

# The Impact of Labor Market Outcome on Job Dissatisfaction

Yeu-Sheng Hsieh\*

This paper examines the role of labor market outcome in the determination of job dissatisfaction by focusing on the impact of occupational incongruity on job dissatisfaction. It tests the hypothesis that "bad" labor market outcome, i.e., occupational incongruity, has a significant effect on job dissatisfaction by using the data from a labor utilization survey conducted in Taiwan. Job dissatisfaction in this study is measured from an indirect approach by examining workers' intentions to change jobs. This approach is based on the assumption that a worker is dissatisfied with his current job for some reasons when he intends to change his job. The evidence supports the hypothesis. That is, all of the work hours, low income, and educationally mismatched types of occupational incongruity have significant effects on job dissatisfaction. Workers are more likely to experience job dissatisfaction if they are incongruent in low hours, low income, and educational mismatch. However, workers are less likely to be dissatisfied if they are experiencing excess hours of incongruity.

1. Introduction
2. Theories of Job Dissatisfaction
3. Labor Market Outcome
4. Data and Measurements
5. Results
6. Conclusion

---

\*Associate Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension, National Taiwan University.

The author wishes to thank two anonymous reviews for their valuable suggestions.

## **1. Introduction**

The topic of job dissatisfaction or satisfaction has been studied over several decades using various approaches in many types of settings. Most of the analyses incorporate human capital variables such as education and work experience (Kalleberg and Griffin, 1978) and/or structural variables such as occupational and industrial sectors, organization size and social class (Bielby and Baron, 1983; Locke, 1976; Gruneberg, 1979). There is also an inclusion of intrinsic factors which include working conditions and interpersonal relations on the job (Kalleberg and Loscocco, 1983; Kalleberg and Griffin, 1978; Kalleberg, 1977; Janson and Martin, 1982).

The usual measurement instruments for job satisfaction are self-report rating scales, and the typical research design is a correlational one, examining satisfaction with one or more hypothesized antecedents or consequences. Locke (1976) has pointed out that researchers have relied far too heavily on rating scales and correlational designs to the exclusion of more varied and potentially more powerful approaches. Moreover, they have been criticized for their focuses on the antecedents of job satisfaction at the expense of studying personal resources and job characteristics. And, the literature in the field of job satisfaction tends to be inconclusive because there are many inconsistent findings among comparable studies. This phenomenon has been attributed to various factors such as differences in operational definition of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, the measurement scales itself, study subjects and situations, etc. Besides, it is noted that both job dissatisfaction and intention to job change are the important factors influencing workers turnover behavior (Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1978; Steers and Mowday, 1981). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that a worker is dissatisfied with his current job for some reasons when he intends to change his job. Based on this assump-

tion, this study attempts to measure worker's job dissatisfaction through indirect approach by examining the intention to job change in order to avoid the problems mentioned above.

This paper is concerned with the impacts of labor market outcome on job dissatisfaction. As has been well documented, the labor market outcome of a worker is determined by his or her human capital, job characteristics, and interpersonal relations and the findings in the literature are quite consistent. As we shall argue, however, labor market outcome may bring effects on some outcome variables, such as life chances, job dissatisfaction, and political attitude, etc. Thus, one would expect that labor market outcome may be regarded as a variable which intervenes between antecedent variables mentioned above and the outcome of job dissatisfaction. This might expand an explanation of job dissatisfaction in a new direction.

On the other hand, underemployment is an important form of labor market outcome. It has become a central topic in recent studies of the labor market (Rumberger, 1981; Clogg, 1979, 1980; Hauser, 1974, 1977; Carter, 1982). There has been an increase in research on the consequences of labor market outcome viewed in terms of categories of underemployment (Glenn and Weaver, 1982; Burris, 1983). Burris (1983) examined job dissatisfaction as one of the social and political consequences of overeducation. Glenn and Weaver (1982) are concerned with the hypothesis regarding the relationship between overeducation and job satisfaction. They found that education seemed to have little direct effect on job satisfaction. However, the proponents of the overeducation thesis argue that overeducation should have impact on job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

In spite of wide spread recognition of the prevalence of underemployment, it is still not quite clear that whether labor market outcome has a significant effect on job dissatisfaction. Therefore, this study attempts to shed the light on this issue. Labor market outcome in this study includes involuntary

part-time work, excess hours' work, relatively low income work, and educationally mismatched work, and it can be named occupational incongruity. It has been argued that occupational incongruity of an individual worker may produce psychological stress or attitude change toward the job (Lenski, 1954, 1956; Jackson, 1962; Pearlin, 1975; House and Harkin, 1975; Hornung, 1977, 1980). This change may lead to dissatisfaction with the worker's job which may further lead to the motivation or intention to leave the job. The most direct way to answer this question would be to examine the effects of occupational incongruity on job dissatisfaction.

## **2. Theories of Job Dissatisfaction**

Job dissatisfaction refers to the individual's negatively emotional reactions to a particular job. In other words, job dissatisfaction is an unpleasant or negative emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. There are many different theories of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction in the literature, and this makes measurement and interpretation of individual job dissatisfaction difficult and confusing. Although dissatisfaction and satisfaction are not exactly opposite poles of one continuum (Herzberg, 1966), they are considered simultaneously in the following sections for the convenience of discussion.

From the psychological point of view, there are several theories options of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. First, discrepancy theories (Oskamp, 1984; Cope 1979) view job satisfaction as a function of the degree of fulfillment of a person's needs, including both physical and psychological needs. If any of these wants or needs are unfulfilled, that is, are not regarded by the job or the job environment, then this leads to a discrepancy or tension. If this tension is not resolved, it results in a state of job dissatisfaction. In general, a large discrepancy is associated with dissatisfaction, while a small or zero discrepancy is related with satisfaction.

### The Impact of Labor Market Outcome on Job Dissatisfaction

Second, equity theories (Adams, 1963; Cope, 1979) view satisfaction as a result of the evaluation of a given individuals' job in comparison with the perceived regards of another person. This comparison is made in the form of a ratio of the inputs in the job situation to the outcome obtained from it. Outcomes refer to rewards such as pay or job status which a worker receives for performing his job. Inputs represent the contributions a worker brings to the job, such as age, education, skill, and physical effort. If this ratio compares unequally or unfavorably with that of others, then the feeling of inequity and job dissatisfaction occurs.

