment, probation and termination; the basic salary scales for each grade (they had grades from Z1 to Z10); same leave days in each grade (such as from Z1 to Z3 there were 24 days, Z4/3 to Z6 there were 30 days and from Z7/6 to Z10 inclusive there were 36 days per employment year). The fringe benefits were also almost the same. Each grade was entitled to its own travel and subsistence allowance. There were also allowances for loans in each grade such as car loan, furniture loan and other special needs. There were provisions of paying housing allowances which ranged from K40 to K240 which was assessed in each grade. With this were housing rents as well for those who were provided with accommodation which ranged from 6% to 10% of the basic salary without ceiling. There was a provision for sick leaves which states that "when an employee is absent from work or unable to carry out his duties, through sickness, accidents, or other disability, he must produce to the Company such evidence of his sickness or accident as the company requires. Failure to do that the case falls under the section of misconduct." Under this section the ZIMCO group of Companies had the same disciplinary and grievance procedure. This dealt with cases such as absenteeism, sick leave, violation of Company rules and procedures. All these were regarded as different breaches of contract and had different procedures of discipline ranging from verbal warning to dismissal; in between there were written warnings and suspensions, depending on each case. In short these are some of the conditions of service under which some workers who were interviewed worked,

Each company in the ZIMCO group of Companies has workers who are not in the above contract but are under the "Collective Agreement". These are the workers who are represented by the Union of each Company. Therefore, each Company has a "Collective Agreement". Here it is difficult to put together all the contents in each Agreement since each Agreement is different from the other depending on the Agreement between the Union and the Company concerned. So each of these are attached to the appendices (Appendix III - Collective Agreement between the Post and Telecommunication Corporation and the National Union of Postal and Telecommunications Workers; Appendix IV - Collective Agreement between Zambia Electricity Supply Corporation Limited and Zambia Electricity Workers' Union; Appendix V - Collective Agreement between ROP (1975) Limited and National Union of Commercial and Industrial Workers; Appendix VI - Collective Agreement between Nitrogen Chemicals of Zambia Limited and the National Union of Commercial and Industrial Workers; and Appendix VII Chilanga Cement Limited and The National Union of Commercial and Industrial Workers).

1.f. Methodology:

(i) Sampling:

There was a random sampling of at least five organization which were under ZIMCO group of Companies. The method of sampling used was writing names of all ZIMCO group of Companies which were in Lusaka and Copperbelt Provinces on small pieces of paper and then picked at random one at time with replacement. But ZIMCO group of Companies were chosen deliberately because these Companies had

almost the same conditions of service, though they differed a bit when it came to those under the 'Collective Agreements'. All the same this was used as a case study for workers' satisfaction and nature of work environment among ZIMCO group of Companies. While the Provinces could easily be reached and had most of the ZIMCO group of Companies. It was necessary to have the same condition of service so that the analysis of data is not complex because of different conditions of services.

(ii) Research Design:

This was a survey Design covering the following companies, which were randomly sampled: Chilanga Cement Limited; Nitrogen Chemicals of Zambia Limited(NCZ); ROP (1975) Limited; Post and Telecommunication Corporation (PTC); and Zambia Electricity Supply Corporation (ZESCO). Thereafter there was a weighted stratified sampling of workers in each company. The sample from each of these Companies depended on the number of employees in each Company. All these were grouped in the occupational classification (professional, skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers) proportionately to the representation of each group in the Company.

(iii) Sample Size:

The sample size was to be between 150 and 200 workers drawn from five companies; 194 workers were interviewed from the four levels of occupations. The following was the work force for each of the five companies and the samples drawn in each company. P.T.C. had 5,025 workers; 74 workers were interviewed of which 5 were professionals, 15 were skilled, 26 were semi-skilled and 28 were unskilled workers. ZESCO had 4,800 workers; 65 workers were interviewed

of which 2 were professionals, 6 were skilled, 27 were semi-skilled and 30 were unskilled workers. ROP (1975) Limited had 1,373 workers; 21 workers were interviewed of which 2 were professionals, 3 were skilled, 7 were semi-skilled and 9 were unskilled workers. NCZ had 1,279 workers; 20 workers were interviewed of which 1 was a professional, 7 were skilled, 7 were semi-skilled and 5 were unskilled workers; and Chilanga Cement Limited had 841 workers; 14 workers were interviewed, of which 1 was a professional, 2 were skilled, 3 were semi-skilled and 8 were unskilled workers (Appendix VIII shows the calculations for each company).

The whole sample was 194 workers, out of which 80 were unskilled, 70 were semi-skilled, 33 were skilled and 11 were professional workers.

(iv) Data Collection

Data was collected largely but not exclusively by interviews. Structured/Unstructured questionnaires were administered by the researcher. The interviews were conducted either in Bemba or Nyanja with a backward use of translation and in English. Further data was collected from the management records on the Companies. Unstructured interviews and discussions with both workers and the management were done. 1.g. Economic Situation at the Time of Study.

This study was carried at the time when the country's (Zambia) economy was not doing well. The evidence to see that the country was in a bad state did not require an economist to analyse and read the situation. This acted very much as an intervening variable to most of the responses on workers' satisfaction as it shall be seen in the Chapter that follow.

To start with it is important to point out some things which indicated that the economy was in a bad state. The International Labour Organization (ILO) report on Zambia clearly points to that by

this statement, "Zambia's economic prospects are thus extremely serious - more serious than at anytime since independence. Already the mass population is under considerable pressure in terms of meeting their basic needs for food, everyday consumption goods, medicines, basic services and transportation" (ILO Report (1981) ; XXIV). These are some of the indicators which show that the economy was not doing well: firstly the devaluation of the Kwacha. In 1976 the Kwacha was devalued by 20 per cent, in 1978 there was a 10 per cent devaluation; and in 1983 there was a 20 per cent devaluation. Thus up to 1983 there was 50 per cent devaluation of the Kwacha. Secondly the government reduced subsidies since the early 1970s, leading to increases in prices of commodities; thirdly in 1982 there was a decontrol of prices giving power to producers to increase prices as they thought to be reasonable for their production costs; and finally there had been a continuous rise in prices of commodities since the early 1970s to date. Table 1.1 and 1.2 give an outline of this situation.

Table 1.1

SELECTED ECONOMIC INDICATORS

INDICATORS	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Total domestic product							
1. at current prices	1,583.4	1,872.2	1,951.5	2,202.6	2,570.6	2,978.1	3,040.4
2. at 1970 prices (K,000,000)	1,438.1	1,500.1	1,428.4	1,454.8	1,314.6	1,367.9	1,358.2
External Trade							
1. Export	521.1	751.9	708.0	686.8	1,091.0	980.4	-
2. Imports (K,000,000)	603.0	468.0	530.0	493.9	590.7	870.0	-
Prices-							
Consumer prices, Nos. Unit 1975=100							
1. High income	100.0	116.1	136.0	152.6	169.8	189.4	208.0
2. Low Income	100.0	118.8	142.0	165.6	181.6	202.9	231.0
Earnings Average annual earnings							
1. Zambian (Kwacha)	1,381	1,478	1,566	1,740	2,000	-	-
2. Non Zambian	6,799	6,858	7,086	6,887	7,114	-	-

Source: Monthly Digest of statistics - CSO- July/September, 1982.

The prices have been increasing every year, while wage increases have fallen since 1973 to 1977, leading to a decrease in recorded average wages by about tenth. This decrease could be estimated to have continued ever since. This is a serious situation which cuts the earnings of workers so much that most of their basic needs are left dissatisfied.

Table 1.2

<u>PRICE INCREASES FOR CERTAIN BASIC COMMODITIES</u>		
<u>COMMODITIES</u>	<u>Increase from 1975 (average) to 1980 (in percentages)</u>	<u>Increase from March, 1979 to March, 1980 (in percentages)</u>
Roller meal	155	70
Bread	128	24
Cooking Oil	149	75
Dried Beans	154	40
Salt	50	0
Milk	64	13
Chibuku - Opaque beer	90	27
La ger Beer	93	11

Source: Monthly Digest of Statistics - CSO, March, 1980.

To give a brief explanation on each of these constraints, it's necessary to begin with the major one, the Devaluation of the Kwacha. Devaluation "is an official reduction in the value of a currency in relation to other currencies or to gold. It is one of the measures designed to solve a country's balance of payment"

(National Mirror, No.171-1983; p.12). Devaluation makes Imports dearer. Increased costs are meant to discourage imports and divert demand from imports to domestic products. This does not only reduces the outflow of foreign exchange but also stimulates domestic production and generates employment. Theoretically this is what devaluation is meant for but in practice, however, the success or failure of devaluation to check imports depends on how demand responds to prices of imported goods. This is the reason why devaluation does not work in Zambia because she depends very heavily on imports, that is even if prices of imports go up, there is always an increased demand for imports. This observation is true, for instance, despite the 30 per cent devaluation of the Kwacha between 1976 and 1980 Zambia's import bill rose by K412 million from K468.0 million in 1976 to K870.0 million in 1980 (see Table 1.1). Due to heavy dependence on imported commodities, there was an increase in prices which raised the cost of living and this accelerated the demands for high wages. This in return caused rises in the prices of domestically produced goods creating an inflationary atmosphere (see Table 1.2). This is connected to the other three factors which were existing at the time of the study as outlined already. Inflation is a term which can be used here to describe the three factors. This is referred to a loss in the purchasing power of money. This is because when prices increased very rapidly in Zambia, the things that money used to buy became less and less. This has led to workers, through their trade unions, pressing for more pay which can buy the same amount of commodities which they used to buy before this situation (inflation) came up. Worse still

the decontrol of prices in Zambia, made private and parastatal organizations to charge what was termed as "economic prices". Although high prices restored profits of the companies they also reduced the real income of wage earners and thus sowing seeds for a further round of wage demands. This just worsens the situation of inflation in the country. At this time of study, the government issued statements that the wage ceiling of workers was to be raised to 10 per cent only. This was rejected by the trade unions who were summoned to the State House for further discussions with the President. From a realistic point of view this did not make sense since the prices were not controlled by the State but the wages of workers were being controlled limiting the workers purchasing further.

Here are a few comments from the leaders, of that time, showing that they also recognised that the economic situation was in a bad state.

- The then Minister of Finance, Kebby Musokotwane, warned the nation to brace for harder times ahead as more subsidies were withdrawn from consumer goods. Thus the government announced a 'belt tightening' budget in which prices of beer, sugar, petrol, soft drinks, cigarettes and spirits were increased. (Times of Zambia: No. 5,183, January, 1982).
- President Kaunda during the opening of the 17th Party National Council Meeting in Lusaka's Mulungushi Hall said, "next year (1983) the government should reduce its expenditure while agriculture and industrial revival were long term plans." (Times of Zambia: 5,456; December, 1982).

- Minister of Commerce and Industry Mr. Clement Mwananshiku announced that control of goods (price control) regulation on a number of items had been revoked with immediate effect. (Times of Zambia; No.5,463; December 1982).
- Chairman of Zambia Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU) Mr. Fredrick Chiluba attacked the Party and its Government for allowing companies to charge economic prices, "while the prices and incomes commission sits as an intellectual spectator." He said trade Unions should be given equal rights to demand for their members improved condition of service in line with the International Convention of Free Collective bargaining (Times of Zambia; No. 5,464; December, 1982).
- President Kaunda while addressing ZIMCO board of directors said "Zambians have no choice but to lower their standard of living because the economic crunch has come." (Times of Zambia; No. 5,478; January, 1983).
- Prime Minister and Minister of finance warned Zambia's economy was in shambles and the economic outlook for 1983 was gloomy. The Prime Minister, Mr. Nalumino Mundia, said at the same time that Zambians have no choice but to accept further personal hardships by reducing both public and private consumptions to safeguard the the nation's future. (Times of Zambia; No. 5,574, January, 1983).
- Bank of Zambia said bargaining the 10 per cent wage ceiling would upset the International Monetary Fund to restructure Zambia's economy. Zambia is at its economic cross-roads and we have a real economic watershed. (Times of Zambia: No.5,594; June, 1983).

- Dr. Kaunda said despite the difficulties the economy was going through the Party was determined to restructure it. He reiterated that Zambians must accept their country was poor and could no longer continue enjoying the same luxuries which they could afford previously. (Times of Zambia; No.5,617; June, 1983).

These extracts just point to the condition of the country's economic state. All these show that the economic situation in the country was not good and as such it was not in favour of a worker who depended very much on the earnings he gets per month to buy the things he needs. In addition to these economic problems, nature was not in favour of the country's agricultural output because of the little rain fall in the country which brought low yield in agriculture. "Zambia's agriculture production dropped by 19 per cent last year (1982) because of a drought in contrast to an increased production of 27 per cent in 1981." (Times of Zambia, January, 1983). This led to the importation of essential food stuffs such as Maize, draining further the already limited supply of foreign exchange.

It was in such a depressing atmosphere that this study was carried out. So one can argue that the economic situation could be an intervening variable in so far as workers satisfaction is concerned.

CHAPTER TWOA WORKER AND HIS LIVELIHOOD

This Chapter will present and analyse responses from workers regarding their material factors and their material needs. To accomplish this, we will look at the recorded attitudes workers presented in terms of their pay; other material fringe benefits, such as accommodation, loans and health facilities; and Job Security. These fundamental material factors, are extremely important to a worker because they are mainly physiological needs (dealing with hunger, thirst, rest and sleep, escaping danger or pain, that is, being in good health, clothing and protection).^{*} These physiological needs are the ones Maslow (1954) regarded as being among the basic needs, which are related to what Fraser (1962) termed as material needs which are in terms of food and drink, clothing and shelter. Maslow stated that a human being will not be happy unless the basic needs are gratified or fulfilled. It is from this basic needs perspective that this study has looked at what workers regard as the most essential factors for their satisfaction and how catered or provided for these are in their working environment.

The hypotheses being analysed here are as follows:

- (i) Pay is a source of satisfaction at all levels of occupation among ZIMCO workers;

- (ii) lack of fringe benefits (such as accommodation and health facilities) is a source of dissatisfaction at all levels of occupation among ZIMCO workers;
- (iii) Job Security is an essential factor for workers' satisfaction in their environment, among unskilled and semi-skilled workers. This is in regard of the assumption that skilled and professional workers worry less about Job Security because they have the professional and qualification and Companies need their services. These hypotheses relate to the material needs of a human being and are related with the workers' livelihood.

To reiterate, 194 workers were interviewed from the five organizations under ZIMCO group of companies. The levels of occupation and samples in each level were as follows:

80 workers were unskilled; 70 workers were semi-skilled;

33 workers were skilled and 11 workers were professional.

