In presenting the dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from the Georgia Institute of Technology, I agree that the Library of the Institute shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to copy from, or to publish from, this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written, or, in his absence, by the Dean of the Graduate Division when such copying or publication is solely for scholarly purposes and does not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from, or publication of, this dissertation which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without written permission.

// n n n n . -

NEED SATISFACTION AND ABSENTEEISM

A THESIS

Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate Division

bу

Charles Richard Martin

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Psychology

Georgia Institute of Technology

December 1971

NEED SATISFACTION AND ABSENTEEISM

Approved:

Chairman

1 M 1 12

Date approved by chairman: 6 Dec 1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Edward H. Loveland for serving as my thesis advisor. His enthusiasm and guidance during the investigation of this problem were greatly appreciated by the author. I would also like to thank Dr. Stanley A. Mulaik and Dr. Morris Mitzner for contributing their time and advice as members of the reading committee.

My wife, Linda, generously contributed her typing skills, but her keen sense of humor and constant optimism aided even more toward the completion of this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOW	LEDGMENTS	íi
LIST O	F TABLES	v
SUMMAR	Y	vii
СНАРТЕ	R	
I.	INTRODUCTION AND RELATED RESEARCH	1
	Costs to Industry Measurement of Absences Literature Review	
II.	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	36
III.	PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY	42
	Subjects Job Satisfaction Ouestionnaire Data Collection The Criterion Analytic Design	
IV.	RESEARCH FINDINGS AND RELATED DISCUSSION	53
	Job Satisfaction and Absence Frequency Job Satisfaction Moderated by Age, Length of Service, Salary, and Job Level Multi-dimensional Aspects of Job Satisfaction and Their Relationship to Absence Behavior Employee Perceptions of Mistreatment and Absence Frequency Absence Behavior and Perceptions of Absenteeism as a Problem Employment History, Number of Dependents, and Attendance Behavior	
v.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	78

Table of Contents Continued

																					Page
APPENDIX A							•				•	•	•	•	•		•			•	78
APPENDIX B	•	•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•					•	•	•	•	97
BIBLIOGRAPI	ΙΥ															٠					148

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Product-moment Correlations Between Absence Frequency and Three Overall Job Satisfaction Measures	54
2.	Product-moment Correlations Between Job Satisfaction Within High and Low Moderator Subgroups	58
3.	Significance of Multiple and Moderated Multiple Correlation Coefficients	60
4.	Comparison of Product-moment, Multiple, and Moderated Multiple Correlations Between Overall Job Satisfaction Measures and Absence Frequency	63
5.	Intercorrelation Matrix of Cluster Scores on Evaluative Scale	67
6.	Intercorrelation Matrix of Cluster Scores on Difference Scale	68
7.	Intercorrelation Matrix of Cluster Scores on Weighted Difference Scale	69
8.	Intercorrelation Matrix of Cluster Scores on Importance Scale	70
9.	Product-moment Correlations Between Absence Frequency and Employee Perceptions of Mistreatment	72
10.	Difference Between Mean Frequency of Absences for Subjects Who Do or Do Not Feel Mistreated	73
11.	Product-moment Correlations Between Perceptions of Absenteeism as a Problem and Absence Frequency	74
12.	Completely Randomized Factorial Analysis of Variance of Absence	76
13.	Intercorrelations Among Items on the Evaluative Scale .	99
14.	Intercorrelations Among Items on the Difference Scale .	115
15.	Intercorrelations Among Items on the Weighted Difference Scale	131

Tab1e		Page
16.	Intercorrelations Among Items on the Importance Scale	137
17.	Factor Pattern Matrix of Evaluative Scale Items	143
18.	Factor Pattern Matrix of Difference Scale Items	144
19.	Factor Pattern Matrix of Weighted Difference Scale Items	145
20.	Factor Pattern Matrix of Importance Scale Items	146
21.	Multiple Correlation of Frequency of Absences with Four Demographic Variables and Expressions of Overall Job Satisfaction	147

SUMMARY

An often quoted study by Metzner and Mann (1953) reported no association between expressions of job satisfaction and group-absence data for female, white-collar employees. Until recently no evidence has been presented which indicates that considerations of job satisfaction are important for understanding attendance violations by women. In 1971, however, Waters and Roach reported a negative relationship between individual indices of absence frequency and job satisfaction for nonsupervisory female office workers.

The present study, which was begun before the publication by Waters and Roach, used secretaries at an educational institution as subjects. The 165 subjects were administered a 63 item job satisfaction questionnaire based on an existing questionnaire (Loveland, Ronan, and York, 1968). The number of times individuals were absent over a six month period was also computed. The findings confirm the Waters and Roach results. That is, significant negative relationships were discovered between frequency of absences for individuals and three overall measures of job satisfaction.

One measure of overall job satisfaction consisted of the employee's evaluation of the amount of satisfaction she derived from her job.

A second measure was an estimate of the employee's desire for more job
satisfaction, expressed as the difference between her expectations of
how much satisfaction should exist and her evaluation of how much
actually existed (Porter, 1962). The third measure was computed as

the product of the employee's expressed desire for more job satisfaction and the importance of job satisfaction to the individual.

The present findings provide some support for the theoretical positions of Vroom (1964) and Gibson (1966) who feel that employees who are not attracted to their work will tend to be absent more often. Support was also mounted for Ewen's (1967) contention that nothing is gained by weighting a total job-satisfaction score with the importance of job satisfaction to an individual.

The possibility that age, job level, salary, and length of service moderate the relationship between overall job satisfaction and frequency of absences was examined by use of subgroup analysis (Frederiksen and Melville, 1954) and moderated multiple regression (Saunders, 1956). No indication of an interaction between any one of the demographic items and overall job satisfaction was noted. However, each of the four demographic items was found to account for additional variance in absence behavior beyond that attributed to overall job satisfaction.

Second- and third-degree polynomial equations employing an overall job satisfaction measure as the independent variable, were calculated to investigate possible nonlinear relationships with absence frequency. No stronger relationships were noted between overall job satisfaction and the criterion than had been established previously with first degree equations.

Clusters of salient items on the job satisfaction questionnaire were obtained by utilizing principal axes factor analyses and oblimin rotations. Four sets of cluster scores, one each for the four ques-

tionnaire rating scales employed, were used as independent variables.

Only two clusters, overall job satisfaction and campus mail service,

were significantly related to frequency of absences.

Employees who felt mistreated, compared to other employees, with respect to salary increases or promotion consideration were not found to be absent more frequently than those secretaries who felt more equitably treated. These results were contrary to the findings presented by Patchen (1960). Also in contrast to the absenteeism literature (Naylor and Vincent, 1957; Gadourek, 1965), possession of dependent relatives and/or a history of many previous jobs were not found to be characteristics of those secretaries having more absences.

Secretaries who worked for supervisors who were perceived as being concerned with absenteeism as a problem were discovered to be absent more frequently. This finding is opposite to the results reported by Tucker and Lotz (1957). Whereas, White (1960) found a negative relationship between employee concern for absenteeism and attendance behavior, no relationship was noted between absence frequency and employee concern for absenteeism in this study.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND RELATED RESEARCH

Costs to Industry

Industrial absenteeism is a problem which has been minimized or ignored by many within the ranks of management. As a slow drainage of manpower from industry, absenteeism fails to attract the urgent attention which accompanies phenomena such as strikes by large unions. Yet, more time is lost through absences than through strikes.

In a recent management journal article (Balfour, 1971), the extent of the absenteeism problem was profiled for the British economy. The ratio of time lost from absenteeism to time lost from strikes, during a year in which many strikes occurred, was estimated to be over 100 days lost through absenteeism for every one day lost through strikes. During 1958 and 1969, years listed as severe strike periods, companies were reported to have lost six to eight million working days through strikes, compared to 600 million days lost through absences. In Britain, West Germany, Sweden, and Italy, a trend toward more frequent short-term absences due to sickness was noted.

Commenting on the relationship between absenteeism and the American economy, Kearns (1970) estimated that a one percent rise in the absentee rate in a plant of 1,000 employees would cost approximately \$150,000 per year. Kearns stated that, as of January 1970, the American industry had a minimum absentee rate of three and one-half percent of scheduled working time, whereas a rate exceeding two percent was

considered excessive.

Among the costs of absenteeism to industry are the expense of replacing an absent worker, the costs of fringe benefits when there is no work in return, and the loss of efficiency resulting from the use of untrained or fatigued overtime workers. A description of the cost of sickness absences to both industry and the employee, placed the annual cost at ten billion dollars for American industry as a whole, and 66 million dollars for the Bell System alone (Plummer, 1960).

Measurement of Absences

The investigation of this problem area has been hindered by the abundance of indices of absenteeism used and the lack of comparable definitions of absence (Heneman, Comaford, Jasmin, and Nelson, 1961; Gaudet, 1963). The disparity among definitions of absence results from the failure to categorize employee attendance violations uniformly as tardy or absent and excused or unexcused. However, these are not the only dichotomous classifications used in American industry. Gaudet listed over 24 such dichotomies, many of which appear redundant and subject to misinterpretation.

American Management Association recorded absences by the number of days absent or number of times absent per individual. Such individual measures allow for the comparison of individual absence records within organizational units. The next method used most often was the computation of the same records by plant, work group, division, or organizational unit. With such group measures, one may only compare absence records between organizational units. The remaining companies in the survey reported

using any one of the many absence rates which are available.

The most common absence rates found in the literature are the frequency rate, the severity rate, the disability rate, and the ineffective rate. One may compute individual and group absence criteria using each of the four rates. The group frequency rate is defined as the average number of separate periods, regardless of the number of days involved, during which individuals in a certain group have been absent within a particular interval of time. The individual frequency rate refers to the number of periods during which a certain individual has been absent within a given time interval. The group severity rate is defined as the average time lost per absence for a certain period of time. An individual severity rate, on the other hand, refers to the time lost per absence for a single employee. The group disability rate is computed as the average time lost per employee per unit of time. However, for the individual disability rate the total time lost per individual employee per unit of time is calculated. The disability rate may also be thought of as the product of the frequency and severity rates. The ineffective rate is calculated as the number of man-days lost within a given period of time divided by the product of the average number of employees for that period of time and the number of days of work scheduled. The individual ineffective rate is simply the number of man-days lost by an individual divided by the number of work days scheduled.

A total of 41 formulas were presented for discussion by Gaudet.

The majority of the different measures were variations on the four basic formulas. Of the 41 formulas, four group measures of absence behavior

appear frequently in the literature: (1) the "Other Reasons Absence Rate" (ratio of the number of days lost through absence other than certified sickness x 100, to the number of employees x the number of scheduled days); (2) the "Blue Monday Index" (difference between the total of Friday's and Monday's absentees for the period under observation x 100, divided by the average number employed); (3) the "Daily Variations Absence Rate" (difference between the total number of absences on the best and worst attendance days of the week x 100, divided by the number of weeks under consideration x the average number of employees during the period) and; (4) the "Worst Day Index" (difference between the total number of absences on the best and worst attendance days of the week, divided by the number of weeks and expressed per 100 workers).

As can be seen from the previous discussion, different rates require different methods of collecting absence records and provide indices of attendance behavior which cannot be compared meaningfully. Therefore, an awareness of the distinctions among the various absence rates provides a better perspective when examining the findings on absenteeism in the literature.

<u>Literature Review</u>

In addition to the diversity of absence indices employed, a review of the literature on absenteeism revealed that heterogeneous occupations and job levels were often included in the same sample. Similarly, many studies failed to control for the interaction of the stated independent variables and other "logically" pertinent variables. Such methodological handicaps hindered efforts to review the specific

factors influencing absence behavior. Nonetheless, an attempt is made in the following pages to discuss those variables to which work attendance appears related. The sections are separated according to the independent variables which are given consideration, e. g., sex, marital status and number of dependents, wage level, day of the week, shifts worked, and incidence of pay day. Also discussed are the influences of employment level, length of service, supervision, the physical conditions of the work, the distance to work, job classification and job level, personality, organization size, and employee attitudes toward their jobs.

Age

The rationale for studying the effects of aging on work attendance includes the hypothesized changes in life style that accompany aging, the cultural and generational demands which are implicit in different age categories, and the self-perception aspects of age (Gadourek, 1965). Recognizing that the worker's perception of job responsibility changes with age, Gibson (1966) postulated that work identification might be expected to solidify with age so that absence frequency should decline, while absence duration, because of ill health, could be expected to increase. However, the last few years of work were predicted to be accompanied by increased frequency of absences as job responsibility diminished and avocational activities were gradually substituted.

Findings reported in the absenteeism literature, being inconsistent with respect to age, do not lend themselves to an easy adoption of Gibson's age-absenteeism explanation. Eight different studies indicated that younger workers are absent more frequently and/or that

older employees are absent longer. For approximately 22,000 male and female electrical company employees, Tucker and Lotz (1951) found that both of the above relationships existed when they used age 45 as the boundary between "young" and "old." Kahne, Ryder, Snegireff, and Wyshak (1957), using the same age for the old-young dichotomy, reported identical results for 619 plant workers representing both sexes and differing skill levels. Duration of absence was measured by the average length of time lost per absence and frequency was indicated by the average number of times absent per 100 scheduled work days. For approximately 150 white-collar male electrical power workers, Metzner and Mann (1953) reported that the lowest absence group was composed of fewer members under 30 years of age. These investigators failed to find this relationship for white-collar women or blue-collar Schenet (1945) cited evidence that, for approximately 900 warplant workers, age was not significantly related to the number of days lost by the group, but that females over age 40 tended to be absent longer than younger women. For 113 Swedish production line workers, Lennerlof (1966) established a negative relationship between age and frequency of "no reason" absences, as well as between age and leave of absence time taken. Gadourek (1965), in a factor analysis of background and job satisfaction data for 2,209 Dutch workers from differing plants, reported age to be positively correlated with the number of days missed, but not with the number of times absent. Gadourek's results were consistent for both individual and group indices of absence behavior.

Although the significance of the difference was not tested,

Noland (1946) found that the mean absenteeism records were lower (3.055 days per month) for workers under age 30 when compared to older workers who were absent 3.299 days per month. These findings for 861 Morse Chain Company employees agree with Gibson's theory on absence duration, but no absence frequency data were included in the study. Gadourek reported that the Netherlands Institute for Preventive Medicine also found a positive relationship between the total number of days lost and the number of people in the higher age categories.

Seven studies offered information contrary to Gibson's hypothesized relationship between age and absence behavior. Two results, indicating that younger workers are absent for longer durations, were cited by Jackson (1944) and Liddell (1954). Male machine shop workers in the age category 26-35 were reported by Jackson to have had fewer total days lost than employees under and over this age range. The total number of absences "without permission" was reported to decrease with age. Liddell stated that of 2,300 coal workers at one colliery, men under 35 years of age were voluntarily absent for more weeks per year than were older workers.

Baumgartel and Sobol (1959) studied approximately 500 white-collar, non-managerial female airline employees. Those employees in jobs characterized by higher mean ages had a higher mean number of times absent (.01 < \underline{p} < .05), but not a higher mean number of days absent. Kossoris (1948) found a consistent downward trend, with increasing age, for "Other Reason Absence Rates" in men, but no definite trend was established for women. Citing an earlier, unpublished study, Behrend (1959)

reported that the "Other Reason Absence Rate" and "Blue Monday Index" were highest for men below the age of 30. For both single and married women, the "Other Reason Absence Rate" reached its peak for those below age 40, while the "Blue Monday Index" was highest between the ages of 30 and 39.

Mare and Sergean (1961) observed that the results of longitudinal studies do not support the findings of cross-sectional age studies which indicate that high absence frequency is characteristic of younger people. They also found a positive relationship between aging and certified sickness, but no relationship between absence frequency and age. In 1965 Cooper and Payne described a longitudinal study among long-service employees which also produced results differing from the usual crosssectional studies. Three firms within the same company were examined. The men in the first firm had 38.58 mean years of service. In the second and third firms, the mean lengths of service were 31.88 and 38.97 years respectively. Among 89 men in the first organization, both the absence frequency per man and the absence duration per man, for certified sickness and permitted absence, showed a systematic increase over a 35 year period. Over a 15 year period in the second firm, there was an increase in the length but not the frequency of certified sickness absences for the 147 men employed. The third firm was similar to the first in that frequency and duration of absence for certified sickness increased with age for the 156 men observed over a 15 year period. Whereas these studies support Gibson's expectation that longer duration of absences will accompany the aging process, evidence was produced that frequency of absences does not decrease with age.

Four studies failed to establish a relationship between age and absence behavior. Covner (1958) could find no relationship between age and mean number of days absent in a sample of 868 nonsupervisory employees of both sexes. The number of days absent for 220 clerical workers was found to be unrelated to age when investigated by Naylor and Vincent (1959). In a study of 21,000 male Dutch factory workers, Fortuin (1955) also failed to report a relationship between age and the mean number of sickness absences per worker. Behrend (1959) stated that her 1951 investigation found no relationship between age and Monday absenteeism for men. Evidence appears to be equally weighted in support of and in opposition to the contention that younger employees are more frequently absent while older workers stay absent longer. Longitudinal research in this area similar to the work by Cooper and Payne (1965) might prove fruitful.

Sex

Nine studies, using various measures of the absence criterion, reported more absenteeism among female employees. The measures of absenteeism were days per year (Tucker and Lotz, 1957), mean number of absences per month (Metzner and Mann, 1953), mean days absent per year (Baumgartel and Sobol, 1959), average length of time lost per absence, average number of absences per 100 scheduled work days, and average number of days absent per 100 scheduled work days (Kahne, Ryder, Snegireff, and Wyshak, 1957), number of man days lost by individual absence per total potential work days (Canfield and Soash, 1955; Gales, 1955), average number of days lost per employee (Schenet, 1945), percentage of working time lost (Jackson, 1944; White, 1960), and

number of absences per 1,000 employees (White, 1960).

In another study (Kerr, Kopplemeir, and Sullivan, 1951) found, using a non-specified measure, a high rate of unexcused absences to be associated "with low job satisfaction, low turnover, departmental job heterogeneith, low conversation opportunity and a larger portion of males." However, the authors failed to isolate the effects of sex from the contribution made by job grade and thwarted social needs.

Covner (1950) reported that the distribution of absences per month was similar for both men and women in a manufacturing plant.

Behrend (1959) suggested that the higher rates of absence among women might be a function of the type work which they do. She observed little voluntary absenteeism among female teachers, but found this result to contrast sharply with records for women in unskilled jobs. Metzner and Mann (1953) also reported that the difference between the frequencies of absence for the two sexes disappeared in the higher level white-collar positions. In a later study Isambert-Jamati (1962) found evidence that women with high level positions in skilled jobs were absent infrequently.

There is little support for an explanation of absence behavior based on the physiological differences between the sexes. Smith (1950) hypothesized that the menstrual cycle could affect the industrial efficiency of female workers. Studying women in three different industries, she found that the high absence rates, measured as man-days lost, did not occur consistently in the pre-menstrual, menstrual, or post-menstrual periods. Reviewers of the topic, such as Behrend (1959) and Gadourek (1965), seem convinced that physiological factors are minor considera-

tions. Instead they view the societal expectations concerning the female role (family tasks and jobs offered in industry) as well as the self-expectations (especially concerning fraility and competence) as fruitful areas of research. In addition to societal expectations and self-expectations, Gadourek (1965) suggested that other variables and their relationship with sex be considered. He noted that most studies fail to examine the simultaneous effects of sex, age, and seniority on absence behavior.

Marital Status and Number of Dependents

Family responsibility is another factor which has been examined with respect to differences in absence behavior. Behrend (1959) attempted to explain the divergent results concerning absence behavior and family responsibility by postulating that female absences correlate positively with the number of children because of increased home demands made upon the mother. For men, the correlation between number of dependents and absences is negative, she argued, because being dismissed for excessive absences would leave the male unable to meet his family responsibilities.

Seven studies provided results which fit reasonably well within Behrend's explanation. Liddell (1954) reported that single male coal workers lost more weeks per year in voluntary absence than did men with family responsibilities. In a study of approximately 2,400 Indians, Europeans, and native male workers in South Africa, Lapping (1953) found that single Indians and Europeans had higher percentages of working days lost than did married Indians and Europeans. Native South African married men, whose wives lived out of town in reserves, behaved like

the previously mentioned single workers and were absent more than the natives with wives in the city.

The percent of working time absent for single males with no dependents, as reported by Jackson (1944), slightly surpassed the average of seven percent for the machine shop being studied. percentage was higher for single males with one or two dependents and for married males with no dependents. As the number of dependents of married males increased, the absence rate was found to decrease. Kahn, Ryder, Snegireff, and Wyshak (1957) stated that for married men under age 45, absence frequency rates tended to decrease with increasing family ties. Also in agreement with Behrend's theory, Noland (1946) found that male workers with better absenteeism records (days per month) had a greater number of dependents than those workers with poor records. For female clerical workers, Naylor and Vincent (1959) reported a significant (p < .01) positive relationship between the number of days absent and the possession of dependents. Behrend (1959) reported that married women working in a food-processing plant had a higher Monday absenteeism rate than single women and a higher Other Reason Absence Rate than for the factory as a whole.

Shepherd and Walker (1958) found that the relationship between the average number of absences and average number of shifts lost per 100 men, among the six wage levels examined, was "U" shaped with respect to increasing family responsibility. This same relationship was found for absence without permission and sickness absences, except that the "U" shape was more well-defined in the low pay groups. Waters and Roach (1971) reported no significant relationship between marital status

and frequency of absences for 160 non-supervisory female office employees. Gadourek (1965) in his factor analytic study of the attitudinal, social, personal, and work group characteristics of male Dutch workers found a low, but statistically significant correlation between absence frequency and possession of children. One interpretation of this finding was that married workers with children accepted better paying, yet more dangerous work and, therefore, were exposed to greater possibility of injury.

Wage Level

From the seven studies encountered, there was no clear indication that either employees making high or low wages are more often absent or absent for longer periods of time. Gibson (1966) offered two explanations of such diverse findings with respect to wage level and absence behavior. These interpretations would appear to apply not only to salary but also to job level, since these are usually related. The first explanation given was that at higher levels of wage and responsibility, a worker may feel that he has to be present at work to set an example or to insure future advancement. The second explanation offered was that a person working at a lower wage level may feel himself to be of little value and to possess little chance for improvement at another place of work. This person would probably be too insecure to risk compiling as many absences as better paid, more valued employees.

Two studies (Kahne, et al., 1957; Canfield and Soash, 1955) came to the very general conclusion that hourly-paid employees had poorer attendance records than salaried employees. These findings would tend to provide weak support at best for the first of Gibson's explanations

since no attempts were made to control for the effects of seniority, skill, or age. Metzner and Mann (1953) also reported that high absence groups (five or more absences in a six month period) among blue-collar workers had a significantly larger proportion of men in the low pay category. This result should be accepted with caution since the influence of job grade was not controlled.

Support for the second interpretation may be found in studies by Shepherd and Walker (1958), Liddel (1954) and Metzner and Mann (1953). Shepherd and Walker examined total absence, sickness absence, absence without permission and absence with permission for six hourly wage rate groups. The average number of absences and average shifts lost per 100 men per year were calculated for each wage level. The subjects were 245 male workers in an iron works who were matched with respect to number of dependents, age, heaviness of their work, and the work place temperature. Except for the lowest pay group, both total absence figures increased as the rate of pay increased. With the exception of the lowest and highest wage groups, absence without permission varied positively with increasing wage. There was little relationship between wage and absence with permission, except that there were slightly more absences in the lower three pay groups. However, absence because of sickness increased with increasing wage level. Similarly, in 1954, Liddel had noted that higher earnings were associated with more voluntary absences among underground coal mine contractors over the age of 40 and among underground workers.

Metzner and Mann (1953) reported that the highest absence groups (four or more absences during a six month period) among white-collar

workers contained significantly smaller proportions of men earning less than \$65 per week. Also, there were more women earning less than \$55 per week in the low absence group (two absences or less for the six month period). These results would be consistent with Gibson's second explanation, if the effects of age and length of service had been adequately controlled.

Baumgartel and Sobol (1959) noted that for blue and white-collar women and white-collar men, there was a positive relationship between wage, age, and seniority and both mean days and mean times absent. However, when the other two effects were partialled out, there appeared to be no relationship between wage and absence rates.

Behrend (1959) remarked that the equivocal literature on the subject fails to indicate that the influence of wage rates on absenteeism is anything but a complex phenomenon. The complexity of the issue derives from the fact that salary is linked to such variables as seniority, skill level, age, and sex. Few studies control adequately for the influence of these variables when examining the relationship between wage and absence behavior. Among the studies reviewed in this section, only two (Baumgartel and Sobol, 1959; Shepherd and Walker, 1958) attempted such control. Longitudinal studies wherein individual absence rates are monitored as pay increases occur would seem to be an appropriate, new approach to the study of the influence of changing wage rates on absence behavior.