The third option is expectancy theories (Oskamp, 1984; Cope, 1979), which consider satisfaction to be determined by the degree to which one's expectations are matched by one's achievements. Job dissatisfaction is produced if one's job expectations are unsatisfied in job outcomes. For example, if a worker expects adequate utilization in terms of work hours, income, and skill on the job, and this expectation is not matched by his job, then job dissatisfaction occurs. In addition, value theories (Locke, 1976; Kalleberg, 1977) suggest that job satisfaction is determined by whether job attainment of the individual matches his own personal values. Locke (1976) points out that job satisfaction results from the perception that one's job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one's important job values, and to the degree that those values are congruent with needs.

Finally, Maslow (1970) describes a hierarchy of needs; first the physiological needs, then, successively, the need for safety in the sense of social security, the need for social contacts, the need for self-esteem and for esteem from others, and finally the need for self-actualization. According to Maslow, only when a need lower in a hierarchy is fulfilled will the higher needs become operative. Only when the higher needs become operative will workers try to satisfy them. Hence job satisfaction or dissatisfaction should be determined by how well the job meets the needs that are dominant for an

individual. Verhaegen (1979) argues that most lower needs can be fulfilled by work quite easily, at least in advanced countries, however, they are frequently not too well satisfied in the work situation itself. This implies that many people may not be satisfied with their jobs even though lower needs are fulfilled, particularly for the person with a fairly high educational level in advanced countries. In other words, some people who have adequate income from their jobs may not be satisfied with their jobs because of skill underutilization and other factors not related to income.

Furthermore, from the economic point of view, there are at least two theories, job search theory and job matching theory, that can be linked to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction in direct or indirect ways. Originally, these two theories, which are proposed by economists, provide the explanations of job search, unemployment, earnings, or turnover behavior. However, the evidence shows quite conclusively that low satisfaction fosters employee turnover. It thus may be appropriate to apply them to interpret job dissatisfaction.

The basic structure of the simplest form of job search theory is that an individual attempts to maximize expected wealth by accepting an employment offer only if it exceeds a single critical number termed the reservation wage. Any offer then made to that worker will be accepted if and only if the wage offered is at least as great as the reservation wage. If an offer is accepted, the worker is assumed to work at the firm until retirement. Previous studies on job search, with a perfect information assumption, assumed that workers were never dissatisfied with their jobs and never looked for jobs while employed. But, it is argued that this is not the case in many actual markets (Parsons, 1972; Mattila, 1974). In one study, Mattila (1974) estimated that 60 percent of those workers who voluntarily change jobs in the United States suffer no interim unemployment. Since this can only occur if some employed workers obtain new jobs before quitting, this means that

dissatisfaction does occur and on-the-job search is allowed when employed.

Also, Burdett (1978) explained that a worker may select two reservation wages where one is relatively higher. A job searcher will then accept any offer if and only if the wage offered is at least as great as the lower reservation wage. However, if the wage offered is acceptable but less than the higher reservation wage, dissatisfaction will result and on-the-job search will happen. In addition, the reservation wage in this model may change over time, a phenomenon that is labelled a variable reservation wage. An increasing reservation wage of a worker may induce dissatisfaction which further leads to on-the-job search behavior. The difficulty of this theory is that the reservation wage for any individual is unobserved and difficult to measure, particularly under an assumption for variable reservation wages.

However, education, experience, and other human capital factors are often used as proxies for the reservation wage of an individual. It is predicted that workers with different education and experience may have different degrees of job dissatisfaction based on this theory. Although this study only deals with job dissatisfaction of job-holders, not job-seekers, job search theory still provides a possible basis for explanation. Job search theory does not directly explain worker dissatisfaction, but it does account for on-the-job search and turnover behavior which are the direct evidence of job dissatisfaction. The assumptions of homogenous labor and complete knowledge by workers (sellers) and employers (buyers) of the offers are not realistic. In fact, individuals with identical skills confronting the same wage offer distributions may end up receiving different wage rates or different earnings. When those persons compare themselves with each other, job dissatisfaction may be caused by perceived differences in wage rates. Similarly, imperfect information in the labor market also makes a worker dissatisfied with his job if the information of a better offer is obtained later. The weakness of job search theory is that it only focuses on wages and ignores nonwage aspects of

jobs, such as work hours, skill utilization, and others.

Job matching theory is another important economic model for explaining job dissatisfaction. Jovanovic (1979) demonstrated that turnover occurs as a result of the arrival of information either about the current job match or about a possible match. He also assumed that job match is a pure experience good. It means that if a worker accepts the job offered and then experiences the job itself, then he can know the degree of quality of job matching. If there is a poor match between employee and employer, the employee is dissatisfied with his job and is more likely to change jobs. The quality of matching is measured by the wage contract between worker and firm which has the property that at each moment in time the worker is paid his "marginal" product conditional upon all the available information at that time. The quality of matching in economics is only measured in terms of marginal productivity (or wage, pay, and earnings, etc.) and it is often criticized by sociologists.

In reality, the quality of matching should be measured in more than the dimension of marginal productivity. That is, working hours and skill utilization should at least also be included. Many workers do obtain a good quality match in marginal productivity, but they may have a poor quality match in the dimensions of work hours and skill utilization. Extending from job matching theory, it is predicted that a worker is satisfied with his or her current job if the current job represents a good match and that a worker is dissatisfied with the current job if it is a poor match.

### **3. Labor Market Outcome**

Labor market outcome can be measured in different dimensions, such as earning or income, work hours, and skill utilization. Hauser (1974, 1977) has proposed the Labor Utilization Framework (LUF) to systematically measure labor market outcome. Through the efforts of Clogg (1979; Clogg and Sullivan, 1983) and Sullivan (1978), the LUF has undergone several changes in



operationalization and it has become the most widely used approach to measure labor market outcome. The current LUF includes seven categories: (1) not in the labor force, (2) discouraged worker, (3) unemployment, (4) part-time unemployed or involuntary part-time workers, (5) low-income underemployment, (6) occupational mismatch, and (7) adequately employed (Clogg, 1979; Clogg and Sullivan, 1983). This study focuses on three forms of underemployment, i.e. involuntary part-time work, low income work, and educational mismatch, plus an additional indicator – excess hours of work, to represent work hours, earnings, and skill utilization dimensions of the job. These four indicators are assumed to be caused by a latent factor – occupational incongruity. It is noted that excess hours of work may not be a problem in the developed countries, but is an important type of labor market outcome in less developed countries. Even though Taiwan's economy has reached the status of a developed country in recent years, excess hours of work still exists in the labor market and may cause job dissatisfaction.