Each worker was asked to say how he regarded pay, accommodation, health facilities and Job security in relation to his satisfaction. Job security may seem to be a non-material factor but it is regarded here as a material factor in the sense that when a worker is sure to be in employment then the worry of where he will draw the next income to feed his family does not bother him. The aims of this section were to see what sources of satisfaction are emphasised by the workers in their working environment and to see which level of occupation emphasized which factors, that is either material or non-material factors.

In addition to see if, according to Maslow and Fraser, these material are not provided for as the workers need, would the workers be dissatisfied.

(2.a) PAY IN RELATION TO WORKER'S SATISFACTION.

The first factor to be analysed here is pay, which is seen in relation to workers' satisfaction. The workers were asked to say how they regarded pay in terms of their satisfaction. The follow up question was asked to see if this was most catered for, for their satisfaction. This was then related to how workers felt about their working environment at each level of occupation. There were several responses to this factor which are shown in table 2.1a and 2.1b. Table 2.1a shows responses on how they regarded pay in relation to how essential it is for their satisfaction and table 2.1b shows how they regarded pay as being catered for (or provided for) in their Jobs, that is to say how satisfied they were with what they were paid.

Table 2.1.a

THE RESPONSES OF WORKERS TOWARDS PAY BEING ESSENTIAL

PAY	NO OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGES
MOST ESSENTIAL	134	69.1
MORE ESSENTIAL	17	8.8
ESSENTIAL	23	11.9
LESS ESSENTIAL	12	6.2
LESSER ESSENTIAL	4	2.1
LEAST ESSENTIAL	4	2.1
TOTAL	194	100.0

The data in Table 2.1a point out that over sixty percent of the workers said pay was most essential for their satisfaction. Only about ten per cent of the workers said pay was not essential for their satisfaction. The results in Table 2.1b show that less than ten per cent of the workers said their pay was most catered for, for their satisfaction and over fifty per cent of the workers said that pay was not catered for, for their satisfaction in their work environment.

Table 2.1b

THE RESPONSE OF WORKERS TOWARDS PAY BEING CATERED

PAY	NO OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGES
MOST CATERED FOR	17	8.8
MORE CATERED FOR	7	3.6
CATERED FOR	57	29.4
LESS CATERED FOR	27	13.9
LESSER CATERED FOR	27	13.9
LEAST CATERED FOR	59	30.4
TOTAL	194	100.0

The data in Table 2.1a and 2.1b demonstrate how the workers regard pay to their satisfaction. From this general view it can be seen that the majority of the workers said pay was the most essential factor which makes them happy in their work environment but for the majority ^{of the} workers pay was not catered for, for their satisfaction.

It is from here where the analysis can be taken further to see if the views of the workers, on how satisfied they were with their work environment, are related to the results above (on essential and catered for). In essence, this analysis is to see if workers who regarded pay as being the most essential or most catered for, also said they were satisfied or dissatisfied with their work environment. Table 2.2_a shows the responses on how workers think of pay in relation to their satisfaction in their work environment.

Table 2.2a
THE IMPORTANCE OF PAY IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF
SATISFACTION
(ROW PERCENTAGES (%))

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION IMPORTANCE OF PAY	SATISFIED		DON'T KNOW		DISSATISFIED		TOTAL	
	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%	NO	%
MOST ESSENTIAL	51	38.1	1	0.7	82	61.2	134	69.1
MORE ESSENTIAL	7	41.2	1	5.9	9	52.9	17	8.8
ESSENTIAL	14	60.9	0	0	7	39.1	23	11.9
LESS ESSENTIAL	5	41.7	0	0	7	58.3	12	6.2
LESSER ESSENTIAL	1	25.0	0	0	3	75.0	4	2.1
LEAST ESSENTIAL	2	50.0	0	0	2	50.0	4	2.1
TOTAL	80	41.3	2	1.0	112	57.7	194	100.0

These results are not statistically significant with Chi-square test (χ^2) at 0.05 per cent level of confidence.

Table 2.2_a shows that out of 69.1 per cent of the workers who said pay was the most essential factor for their satisfaction in their work environment, 38.1 per cent said they were satisfied and 61.2 per cent said they were dissatisfied with their work environment.

Now to see if pay was among the factors which contributed to worker's satisfaction. It is necessary to analyse the relationship between those who said pay was catered for in relation to levels of satisfaction as shown in Table 2.2b.

Table 2.2b

THE PROVISION OF PAY IN RELATION TO LEVEL OF SATISFACTION

(ROW PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

PROVISION OF PAY	LEVELS OF SATISFACTION			
	SATISFIED	DON'T KNOW	DISSATISFIED	TOTAL
MOST CATERED FOR	14 (82.4)	0 (0)	3 (17.0)	17 (8.8)
MORE CATERED FOR	5 (71.4)	0 (0)	2 (28.6)	7 (3.6)
CATERED FOR	34 (59.6)	1 (1.8)	22 (38.6)	57 (29.4)
LESS CATERED FOR	6 (22.2)	0 (0)	21 (77.8)	27 (13.9)
LESSER CATERED FOR	9 (33.3)	0 (0)	18 (66.7)	27 (13.9)
LEAST CATERED FOR	12 (20.3)	1 (1.7)	46 (78.0)	59 (30.4)
TOTAL	80 (41.3)	2 (1.0)	112 (57.7)	194 (100.0)

The results are statistically significant with chi-square (x^2) at 0.0001 per cent level of confidence.

The results in Table 2.2b show that out of 8.8 per cent of the workers who said pay was the most catered factor for their satisfaction, 82.4 per cent said they were satisfied. Of the 30.4 per cent of the workers who said pay was least catered factor for their satisfaction, 78.0 per cent were dissatisfied. This demonstrates that those workers who said pay was the most catered factor for their satisfaction, the majority were satisfied with their work environment.

Of those who said pay was the least catered factor for their satisfaction, the majority were dissatisfied with their work environment. This is an indication that those who are happy with the factor of pay are also satisfied with their work environment and those who are not happy with the pay are also dissatisfied with their work environment. In essence, this shows that pay could be a source of satisfaction if it is provided for and a source of dissatisfaction if it is not provided for, in the work environment.

This can be seen further when we see how pay is ranked in general in relation to other factors in the work environment. This is necessary to confirm the other studies of Dufty (1960); Schneider (1957); Tredgold (1949); and Taylor (1947), who found that workers ranked pay on the top of the list among other factors in the work environment. In this study the item is arranged according to the responses of all the workers as shown in table 2.3. This is in terms of the most essential and the most catered factors in relation to the workers' satisfaction.

The data in Table 2.3 point out that pay was ranked first among all other factors as ranked in regard to the workers' most essential factor in their work environment. But it was ranked eighth among the factors which workers regarded as the most catered for factor in their work environment. This demonstrates that pay was regarded as a very important factor for workers' satisfaction but it was the least ranked factor in terms of being the most catered for factor among workers in their work environment.

FACTORS OF SATISFACTION IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF SATISFACTION

(DATA IN PERCENTAGES AND RANKED)

LEVELS OF SATISFACTION FACTORS OF SATISFACTION	SATISFIED		DON'T KNOW		DISSATISFIED		TOTAL		RANKING	
	MOST ESSENTIAL	MOST CATERED	MOST ESSENTIAL	MOST CATERED	MOST ESSENTIAL	MOST CATERED	MOST ESSENTIAL	MOST CATERED	MOST ESSENTIAL	MOST CATERED
PAY	26.3	7.3	0	0	42.3	1.2	69.1	8.8	1	8
JOB SECURITY	25.9	13.6	0	0	38.3	8.4	64.8	22.0	2	5
FRIENDLY WORK-MATES	27.5	20.6	0	0.5	36.3	32.0	64.2	53.1	3	1
UNDERSTANDING SUPERVISORS	24.1	16.7	0	0	37.7	22.9	62.3	39.6	4	3
WORKING CONDITIONS	24.4	13.9	0	0	37.8	13.4	62.1	27.3	5	4
CONVENIENT WORKING HOURS	22.8	21.2	0.5	0	32.8	26.9	56.1	48.7	6	2
STRONG TRADE UNION	16.1	10.1	0	0.5	31.3	11.2	47.9	21.8	7	6
SOCIAL FACILITIES	12.3	7.2	0	0	23.0	9.8	36.1	17.0	8	7
CHANGE TO DO SOMETHING WORTHWHILE (ACHIEVEMENT)	17.0	-	0	-	15.5	-	32.5	-	9	-
RECOGNISED EASILY BY OTHERS	12.6	-	0	0	12.6	-	25.3	-	10	-

The blank spaces on achievement and recognised, mean that there were no questions which covered the two factors to see if there are catered.

In fact this is the major reason why most workers complained of dissatisfaction in their work environment. This could be seen better when the major reasons for the levels of satisfaction are analysed together as shown in Table 2.4.

Table 2.4

REASONS FOR SATISFACTION IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF
SATISFACTION
(ROW PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION REASONS FOR SATISFACTION	SATISFIED	DONT KNOW	DISSATISFIED	TOTAL
DONT KNOW	3(75.0)	1(25.0)	0(0)	4(2.1)
PAY AND OTHER BASIC CONDITIONS OF SERVICES ARE OKAY	46(95.8)	0(0.0)	2(4.2)	48(25.7)
THEY DONT FOLLOW EDUCATION WHEN GIVING PAY	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(100.0)	3(1.6)
JOB ITSELF IS OKAY	2(66.7)	0(0.0)	1(33.3)	3(1.6)
HAVE NOWHERE TO GO SO I JUST MAKE ENDS MEET	3(60.0)	0(0.0)	2(40.0)	5(2.7)
BENEFITS TAKE TOO LONG TO BE GIVEN	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(100.0)	3(1.6)
HAPPY WITH EVERY- THING	11(100.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	11(5.9)
RED TAPE	0(0)	0(0.0)	1(100.0)	1(5.9)
LACK OF FRINGE BENEFITS AND LOW PAY	5(5.5)	0(0.0)	85(94.4)	90(48.1)
LACK OF PROMOTION AND RECOGNITION	6(31.5)	0(0.0)	13(63.4)	19(10.2)
TOTAL	76(40.6)	1(0.5)	110(58.8)	187(100.0)

The results are statistically significant with chi-square test (χ^2) at 0.0001 per cent level of confidence; missing cases = 7

Table 2.4 emphasises two main reasons for either their satisfaction or dissatisfaction in the work environment. 48.1 per cent of the workers said low pay and lack of fringe benefits was the main reason why they were either satisfied or dissatisfied. The majority of the workers who gave this reason were dissatisfied with their work environment. The other reason given was that pay and other basic conditions of service were okay, 25.7 per cent of the workers gave this reason. The majority of these workers were satisfied with their work environment. The data illustrates the point that the majority of the workers who complained of low pay and lack of fringe benefits were dissatisfied. Thus emphasizing the position of pay and other fringe benefits being the source of satisfaction in the work environment. Or vice versa, being the source of dissatisfaction in the work environment to those who complain of low pay and lack of fringe benefits.

It is necessary to delineate the workers and thereby see which level of occupation regard this as a source of satisfaction. This is by looking at which level of occupation said pay was the most essential and most catered for factor for their satisfaction in their work environment (This is related to the Statement, "Pay is a source of satisfaction at all levels of occupation"). Such an analysis should prove if this factor (pay) is the source of satisfaction at each level of occupation. The data in table 25a point out the importance of pay in relation to levels of occupation.

Table 2.5a

THE IMPORTANCE OF PAY IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION
(COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

THE IMPORTANCE OF PAY	LEVELS OF OCCUPATION				
	UNSKILLED WORKERS	SEMI- SKILLED WORKERS	SKILLED WORKERS	PROFE- SSIONAL WORKERS	TOTAL
MOST ESSENTIAL	67(83.7)	41(58.6)	20(60.6)	6(54.5)	134(69.1)
MORE ESSENTIAL	1 (1.2)	10(14.8)	3(9.1)	3(27.3)	17(8.8)
ESSENTIAL	9(11.2)	9(12.9)	4(12.1)	1(9.1)	23(11.9)
LESS ESSENTIAL	2(2.5)	5(7.1)	4(12.1)	1(9.1)	12(6.2)
LESSER ESSENTIAL	0(0.0)	2(2.9)	2(6.1)	0(0.0)	4(2.1)
LEAST ESSENTIAL	1(1.2)	3(4.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(2.1)
TOTAL	80(41.3)	70(36.1)	33(17.0)	11(5.7)	194(100.0)

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square test
(χ^2) at 0.02 per cent level of confidence.

The results in Table 2.5a show that 83.7 per cent of the unskilled workers, 58.6 per cent of the semi-skilled workers, 60.6 per cent of the skilled workers and 54.5 per cent of the professional workers said pay was the most essential factor for their satisfaction.

Showing that the majority of the workers at each level of occupation regard pay as the most essential factor for their satisfaction in their work environment. Now it is important to see if this was also the case in terms of provision of pay at each level of occupation. This is shown in table 2.5^b, where 11.2 per cent of the unskilled workers, 7.1 per cent of the semi-skilled workers, 9.1 per cent of the skilled workers and no professional worker said pay was the most catered factor for their satisfaction in the work environment.

Table 2.5b

THE PROVISION OF PAY IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION.

(COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

THE PROVISIONS OF PAY	LEVELS OF OCCUPATION				
	UNSKILLED WORKERS	SEMI- SKILLED WORKERS	SKILLED WORKERS	PROFESSIONAL WORKERS	TOTAL
MOST CATERED FOR	9(11.2)	5(7.1)	3(9.1)	0.(0.0)	17(8.8)
MORE CATERED FOR	0(0.0)	4(5.7)	2(6.1)	1(9.1)	7(3.6)
CATERED FOR	15(18.7)	25(35.7)	10(30.3)	7(63.6)	57(29.4)
LESS CATERED FOR	11(13.7)	7(10.0)	7(21.2)	2(18.2)	27(13.9)
LESSER CATERED FOR	8(10.0)	14(20.0)	4(12.1)	1(9.1)	27(13.9)
LEAST CATERED FOR	37(46.3)	15(21.4)	7(21.2)	0(0.0)	59(30.4)
TOTAL	80(41.2)	70(36.1)	33(17.0)	11(5.7)	194(100.0)

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square test (x^2) at 0.0043 per cent level of confidence.

Clearly, the majority of the workers at all levels of occupation did not regard pay as the most catered factor in their work environment. Comparing the findings on Pay as being essential and catered for factor, it is clear that the majority of the workers who said it is most essential to have good pay in the work environment were not satisfied with the pay they got as shown in table 2.5c.