Behrend added that the effect on absence behavior of changes in the wages of individuals within a given job should be the subject of subsequent studies. She concluded by advancing the assumption that "it is likely that conceptions of earnings rather than actual earnings matter most" and that individual status and situational variables determine the functioning of this conception within the realm of absence behavior.

Day of the Week, Shifts Worked, and Incidence of Payday

The general findings with respect to the relationship between the day of the week and absenteeism indicate that the first and last days of the week involve the poorest attendance rates. Canfield and Soash (1955) in a one month survey of absence statistics for Los Angeles manufacturers found a tendency for Monday to be the worst day of attendance. Wednesday and Thursday were reported to claim the best attendance records. The majority of the 219 firms studied, however, paid their employees on Friday. Therefore, the investigators felt that the "payday" factor increased the attendance on that day. Companies which utilized Monday as their payday had lower percentages of absences on that day than Monday percentages for all the companies combined. Also, it was noted that absence rates on days before and after holidays were lower for those companies requiring attendance as a prerequisite for receiving holiday Baldamus and Behrend (1950) earlier had reported that the average pay. number of absences per day, expressed as a percentage of Friday absences and computed on a weekly basis, was greatest on Monday and improved as the end of the week approached. This trend for the 7,000 employees examined remained the same throughout the year except when breaks in the schedule (e. g., vacations and bus strikes) were accompanied by increased absences. During one year in which a six day work week was scheduled, Saturday became the worst day of attendance. Gadourek (1965) cited additional evidence from Dutch studies wherein the Monday absen-

teeism problem was shown to be more severe than Friday or Saturday absenteeism.

Data relating to the influence of shift work on absence behavior have not provided clear evidence of consistent relationships between shift work and absence behavior. Shepherd and Walker (1956) examined the distribution of short-term absences from work on two types of three-shift systems in an iron and steel works. Seventy-five percent of the single shift absences for both shift systems occurred on the morning shift, but there appeared to be no preference for any specific day of the week. Evaluating a system which offered a pay advantage of four hours to night shift workers in a metal factory, Sergean and Brierly (1968), however, found the highest percentage of lost shifts occurring on the night shift over a two year period. Even though the night shift received the four hour pay benefit, the day shift encountered the greatest opportunity for overtime work. The authors expressed uncertainty as to whether dislike for night work or the attraction of overtime during the day shift was the contributing factor in accounting for the higher percentage of lost shifts at night. Behrend (1959), noting the apparent influence of the "payday" factor, cited the Wyatt and Mariott (1947) report which stated that nightshift workers paid during the Thursday night shift were absent less on that night, but more on Friday. Therefore, the occurrence of payday should be considered before attributing poor attendance to any particular time of the week or shift schedule.

Employment Level

Available literature seems to suggest that as full employment is

approached, absenteeism increases, but that as jobs become scarce, absenteeism dwindles. Behrend (1953) reported that as unemployment doubled in approximately one year, a statistically significant decline occurred in the number of days lost through absence for other than certified illness. This decline was noted in all but one of fourteen factories examined.

Similarly, Crowther (1957) examined monthly records of ten British factories over a five year period in the context of changing work population sizes and fluctuations in the number of persons employed. Each factory employed at least 500 men, and eight factories employed over 270 women. As unemployment increased, the monthly absence rate, computed as the ratio of days lost to days scheduled, decreased. Gadourek (1965) cited an earlier Dutch study which showed a negative relationship between the unemployment percentage and an estimate of the total absence percentage for seven industrialized Western countries, including the United States.

Length of Service

Eight studies seem to support the belief that decreased absenteeism accompanies increased length of service. Gibson (1966) explained this phenomenon in terms of a stronger degree of identification with the organization, which he postulated would develop over time. Gadourek (1965) speculated that this relationship might result because unhappy workers, who may more readily be absent have left.

Metzner and Mann (1953) found that white-collar groups with low absence records were characterized by fewer men with less than five years of experience. The same finding did not materialize for blue-

collar men, but there were fewer short service white-collar women in the lowest absence group who earned under \$55 per week. Salary and length of service were not partialled out in order to determine their contributions to the relationship. Hill and Trist (1955) examined records of 289 men in their first four years of service with a British iron and steel works company to see if the tendency to be absent changes with increased length of service. A four year period was divided into eight one-half year intervals. The results showed an increase in the number of shifts lost as a percentage of shifts scheduled over the first two intervals, then a drop until period five and thereafter a leveling trend for the remaining time period. The change was explained by the authors as an adjustment to the accepted absence pattern of the company. That is, sanctioned absences increased but "no reason, able-bodied" absences decreased over the four year period.

Kahne, Ryder, Snegireff, and Wyshak (1957) noted that the absence frequency rate (average number of absences per 100 scheduled work days) for 619 male and female, skilled and semi-skilled, plant workers, who were under 45 years of age, decreased with length of service, For the over 45 age group, the frequency rate also dropped with the length of employment, but the decrease was more gradual. However, there was no attempt made to control for differences in age within groups. Fox and Scott (1943) noted that the number of absences, during a three month period in a casting shop and a sheet mill, was less for employees with more than one year of experience than for those more recently employed. Behrend (1959) reported that her earlier study uncovered a situation wherein engineering workers with no Monday absences in a nine month

period, had been employed twice as long as men with an obvious Monday absenteeism problem. Jackson (1944) also found that the average percentage of working time lost among machine shop employees decreased as the length of service increased.

Baldamus and Behrend (1950) examined the average number of absences among factory workers on each day of the week. Those employees with less than three years of service showed greater average absences at the beginning of the week than those employees with over three years of employment. This trend was interpreted to reflect "the morale" which improved as payday and the end of the work week approached. Waters and Roach (1971) recently reported a low, but significant, negative correlation between company tenure and absence frequency for 130 non-supervisory female office workers.

In a study of airline employees, Baumgartel and Sobol (1959) found for white-collar men and women and blue-collar women a fairly consistent positive relationship between seniority, wage level, and age and mean days and mean times absent. By employing partial correlation, seniority was shown to be the significant factor in this grouping when sex and collar were held constant. Using Kendall's tau, they found a significant positive relationship between seniority and mean times absent. Among blue-collar men, the mean seniority was negatively related to mean days absent. Except for a small group with high seniority, higher mean days absent among blue-collar males seemed to occur in the middle years of employment with fewer mean days absent in the early and late years of employment. It was found that the longer service men in blue-collar job classifications were absent less (both

with respect to mean days and mean times absent).

Supervision

Mayo (1945) stated that the reason for low absences (number of days) in one department of a sheet metal company appeared to be the foreman's behavior. The foreman in the department had been taught the importance of listening to his workers and avoiding emotional "outbursts" when handling employee problems. Also, the foreman and workers jointly arranged the "day-off" schedule for each week. same ability of the foreman to communicate with his workmen was noted by Covner (1950) in a manufacturing department with the best attendance record. Similarly, Lennerlof (1966) noted that workers who rated their supervisor high on the "consideration" dimension (behavior indicative of mutual trust and respect between the leader and his group) had significantly fewer "no reason absences." In 1955, Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt had also noted that foreman "consideration" correlated -.49 (p < .01) with absenteeism rate (number of absences per worker over a common unit of time), while "structure" (leader endeavors to establish well-defined patterns of organization and procedures) correlated .27 (p < .05).

Mann and Baumgartel (1952) found that foremen who hold group discussions have lower absence rates among their workers. Only 18 percent of the blue-collar men in work groups having a low average absence rate stated that their foreman "practically never" had group discussions; on the other hand, 34 percent of the men in the high absence rate groups stated that these meetings "practically never" occurred.

Mann and Sparling (1956) compared two plants in the same company where absence offenders were treated differently. In one plant where absences dropped the most, there was increasing administrative control with conferences used with offenders and written proof required where the offenses continued. The absences were low, but resentment toward management practices was high. In another plant, discipline was handled informally by an immediate supervisor, but the plant superintendent insured that "favoritism" was not practiced. In this instance absences also decreased, but, in contrast to the first plant, attitudes toward management remained favorable.

Tucker and Lotz (1957), in a study of 22,052 employees in the Detroit Edison Company, found absence rates (days per year) lower than average for 71 percent of the departments where first-line supervisors, rather than higher administration, made decisions regarding pay during absence periods. Only 48 percent of the departments, where higher administration made the decision, possessed lower than average absence rates. In a group of 14 departments in which 30 percent or more of the men had excessive single day absences, 64 percent of the departments placed the responsibility for decisions concerning payment at higher supervisory levels. Whereas, in a group of 14 departments in which 15 percent or less of male employees had excessive absences, 64 percent of the departments placed the responsibility with the first-line supervisor.

Argyle, Gardner, and Cioffi (1958) found that the foreman behavior characteristic referred to as "democratic" was significantly positive in relationship (p < .05) to low absenteeism (as determined

by the Worst Day Index) for each of three departments studied. The foremen were separated into high and low categories relative to the "democratic" foremanship dimension using the average rank-order on interview data, a managerial rating, and a foreman description preference test.

A study supporting the "structure" leadership approach was reported by Gadourek (1965) who found that under the conditions of "first job" and close supervision, absence frequency was less. It was also noted that fewer absences occurred in groups which were supervised by foremen recruited from outside the group. Men whose foremen admitted spending little work time in supervision were absent more often. Those foremen who wished to gain more supervisory power had fewer absences among their workers. All but one of the studies reviewed in this section have tended to associate "general," "democratic," "employee-centered" leadership styles with low absenteeism among employees.

Physical Conditions of Work

In 1959 Behrend stated that sufficient evidence had not been presented to suggest that high absenteeism resulted from poor working conditions. Fox and Scott (1943) found that better working conditions did not accompany better absence records in casting shops which they studied. Behrend, voicing the opinion that "bad jobs," not bad conditions, accompany high voluntary absences, quoted from her 1951 study wherein she found that the "Blue Monday Index" was much lower for floor moulders than for foundry labourers though the same work conditions prevailed in each case. Shephard and Walker (1957) found no

relationship between average heaviness and temperature ratings of the work and absence frequency.

Liddell (1954) found no indication that attendance at a colliery was influenced by the availability of "pithead baths" or by the "extent of service in pit canteens." No relationship was observed between absences among underground workers and "depth of the shaft, seam thickness, or degree of mechanization." However, he noted that voluntary absence was greatest among the "face workers" whose work was the hardest, but whose pay was the highest. Gadourek (1965) found that heaviness of the work, heat involved, and exposure to dust were positively related to absence frequency for Dutch male blue-collar workers.

One might expect that excessive absences would accompany jobs wherein poor physical work conditions exist. However, little support for this belief has been demonstrated by the studies presented in this brief review.

Distance to Work

Although the number of cases supporting the hypothesis is small, all of the studies encountered tend to suggest that as distance increases between the place of residence and work, the worker's absence rate also increases. Of course, the problem of transportation makes a contribution to this relationship (Jackson, 1944; Canfield and Soash, 1955). In 1954, Lapping noted that as the distance of the residence from work increased, up to about 10 miles, the percentage of days lost from work showed a rising trend. Liddell (1954), making observations in a rural coal field, discovered the same phenomenon. In later studies, Isambert-Jamati (1962) and Gadourek (1965) reported a positive relationship between

absence rates and distances between the home and the work sites for Parisian female workers and for Dutch factory workers.

Job Classification and Job Level

Behrend (1959) concluded that "the available evidence suggests there is a strong association between absenteeism and type of work." Metzner and Mann (1953) found that blue-collar workmen averaged about one-half absence more for the six month period than did the white-collar men (p < .05). An analysis of variance performed on absence rates by Baumgartel and Sobol (1959) indicated that the variability of absenteeism (mean days absent) across job classifications, e. g., within each of four sub-populations (blue-collar males, white-collar males, bluecollar females, and white-collar females) was "greater than the variability contributed by age, wage, or seniority and less than that contributed by the location with the company's scattered organizations." Among blue-collar men it was noted that both mean days and mean times absent decreased ($\underline{p} \le .05$) as personnel department ratings of the job on "social status," "responsibility," and "freedom" increased. No significant relationships were found among these variables for groups of white-collar females. Among white-collar males the only significant correlation revealed that as the "responsibility" rating increased, mean times absent also increased. Blue-collar women were not examined in this analysis because of their small sample size.

Gibson (1966) cited a study by the Board of Education of Chicago which reported increasing mean number of days sick leave taken per month as job status decreased. Administrators had the lowest absence rate (.30 average number of days). Within four levels of teaching positions,

college teachers had the lowest rate which was .37, while vocational teachers evidenced the highest rate of .80. Among four levels of unskilled workmen employed by the board of education, watchmen had the lowest absence rate (.95) and window washers the highest (1.39). In a study of eight industrial establishments in Paris, Isambert-Jamati (1962) reported that the "higher the level required by the job and the more responsibility involved, the greater the degree of assiduousness noted among both women and men." Similar results have been evidenced in other investigations (Canfield and Soash, 1955; Kahne et al., 1957; and Tucker and Lotz, 1957). More recently, Waters and Roach (1971) found job grade significantly correlated (-.23; p <.01) with absence frequency among white-collar female workers. However, Gadourek (1965) failed to find any significant relationship between skill level and absence frequency, although there was a tendency toward more frequent absences among unskilled workers.

Therefore, nine of the ten studies examined indicated that job level or classification is an important consideration when considering absence behavior. Most of these studies, however, failed to control for the influences of age and length of service. A longitudinal approach, wherein absence behavior of an individual is followed as he attains higher job levels, should be considered in future research.

Personality

The scarcity of studies dealing with the relationship between absence behavior and personality variables was noted by Cooper and Payne (1967). Using the Eysenck Personality Inventory, these authors discovered that, among 55 female plant operators, nonpermitted absence frequency

correlated .16 and .19 (\underline{p} < .05) with extraversion and neuroticism, respectively. For nonpermitted absence, as measured by total days lost, the correlations were .15 (.05 < \underline{p} < .10) and .16 (\underline{p} < .05) with extraversion and neuroticism. With the effects of age and neuroticism partialled out, extraversion was found to be correlated .14 with nonpermitted absence frequency and .14 with nonpermitted total days absent. Neither correlation was significant at the .05 level.

Lokander and Mach1 (1964) examined 225 Swedish workmen using the Bronner Personality Inventory. The "manic factor" was found to be significantly correlated, in a positive manner, with the number of absence spells within a given period of time expressed as a ratio of the average number of persons under observation. However, the authors concluded by stating that since all the factors on the Bronner Personality Inventory were correlated, it could not be concluded that only the "manic factor" was related to absence frequency. Plummer and Hinkle (1955) found great personality differences between 20 women with the highest and 20 women with the lowest absence rates during 20 or more years of service with the New York Telephone Company. The average highabsence person was found to be resentful and unhappy, while the lowabsence person on the average was more contented. The high-absence employees had 492 occasions of absence, while the low-absence people had only 23 periods of absence. Using the dichotomy three or less days per year absence and six to twelve days per year, Newton (1950) studied 62 machine tool operators at a metal fabricating plant. The two absence groups, which were controlled for length of service, age,

Temperament Schedule. On the General Activity factor, the low-absence group scored significantly higher on the characteristic "strong drive and energy." The low-absence group also appeared to score higher on "emotional stability, optimism, and cheerfulness." Examining the relationship between anxiety and absenteeism, Sinha (1963) found a correlation of .89 between scores on the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale and the number of days absent per year for 110 Indian plant workers. An interesting result is reported by Gadourek (1965) who noted a higher frequency of absences among groups of workers who said that they often thought about their work while at home. This relationship was noted only for group data, not individual absence records.

The contribution of personality variables to an understanding of attendance behavior has been researched only briefly. Future studies might explore the interaction of personality with other frequently used predictors of absenteeism.

Organization Size

Porter and Lawler (1965), in a review of the literature concerning job behavior and organizational subunit size, reported a positive relationship between absenteeism and organization size in ten of the twelve studies examined. Three of the studies were conducted by Revans (1958). Revans found significant moderate to high correlations between the logarithm of the factory size and absence duration due to accidents and sickness. The Acton Society Trust (1953) noted that more bonus shifts, awarded to coal workers who worked five consecutive shifts, were given to men working in smaller groups in the 18 pits selected for study. Their

study of non-coal industries, employing from under 600 to 1,000 workers, revealed that sickness and "other reason absences" increased with factory size. Baumgartel and Sobol (1959) found a significant positive relationship between absenteeism by airline employees and the number of persons employed. A more marked relationship was noted when mean days absent rather than mean number of times absent was used as the absence measure. The work group sizes at 11 locations varied from smallest (172-283 employees), small (381-639), large (1,330-1,554) to largest (3,174-3,205 employees). The relationship persisted even when sex, "collar," age, wage, seniority, and job classification were held constant. Porter and Lawler also cited the 1957 finding of the Research Council for Economic Security that smaller-sized plants (under 100 employees) had lower prolonged illness rates than middlesized plants (100-500 employees). Hewitt and Parfit (1953) showed a positive association between group size and the number of absence incidents expressed as a percentage of the "expected" working days The influences of sex, age, marital status, and type of employment were held constant. Kerr, Koppelmier, and Sullivan (1951) found large departments of companies to have higher absenteeism rates. Small blue-collar work groups were reported by Metzner and Mann (1953) to have had fewer mean days absent than larger work groups.

Only two studies were reported by Porter and Lawler (1965) which failed to indicate a positive relationship between absenteeism and work group size. A curvilinear relationship was reported by Argyle, Gardner, and Cioffi (1958) when three separate departments of a British manufacturing plant were divided into sizes of less than 20,

20-30, and over 30. The Worst Day Index was highest in the middle-sized group (20-30 employees), but dropped at either extreme. No relationship between size of work group (12 or more employees versus less than 12) and mean days absent per month was reported for white-collar men by Metzner and Mann (1953).

Three additional studies support the conclusions of the Porter and Lawler review. Covner (1950), Liddell (1954), and The Acton Society Trust (1957) each reported that larger work group size tended to accompany more absenteeism. When departments were grouped by size (1-9, 10-19, 20-39, and 40 or more people), Covner noted, in his study of 868 manufacturing employees, that larger-sized departments tended to have a greater number of absences per month. Liddell described the relationship he discovered in 133 collieries as indicating a marked positive association between pit size and the voluntary absenteeism rate. The Acton Society Trust found that man days lost per man tended to increase as the work group size increased within five manufacturing works.

Attempts to explain the relationship between organization size and member participation were reviewed by Indik (1963). He credited Revans (1958) with offering the clearest presentation of this phenomenon. Revans postulated that operatives will work toward the aim of the organization if management provides what they need to reach that goal. Therefore, increased organization size might tend to accelerate faulty communication. He further proposed that morale, as a function of the difference between workers' expectations and experience, will then decrease and that absenteeism, accidents, and strikes will increase. Indik also offered three paradigms to explain the relationships among

increased size, members' attitudes toward the group and/or the organization, and the amount of member participation. The moderators utilized in the three paradigms were bureaucratization and impersonal controls, decreased member communication, role specialization, decreased job complexity, and decreased individual satisfaction.

Job Attitudes

In three reviews of the job-satisfaction literature (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell, 1957; and Vroom, 1964), the majority of the available evidence supported the notion that a negative relationship exists between job satisfaction and absenteeism. Brayfield and Crockett reported this negative relationship in five of the seven studies they analyzed. The same trend was noted in twelve of the thirteen articles which Herzberg et al. reviewed. Seven years later, Vroom concluded that the negative relationship appeared in six of nine studies which he examined.

Nine studies, representative of the research quoted in the previously cited literature reviews, suggest negative relationships between job satisfaction and absence behavior. Kornhauser and Sharp (1932) noted that unfavorable job attitudes among female machine operators were slightly correlated with time lost because of sickness. Among 550 machine-shop workers, Jackson (1944) found that there were 120 employees with absence rates greater than the plant seven percent average. Dissatisfaction with work was indicated by the employee or his foreman as the cause of the poor attendance in 16 percent of the cases. In 1946, Noland indicated that the number of days absent per month decreased among factory workers as employee expressions of job

satisfaction increased. Giese and Ruter (1949) studied 3,000 subjects working in 25 departments of a mail-order company. They established that morale correlated higher with the departmental mean percentage absent (-.47) than with percent production efficiency (.19), percent error efficiency (.15 to .27), percent turnover (-.42), or percent late (-.20). It should be noted that the highest correlations occur with absence and turnover criteria which represent withdrawal from the work situation.

Kerr, Koppelmeir, and Sullivan (1951), while studying 25 departments in a metal fabrication plant, found departmental mean scores on the Tear Ballot for Industry to be correlated -.44 with unexcused absenteeism, while correlated .51 with total absenteeism. attitude survey relating to merit ratings, Van Zelst and Kerr (1953) discovered a definite, but moderate correlation (.21) between overall job satisfaction and a favorable self-reported absenteeism record (days per year) among 340 employees from 14 separate companies. Metzner and Mann (1953) reported that sex and job level moderated the relationship between absence frequency (mean number of times absent) and job satisfaction. There was no significant relationship indicated for the 212 white-collar women as a group, nor when high and low job-level subgroups were examined separately. Among 163 white-collar males, ten of fifteen attitude measures showed significant negative associations with absence frequency. When job level was controlled, the association persisted only for the lower level white-collar jobs. Among 251 blue-collar males, nine of eighteen attitude variables were significantly and negatively related to the absence frequency criterion.

Sawatsky (1951) suggested that the reasons for higher absenteeism and turnover among machine operators compared to nonmachine operators were reduced communication and reduced social interaction with other production staff members. Since their chance to receive social recognition was diminished, they were less likely to become ego-involved with the group members or the work. Therefore, their job satisfaction became low and they tended to be absent or terminate more often. Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt (1955) cited evidence that morale is negatively related (-.25) to the number of absences per worker. The morale index was derived from the "like" ratings for foremen expressed by the workers. Using a multiple correlation approach, Harding and Bottenberg (1961) reported a negative correlation (-.38) between eight attitudinal variables and the number of times each of 326 airmen asked to be excused from duty for reasons other than sickness.

Among studies which Brayfield and Crockett, Herzberg et al., and Vroom cited as failing to indicate a negative relationship were the following three. Using the number of days absent in a six week period, as supplied by the questionnaire respondents, Yoder (1951) could find no significant relationship between an attitude index, based on 66 items, and the absence criterion. In 1952, Bernberg also found no significant relationship between morale scores for 890 hourly-paid aircraft employees and short-time absences (less than a full day) or the number of days absent. Similarly, among 489 oil refinery workers, Vroom (1962) reported only a -.07 correlation between job satisfaction and the number of times absent during the year preceeding the survey. The job satisfaction index was defined as the sum of the responses to three questions

concerning feelings about the supervisor, feelings about the kind of work performed, and overall feelings toward the job.

Other studies, pertinent to the area, presented findings favorable to the conception that job satisfaction is negatively related to absence rate. Lennerlof (1966) in a study of 113 Swedish workmen, found fewer "no reason absence" among workers satisfied with their work-mates (-.24, and -.33), immediate supervisor (-.28), senior managers (-.27), immediate supervisors' treatment of personnel (-.37), senior managers' treatment of personnel (-.25), senior managers' general supervision (-.28), and the description of the immediately superior supervisor (-.35). Yuzuk (1961) found significant correlations (p < .05) between the mean number of absences (over a four month period) in a department and the following morale factors: job satisfaction (-.47), conditions of work (.56), general competence of fellow employees (.50), and interpersonal relationship with the supervisor (-.46). Patchen (1960), in a study of 487 Canadian oil workers, found that the mean number of absences per year was significantly higher for employees who felt that their present chances for promotion were not "as good as they should be." Men who were satisfied with past promotions and were satisfied with the fairness of their present chances had a lower absence rate. Of those men who felt present chances for promotion were "fair," men resentful about the lack of past promotions were absent more often. Men who felt that the pay for their present jobs should be higher had more absences than those who felt that their pay was "fair." All of these differences in absence rate between satisfied and dissatisfied workers were significant at or beyond the .05 level. In 1960, Talacchi noted a significant

negative relationship between level of job satisfaction and the number of short absence periods composed of three days or less.

The influence of attitude similarity among co-workers on the decision to be absent or attend work was demonstrated in a laboratory experiment. In an unpublished study, Lamberth and Padd found that as attitude similarity increased between 64 subjects and hypothetical "work partners" a greater willingness to go to work was expressed. The subjects were asked to indicate what their behavior would be on a morning on which they did not feel well and had on similar occasions been absent 50 percent of the time.

Wherry (1958) quoted the finding from Hitt's unpublished 1956 doctoral dissertation that a nonspecified measure of absenteeism was lowest when workers expressed favorable attitudes toward supervision (-.31) and job setting (-.12), and had high pride in the company (-.70). However, absenteeism was also highest when attitudes were favorable toward the work load (.36) and fellow employees (.21).