Several theories have been applied to explain the labor market outcome. In the dimension of earnings, human capital theory (Schultz, 1961; Becker, 1975; Mincer, 1974; Ben-Porath, 1967), dual labor markets theory (Doeringer and Piore, 1971), and segmented economy theory (Averitt, 1968; Bluestone, 1970; Gordon, 1972) are the dominant streams in the literature. Also, the time allocation theory (Becker, 1965; Michael and Becker, 1973; Gronau, 1977; Pollak and Wachter, 1975) and the new home economics theory (Berk and Berk, 1983) have been formulated to deal with the dimension of work hours. Finally, most research on educational mismatch has focused on returns to schooling which are also based on the views from human capital theory. In order to shorten this paper, the detailed discussion regarding these theories are avoided, and any interest in these theories is suggested to refer to the original papers.

Whatever theory is used to explain the labor market outcome, it repre-

sents the quality of job match. Job dissatisfaction may result because of “bad” labor market outcome of the job, which is derived from a “poor match” in work hours, earning, or skill utilization’s dimension either between job expectations and job outcomes or between workers and employers. The bad labor market outcome is named occupational incongruity. Thus, it can be hypothesized that a worker with occupational incongruity may be more likely to have job dissatisfaction.

#### **4. Data and Measurements**

The data for this study come from an islandwide labor utilization survey conducted in May, 1981, by the Office of the Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics, Executive Yuan, Republic of China. The Survey utilized a national probability sample of households. The sample households were designed to be representative of all 361 townships in Taiwan. The sample consisted of 53,139 individuals 15 years old and over. However, the analysis is restricted to the 2,310 respondents who were currently employed, aged 15 to 50, and for whom complete data on occupation, years of schooling, and income were available. Limiting the analysis to currently employed persons less than 50 was done for several reasons. Older workers closer to retirement age generally have low motivation for changing jobs, or they have rationalized job-related problems. The measurement of job dissatisfaction in this study is based upon information about intentions to change the current job. Therefore, to avoid the confounding effect produced from those older workers, persons aged 51 and over the excluded from this study.

The measurement instrument used for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction often may not measure the true state of satisfaction due to the instrument itself, study situations, and other related factors. In addition to the measurement problem, the difficulty also comes from the concept of job satisfaction and its operational definitions. However, when a worker intends to change

his job, it is more certain that he is dissatisfied with his current job for one or more reasons. Based on this assumption, job dissatisfaction in this study is measured from an indirect approach by asking workers a question about their intentions to change jobs. It is based upon replies to the question: Do you want to change your job or do you need an additional job? The answer, "I want to change jobs", is taken to mean that the respondent is strongly dissatisfied with his or her current job and is coded 3. The second category of answer, "I need an additional job", indicates moderate dissatisfaction with the current job due to unsatisfactory pay, inadequate skill utilization, or other reasons, and is coded 2. The third category, coded 1, refers to the respondent who neither wants to change jobs nor needs an additional job and indicates a low degree of dissatisfaction with the job or who is satisfied with the job. It is believed that this approach can overcome some of the problems previously identified in measuring job dissatisfaction.

Labor market outcome is measured by a latent factor, i.e. occupational incongruity. And, Occupational incongruity influences four indicators--involuntary part-time work, excess hours work, relatively low income work, and educationally mismatched work. First, involuntary part-time work refers to persons who are working at part-time jobs, but who want to increase their working hours. Second, excess-hours work refers to persons whose work hours of main job are higher than the mean plus one standard deviation of work hours of total employed workers. Forty-eight hours was initially chosen because it is the maximum working hours per week under the "Labor Standards Law" in Taiwan. However, in this study, the mean of working hours in the total sample is 50.0 hours per week, with a standard deviation of 8.6 hours. The sum of these two quantities is 58.6, which rounds up to 59. Thus, a worker who works 60 or more hours per week is classified as an excess-hours worker.

Third, relatively low income work refers to workers whose monthly in-

come from their main paid jobs is less than the mean income of total employed workers, minus half of its standard deviation. In the present study, a worker is identified as a relatively low income worker if the monthly income from the job is less than 6,190 N.T. dollars which is the mean (9,918) minus half of the standard deviation ( $1/2 * 6,016$ ). This cutting point is chosen to reflect the subsistence income needed by an individual worker each month. Also, it should be noted that relatively low income here is not equivalent to poverty low income in the LUF.

Finally, educational mismatch is measured as that in LUF by using years of formal schooling and occupational categories, that is, measurement of mismatch is based on a comparison between the educational attainment of each respondent and the years of education necessary or likely to be utilized in his or her present occupation. Any worker who has more schooling than the mean plus one standard deviation in the occupation category is classified as an educationally mismatched worker. The mean and standard deviation of years of schooling are computed separately for each of sixty-two occupation categories, which were reduced from the original seventy-four categories. Occupational categories are combined with other categories in the same one digit occupation code if the sample size is less than 10. To ensure that the procedure used to collapse categories does not distort the relationship between education and occupation, an analysis of variance was conducted. The results reveal the sum of squares between occupational categories change only .07 percent and multiple R-square stays the same, indication that collapsing categories from 74 to 62 does not distort the relationship between education and occupation.

## **5. Results**

To investigate the impacts of labor market outcome on job dissatisfaction, the cross-classification of the types of occupational incongruity and job

The Impact of Labor Market Outcome on Job Dissatisfaction

Table 1: Cross-Classification of the Types of Occupational Incongruity and Job Dissatisfaction

Types of Occupational Incongruity A-I-M <sup>b</sup>	Job Dissatisfaction <sup>a</sup>						Meaning
	Frequency			Percent			
	3	2	1	3	2	1	
I. Raw Data							
1 1 1	4	4	10	0.22	0.22	0.56	
2 1 1	6	4	28	0.16	0.11	0.73	
3 1 1	135	31	407	0.24	0.05	0.71	
1 2 1	3	3	7	0.23	0.23	0.54	
2 2 1	25	9	249	0.09	0.03	0.88	
3 2 1	267	84	1976	0.11	0.04	0.85	Mismatch only
1 1 2	23	42	103	0.14	0.25	0.61	
2 1 2	40	18	321	0.11	0.05	0.84	
3 1 2	689	347	4263	0.13	0.07	0.80	Low income only
1 2 2	15	14	116	0.10	0.10	0.80	Low hours only
2 2 2	101	60	1298	0.07	0.04	0.89	Excess hours only
3 2 2	748	447	9413	0.07	0.04	0.89	Not incongruent
Total	2056	1063	18191	0.10	0.05	0.85	

<sup>a</sup>Category 3 of job dissatisfaction refers to strong job dissatisfaction.  
 Category 2 refers to moderate job dissatisfaction.  
 Category 1 refers to job satisfaction.