Table 2.5c

THE LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF
PROVISION OF PAY
(ROW PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE	LEVELS OF PROVISION						TOTAL
	MOST CATERED FOR	MORE CATERED FOR	CATERED FOR	LESS CATERED FOR	LESSER CATERED FOR	LEAST CATERED FOR	
MOST ESSENTIAL	12 (9.0)	4 (3.0)	31 (23.1)	15 (11.2)	22 (16.4)	50 (37.3)	134 (69.0)
MORE ESSENTIAL	1 (5.9)	3 (17.6)	8 (47.1)	2 (11.8)	2 (11.8)	1 (5.9)	17 (8.8)
ESSENTIAL	3 (13.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (56.5)	6 (26.1)	1 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	23 (11.0)
LESS ESSENTIAL	1 (5.9)	0 (0.0)	2 (16.7)	3 (25.0)	2 (16.7)	4 (33.3)	12 (6.2)
LESSER ESSENTIAL	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (25.0)	4 (2.1)
LEAST ESSENTIAL	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (25.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (75.0)	4 (2.1)
TOTAL	17 (8.8)	7 (3.6)	57 (29.4)	27 (13.9)	27 (13.9)	59 (30.4)	194 (100.0)

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square (χ^2) test at 0.00 per cent level of confidence.

It is also seen that out of 69.1 per cent of the workers who said pay was most essential, only 9.0 per cent were very happy with the pay they got and 37.3 per cent were not in the least happy with the pay they got.

In this study it has been seen that the majority of the unskilled workers, semi-skilled workers and skilled workers complained of pay not being catered for, for their satisfaction, while the majority of the professional workers said pay was at least catered for their satisfaction. This can clearly be seen when workers who said pay was most essential, more essential and essential are grouped together to just read as essential and those who said pay was less essential, lesser essential, and least essential are grouped together to read as not essential factor for their satisfaction. Similarly, group those who said pay was most catered, more catered and catered to read as catered and less catered, lesser catered and least catered to read as not catered for their satisfaction. Thus from here there will be only two groups in each relationship as shown in table 2.6^a and 2.6b.

Table 2.6a

THE IMPORTANCE OF PAY IN RELATIONS TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION

(COLUMN PERCENTAGES (%))

IMPORTANCE OF PAY	LEVELS OF OCCUPATION				TOTAL
	UNSKILLED WORKERS	SEMI- SKILLED WORKERS	SKILLED WORKERS	PROFESSIONAL WORKERS	
ESSENTIAL	77 (96.3)	60 (85.7)	27 (81.8)	10 (90.9)	174 (89.7)
NOT ESSENTIAL	3 (3.7)	10 (14.3)	6 (18.2)	1 (9.1)	20 (10.3)

The results are statistically significant with chi-square test (x^2)

Table 2.6b

THE PROVISION OF PAY IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION(COLUMN PERCENTAGES (%))

PROVISION OF PAY	LEVELS OF OCCUPATION				TOTAL
	UNSKILLED WORKERS	SEMI- SKILLED WORKERS	SKILLED WORKERS	PROFESSIONAL WORKERS	
CATERED	24(30.0)	34(48.8)	15(45.5)	8(72.7)	81(41.8)
NOT CATERED	56 (70.0)	36(51.4)	18(54.5)	3(27.3)	113(58.2)

The results are statistically significant with chi-square (x^2) at 0.01 per cent level of confidence.

The results in table 2.6a point out that 89.7 per cent said pay was an essential factor and 10.3 per cent said it was not an essential factor for their satisfaction in their work environment. Analysing each level of occupation, the following results were obtained: 96.3 per cent of the unskilled workers, 80.7 per cent of the semi-skilled workers, 81.8 per cent of the skilled workers and 90.9 per cent of the professional workers said pay was an essential factor for their satisfaction in their work environment. In Table 2.6b there is a different picture on how workers regarded the pay they got: 41.8 per cent of the workers said pay was catered for, and 58.2 per cent said it was not catered for, for their satisfaction. This was mainly true of the unskilled workers, semi-skilled and skilled workers who had the majority saying pay was not catered for, for their satisfaction. The majority of the professional workers said pay was catered for, for their satisfaction in their work environment.

This clearly shows that the majority of the professional workers were happy with the pay they got but they also regarded it as an essential factor. The other levels of occupation complained of pay not being catered for, for their satisfaction. This could be the reason why the majority of the workers in the lower ranks complained of dissatisfaction in their work environment (see Table 2.8). From this analysis it is clear that pay is regarded as the source of satisfaction at all levels of occupation, though it was not provided for at all levels of occupation.

Table 2.3 shows the ranking of factors of satisfaction as said by workers. It is important to relate these rankings to the levels of occupation as shown in Table 2.7.

The results in the Table (2.7) demonstrate that unskilled and skilled workers regarded pay as the most essential factor for their satisfaction among all the factors in the work environment. But the semi-skilled and the professional workers had other factors which they regarded as the most essential besides pay, such as job security, friendly work-mates and achievement. This points out that the professional and semi-skilled workers have higher expectations for the factors which satisfy them. But it is seen that pay was not catered for, for the majority of the workers at all levels of occupation since they all ranked pay the least as the most catered for factor for their satisfaction among all the factors in the work environment.

Table 2.7

FACTORS OF SATISFACTION IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION WHEN RANKED

(COLUMN PERCENTAGES USED AS DATA)

FACTORS OF SATISFACTION	UNSKILLED WORKERS			SEMI-SKILLED WORKERS			SKILLED WORKERS			PROFESSIONAL WORKERS		
	MOST ESSENTIAL	RANKING	MOST CATE-RED	MOST ESSE-	RANKING	MOST CATERED	MOST ESSE-NTIAL	RANKING	MOST CATERED	MOST ESSE-NTIAL	RANKING	MOST CATERED
PAY	83.7	1 8	11.2	58.6	6 8	7.1	60.6	1 7	9.1	54.5	4.5	8 0
JOB SECURITY	67.5	6 7	15.6	68.1	1 4	27.1	48.5	2 3.5	21.2	72.7	2.5	1 36.4
FRIENDLY WORK-MATES	73.7	3 1	67.5	63.8	2 1	52.9	33.3	6 2	30.3	54.5	4.5	4 18.2
UNDERSTANDING SUPERVISORS	77.2	2 3	46.8	58.8	5 3	43.5	39.4	4 3.5	21.2	45.5	7	4 18.2
WORKING CONDITIONS	68.4	4 4	35.0	60.0	3 5	26.1	45.5	3 5	18.2	81.8	1	7 9.1
CONVENIENT WORKING HOURS	67.9	5 2	56.2	59.0	4 2	48.6	30.0	7 1	37.5	27.3	8	2 27.3
STRONG TRADE UNION	64.1	7 5	28.7	40.0	8 6	21.4	36.4	5 6	9.4	18.2	9.5	6 11.1
SOCIAL FACILITIES	45.0	8 6	21.6	31.9	10 7	17.1	18.7	10 8	6.1	50.0	6	4 18.4
CHANGE TO DO SOMETHING WORTHWHILE (ACHIEVEMENT)	23.2	9 -	-	41.4	7 -	-	21.2	9 -	-	72.7	2.5	-
RECOGNISED EASILY BY OTHERS.	16.9	10 -	-	36.2	9 -	-	24.2	8 -	-	18.2	9.5	-

Table 2.8

LEVELS OF SATISFACTION IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION(COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

LEVELS OF SATISFACTION	LEVELS OF OCCUPATION				
	UNSKILLED WORKERS	SEMI- SKILLED WORKERS	SKILLED WORKERS	PROFESSIONAL WORKERS	TOTAL
SATISFIED	26 (32.6)	31 (44.0)	19 (57.6)	4 (36.4)	80 (41.2)
DON'T KNOW	1 (1.2)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.0)
DISSATISFIED	53 (66.0)	39 (55.7)	13 (39.4)	7 (63.6)	112 (58.8)
TOTAL	80 (41.2)	70 (36.1)	33 (17.0)	11 (5.7)	194 (100.0)

The results are not statistically significant with chi-square (χ^2) test at 0.05 per cent level of confidence.

From this comparison it is not surprising to see that the majority of the workers said they were dissatisfied with their work environment because the majority complained of pay not being catered for, for their satisfaction, this is shown in Table 2.8. It illustrates the point that the majority of the workers, except the skilled workers, complained of dissatisfaction at all levels of occupation. 41.3 per cent of the workers said they were satisfied; here 32.6 per cent of the unskilled workers, 44.3 per cent of the semi-skilled workers 57.6 per cent of skilled workers and 36.4 per cent of the professional workers said they were satisfied with their work environment. 57.3 per cent of the workers were dissatisfied with the work environment; here 66.2 per cent of the unskilled workers, 55.7 per cent of the semi-skilled workers, 39.4 per cent of the skilled workers and 63.6 per cent of the professional workers said they were dissatisfied with their work environment.

It is necessary to relate these findings to the reasons why workers said they were either satisfied or dissatisfied. The reasons of satisfaction or dissatisfaction are shown in Table 2.9 in relation to levels of occupation.

The results show that nearly fifty per cent of the workers complained of low pay and lack of fringe benefits. The majority of these workers were dissatisfied (see Table 2.4) with their work environment. Narrowing the analysis to each level of occupation, it is seen that 57.9 per cent of the unskilled workers, 42.6 per cent of the semi-skilled workers, 43.7 per cent of the skilled workers and 27.3 per cent of the professional workers gave this as the main reason for their dissatisfaction.

Table 2.9

REASONS FOR SATISFACTION IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION
(COLUMN PERCENTAGE IN BRACKETS)

REASONS FOR SATISFACTION	LEVELS OF OCCUPATION				TOTAL (%)
	UNSKILLED WORKERS	SEMI-SKILLED WORKERS	SKILLED WORKERS	PROFESSIONAL WORKERS	
DON'T KNOW	2 (2.6)	1 (1.5)	1 (3.1)	0 (0.0)	2.1
PAY AND OTHER BASIC CONDITIONS OF SERVICE ARE OKAY	12 (15.5)	20 (29.4)	12 (37.5)	4 (36.4)	25.7
THEY DON'T FOLLOW EDUCATION WHEN GIVING PAY	1 (1.3)	2 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1.6
JOB ITSELF IS OKAY	0 (0.0)	1 (1.5)	2 (6.2)	0 (0.0)	1.6
HAVE NOWHERE TO GO SO JUST MAKE ENDS MEET	4 (5.3)	1 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2.7
BENEFITS TAKE TOO LONG TO BE GIVEN	1 (1.3)	2 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1.6
HAPPY WITH EVERY THING	3 (3.9)	6 (8.8)	2 (6.2)	0 (0.0)	5.9
RED-TAPE	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (9.1)	0.5
LOW PAY AND LACK OF FRINGE BENEFITS	44 (57.9)	29 (42.6)	14 (43.7)	3 (27.3)	48.1
LACK OF PROMOTION AND RECOGNITION	9 (11.8)	6 (8.8)	1 (3.1)	3 (27.0)	10.2
TOTAL	76 (40.0)	68 (36.4)	32 (17.1)	11 (5.9)	100.0

MISSING CASES=7. The results are statistically significant with chi-square (χ^2) test at 0.01 per cent level of confidence.

At least 40 per cent of the workers at all levels of occupation except the professionals complained of low pay and lack of fringe benefits as sources of dissatisfaction. The other main reason given was that pay and other basic conditions of services were okay. The majority of these workers were satisfied with their work environment. Here 15.5 per cent of the unskilled workers, 29.4 per cent of the semi-skilled workers, 37.5 per cent of the skilled workers and 36.4 per cent of the professional workers gave this as the main reason for their satisfaction. This confirms the other earlier findings that those who complain of low pay and lack of fringe benefits also complain of dissatisfaction in their work environment. Fraser (1962), Maslow (1954) and Albrecht (1972) have showed the same relationship, that is if material needs are not adequately provided for to the expectations of the worker then the person will not be satisfied with whatever job he will be doing.

From this analysis one can say that pay is a source of satisfaction at all levels of occupation, if provided for, or vice versa, a source of dissatisfaction if not provided for. Before the conclusion of this chapter it is necessary to look at some fringe benefits and the factor of Job Security which workers are subjected to. This will complete the analysis on the material factors which were studied here.

(2.b) SOME FRINGE BENEFITS IN RELATION TO WORKERS' SATISFACTION

The fringe benefits examined here are connected to the second hypothesis on material factors, that is, lack of fringe benefits (such as accommodation and health facilities) is a source of dissatisfaction at all levels of occupation.

Workers were asked about their accommodation and health facilities, that is to say, they were asked to say if they were happy about the facilities they had. The results shown in Table 2.10a point out that the workers who are either accommodated or not, were either happy or not respectively.

TABLE 2.10a

THE IMPORTANCE OF ACCOMMODATION TO WORKERS(ROW PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

LEVEL OF HAPPINESS			
ACCOMMODATION SITUATION	NOT HAPPY	HAPPY	TOTAL
NOT ACCOMMODATED	78(40.8)	37(19.4)	115(60.2)
ACCOMMODATED	36(18.9)	40(20.9)	76(39.8)
TOTAL	114(59.7)	77(40.3)	191(100.00)

MISSING CASES= 3 DID NOT RESPOND.

The results are statistically significant with chi-square (χ^2) test at 0.01 per cent level of confidence.

Sixty per cent of the workers said they were not accommodated, out of which 40.8 per cent said were not happy and 19.4 per cent said they were happy with the accommodation they had. Of these who were accommodated, 18.9 per cent said they were not happy and 20.9 per cent were happy with the accommodation they had. When these results were compared with the levels of satisfaction, 59.4 per cent were not happy about their accommodation situation, out of which 20.3 per cent were satisfied and 38.5 per cent were dissatisfied; 40.6 per cent were happy about their accommodation

situation, out of which 20.3 per cent were satisfied and 19.8 per cent were dissatisfied though they said they were happy about their accommodation situation as shown in Table 2.10.

Table 2.10b

THE LEVELS OF SATISFACTION IN RELATION TO HAPPINESS
TOWARDS ACCOMMODATION
(GRAND PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

LEVELS OF SATISFACTION				
LEVEL OF HAPPINESS	SATISFIED	DON'T KNOW	DISSATISFIED	TOTAL
HAPPY ABOUT ACCOMMODATION	39 (20.3)	1 (0.5)	38 (19.8)	78 (40.6)
NOT HAPPY ABOUT ACCOMMODATION	39 (20.3)	1 (0.5)	74 (38.5)	114 (59.4)
TOTAL	78 (40.6)	2 (1.0)	112 (58.8)	192 (100.0)

MISSING CASES = 2

The results are statistically significant with chi-square (x^2) test at 0.08 per cent level of confidence.