A factor analysis of attitude, demographic, and absence data for 2,209 male, Dutch workers resulted in a surprising finding. "Absences and satisfaction are quite distinct things," commented Gadourek (1965), after examining group and individual responses to an attitude questionnaire. Factor analyses of group and individual responses either placed high satisfaction with the work and low absence frequency on separate factors or high work satisfaction and high absence frequency on the same factor with wide discrepancies between the loadings. Individuals with high frequency of absences (factor loading .556) were found to evaluate their health as poor (.768), possess many psychosomatic complaints (.552) and complain of preoccupation with work while at home (.310).

CHAPTER II

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In a recent investigation of the relationships between job attitudes and absence frequency among female clerical workers, Waters and Roach (1971) found low, but significant negative correlations between the absenteeism criterion and the work scale (-.28, \underline{p} < .01) and co-worker scale (-.18, \underline{p} < .05) of the Job Description Index (Smith, 1967). Significant negative associations (\underline{p} < .05) were noted with ratings of satisfaction/dissatisfaction on sense of achievement (-.18), work (-.20), and salary (-.21). An over-all measure of satisfaction/dissatisfaction correlated significantly (-.23, \underline{p} < .01) with absence frequency, as did a separate over-all satisfaction measure (-.28).

Despite the fact that these correlations are low, the implications are especially important when compared to the conclusions of the most comparable study cited in the literature (Metzner and Mann, 1953). In the earlier study, the researchers examined job attitudes, mean frequency of times absent and personal characteristics among 212 white-collar women in accounting departments of an electric power company. The hypotheses tested were that groups of employees having high rates of absence would express dissatisfaction with the kind of work performed, personal practices, wages, chances for promotion, the supervisor and his practices, and work group pride. None of these hypotheses were confirmed for the women as an entire group or for

groups separated into high and low skill level jobs.

Certain differences, however, between the two studies should be noted. Whereas Metzner and Mann used group data on absences and examined the effects of high and low job level, Waters and Roach obtained the more desirable individual measures of absences, but failed to examine the differential influences of job levels on job satisfaction and absenteeism. Only the later study makes an overt reference to a particular theoretical position, that of Vroom (1964). Within the context of his instrumentality model, Vroom theorized that:

. . . the valence of the work role to its occupant is directly related to the strength of the force acting on him to remain within that work role. In other words, workers who are highly attracted to their jobs should be subject to stronger forces to remain in them than those who are less attracted to their jobs. These stronger forces to remain should be reflected in a lower probability of behaviors which take the person out of his job, both permanently and temporarily (p. 187).

Waters and Roach expressed the conviction that Vroom's proposed connection between job attitudes and withdrawal from work had been supported by their finding that turnover and absenteeism were negatively related to expressions of job satisfaction.

In an effort to examine the same major variables in a similar work population, the present study explores relationships among job satisfaction, demographic information, and rates of absenteeism among female secretaries. This investigation adopts Gibson's (1966) concepts of absenteeism. It should be noted that the rationale of the Gibson model strongly resembles the instrumentality model as developed by Vroom or as extended by Graen (1969).

The Gibson model is based on the assumption that man seeks need-gratification while organizations desire that certain goals be obtained.

According to Gibson, need-directed man enters into a work contract with the goal-directed organization, agreeing to perform certain services so as to receive in return the benefits and wages necessary to fulfill his personal needs. The interaction of a man's priorities concerning his needs with his predictions concerning the consequences of his actions creates his system of beliefs and values. Filtered through this system, the perceived desirability of objects and events creates "a tendency to act positively or negatively toward those perceived objects and events." Therefore, Gibson argues that man adopts certain identifications (characterized by positive or negative valences which may be strong or weak) with tasks, rewards, and objects in the work setting. The resultant, or centroid of all valences, Gibson labeled the "core identification."

An absence event is assumed to be the result of the operation of the individual's belief-value system and is impeded or facilitated by the strength and direction of identification within the work-space and in the life-space outside the work area. Thus, if core identification is weak or negative, it is assumed that it will be easier for the person to legitimize his absence to himself (p. 115).

In other words, if over-all attraction to work is weak or negative, an individual might more easily rationalize his absences.

Similarly, one of Gibson's general propositions is that the frequency of absences "varies inversely with the valence of work identification." A restatement of this proposition, in more conventional terms, becomes the first and basic hypothesis to be tested.

Hypothesis 1: A negative relationship exists between employee expressions of job satisfaction and frequency of absences.

Four additional hypotheses were generated by the Gibson proposition that "As the location of core identification varies from centrality in the work-space toward and into the outside life-space, frequency of absence

will increase" (p. 133). That is, as attraction to objects and events in one's social and personal life begin to dominate, more absences will occur. Those factors which might act to alter the location of core identification for an individual include job and wage level (Isambert-Jamati, 1962), length of service (Kahne et al., 1957; Metzner and Mann, 1953), and age (Tucker and Lotz, 1951; Kahne et al., 1957). Stated differently, increased attachments to work which accompany prolonged contact with the organization or increased age, salary, or job level might counteract low job satisfaction which ordinarily would lead to temporary withdrawal from work. This study was, therefore, designed to test:

Hypothesis 2: A negative relationship between job satisfaction and frequency of absences will be more pronounced for young employees,

Hypothesis 3: A negative relationship between job satisfaction and frequency of absences will be more pronounced for employees with short lengths of employment,

Hypothesis 4: A negative relationship between job satisfaction and frequency of absences will be more pronounced for employees who work in the lower paying jobs, and

Hypothesis 5: A negative relationship between job satisfaction and frequency of absences will be more pronounced for employees who work in lower job levels.

Gibson's (1966) concept of authenticity, the attitude of faithfulness to a contract by either party, seemed to provide a pertinent
issue to be considered when examining the attendance behavior of employees.
He felt that the

. . . formal contract specifies relatively few of the rights and duties of the parties to the contract. Most of them are included informally, as a quasi-contract, within the consensual and discretionary areas. Consequently, the ethical commitment, the justice, or the sense of fair play on the parts of the contracting agents becomes fundamental to the satisfactory implementation of the contract (p. 121).

In connection with the concept of authenticity, Patchen (1960) found that employees, who felt that company decisions regarding their salaries and promotions were unfair, tended to be absent more often. Adam's (1963) Inequity Theory offers a conceptualization within which one may examine behavior changes which result from treatment perceived as inequitable. The Inequity Theory states that:

When the normative expectations of the person making social comparisons are violated—when he finds his inputs and outcomes are not in balance in relation to those of others—feelings of inequity result (p.424).

Inequity was postulated to produce tension within the person which would be equalized by: increasing one's "inputs" (personal investments), if they are lower than the other party's "inputs" and one's own "outcomes" (rewards); decreasing "inputs," if they are high relative to those of others and one's own "outcomes;" increasing one's "outcomes," if they are low relative to "outcomes" of others and to one's own "inputs;" decreasing one's "outcomes" if they are high relative to other's "outcomes" and one's own "inputs;" leaving the field when experiencing inequity (e. g. transferring, terminating, or being absent); psychologically distorting one's "inputs" and "outcomes" in either direction as needed; applying the first six coping techniques to the other person; or changing the "other" whom one uses for comparison. Within such a theoretical framework, the following two hypotheses were formed to examine the relevance of Patchen's findings for secretaries.

Hypothesis 6: Those employees who feel mistreated compared to other employees with respect to pay increases will tend to be absent more frequently than those who feel equitably treated, and

Hypothesis 7: Those employees who feel mistreated compared to other employees with respect to promotion consideration will tend to be absent more frequently than those who feel equitably treated.

The eighth and ninth hypotheses are based on findings that absence offenders frequently fail to recognize absenteeism as a problem (White, 1960) and that workers supervised by those believed to be unconcerned with absenteeism as a problem tend to be absent more often (Tucker and Lotz, 1957). Hence, the present investigation involved:

Hypothesis 8: Employees who fail to express concern for absenteeism as a problem will tend to be absent more frequently than those responding oppositely, and

Hypothesis 9: Employees who believe that their supervisors do not see absenteeism as a problem will tend to be absent more frequently than those responding oppositely.

A final hypothesis resulted from the findings of two studies.

Female clerical workers, who possessed dependent children, were found to be absent more often than employees having no children (Naylor and Vincent, 1959). Gadourek (1965) noted that male plant workers who had many previous jobs were absent frequently. Turnover (job change) is often considered as the ultimate expression of withdrawal from work, while absenteeism is seen as a less severe expression (Vroom, 1964). Within this conceptualization, it appeared probable that joint possession of an unstable employment record and the responsibility for dependent relatives at home might characterize female employees with frequent absences.

Hypothesis 10: Female employees possessing one or more dependents and a history of many previous jobs, will tend to be absent more frequently than those possessing no dependents and a history of few previous jobs.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

<u>Subjects</u>

The 165 subjects studied in this investigation were employed at an educational institution as secretaries. Eighty-four subjects were in job level I, the lowest level. Thirty-four secretaries were in job level II, 33 in level III, nine in level IV, and one in level V. The job level of four subjects was undetermined. The subjects ranged in age from 19 to 63 years of age and in length of service from one to 331 months. Annual hourly and salaried pay for this sample ranged from \$2,550 to \$12,000. The educational level ranged from high school to six years beyond high school graduation. A maximum of four dependents was claimed, and no employee had more than eight previous jobs. Over a six month period, the frequency of absences for employees ranged from zero to 13 periods of absence. Two subjects were omitted from the sample because they failed to complete large sections of the job satisfaction questionnaire.

Job Satisfaction Ouestionnaire

The instrument used to measure job satisfaction involved three item formats which trace their origins to the item structures of a previous questionnaire (Loveland, Ronan, and York, 1968). Other investigations, cited in the literature on absenteeism, examined similar variables and provided support for each item. Twenty-eight items conformed

to the following format:

Opportunity to use your special skills and abilities:

- a. How much opportunity do you have? very little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very much
- b. How much opportunity should you have? very little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very much
- c. How important is this to you?

 not important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very important

The three questions per item attempted to provide respondents with an opportunity to record their evaluation of each item as it existed at that time, their expectation of how it should have existed ideally, and their estimation of the topic's importance to them. Subjects were asked to circle the number corresponding to their opinion on each of the three questions per item. The difference (b - a) was employed as an indirect measure of expressed need. To eliminate negative difference scores, the quantity seven was added to each difference score, thus creating a scale ranging from one to 13. The larger the difference score, the larger the degree of expressed need. In outlining his rationale of this measurement approach, Porter (1962) stated that the method has two presumed advantages:

(a) The subject is not asked directly concerning his satisfaction. Therefore, any tendency for a simple "response set" to determine his expression of satisfaction is probably reduced somewhat. is more difficult, although by no means impossible, for the respondent to manipulate his satisfaction measure to conform to what he thinks he "ought" to put down versus what he actually feels to be the real situation. (b) Secondly, this method of measuring need fulfillment is a more conservative measure than would be a single question concerning simple obtained satisfaction. It takes into account the fact that higher level positions should be expected to provide more rewards because it utilizes the difference between obtained and expected satisfaction. In effect, this method asks the respondent, "how satisfied are you in terms of what you expected from this particular management position?" Thus, it is designed to be a realistic and meaningful measure in comparing different management groups (p. 378).

The second format consisted of 13 items with the following structure:

Satisfaction

Importance

very	very		not	very
dissatisfied	satisfied		important	important
1 2 3	4 5 6 7	Vacation Policy	1 2 3	4 5 6 7

The respondents were asked to circle a number on the left corresponding to their satisfaction with items concerning policies, benefits, and other aspects of the work situation. On the scale to the right, they were asked to indicate the importance of each item to them.

The third item format required the subjects to indicate on the left scale the extent to which <u>they</u> considered each of the ten items to be a problem at work. The scale on the right allowed respondents to indicate the extent to which they believed that <u>their supervisor</u> considered the item to be a problem on campus. These items were structured as follows:

Your Opinion

Your Supervisor's Opinion

very :	sma	11	ve	ry	1ar	ge		very	sm	a11		ve	ry	large
prob	1em	ı	p	rob	1em			pro	ble	m		р	rob	1em
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Employee Turnover	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Two questions concerning employee perception of equitable treatment in relation to pay increases and promotion consideration were included. These items appeared in the following format:

Compared to other employees, have you been treated fairly with regard to salary increases? (Circle One of the Following Responses)

Yes No Do Not Know

In only two instances did subjects encounter questions which failed to provide a multiple-choice answer format. The number of employee dependents was requested on the questionnaire. Secondly, and

open-ended response item was included on the instrument to enable respondents to express ideas and attitudes not given coverage in the questionnaire. The last page provided space for these written comments which were collected for use in a separate study.

The first draft of the instrument was submitted to one member of the subject population for her comments regarding instructions and item content. This subject was omitted from the actual attitude survey.

Data Collection

For 192 secretaries of job levels I, II, III, IV, and V the personnel department produced from computerized data and employee records, according to social security number, the following demographic data:

- 1. birthdate
- 2. marital status
- 3. highest educational level attained
- 4. date of employment
- 5. salary
- 6. job level
- 7. number of previous jobs
- 8. frequency of absences over a specified six month period

Subjects were notified by a letter from the personnel department (see Appendix A) that a job-attitude survey would be conducted on campus. Institutional secretaries who worked off campus also were contacted. In the following two weeks, the investigator personally delivered the questionnaires and returned for them at an agreed upon time, usually one, two, or three days later. Each subject was given a brown, unmarked Manila envelope in which to seal her completed questionnaire.

So as to utilize the demographic data collected by social security number, each respondent was requested to enter her social security number on the instrument. Subjects were assured that, as soon as a 5 x 8 inch card containing biographical information could be stapled to their questionnaire, both social security numbers on the instrument and the card would be destroyed. This procedure was followed immediately subsequent to transcription of data.

Subjects were informed that the biographical data would be used only to describe groups which responded similarly on the questionnaire. Those subjects who were hesitant to enter their social security numbers were encouraged to complete their questionnaires and return them without social security numbers.

The 15 employees who had terminated between the date on which absence and personnel data were collected and the time of the survey were mailed a copy of the instrument, the letter from the personnel deaprtment, an additional letter asking for their assistance (see Appendix A), and a stamped, addressed return envelope. Eight such attitude surveys were returned.

Of 192 secretaries whose names were supplied by the personnel department, 184 were contacted. The investigator was unable to contact eight members of this population. Only five employees refused to participate in the survey. The total questionnaires returned numbered 165, thus providing a 90 percent over-all return rate.

Usable absence data were available for only 166 salaried workers employed during the entire six month period for which frequencies of absences were compiled. One hundred and sixty-two of these employees

were among those contacted. The return rate for these secretaries, who identified themselves by social security number, was also 90 percent. That is, 145 of the 162 distributed questionnaires were returned.

Each item response on the questionnaire and all demographic data were key punched into computer cards.

The Criterion

The absence records were examined for 166 salaried employees who were employed between October 1, 1970, and March 31, 1971. A record was compiled of the frequency of absences (number of times absent without regard for the length of absence period) for each employee over two adjacent three month periods (October 1, 1970 to December 31, 1970, and January 1, 1971, to March 31, 1971). Absence frequency, rather than the total number of days absent, was chosen as a criterion measure because of higher reliability coefficients reported in the published literature (Huse and Taylor, 1962; Covner and Smith, 1951).

To obtain an estimate of the reliability of the absence frequency criterion, a product-moment correlation between the absence frequencies for two three month periods was calculated. These data, for the 166 salaried workers employed during the complete six month period, correlated .35 ($\underline{p} < .01$). Through the use of the Spearman-Brown formula, an estimated six month criterion reliability of .52 was obtained. The total absence frequency for the individual employee over the six month period was used as the criterion in the study.

Analytic Design

Zero-order and multiple correlation were the statistics chosen to examine the relationships between job satisfaction variables and absence behavior as stated in the first hypothesis. Since two comparable studies (Metzner and Mann, 1953; Waters and Roach, 1971) examined overall job satisfaction among female white-collar samples, hypothesis one was tested initially by considering the relationship between general job satisfaction and frequency of absences. Hence, for overall satisfaction productmoment correlations between the criterion and the evaluative, difference, and weighted difference scores were computed.

Since most studies indicate that job satisfaction is multifaceted (Ronan, 1970), a second test of hypothesis one was performed. Item clusters, considered as dimensions of job satisfaction, were derived and were utilized as predictors of absence frequency.

The initial step in determining the item clusters involved calculating four intercorrelation matrices. The first matrix included the intercorrelations among the evaluative attitudinal items in the first question format, the demographic data, and all other responses, excluding the expectancy and importance items. The second matrix included intercorrelations among the difference scores, the job satisfaction items, and the demographic data. The importance items of the first and third item formats and the demographic data were intercorrelated in the third matrix. The fourth matrix of items from the questionnaire reported the intercorrelations among the weighted difference scores (the product of the difference scores and importance scores on the first item format), the product of job satisfaction and importance responses

on the second item format, and the demographic data.

The rationale for calculating the fourth intercorrelation matrix rests on the assumption that dissatisfaction with aspects of the work situation, which the employee concedes as being personally important, should be more directly related to work behavior than dissatisfaction with items viewed as less important. The literature on the use of weighted satisfaction scores seems about evenly divided concerning the benefits of such an approach (Ronan, 1970). Ewen (1967) reported that a weighted job satisfaction scale correlated .99 with the non-weighted scale and, therefore, seemed a redundant, time-consuming exercise at best. Since Ewen's sample sizes were small, and since the question seems far from being resolved, the weighted analysis was included.

To reduce the number of job satisfaction variables and, therefore, the rank of the four matrices of intercorrelations, principal axes factor analyses were performed (Darlington, 1968). Using an existing program (Mulaik and Burkheimer, 1971) written for the Univac 1108, both varimax and oblimin rotations were performed. Only factors with eigenvalues greater than one were rotated in the oblimin procedure. In the oblimin rotations, matrices were rotated to their factor patterns rather than to their factor structures. In a personal communication, Mulaik (1971) stated that in his experience the mank order of the normalized factor loadings of the variables corrected for communality remained the same when either factor patterns or structures were obtained.

Since the oblimin rotations were considered to yield the clearest pattern of clusters, those variables which had loadings \geq .50 were retained. The item responses were summed within each cluster to yield

attitudinal cluster scores. Where necessary a constant was added to avoid negative scores. These attitudinal cluster variables and all demographic data variables were intercorrelated. In addition, the zero-order correlations between the cluster scores and the frequency of absences were computed.

Moderated multiple regression (Saunders, 1956) and subgroup analysis (Frederiksen and Melville, 1954) were the methods by which hypotheses two through five were tested. Whereas, linear regression takes the form

$$y = \tilde{y} + \sum_{i} a_{i}^{x}$$

moderated regression equations are of the form

$$y = \overline{y} + \sum_{i} a_{i} x_{i} + \sum_{j} b_{j} z_{j} + \sum_{ij} c_{ij} x_{i} z_{j}$$

In both equations, the \mathbf{x}_i terms refer to the independent variables. The \mathbf{z}_i terms are known as the moderator variables, since they are hypothesized to moderate the relationship between the independent variables and the criterion.

Age and length of service were employed as moderators because Gibson (1966) believed that employee identification with a company alters with age and prolonged contact with the organization. Similarly, pay level and job level were thought to enhance identification with work and, thereby, to reduce the negative relationship between job satisfaction and frequency of absences. For each of the four moderators (age, length of service, pay level, and job level), three equations were considered. The single independent variable in each case was the

subject's evaluative, difference, or weighted-difference score on the overall job satisfaction question. A single moderator variable and its product with the job satisfaction measure composed the second and third predictors in the multiple correlation. The partial correlations with frequency of absences and beta weights for each independent variable, moderator variable, and moderator X independent variable were also computed. Significance of increases in the moderated multiple correlations over the zero-order correlations, as computed in testing hypothesis one, were examined by <u>t</u> tests.

The subgroup analysis (Frederiksen and Melville, 1954) involved determining the product-moment correlations between the criterion and overall job satisfaction within eight moderator variable subgroups. Subjects whose ages, salaries, or lengths of service exceeded the medians composed three "high" moderator subgroups. Employment in job levels II through IV defined membership in the fourth "high" moderator subgroup. Similarly, subjects with ages, salaries, or lengths of service less than the medians established three "low" moderator subgroups. Job level I employees were considered the fourth "low" moderator subgroup.

Hypotheses six through nine were tested by evaluating the zeroorder correlations which they imply.

A completely randomized factorial 2X2 analysis of variance design was used to test hypothesis ten. With respect to dependent status, the sample was divided into a group having one or more dependents and a group having none. A similar procedure was followed for number of previous jobs, with the division of groups being made

at the median of three jobs. An existing program (Cramer, 1969) for the Univac 1108 was employed for the analysis.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND RELATED DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to provide a better understanding of the absence behavior of secretaries. Analyses of data provided in this chapter are correlational in nature. Therefore, it should be stressed that the correlations reported in the pages which follow do not imply causal relationships.

Job Satisfaction and Absence Frequency

The major concern of this investigation involved the relationship between absence frequency and overall job satisfaction. Table 1
indicates that as the rating of the amount of job satisfaction increases,
absences tend to decrease. Similarly, as difference scores and weighted
difference scores increase, absences occur more frequently. In other
words, as employees tend to find more overall satisfaction in their jobs
they tend to be absent less often. Also, employees who express the need
for more satisfaction from their work tend to be absent more frequently.
Therefore, the existence of a significant, but small, negative relationship between employee expressions of overall job satisfaction and
absence behavior is demonstrated. This finding provides modest support
for the first hypothesis given in the second chapter.

This finding also gives modest support to the conclusion of Waters and Roach (1971) that employees dissatisfied with their jobs will tend to withdraw temporarily from the work setting. Metzner and Mann (1953)

Table 1. Product-Moment Correlations Between Absence Frequency and Three Overall Job Satisfaction Measures.

Overall Job Satisfaction Measure	<u>r</u>
Evaluation Score ^a	175*
Difference Score ^b	.266**
Weighted Difference Score	.245**

Note--Lower bound estimates of the reliabilities of these measures are given by their communalities of .708, .773, and .783 in Tables 17 through 19 of Appendix B.

 $a_N = 143$

 $^{^{}b}N = 142$

 $[\]frac{*}{p} < .05$

^{**}p < .01

found no such relationship between job attitudes and the absence criterion for women. It should be noted that they used group absence data, whereas the Waters and Roach study and the present study utilized individual absence records. Another distinction among the studies is that the subjects in the present study were all employed as secretaries, a single job category. The research samples were much less homogeneous with respect to occupation in the Metzner and Mann study since the electric company employees prepared customer billings, accounts, financial statements, and tax reports. Occupations of subjects in the Waters and Roach investigation were described only as nonsupervisory.

The findings of the present study are also consistent with the similar "attraction to work" theories of Vroom (1964) and Gibson (1966). Vroom theorized that "the force on a person to remain in a job . . . is a monotonically increasing function of the product of the valence of that job . . ." Gibson's hypothesis was that "frequency of absence varies inversely with the valence of work identification." In other words, both theories suggested that one's attendance is directly related to one's attraction to the work.

The results shown in Table 1 indicate that the weighted-difference score was not more highly correlated with absenteeism than was the difference score. This finding suggests that nothing is gained by the weighting process and adds support to Ewen's (1967) suspicions regarding this practice. Ewen reported that in combining satisfaction with several job components into a single job satisfaction score, an unweighted total score was "as good an estimate of

overall satisfaction" as a total score weighted by importance.

The finding that secretaries' expressions of overall job satisfaction are negatively related to absenteeism implies that more consideration should be given by employers and researchers to "general" reactions to the work situation.

An awareness of the need for overall job satisfaction might also have implications for curbing turnover. The existence of a negative relationship between turnover and job satisfaction has often been referenced (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955; Vroom, 1964; Waters and Roach, 1971). If, as Melbin (1961) suggests, absenteeism is the first step toward a more permanent form of withdrawal (e.g., turnover), then a better understanding of absenteeism should provide information useful in controlling turnover.

As indicated earlier in this thesis, the present study employed total frequency of absences as a dependent variable. It would be interesting to conduct future research directed toward studying only unexcused absences and expression of overall job satisfaction among female, white-collar employees. If more definite relationships exist, they might emerge if the criterion data were collected over a longer period of time, e. g., a year or longer.

Since the initial findings supported hypothesis one, the next efforts involved examining the contributions made by age, salary, job level, and length of service to the relationship between absenteeism and job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction Moderated by Age, Length of Service, Salary, and Job Level

Hypotheses two through five stated that a larger negative rela-

tionship between job satisfaction and absenteeism would be noted among workers who were young, possessed short length of service, and were employed in lower job levels or in lower paying jobs. The most intuitive approach in testing these hypotheses, involving the division of subjects into subgroups according to their status relative to the moderator variables, was suggested by Frederiksen and Melville (1954). "Young" and "old" employees were defined as those under and over the median age for the entire group which was 27.7 years. Lenghts of employment were categorized as "short" or "long" depending on whether subjects had been employed less or more than 22.5 months, the median length of service. Similarly, the median salary of \$5949 was used to define "high" and "low" paying jobs. Job level was designated "low" if subjects were employed in job level I and "high" if they were employed in levels II through IV.