<sup>b</sup>A refers to work hours type. 1 = "Low Hours", 2 = "Excess Hours", and 3 = "Neither"  
 I refers to low income. 1 = "Low Income", 2 = "Not Low Income".  
 M refers to educational mismatch. 1 = "Mismatch", 2 = "Not Mismatch".

Table 2: Chi-Square Values for Some Logit Models Pertaining to Table 1

Model	Fitted Marginals	Degrees of Freedom d.f.	Likelihood-Ratio Chi-Square L <sup>2</sup>	Goodness-of-fit Chi-Square X <sup>2</sup>
H1	(MIA) (D) *	22	448.13	556.37
H2	(MIA) (DA)	18	347.80	379.13
H3	(MIA) (DI)	20	183.54	238.31
H4	(MIA) (DM)	20	383.78	475.74
H5	(MIA) (DA) (DI) (DM)	14	15.80	16.05
H6	(MIA) (DM) (DIA)	10	9.87	11.28
H7	(MIA) (DI) (DMA)	10	12.80	12.78
H8	(MIA) (DA) (DMI)	12	13.13	13.25
H9	(MIA) (DIA) (DMA)	6	6.60	7.20
H10	(MIA) (DIA) (DMA) (DMI)	4	4.47	5.00

\*A: Work Hours Type

I : Low Income

M: Educational Mismatch

D: Job Dissatisfaction

dissatisfaction shown in Table 1 was constructed. Eighty-five percent of all employed workers are not dissatisfied with their current jobs, in the sense that they neither want to change their current jobs nor do they need an additional job.

For workers not experiencing occupational incongruity or those with excess hours, 89 percent are satisfied with their current jobs, while 7 percent of them are strongly dissatisfied with their current jobs and 4 percent are moderately dissatisfied with their current jobs. Job dissatisfaction seems to relate quite clearly to the type of occupational incongruity. Workers who experience occupational incongruity on several dimensions and who are occupationally incongruent in the low income or mismatch type are more likely to want to change jobs reflecting a stronger dissatisfaction with their current jobs. Similarly, workers occupationally incongruent in low hours and joint types are more likely to state that they need an additional job which reflects moderate dissatisfaction with their current jobs.

In order to assess the effects of labor market outcome on job dissatisfac-

tion, some logit models are examined. The logit model is appropriate for this purpose because the three independent variables, A, I, and M, are discrete variables and the dependent variable, job dissatisfaction (D), is a trichotomous variable. In order to identify the logit model which has the best fit, a series of models are fitted. The results are presented in Table 2, where fitted marginals, the degrees of freedom, and the chi-square values are shown. Model H 1 is the model which assumes that occupational incongruity and job dissatisfaction are independent. That is, occupational incongruity has no effect on job dissatisfaction. From Table 2, it can be seen that model H 1 does not fit the data well ( $L^2 = 448.13$  on 22 d.f.). The hypothesis that occupational incongruity has no effect on job dissatisfaction is not acceptable. Substantively, occupational incongruity has some effects on job dissatisfaction.

Models H 2 through H 4 assume that only one type of occupational incongruity has an effect on job dissatisfaction, and they also assume that the other types of occupational incongruity have no impacts on job dissatisfaction. Model H 2 allows one to examine whether the work hours type of occupational incongruity has a statistically significant effect on job dissatisfaction. With  $L^2 (H 2) = 347.80$  on 18 d.f., the model does not fit the data well. However, the conditional test statistic,  $L^2 (H 2/H 1) = L^2 (H 1) - L^2 (H 2) = 100.33$  on 4 d.f., indicates that there is a statistically significant effect of the work hours type of occupational incongruity on job dissatisfaction. Model H 3 assumes that only low income types of occupational incongruity has an impact on job dissatisfaction and assumes that the educational mismatch type and the work hours type of occupation incongruity are independent of job dissatisfaction. The conditional test statistic,  $L^2 (H 3/H 1) = L^2 (H 1) - L^2 (H 3) = 264.59$  on 2 d.f., shows that the low income type of occupational incongruity has a statistically significant effect on job dissatisfaction, but the model again does not fit the data well. Similarly, the conditional statistic in

model H4,  $L^2(H4/H1) = 64.53$  on 2 d. f. , reveals that the educational mismatch type of occupational incongruity also has a statistically significant impact on job dissatisfaction. The work hours, low income, and educational mismatch types of occupational incongruity account for approximately 22.38, 59.04, and 14.36 percent of the variation of job dissatisfaction in the baseline model H 1, respectively.

Because the work hours, low income, and educational mismatch types of occupational incongruity separately have statistically significant effects on job dissatisfaction, model H 5 which includes the effects of these three types of occupational incongruity on job dissatisfaction simultaneously is considered next. With  $L^2(H 5) = 15.80$  on 14 d. f. , it is found that model H 5 fits the data very well. This model explains 96.47 percent of the variation in the baseline model H 1. Model H 6 through model H 10 are proposed to evaluate the effects of the interactions between the different types of occupational incongruity. Nevertheless, no significant effect of interactions between the different types of occupational incongruity on job dissatisfaction is found. Finally, model H 5 is the best fitting parsimonious logit model. This model indicated that job dissatisfaction is significantly influenced by all of the work hours, low income, and educational mismatch types of occupational incongruity.

To further analyze the effects of labor market outcome on job dissatisfaction, continuation ratio models (Fienberg, 1980, ch. 6) are used for the logit model H 5 which best fit the data. This means that the method of maximum likelihood is used to estimate the parameters for logit model H 5 by fitting two separate continuation ratio model where job dissatisfaction in each model is dichotomous rather than trichotomous. Specifically, the first continuation ratio model deals with all employed workers who are divided into two groups — workers satisfied with their jobs, coded 1, and workers that are dissatisfied, coded 2. In this model, dissatisfied workers consist of



Table 3: Estimated Parameters and Standard Errors for the Continuation Ratio Models, Job Satisfaction vs. Job Dissatisfaction (1 vs. 2 & 3) and Moderate Dissatisfaction vs. Strong Dissatisfaction (2 vs. 3)