The results of the data show that the majority of those who were happy with their accommodation were also satisfied with their work environment. On the contrary the majority of those who were not happy with their accommodation were also dissatisfied with their work environment.

In essence this demonstrates that the workers who are not happy with their accommodation are more likely to be dissatisfied, thus one can say that accommodation can be a source of dissatisfaction if one is not happy with it. Longer informal interviews with workers at each level of occupation showed that the reasons given by those who were not accommodated and were not happy were, firstly, that the company did not pay much attention to their plight; secondly, that the housing allowance which was given to them was too little to enable them to get better accommodation elsewhere. This they said brought a lot of troubles because most of them rented houses in squatter townships. Where as those who were happy though they were not given accommodation, gave their main reason as having their own accommodation, which meant that the housing allowance supplements their pay. At the same time they said this gave them more security in times of being unemployed. Those with accommodation but were not happy complained of the houses being too small for their big families or too far from the working place, which means spending a lot of transport money everyday or walking long distances to and from work. This shows that when one is not happy with accommodation it is also likely that he would be dissatisfied with the work environment. But the opposite is not always true, that is, it cannot be said that when one is happy about his accommodation he would also be satisfied with the work environment. This is because when a worker or any human being is satisfied about a particular need, it is said (Maslow 1954), then he seeks to satisfy other higher needs than the already satisfied ones. This is true at all levels of occupation. In fact the majority of the lower ranks were not accommodated and it is these majority who were not happy about their accommodation situation as shown in Table 2.10c.

Table 2.10^cACCOMMODATION IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION(COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

ACCOMMODATION SITUATION	LEVELS OF OCCUPATION			
	UNSKILLED WORKERS	SEMI-SKILLED WORKERS	SKILLED WORKERS	PROFESSIONAL WORKERS
ACCOMMODATED	23 (28.7)	22 (31.9)	20 (64.5)	11 (100.0)
NOT ACCOMMODATED	57 (71.3)	47 (68.1)	11 (35.5)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	80 (41.3)	69 (36.1)	31 (16.2)	11 (6.4)

MISSING CASES = 3

The results are statistically significant with chi-square (x^2) test at 0.0001 per cent level of confidence.

The data shows that the majority of those who were accommodated were those in higher ranks, while the majority of the lower ranks were not accommodated. As shown already, the majority of those who were not happy with their accommodation were not satisfied with their work and the majority of those who were happy with their accommodation were also satisfied with their work environment.

The other factor analysed on fringe benefits was the availability of the health facilities in the working places. Here the workers were asked if they had any health facilities at their working places, and to say if they were happy or not as shown in Table 2.11a.

Table 2.11a

HEALTH FACILITIES IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF HAPPINESS
(ROW PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

HEALTH	LEVEL OF HAPPINESS		
	HAPPY	NOT HAPPY	TOTAL
HEALTH FACILITIES	111(87.4)	16(12.6)	127(65.5)
NO HEALTH FACILITIES	3(4.5)	64(95.5)	67(34.5)
TOTAL	114(58.8)	80(41.2)	194(100.0)

The results were statistically significant with chi-square (x^2) test at 0.0001 per cent level of confidence.

Over eighty per cent of the workers who had health facilities were happy with them and over ninety per cent of the workers who had no health facilities were not happy with the non-availability of health facilities. These findings were analysed further by relating them to the levels of satisfaction as shown in Table 2.11b. The majority of the workers who were not happy with the health facilities were also not happy with their work environment, while of those who were happy only a small number were also dissatisfied with their work environment. This demonstrates that those who are not happy with the health facilities are likely to be dissatisfied with the work environment. But it does not follow that if one is happy with the health facilities one is also happy with one's work environment. This is true at all levels of occupation as shown in Table 2.11c.

Table 2.11b

THE LEVELS OF HAPPINESS IN RELATION TO LEVELS
OF SATISFACTION
(ROW PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

LEVELS OF SATISFACTION				
LEVEL OF HAPPINESS	SATISFIED	DON'T KNOW	DISSATISFIED	TOTAL
NOT HAPPY WITH HEALTH FACILITIES	28 (35.0)	2 (2.5)	50 (62.5)	80 (41.2)
HAPPY WITH HEALTH FACILITIES	52 (45.6)	0 (0.0)	62 (54.4)	114 (58.8)
TOTAL	80 (41.3)	2 (1.0)	112 (57.7)	194 (100.0)

The results are statistically significant with chi-square (x^2) test at 0.09 per cent level of confidence.

Table 2.11c

LEVELS OF HAPPINESS IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION
(COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

LEVELS OF OCCUPATION				
LEVELS OF HAPPINESS	UNSKILLED WORKERS	SEMI-SKILLED WORKERS	SKILLED WORKERS	PROFESSIONAL WORKERS
NOT HAPPY WITH HEALTH FACILITIES	29 (36.2)	23 (32.9)	23 (69.7)	5 (45.5)
HAPPY WITH HEALTH FACILITIES	51 (63.7)	47 (67.1)	10 (30.3)	6 (54.5)
TOTAL	80 (41.2)	70 (36.1)	33 (17.0)	11 (5.7)

The results are statistically significant with chi-square (x^2) test at 0.003 per cent level of confidence.

These data show that those who were not happy were mainly those who had no health facilities at their working place. The majority who had health facilities were happy with what they had. Thus the availability of health facilities in the working place could be a source of satisfaction. There is a likelihood of dissatisfaction among the majority of workers who complain of not being happy with the health facilities at all levels of occupation.

(2.C) JOB SECURITY IN RELATION TO WORKERS' SATISFACTION.

The last of the material factors analysed here is Job Security. The feeling of Job Security is a feeling which a worker gets of being in permanent employment, that is, to be sure of being employed and thus of drawing an income for the family. The feeling of Job Security is a factor which deals with the steadiness of one's employment. This factor may cause a worker to like his Job because he is sure of his position in the organization. Other studies have shown that Job Security is more threatened in lower ranks than in the higher ranks (Beynon and Blackburn (1972), that is it varies with the levels of occupation. The lower ranks are unskilled and semi-skilled workers. It is assumed that the lower one is at the level of occupation, the greater is the feeling of insecurity, and thus of losing his Job.

The hypothesis being analysed here is as follows: Job Security is an essential factor for workers' satisfaction in their working environment, among unskilled and semi-skilled workers. This is with an assumption that skilled and professional workers do not worry much about

Job Security because they have professional qualifications and companies need their services.

To analyse this hypothesis the workers were asked to say if Job Security was an essential factor for their satisfaction in their work environment. The attitudes given by the workers on this factor are outlined in Table 2.12a. This is in relation to levels of occupation so as to see which level of occupation regards this as the most essential factor in the work environment.

Table 2.12a

THE IMPORTANCE OF JOB SECURITY IN RELATION
TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION
(COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE	LEVELS OF OCCUPATION				TOTAL
	UNSKILLED WORKERS	SEMI-SKILLED WORKERS	SKILLED WORKERS	PROFESSIONAL WORKERS	
MOST ESSENTIAL	54 (67.5)	47 (68.1)	16 (48.5)	8 (72.7)	125 (64.8)
MORE ESSENTIAL	10 (12.5)	10 (14.5)	4 (12.1)	2 (18.2)	26 (13.5)
ESSENTIAL	7 (8.7)	4 (5.8)	8 (24.2)	1 (9.1)	20 (10.4)
LESS ESSENTIAL	3 (3.7)	4 (5.8)	1 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (4.1)
LESSER ESSENTIAL	4 (5.0)	3 (4.3)	1 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (4.1)
LEAST ESSENTIAL	2 (2.5)	1 (1.4)	3 (9.1)	0 (0.0)	6 (3.1)
TOTAL	80 (41.5)	69 (35.8)	33 (17.1)	11 (5.7)	193 (100.0)

MISSING CASE=1 DID NOT ANSWER THE QUESTION

The results are not statistically significant with chi-square (χ^2) test at 0.05 per cent level of confidence.

The results in Table 2.12a point out that 64.8 per cent of the workers said they regarded Job Security as the most essential factor for their satisfaction in their work environment; of which 67.7 per cent of the unskilled workers, 68.1 per cent of the semi-skilled workers, 48.5 per cent of the skilled workers and 72.7 per cent of the professional workers said this factor was most essential to their satisfaction. Less than 10 per cent at each level of occupation said it was less essential for their satisfaction. The results give an indication that it is not only the unskilled and semi-skilled workers who regard Job Security as the most essential factor in their work environment. The majority of the workers at each level of occupation said that it was most essential to be sure of being in employment for them to be happy in their work environment.

Now it's important to relate how each worker regarded his security in his working place, that is, how they were satisfied with the security they had. The workers at each level of occupation were assessed to see how satisfied they were with the Job Security they had as shown in Table 2.12b.

Table 2.12b

THE ATTITUDES OF WORKERS TOWARDS JOB SECURITYIN RELATION TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION(COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

LEVELS OF OCCUPATION					
ATTITUDE OF WORKERS TOWARD JOB SECURITY	UNSKILLED WORKERS	SEMI-SKILLED WORKERS	SKILLED WORKERS	PROFESSIONAL WORKERS	TOTAL
MOST CATERED FOR	12 (15.6)	19 (27.1)	7 (21.2)	4 (36.4)	42 (22.0)
MORE CATERED FOR	9 (11.7)	9 (12.9)	2 (6.1)	3 (27.3)	25 (12.0)
CATERED FOR	19 (24.7)	19 (27.1)	16 (48.5)	2 (18.5)	56 (29.3)
LESS CATERED FOR	10 (13.0)	9 (12.9)	2 (6.1)	0 (0.0)	21 (11.0)
LESSER CATERED FOR	13 (16.0)	6 (8.6)	5 (15.2)	1 (9.1)	25 (13.1)
LEAST CATERED FOR	14 (18.2)	8 (11.3)	1 (3.0)	1 (9.1)	24 (12.6)
TOTAL	77 (40.3)	70 (36.6)	33 (17.3)	11 (5.8)	191 (100.0)

MISSING CASES = 3 DID NOT ANSWER THE QUESTION.

The results are not statistically significant with chi-square at 0.05 per cent level of confidence.

The data in table 2.12b show that 22.0 per cent of the workers said that Job Security was the most catered for factor, for their satisfaction in their working environment. It is seen that 15.6 per cent of the unskilled workers, 27.1 per cent of the semi-skilled workers, 21.2 per cent of the skilled workers and 36.4 per cent of the professional workers said they were most happy with the security they had in their Jobs.

On the other hand 18.2 per cent of the unskilled workers, 11.3 per cent of the semi-skilled workers, 3.0 per cent of the skilled workers and 9.1 per cent of the professional workers said they had feelings of insecurity, that is feelings of uncertainty about their Jobs. They said the factor was least catered for, in their work environment. From the analysis of the whole data, it can be seen that Job Security was not catered for, for the majority of the unskilled workers, while the rest of the levels of occupation felt that the factor was at least provided for in their work environment. The professional workers who said they were not happy, after longer informal interviews with them, it was found that they were in middle management. Therefore they emphasised the reason of insecurity being that they were neither part of the top management nor union members, so their future lay very much in balance because of lack of protection. Of those in the other levels of occupation who said they had feelings of insecurity, the majority complained of the union being weak, thus it was not able to protect them in times of crisis.

There is need to see if there was a relationship between those who regard Job Security as essential in relation to how catered for it was for their satisfaction. This will show if workers who complained of lack of Job Security said it was essential. The data in Table 2.12c gives the relationship between the two types of responses.

Table 2.12 c

THE LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE AND THE PROVISION OF

JOB SECURITY IN THE WORKING PLACE

(ROW PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

LEVELS OF PROVISION

LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE	MOST CATER- FOR	MORE CATERED FOR	CATERED FOR	LESS CATER- ED FOR	LESSER CATERED FOR	LEAST CATERED FOR	TOTAL
MOST ESSENTIAL	31 (24.8)	13 (19.2)	36 (28.8)	16 (12.8)	13 (10.4)	16 (12.8)	125 (65.8)
MORE ESSENTIAL	6 (23.1)	5 (19.2)	9 (34.6)	1 (3.8)	3 (11.5)	2 (7.7)	26 (13.1)
ESSENTIAL	2 (11.1)	4 (22.2)	9 (50.0)	2 (11.1)	2 (11.1)	1 (5.6)	0 (0.0)
LESS ESSENTIAL	0 (0.0)	1 (12.5)	2 (25.0)	1 (12.5)	2 (25.0)	2 (25.0)	8 (4.2)
LESSER ESSENTIAL	2 (28.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (14.3)	4 (57.1)	0 (0.0)	7 (3.7)
LEAST ESSENTIAL	1 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (16.7)	4 (66.7)	6 (3.6)
TOTAL	42 (22.1)	23 (12.1)	56 (29.5)	21 (11.1)	24 (12.6)	24 (12.6)	190 (100.0)

MISSING CASES= 4 DID NOT ANSWER THE QUESTION

The results are statistically significant with chi-square (χ^2) test at 0.003 per cent level of confidence.

The results demonstrates that the majority of the workers who said Job Security is the most essential factor for their satisfaction had job security in their work. On the contrary the majority of those workers who said Job Security is not essential also said Job Security was not catered for, for their satisfaction.

A follow up question was asked to see if workers felt secure in their work with looming redundanciesⁱⁿ the country. Table 2.13a gives the distribution of data on either secure or insecure and the reasons for their action.

Table 2.13a

ATTITUDES OF WORKERS TOWARDS JOB SECURITY IN

RELATION TO REASONS

(COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

ATTITUDES TO JOB SECURITY

REASONS FOR SECURITY	SECURE	DONT KNOW	INSECURE	TOTAL
DONT KNOW	1 (1.0)	7 (21.7)	1 (2.5)	9 (5.2)
THE UNION PROTECTS ME	39 (38.2)	6 (18.7)	5 (12.5)	50 (28.7)
THE UNION HAS NO POWER	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	9 (22.5)	9 (5.2)
PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION AND EXPERIENCE	49 (48.0)	1 (3.1)	1 (2.5)	51 (29.3)
UNLESS I BREAK THE RULES OF THE COMPANY	13 (12.7)	6 (18.7)	6 (15.0)	23 (14.4)
MANAGEMENT IN CONTROL	0 (0.0)	12 (37.5)	16 (40.0)	20 (16.1)
ADVANCE IN TECHNOLOGY	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (5.0)	2 (1.1)
TOTAL	102 (58.6)	32 (18.4)	40 (23.0)	174 (100.0)

MISSING CASES = 20 CASES WERE NOT APPLICABLE.