Product-moment correlations between the absence criterion and three measures of overall job satisfaction were computed within these eight subgroups. It had been predicted that the product-moment correlations would be larger for subgroups with lower positions with respect to the moderator variables than those subgroups with higher positions. Table 2 indicates that no differences in correlations between high and low moderator subgroups reached the .05 or even the .10 level of significance when the significance was tested using Fisher's \underline{z}_{T} transformation (Ferguson, 1971). Therefore, contrary to hypotheses two through five, higher negative relationships between overall job satisfaction and absence frequency were not found in the four low moderator subgroups.

Gibson (1966) implied that the same higher negative relationship

Table 2. Product-Moment Correlation Between Absence Frequency and Job Satisfaction Within High and Low Moderator Subgroups.

Overall Job			Subgro	roups Based on Moderator				
Satisfaction Measure	Moderator	N _L	N _H	<u>r</u> L	<u>r</u> H	<u>Δ</u> <u>r</u>	<u>z</u> a	
	Age							
Evaluative Score	C	7 0	73	186	153	.033	.199	
Difference Score		7 0	72	.273	.260	.013	.076	
Weighted-Difference Score		70	7 2	.219	.276	057	.350	
	Length of Service							
Evaluative Score	_	71	7 2	191	067	.124	.738	
Difference Score		70	72	.315	.158	.157	.980	
Weighted-Difference Score		70	72	.282	.174	.108	.665	
	Salary							
Evaluative Score		69	74	128	209	081	.485	
Difference Score		68	74	.217	.331	114	.864	
Weighted-Difference Score		68	74	.183	.329	146	1.094	
	Job Level							
Evaluative Score		76	67	194	082	.112	.684	
Difference Score		75	67	.283	.187	.096	.564	
Weighted-Difference Score		75	67	.258	.193	.065	.402	

Note--N = 142-143.

^aNo z exceeded the critical value of 1.645 which was required for the difference between correlations to be significant at the .05 level.

would exist among subjects with lower job levels, shorter lengths of service, and lower salaries. His assumptions were based on the belief that a higher negative relationship would be noted among low status subgroups because higher status would tend to counteract negative job satisfaction. The present study predicted a higher negative relationship between the criterion and overall job satisfaction among younger employees, since it was assumed that their more active social life would present more attractive alternatives than work, especially for employees with low overall job satisfaction. However, Gibson predicted a higher negative relationship for the older age group. Neither hypothesis was supported.

Since the directional test of the influence of the four moderators did not uncover any contribution, a more sensitive, nondirectional approach suggested by Saunders (1956) was employed. Saunders' method for examining moderated multiple regression for one independent and one moderator variable involved utilizing the cross-product of the two, as a third independent variable which was considered an index of interaction. The third term in this analysis provided for the interaction of overall job satisfaction with age, job level, salary, or length of service. Table 3 indicates the significance of the moderated multiple correlation $(\frac{R}{m})$ and the multiple correlation $(\frac{R}{m})$ which was computed without the cross-product term. The values of the beta weights (β) indicate the contributions of the independent variables to the relationship with frequency of absences. In addition to the sample multiple correlation coefficient estimates $(\frac{R}{s})$, estimates of the population multiple correlation $(\frac{R}{n})$ were determined by a formula developed by

Table 3 (Continued)

Predictors	Mu	Moderate <u>ltiple Corr</u> e		Multiple Correlations			
	β	<u>R</u> s	<u>R</u> P	β	$\frac{R}{s}$	<u>R</u>	
. Evaluative Score	3475			1558	-		
o. Salary c. (a) (b)	2126 .2350	.208	•174	1100	.206*	.191	
. Difference Score	.4435			.2855			
o. Salary c. (a) (b)	0074 2088	.320**	.302	1370	.317**	.309	
. Weighted Difference Score	.5122			.2643			
• Salary • (a) (b)	.0206 2980	.303**	.284	1363	.298**	.289	
. Evaluative Score	2233			1396			
• Job Level • (a) (b)	3290 .1957	•249*	.222	1743	.245*	•224	
. Difference Score	.2933			•2621			
Job Level (a) (b)	0716 0959	.330**	.312	- .1654	.329**	.322	
. Weighted Difference Score	.3131			.2462			
o. Job Level (a) (b)	0333 1555	.320**	.301	1766	.318**	.310	

Claudy (1969). Claudy found this formula to yield a lower error of estimation than the Wherry (1931), Pratt (1958), Herzberg (1967), or double cross-validity (Mosier, 1951) estimates when sample sizes of 40 or greater were employed.

Examination of Table 3 reveals that the difference and weighted difference scores of overall job satisfaction, for both \underline{R} and \underline{R}_m , were significantly correlated with the absence criterion. However, the size of these correlations indicate that a low, but definite, relationship exists.

Comparisons of \underline{r} , \underline{R} , and $\underline{R}_{\underline{m}}$ are presented in Table 4. One-tailed \underline{t} tests (Saunders, 1956) were performed to test the significance of differences between \underline{r} and \underline{R} . \underline{F} tests were also performed to indicate whether the interaction term made any $\underline{R}_{\underline{m}}$ significantly greater than its corresponding R (Guilford, 1956). Those values of \underline{R} which statistically exceed \underline{r} are designated by asterisks. However, the \underline{F} tests revealed that no $\underline{R}_{\underline{m}}$ was significantly greater than the corresponding R. Therefore, these results suggest that the four moderator variables did not significantly affect the relationship between absence frequency and overall job satisfaction.

Exploration of the importance of overall job satisfaction as a moderator of the relationship between overall job satisfaction and

 $[\]frac{1_{\underline{R}_p} = \left[\frac{1 - (N-4)(1-r^2)}{N-n-1} \quad (1 + \frac{2(1-r^2)}{N-n+1}) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}; \text{ where } N = \text{sample size, } n = number of independent observations, and } \underline{r} = \text{sample estimate of the multiple correlation coefficient.}$

Table 4. Comparison of Product-Moment, Multiple, and Moderated Multiple Correlations Between Overall Job Satisfaction Measures and Absence Frequency.

Overall Job	Product-	Coefficient	Personal Data Variables									
Satisfaction Moment <u>r</u>		Estimate	Age		Length of Service		Job Level		Salary			
		<u>R</u>	R ^c m	<u>R</u>	R _m	<u>R</u>	R ^c m	<u>R</u>	R ^c m			
Evaluative ^a 175 Score	175	Sample	.236*	•237	.204	.230	.245	.249	•206	.208		
	•.1/3	Population	.223	.208	•191	•200	•224	•222	•191	.174		
Difference	•266	Sample	.316*	*. 316	.303*	•314	•329**	.330	.317*	*.320		
Score	•200	Population	.307	.298	•294	•295	•322	•312	•309	.302		
Weighted	04.5	Sample	.307*	*. 312	.291*	.293	.318**	*.320	.298*	*.303		
Difference .245 Score	•245	Population	.299	.294	.282	•272	•310	.301	.289	.284		

Note--All probabilities (p) refer to significance of increase in R over r.

^CNo moderated multiple correlation (\underline{R}_m) was significantly larger than its corresponding multiple correlation (\underline{R}) .

 $a_{N} = 143$

 $b_{N} = 142$

 $[*]_{p} < .05$

 $^{**}_p < .025$

 $^{***}_{\underline{p}} < .01$

absenteeism, revealed that evaluative score plus importance score yielded a significantly greater \underline{R} (.251) than the \underline{r} of -.175 between the evaluative score and the criterion (Saunders, 1956). However, including the cross-product term in the moderated multiple produced an \underline{R}_{m} of .295, which was shown by an \underline{F} test (Guilford, 1956) to be an insignificant increase in correlation.

Since single demographic items were shown to account for additional variance in absence frequency, all four demographic items were included in separate equations for the evaluative, difference, and weighted difference scores. The multiple-correlation coefficients which resulted were .27, .33, and .32, respectively. F tests (Guilford, 1956) indicated that these coefficients were not significantly greater than the multiples computed when only job level and job satisfaction were used as independent variables. Examination of the beta weights in all three equations revealed that the overall job satisfaction measures, job level, and age made the major contributions. The three sets of beta weights are given in Table 21 of Appendix B.

Comrey and Wilson (1955) reported curvilinear relationships between job attitudes and quality control measures among aircraft employees. In exploration of possible nonlinear effects in the present study, two multiple correlations were computed. The independent variables in the first multiple regression equation were the difference score and the square of the difference score. The second regression equation included the difference score, its square, and its cube. The difference score was chosen as the job satisfaction measure since its zero-order correlation of .266 with the criterion was the highest among the three

overall satisfaction measures. The multiple correlation obtained from the third degree equation was .278, while the correlation from the second degree equation was .273. One-tailed \underline{t} tests (Saunders, 1956) showed that neither \underline{R} was significantly greater than the product-moment correlation of .266 between frequency of absence and the difference score.

Multi-dimensional Aspects of Job Satisfaction and Their Relationship to Absence Behavior

Having examined the relationship of absenteeism to overall job satisfaction, the separate dimensions of job satisfaction were then considered. The evaluative, difference, weighted difference, and importance score intercorrelation matrices, which are given in Tables 13 through 16 of Appendix B, were noted to contain a large number of significant intercorrelations among variables. Since the sample size was limited, the rank of each matrix of independent variables was reduced by means of a principal axes factor analysis. Oblimin rotations were performed. The four rotated factor pattern matrices are presented in Tables 17 through 20 of Appendix B.

Salient items for each factor (those having pattern loadings of .50 or higher) were selected for inclusion in job satisfaction clusters. The sum of item scores within a cluster was used as the cluster score. In those instances where items with negative pattern loadings necessitated subtracting those item responses, constants were added to insure that the total cluster score would remain positive.

Orthogonal rotations using the varimax method were also performed. However, the oblique rotations appeared to yield more interpretable clusters of items.

The clusters which emerged and their intercorrelations may be seen in Tables 5 through 8. Clusters which were found on all four scales were supervision, personnel policies, pay, and leave policy. A work contribution cluster appeared on the importance, evaluative, and weighted difference scales. Attendance and campus mail clusters were noted on both the evaluative and difference score scales. The importance and weighted difference scales produced work identification and support clusters. Social and security clusters emerged on the evaluative and weighted difference scales. An overall job satisfaction cluster and an uninterpretable cluster of items appeared only on the weighted difference scale.

Ronan (1970) noted that 14 earlier studies had enumerated the most frequent dimensions of job satisfaction as being work content and control of work, supervision, the organization and its leadership, advancement opportunity, pay and financial benefits, co-workers, and the conditions of work. Although several were not adequately determined, most of these dimensions seemed to emerge in the factors which were obtained in the present study.

Examination of Tables 5 through 8 reveals that only two clusters in the four matrices (campus mail and overall job satisfaction) were significantly correlated ($\underline{p} < .05$) with frequency of absences.

Finding no relationship between the separate dimensions of job satisfaction and the criterion, in addition to finding low negative correlations between the criterion and expressions of overall job satisfaction, raises the question of how much of the variance in absence behavior should be attributed to individual differences with

Table 5. Intercorrelation Matrix of Cluster Scores on Evaluation Scale.

Cluster	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
. Supervision									
• Personnel Policies	.15								
. Attendance	23	08							
. Pay	.22	.06	01						
. Contribution	.40	•15	04	02					
. Campus Mail	08	06	.39	07	.02				
. Social	.30	•09	11	.16	.28	.05			
. Leave Policy	.20	.36	11	05	.18	.02	.09		
 Security 	•30	.35	05	.40	.21	00	.15	.26	
O. Absence Frequency	08	08	.14	05	10	.24	03	09	05

Note--N = 126-141.

Table 6. Intercorrelation Matrix of Cluster Scores on Difference Scale.

Cluster	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1. Supervision						_		
2. Personnel Policies	·15							
3. Attendance	.20	04						
4. Contribution	.25	07	.10					
5. Pay	.14	• 04	04	1 2				
6. Campus Mail	•03	07	•39	03	•02			
7. Leave Policy	11	•39	11	•00	.03	.02		
8. Absence Frequency	.06	 04	.14	•08	.03	.24	09	

Note--N = 126-143.

Table 7. Intercorrelation Matrix of Cluster Scores on Weighted Difference Scale.

Cluster	1	2	3	4	5 	6	7	8	9
. Supervision									
Personnel Policies	.13								
3. Identification	.26	.21							
• Pay	.21	•13	•05						
Social or Security	04	.25	•24	07					
. Leave Policy	.11	•35	.19	•13	•33				
7. Support	.24	.29	•26	•17	•06	.21			
3. Overall Job Satisfac	t io .48	.24	.32	•11	02	.07	.28		
. Unnamed ^a	.33	.06	07	.15	.00	.08	.08	.03	
0. Absence Frequency	.14	01	.10	.04	05	07	.01	.19	13

Note--N = 131-141.

^aAlthough the cluster could not be clearly named, it was included since all clusters with pattern loadings equal to .50 or higher were retained.

Table 8. Intercorrelation Matrix of Cluster Scores on Importance Scale.

	Cluster	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. 2. 3.	Contribution Personnel Policies Support	.26	•24						
4. 5. 6.	Advancement Identification Leave Policy	•43 •39 •27	•38 •26 •42	•31 •31 •28	•26 •33	•29			
7. 8. 9.	Pay Supervision Absence Frequency	.34 .50 .09	•35 •22 •08	•41 •42 ••03	.36 .33 .16	.28 .29 .06	•32 •18 •00	.32 .10	04

Note--N = 127-141.

respect to job satisfaction. It may be that such random occurrences as illness in the immediate family, sudden transportation difficulties, or other chance phenomena make more than minor contributions. In addition, other variables, as yet not determined, may account for much of the variance in absence behavior. On the other hand, it may be that attitudes toward "work in general" rather than toward a specific job assume a major role in deciding a person's attendance behavior.

Employee Perceptions of Mistreatment and Absence Frequency

The relationship between absence frequency and employee perceptions of mistreatment regarding pay or promotion was investigated by the use of a three point scale. When questioned as to whether they had been mistreated, subjects were permitted a "yes," "no," or "I don't know" response. As Table 9 indicates, no association was discovered between the mistreatment and absence variables.

Since neutral, "I don't know" responses were available for the items used to examine these issues, the frequency of absences for subjects who expressed definite feelings, e. g., those who answered "yes" or "no," were compared. A one-tailed <u>t</u> test, as can be seen in Table 10, revealed no significant differences between the means of the two groups.

Therefore, no support was demonstrated for hypotheses six and seven which stated that employees who felt mistreated compared to other employees with respect to salary increases or promotion consideration would be absent more frequently. These results fail to support Patchen's (1960) finding that employees who feel mistreated with respect

Table 9. Product-Moment Correlation Between Absence Frequency and Employee Perceptions of Mistreatment.

Perceptions of Mistreatment	<u>r</u>
Salary Increases ^a Promotion Consideration ^b	06 08
$a_{N} = 142$	
$^{b}N = 141$	

Table 10. Differences Between Mean Frequency of Absences for Subjects Who Do or Do Not Feel Mistreated.

Perceptions of Mistreatment	N _	$\overline{\mathbf{x}}$	\$	<u>t</u> ^a
Salary Increases Yes (treated fairly) No (treated unfairly)	55 32	2.24 2.66	1.91 2.50	.871
Promotion Consideration Yes (treated fairly) No (treated unfairly)	59 25	2.76 3.20	2•15 1·74	.892

 $^{^{\}text{a}}\text{Critical}$ value for the .05 level of significance for a one-tailed $\underline{\textbf{t}}$ test is 1.645.

to pay and promotion opportunity are more often absent. However, it should be noted that Patchen utilized group data rather than the individual absence data which were employed in the present study.

Absence Behavior and Perceptions of Absenteeism as a Problem

Relationships between absence frequency and perceptions of absenteeism were also considered in the present study. Results presented in Table 11 indicate that no association between absence frequency and employee perception of absenteeism as a problem exists. Thus, no support was generated for hypothesis eight, which proposed that employees who were concerned about absenteeism as a problem would tend to be absent less frequently, or for White's (1960) finding that employees who "noticed" the absences of others were absent less often themselves.

Table 11. Product-Moment Correlations Between Perceptions of Absenteeism as a Problem and Absence Frequency.

Absence as a Problem on Campus	<u>r</u>
Employee Perception ^a Employee Perceptions of Supervisor's Concern ^b	•12 •18*

 $a_{N} = 133$

 $^{^{}b}N = 126$

 $[*]_{p} < .05$

However, as the significant correlation in Table 11 signifies, there exists a low relationship between frequency of absence and employee perception of their supervisor's concern for absenteeism as a problem. This finding is contrary to hypothesis nine and to the finding of Tucker and Lotz (1957) on which it was based. Hypothesis nine stated that those employees who perceived their supervisors as being concerned about absenteeism would be absent less often. To the extent that this relationship exists, it could be explained if supervisors of more frequently absent secretaries had discussed the problem with the employees in question.

Employment History, Number of Dependents, and Attendance Behavior

A 2X2 completely randomized factorial analysis of variance was performed to see if the joint possession of dependents and an unstable employment record were characteristic of employees with greater frequencies of absence. The two levels of dependent status (D) were "none" and "some." More than three jobs and three or fewer jobs were the levels used for the number of previous jobs (J) factor. Since the numbers of subjects within cells were unequal, one analysis was completed by examining the influence of D and JD with the J effect removed from them. Then, a re-analysis was performed to examine the effects of J and JD with the D effect removed. This method of analysis presented by Cramer (1969) provides a way of analyzing the effects with disparity in cell frequencies which produce a non-orthogonal design. As can be seen from Table 16, neither J, D, nor JD effects were significant. Hays (1963) noted that evidence for the alternative hypothesis must appear as an F ratio exceeding 1.00, and "an F ratio less than 1.00 can

Table 12. Completely Randomized Factorial Analysis of Variance of Absence Frequency as a Function of Dependents and Number of Previous Jobs.

Source	SS	DF	MS	<u>F</u>	P Less Than
		Anal	lysis with	D = 0	
Within Cells	738.025	126	5.857		
J	.002	1	.002	.000	.985
DJ	3.140	1	3.140	.536	. 465
		Re-ar	nalysis wit	h J = 0	
Within Cells	738.025	126	5.857		
D	10.785	1	10.785	1.841	•177
JD	3.140	1	3.140	.536	.465

Note--Program supplied by Cramer (1969).

signify nothing except sampling error (or perhaps nonrandomness of the samples or failure of the assumptions)."

Whereas, Naylor and Vincent (1959) found that female office personnel with dependent children tended to be absent more often than women with no dependent children, no evidence of such an association was demonstrated in the present study. Also, Gadourek's (1965) finding that workmen with a history of many previous jobs have poorer attendance records does not seem to apply to the secretaries in this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Several findings of the present study seem to have important implications regarding the study of female absence behavior and its relationship to expressions of job satisfaction. These findings and their pertinence to the existing literature are as follows.

The major finding of the present study is that overall job satisfaction is significantly negative in relationship to absence behavior for female clerical workers. This result confirms the first hypothesis of this study and agrees with the findings of Waters and Roach (1971). It is, however, contrary to the findings of Metzner and Mann (1953) who failed to establish any such definite relationship for white-collar women. This finding also lends some modest support to the "attraction to work" theories of Vroom (1964) and Gibson (1966) which posit that employees who are attracted to the work situation will tend to be absent less often.

Since overall satisfaction with the work environment appears to be associated with the attendance behavior of secretaries, implications for job design seem to exist. From those items which correlated highest with overall job satisfaction (.45 to .60), it appears that jobs which are satisfying provide opportunity to use and develop skills, freedom to make decisions regarding the work, information about what supervisors' expect, and recognition for good ideas and good work. Considering such "general" needs when designing secretarial jobs might prove beneficial

in reducing absenteeism. In addition, if those employees who withdraw temporarily from work through being absent are the same workers who later withdraw permanently through termination (Melbin, 1961), the findings of the present study might contain implications for controlling turnover.

The weighted difference overall job-satisfaction score failed to be more strongly related to absences than was the unweighted difference score. Therefore, Ewen's (1967) suspicion that an unweighted job satisfaction score is "as good an estimate" of overall satisfaction as a weighted total score seems justified.

Subgroup analyses failed to find support for hypotheses two through five which stated that for younger employees, in a lower job level, having shorter length of service, or lower pay, a higher negative relationship between absence frequency and overall job satisfaction would exist. These results were also contrary to Gibson's (1966) suggestion that there would be a higher negative relationship between work identification and absence in lower status jobs. He predicted a moderating effect for age opposite to the one hypothesized in the present study, but it too was not supported by the results reported in this thesis.

A nondirectional investigation of the possible interaction between these same demographic variables and overall job satisfaction, using moderated multiple regression techniques, indicated that no significant interactions occurred. However, the separate contributions of age, job level, length of service, and salary accounted for additional variance in absence behavior beyond that "explained" by overall job satisfaction. When all four demographic variables and overall job satisfaction were

included as independent variables in the same regression equation, overall job satisfaction, job level, and age made the major contributions to the relationship with the criterion.

Exploration for possible nonlinear relationships between overall job satisfaction and absence frequency was effected by comparing second and third degree polynomial regression equations to first degree equations. Utilizing the square or the square and cube of overall job satisfaction failed to establish a stronger relationship with the criterion than the one noted by using a first degree equation.

Clusters of salient job satisfaction items were derived by factor analysis to study the relationship between the separate dimensions of job satisfaction and absence frequency. Only two clusters, overall job satisfaction and campus mail service, were significantly correlated with the criterion.

Since the separate clusters were found to be unrelated to the criterion and the criterion's relationship with overall job satisfaction was low, the extent to which individual differences with respect to job satisfaction should be expected to be related to understanding absenteeism was questioned. It is possible that other variables or chance phenomena such as illness in the family might account for much of the variance in absence behavior.

No definite relationship emerged between employee feelings of fair treatment with respect to salary increases or promotion consideration and absence behavior. These results fail to confirm the findings by Patchen (1960) that employees who feel unfairly treated with respect to promotion or salary tend to be absent more frequently.

The belief that regular attenders would more likely "notice" the absence behavior of their co-workers was the basis for hypothesis eight, which stated that a negative relationship between absence frequency and employee concern for absenteeism as a problem would exist. The results present no evidence to support this hypothesis or the finding by White (1960) from which the hypothesis was derived. However, contrary to hypothesis nine and findings by Tucker and Lotz (1957), employees who consider their supervisors to be concerned with absenteeism as a problem, tend to be more often absent. This finding might reflect supervisors' discussions with the more frequently absent employees.

No support emerged for hypothesis ten which stated that the joint possession of dependents and an unstable employment history would be characteristics of attendance violators. Neither dependent status, number of previous jobs, nor their interaction appeared significantly related to the criterion. These findings were not consistent with the results reported by Gadourek (1965) who found more absences among men with a history of many previous jobs and those reported by Naylor and Vincent (1957) who noted that female clerical workers possessing children had worse attendance records than childless workers.

APPENDIX A

	Page
Job Satisfaction Questionnaire	83
Letter to Employees	95
Letter to Terminated Employees	96

Social	Security
Numbe	er

EMPLOYEE ATTITUDE SURVEY

This questionnaire has been prepared by a graduate student in the School of Psychology. It is requested that you record your social security number in the above space. The use of social security numbers will allow composite descriptions of those groups responding similarly on the survey to be developed. These group descriptions will be derived from data already collected by employee social security number. After the two sources of information are combined, both social security numbers will be destroyed. The personnel department will be given only a summary of ideas and attitudes expressed in this survey. No individual will be identified; no records of individual attitudes will be supplied to the personnel department or any other department, faculty member, or administrative person. Once the information has been collected the questionnaires will be destroyed.

PLEASE DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME

INSTRUCTIONS

On the following pages are some questions which ask you to give your opinions on various aspects of your job and --*. Indicate your answers to each question by circling one number on each rating scale, with 7 being the highest rating, and 1 the lowest. Numbers between 1 and 7 should be used for ratings between "very little" and "very much" or between "not important" and "very important." (LOOK AT THE EXAMPLE WHICH IS ALREADY MARKED.)

OPPORTUNITY FOR CONVERSATION WITH CO-WORKERS:

How much opportuni	ty do	you h	ave?				
very little	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 very much
How much should yo	u hav	e?					
very little	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 very much
							-
How important is t	his t	o you?					
not important	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 very
•							important

DO NOT CIRCLE ANYTHING BUT NUMBERS

*All references to the institution in which the survey was conducted have been removed from this sample of the questionnaire.