Type of Occupational Incongruity	1 vs. (2 & 3)			2 vs. 3		
	Coefficient	Standard Error	Z-value	Coefficient	Standard Error	Z-value
Constant	1.2979	0.0491	26.41	-0.5643	0.0889	-6.34
Low hours	-0.6212	0.0821	-7.57	0.6945	0.1397	4.97
Excess hours	0.3724	0.0598	6.23	-0.3333	0.1108	-3.01
No	0.2492			-0.3612		
Low income	-0.3323	0.0202	-16.44	-0.0787	0.0393	-2.01
No	0.3323			0.0787		
Mismatch	-0.1897	0.0258	-7.35	-0.3192	0.0538	-5.93
No	0.1897			0.3192		
Model L <sup>2</sup>	9.28			6.26		
d.f.	7			7		

those with moderate job dissatisfaction and those with strong job dissatisfaction. The second continuation ratio model only looks at workers with job dissatisfaction: workers with moderate job dissatisfaction are coded 1 and workers with strong job dissatisfaction are coded 2. These two continuation ratio models are independent so that the fit of two models can be independently assessed. Moreover, the chi-square values of these two continuation ratio models add up to the  $L^2$  values for the logit model with the original trichotomous dependent variable. The use of this technique allows an examination of the differences of the effects of occupational incongruity on job dissatisfaction between satisfied workers and workers with job dissatisfaction, and to evaluate the differences between workers with moderate job dissatisfaction and workers with strong job dissatisfaction.

Table 3 presents the estimated parameters and their corresponding standard errors and Z-values for these two continuation ratio models. The estimated parameter indicates the change in the log of the expected odds on the dependent variable associated with the category change in an independent variable. Here separate coefficients for each category of the various types of occupational incongruity are shown in Table 3. A positive coefficient indicates that the log of the expected odds are increased for those in the category, relative to the mean, while a negative coefficient indicates that the log of the expected odds are decreased for those in the category. The overall fit of the model is also assessed with the likelihood ratio chi-square statistic.

In each model, the relative magnitude and direction of the effects of the various types of occupational incongruity on job dissatisfaction can be evaluated by looking at the estimated parameters for the logit model. Standard errors are reported except for the suppressed category of each variable. Coefficients are significant at the 0.05 level if they are roughly two times the size of their standard errors, and for the convenience of evaluation, Z-values are also reported in Table 3. Z-values are obtained by dividing each

coefficient by its corresponding standard error.

As shown in Table 3, all coefficients in the two continuation ratio models are statistically significant at 0.05 level because their Z-values are all greater than 2. The first continuation ratio model indicates that low hours type of occupational incongruity decreases the log of the expected odds on jobs satisfaction by 0.6212, net of the effects of other types of occupational incongruity. Low income type shortens the log of the expected odds on job satisfaction by 0.3323, and educational mismatch type drops the log of the expected odds on job satisfaction by 0.1897. This means that low hours, low income, and educational mismatch types of occupational incongruity have significantly negative relationships with job satisfaction. In substantive terms, workers with low hours, low income, or educational mismatch types of occupational incongruity are more likely to experience job dissatisfaction.

On the other hand, the excess hours type of occupational incongruity increases the log of the expected odds on job satisfaction by 0.3724. Not expectedly, excess hours has a significantly positive association with job satisfaction. In other words, workers with the excess hours type of occupational incongruity are more likely to report that they are satisfied with their current jobs. In part, this finding reflects the evidence that excess hours workers are found to have, on the average, more income than workers with no excess hours type of incongruity, and about 37 percent of excess hours workers are self-employed. It is well known that small family-owned stores or businesses are the most popular structure of economic activities in Taiwan and their business hours always tend to be considerably longer. It seems reasonable to reach a conclusion that self-employed workers tend to work longer and they work for their own business. Thus, perhaps excess hours workers are less likely to be dissatisfied. Besides, over fifty percent of excess-hours workers are employed in private companies. The longer they work, the more they earn; they will then have lower job dissatisfaction.

Similarly, the second continuation ratio model that considers only dissatisfied workers shows that low hours incongruity increases the log of the expected odds on moderate job dissatisfaction by 0.6945, controlling for the effects of other types of occupational incongruity. This implies that workers who are dissatisfied with their current jobs are more likely to express that they need an additional job, rather than that they want to change jobs if they are occupational incongruent in the low hours type. In contrast, it also shows that the excess hours type of occupational incongruity decreases the log of the expected odds on moderate job dissatisfaction by 0.3333, that the low income type of occupational incongruity lowers the log of the expected odds on moderate job dissatisfaction by 0.0787, and that the educational mismatch type of occupational incongruity lowers the log of the expected odds on moderate job dissatisfaction by 0.3192. These findings suggest that workers who are dissatisfied with their current jobs are more likely to report that they want to change jobs if they are occupational incongruity in excess hours, low income, or educationally mismatched.

In order to further understand the relationship between labor market outcome and job dissatisfaction, it is necessary to convert estimated parameters to partial odds by taking the anti-log of them. Moreover, for comparing and checking the strength of relationships, partial odds are needed to convert to odds ratio and Yule's Q. Partial odds, odds ratio, and estimated Yule's Q of estimated parameters in continuation ratio models are given in Table 4. Those that are occupationally incongruent in the low hours type are more likely to express job dissatisfaction (partial odds = 0.5371), regardless of other types of occupational incongruity; those who are occupationally incongruent in the excess hours type are more likely to state job satisfaction (partial odds = 1.4512); those who are not occupationally incongruent in the work hours type are more likely to report job satisfaction (partial odds = 1.2830). However, workers occupationally incongruent in low income are more likely

Table 4: Partial Odds, Odds Ratio, and Estimated Yule's Q of the Continuation Ratio Models, Job Satisfaction vs. Job Dissatisfaction (1 vs. 2 & 3) and Moderate Dissatisfaction vs. Strong Dissatisfaction (2 vs. 3)

Type of Occupational Incongruity	1 vs. (2 & 3)		2 vs. 3		$\hat{Q}$
	Partial Odds	Odds Ratio	Partial Odds	Odds Ratio	
A	Low hours	0.5371	0.3701	2.0027	0.4729
	Excess hours	1.4512	-0.4597	0.7166	2.7947
I	Excess hours	1.4512	0.0615	0.7166	0.0140
	No	1.2830	0.4186	0.6968	1.0284
M	Low hours	0.5371	-0.4098	2.0027	0.4837
	No	1.2830	0.5145	0.6968	2.8741
I	Low income	0.7173	-0.3206	0.9243	-0.0786
	No	1.3942	0.6843	1.0819	0.8543
M	Mismatch	0.8272	-0.1874	0.7267	-0.3088
	No	1.2089	0.5281	1.3760	0.5281

\* $\hat{Q} = (\hat{\alpha} - 1) / (\hat{\alpha} + 1)$ , where  $\hat{\alpha}$  is odds ratio.