The results are statistically significant with chi-square (χ^2) test at 0.0001 per cent level of confidence.

The data in Table 2.13_a shows that 58.6 per cent of the workers said their Jobs were secure. Among these 38.2 per cent said they were secure because they were protected by the union, while 48.0 per cent said they were protected by their professional qualification and experience which makes the company depend on them. They said if they were to be unemployed they could easily find a job somewhere else. 23.0 per cent of the workers said they were insecure in their Jobs. The majority of these workers said it was because their unions were weak, that is their union had little power to protect them during the times of crisis, while others said all depended on the decisions made by the management which is in control of the situation. They said they could be thrown out of employment for any mistake they made, such as breaking the rules of the company. The unskilled and semi-skilled workers emphasised mainly the reason of protection from the union since they were union members, while the skilled and professional workers emphasised qualification and experience as a source of security.

The results on this factor demonstrate that the majority of the workers regard Job Security as an essential factor for their satisfaction in their work environment. In fact the majority of the workers said that they were secure in their employment. But inspite of this the majority of the workers still said that they were dissatisfied in their work environment as Table 2.13_b illustrates.

Table 2.13_bATTITUDES OF WORKERS TOWARDS JOB SECURITY INRELATION TO LEVELS OF SATISFACTION(ROW PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)LEVELS OF SATISFACTION

LEVELS OF PROVISION	SATISFIED	DONT KNOW	DISSATISFIED	TOTAL
MOST CATERED FOR	26 (61.9)	0 (0.0)	16 (38.1)	42 (22.0)
MORE CATERED FOR	6 (26.1)	0 (0.0)	17 (73.9)	23 (12.0)
CATERED FOR	24 (42.9)	1 (1.8)	31 (55.4)	56 (29.3)
LESS CATERED FOR	9 (42.0)	0 (0.0)	12 (57.1)	21 (11.0)
LEAST CATERED FOR	4 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	20 (83.3)	24 (12.6)
TOTAL	79 (41.4)	2 (1.0)	110 (57.6)	191 (100.0)

MISSING CASES = 3 DID NOT RESPOND

The results are statistically significant with chi-square (x^2) test at 0.04 per cent level of confidence.

The majority of the workers who said Job Security was the most catered for factor for their satisfaction, were satisfied with their work environment, where as the majority of those who said it was not catered for were dissatisfied. This demonstrates the point that Job security could be one of the factors which can cause satisfaction if adequately provided for in the work environment. It is true, however, that workers who are not sure of their future employment can also be dissatisfied in their work environment.

In this chapter the hypotheses which were being analysed were proved to be true. Firstly, the hypothesis that pay was a source of satisfaction at all levels of occupation was seen to be true. Secondly, it was equally true of the fringe benefits which were analysed. Thirdly, Job Security was found to be not only an essential factor to the unskilled and semi-skilled workers but was essential to the skilled and professional workers as well. All the workers regarded Job Security important to be sure of being in employment and thus know where to draw the next income for the family. The findings showed that the majority of the workers were not happy with the pay and fringe benefits they got. One of the reasons or indications for this situation could be attributed to the economic situation in the country at the time of this study (see Chapter One). This situation was not good; as a result the material needs of the workers could not be met; thus it is expected, as Maslow and Fraser stated, to find that most of the workers could complain of dissatisfaction in relation to their material needs.

CHAPTER THREE

A WORKER AND HIS NON-MATERIAL FACTORS.

This chapter focuses on the non-material factors of a worker in his working place. Non-material factors are usually not conspicuous to human eyes so that their effect is not easily seen by other people apart from the one who is involved. The chapter concentrates on two areas: the working relations and the ego needs of a worker.

The data presented in this chapter are an attempt to gain insights into workers' attitudes towards their working relations and achievement. This is the light of other previous studies done on these factors, such as those of Herberg et al (1959), Blauner (1960), Katz (1954) and Fraser (1962). These authors pointed out that these factors are regarded by workers as essential factors in the work environment, for their satisfaction.

(3.a) A Worker and his Working Relations

This section covers the social aspect of a worker in his working place. This is dealing with the way workers regard the working relations around them. This social aspect, the working relations, is on the hierarchy of needs which is said by Maslow (1954) to be among the basic needs of a person. It is this social aspect which is being analysed in this chapter. This is to see if the attitude workers have towards their fellow workers in their work environment is related to their satisfaction. The section has two main parts which are concerned with working relations. The working relations that exist between a worker and his work-mates, covering the following things: the way a worker regards

working with friendly work-mates in their working environment for them to be satisfied; for example are workers happy to work with fellow employees of the same level of education as well as with workers of the same ethnic group. The other part is on the relation of workers with their supervisors: for example is it essential for workers to have understanding supervisors at their working places for them to be satisfied and how well do workers relate with their immediate supervisors.

(3.1) A Worker and His Work-mates

The study here is aimed at seeing the attitude workers have, in their working relations, towards their work-mates. This is to see if working with friendly work-mates made workers satisfied at their working places.

The hypotheses being analysed here are as follows:- (i) to see if working with friendly work-mates is essential for worker's satisfaction at all levels of occupation; (ii) working with workers who have the same level of education is essential for workers' satisfaction at all levels of occupation; (iii) working with different ethnic groups is essential for workers satisfaction at all levels of occupation in the ZIMCO group of Companies.

The workers were asked to say if working with friendly work-mates was essential for them to be satisfied. The views were ranked as shown in able 3.1 .

Table 3.1a

THE LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE IN WORKING WITH FRIENDLY WORK-MATES.

<u>Importance of working with friendly work-mates</u>	<u>Number of respondents</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Most essential	124	64.2
More essential	30	15.6
Essential	28	14.5
Less essential	7	3.7
Lesser essential	2	1.0
Least essential	2	1.0
Total	193	100.0

Missing case = 1 Did not answer this part.

Over sixty percent of the workers said that working with friendly work-mates is most essential for their satisfaction. These findings were related to the actual working relations, that is how the workers viewed their work-mates, to see if the workers had good interpersonal relationships among themselves. This item was also arranged in six ranks as in Table 3.1b. The data point out that 53.1 percent of the workers said they were very happy with the work-mates they had; 14.4 per cent said they were quite happy and 21.1 per cent said they were just happy. These results demonstrate that the majority of workers said it is essential to have friendly work-mates and most of them said they had friendly work-mates. But the analysis could be better understood if workers who said that it is essential

for them to have friendly work-mates are compared with those who said they actually had friendly work-mates. Table 3.1c outlines the levels of importance in attitudes in relation to the levels of provision (or catered for) of work-mates in the work environment.

Table 3.1b

THE LEVELS OF PROVISION IN HAVING FRIENDLY WORK-MATES IN THE
WORKING PLACE

<u>Working with</u> <u>Friendly work-mates</u>	<u>Number of</u> <u>respondents</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Most catered for	103	53.1
More catered for	28	14.4
Catered for	41	21.1
Less catered for	11	5.7
Lesser catered for	6	3.1
Least catered for	5	2.6
Total	194	100.0

In Table 3.1c, out of 64.2 percent of the workers who said having friendly work-mates at work was the most essential factor, 75.0 percent said they had very friendly work-mates; 8.9 percent said they had quite friendly work-mates and 10.5 percent said they had had just friendly work-mates; the percentages of negative responses were both low.

Table 3.1c.

THE IMPORTANCE AND PROVISION OF FRIENDLY WORK-MATES (ROW PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE	Level of Provision							TOTAL
	MOST CATERED FOR	MORE CATERED FOR	CATERED FOR	LESS CATERED FOR	LESSER CATERED FOR	LEAST CATERED		
Most essential	93 (75.0)	11 (8.9)	13 (10.5)	1 (0.8) ^a	3 (2.4)	3 (2.4)	124 (64.2)	
More essential	3 (10.0)	13 (43.3)	9 (30.0)	3 (10.0)	1 (3.3)	1 (3.3)	30 (15.6)	
Essential	5 (17.9)	3 (10.7)	14 (50.0)	5 (17.9)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.6)	28 (14.5)	
Less Essential	2 (28.6)	0 (0.0)	4 (57.1)	1 (14.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (3.7)	
Lesser Essential	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.0)	
Least Essential	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.0)	
Total	103 (53.4)	28 (14.5)	41 (21.2)	10 (5.2)	6 (3.1)	5 (2.6)	193 (100.0)	

Missing case = 1

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square test (X^2) at 0.0001 percent level of confidence.

The data clearly show that the majority of the workers who were interviewed and regarded having friendly work-mates as the most essential factor in their working environment for their satisfaction had very friendly work-mates. They were very satisfied with the work-mates they had. Therefore the factor of having friendly work-mates was provided or catered for, for the majority of the workers. Thus one can expect the majority of the workers not to be dissatisfied with the factor of work-mates. But it is necessary to see if this is applicable to all levels of occupation.

Table 3.2 gives a picture of how the workers at each level of occupation regarded the importance of having friendly work-mates in their work-environment for their satisfaction.

THE LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE OF HAVING FRIENDLY WORK-MATES IN RELATION

LEVELS OF OCCUPATION (COLUMN PERCENTATES IN BRACKETS)

<u>Level of Importance</u>	<u>Level of Occupation</u>				<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>Unskilled Workers</u>	<u>Semi-skilled workers</u>	<u>Skilled workers</u>	<u>Professional Workers</u>	
Most essential	63 (78.8)	44 (63.8)	11 (33.3)	6 (54.5)	124 (64.2)
More essential	7 (8.7)	11 (15.9)	10 (30.3)	2 (18.2)	30 (15.6)
Essential	6 (7.5)	11 (15.9)	9 (27.3)	2 (18.2)	28 (14.5)
Less essential	2 (2.5)	2 (2.9)	2 (6.1)	1 (9.1)	7 (3.7)
Lesser essential	1 (1.2)	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.0)
Least essential	1 (1.2)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (1.0)
Total	80 (41.5)	69 (35.8)	33 (17.1)	11 (5.7)	193 (100.0)

Missing case = 1

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square (X^2) test at 0.04 percent level of confidence.

The results in the Table (3.2) show that 78.8 percent of the unskilled workers, 63.8 percent of the semi-skilled workers, 33.3 percent of the skilled workers, and 54.5 percent of the professional workers said it is most essential to have friendly work-mates in the working environment for them to be satisfied. From these data one

The results in Table 3.3 are that 67.5 percent of the unskilled workers, 52.9 percent of the Semi-skilled workers, 30.3 percent of the skilled workers and 18.2 percent of the professional workers said that they had very friendly work-mates in their work environment. The majority of the workers at all levels of occupation said that they had friendly-mates. This demonstrates that the majority of workers at all levels of occupation had little complaint about the work-mates they had. In fact it is possible to say that the workers regard having friendly work-mates as essential in their working environment for their satisfaction. Here it could be expected that few workers would give work-mates as a factor which dissatisfies them.

Before the final analysis is done on the section, it's important to look at other factors which may either cause satisfaction or dissatisfaction among workers working together.

The other factors which were inquired on are levels of education and ethnic groups. This was to see if working with people of the same level of education and with people of the same ethnic group were essential for the workers' satisfaction.

The workers were asked if they would be happy working with people of same level of education. Table 3.4 shows the results.

The results in Table 3.3 are that 67.5 percent of the unskilled workers, 52.9 percent of the Semi-skilled workers, 30.3 percent of the skilled workers and 18.2 percent of the professional workers said that they had very friendly work-mates in their work environment. The majority of the workers at all levels of occupation said that they had friendly-mates. This demonstrates that the majority of workers at all levels of occupation had little complaint about the work-mates they had. In fact it is possible to say that the workers regard having friendly work-mates as essential in their working environment for their satisfaction. Here it could be expected that few workers would give work-mates as a factor which dissatisfies them.

Before the final analysis is done on the section, it's important to look at other factors which may either cause satisfaction or dissatisfaction among workers working together.

The other factors which were inquired on are levels of education and ethnic groups. This was to see if working with people of the same level of education and with people of the same ethnic group were essential for the workers' satisfaction.

The workers were asked if they would be happy working with people of same level of education. Table 3.4 shows the results.

Table 3.4

THE NEED TO WORK WITH WORKERS OF THE SAME LEVEL OF EDUCATION

<u>Working with workers of same level of Education</u>	<u>No. of respondents</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
I could not be happy	109	56.2
It depends on the situation	16	8.2
I would be happy	69	35.6
Total	194	100.0

In Table 3.4, 56.2 percent of the workers said they could not be happy working with workers of the same level of education; 8.2 percent said it depends on the situation, sometime it's good and other times it's not good; and 35.6 percent of the workers said they could be happy working with the majority of the workers of the same level of education. Here it's seen that the majority of workers were in favour of working with people of different levels of education. This could be analysed further by looking at which level of occupation said which view was important to their satisfaction. The results in Table 3.5 outlines which level of occupation was in favour of this factor.

Table 3.5

THE NEED TO WORK WITH WORKERS OF SAME LEVEL OF EDUCATION IN RELATION
TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION. (COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

	Levels of Occupation				Total %
	Unskilled workers	Semi-skilled workers	Skilled workers	Profesional workers	
Work with same level of education					
I could not be happy	41 (61.2)	42 (60.0)	14 (42.4)	4 (36.4)	56.2
It depends on the situation	2 (2.5)	8 (11.4)	4 (12.1)	2 (18.2)	8.2
Could be happy	29 (36.2)	20 (28.6)	15 (45.5)	5 (45.5)	35.6
Total	(41.2)	(36.1)	(17.0)	(5.7)	100.0

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square (χ^2) test at 0.1 percent level of confidence.

The table (3.5) shows that 61.2 percent of the unskilled workers, 60.0 percent of the semi-skilled workers, 42.4 percent of the skilled workers and 36.4 percent of the professional workers said they could not be happy working with the majority of the people with the same level of education. Longer informal interviews with workers at each occupation level showed that the majority gave their reasons as the need to learn from others and the necessity to mix for better workmanship; this means that the workers viewed it necessary to mix so as to make them happy and divide work properly in accordance with the right division of labour. On the other hand 35.6 percent of the workers who said that they could like to work with the majority of the workers

with the same level of education: 36.2 percent of the unskilled workers, 28.6 percent of the semi-skilled workers, 45.5 percent of the skilled and 45.5 percent of the professional workers felt it was good to work with people of the same level of education. Their main reason was that Communication and sharing of ideas was easier. The data illustrates that the majority of the workers who could like to work with people of the same level were mainly skilled and professional workers, while the majority of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers would like to mix with different levels of education for them to be happy. Informal interviews with all the workers showed that the skilled and professional workers mostly work in small groups or alone, so they don't emphasize the importance of other workers from other levels of education so much. The unskilled and semi-skilled workers work in large groups and furthermore they would like to learn from those with higher levels of education for them to progress in their work. These reasons appear to explain this distribution of data.