I	REPUTATION:								
1-	How much prestig very little	e does 1	ha 2	ve in 3	the o	ommuni 5	lty? 6	7	very much
2-	How much should very little			3	44	5	6	7	very much
3-	How important is not important				4	5	6	7	very important
OPPO	ORTUNITY TO USE YO	UR SPE	CIAL S	KILLS	AND A	BILITI	ŒS:		
4-	How much opportu very little		you i	have? 3	4	5	6	7	very much
5-	How much opportu very little			you h 3	ave? 4	5	6	7	very much
6-	How important is not important			?	4	5	6	7	very important
THI	KING ABOUT YOUR J	OB OUT:	SIDE W	ORKIN	G HOUI	RS:			
7-	How much do you very little	think a	about 2	your 3	job af 4	ter wo	orking 6		s? very much
8-	How much should very little		2	3	4	5	6	7	very much
9-	How important is not important				4	5	6	7	very important
G001	D PLANNING AND SCH	EDULIN	G OF W	ORK B	Y You	R SUPE	RVISOR:		
10-	How much is ther very little	e? 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	very much
11-	How much should very little			3	4	5	6	7	very much
12-	How important is not important		to you 2	?	4	5	6	7	very important

PAY	PAY FOR THE WORK WHICH YOU DO:									
13-	How high is it? very low		2	3	4	5	6	7	very	high
14-	How high should very low	it b	e? 2	3	4	5	6	7	very	high
15-	How important in not important			you? 3	4	5	6	7	very	important
F E E I	ING OF SATISFACT	ION F	ROM Y	our J	ОВ:					
16-	How much satisf very little				get? 4	5	6	7	very	much
17-	How much should very little			3	4	5	6	7	very	much
18-	How important i not importan				4	5	6	7	very	important
PRES	TIGE OF YOUR JOB	OUTS	SIDE -	-:						
19-	How much presti very little	ge do 1	es y o 2	ur jo 3	b hav 4	e out	side: 6	? 7	very	much
20-	How much presti very little	ge sh 1	ou1d 2	your 3	job h 4	ave o	utsid 6	e : 7	-? very	much
21-	How important i not important				4	5	6	7	very	important
OPPO	RTUNITY IN YOUR	JOB I	O DEV	ELOP	NEW S	KILLS	AND	KNO	WLEDG	E:
22-	How much is the very little		2	3	4	5	6	7	very	much
23-	How much should very little			3	4	5	6	7	very	much
24-	How important i			you? 3	4	5	6	7	very	import <i>a</i> nt

FEEL	ING A PART OF THE	COM	TINU	Y:					
25 -	How much do you for very little			of th		commu 5			very much
26-	How much should ye very little		lap 2		of it	5	6	7	very much
27-	How important is not important		you 2		4	5	6	7	very important
INFO	RMATION RELATING TO	0 0	PERAT	'ING I	PROCEI	oures:			
28-	How much imformat very little			prov 3	vide? 4	5	6	7	very much
29-	How much should b very little			3	4	5	6	7	very much
30-	How important is not important			.? 3	4	5	6	7	very important
COOL	PERATION FROM THE F.	ACULTY:	:						
31-	PERATION FROM THE F. How much cooperat very little	ion is	ther	e? 3	4	5	6	7	very much
•	How much cooperat	ion is 1 2	ther 2 ould	3		5	6		very much
31-	How much cooperativery little How much cooperat	ion is 1 2 ion sho 1 2	ther 2 ould 2 o you	ther	e be?			7	•
31- 32- 33-	How much cooperativery little How much cooperativery little How important is	ion is 1 2 ion sho 1 2 this to	ther 2 ould 2 o you	there	e be? 4	5	6	7	very much
31- 32- 33-	How much cooperativery little How much cooperativery little How important is not important CREATMENT OF EMPLOY How much does	ion is 1 2 ion sho 1 2 this to 1 2	ther 2 ould 2 o you 2	3 there3 ?	e be? 4 4	5	6	7	very much very important
31- 32- 33-	How much cooperativery little How much cooperativery little How important is not important CREATMENT OF EMPLOY How much does affecting them?	ion is 1 2 ion sho 1 2 this to 1 2	ther ould you ther ould in out out out out out out out ou	3 there3 ?	e be? 4	5	6	7 7 dec	very much very important
31- 32- 33-	How much cooperativery little How much cooperativery little How important is not important REATMENT OF EMPLOY How much does affecting them?	ion is 1 2 ion sho 1 2 this to 1 2 EE: conside 1 2	ther ould you in in ther	there 3 ? 3 divid	e be? 4 4 duals	5 5 in ma	6 6 aking	7 7 dec 7	very much very important

37-	How much do you f	eel y	our j 2	ob co	ntrib 4	utes? 5	6	7	very much
٠,					·	_			•
20	How much would yo								
38-	very little	Ţ	2	3	4	5	6	7	very much
39-	How important is not important				4	5	6	7	very important
YOUR	WORK PLACE:								
	How much do your	worki	ng co	nditi	ions h	elp y	ou do	а	good job?
40-		1	2	3	4				very much
	How much should t	har h							
41-				3	4	5	6	7	very much
	•								•
42-	How important is not important		to yo	ou? 3	4	5	6	7	very important
42-	not important	1	2	3	4	,	U	′	very important
SUPE	RVISOR'S APPRECIAT	ON C	of the	IMPO	ORTANC	E OF	Your	WOR	K:
	How much is there		_	_		_	.=	_	_
43-	very little	7	2	3	4	5	6	1	very much
	How much should t	here	be?						
44 -	very little	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	very much
	How important is	this	to vo	111?					
45-	not important	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	very important
FREE	DOM TO MAKE DECISI	ONS I	уоу из	JR WOE	RK:	-			
	How much is there	?							
46-	very little	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	very much
	How much should t	hare	ho?						
47-				3	4	5	6	7	very much
						•			
1.0	How important is						c	-	4
40-	not important	7	2	3	4	5	6	/	very important

YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO -- OPERATIONS:

COOPERATION AMONG YOUR FELLOW WORKERS:

49-	How much teamwork very little			3	4	5	6	7	very	much
50 -	How much should the very little			3	4	5	6	7	very	much
51-	How important is to not important			ı? 3	4	5	6	7	very	important
PROM	PT ACTION ON YOUR C	OMPL	AINTS	AND	PROBLI	EMS B	Y YOU	R SI	JPERV]	SOR:
52-	How much is there?		2	3	4	5	6	7	very	much
53-	How much should the very little			3	4	5	6	7	very	much
54 -	How important is to not important				4	5	6	7	very	important
OPPO	RTUNITY TO CHANGE J	OBS	AT:	:						
55 -	How much is there?		2	3	4	5	6	7	very	much
56-	How much should the very little			3	4	5	6	7	very	much
57-	How important is to not important	his 1	to you	ı? 3	4	5	6	7	very	important
PRES	TIGE OF YOUR JOB AT	r:						•		
58~	How much does your very little			? 3	4	5	6	7	very	much '
59-	How much should it very little			3	4	5	6	7	very	much
60-	How important is to not important				4	5	6	7	very	important

YOUR	R SUPERVISOR'S ABI	LITY	IO GET	ALO	NG WI	гн ре	OPLE:			
61-	How much ability very little		he or 2	she 3	have?	? 5	6	7	very	much
62-	How much should very little		she h 2		4	5	6	7	very	much
63-	How important is not important			u? 3	4	5	6	7	very	important
OPPO	ORTUNITY FOR PROMO	TION I	FROM Y	our .	JOB:					
64-	How much opportu very little			re? 3	4	5	6	7	very	much
65-	How much should very little			3	4	5	6	7	very	much
66-	How important is not important				4	5	6	7	very	important
CONT	FACT WITH FELLOW V	ORKER	s ours	IDE 1	WORKI	NG HO	URS:			
67-	How much do you very little		iate w 2				kers o			
68-	How much should very little		sso ci a 2	te?	4	5	6	7	very	much
69-	How important is not important				4	5	6	7	very	important
INFO	DRMATION ABOUT WHA	T YOU	R SUPE	RVIS	OR EX	PECTS	OF YO	ប:		
70-	How much information very little		about 2	your 3	job 1 4		nsibil 6			
71-	How much should very little	you g	et? 2	3	4	5	6	7	very	much
72-	How important is not important		-	u? 3	4	5	6	7	very	important

73-	How much is very litt			2	3	4	5	6	7	very	much
74 -	How much sh				3	4	5	6	7	very	much
75 -	How imports	nt is t	this 1	to 2	you? 3	4	5	6	7	very	important
RECO	GNITION FOR	GOOD II	DEAS	OR	COOD	work:					
76-	How much do			2	3	4	5	6	7	very	much
77-	How much sh very litt			t? 2	3	4	5	6	7	very	much
78-	How imports not impor					4	5	6	7	very	important
HIGH	ER ADMINISTE	RATION':	s suf	POR	T OF	YOUR SU	PERV	ISOR:			
79-	How much ba				or sh 3		5	6	7	very	much
80-	How much ba						: ? 5	6	7	very	much
81-	How importa					4	5	6	7	very	important
YOUR	JOB WORK LO	DAD:									
82-	How much wo				?	4	5	6	7	very	 auch
83-	How much sh very litt				3	4	5	6	7	very	much
84-	How imports			to 2	you? 3	4	5	6	7	very	important
85-	Compared to with regard responses.)	l to sa	e lary	mpl inc	oyees rease	, have ? (Cir	you l	been t one of	rea th	ted fa	airly lowing

Yes

No Do Not Know

OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN GOOD EQUIFMENT, SUPPLIES, AND MATERIALS:

86- Compared to other -- employees, have you been treated fairly with regard to promotion consideration? (Circle one of the following responses.)

Yes No Do Not Know

87- How many dependents do you have? (Write number in space)

OTHER ASPECTS OF YOUR JOB AND --

Consider the following items. Indicate <u>your</u> satisfaction with each item as it exists now at --by circling a number from 1 to 7 at the left. Then indicate the importance of the item to <u>you</u> by circling a number from 1 to 7 at the right.

IMPORTANCE	very important	3 4 5 6 7	3 4 5 6 7	3 4 5 6 7	3 4 5 6 7	3 4 5 6 7	3 4 5 6 7	3 4 5 6 7	3 4 5 6 7	3 4 5 6 7	3 4 5 6 7	3 4 5 6 7	3 4 5 6 7	3 4 5 6 7
7	ant	2	2	2	7	7	7	7	2	7	7	7	7	7
	not important	~	H	-	-	-	-	-	-	H	H	H	-	-
	dw;	101-	102-	103-	104-	105-	106-	107-	108-	109-	. 110-	111-	112-	113-
		Vacation Policy	Sick Leave Policy	Maternity Leave Policy	Miscellaneous and Personal Leave Policy	Retirement Income Pay Deductions	Group Life Insurance	Group Hospital, Medical, and Dental Insurance	Retirement Plan	Appeals Procedure	Your Job Security	Chance to Meet New People in Your Work	Your Supervisor's Concern for You as a Person	Your Pay Compared to Other Secretarial
<u>ION</u>	very satisfied	6 7	2 9	2 9	1 9	2 9	2 9	6 7	2 9	6 7	2 9	. 2 9	6 7	6 7
ACT		5	3	2	Ŋ	Ŋ	S	2	2	5	2	5	ζ.	'n
SATISFACTION		4	4	4	4	7	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
SAI	ied	က	m	ო	ന	က	m	n	m	ო	m	ო	3	e
	ry tisf	7	2	7	2	7	7	2	7	7	7	7	2	7
	very dissatisfied	-	7	*	-	H	7	-	-	~-1	7	-	7	-
	d£.	-88	-68	-06	91-	92 -	93-	- 76	-56	- 96	-16	-86	-66	100-

OPINIONS CONCERNING ADDITIONAL JOB FACTORS

following items to be a problem on the -- campus. Then indicate on the right, by circling a number from 1 to 7, the extent to which you believe your supervisor considers the item to be a problem on the -- campus. By circling a number from 1 to 7 indicate on the left the extent to which you consider each of the

YOUR OPINION

≻ ar ea										
very large problem	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
C	9	9	9	•	9	9	9	9	9	9
	S	Ŋ	2	5	S	Ŋ	S	5	'n	'n
	7	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	3	3	e.	e	e	Э	က	c,	n	n
/ 11 [em	2	2	7	7	7	7	2	7	2	2
very small problem	-	н	 1	H	1	-	-	7	p=4	7
•	124-	125-	126-	127-	128-	129-	130-	131-	132-	133-
	Parking	Maintenance of Buildings and Equipment	Maintenance of Campus Grounds	Employee Turnover	Campus Mail Service	Employee Tardiness	Availability of Part-time Help	Procedures for Obtaining Supplies and Materials	Employee Absenteeism	Restroom Facilities
very large problem	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
ve 1a pro	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
	Ŋ	'n	2	s,	5	S	5	'n	٠	2
	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	ო	e.	ო	ო	က	e	m	m	ო	n
, ч	7	7	2	2	7	8	7	5	7	7
very small problem	—	Ħ	Ħ	-	=	-	, -	- i	-	-
ve sn pro	114- 1	115-	-911	117-	118-	119-	120-	121-	122-	123-

YOUR WRITTEN COMMENTS

If you have opinions or ideas that you have not been able to express in this questionnaire, please write them in the space provided below.

During the next week a questionnaire will be distributed as a part of a research project conducted by Mr. Richard Martin, a graduate student in the School of Psychology. A principal aim of the project is to study employee attitudes toward their work and their work environment. Your participation in completing this questionnaire will contribute greatly toward the success of this research project and toward making * a better place in which to work. Results of the study will enable us to concentrate our efforts toward improving the employee work environment.

The anonymity of the employee will be insured. Social security numbers are requested so that additional information, already collected according to social security number, may be used to create composite descriptions of those groups which respond differently on the questionnaire. To insure further anonymity, upon receiving the questionnaire, Mr. Martin will match identical social security numbers, recode the questionnaire and descriptive data with a new three digit number, and then destroy both social security numbers.

You will be personally contacted by Mr. Martin and given additional information and instructions. Again, please feel free to give your honest opinions concerning your work setting without fear of identification.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Personnel Director

^{*} name of institution removed.

During the week of June 21, an effort was made to contact all of the secretaries employed by -- *. The purpose of this personal contact was to distribute a job attitude survey, which is discussed in the enclosed letter prepared by the personnel office. Even though you are no longer employed by --, your participation would be of service in evaluating the present working conditions and would contribute to the success of this thesis project.

The completion of this questionnaire and its return in the enclosed envelope would be greatly appreciated. If you have any questions concerning the questionnaire or the purpose of the survey, please feel free to contact me at 872 7048.

Yours truly,

C. Richard Martin

^{*} Name of institution removed.

APPENDIX B

		Page
	Procedures for Interpreting Entries on the Intercorrelation Matrices	98
Table 13.	Intercorrelations Among Items on the Evaluative Scale	99
Table 14.	Intercorrelations Among Items on the Difference Scale	115
Table 15.	Intercorrelations Among Items on the Weighted Difference Scale	131
Table 16.	Intercorrelations Among Items on the Importance Scale	137
Table 17.	Factor Pattern Matrix of Evaluation Scale Items	143
Table 18.	Factor Pattern Matrix of Difference Scale Items	144
Table 19.	Factor Pattern Matrix of Weighted Difference Scale Items	145
Table 20.	Factor Pattern Matrix of Importance Scale Items	146
Table 21.	Multiple Correlations of Frequency of Absences with Four Demographic Variables and Expressions of Overall Job Satisfaction	147

The items, for which intercorrelations appear in Tables 13 through 16, are represented by the numbers which they were assigned on the job satisfaction questionnaire (see Appendix A). Exceptions to this procedure occur on Tables 14 and 15. On Table 14, the first 28 entries are Difference Score items which were computed as the difference between "How much should there be" and "How much is there" questions. These 28 items are referred to as D1 through D28. On Table 15, Weighted Difference Score items are denoted by the product of questionnaire numbers for the item and its importance rating. Again as in Table 14, D1 through D28 refer to the Difference Score items.

For all four intercorrelation matrices, the letters A through K represent demographic and criterion data. The interpretation of these letters are as follows:

- A Number of months employed
- B Salary
- C Job Level
- D Age
- E Marital Status
- F Number of previous jobs
- G Years of Education
- H Frequency of absences (first three month period)
- J Frequency of absences (second three month period)
- K Total frequency of absences (six month period)

TABLE 13

			INTERCO	rrelations a	MONG ITEMS O	N THE EVALUA	TIVE SCALE			
	1	4	7	10	13	16	19	22	25	28 .
1	1.00000	.31656	• ก8885	.23674	•06 ⁰ 19	21139	33719	27724	27632	.1P620
ů	.31656	1.00000	.25717	37199	11267	47795	34237	43364	25941	24674
7	.08885	.25717	1.00000	18455	.10743	28430	.20071	22946	15909	09441
10	.23674	.37199	100000	1.00000	.11339	.39699	.16070	33098	.08784	.22187
13	.06919	.11267	10743	.11339	1.00000	.16005	25538	.12661	.18101	.21534
16	.21139	.47795	.28430	•39699	•1600B	1.00000	36929	.51194	30743	2*191
19	.33719	.34237	.20071	•16070	25538	.36929	1.00000	21174	31947	13226
22	.27724	.43364	.22946	•10070 •33098	12661	.51194	24140	1.00000	33760	22595
25	.27632	.25941	•1590 9	• 09784	18181	.30743	.24140 .3194 7	.33760	1.00000	•22545 •34 3 52
28	.18620	24674	• n9441	.22107	21534	.25191	13228	.22595	34372	1.00000
31	.16616	-21524	~•n4697	28790	.09706	.30651	.18148	.20499	•273 <u>92</u>	.30680
34	.30490	.38752	•06660	22078	21176	.32916	12182	.46725	377 0	.41171
37	.40341	.50803	•24652	.30095	10057	54751	43404	43031	32765	26997
40	14946	.21553	•2465£ •06345	.27310	·18636	44268	17101	34067	180"3	21797
43	.28549	.40028	•11117	47014	.15230	49903	17862	36581	32694	31373
46	.18600	.31522	• në 065	28298	.05154	49668	27352	.33124	24694	22316
49	.27536	.34187	•08966	.39170	•17136	•48760	28889	.35754	•337P1	.22199
52	.21511	.30371	•02507	.43341	17061	.42235	.21760	.32099	.20210	•2285e
55	.19639	.23040	•n4633	•11535	·18693	23901	.17363	29257	20777	.33245
5B	.26937	•46862	• 5998	21608	29642	38920	49258	4047e	40715	.31333
61	.21749	.24480	•n5835	40164	17227	40236	08415	29050	17754	•22179
64	.07330	.23241	•n9917	•11310	.22583	.22895	16233	.30002	27205	10603
67	.18531	.15639	•16739	•05555	.01583	.20323	.25321	.18220	40063	•n634a
70	.15279	.32440	.14875	45725	.15321	.53618	.16259	.22128	27047	.32214
73	26392	19277	.07430	19967	22413	28643	11697	14820	137.1	28380
76	-21645	35721	13386	41722	17031	51623	18378	36672	29570	34907
79	.21147	.18457	.04729	23583	02208	.246J7	19879	12592	20347	22695
82	21379	.34123	.22212	15637	17469	26236	08021	25834	00015	03500
85	.05339	.05160	-•n5164	.13732	51900	.10767	18567	.16622	19304	.14768
86	.00331	.21967	09099	.07830	32922	15172	04765	.26367	1601	(9925
86	19609	13941	•n6204	03427	02143	14442	05692	03836	03205	01291
89	13720	• 96802	n2735	18336	01122	12239	15771	05922	05679	n9524
90	.16497	10,65	• 06840	.02111	06059	.09114	.16104	04514	21321	14339
91	.26223	.14467	69733	•17974	02418	.23010	.08739	21812	.18574	.18118
92	26116	00486	r93r2	06:37	05391	01866	.05104	00454	07199	11894
93	36019	15792	.00165	.15987	16255	19090	08226	14748	16908	10972
94	.23975	.02590	00918	00620	10750	01575	03037	0782n	02008	00770
95	.17673	. 67260	n0556	14865	05714	14268	03017	14178	06792	15065
96	.18361	.11659	02215	.09165	.15549	.16903	.21046	09525	.14521	.22791
97	.26214	.22418	.08470	.11901	.19492	.25032	.21115	.18896	24000	34350
98	.28765	.51118	11096	.16555	→.00576	.34611	.21697	34783	25603	20304
99	.23504	.2983p	.07170	.40783	•16189	41018	.16937	27631	25811	.31704
100	.09039	•08954	•n53n8	• 07540	63594	.12852	.30304	17024	•20K25	.24901
114	.08526	.69117	.08743	• G & A & O	.12535	•n396 7	.11318	.16780	.11436	•07195
115	.04288	.04851	•n4976	·05322	- •0.1206	.11105	.05033	.12579	•08106	 13590
116	.07267	.03058	•01769	•00870	.09116	.06338	.10748	 0598a	•00095	- •∩₽291
117	.09126	+11499	•1028B	.02087	11956	01675	01671	01526	.06673	+C4298
118	.06873	• 05307	.02050	.00139	01629	02660	.11028	.07073	01218	-•n2494
119	10034	08390	.04830	12261	02277	~. 12056	00068	09882	15215	→ •04906
120	13795	+.11805	•01111	14964	~.09195	08583	07293	22749	14303	19220
121	.18310	.11884	⊌ ∩3526	.01040	-,13629	- .04034	.01260	.07062	.03178	16179
122	11556	 1331¢	-05258	21823	•05536	 10694	.02479	13489	04940	05386
123	09580	02282	11259	17846	05336	14737	07857	06222	01361	-,21541
124	.15637	.19748	•14889	.22376	.20212	.28365	.20466	.27433	.11657	16499
125	.03701	.11914	.02480	.03991	.14822	.14128	05139	.06166	.07068	13299

Teble 13--(Continued)

126	.09276	.06823	•n3056	.08452	.14536	10061	.08667	07312	.09020	07050
127	09225	.12752	•n3554	.02717	13652	05691	06156	.00039	07296	16604
128	.07055	.02872	02044	.00505	-,00749	08352	.08630	.03374	00m10	.02387
129	.00162	•u7566	· D8447	- 16289	02533	08680	.06978	02160	03188	•05128
130	06731	09112	01582	09016	07n25	05032	05012	22159	18516	15782
131	.12202	.09592	•n2354	.03212	05825	-,11874	.01402	.02744	00138	10328
132	01656	+,11209	.04758	22217	.09007	11900	.07976	0657p	07430	n1092
133	03068	.05858	13404	09331	-,03664	•06224	06364.	.04025	11202	- 22435
87	09612	 ₩2055	- •∩2692	11177	00162	07577	03839	 03651	06600	10964
Α	.25#36	.17005	•14692	•02756	05336	.24644	.17710	.13147	•13099	07622
ь	.19424	·16096	•17576	.04935	.27254	.19830	.13102	.22043	.1512 5	- •00979
C	.20495	.19525	.13200	•12265	.27853	.20021	16335	.20312	•10354	02738
Ð	.26408	.16362	.07930	.16794	.00426	.27758	17931	.0752ი	034 1	.02780
Ł	-,11231	.13180	.09263	.04746	- .0995 7	.11206	09488	.04839	02621	12815
F	.09481	• 44694	•n2506	•06453	13957	00436	08244	.00141	02325	14743
. 6	.19343	00498	.02223	.04397	0627 6	.00076	.02660	.00862	.09057	03830
H	10954	15598	•06177	07102	04712	16143	- 03283	04971	- 03940	10717
J	03126	.02110	-n8083	06220	13171	09156	.01864	03814	.06375	•12833
K	09100	08235	• n8844	09089	11772	15680	00880	05619	.00865	•01155