Table 5: Predicted Log-Odds, Predicted Odds, and Predicted Probability of the Continuation Ratio Models, by the Types of Occupational Incongruity

Type of Occupational Incongruity A-I-M	Meaning	1 vs. (2 & 3)		2 vs. 3	
		Predicted Log-Odds	Predicted Odds	Predicted Log-Odds	Predicted Odds
1 1 1		0.1543	1.1668	0.5385	0.7651
2 1 1		1.1483	3.1528	0.7592	0.2738
3 1 1		1.0251	2.7874	0.7360	0.2662
1 2 1		0.8189	2.2680	0.6940	0.8956
2 2 1		1.8129	6.1282	0.8597	0.3204
3 2 1	Mismatch only	1.6897	5.4179	0.8442	0.3116
1 1 2		0.5337	1.7052	0.6303	1.4487
2 1 2		1.5277	4.6076	0.8217	0.5184
3 1 2	Low income only	1.4045	4.0735	0.8029	0.5041
1 2 2	Low hours only	1.1983	3.3145	0.7682	1.6957
2 2 2	Excess hours only	2.1923	8.9558	0.8996	0.6067
3 2 2	Not incongruity	2.0691	7.9177	0.8879	0.5900

\* $\hat{p}$  = Odds/(1 + Odds).

to express job dissatisfaction (partial odds = 0.7173). Workers who are educationally mismatched are also more likely to express job dissatisfaction (partial odds = 0.8272).

Odds ratios are simply a ratio of the odds of two variable categories. They allow one to compare the odds of corresponding at two different levels of the same variable. Also, odds ratio here is a measure of association describing the strength of the relationship between two levels of various types of occupational incongruity and job dissatisfaction. In general, an odds ratio which is very different from 1 indicates a large difference between the two odds. By looking at odds ratios in the first model, we can see that workers with low hours occupational incongruity are 0.37 times as likely to be satisfied as workers with the excess hours type of occupational incongruity, while workers with excess hours are 1.13 times as likely to be satisfied as workers with no work hours type of occupational incongruity, regardless of the other types of occupational incongruity. In addition, workers with the low hours type of occupational incongruity are 0.42 times as likely to be satisfied as workers with no work hours type of occupational incongruity, net of the effects of the other types of incongruity. These findings reveal that low hours type of incongruity is negatively associated with job satisfaction, but excess hours type is positively associated with job satisfaction. Yule's Q also reflects these findings. The association between work hours incongruity and job satisfaction is negative (-0.46) when the focus is on low hours and excess hours, and it is negative (-0.41) when low hours versus no work hours is examined. However, it is positive (0.06) when we compare low hours with no work hours. In addition, workers with low income occupational incongruity are 0.51 times as likely to be satisfied as workers with adequate income, net of the effects of the other types of occupational incongruity. The association between low income and job satisfaction is moderately negative ( $Q = -0.32$ ). It is also found that workers who are educationally mismatched are 0.68

times as likely to express job satisfaction as workers with no educational mismatch. The Q value of  $-0.18$  indicates that the association between educational mismatch and job satisfaction is negative and statistically significant. Consequently, workers with low income or educational mismatch are more likely to be dissatisfied with their current jobs.

The comparison of workers with moderate job dissatisfaction to those with strong job satisfaction are examined next. The results shown in the last three columns of Table 4 suggest that workers who are dissatisfied with their current jobs are 1.79 times more likely to express that they need an additional job, rather than want to change jobs if they are occupationally incongruent in low hours, controlling for other types of occupational incongruity. Again, comparing those low in hours and those who are congruent in work hours, it can be seen that the former are 1.87 times more likely to say that they need an additional job rather than that they want to change jobs, regardless of the effects of other types of occupational incongruity. However, the odds ratios for low income versus adequate income and for educational mismatch vs. no educational mismatch show that workers with low income or educational mismatch are more likely to report that they want to change jobs rather than needing an additional job. The Yule's Q values show that the low hours and excess hours types of occupational incongruity are positively associated with moderate job dissatisfaction, but the low income or educational mismatch type of occupational incongruity have negative associations with moderate job dissatisfaction, among the dissatisfied. The former indicates that workers are more likely to state a desire for an additional job if they are dissatisfied with their current jobs and they are occupationally incongruent in the work hours type. In contrast, the latter connotes that workers are more likely to report that they want to change jobs if they are dissatisfied with their current jobs and also are occupationally incongruent in low income or educational mismatch.



The Impact of Labor Market Outcome on Job Dissatisfaction

Finally, it should be noted that there is a stronger negative association between the low income type of occupational incongruity and job satisfaction than between educational mismatch type and job satisfaction (column 3). But, there is a stronger negative association between the educational mismatch type of occupational incongruity and moderate job dissatisfaction than between low income and moderate job dissatisfaction.

Furthermore, estimated parameters can be added together to obtain a predicted log-odds for the categories of the dependent variable, i.e., job sat-

Table 6: Estimated Parameters and Standard Errors of Two Contrasts, Job Satisfaction vs. Job Dissatisfaction (Contrast 1) and Moderate Dissatisfaction vs. Strong Dissatisfaction (Contrast 2), for the Multinomial Logit Model

Type of Occupational Incongruity		Coefficient	Standard Error	Z-value
A	Constant (1)*	1.3907	0.0342	40.60
	Constant (2)	-0.5656	0.0889	-6.36
	Low hours (1)	-0.4313	0.0554	-7.79
	Excess hours (1)	0.2543	0.0410	6.21
	Low hours (2)	0.6763	0.1389	4.87
	Excess hours (2)	-0.3160	0.1099	-2.88
I	Low income (1)	-0.2131	0.0141	-15.10
	Low income (2)	-0.0809	0.0389	-2.08
M	Mismatch (1)	-0.0835	0.0194	-4.31
	Mismatch (2)	-0.3185	0.0538	-5.92
Model L <sup>2</sup>		15.80		
d.f.		14		

\* The figure in the parenthesis refers to the contrast number.

isfaction versus job dissatisfaction in the first model, and moderate job dissatisfaction versus strong job dissatisfaction in the second model. Estimated parameters then can be converted to predicted odds and further to predicted probability. To clarify what the probability is of being satisfied or moderately dissatisfied for a worker with a certain type of occupational incongruity, the predicted probability for workers with various types of occupational in-

congruity must be calculated. The results reported in Table 5 indicate that approximately 16 (1-0.84) percent of workers with educational mismatch only are expected to report job dissatisfaction, compared to 20 (1-0.80) percent with low income only. Likewise, approximately 23 (1-0.77) percent of workers only with low hours type of occupational incongruity are expected to express job dissatisfaction, compared to 10 (1-0.90) and 11 (1-0.89) percent for workers with only excess hours and for workers who are not occupationally incongruity, respectively.