The other aspect analysed which is said to affect workers in their work environment is working with the majority of people of the same ethnic group. The study of Machungwa and Schmitt (1983) found that this factor affects the motivation for work in the work environment. In this study workers were asked if they would be happy working with workers of the same ethnic group as the majority in the work group. The results of these responses are given in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6

THE NEED TO WORK WITH SAME ETHNIC GROUP.

<u>Working with same ethnic group</u>	<u>No. of respondents</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
I could not be happy	110	57.0
It depends on the situation	44	22.8
I could be happy	39	20.2
Total	193	100.0

Missing case = 1

The data in Table 3.6 shows over fifty percent of the workers said they could not be happy working with people of the same ethnic group, while only twenty percent of the workers said they would be happy working with the majority of people of the same ethnic group. This could be analysed further to see which level of occupation favoured which view. The data are shown in Table 3.7.

In the Table 3.7, 60.0 percent of the unskilled workers, 60.9 percent of the semi-skilled workers, 39.4 percent of the skilled workers and 63.6 percent of the professional workers said that they would not be happy working with the majority of people of the same ethnic group.

Table 3.7

WORKING WITH SAME ETHNIC GROUP IN RELATION TO LEVEL OF OCCUPATION.

(COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

	Levels of Occupation				Total
	Unskilled workers	Semi-skilled workers	Skilled workers	Professional workers	
Working with same ethnic group.					
I could not be happy	48 (60.0)	42 (60.9)	13 (39.4)	7 (63.6)	110 (57.0)
It depends on the situation	11 (13.7)	13 (18.8)	16 (48.5)	4 (36.4)	44 (22.8)
I could be happy	21 (26.3)	14 (20.3)	4 (12.1)	0 (0.0)	39 (20.2)
Total	80 (41.5)	70 (35.8)	33 (17.1)	11 (5.7)	193 (100.0)

Missing case = 1

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square (X^2) test at 0.002 percent level of confidence.

The reasons given for these attitudes are shown in Table 3.8. They mainly centred on three aspects for those who were not happy, that is segregation, tribalism, nepotism and personal hatred among the workers which may breed confusion and consequently affect production at the place of work. Further informal interviews showed that workers preferred working with different levels of ethnic group because this did not affect their promotion, since if they worked with people of the same ethnic group promotion or any awards would be on family background or the area where the boss comes from. This would not be good at all. The other reason given was that, they would learn from other people through mixing with other ethnic groups, that is their

cultural background would help them to understand the wider society better.

Table 3.8

ATTITUDES OF WORKING WITH SAME ETHNIC GROUP IN RELATION TO REASONS.

(COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

Attitudes in working with same ethnic group

	YES	DEPENDS	NO	TOTAL
Reasons for the attitude				
It depends on the situation	2 (2.8)	16 (37.2)	3 (2.8)	21 (11.2)
We can understand each other better	18 (47.4)	2 (4.7)	0 (0.0)	20 (10.7)
To learn from others	5 (13.2)	1 (2.3)	18 (17.0)	24 (12.8)
Ready to work with anybody	13 (34.2)	19 (44.2)	18 (17.0)	50 (26.7)
Would mean segregation tribalism, nepotism and breeds confusion	0 (0.0)	5 (11.6)	67 (63.2)	72 (38.6)
Total	38 (20.3)	43 (23.0)	106 (56.7)	187 (100.0)

Missing cases = 7 did not respond.

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square (X^2) test at 0.0001 percent level of confidence.

The results in Table 3.7 point out that 26.3 percent of the unskilled workers, 20.3 percent of the semi-skilled workers, 12.1 percent of the skilled workers and no professional worker said they would be happy working with the majority of the people of the same ethnic group. This is because, they said, they would understand each other better since they know each others background already (see Table 3.8). But it is found that the majority of workers in all levels of occupation preferred working with other ethnic groups to their own.

In each of these aspects, that is of education and ethnic group, it can be seen that the majority in all levels of occupation said it was essential for their satisfaction to work with the majority of workers who have different levels of education and come from different ethnic groups.

The results in this section demonstrates that the majority of the workers preferred working with friendly work-mates who are not of the same level of education or of the same ethnic group background as the majority in their work group. But to see if this made any difference on the workers' satisfaction it is necessary to see what these workers who were provided with friendly work-mates said about their satisfaction in relation to the whole working environment as shown in Table 3.9a.

Table 3.9a

THE LEVELS OF PROVISION OF HAVING FRIENDLY WORK-MATES IN RELATION TO
LEVELS OF SATISFACTION. (ROW PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

Levels of Provision	Levels of satisfaction			Total
	Satisfied	Don't know	Dissatisfied	
Most catered for	40 (38.8)	1 (1.0)	62 (60.2)	103 (53.1)
More catered for	16 (57.1)	0 (0.0)	12 (42.9)	28 (14.4)
Catered for	14 (34.1)	1 (2.4)	26 (63.4)	41 (21.1)
Less catered for	4 (36.4) *	0 (0.0) *	7 (63.6)	11 (5.7)
Lesser catered for	3 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (50.0)	6 (3.1)
Least catered for	3 (60.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (40.0)	5 (2.6)
Total	80 (41.3)	2 (1.0)	112 (57.7)	194 (100.0)

The results are not statistically significant with Chi-square (X^2) test at 0.05 level of confidence.

The data in Table 3.9a shows that there was no difference between those who said they had friendly work-mates and those who said they did not have any friendly work-mates, which shows that

whether workers have friendly or no friendly work-mates if they are not satisfied with other factors of the work environment they will still complain of dissatisfaction. Thus one can say that workers can be working in a happy interpersonal atmosphere but still complain of dissatisfaction with their working environment because other factors of satisfaction are not met or catered for.

This could be an indication as to why most workers who said they were dissatisfied did not give any reasons relating to work-mates as a cause for their dissatisfaction. It can be seen that inspite of the majority of workers not having complaints against their work-mates, the majority of the workers at all levels of occupation said they were dissatisfied with their work environment, as shown in Table 3.9a. This illustrates what Maslow (1954) states on the lower needs and the higher needs, that is when lower needs are not satisfied (see Chapter Two) then a worker will still complain of dissatisfaction even though the higher needs are met.

This could be the reason why the majority of workers did not mind leaving their work-mates as shown in Table 3.9b.

Table 3.9b

WORKERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS LEAVING THEIR WORK-MATES.

<u>WORKERS' ATTITUDES</u>	<u>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</u>	<u>PERCENTAGES</u>
Upset	46	23.7
Not much bothered	87	44.9
Not bothered	61	31.4
Total	194	100.0

The results in Table 3.9b show that 23.7 percent of the workers said they would be upset, 44.8 percent said they would not be much bothered and 31.4 percent said they would not be bothered at all if they had to leave their work-mates to go to another place. The data points out that the workers were more interested in other factors which could make them happier. Most of them said they would not mind leaving their work-mates if they were given a better position or promoted to high scales at the new place wherever they went. This demonstrates that when workers are given better material rewards they are ready to leave their friendly work-mates. This is related more to the meeting of the lower needs in Maslow's hierarchy and therefore can be seen as upholding Maslow's view.

(3-2) A Worker and His Supervisors

In this part we shall analyse how the workers view their supervisors in relation to their happiness. An analysis will be made on all levels of occupation, using the same structure of enquiry as on the previous items.

The hypothesis being analysed here is, working with understanding supervisors is an essential factor for workers' satisfaction among unskilled and semi-skilled workers in ZIMCO.

The workers were asked how they viewed working with understanding supervisors, that is how essential is this factor to the workers' satisfaction. Then they were asked to say if their supervisors were understanding in their working relations.

The results of how important (essential), the factor of having understanding supervisors in their working environment is, are shown in Table 3.10 a.

Table 3.10a

THE LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE IN WORKING WITH UNDERSTANDING
SUPERVISORS.

<u>Levels of importance</u>	<u>No. of respondents</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Most essential	119	62.3
More essential	26	13.6
Essential	34	17.8
Less essential	8	4.2
Lesser essential	2	1.0
Least essential	2	1.0
Total	191	100.0

Missing cases = 3 did not answer the question.

Nearly two-thirds of the workers considered this factor most essential. Then the workers were asked if they had understanding supervisors in their working environment. Table 3.10b shows the attitudes of the workers towards their supervisors whom they were working with.

Table 3.10^b

THE ATTITUDES OF WORKERS TOWARDS THEIR SUPERVISORS

Attitudes of workers towards their super- visors	No. of respondents	Percentages
Most catered for	76	39.6
More catered for	41	21.4
Catered for	43	22.4
Less catered for	15	7.8
Lesser catered for	7	3.6
Least catered for	10	5.2
Total	192	100.0

Missing cases = 2

The data in Table 3.10^b point that 39.6 percent of the workers said the factor of having understanding supervisors in their work environment for their satisfaction was most catered for, 21.4 percent said it was more catered for, and 22.4 percent said it was just catered for, making 82 percent who were relatively satisfied.

But it is important to see how many of the workers said it is essential to have understanding supervisors and actually had them. Table 3.10 gives the results of the workers who had understanding supervisors.

Table 3.10c.

THE LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE IN HAVING UNDERSTANDING SUPERVISORS IN
RELATION TO HOW THEY WERE PROVIDED AMONG THE WORKERS. (ROW PER-
CENTAGES IN BRACKETS).

Levels of Importance	Levels of Provision						Tot. %
	Most catered for	More catered for	Catered for	Less catered for	Lesser catered for	Least catered dor	
Most essential	57 (47.9)	26 (21.8)	18 (15.1)	8 (6.7)	3 (2.5)	7 (5.9)	62
More essential	11 (42.3)	5 (19.2)	5 (19.2)	4 (15.4)	1 (3.8)	0 (0.0)	13
Essential	5 (14.7)	9 (26.5)	14 (41.2)	3 (8.8)	2 (5.9)	1 (2.9)	17
Less essential	1 (14.3)	1 (14.3)	4 (57.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (14.3)	0 (0.0)	3
Lesser essential	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1
Least essential	1 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (50.0)	1
Total	76 (40.0)	41 (21.6)	42 (22.1)	15 (7.6)	7 (3.7)	9 (4.9)	100.

Missing cases = 4 did not respond.

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square (X^2) test at
0.03 percent level of confidence.

The results in Table 3.10c show that among the workers who said
it is most essential to have understanding supervisors in their working
environment for them to be satisfied, 47.9 percent said they had very

good understanding supervisors, 21.8 percent said they had quite good understanding supervisors, 15.1 percent said they did not have understanding supervisors, that is they were not happy with their supervisors even though they regarded it as most essential for them to be satisfied. But still the majority of the workers who said it was most essential to have understanding supervisors, did so. When these findings were related to levels of occupation the following results, in Table 3.11_a, were given.

Table 3.11_a.

THE ATTITUDES OF WORKERS IN WORKING WITH UNDERSTANDING SUPERVISORS IN
RELATION TO THE LEVELS OF OCCUPATION. (COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

	Level of Occupation				TOTAL %
	Unskilled workers	Semi-skilled workers	Skilled workers	Professional workers	
Levels of Importance					
Most essential	61 (77.2)	40 (58.8)	13 (39.4)	5 (45.5)	62.3
More essential	4 (5.1)	14 (20.6)	7 (21.2)	1 (9.1)	13.6
Essential	8 (10.1)	11 (16.2)	10 (30.3)	5 (45.5)	17.4
Less essential	4 (5.1)	2 (2.9)	2 (6.1)	0 (0.0)	4.2
Lesser essential	1 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	1.0
Least essential	1 (1.3)	1 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1.0
TOTAL	79 (100.0)	68 (25.6)	33 (17.3)	11 (5.8)	100.0

Missing case = 1

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square (χ^2) test at 0.02 percent level of confidence.

Table 3.11a shows that 77.2 percent of the unskilled workers, 58.8 percent of the semi-skilled workers, 39.4 percent of the skilled workers and 45.5 percent of the professional workers said it is most essential to have understanding supervisors in their working environment for them to be satisfied. This shows that the majority at each level of occupation, except the skilled workers, preferred having understanding supervisors in their working relations so as to be satisfied. Informal interviews reviewed that skilled workers spend most of their time working in small groups or individually without immediate supervisors. So they find little difference when looking at what they regard as understanding supervisors. But it is important also to show how they regarded the supervisors they were working with at that time. The results in table 3.11b show how the workers regarded this factors in their working place.

Table 3.11b.

THE ATTITUDES OF WORKERS TOWARDS THE SUPERVISORS THEY WERE WORKING
WITH IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION. (COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

<u>Level of occupation</u>	<u>Unskilled workers</u>	<u>Semi-skilled workers</u>	<u>Skilled workers</u>	<u>Professional workers</u>	<u>Total %</u>
Level of Importance					
Most catered for	37 (46.8)	30 (43.5)	7 (21.2)	2 (18.2)	76 (39.6)
More catered for	14 (17.7)	18 (26.1)	6 (18.2)	3 (27.3)	41 (21.4)
Catered for	11 (13.9)	12 (17.4)	14 (42.4)	6 (54.5)	43 (22.4)
Less catered for	7 (8.9)	4 (5.8)	4 (12.1)	0 (0.0)	15 (7.8)
Lesser catered for	4 (5.1)	2 (2.9)	1 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (3.6)
Least catered for	6 (7.6)	3 (4.3)	1 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (5.2)
Total	79 (41.1)	69 (35.9)	33 (17.2)	11 (5.7)	192 (100.0)

Missing cases = 2.

The results are statistically significant with

Chi-square (X^2) test at 0.04 percent level of confidence.

The results in Table 3.11b point out that 46.8 percent the unskilled workers, 43.5 percent of the semi-skilled workers, 21.2 percent of the skilled workers, and 18.2 percent of the professional workers said the factor of having understanding supervisors was most catered for in their working environment. Here the majority of the skilled and professional workers said the factor was just catered for, that is there was need for improvement for them to be most satisfied. The reason for this attitude, as discerned in the depth interviews, was that the skilled and professional workers have high chances of taking over the supervisory position, so most of them would have loved to be in those positions themselves. The unskilled and the semi-skilled workers seemed to appreciate and like their supervisors because they have to get on well with them if they are to progress in their scales and in their work. The supervisors hold the key for the workers' climb up the ladder. This conclusion was reached because even though some workers said that they had very good understanding supervisors, it was observed in the management records that they were served with several warning letters for various offences, such as these below.