	31	34	37	40	43	46	49	52	55	58
1	.16616	.30490	. 40341	14946	28549	.18600	.27536	.21511	.19639	.26937
4	.21524	38752	.50803	21553	40026	.31522	.34187	30371	.23040	.46862
7	0469 7	.06660	•24652	06345	11117	.08065	.03966	.02507	.04633	.25998
10	.28790	.2207#	•30095	.27310	47014	.28298	.39170	.43341	11535	21608
-					15230	.05154	.17136	.17061	.18693	.29642
13	.09306	.21176	•10057	.18636			•			•38920
16	.30651	.32516	.54751	44268	,49903 .17882	.49668 .27352	.48760	.42235	.23901 .17363	•49258
19	.18148	.12182	.43404	-17101		.33124	.28889	.21760	.29257	•49478
22	,20499	.46725	.43031	-34067	.36581	.24094	,35754	.32099	•	•40715
25	.27382	.37740	•32765	.18033	,32684 .31373	.22316	.33781	.20210	.20777	
28	30680	.41171	• 26997	.21797			.22199	.22858	.33245	.31333
31	1.00000	.10875	.32930	.33088	.44092	.15093	.37062	•5097a	.21250	.23263
34	.30875	1.00000	•37619	.23713	.38963	.26152	.41927	.30135	.33515	.30577
37	.32930	.37619	1.00000	.36103	.33448	.44A25	.34061	.32116	.23597	.49325
40	.33088	.23713	•36103	1.00000	.35874	.31007	.39867	.37626	.07910	.23193
43	.44692	.38963	.33448	.35874		.51154	.53175	.66692	26526	.39871
46	15093	26152	44825	•31007	.51154	1.00000	.34699	.43072	•163A3	.40666
49	.37062	.41927	.34061	•39867	,53175	.34699	1,00000	#4643	.24088	.35869
52	.50978	.30135	.32116	.37626	.66692 06506	,43072	•48643	1.00000	.27225	.37709
55	.21250	.33515	•23597	.07910	.26526	.16383	.2408B	.27285	1.00000	.29422
58	.23863	.30577	49325	.23193	.39771	40666	.35869	.37709	29422	1.00000
61	.27643	30698	26952	.34261	.65650	.30405	.47724	.4668n	17252	•22565
64	.21143	.33535	.22263	•2658 9	.31034	.20834	.29042	.24744	.37952	.33820
67	.04207	.21468	• 28605	.06585	.23152	.19795	.20842	.09583	14941	•25008
70	.36909	.29855	• 28437	•318A8	.62159	.47111	.41362	.55991	.17472	.27925
73	.15805	.25320	•24696	.37900	.20477	.24642	•30766	.35669	• 1 6я - 1	•25869
76	34426	.42020	•27551	.36591	.77095	.49477	.53567	.59443	.32768	32507
79 82	.1887u	.20339	•34639 . E = E B	•2035B	•26328 00840	.28475	.33191	.26040	•19660 - 03569	•28874 21156
85	- ,01694	.07946 .23909	45558	.04005	.04964 .13666	.10361 .07983	.09439	.06802	03509	.21196
86	.10078 .13697	.33368	•02385	•11422 •16758	•10866 •22821	.08346	.10652 .23051	.17854	.10773 .14986	.21229 .20344
88	11455	07236	-•n0133 •19165	.12602	06341	19483	.14610	.19135 .11717	11095	12224
89	21703	.02207	+14500	.18166	13117	.13320	.13007	16794	03610	•06458
90	.15778	01306	14275	.06061	14558	.10850	.12916	18649	03768	.20056
91	.16518	.19136	19849	.20521	25421	.2096B	25524	28733	01284	.09788
92	.10403	.01607	• n6492	.09444	.02427	01916	.06330	10096	.03234	05028
93	.13261	.17021	.25907	15595	11502	19344	.21558	.21522	.05468	19779
94	12225	17415	10678	.02426	03/166	.03750	.05201	12159	.00238	06256
95	.12431	14084	18818	12168	10675	09843	10690	15343	.07321	04966
96	.29342	.25602	.22075	.13919	.22282	.18030	24443	19015	11984	07332
97	.31453	.40183	31927	.33145	32134	22540	31747	30939	14182	.27056
98	.27076	.33492	38729	-24416	36305	.27172	32774	.22426	28562	.37914
99	34621	.34733	27715	29241	71793	34061	45903	58599	.17270	26004
100	16440	29092	12832	.1769n	15749	05290	25338	.16807	16293	.26706
114	,10803	19873	n6329	02223	12611	.07076	.13164	.16256	.14484	•10484
115	02898	.01761	n7980	07445	06/128	.03787	01472	.08581	00799	c1395
116	00233	13335	•n6372	.00179	.00932	00526	00253	.05753	00219	00528
117	10798	12850	.n5972	 01650	→.05105	.02638	06040	- 16917	08338	.02068
118	08601	05121	05032	•02998	02208	03109	16370	07374	06195	.07871
119	10662	08137	03493	14832	04986	12047	- 25116	-,10093	05124	.07253
120	08245	17014	11140	07485	15173	18548	17845	13247	14246	21171
121	.06356	04284	16332	⇒. 08692	.01693	01537	11262	.04933	.11237	.00573
122	11232	09927	n5993	18189	17063	16068	21847	24529	.03813	.01499
123	.10882	12418	06923	25941	06819	-,15863	05584	11951	03181	12336
124	16914	.24661	25904	.18126	.24779	.22640	.20831	30361	.29077	.23900
125	05111	.06425	·06746	.06461	.10104	.09159	01927	.08288	03739	.02372

Table 13-(Continued)

126	.04459	06817	• 08642	·D8035	.14137	.14022	.03755	.13578	01511	.06504
127	07922	03859	•n8589	.02728	.08239	.12907	.07700	08533	00868	•n8966
128	10461	U477I	.01644	.02938	04031	.00532	08833	07213	05199	.08560
129	00689	.01707	.09101	13816	09565	00885	21225	10295	02908	10679
130	11425	-,14925	-•n575 3	•0269A	09045	05658	14270	07535	11780	- 18831
131	.06300	.05110	•n6527	04762	.03139	01366	05259	03654	15015	00271
132	05270	07795	•n2059	-,16752	1 7844	04543	22645	20637	01495	02970
133	.08335	.00833	•n4921	07035	.03050	03080	.07762	07171	04550	··08994
87	09903	-,10953	08235	06643	.02218	06024	05558	05974	19652	.00857
A	.09724	.14779	.27077	.19518	.05622	.17253	.06631	.10355	14317	.15462
В	10857	•08488	•23485	•16980	.04992	·13867	.15283	.10088	11807	19277
C	0234 <u>1</u>	.15379	•26967	•15609	.12586	.18106	.18390	.17393	13118	·26699
U	.17668	•u672I	• 26946	.24694	·11954	.15416	.17550	£009£	09193	.07817
Ε	.11507	.03094	•n6051	.11128	.07376	00680	.13575	.02454	05A53	06351
F	03772	.00008	• 08392	.03391	02684	.04332	.07090	.02345	01660	02301
G	06544	.01556	- ∙n2087	.00109	•05605	.11792	.84517	.03926	01372	.05477
H	09449	18785	-•n6415	07383	11607	27034	12953	11160	05479	08401
ن	02858	01742	- ∙n6686	16147	.03938	03809	01558	05930	02176	06535
K	07577	12468	n8511	14835	D4780	18645	09275	10907	02369	09573

Table 13-(Continued)

					, (
	61	64	67	70	73	76	79	82	85	86
1	.21749	.07330	-18531	15279	.26392	-21645	.21147	.21379	.05339	.00331
û	24480	.23241	.15639	32440	19277	35821	18457	34123	.05160	21967
7	05835	.09917	.16739	14875	.07430	13386	04729	22212	05164	09099
10	.46164	.11310	05555	45725	.19967	.41722	.23583	15637	.13732	.07830
13	.12227	.2258 3	•n1583	15321	.22413	.17031	.02208	17469	.51800	.32922
		.32895		.53618	.28643	.51623	.24607	• - : -	.10767	15172
16	.40236		.20323					.26236		
19	.08415	.16235	.25321	•168E9	.11697	:18378	,19879	.08021	18567	04765
22	.29050	.30002	.18550	.22128	.14820	.36672	.12592	.25834	.16622	.26367
25	.17754	.27205	.40063	.27067	.13731	.29570	.20347	00015	19304	.16031
28	.22179	.19683	• 06 3 4 0	.32214	30.80	.34907	.22695	.03200	.14768	•09925
31	.27643	.21143	+n4207	•36909	.15405	.34426	.16870	01694	.10078	13697
34	.30698	.33535	.21468	•29855	.25320	.42020	.20339	.07946	23909	.33368
37	.26952	.22263	·28605	·28437	.24696	.27551	.34639	,4555A	02385	00133
40	.34261	.26589	06585	•31888	.37900	.38591	.20358	.04005	.11422	+1675P
43	.65650	•31v34	.23152	.62159	·28477	.77895	.26328	.04964	,1366 6	•22ª21
46	.20405	. 20834	•19795	•47111	.24642	.45477	.28475	.i n361	.079A3	.08346
49	•47724	.29082	.20842	.41362	•3076 6	.53567	.33191	.09439	.10652	.23051
52	.46680	.24744	• 09583	•55991	•35669	.59443	.28040	.06802	.17804	.19135
55	.17252	.37952	.14941	.17472	.16051	•32768	.19660	03509	.10773	•1498E
58	.22565	.3382U	.25008	.27925	25069	.32507	.28874	.21196	.21229	.20344
61	1.00000	.25519	.07316	.44188	.11752	.54452	.25386	06623	.07318	15743
64	.25519	1.00000	.19211	26570	05583	33555	.12910	06874	.17929	25500
67	.07316	.19211	1.00000	29713	.04382	.16010	.04745	.13707	.05765	01016
70	44188	.2657u	.29713	1.00000	.27150	.52198	.29310	07402	18145	.16437
73	11752	.05583	04382	.27150	1.00000	29462	40172	08192	10554	.05727
76	54452	.33555	.16010	.52198	.29462	1.00000	25804	.03555	15353	.29430
79	.25306	.12910	·n4745	.29310	40172	.25204	1.00000	.08674	05680	.04842
82	.06623	06874	• 13707	.07402	.08192	.03555	.08674	1.00000	12007	09064
85	.07318	.17929	•n5765	19145	.10554	.15353	.0568 0	12007	1.00000	49876
86	15743	.25500	 01016	.16437	.05727	.29430	.04842	09064	76 د 49	1.00000
88	05183	06161	.01792	08288	25417	.06003	10642	08704	- 15253	- 05152
89	.12798	02371	•07063	.15115	.17549	.16864	.09920	.08283	O6F29	06476
90	.10309	.00266	·03941	14393	12747	.08751	.22922	.13811	.09178	03947
91	24492	.12652	13302	24101	14543	24957	.12041	.09171	00440	10313
92	.06890	00527	-•n9256	•05731	.07319	.05509	.04361	09265	06971	06049
93	.18481	.05054	.07841	12068	18223	16956	.08370	14928	09691	05470
94	15975	00159	01079	07450	00348	.08957	04695	07071	07053	00138
95	12040	.12858	.03079	17279	02173	.14565	.07698	.10137	13502	- 05592
96	.11904	.07936	• 00027	17995	07831	25541	.24651	02749	14490	16710
97	.21670	.29118	•12U98	19602	.29762	.35009	.15437	.15452	21193	17671
98	.20£34	.12563	• 26470	•17300	.32318	.29n4A	.22881	.05900	02772	06513
99	.73777	•2293U		•40309	19869	62297			11997	•15583
		.24239	12569		19347	.23255	.22026	.06937		
100	.20871	.08655	+n2041	.10616	00991	.11832	.09164	08503	.43174	.37366
114 115	02182 01430		•n4506	00349 03288	11460	.01751	0132 7 0279 3	.00707	.03773 12569	10337
116	10410	•16694 •14905	=+n2369	• 05460	10772	04430	•06971	.02033		+03184
117	-,13787	.04531	•86976	•05460 •02244	07828	04430 02418		.10205	05357	10495 04421
118			•p5811		+07628 +•06880	02418 07434	.01524	.05464	.02242	~.06421 - 15424
	10546 - 08045	.u682d	•n4966	10073	•		.02930	02836	10570	15426
119	08965	.11632	*•11066	- 00005	05764	14273	.01021	~.07737	12963	- ∙09650
120	12776	00052	n2101	099A5	-,15708	21771	21862	.0515#	09526	16845
121	00462	• 06523	.14063	.00771	16092	07535	11353	.00221	07051	02191
122	15926	.08412	09403	18692	07515	17889	09223	08689	10625	07939
123	14260	+13099	•00481	14342	20436	16077	05944	09023	-,04064	.02718
124	.11889	.20564	.17814	.23300	.13761	.22252	.11988	.10725	.15262	.08358
125	.10193	.14048	• 08447	.01305	02911	.03574	04995	05109	.03071	.06387

Table 13-(Continued)

126	.04596	.16970	.13343	.13181	04494	•04721	.04120	.03818	.04607	07858
127	01870	.10118	.18085	.05609	,16318	.04517	.08114	.05406	.01846	.01107
128	12358	.03464	•10780	11840	.03433	09974	.01765	05631	09847	17331
129	27421	.08296	61386	08508	.00186	22698	00609	00252	16494	14034
130	.00446	.62801	- •∩3612	02258	11431	19024	20360	.08791	08459	11539
131	.04511	.07275	• 14942	 05663	09579	04786	15352	08111	04598	02073
132	-,25251	. 35881	-•n6459	09717	00814	24411	10326	07989	-,05625	** 05025
133	.09358	.17379	- •n0205	07322	11763	- ₄05687	10941	01386	.03348	•13906
87	00344	-,09955	12039	08415	16472	08250	09071	.00744	10420	05949
A	.09398	.12031	• n504 0	.DA199	.11607	.08770/	.06536	.21990	07515	+. 044 01
8	.14435	.09358	- ∙01970	- ∗02594	.D5277	10345	.05171	.16451	.15117	• né966
C	.15736	. J6532	- ∙n18n7	.07489	•11994	.14205	.07165	.20871	.16490	.09322
D	.13796	02987	•01434	.17978	•18550	.19163	.16504	.27289	08268	17551
E	-,02274	.04469	14550	•06503	.12239	.14421	.02483	.09761	01772	06012
F	03968	03800	- ∙03542	•06943	.06199	-,01078	02256	.14476	18371	15938
G	.04049	01107	·06819	.02700	.05212	.13090	.01803	.07679	.01826	04737
н	.03926	-,05093	-•n8882	09071	13822	14539	03206	02299	- .03480	11810
ان	.00331	.10968	•n1240	•01 <u>9</u> 78	08087	.01311	.06347	02435	08269	01079
K	.02048	.03718	05190	04706	-,13786	07908	.01484	03137	07647	07898

	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	٥6	ç 7	
1	.19 609	.13720	•16497	.26223	.26116	.36R19	.23975	.17673	.18361	.26214	
4	.13941	.06802	•10085	.14467	.00486	.15792	.02590	.07260	11659	.22418	
7	.06204	+. 02735	•66840	04733	09382	.00165	.00918	00556	02215	.08470	
10	.03427	.18336	•n2111	•17974	.06137	.15987	.08620	14865	.09165	.11901	
13	02143	01122	•n6859	.02418	.05391	.16255	.10750	05314	.15549	.18492	
16	.14442	.12239	•n9114	.23010	.01886	19990	.01575	14268	.16903	.25032	
19	.05692	,15731	.16104	.08739	.05104	.08226	03037	03017	.21046	.21115	
22	,03838	-,05922	04514	.20812	00454	,14748	.07820	.14178	.09525	.18896	
25	.03275	. 05939	. 21321	.18574	07199	1600A	.02098	06792	14571	្ទុំសព្ទព	
28	.01291	. 09524	14339	.18118	.11894	.10972	.00770	.15065	22701	34350	
31	.11455	.21703	.15778	.16518	.10403	.13261	.12225	.12431	.29342	.31453	
34	.07236	.02207	-•n13n6	.19136	.01607	.17021	.17415	.14084	.26602	.40100	
37	.19165	.14500	•14275	.19849	.06492	.25907	.10678	.18818	.22975	.31927	
4 U	.12602	.18166	.n6061	+20521	.09444	.15595	.02426	.12168	.12919	+33145	
43	.06341	.13117	• 14558	.25421	D2427	.11502	.03866	.10675	.22272	.32134	
46	.19483	.13320	•10850	.20968	01016	.19344	.03750	.09843	.18030	.22540	
49	.14610	.13007	12916	.25524	.06330	.21558	.05201	.10690	.24403	.31747	
52	.11717	.16794	.18649	.28733	.10096	.21522	.12159	.15343	.19015	.30939	
55	11095	03610	-•n3788	01284	.03234	.05468	85500.	07321	·119/4	-14182	
58	.12224	.06458	.20056	•09788	05028	•09779	06256	04966	.07332	27056	
61	.05183	.12798	•10309	.24492	.06800	.18481	.15975	.12040	.11904	.21670	
64	06161	02371	•n0266	.12652	 0052 7	.05054	00159	.12858	.07936	.29118	
67	.01792	•U706 3	.03941	.13302	09256	.07841	.01079	.03078	.00627	.12098	
70	.08268	.15115	•14393	.24101	.05731	.18068	.07450	.17279	.17990	•19802	
	25417	.17549	•12747	•14543	.07319	.18223	00348	.02173	.07831	.29762	
76	.06903	.16864	• ŋ8751	• 24957	•05509	•1695 6	•08957	.14565	.25541	•35009	
79	.10642	•09920	.22922	•12041	.04761	.08370	 04095	•0769₽	.24651	.15437	
82	.08704	.08285	.13811	.09171	.09265	•1492B	•0 <u>7</u> 071	.10137	02749	.15452	
85	15253	-,06629	• 09178	00940	06971	.09681	.07053	13502	.14490	.21193	
86	05152	06476	- ∙n3947	•16313	06049	.09470	.08138	05582	.16710	+17671	
88	1.00000	.50092	•27960	•273A9	.25375	.39788	.22102	.23843	.10218	•11614	
89	.50092	1.00000	•33381	.27288	27227	.34893	.18056	.29570	.20524	.22605	
90	·27960	.33381	1.00000	.35782	.23039	•31012	.20593	.32569	.28120	•22562	
91	.27389	.27289	•357P2	1.00000	.39198	.38399	.21503	.39859	.23272	.20748	
92	.25375	.28227	.23039	.39198	1.00000	.43397	.35096	.67922	.17026	.08935	
93	.39728	.34893	• 31012	.38399	.43397	1.00000	.67917	.51056	•29820	23367	
94	.22102	·18056	• 20593	.21503	.35096	.67917	1.00000	.47799	•33588	20654	
95	.23843	.29570	• 12563	.39959	.67922	.51056	47799	1.00000	.30967	.22832	
96	.10818	.20524	.28120	23272	.17026	• 29820	.33588	30967	1.00000	.33460	
97	.11614	.22005	. 22562	20748	• 08935	.23367	.20654	.22832	.33460	1.00000	
98	.20195	.14583	25227	•12362	.01947	.14489	.01243	.17285	.28107	•36595	
99	•19317	.23232	•21421	•34680	•13077	.21824	.13341	.17412	.23138	.34754	
100	.02259	.11339	.27973	107213	•0A266	.21051	.18930	.06085	.45419	.45339	
114 115	.06917	.01547	• n2226	.04519	.04521	.03359	.06986	.05406	05004	•07667	
116	.00588	.02811	01566	03275	.03693	05798	06886	02243	08367	12949	
117	.01120 03248	U1169 U4009	•∩1376 ••∩7556	.11050 usü75	.04095 04187	~.01449 05215	-,11336	03331	11452	14483	
113	05570	V1024	15681	04609	06231	15672	13253 04493	12429	00029	•01943	
119	11562	09214	-•136F1 -•17682	09760	01976	25011	18372	11400	01923	01060	
120	18901	09214 14717	n/002 10715	U976U 16060	.01626	12083	.05566	08962	12733 05299	11415 14849	
121	03930	12383	10715 n1788	•13698	.03526	.01908	.12731	.00722	•		
122	11886	12581 11581	•0108	+14129	.09095	13410		.15659	02338	.00809 07010	
123	07127	08875			.01797		16440	.04030	020P4		
			•n0992	.02174		.00136	04992	01143	06375	-,29940	
124	.10813	+05737	01690	-15403	.09408	.07842	.04290	.07775	.02334	.24929	
125	.05928	~. ∪0694	- •n0277	.08490	.02314	03687	00828	01629	08217	07170	

Table 13--(Continued)

126	.05021	02806	•n2209	•16322	•04025	.01851	02581	02716	04743	07285
127	06329	00070	12226	00042	.01361	07299	15377	05581	01386	05182
128	.05571	u3187	;8501	08464	07757	13016	06268	13714	.00456	01266
129	06825	19522	 n8u66	04282	.09240	 18∩95	-,12706	01746	12676	10224
130	17229	11756	16369	13231	.05301	-,08962	.09833	 00190	10:08	15F49
131	01861	07703	-•n9912	•03569	.06947	05275	.10909	.11769	03261	.03458
132	09782	12151	-•n0614	06304	.10510	09555	06989	.07344	.06612	06798
133	04667	34481	n0175	•03436	.02087	- .04025	07169	04501	07683	12174
87	21r33	11474	07160	D8089	.04968	13707	10162	09957	00560	12625
A	.16482	.08229	• 09609	.11192	.23702	.26977	.19184	.16354	.02677	•13B76
Ð	.08066	• 64624	.12254	.12474	•D3946	.24601	.12825	02785	8850 0 ,	•08556
¢	.12523	.10763	• ; 7565	.17102	.07053	.27361	.19341	.04176	.04621	•04298
D	.20428	.13383	.11653	.09123	.30041	.23119	.11076	.18588	.07505	•10361
Ε	08128	 00718	•n7381	11238	10108	09213	15494	01117	.15077	.12247
F	.16428	.10588	• ก3983	.17216	.13193	.10702	.05390	.12222	14534	- •07º79
G	03584	.03672	•n3607	•00594	02213	02534	.03449	05559	14487	02349
н	00068	u2006	01320	.00668	.00673	06055	05488	04305	11461	10694
ال	05667	08166	02459	.02376	01522	05175	.02343	07575	.11480	03163
' K	- 04032	- u6834	=•02650	.01414	00865	06653	01588	07906	.00770	08927

Table 13-(Continued)

					010 17 (00	·,				
	98	99	100	114	115	116	117	118	119	120
1	.28785	.23504	•n9039	.08526	.04288	.07267	.09126	.06873	10034	13755
4	31:18	29836	08954	.09117	.04851	03058	.11499	.05307	08390	11805
7	11086	.U717U	•n5308	08743	04976	.01769	.10288	.02050	.04830	.01111
10	16555	40783	.07540	08880	.05322	.00870	02087	.00139	12261	14964
13	00576	.16189	. 53584	.12535	01246	.09116	.11956	.01629	02277	09195
16	34611	41018	12852	.03967	.11105	.06338	.01675	02660	12056	08583
19	21697	.16937	.30304	.11318	.05033	.10748	01671	.11828	00068	07293
22	34783	27631	17024	16780	12579	05980	01526	.07073	09882	- 22749
25	25603	25811	.20625	11436	0/106	05095	106673	012IA	15715	4103
26	.28304	.31704	•24901	67195	13590	08291		02494	04906	19220
31	.27076	.34621	• 16440	• 10803	02898	00231	.04298 10798			
34	.33492	.34733	•29092	.19873	.01761	13335	02850	08601 - 05121	10662 08137	08345 - 13010
37	.38729	.27715	•12832	.06329	.07980	.06372	.05972	05121 .05032	03493	17014
40	.24416	29241		.02223	.07445	.00179	01650		14832	11140 07485
43	.36305	.71795	•17690		.06028	.00932		.0299A	04986	15173
-			•15749	•12611			05005	02208		
49	.27172	.34061	05290	.07076	.03787	00526 00853	.02638	03109	12047	18548
52	•32774	•45903	• >5338	,13164	01472 .08581	.05753	06040	16370	-,25116	17845
	.22426	•5e599	•16807	•16256			1 6917	07374	100°3	13247
55	.28562	.17270	16293	•14484	•00799	00219	08338	06195	05124	14246
58	.37914	.26004	•26706	.10484	01395	00528	.02068	.07871	.07253	21171
61	.20634	•73777	•20871	02182	01430	10410	13787	10546	08965	12776
64	18563	+22930	.24239	.08655	.18694	.14905	.04531	.06828	.11632	00052
67	.26470	12569	•n2041	04506	02369	.06976	.05811	.04966	11066	02101
70	.17300	.46309	10616	00349	03288	.05460	.02244	10073	08163	09985
73	.32318	•19869 (2007	• 19347	•00991	11460	10772	.07828	0€880	05764	15708
76 79	29048	,62297	• 23255	11832	.01751	04430	02418	07434	14273	21771
82	.22681	.22026	•n91=4	01327	02793	.06971	.01524	.02930	.01021	21902
85	.05900	.06937	 ∩8503	.00707	.02133	•10205	.05464	02836	07737	.05158
86	02772	.11887 .15583	• 43174	.03773	12569	-,0535 7 -,10495	.02242	10570	12963	09526 0055
	.00513		•37366 •3248	.10337	.03184		06421	15426	09650	16945
88 89	.20195	19317	•n2259	.06917	.00588	.01120	-,03248	05570	11562	18901
90	.14583	.23232	+11339	.01547	.02811	01169	~.0 4009	01024	09214	14717
_	.25227	.21421	• > 7973	02226	01566	.01376	07556	15681	~.07682	10715
91	12362	.34680	•n7213	04519	0*275	11050	08075	04609	09760	16060
92	.01947	•13077	•n8266	.04621	,03f93	,74095	04187	06231	01976	.01626
93	14489	21824	+21051	.03359	05798	01449	05215	15672	25011	12083
94	01243	13341	•18930	•06986	06886	11336	13253	04493	18372	·05566
95	.17285	.17412	•n6u65	.05406	.02243	03331	12429	11400	08962	•0722
96	.28107	.23138	.45419	05804	09367	11452	00029	01923	12733	05299
97	36595	.34.754	•45339	.07667	-,12949	14433	.01943	01060	11415	14849
98	1.00000	. 12296	• 26667	•02771	00035	17315	06942	1 0526	20715	20552
99		1.00000	24315	.03124	~. 09836	05396	12015	08605	10206	23757
100	.26667	.24315	1.00000	- •01154	08673	12766	.01972	03880	08511	11377
114	.02770	.u3124	-•n1154	1.00000	.33451	23943	.02004	.12223	04579	03593
115	00035	u9836	- •68673	-33"51	1,00000	.49343	.15925	.23868	·11087	. 05480
116	17315	05396	··12766	.23943	49343	1.00000	.19050	.34803	.19728	.07407
117	06942	12015	.01972	.02004	.15925	.19050	1.00000	.27107	.24763	·19039
118	10526	08605	05650.	.12223	.23868	.34803	.27107	1.00000	.32429	•16865
119	→. 20715	-,10206	~.n8511	04579	.118a7	.19728	.24763	.32429	1.00000	.21526
120	20552	23757	11377	03593	.0548 c	.07407	.19039	.16865	.21526	1.00000
121	.04307	03957	12915	• 08675	.26314	23270	.14206	.27281	.09534	.12323
122	11540	20421	•10857	04607	.12646	.12742	.20292	.17069	.64868	.24526
123	07109	15302	13384	•11339	.15447	.24271	.12401	.18883	.18507	.16819
124	•17118	.23321	•n3457	•63383	.18938	.17541	.04621	.12062	09291	08835
125	02319	.04698	n1603	.28644	.69653	.41172	.20777	.17470	.066ñG	.05401