Quite clearly, workers with the job types of occupational incongruity have lower expected probabilities of job satisfaction than other workers. In other words, workers with joint types of occupational incongruity have higher expected probabilities of job dissatisfaction than other workers. The predicted probabilities shown in the last column of Table 5 indicate that about 76 (1-0.24) percent of dissatisfied workers with educational mismatch only are expected to state strong job dissatisfaction, while 66 (1-0.34) percent of dissatisfied workers with low income type only are expected to express strong job dissatisfaction. As noted previously, dissatisfied workers with low hours only have the highest expected probability to be moderately dissatisfied, i.e., 63 percent. Dissatisfied workers with low income and educational mismatch types of occupational incongruity have the highest expect probability (1-0.21 = 0.79) indicating strong job dissatisfaction. Indeed, these results confirm the findings of the previous discussion.

A second approach to looking at the effects of various types of occupational incongruity on job dissatisfaction is based on the linear contrast in the log-linear model or logit model (Fienberg, 1981; Haberman, 1979; Bishop et al., 1975). The advantage of this approach is that it allows us to examine some linear contrasts simultaneously. It utilizes full information from the data to estimate parameters for the specified model, while the individual continuation ratio model only uses part of the information provided by the

original cross-classified data, through recombination of categories. Hence, estimated parameters based on the linear contrast approach are expected to differ from those obtained from separate continuation ratio models. Henceforth, we use two linear contrast, (2, -1, -1) and (0, 1, -1), which are orthogonal, to examine the effects of the various types of occupational incongruity on job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction simultaneously. Results are shown in Table 6, where estimated parameters, standard errors, and Z-values are provided. Clearly, all coefficients are statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Virtually, all the relationships between the various types of occupational incongruity and job dissatisfaction are consistent with the findings derived from Table 3, but the magnitudes of the effects display some differences from those presented earlier.

The coefficients of contrast 1 indicate that low-hours workers are more likely to be dissatisfied, but excess-hours workers are more likely to be satisfied. Again, workers with the low income or educational mismatch types of incongruity are more likely to be dissatisfied. The coefficients of contrast 2 show that dissatisfied workers are more likely to express that they want to change job if they are incongruent in excess hours, low income, or educationally mismatched. However, they are more likely to need an additional job if they are low-hours in congruent among dissatisfied workers.

## **6. Conclusion**

The major objective of this paper was to examine the effects of labor market outcome on job dissatisfaction in Taiwan. The data on labor utilization taken from a cross-sectional survey of Taiwan's labor force have been elaborated and provided insight into this relationship. Job dissatisfaction in this study is measured from an indirect approach by examining workers' intentions to change jobs. This approach is based on the assumption that a worker is dissatisfied with his current job for some reasons when he intends to

change his job. As expected, labor market outcome significantly affected job dissatisfaction. In other words, all of the work hours, low income, and educationally mismatched types of incongruity have significant effects on job dissatisfaction. In substantive terms, workers were more likely to experience job dissatisfaction if they were incongruent in low hours, low income, and educational mismatch. However, contrary to expectations, workers experiencing excess hours of incongruity were more likely to be satisfied.

The significant positive relationship between educational mismatch and job dissatisfaction was consistent with the finding of Burris (1983). Among dissatisfied workers, those who were incongruent in excess hours, low income, and educational mismatch were more likely to report that they wanted to change jobs, but those who were incongruent in low hours were more likely to express that they needed an additional job.

There was a stronger positive association between low income incongruity and job dissatisfaction than between educational mismatch and job dissatisfaction. However, there was a stronger positive association between educationally mismatched incongruity and strong job dissatisfaction than between low income incongruity and strong job dissatisfaction. These findings suggested that low income is more powerful in predicting job dissatisfaction than educational mismatch, but the latter is more powerful in predicting the intention to change jobs than the former. This result provides an important beginning in the understanding of the relationship between educational mismatch (or overeducation) and job dissatisfaction. However, these findings have provided convincing evidence that labor market outcome should be incorporated into models of the job dissatisfaction process.

Moreover, there are several possible reasons why this study has found educational mismatch useful in explaining job dissatisfaction and strong job dissatisfaction, whereas Glenn and Weaver (1982) failed to find any effect. One possible reason may be that Taiwan is a different context than the

United States. A second possibility is that the measure of job dissatisfaction used in the present study was more successful in dealing with the global concept of job dissatisfaction. A third possibility is that the indicator of educational mismatch more nearly tapped the concept of overeducation.

Having examined the impacts of labor market outcome on job dissatisfaction, several directions for further research emerge. First, additional research could profitably take up the issue of net effects of labor market outcome on job dissatisfaction after taking the influences of personal resources, job characteristics, and the characteristics of labor markets into account. Second, greater attention to the impact of business cycles on the relationship between labor market outcome and job dissatisfaction over time might expand the understanding of job dissatisfaction. Third, whether the effects of labor market outcome on job dissatisfaction varies by overall labor market conditions also needs to be examined. Finally, more research on the causes of labor underutilization, including involuntary part-time work, low income work, and educationally mismatched work which have been found to have significant effects on job dissatisfaction, is necessary so that policies can be formulated to improve labor utilization, to adjust the educational programs, or to enhance manpower planning.

## References

Adams, J.S.

1963 "Wage Inequities, Productivity, and Work Quality," *Industrial Relations*, 3: 9-16.

Averitt, R.T.

1968 *The Dual Economy: The Dynamics of American Industry Structure*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Inc.

Becker, G.S.

1965 "A Theory of the Allocation of Time," *Economic Journal*, 75:

493-517.

1975 *Human Capital*. (2nd ed.) New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, Columbia University Press.

Ben-Porath, Y.

1967 "The Production of Human Capital and the Life Cycle of Earning," *Journal of Political Economy*, 75: 352-365.

Berk, R.A. and S.F. Berk

1983 "Supply-side Sociology of the Family: The Challenge of the New Home Economics," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9: 375-395.

Bielby, W.T. and J.N. Baron

1983 "Organizations, Technology, and Worker Attachment to the Firm," in D.J. Treiman and R. V. Robinson (eds.), *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility: A Research Annual*. Vol. 2. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.