A plant operator (unskilled worker) said he was getting along very well with his supervisor and that the supervisor was very understanding. But the management records showed that this man was frequently in trouble with the supervisor because he had received verbal and written warnings for several cases concerning his work. This showed that even though the worker said he got on well with his supervisor, all was not well at all. Another example was of a fitter attendant (unskilled worker) who also said he got on pretty well with his supervisor, but the management

records showed that he had more than three verbal warnings, four written warnings, two times suspended and at that time he was served with a comprehensive final warning. This showed that he was not in very good terms with the supervisor, since all these warnings originated from the supervisor. The last example is of a brick-layer (semi-skilled worker) who said that he got on very well with the supervisor, but the management records showed that the worker was not in fact obedient to the instructions of the supervisor and was suspended for this. He was also charged with incompetence by his supervisor, showing that they were not also on good terms with each other.

All these examples point out that though some workers said they got on very well with their supervisors they ⁱⁿ fact were in several troubles with them. They said they got on well with their supervisor probably in fear of painting a true picture of the relationship with their supervisors. But some were served with warning letters after several verbal warnings which means that their supervisor was quite understanding, that is why he took some time to report the matters to the higher authorities. In this case one can say the supervisor was understanding.

In general it was found that the majority of the workers felt that to have understanding supervisors in the work environment is an essential factor for a worker to be satisfied. Here the majority of the workers said they got on very well with their supervisors as shown in Table 3.12.

Table 3.12,

THE ATTITUDES OF WORKERS TOWARDS THEIR SUPERVISORS IN RELATION
LEVELS OF SATISFACTION. (ROW PERCENTAGE IN BRACKETS)

<u>Levels of satisfaction</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Attitudes of workers.</u>				
Very well	46 (42.6)	0 (0.0)	62 (57.4)	108 (55.7)
Well	27 (50.9)	2 (3.8)	24 (45.3)	53 (27.3)
Not so well	7 (23.3)	0 (0.0)	23 (76.7)	30 (15.5)
Badly	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (100.0)	3 (1.5)
Total	80 (41.3)	2 (1.0)	112 (57.7)	194 (100.0)

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square (χ^2) test at 0.02 percent level of confidence.

The major reason given for getting on well with their supervisors was that the supervisors were very understanding to workers' problems and very easy to communicate with. But when these findings were related to the levels of satisfaction,

it was found that the majority of the workers were still dissatisfied with their working environment. This must be due to other factors in the work environment since no worker gave the reason of misunderstanding with supervisors for their dissatisfaction.

The main reason given for this was low pay and lack of fringe benefits (see Chapter Two). This demonstrates that workers could be satisfied with the supervisors they have but if the lower needs, that is the material needs, are not satisfied then the workers will still complain of dissatisfaction in their work environment. When the worker complains of not getting on well with the supervisor the likelihood of being dissatisfied gets higher (see Table 3.12). The majority of workers who did not get on well with their supervisors also complained of dissatisfaction. There is a possibility of these workers not being happy with both their supervisors and the lower needs resulting in their dissatisfaction. So Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs depends very much on individuals, not necessarily on the factors provided. The same factors would be good to one person but not good to the other in the same work group.

In this section we have focussed on the worker and his working relations. The data illustrated that workers saw their work-mates and supervisors as essential factors for their satisfaction in the work environment. In fact the majority of the workers at all levels of occupation felt they had friendly work-mates and supervisors. It was also found that the majority of the semi-skilled and unskilled workers preferred working with different levels of education, while the majority of the skilled

and professional workers preferred working with the same level of education. It was further found that the majority of workers at all levels of occupation preferred working with different ethnic groups than their own. It is necessary for employers to focus on the lower needs of the workers just as they focus on the relationship existing between the worker and his work-mates, and his supervisors, so as to balance the needs on the hierarchy which satisfy workers.

(3.b) The Importance of Achievement Among Workers

This section analyses the attitude of workers towards achievement in their work environment in relation to their satisfaction. The primary concern is how workers regard achievement in terms of its being essential for their satisfaction. This factor touches the person's ego, so achievement fits in the ego needs of the basic needs which Maslow (1954) outlined. Achievement deals with what workers accomplish during their working hours and if they regard that worthwhile for their satisfaction. This is in view that workers, like all human beings, want to be noticed, to have some impact on other people's feelings. If a worker feels that he is being over looked, disregarded or taken for granted, he will react either negatively or positively towards the situation. This study examines the attitude workers have towards achievement.

The hypothesis being examined here is: Achievement is an essential factor for workers' satisfaction in the work environment at all levels of occupation. To analyse this hypothesis the workers were asked to say how essential doing something worthwhile (achievement) is to their satisfaction and to state the things which gave them a

feeling of achievement or accomplishment in their working place. In Table 3.13 there are responses on how important achievement is to workers' satisfaction in relation to the levels of occupation.

Table 3.13.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ACHIEVEMENT IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION
(COLUMN PERCENTAGE IN BRACKETS).

Level of importance	Levels of Occupation				Total
	Unskilled workers	Semi-skilled workers	Skilled workers	Profes- sional workers	
Most essential	19 (23.2)	29 (41.4)	7 (21.2)	8 (72.7)	63 (32.5)
More essential	12 (15.0)	13 (18.6)	9 (27.3)	2 (18.2)	36 (18.6)
Essential	16 (20.0)	12 (17.1)	8 (24.2)	1 (9.1)	37 (19.1)
Less essential	27 (33.7)	8 (11.4)	4 (12.1)	0 (0.0)	39 (20.1)
Lesser essential	2 (2.5)	0 (0.0)	3 (9.1)	0 (0.0)	5 (2.6)
Least essential	4 (5.0)	8 (11.4)	2 (6.1)	0 (0.0)	14 (7.2)
Total	80 (41.2)	70 (36.1)	33 (17.0)	11 (5.7)	194 (100.0)

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square(X^2) test at 0.001 per cent level of confidence.

The data in table 3.13 shows that 32.5 percent of the workers felt that achievement was the most essential factor, of which 23.2 percent of the unskilled workers, 41.4 percent of the semi-skilled workers, 21.2 percent of the skilled workers and 72.7 percent of the professional workers said this was the most essential factor for their satisfaction in the work environment. They regarded doing something worthwhile as essential for their satisfaction in their working environment.

As seen on the distribution of data, it is found that the majority of the professional workers regarded achievement as the most essential factor for their satisfaction. This confirms the earlier hypothesis that the higher one is on the level of occupation the more one will require non-material needs. This is because these don't complain much on material needs, just as Maslow (1954) stated. In other working groups the majority did not emphasise achievement, apart from the semi-skilled workers who emphasized a bit on achievement because of the nature of the work they do. Most of them were bricklayers, carpenters, painters and other trades which easily expose the final product of their labour. This makes them happy with what they had done. But still the majority of these workers did not emphasize this factor as essential. This indicates that achievement is a factor which is not very important to the lower levels of occupation.

Analysing achievement further, the follow-up question was posed to the workers whether there was anything in their work environment which gave them a feeling of achievement or frustration for either their satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The responses on this question are given in Table 3.14a in relation to levels of occupation.

Table 3.14a.

FEELINGS OF ACHIEVEMENT IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF OCCUPATION.

(COLUMN PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS).

	<u>Levels of Occupation</u>				Total
	Unskilled workers	Semi-skilled workers	Skilled workers	Professional workers	
Feelings of Achievement					
Achievement	44 (60.3)	41 (61.2)	21 (67.7)	7 (70.0)	113 (62.4)
Frustration	27 (37.0)	25 (37.5)	9 (29.0)	3 (30.0)	64 (35.5)
It depends.	2 (2.7)	1 (1.5)	1 (3.1)	0 (0.0)	4 (2.2)
Total	73 (40.3)	67 (37.0)	31 (17.1)	10 (5.5)	181 (100.0)

Missing cases = 13 did not respond.

The results are not statistically significant with Chi-square (χ^2) test at 0.05 percent level of confidence.

The results shown in Table 3.14a point out that the majority of workers in all levels of occupation had some feelings of achievement in their work. 62.4 percent of the workers said they had feelings of achievement, 35.4 percent said they had feelings of frustration and 2.2 percent said it depended on the situation while at work. The levels of occupation were related to the reasons given for the responses; these are shown Table 3.14b.

Table 3.14 b

REASONS FOR FEELINGS OF ACHIEVEMENT IN RELATION TO THE LEVELS
OF OCCUPATION. (COLUMN PER CENTAGES IN BRACKETS)

	Levels of Occupation				Total
	Unskilled workers	Semi-skilled workers	Skilled workers	Professional workers	
Reasons for Feelings of Achievement.					
Contributing to finished work, gaining more knowledge.	35 (50.7)	42 (61.8)	18 (69.2)	7 (70.0)	102 (59.0)
Understanding supervisors/ work-mates.	7 (10.2)	1 (1.5)	1 (3.9)	1 (10.0)	10 (5.8)
Lack of promotion, low pay and lack of fringe benefits.	14 (20.3)	19 (27.9)	5 (19.2)	1 (10.0)	39 (22.5)
Too much work, work is mono- tonous, no tool to use.	13 (18.7)	6 (8.8)	2 (7.7)	1 (10.0)	22 (12.7)
Total	69 (40.6)	68 (38.2)	26 (15.3)	10 (5.9)	173 (100.0)

Missing cases = 21 did not give any reason.

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square (X^2)

test at 0.05 per cent level of confidence.

In Table 3.14b, the workers focussed their response to two reasons mainly, this is for either achievement or frustration.

The reason given by the majority of workers who had feelings of achievement was that, they contributed to finish the work of the day, made major repairs and the working with understanding supervisors which made them happy. By finished work they referred to making repairs, balancing accounts' figures, sorting workers' problems and so forth. This gave them a feeling of achievement or accomplishment. The other reasons given by the rest of workers centred on lack of promotion, low pay and lack of fringe benefits. These said nothing in the work environment would give them a feeling of achievement as long as these factors were not fulfilled. The distribution of data shows that the majority of the workers had some feelings of achievement, while only about a third of the workers said they had feelings of frustration.

The results demonstrate that the majority of the professional and skilled workers emphasized achievement for their satisfaction. After depth interviews the reason was seen to be because of the type of work these two levels of occupation do. The feeling comes after they accomplish major assignments of the day. With the unskilled and semi-skilled workers only a few workers gave this as a reason for their satisfaction. The majority of the unskilled and semi-skilled workers gave their main reason for frustration as low pay and lack of fringe benefits.

There is an indication that of the workers who said they had feelings of achievement, the majority also said that they were satisfied, as shown in Table 3.15. Equally the workers who said they were frustrated, the majority also said that they were dissatisfied.

Table 3.15.

FEELINGS OF ACHIEVEMENT IN RELATION TO LEVELS OF SATISFACTION.

(ROW PERCENTAGES IN BRACKETS).

	<u>Levels of satisfaction</u>			Total
	Satisfied	Don't know	Dissatisfied	
Feelings of Achievement				
Achievement	60 (53.1)	1 (0.0)	52 (46.0)	113 (62.4)
Frustration	14 (21.9)	0 (0.0)	50 (78.1)	64 (35.4)
It depends	2 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (50.0)	184 (2.2)
Total	76 (42.0)	1 (0.6)	104 (57.5)	181 (100.0)

Missing cases = 13 did not respond.

The results are statistically significant with Chi-square (X^2) test at 0.001 per cent level of confidence.

From here one can say that the factor of achievement contributes to satisfaction, that is the workers who had feelings of achievement are more likely to be satisfied than workers who complain of frustration.

In general it can be said that the majority of the professional workers regard achievement as an essential factor, while the majority at other levels of occupation regard it as not essential. Following Maslow's hierarchy of needs, this makes sense since most of the professional workers did not say material factors were not catered for, for their satisfaction (see Table 2.6b) and thus it can be seen that they emphasize higher needs than other levels of occupation. The other levels of occupation emphasized very much on material factors as causes for their dissatisfaction (see Chapter Two). One can say that achievement is an essential factor but when lower needs are not met the workers will still complain of dissatisfaction.

CHAPTER FOUR

C O N C L U S I O N

From the ^{one} set of this study, the primary objective was to discover the sources of the worker's satisfaction in the work environment. To accomplish this task various occupational levels were analysed to determine if they emphasised different factors of the work environment for their satisfaction. The factors examined were taken from previous studies and placed into Maslow's (1954) theoretical framework (see Chapter One).

The study was partitioned in two major sections, that is the factors affecting material and non-material needs of the workers. Material needs were examined with the help of the material factors, while non-material needs were examined with the help of non-material factors. All this was analysed using Maslow's major propositions that, man's needs are organized in series of levels - a hierarchy of importance.

It is found, in this study, that workers at all levels of occupation regard pay, fringe benefits and Job Security, which are material factors, as sources of their satisfaction in the work environment. This is because workers who complained of low pay, lack of fringe benefits and lack of job security said they were dissatisfied with their work environment. In comparison, those who are happy with these factors said they were satisfied with their work environment.

The majority of the unskilled workers, semi-skilled workers and skilled workers complained of lack of material factors, while the majority of the professional workers said they were happy with the above factors. The analysis of non-material factors found that the workers at all levels of occupation regard having friendly work-mates as essential for their satisfaction. Most of the workers were happy with the work-mates they had; this was also true of the supervisors they had. Following the hierarchy of needs, this factor is a social need. It is discovered that the majority of workers are dissatisfied in spite of being happy with their working relations. This proves what Maslow stated that the lower level of needs, which are material needs, must be satisfied before higher needs would dominate the worker's behaviour. This is further seen in the study of achievement, which is an ego need. The majority of the workers at the lower levels of occupation did not regard this as an essential factor, while the majority of the professional workers did so.

From these findings it can be said that workers in the lower ranks, such as the unskilled workers, are mainly dominated by the material factors for their satisfaction in their work environment. The higher levels of occupation such as the professional workers, who are happy with material factors, are mainly dominated by the non-material factors which are not met for their satisfaction. This confirms the studies of Maslow (1954) and Fraser (1962) that when the lower needs, which are material, are reasonably provided, needs at the next level of hierarchy begin to dominate man's behaviour.

Finally the data suggests that the material factors are sources of satisfaction at all levels of occupation. If these factors are not provided for, they cause the workers to be dissatisfied. The non-material factors affect the worker's satisfaction only after the material factors are adequately provided for in the work environment. However, while it is correct to say that different levels of occupation have different sources of satisfaction, it is also true to say that this depends very much on the needs of an individual worker in that level of occupation. In other words each worker has his own sources of satisfaction in the work environment. This is the reason why some workers in the lower ranks were satisfied with their work environment in spite of the material factors not being met.