Table 13--(Continued)

126	13n55	.10515	01800	.16672	.34718	.79282	.19289	.22830	13430	.04976
127	.06273	.01847	•D2970	.01395	.10115	.18561	.66417	29760	.06n78	.08172
128	08415	49653	-•n0354	•07540	.22577	•28348	.31193	.80400	.23733	.12463
129	17174	15385	10957	• pe675	.16021	24823	.19461	36706	64860	14504
130	19290	15287	-• n7546	⊶.D0591	.07107	.08370	.07196	.15087	.06794	P2430
131	.02401	03744	- •∩6592	.00130	.21452	.10541	.09042	2388P	.06411	16686
132	11 68 9	20413	.12617	.03542	•09 497	.12336	.19104	.21575	.44242	•16967
133	.01492	04017	- ∙n7129	•07417	.24785	.13029	.10882	.13391	.09791	.12034
67	21340	⊸.ს5910	+ +06032	03185	*D6942	.02635	.00548	04025	.09795	-11443
A	.06715	.04045	- • n2575	02333	.08921	.17608	.02599	.01729	01066	.10182
b	04348	•0563 6	•12036	 00604	.14715	.10805	16296	.00827	06514	07962
Ç	01127	.11022	•16796	02065	11349	•0795 7	.02631	02336	07437	- • 6 0 648
D	•08609	.08343	• 00998	-•09 <u>8</u> 06	11990	17646	09345	04862	05822	• reo96
E	•04876	.00953	•n4207	•01783	01640	09519	03713	04055	03871	-•02366
F	19028	05370	17640	07715	.07288	+05950	08508	10386	10546	- .ინ241
G	11600	.03851	13240	04976	.11081	00461	.05714	06614	05211	01319
н	14218	04077	01189	16791	.09566	.12685	.08078	10064	05674	.09748
. J	08393	-,01940	00850	12321	01338	03973	03260	.23212	12412	.07730
K	14438	04159	01932	.17344	.06344	. 10156	•06353	.21013	.11261	•11416

				Table	13(Conti	inued)				
	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	139
1	.18310	- 11556	09580	,15637	.03701	.09276	.09225	.07055	.00162	06731
4	11484	18318	n2202	19748	11914	.06823	12752	.02872	.07566	09112
7	03526	05258	11259	14669	.02480	.03056	.03554	.02044	.08447	01582
. 10	01040	21823	- 17846	.22376	.03991	.08452	.02717	.00505	16289	09016
13	13629	v553 6	- ∩5336	.20212	.14822	.14536	.13652	01749	02533	- •07025
16	04034	10694	- 14737	.28365	.14128	.10061	.05691	08352	08680	⊶. 05032
19	.01260	.02479	α7857	.20466	.05139	.08667	.06156	.08630	.06978	05012
22	.07062	13489	06222	.27433	.0616 6	-,07312	.00039	.03374	02160	22159
25	03178	04940	n1361	.11657	,07068	•09020	.07296	aeain	031P8	18516
28	16179	05386	21541	16499	-,13299	07050	·16604	.02387	.05128	15782
31	• C6 356	7 11232	10002	16914	05!!!	∙ ೧५५5∮	07552	w.10461	₩ , ₽0(89	••1142×
34	•04ខ្ម4	≐ .ű992 7	- 12418	24661	.06425	06817	.03859	04771	.01707	-,14925
37	.16232	05993	00923	·25904	.06746	• 00642	.08589	.01644	.09101	08753
40	08692	18189	> 5941	18126	.06461	•08035	.02728	.0293₽	13016	•0269A
43	.01693	-,17063	ლ∙ინ819	24779	.16104	,14137	.08239	04031	0 9565	- •09045
46	01537	16068	-•15863	·22640	•09159	.14022	.1290 7	.00532	-,00225	- .05658
49	11262	21847	05584	.20831	01927	.03755	.07700	08833	-,21225	14270
52	04933	- 24529	11951	•30361	• 0822 8	.13578	08533	07213	10205	07535
55	11237	.03813	- •n3101	·25 <u>0</u> 77	03739	01511	.0086B	05199	02908	11780
58	.00573	.01499	12336	.23900	.02372	.06504	.08966	.08560	.10579	18831
61	00462	15926	14260	•11 ² 89	10193	.04596	-,01870	12358	-,27421	•n044 6
64	.06523	.08412	•13099	•2n564	•1404B	.16970	.10118	.03464	.08296	•02801
67	.14063	09403	•00481	.17814	08447	13343	.18085	.10780	013A6	03612
70 73	.00771	- 18692	14342	.23300	.01305 02911	.13181 04494	.05609	11840	08508	∸.n225P
76	16092 07535	07515 17889	-•20436 -•16077	.13361 .22252	.03574	.04721	.16318 .04517	.03433 09974	.00186 22698	11431 19024
79	11353	09223	n5944	11988	04995	.04120	.08114	.01765	00609	20360
82	06221	08589	09023	10725	- 05109	03018	.06406	05631	00252	.08791
85	07951	10625	- n4064	15282	.03071	04607	.01846	05847	16494	08459
86	~.02191	37933	n2718	•08358	.06387	07858	.01107	17331	14034	11539
88	03930	- 11886	-•n7127	.10813	05928	.05021	06329	.05571	06825	17220
89	12380	11581	÷•∩8875	•05737	 00694	02806	00070	03187	19522	-•1175 6
96	01788	.00108	+n0992	01690	 00277	.02209	12226	18501	08066	=•1636°
91	.13698	- 14129	n2174	15403	00400	•16322	00042	08464	04282	13231
92	.03526	• 49095	n1797	09408	.02314	.04025	.01361	07757	.09240	.n5301
93	.01908	13410	•n0136	.07842	03687	.01851	07299	13016	18095	- •n₽962
94	.12731	16440	- •ր4992	04290	- •00828	n258i	15377	06268	12706	.09833
95	.15t59	• 04630	- 01143	•07775	01629	02716	05581	13714	01746	00190
96	02:38	02054	∂637 5	. 02334	0 ⁿ 21 7	04743	01386	.00456	12676	-•10108
97	•00-0 9	07010	-,25940	24929	07170	- .072£5	.05182	01266	10224	15849
98	.04307	11540	07109	.17118	02319	13055	06273	08415	17174	19290
39	03957	20421	:5302	53351	.04698	.10515	.01847	-,09653	15385	15287
100	12915	10857	13384	•n3457	01603	01800	.02970	00354	10957	07546
114	06675	04607	11339	63383	.28644	.16672	.01395	.07540	.08675	-•00691
115	.26314	12646	•15447	18938	•6965 3	.34718 .79282	.10115	.22577	.16021	.07107 .08370
116	23270	.12742	+24271	17541	.41172 .20777	19269	.18561 .66417	.28348 .31193	.24 <i>2</i> 23	•07196
117 118	.14206 .27281	.20292 .17069	•12401 •9993	.04621 .12062	.17470	.19709	.29760	.8040p	•36706	•15087
119	.09534	•64868	•1888 3 •18507	09291	06660	.13430	.29760 .06878	.23733	.5670B	•15067 •06794
120	.12323	.24526	•16819	09291	.05401	.04976	.08172	.12463	•14504	482430
121	1.00000	10517	17208	15931	28617	25413	09555	24027	•18050	.10316
122	.10517	1.00000	19557	- 12030	10142	11746	07176	.15491	.49701	.13710
123	17288	19557	1.00000	05189	.15537	.17042	01065	10186	24280	.05134
124	15931	12030	·n5189	1.00000	33459	22371	.18066	.08631	.04421	00062
125	.28817	.10142	15537	.33459	1.00000	.53612	.16985	.18065	.11786	.12721
•			.,			·	•	12.22		

Table 13-(Continued)

126	.25413	.11746	.17042	.22371	.53612	1.00000	.19409	.23819	.23729	.15558
127	.09555	.07176	n1065	.18066	.16985	.19409	1.00000	.36339	.20748	·16889
128	.24927	.15491	10186	08631	18065	.23819	.36339	1.00000	•38049	.13135
129	.18650	.49701	·24280	04421	.11786	.23729	.20748	.38049	1.00000	.13017
130	.10316	13710	-p5134	00062	.12721	15558	.16889	.13135	.13017	1.00000
131	.75177	.11967	<n4114< th=""><th>12445</th><th>•29939</th><th>.18453</th><th>-22574</th><th>.31599</th><th>.22809</th><th>.23579</th></n4114<>	12445	•29939	.18453	-22574	.31599	.22809	.23579
152	.21259	• 16794	• 20199	01403	.07286	.14701	.18663	.29250	.64314	.18259
133	.16262	17519	+68464	,11075	,30780	.12895	.11665	.13490	.17571	• 14404
87	05679	.02518	• ก7890	007A7	•63950	00275	05219	.02429	.13672	.11504
A	 05d75	.02615	.03721	02621	·13982	.11773	-,01077	 0590e	01417	.11110
Ð	04895	06191	-•n4316	01135	•1470 7	.04856	.05350	02130	14122	11365
C	04934	11196	- n14n2	0280 2	.12253	04547	00685	08031	-,14553	06601
D	13399	06322	- .04914	0"172	•0A058	.11742	03865	08111	09832	.04522
E	10904	.04719	.n2618	 05186	01905	14967	-,09662	00666	 0804 0	06497
F	01380	09744	- •06820	 08653	.03251	.01054	-,21849	-,16873	12130	05413
G	02309	-,20164	11349	06766	01428	-,05310	07 70 6	10412	19 849	04484
H	.02553	.08846	• r4601	•02933	.03893	11814	09627	.04280	06946	•67920
J	.04710	.09112	.17241	.03373	04427	.02747	00856	.20679	,18680	.02984
K	.04320	.11720	14388	•03295	00841	.09023	06623	.15822	.08605	.07259

				Isto	178 T)(CD110	Titlen)				
	131	132	133	87	A	יו	С	0	Ε	F
1	.12202	~. U1656	-•n3068	09612	.25036	.19424	20495	-26408	-,11231	.0c481
*4	09592	11209	ი5858	02855	.17005	.16096	.19525	.16362	.13180	.04698
7	.02354	.04758	13404	02692	.14692	•17576	.13200	.07930	.09263	.02506
10	.03212	-,22217	n9331	11177	.02756	.04935	.12265	.16794	.04748	.06953
13	05825	.09007	03664	00162	.05336	.27254	.27853	.00426	09957	13957
16	11874	11900	n6224	07577	,24644	19830	.20821	.27758	11206	00436
19	.01462	• U7976	06364	.03839	.17710	.13102	.16335	.17931	09488	08244
22	02744	+. 06578	·04025	03651	.13147	.22043	.20312	.07520	•04039	.00141
25	-,00138	07430	11202	• 06990	.13099	.15125	10354	.03411	02621	02325
24	10328	01092	22435	10964	.07622	00979	02738	.02780	.12/15	14743
31	.06300	 05270	·n8335	09903	.09724	 1085 7	02341	.17668	.11507	03772
34	.05110	-,67793	•00833	10953	.14779	.08488	.15379	.06721	•03n94	80000•
37	.06527	.02059	•n4921	08235	.27077	.23485	.26967	.26946	.06051	•00392
40	04762	16752	- ∙n7u35	06643	.19618	.16980	.15609	.24694	.11128	.03391
43	.03139	17844	· 63050	.02218	.05622	56640.	.12586	.11954	.07376	02684
46	01366	04543	03080	06024	.17253	.13P67	.18106	.15416	00680	.04332
49	05259	-,22845	•n7762	-,05558	.05631	.15263	.18390	.17550	.13575	.07090
52	.03654	-,20637	p7171	05974	.10355	. 10088	.17393	.18903	.02454	.02345
55	.15015	01495	- ∙04550	-+19652	14317	11 80 7	13118	09193	05853	01660
58	00271	02870	- •∩5994	.00857	·15462	•192 77	.26699	.07817	-,06351	02301
61	.04511	~. 25251	•n9358	00344	.09398	.14435	.15736	.13796	02274	 03968
64	.07273	• U5881	.17379	09955	.12031	.09358	.06532	+. 02987	.04469	 n380n
67	.14942	06459	n0205	12039	.05040	-,01970	01807	.01434	14550	03542
70	05663	09717	-•n7322	08415	.08199	02594	.07489	.17978	.06503	•06943
73	09579	00814	11763	16472	.11607	.05277	.11994	.lf55o	.12239	.06199
76	04786	24411	- .n5687	08250	.04770	·10345	.14205	.19163	.14421	0107A
79	15352	10326	10941	09071	·06536	.05171	.07165	.16504	.02483	02256
82	00111	07989	 01386	•00744	.21090	.16451	.20871	.27289	•09761	• 14476
85	04598	u5625	• 03348	10420	07515	.15117	.16490	08268	01772	10371
86	02073	05025	•13906	05949	04401	•06966	.09322	17551	06012	15938
88	01861	09782	04667	21033	.164BS	.08066	.12523	.2042B	08128	·16428
89	07703	12151	n4481	11474	.DP229	.04624	.10763	.13383	00718	•10588
90	09512	00614	-•n0175	07160	• 60460	.12254	•1756 5	.11653	·07381	58₽50•
91	.03569	06304	•n3436	08089	•11192	.12474	.17102	.09123	11238	.17216
92	.06947	.10510	n20e7	·04968	.23702	.03846	.07053	.30041	10108	.13193
93	05275	09555	-•n4025	13707	.26977	.24601	.27361	.23119	09213	*10702
94	10909	u6989	-•n7169	10162	.19184	12825	.19341	.11076	- 15494	.05390
95	•11769	.07344	n4501	09957	.16354	02785	.04186	.16588	01117	.12222
96	03261	.06612	07683	00560	.02677	.00688	.04621	.07505	·15n77	14534
97	.03458	06798	12174	-:12625	•13976	•08556	.04298	10.61	12247	07879
98	.02401	11689	•01492	-,21340	.06715	- .04348	01127	.08609	.04876	19028
99	-,03744	20413	- •n4017	05910	.04045	•09636	.11022	•08343	.00953	05370
100	06592	.12617	n7129	06032	02575	12036	.16796	.00998	.04207	17640
114	.00130	•03542	•n7417	.03185	02333	00604	02065	09806	.017A3	07715
115	.21452	.09997	•24786	06942	.00921	.14715	.11349	.11990	.01640	.07288
116	.10541	12336	•13059	.02635	.17600 .02599	.10805	.07957	.17646	09519	•05950 -•08508
117	.09642	.19104	•108P2	.00548 .04025		.16296	.02631	.09345	03713	
118	.23888 06513	•21575 66293	•13391	•04025 •09795	.01729 01065	.00827 06514	02336 07437	04862	04055 03871	10386 10546
119	.06411	.4424 <u>2</u>	•69791 •3030	• 11443	010E3 -10182	07962	04948	05822 nenga		
120 121	.16686 .75177	.16967 .21259	.12034 .16262	05079	65875	04895	04934	.0096 13399	02366 10904	05241 01380
122	•11967	.76794		•02516	•02615	=.04693 =.06191	11196	13399 06322	•04719	09744
123	.04114	.20199	• 13216	•07890	.03721	04316	01482	04914	.02618	06920
124	.12445	01403	•68464 •1075	00787	02621	01135	•	04172		
			+11075				02802		05186	08653
125	.29939	.07286	•30780	.03950	.13982	.14707	.12253	.08058	01905	.03251

Table 13—(Continued)

126	.18453	.14701	.12895	00275	.11773	.04856	.04547	.11742	14967	.01054
127	.22574	.18663	•11665	05219	01077	.05350	 00685	03865	09662	21849
128	.31599	.2925u	• : 3490	•02429	05908	02130	08031	08111	00666	16873
129	.22209	.64314	• 17571	.13672	01417	-,14122	14553	09832	08040	12130
136	.23579	.18259	. 14494	.11504	.11110	-,11365	06601	.04522	06497	05413
131	1.00000	.22760	.13311	03458	+. 05222	13019	12006	13287	14485	02253
132	.22760	1.00000	.16401	•03555	-,07956	14900	-,17749	17557	.00940	14332
133	.13311	.16401	1.00000	.04724	.05421	00599	.01042	.03370	.100P7	02877
87	.03458	.03555	·04724	1.00000	.00135	.02538	.01850	01373	17251	₩. ₽4670
A	 06222	07956	•n5421	.00135	1.0000	.49051	.49591	66442	.13475	05542
В	13019	14900	- •∩0599	.02538	•4 ⁴ 751	1.00000	.78122	42809	02070	.10342
C	12006	17749	•n1042	•01850	.49591	.78122	1.00000	45176	.06122	19247
υ	13287	17557	•03370	01373	.66442	·42809	.45176	1.00000	·14676	.24050
E	14485	• UQ94 0	•10087	.17251	13475	.02080	.06122	14676	1.00000	.04654
F	→. 02253	 14332	n2877	04670	.05542	.10342	.19247	.24050	• 04654	1.00000
6	02897	29272	-•n7489	10589	-,01900	.16804	.18636	.14947	-,13172	.30011
Н	.01057	.u3882	- •n1982	12978	10661	01799	10358	-,05617	03566	12486
J	00262	.16004	•n4009	.05784	08461	14526	18403	21287	.11175	01692
K	.00770	.13274	·n1927	.11471	10882	10076	17772	16707	.08839	.C6318

Table 13(Continued)											
	G	н	J	K							
1	19343	10954	-•n3126	09103							
4	00498	15598	.02110	08235							
7	.02223	.06177	*n8083	08844							
10	.04397	07102	06220	-•090A9							
13	06276	04712	13171	11772							
16	.00076	16143	09156	15680							
19	.02660	03283	•n1864	09800.							
22	.00862	04971	n3814	05619							
25	.09057	03940	•n6375	•00865							
28	03838	10717	.12833	.01155							
31	-,06544	09449	- •∩2858	07577							
34	.01556	18785	- •01742	12468							
37	02087	06415	 ₽6686	-•00511							
40	.00109	-,07385	- +16147	14835							
43	.05605	11607	•n3938	 047₽0							
46	.11792	27034	 n3809	 1864 5							
49	• 04517	12953	- •∩1558	09275							
52	.03926	 11160	05930	10907							
55	01372	U54 7 9	•n217 <u>6</u>	02349							
58	.05477	00401	- ∙n6535	09573							
61	.04049	.03926	•n0331	.02048							
64	01107	05093	•10968	.03718							
67 70	.06019	J8882	•01240	05190							
73	.02700 .05212	09071 13822	•n1978	U4706 13786							
76	.13090	14539	-•∩80₽7 •∩1311	07908							
79	.01803	03206	• 0634 7	-01484							
82	.07679	-,62299	-•n2435	03137							
85	.01826	33480	=•n6269	07647							
86	04737	11810	-•n1079	07898							
88	03584	00068	n5667	04032							
89	.03672	02006	-•08166	06834							
90	03607	01320	n2459	02650							
91	.00594	.00668	·02376	.01414							
92	02213	.00673	01522	00865							
93	02534	06055	05175	06653							
94	03449	 J5488	•02343	01588							
95	05559	 .4305	-•n7575	07906							
96	14487	11461	• 11400	.00770							
97	02349	16694	- •n3163	-•08927							
98	11600	-,14218	-•n6393	- •14438							
99	• 03851	04077	-•01940	04159							
100	13240	01189	- •00860	01932							
114	04976	.16791	•12321	.17344							
115	.11081	.09566	•01338	.06344							
116	00461	.12685	•n3973	.10156							
117	.06714 - 06614	.u8078 .10064	•63260	•06353							
118 119	06614 - 06211	.05674	.23212	.21013 .11261							
120	06211 01*10	.09748	•12412 •07710	•11261 •11416							
	01319		+07730								
121	02309	.02553	•04710	•04320							
122 123	20164	.08846 .04601	•n9112	•11720							
124	11349 06766	.02933	•17241 •n3373	.14388 .03295							
125	01428	.03893	-•n3373 -•n4427	00841							
	102720	100000	- #11772 (

Table 13-(Continued)

126	05310	.11814	•n2747	.09023
127	07706	09627	ლ•ი0856	06623
128	10412	•04280	.20679	15822
129	-,19849	06946	·186A0	.08605
130	-,04484	.07920	02944	07259
131	02897	.0105 7	-•n0262	•00 770
132	29272	.03882	16004	13274
133	07489	01982	04009	.01927
87	10589	.12978	n5784	.11471
. A	01900	10061	n8461	-,10882
B	.16804	01799	- 14526	10076
C	.18636	10358	18403	17772
D	.14947	05617	- 21207	16707
E	13172	. U3566	.,1175	.08839
F	.30011	.12486	01692	.06318
G	1.00000	u0552	→•11203	07169
н	•.00552	1,00000	.30185	.78506
J	-,11203	.30185	1.00000	82494
ĸ	07169	.78506	p2494	1.00000