Bluestone, B.

1970 "The Tripartite Economy: Labor Markets and the Working Poor," *Poverty and Human Resources*, 5: 15-35.

Burdett, K.

1978 "A Theory of Employee Job Search and Quit Rates," *The American Economic Review*, 68: 212-220.

Burris, V.

1983 "The Social and Political Consequences of Overeducation," *American Sociological Review*, 48: 454-467.

Carter, K.A.

1982 "Inadequacies of the Traditional Labor Force Framework for Rural Areas: A Labor Utilization Framework Applied to Survey Data," *Rural Sociology*, 47: 459-474.

Clogg, C.C.

1979 *Measuring Underemployment: Demographic Indicators for the*

*United States*. New York: Academic Press.

Clogg, C.C.

- 1980 "Characterizing the Class Organization of Labor Market Opportunity: A Modified Latent Structure Approach," *Sociological Methods and Research*, 8: 243-272.

Clogg, C.C. and T.A. Sullivan

- 1983 "Labor Force Composition and Underemployment Trends, 1969-1980," *Social Indicators Research*, 12: 117-152.

Cope, D.

- 1979 "Understanding the Concept of Job Satisfaction," in R.G. Sell and P. Shipley (eds.), *Satisfactions in Work Design: Ergonomics and Other Approaches*. London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.

Doeringer, P.B. and M.J. Piore

- 1971 *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis*. Lexington, Mass.: Heath.

Glenn, N.D. and C.N. Weaver

- 1982 "Further Evidence on Education and Job Satisfaction," *Social Forces*, 61: 46-55.

Gordon, D.M.

- 1972 *Theories of Poverty and Underemployment*., Lexington, Mass.: Heath.

Gronau, R.

- 1977 "Leisure, Home Production, and Work: The Theory of the Allocation of Time Revisited," *Journal of Political Economy*, 85: 1099-1124.

Hauser, P.M.

- 1974 "The Measurement of Labor Utilization," *Malayan Economic Review*, 19: 1-17.

Hornung, C.A.

Journal of Social Sciences and Philosophy

1977 "Social Status, Status Inconsistency and Psychological Stress," *American Sociological Review*, 42: 623-638.

1980 "Status Inconsistency, Achievement Motivation, and Psychological Stress," *Social Science Research*, 9: 362-380.

House, J.S. and E.B. Harkin

1975 "Why and When Is Status Inconsistency Stressful?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 81: 395-412.

Jackson, E.F.

1962 "Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress," *American Sociological Review*, 27: 469-480.

Janson, P. and J.K. Martin

1982 "Job Satisfaction and Age: A Test of Two Views," *Social Forces*, 60: 1089-1120.

Jovanovic, B.

1979 "Job Matching and the Theory of Turnover," *Journal of Political Economy*, 87: 972-990.

Kalleberg, A.L.

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

Kalleberg, A.L. and L.J. Griffin

1978 "Positional Sources of Inequality in Job Satisfaction," *Sociology of Work and Occupation*, 5: 371-401.

Kalleberg, A.L. and K.A. Loscocco

1983 "Aging, Values, and Rewards: Explaining age Differences in Job Satisfaction," *American Sociological Review*, 48: 78-90.

Lenski, G.

1954 "Status Crystallization: A Non-vertical Dimension of Social Status," *American Sociological Review*, 19: 405-413.

Locke, E.A.



The Impact of Labor Market Outcome on Job Dissatisfaction

- 1976 "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction," In M.D. Dunnette (ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Maslow, A.H.
- 1970 *Motivation and Personality*. (2nd ed.) New York: Harper and Row.
- Mattila, J.P.
- 1974 "Job Quitting and Frictional Unemployment," *American Economic Review*, 64: 235-239.
- Michael, R.T. and G.S. Becker
- 1973 "On the New Theory of Consumer Behavior," *Swedish Journal of Economics*, 75: 378-396.
- Mincer, J.
- 1974 *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*. New York: National Bureau of Economy Research, Columbia University Press.
- Mobley, W.H.
- 1977 "Intermediate Linkages in the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62: 237-240.
- Mobley, W.H., S.O. Horner, and A.T. Hollingsworth
- 1978 "An Evaluation of Precursors of Hospital Employee Turnover," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63: 408-414.
- Oskamp, S.
- 1984 *Applied Social Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Pearlin, L.I.
- 1975 "Status Inequality and Stress in Marriage," *American Sociological Review*, 40: 344-357.
- Pollak, R.A. and M.L. Wachter

Journal of Social Sciences and Philosophy

- 1975 "The Relevance of the Household Production Function and Its Implications for the Allocation of Time," *Journal of Political Economy*, 83: 255-277.

Rumberger, R. W.

- 1981 *Overeducation in the U.S. Labor Market*. New York: Praeger.

Schultz, T. W.

- 1961 "Investment in Human Capital," *American Economic Review*, 51: 10-17.

Steers, Richard M. and Richard T. Mowday

- 1981 "Employee Turnover and Post-decision Accommodation Processes," in L.L. Cummings and B.M. Staw (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 3, Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press Inc.

Sullivan, T. A.

- 1978 *Marginal Workers, Marginal Jobs: The Underutilization of American Workers*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Verhaegen, P.

- 1979 "Work Satisfaction in Present-day Working Life: Ergonomics and Work Satisfaction," in R.G. Sell and P. Shipley (eds.), *Satisfaction in Work Design: Ergonomics and Other Approaches*. London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.

## 勞動市場的不良結果對勞動者 工作不滿意的影響

謝雨生

### 摘要

本研究的主要目的是要檢驗勞動市場的不良結果(“bad” labor market outcome)對勞動者工作不滿意的影響。而以改換工作的傾向來測量工作不滿意，這是基於一個假定：有改換工作傾向的勞動者，通常是對其目前的工作有所不滿意。本研究之研究假設為：不良的勞動市場結果對工作不滿意有顯著的正影響效果。研究結果支持這個研究假設。非志願性的部份時間、超長工時、低所得、以及教育職業不配合等工作，都對勞動者的工作不滿意有顯著的影響。除了超長工時的工作對工作不滿意有顯著的負影響效果外，其餘三種類型的職業不協調，對工作不滿意都有顯著的正影響效果。換句話說，如果一個勞動者經驗到非志願性部份時間、低所得、或教育職業不配合等工作，比較會不滿意他或她目前的工作；而超長工時的勞動者則比較不會不滿意他或她目前的工作。報告中對於這個領域未來的研究方向亦有所討論。