Looking at the findings of this study, it is seen that the majority of the workers who are dissatisfied complain^{of} lack of basic material factors, such as low pay. So if one is to suggest what could be done to these workers, it is clear that the economic situation in the country right now cannot allow further wage increments, since it will just worsen the inflation situation. In the light of the foregoing situation it could be suggested that the organizations should try to meet worker's material need with a help of other means. One of the way, firstly, could be by investing in food production. The organizations should directly be engaged in production of various food stuffs which should be sold to their workers at cheaper prices than the ones existing at the present market.

The money which is got from the sales of the food should be re-invested in the production of more food stuffs . . In other words organizations should engage themselves fully in primary production of food to help the workers meet their material needs. When this is done workers will know that their organizations are concerned about their welfare.

Secondly, the lowly paid workers who have no accommodation from their organizations should be given more housing allowance than they get now. The system of paying housing allowance following the pay scales is not good (see Appendix II). This system of paying more housing allowance to those who are highly paid should end. It's time the managements thought of reversing the situation, otherwise they should make their workers get the same housing allowance. This is because the workers who get low pay may be helped at least to get better houses. This may reduce complaints and frustration on the part of the lowly paid workers who are entitled to low allowances under the present system. Such a policy will obviously not be favoured by those who get more housing allowance or who are highly paid, but the organization ought to defend it in the interest of the lowly paid workers. This policy will not involve increasing the salaries but will be restricted to housing allowance only. This may somehow make the workers affected feel secure^{as} members of the organizations whose needs are being looked after well.

Thirdly, it is necessary to have regular consultation meetings between the management and the workers if the workers are to feel part and parcel of the organization.

There is need to have these meetings so that the workers can suggest some things which can make them happy so that the management can try to implement them. If workers see that their suggestions are being taken seriously by workers, then they may feel valued in the organization. This may help in making them also feel secure in their job. In short workers' participation should be very much put in practice. It should be used to discuss both the material and non-material needs of the workers.

Fourthly, there is need for the management to change their attitude towards workers, that is they must see workers not only as producers but as members who contribute largely to the survival of the organization. It is important that workers feel valued for their labour. The workers, on the other hand, should be made to see the organization as their own, not as a place where they only draw their income for their living. In short this will develop into a spirit of unity within the organization. The management should feel concerned about the welfare of the workers, by making sure that their workers have good facilities, such as good accommodation, health facilities and social facilities for recreation.

This cannot be achieved easily. Both the management and workers must work towards this goal.

To conclude the study, here are some of the constraints that affected this study and suggestions about future researchers in this area. The constraints are as follows: (i) the research funds given were far from being adequate and as a result very little was spent on workers interviewed and on the research as a whole;

- (ii) very few organizations were willing to release the confidential files for the workers where you find detailed records of workers;
- (iii) the organization did not want their workers to spend more time on the interviews as this, they said, cost them money. So again it was a problem to have long informal interviews.

Due to these problems it would be necessary for future researchers doing research on this problem to be given enough money and time so that they would tackle the problem in depth. It is also good for the sponsors of the study to enter into negotiations with the organizations so as to lessen suspicion of the researcher during the research.

In this study, the main area covered was what workers regard as the main source for their satisfaction. It could be good if the next researchers tackled the topic in relation to how the management view the workers' satisfaction, that is what factors do the management think satisfy workers most. In a more rigorous study the research could compare workers in government institutions with those in parastatal organizations so as to see if there is any difference in the attitude of workers towards the factors of satisfaction found in their work environment. Likewise, such a study could follow the levels of occupation, to see if the levels of occupation have same attitudes as those in parastatal organizations. The next study should also look at the individual differences in each level of occupation so as to find other factors which affect satisfaction. There is need also to question on the factors of satisfaction with open-ended questions. Such questions

would allow the workers give their own preference, and possible insights into their rationale. Specifically, open-ended questions could acquire data of why some workers regard pay as not essential for their satisfaction and/or see if these workers have other sources where they draw their income, or see if pay, ⁱⁿ fact, has nothing to do with their satisfaction.

Finally it is necessary that researchers clearly state the aims and objectives of their research just at the beginning to the workers and the management so that the amount of suspicion is minimised. This will make the workers feel free when answering the questions from the researcher.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Albrecht, Karl. Successful Management By Objectives.
(Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall,
1978)
2. Berg, Ivar, Industrial Sociology.
(Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1979)
3. Bergar, Peter, L; Chinoy, Ely; Evan, W.M; Gold, Raymond (eds).
Sociology of Occupation.
(New York: MacMillan, 1964)
4. Beynon, H., and Blackman, R.M. Perception of Work: Variations
Within a Factory.
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
1972)
5. Blauner, R. "Work Satisfaction and Industrial Trends in Modern
Society", in Galenson, W.; and Lipset, S.M. (eds)
Labour and Trade Unionism.
(New York: Wiley, 1964)
6. Brayfield, A.H. ; and Crockett, W.H. "Employee Attitude and
Employee Performance", Psychological Bulletin,
Vol. 52 (1955).
7. Davis, Keith. Human Relations at Work.
(New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962)
8. Dufty, N.F. "Occupation Status, Job Satisfaction and Levels
of Aspirations", The British Journal of
Sociology, Vol. XI (1960).

9. Fraser, J.M. Industrial Psychology.
(New York: Pergamon Press, 1962)
10. Gross, Edward. Work and Society.
(New York: Thomas Y. Growell, 1968)
11. Goode, W.J., and G Fowler, I. "Incentive Factors in a Low
Morale Plant", American Sociological
Review, Vol. 4 (1949).
12. Herberg, F.; Mausner, B.; Syndreman, B.
The Motivation to Work,
(New York: Wiley, 1959).
13. Hoppock, R. Job Satisfaction, (New York: Harper and Row, 1935).
14. Katz, Daniel. "Satisfaction and Deprivation in Industries",
in Kornhouser, A; Dublin, R.; and Ross, A.M.
(eds).
Industrial Conflict.
(New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954).
15. Korhouser, Arther. "Job Satisfaction Relation to Mental Health",
in Vroom, V.H.(ed). Management and Motivation.
(New York: Penguin Book, 1970)
16. Maslow, A.H. Motivation and Personality.
(New York: Harper and Row, 1954).
17. _____ "Theory of Human Motivation",
Psychology Review, Vol. 50 (1943).
18. Machungwa, P.D.; and Schmitt, N. "Work Motivation in Developing
Country", Journal of Applied Psychology,
No. 1, Vol. 68 (1983).
19. Mayo, Elton . The Social Problems of An Industrial
Civilization.
(New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949).

20. McGregor, D.M. The Human Side of Enterprise.
(New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960).
21. Morse, N.C., and Weiss, R.S. "The Function and Meaning of
Work and the Job", America Sociological
Review , Vol. 20 (1955).
22. Peil Margaret. The Ghanian Factory Worker; Industrial
Man in Africa. (Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press, 1972).
23. Parker, S.R.; Smith, M.A. and Brown, R.K.
The Sociology of Industry.
(London: George Allen and Unwin, 1967).
24. Ross, I.C., and Zander, A. "Need Satisfaction and Employee
Turnover", in Vroom, V.H. (ed).
Management and Motivation.
(New York: Penguin Book, 1970).
25. Schneider, E.V. Industrial Sociology.
(New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957).
26. Taylor, F. Scientific Management.
(New York: Harper and Row, 1947).
27. Taylor, G.R. Are Workers Human?
(London: Falcon Press, 1950)
28. Terkel, Studs. Working: People Talk about What they
do all day and How they Fell about What
they do.
(New York: Avon Books, 1972).
29. Vroom, V.H. Work and Motivation.
(New York: Wiley, 1964).

30. Tredgold, R.F.; Human Relation in Modern Industry.
(London: Gerald Duckworth, 1949).
31. Zambia: Basic Needs in An Economy Under Pressure (ILO ;
Addis Ababa - 1981).
32. National Mirror; January, 28th - 10th February, 1983; No. 171.
33. National Mirror; April 22nd - May 5th, 1983; No. 177.
34. Times of Zambia; 30th January. 1982; No. 5183.
35. . 28th December, 1982; No. 5463.
36. 29th December, 1982; No. 5464.
37. 30th December, 1982; No. 5465.
38. 20th December, 1982; No. 5456.
39. 14th January, 1983; No. 5478.
40. 8th January, 1983; No. 5473
41. 29th January, 1983; No. 5491.

APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How old are you? (tick one in which you fall in)
(a) 20 - 24 yrs; (b) 25 - 29 yrs;
(c) 30 - 34 yrs; (d) 35 - 39 yrs;
(e) 40 - 44 yrs; (f) 45 - 49 yrs;
(g) 50 yrs and above.
2. Are you (a) single (b) Married (c) Widowed/separated/
divorced
3. If married/widowed/separated/divorced, how many children
do you have (tick one).
(a) One (b) Two (c)* Three (d) Four (e) Five and above.
4. How many people do you keep at your house those who are not
your own children?
(a) One (b) Two (c) Three (d) Four (e) Five and above.
5. What is your religion (a) Catholic (b) Protestant
(c) Any other (d) None
6. How long have you been with the company? (tick one)
(a) Under 6 months (b) 6 months - 1 year;
(c) over 1 year - 18 months (c) over 18 months-2 years;
(e) over 2 years - 3 years; (f) over 3 years - 5 years;
(g) over 5 years - 10 years; (h) over 10 years.
7. Have you been with this company all your working life?
(a) Yes (b) No.

8. If "No", give details of your previous jobs any companies worked.

- (a) Dates
(b) Job(s).....
(c) Company(ies).....
.....

9. What is your present job?.....

10. Could you tell me briefly in your own words just what is it that you do on your job?.....
.....

11. How long have you been in this job? (tick one).

- (a) Under 6 months; (b) Over 6 months -1 year;
(c) Over 1 year - 18 months; (d) Over 18 months -2 years
(e) Over 2 years - 3 years; (f) Over 3 years - 5 years;
(g) Over 5 years - 10 years; (h) Over 10 years.

12. What is the level of your education? (tick one)

- (a) Grade 1-7 (b) Form 1 - 3 (c) Form 4-5
(d) College (e) University

13. Have you been accommodated?

- (a) Yes (b) No.

If 'Yes' are you happy with it? If 'No' are you happy as you are?

.....
.....

14. Does your company provide health facilities?

- (a) Yes (b) No.

Are you happy about the situation.

.....
.....

In question 15 and 16 there is a scale from 1 to 6 giving each factor the order^{of} importance. The Key for question 15 is: 6 most essential, 5 - more essential; 4 - essential; 3 - less essential; 2 - lesser essential; 1 - least essential.

15. How essential is each factor to your job you do?

- (i) Good pay (.....)
- (ii) Working conditions (.....)
- (iii) Convenient hours (.....)
- (iv) Understanding supervisors (.....)
- (v) Friendly work-mates (.....)
- (vi) Good Social facilities (.....)
- (vii) Security of employment (.....)
- (viii) Chance to do something worth while (achievement)(.....)
- (ix) Strong trade union (.....)
- (x) Recognised easily by others (.....)

The Key for question 16 is: 6 - most catered; 5 more catered; 4 - catered; 3 - less catered; 2 - lesser catered; 1 - least catered.

16. How are these factors catered for in your job?

- (a) Good pay (.....) (b) Convenient work hours (.....)
- (c) friendly work-mates(.....) (d) strong trade union (.....)
- (e) security of employment(.....)(f) understanding supervisors(...)
- (g) Good Social Facilities (....)(h) Working conditions (.....)

17. Which of these statements come closest to describing how you feel about your job? (tick one).

- a) Interesting nearly all the time.
- b) Interesting most of the time - some dull stretches.

c) Interesting some of the time - mostly dull and monotonous.

d) Completely dull and monotonous.

18. Is there anything about your job that gives you a feeling of either (a) accomplishment or achievement

(b) irritable or frustrated.

Which is it?.....
.....
.....

19. Would you like to make this job a career, that is would like to do this kind of work through all your life?

(a) Yes

(b) No •Why "Yes" or "No".....

.....
.....
.....

20. If you had a chance to move to another job in the same company would you do so and why?

.....
.....
.....

21. How friendly would you say you are with the people who work with you or near to you (or work-mates)?

a) Extremely friendly;

(b) quite friendly;

c) Indifferent;

(d) Not very friendly;

e) Don't know each other

22. *How would you feel if you were moved to another job in the company more or less like the one you do now but away from the men who work near to you? Would you feel:-*

- (a) Very upset; (b) fairly upset; (c) Not much bothered;
(d) Not bothered at all.

23. Would you be happy working with people from the same province
or area?

- (a) Yes (b) No (c) Don't know

Why is it.....
.....
.....

24. Would you be happy working with people with same level of
education?

- (a) Yes (b) No; (c) Don't know.

Why is it.....
.....
.....

25. Does the job you do give you a chance to try out ideas of your
own?

- (a) Yes; (b) Sometimes; (c) Rarely; (d) Never
(e) Don't know.

26. Do you have enough freedom on the job? Do you think:

- (a) *Too much is left for you;* (b) *You don't have enough to say;*
(c) *It's about right;* (d) *Don't know*

27. How do you get on with you immediate supervisors?

Would you say you get on.....

- (a) Very well; (b) Pretty well (c) Not so well;
(d) Very badly.

Why is it.....
.....
.....

28. What do you think about the rules for employees?

Would you say there are.....

- (a) Too many; (b) Not enough; (c) About right.
(d) Don't know.

29. Do you think the relationship between management and workers
could be improved than it is now?

- (a) Yes (b) No (c) Don 't know.

If "Yes" in what ways.....
.....
.....

30. Here are two opposing views about industries in general. I
would like you to tell me which you agree with more.

- (a) Some people say that a company is like a football side,
because good team work means success and is to everyone's
advantage.
(b) Others say that team work in a company is impossible
because employers and workers are really on opposite sides.

31. Which view do you agree with more?

- (a) Team work; (b) Opposite side; (c) depends;
(d) Don't know.

Why
.....
.....

32. Are you a member of a trade union? (a) Yes (b) No

33. If "Yes" how did you come to join it?

.....
.....

34. What do you gain to be a member of this union?

.....
.....

35. If your answer to Question 32 is "No" would you want to be
a member of a trade union? (a) Yes (b) No.

Why is it.....
.....

36. How secure do you think your own job is?

(a) secure; (b) insecure; (c) Don't know.

Why do you say that
.....
.....

37. Taking everything into account, that is, pay, hours,
work-mates, supervisors, job security, achievement, working conditions
fringe benefits, and the job itself, would you say you are

(a) Very satisfied; (b) satisfied; (c) dissatisfied;
(d) very dissatisfied; (e) Don't know.

Why is it.....
.....
.....