TARLE 14

			Interc	CRRELATIONS A	MONG ITEMS (N THE DIFFER	RENCE SCALE			
	D1	D2	p.3	D4	D 5	D6	D 7	De	179	010
01	1.00000	.09498	-•n7688	.19104	00120	.01251	.10739	18635	.05163	.05158
D2	.09498	1.00000	.03476	24590	.00730	44897	.30378	.55504	19012	.18604 -
03	07688	03476	1.00000	07946	04075	.09612	.00713	02386	02539	.06156
D4	19104	24590	07046	1.00000	.05792	.36161	10205	35139	.18569	.14205
ŌŠ	00120	00730	04075	.05792	1.00000	02527	.12442	08851	02273	.22330
D6	01251	44897	09612	36161	02527	1.00000	32812	48794	.20973	·13998
07	,10739	.30378	.00713	.10265	.12442	.32912	1.00000	.25252	.13554	•07520
Dá	15035	.58504	•0238ê	.35139	.05851	•40794	.25252	1,00000	.30240	.23598
Dø	.05163	.19012	02539	.18569	⇒. 02273	.20973	.1355u	.30246	1.00600	153/98
υļu	.0515e	.18604	•n6156	.14205	,22330	.13098	.07520	,23598	.22144	1.0000
011	00961	.19483	07427	.25103	.04463	.18200	.18304	,21939	.34298	•10968
012	.09520	.26857	02355	17897	.25003	.25556	.17811	.34504	.31499	.31061
013	.17936	.41546	•n3033	.34861	03610	.46140	.27329	.42156	.22910	•06046
014	05024	,17411	14323	.20513	.15195	.35508	.19082	.30137	•15167	.03272
D15	.11430	.27905	11556	+40141	.13290	.35866	.14598	•3644 0	-31908	•19957
016	.16147	.25655	- •65842	.31739	.02797	.36420	.19340	.25463	.16406	•15659
017	.02966	.24678 .35949	- •∩6066	•38966	.16219 .09945	.45544 13040	.34397 .19130	.33310	.30879	.07862 .16465
018 019	.09064 .14413	.15109	n6493 00979	•34917 •17642	.21137	.33n89 .15217	.19540	.32117 .30847	.33490 .24490	•16465 •23896
520	.10077	.39546	.21736	.31189	.29400	.32019	.30690	.38417	.21933	•33763
521	.09182	.11882	02944	.51316	12781	. 36534	.06725	.31387	.18304	.15765
022	.04377	.24956	•00505	.27554	.25705	.38258	.24140	.41258	,16401	25288
D23	.04402	.13247	•n4085	.10975	.01748	.12712	.12364	.09951	.22946	.01982
D24	01283	31977	00846	.41747	13914	.51766	.22184	26604	32378	.28010
D25	19784	.09153	-•n1596	00612	22761	.14800	14581	.13248	.00204	.27481
026	.12324	.25546	-•n3738	.37388	.16980	.43714	.23787	38342	.23018	.22594
027	.25630	.15622	10883	.21485	,05465	·13A99	.28312	.11247	.13583	·16348
028	.00395	.27924	.17974	•08105	 39081	.11484	06961	.12108	.01509	10291
88	08152	01433	- •07239	.04543	.11058	.01915	02089	.04390	·11859	•08837
89	09436	.03414	•03089	17543	.09976	05090	02597	.0850n	.03483	.06870
90	05001	01838	10890	•00708	03383	.00234	07552	.045.17	09346	•00400
91	13793	04391	.08235	15281	.13692	15620	05748	0717A	23959	03798
92	15800	.00378 07679	•12330	01158	.05293 01557	.05680 10131	.13321 .02036	.0576h 05979	02392 12444	00114
93 94	20964 12523	03954	•03555 •07639	12063 10457	05694	.02548	.02036	02979	01795	.05432 .06417
95	07342	09005	•00870	09948	.12793	09471	•15135	03363	05448	.00539
96	-,12352	17357	62707	13935	-,14643	14164	21249	14444	17050	14215
97	07808	17082	13063	13757	03412	17448	02411	209.82	22025	20191
98	- 17436	24964	16953	10478	\$1280	30386	15373	33436	21887	08354
99	07660	22716	03204	-,43513	07650	35633	18848	28048	33416	20118
100	07943	15255	01600	06409	- 59383	06290	-,13673	19082	10646	15281
114	.08819	08627	08521	02361	~. 02008	.01588	.02123	06826	13346	05023
115	.07012	-,08485	.06131	04212	.12223	12781	.01611	04584	01541	18265
116	.08528	•0140a	•00915	•01000	.05477	02515	.03230	.10939	00812	.12732
117	.01284	.01491	.04360	03973	04362	.04930	.12844	.03745	.05970	.00113
118	14017	12841	•00108	07426	.00364	.02064	05000	08466	• 09n26	.01756
119	.02712	.11312	• n5995	•03960	DOMA5	.08409	.00987	.12907	•16332	04346
120	.08189	.05891 - 05857	.12825	•14574 - 01380	.06493 .19873	•04343 09379	.23616	.17398	•147F0 • 02066	.1691A
121 122	10951 02571	05957 .23678	.09554 .06990	01350 -16188	05742	.09379 .13332	.11097 .07964	.01459 .11871	02066 .08188	.22678 01188
123	•02571 •04391	.02678	• 12977	.18112	•10446	.13332	.04419	.17591	06917	.21754
123	.06355	18179	11862	⇒.1134D	03326	18628	05947	10124	05123	04737
125	.00355	07019	-03089	02989	04644	10950	.01288	02071	405992	.17178
126	.12701	.00949	•030A7 •04571	05434	00946	02264	.06773	.13903	00378	13910
127	06715	~.11544	05030	D9614	06244	02264 02664	00582	02050	.00472	08961
4-1		******	-,00030		*****	40.5004	-40000	-,02000	8004.5	******

Table 14-(Continued)

	14555	10050		-7504	00700	60684	06003	04515	07000	.7070
128	16520	10058	+. 05721	07526	.00788	•nana4	06883	06915	.07888	 03279
129	03960	06854	∽ •n2669	.09033	02216	• 08846	04007	.05163	.09712	10643
130	.01855	.01116	.13691	.11093	05841	•00062	.24054	14881	.22242	•16496
131	05989	03226	+10355	D5827	. 68535	.17969	13409	.00090	.07602	.16531
132	11282	13235	• 06924	·15448	-,08683	.17029	.02519	.07894	.10335	03613
133	.04301	03012	.18076	.09462	.17036	10879	00167	01412	.06170	•2505A
87	.10356	.01383	.13168	04009	.01298	.02284	.00685	.01739	01360	.04224
A	09839	 ∪6396	13885	.03358	.06845	18956	00546	06427	01192	.03916
8	08812	07296	- n3865	07394	14736	1360 0	03961	15700	08342	• 6424
C	07077	15186	01520	10525	1 5456	-,16923	04829	20365	08458	•10328
D	.01609	09260	00920	03653	•09650	-,23488	02624	06688	00513	•∩5554
£.	.07852	18205	- .n8932	.01890	.04653	- .0984 7	10006	06458	03322	16313
F	.09394	.04502	•07214	.03303	.21339	.02694	.08G4 7	.09927	.01721	·12625
G	.00099	.11540	•12986	.01230	.08516	.00268	.08146	07447	01081	.01585
H	.15799	.21492	.07877	02294	05041	.22176	.21567	.17593	.05215	.10130
J	00924	.04810	.66607	.61100	.08715	.16447	05718	.10617	 00729	12106
K	.09276	.16139	-08649	00016	.08897	.24251	.09279	.17112	.03139	01079

Table 14-(Continued)

	011	012	D13	D14	015	016	017	D18	019	020
01	00961	.09520	.17936	05024	11430	.16147	.02966	.09064	14413	10077
02	19483	.26857	41546	.17411	27905	25655	24678	35949	15109	30546
D3	07427	02355	.03033	14323	11556	05842	06066	- 06493	00979	-21736
Du	25103	.17897	.34861	.20513	.40141	31739	.38966	.34917	17642	31189
05	.04463	25003	03610	.15195	13290	.02797	.10219	09845	21137	29400
D6	.18200	.25556	-,05610 -46140	•3550B	•35966	36420	.45544	.33089	15217	32019
07	.18304	.17811	.27329	.19082	•1459B	19340	.34307	19130	.19540	.30690
De	.21939	.J4504	.42156	.30137	36440	29463	.33310	32117	.30847	36417
09	.34298	.31499	.22910	•15167	31908	16406	30879			
			-		19957	19659		.33490	.24490	.21933
D10	.10968 1.00000	.31061 .32071	• ก8046 • 29709	.03272 .23525	•19957 •39493	.13984	.07862 .22020	.16465	.23896	.33763
012	.32071	1.00000	•30969	•23025 •14346	.32407	.17291	.30279	.49783	.21373	.21113
013		.30969	* (7 1)		• 25992	.29105		.26929	.32854	.31624
014	•29709 33536		1.00000	.26501	22052	15723	.31180	.30195	.22567	.33792
	.23525	14346	*26501	1.06000	1.00000	47388	.29730	.27133	.04658	10521
D15	.39493	.32407	•25992	.22852	.47300	1.00000	.36354	-64902	32863	42960
U16 D17	.13984	.17291	.29105	•15723			.18182	.41873	26417	•35273
	.22020	.30279	.31120	-29730	36154	.18182	1.00000	-20987	.19680	.27868
018	.49783	.26929	•30195	•27133	.64902	.41873	.20987	1.00000	.32607	.30190
D19	.21373	.32854	•2256 7	.04658	•32º63	.26417	.19680	.32807	1.00000	39911
020	.21113	.31624	.33792	•10521	.42960	.35273	.27868	.3019n	.39911	1.00000
021	.18922	•29389 ***********************************	.30681	.30440	.56318	.19634	.46200	.42695	21171	.1e960
D22	.21824	.39898	-25593	-29984	.37472	25262	.34285	35472	.44524	.32361
023	.02810	.02893	•2234B	•16379	18416	.23771	,21734	14913	15508	12579
024	.30221	.25868	.32830	•16873	.57535	.46134	.32087	.53644	.21591	.35858
D26	.02358 .20580	.20271 .38761	n2639 .2254 6	.23161 .21216	.18517 .69413	.16754 .41273	.13353 .42240	.1526g	.07224	.30631 .43232
027	.21140	,14725	•31680	.07929	•18102	.21558	.12971	.40174 .17621	.36153 .22797	.30372
D28	02008	07212	•31050 • 31 488	12197	07062	.02410	01365	04567	01085	•11970
88	.02667	02153	.n2733	03431	.01014	18089	.00525	02467	12694	- 03593
89	04146	.05611	n4519	12146	05837	14062	08006	06796	03244	02793
90	05077	.06455	=.n5759	02985	-, nau23	00613	- 02946	08913	03742	c8951
91	04320	07289	- n6457	17430	13433	11774	-,15642	17453	04949	01242
92	03164	.03173	.n1836	06277	.02236	.06753	02150	06370	02537	15706
93	00840	05946	19256	05559	02500	15809	06279	00008	02758	0C867
94	08292	15499	14471	02258	04443	08995	00533	07836	01211	•02591
95	02126	03154	= 14147	08739	03604	04971	06949	09682	00910	.11832
96	24374	22486	- 24538	15056	=.20966	- 19825	18644	16775	18700	10856
97	23214	26590	= 19714	22950	-,25926	12965	-,17260	23311	10040	- 17254
98	16270	26010	*5098	= 11918	2639 7	22079	20105	- 20461	20041	- 27560
99	27184	29587	29755	22195	65901	30040	38601	48626	17538	25312
100	15755	-,26841	 12805	21124	13430	01751	17899	13905	19870	20300
114	14020	16072	.02102	•02810	09162	10°37	10728	11376	05289	11149
115	00024	02697	.n0736	■•04855	.02170	00107	.00672	=.11866	.02723	.08948
116	.03428	.16528	•n2475	.06250	.07752	.03708	03026	03279	.05n32	01268
117	.12091	.03259	•n2475	.07138	13029	.07499	.07035	.17248	.05328	•01200 •05705
118	.06582	.00812	**************************************	• 0405 9	.05453	02531	.09465	.02522	02039	07884
119	.07331	.08240	n3264	•02997	.02315	11024	.17817	.0106n	.05545	07729
120	.04139	,14453	-D4912	.01096	•10411	11097	00175	.03603	.16961	29469
121	02994	04581	13392	.06753	,01634	.07095	.11043	09722	06647	11726
122	.08708	05666	10270	05409	16452	.17724	.13160	18224	02112	06828
123	07251	.11032	.06217	26529	09479	18284	.01626	11094	.04063	15507
124	14854	19726	20955	07006	17441	21445	15891	17321	16417	20838
125	.06013	09592	01280	04235	01246	06034	.03414	08405	.08028	.08075
126		.07864	n1517	00147	06480	10593	.02418	07555	04958	01796
	.02894	04317		.05341	00617	06776	08881	.09405	02004	14293
127	.09325	7,0431	##n6214	*02547	~*****	-•n@tiu	-• 00001	・シャマリカ		

Table 14- (Continued)

128	.06034	.01879	·p2280	04994	.08339	06711	.08181	.07204	.03027	10186
129	03046	00963	-•n5296	•15569	.08768	.08152	.16289	.05082	.06122	n5801
130	.09382	.10912	00194	03772	.04256	-,01676	01213	.02133	.15737	.25405
131	03714	08526	n4866	.03329	01390	.04294	.04994	04513	11199	.02181
132	.04449	.08136	03403	13366	.16410	.08311	.16013	.18269	.03753	.12612
133	02393	01566	6633	.10982	.02799	.12431	10800	.06974	.09n87	.12436
87	01009	.05733	n5465	06202	07860	.05518	01137	.02840	16064	.07508
À	02518	07263	18988	08748	.01671	07937	.02186	04413	.18309	+0.1944
В	10661	01137	19886	11853	.04264	00157	10123	0535n	.14272	D1486
Č	.04010	09501	24018	10428	05926	07583	14460	10701	12918	17244
Ď	07767	00359	m.p1501	 13597	~. 01906	 06303	05629	11619	.12837	02233
Ě	09707	04438	03141	06519	00028	.03429	11193	.01947	.08898	.00969
F	04987	.03699	n1919	-,01166	.06182	.02227	07461	.05357	.03349	•09659
G	.04510	02851	02027	00965	06589	-,12721	05011	03070	00501	 03948
н	12021	.20082	.04137	05888	.15340	.20373	.06157	.06308	.06646	.14075
J	01761	.01458	.02442	•16067	00008	05872	05342	.06377	01877	.03115
K	.05871	.12970	n4119	13834	.09267	.08372	.00676	.08216	.03333	.10779

Table 14-(Continued)

_	D21	D22	D23	D24	0.25	026	_D2 7	D56	88	89
01	•091 <i>82</i>	.04377	• n440 <u>2</u>	.01283	.1 9784	.12324	.25630	.00995	08152	09436 .
05	.11882	.24956	·13247	-31977	.09153	.25546	.15622	.27924	01433	03414
D3	~. 02944	.00505	• n 4085	00846	01596	~. 03738	-,10883	.17974	07239	0.2065
D4	.51316	.27554	•10975	•41747	80612	•37388	.21485	.08105	.04543	-,17543
D\$	12781	.26705	•01748	.13R14	.22761	.16980	.05465	 3e081	.11928	.09976
D6	.36534	.38258	.12712	•51766	•14POO	.43714	.13 899	.11484	.01915	05090
27	•06725	.24140	.12364	-22184	.14581	.23787	.28312	06961	02019	n2597
DB	11787	,4125d	•09751	.26604	.13248	.38342	.11247	.12108	•04,590	0.2500
D 9	.18304	.16401	.22946	•32378	.00204	.23018	.13583	.01309	.11859	•03683
D10	•15765	.25288	•01982	.28010	.27481	.22594	.16348	10291	.08837	• 0 6 8 7 0
011	.18922	.21824	•02810	•30221	.02358	.20580	.21140	02008	.02667	(4146
012	.29389	.39898	∙n2893	• 2 986 8	.20271	.38761	.14725	07212	.02153	•05611
013	.30681	.25593	•2234B	•32830	02639	. 22546	.31680	.31488	.02733	04519
D14	.30440	29784	•16379	•168 73	.23161	.21216	.07929	12197	03431	12146
015	•56318	.37472	•18416	∙ 57535	18517	.69413	.181n2	07062	.01014	05837
D16	.19634	.25262	•23771	•46134	•16754	•41273	.21558	.02410	18089	1 4062
D17	•46200	.34285	.21734	•32087	•13353	•42240	.12971	01365	.00525	- ∙08006
D18	.42655	.35472	•14913	.53644	•15260	.48174	.17621	 04587	02467	=•r679 6
019	.21171	.44524	•15508	.21591	.07224	.36153	•22797	01085	.12694	• B3244
050	.19960	.32381	•18579	•3585 8	.30631	.43232	.30372	•119 7 0	03593	+ .02793
021	1.00000	.37542	•14703	.37056	•02209	.52391	.09840	08499	.05074	 €7125
D25	.37542	1.00000	•07425	.32771	.01853	.44021	.13522	15416	.14022	•06030
U23	.14703	.07425	1.00000	•19268	.D9n47	.15705	.01854	•19379	12690	→• 0ä550
D24	•37056	.32771	•19268	1.00000	•1505 0	.45011	.10561	.02513	02537	-,14385
025	•02509	.01853	•09047	•15050	1.00000	.23652	.23531	 08780	19573	08561
026	.52391	.44021	• 157n5	45011	.23652	1.00000	.18062	11696	.03226	- •05961
027	.09840	.13522	·n1854	10561	.23531	.18062	1.00000	.05398	- .02862	01120
D28	08499	15416	•19379	.02513	08780	11696	.05398	1.00000	01328	•00279
88	.05074	.14822	-•12690	02537	19573	.03226	02862	01328	1.00000	.50092
89	07125	.06030	09280	14385	08561	05961	+.01120	.00279	50092	1.00000
90	-,02512	.08542	14921	07397	01704	00698	09304	02475	.27960	.33381
91	17064	01466	16624	27936	05447	18630	.01716	.00889	·27389	27238
92	05309	.14180	•04489	04397	03405	.01304	•00070	0516A	.25375	128227
93	11567	.00237	19792	-•13849	09299	07044	.03620	02353	.39718	• 34893
94	15121	04679	- •∩5655	12671	.03356	13340	.12939	00029	•22102	•10056
95	08138	01420	- •n8694	+ •08481	.07831	07975	.03428	02184	.23843	·2957n
96	-,10660	17246	08881	24916	•0265 5	23614	24498	.06791	.10a18	.20524
97	16658	35725	17087	18097	-,11326	30691	04339	00901	.11614	22605
98	10271	22676	09728	11359	14743	19431	16271	00767	20195	14583
99	69527	-,31681	22234	46939	 08319	 55029	04911	.04404	•19317	.23232
100	18818	33486	;1533	14020	12377	-,25221	09735	.16911	02259	•11339
114	.07512	33940	• 00593	04344	.03914	12354	.07315	.01183	.06917	01547
115	.06806	01320	•n9563	.04964	.13768	05645	.04183	.00101	.00588	.02811
116	.11391	.02357	•n2758	06701	.13949	.07426	.02430	05439	.01120	01169
117	.14898	.02897	•n5711	.03527	 09317	•05718	.00485	.0234A	03248	04009
118 119	.03286	+.14103	13538	•07237	+03894 -00478	00309	01799	04563	05570	01024
	.05363	07166	.20203	•05737	00172	.06091	00072	.07653	 11562	09214
120	.08205	.02062	.n8894	.04029	.0840B	•16389	-19317	0P159	18901	14717
121	.05695	- 05229	+02321 +7049	.02202	.18793 .007 17	.0199 3	.16294	00014	03930	12380
122	.12017	00064	•17049	.21453		,12578	.04740	.13553	11886	115P1 09975
123	.16179	.05930	.11553	•13773	•19208	- 23635	.04337	.13797	07127	08875
124	08762	-,16008	18004	200A0	03121	18647	01133	09507	.10813	•05737
125	06603	.02649	~•n5928	•01799	.03569	05294	.11228	.03830	.05928	00694
126	02734	.01956	07018	12872	.08492	01860	.05327	01131	.05021	02806
127	.01173	09010	- .07945	08025	12889	03487	07134	03592	06329	00070

Table 11 -- (Continued)

128	.11199	08922	•06111	.10224	03779	00532	-,05889	.04732	.05571	03187
129	.23664	.03462	.20680	01023	-,03563	.15096	03608	.01108	06825	- 19522
130	03248	01405	•n6698	01908	.07079	.14245	.19556	11604	17229	11755
131	02570	.02061	-•n2087	.08756	.10952	03895	.17745	.03993	01861	07703
132	.24747	.05058	19489	·06883	02465	.16862	.04868	.17158	09782	12151
133	06021	05407	03450	•B9845	.14001	.06568	.11340	.06462	-,04667	04481
87	05412	,14163	•n4301	0176n	.09492	•02882	.05892	07014	21n33	- 11474
A	07391	03916	02643	06394	06209	00426	.05367	13815	.16482	.00229
В	10120	05308	ne847	03057	04308	09243	00070	05107	.08066	• 04624
C	15405	.01322	12172	16006	11863	15752	00634	14249	.12523	•10763
D	09726	•U3753	05734	11130	16775	09461	05657	24203	.20428	13383
E	04960	05087	P.01155	07305	-,12734	-,06281	92615	02127	08128	 007]8
Ē	.02961	.16628	09730	01107	08175	.01720	09579	16073	.16428	.10566
6	03774	.08630	11293	02776	-,09529	09223	01514	02735	.03584	იპ672
н	00588	.06243	-10657	.14747	.16433	.12658	06955	- 03424	00068	02006
Ų	.05015	09240	•n505 1	03784	.08373	.01794	02355	00267	05667	08166
K	.03222	01792	•n9837	.06733	.15250	.09106	.03026	02182	04032	06834

		91	92	93	94	95	96	97	9.0	99
D4	90 05001	13793	1580N	-•20064	12323	07342	12352	07808	17436	-•07660
01 02		04391	•n0378	07679	03954	09005	17357	17082	24964	-,22716
03	01838	08235	12330	03555	07639	00870	02707	13063	16953	03204
	1079g	15281	0115B	12063	10457	- 0994B	13935	13957	-,10478	43513
D4	.00708			01557	05694	12793	14643	03412	.08812	07650
05 04	 03383	.13692 15620	•05293	10131	.02548	09471	14164	17448	30386	35633
D6 D7	.00234		05680	•D2036	.0978 0	15135	21249	02411	15373	18848
Da Da	07552	-,65748 07178	•13321	 05979	02979	03363	14444	20982	33436	56048
09	.04517	- 23459	•n576 6 ••n239 2	- 12444	01795	05448	17050	22025	-,21887	33416
	09346	03798		05432	.06417	00539	14215	20191	08354	20118
010	.00400	04320	-•n0114 -•n3164	00840	08292	02126	24374	23214	16270	27184
011 012	-,05077	07289	•03173	=•05946	 15499	03154	22486	26590	26010	29587
	•06455 - 05750	06457		19256	=.14471	14147	24538	19714	35098	29755
013	05759		01836	05559	- 02258	08739	15056	22950	11918	22195
014	=+05o62	17430 13433	-• 6277	⇒.n2580	= 04443 = 04443	03604	-,20956	25926	= 26397	- 65901
015	08423	11774	•n2296	15009	08995	04971	19825	12965	22079	₩. 30046
016 017	00613 02946	- 15642	•n6753 ••n2150	15009 06279	00995 00533	- .06949	18644	12965 17260	20105	20041
D18	08913	- 17453	06370	08088	07836	09682	÷.16775	23311	20461	48626
D19	+03742	.04949	-100370 -n2537	.02758	01211	00910	18700	10040	20041	17538
050	→.08951	01242	•157n6	00867	02591	11832	10856	17254	27560	25312
021	02512	17064	05309	11567	15121	08138	10660	16658	10271	69527
022	08542	- 01466	•14180	00237	- 04679	01420	17246	35725	22676	31581
D23	14921	16624	04429	19792	05655	- .08694	08881	17087	09726	22234
024	07397	- 27936	- 64397	13849	12671	08481	24916	18097	11359	46939
025	01704	05447	-•n3405	09299	03356	.07831	.02655	11326	-,14743	08319
D26	00698	18630	•n1304	- 07944	13340	07975	23614	30691	19431	55029
027	09304	.01716	•n0070	03620	12939	.03428	24488	04339	16271	04911
028	- 02475	00889	n5168	02353	- 00029	02184	06791	00901	00767	.04404
86	2796n	.27389	• 25375	39788	22102	23843	.10818	11614	20195	.19317
89	33381	27288	28227	34893	.10056	.29570	.20524	22605	.14583	.23232
96	1.00000	35782	23019	31012	20593	.32569	.28120	.22562	25227	.21421
91	35782	1.00000	39198	•35399	21503	.39859	.23272	20748	.12362	.34680
9ž	23039	39198	1.00000	43397	.35096	.67922	.17026	08935	.01947	.13077
93	.31012	.38399	.43397	1.00000	.67917	•51056	.29820	.23367	.14489	.21824
94	.20593	.21503	•₹5096	.67917	1.00006	.47799	.33588	.20654	.01243	.13341
95	.32569	. 19859	67922	•51056	.47799	1.00000	.30967	.22832	.17285	•17412
96	.28120	.23272	.17026	•29B20	.33588	.30967	1.00000	.3346n	.28107	.23138
97	.22562	+20748	•n8935	.23367	.29654	.22F32	.33460	1.00000	.36595	.34754
98	.2 5227	.12362	•01947	• 1 44P9	.01243	.17285	.281n 7	. 36595	1.00000	.32296
99	.21421	-34680	•13077	21824	.13341	.17412	.23138	.34754	.32296	1.00000
100	.27973	.07213	•n0266	·21051	.18930	• ᲘᲒᲘᲧᲜ	.45419	45339	.26667	.24315
114	02226	.04519	•n462 1	•03359	•0598 6	.05406	~. 05₽04	.07667	•02770	.r3124
115	01566	03275	•n3693	- ∙05798	- ,0688 6	.02243	08367	12949	00035	09836
116	.01376	.11050	•n4095	01449	11336	n3331	11452	14483	17315	05396
117	07556	 ⊍8075	- +∩4187	05215	13253	12429	00n <u>2</u> 9	.01943	06042	12015
118	15681	04609	06231	15672	04493	11400	01923	01060	-,10526	08605
119	07682	09760	- ∙∩1976	 25011	18372	08962	12733	11415	20715	10206
120	10715 `	16060	•B1626	12083	.05566	.00722	-,05299	14849	20552	23757
121	 01788	.13698	•n3526	•01908	.12731	.15659	02338	.00809	.04307	03957
125	.00108	14129	•09095	13410	16440	•04030	020A4	07010	-:11540	20421
123	.00992	.02174	•c1797	.00136	04992	01143	06375	29940	07109	15302
124	01690	.15403	· 09408	07642	.04590	.07775	.02334	.24929	.17118	.23321
125	00277	.08490	.02314	03687	00828	01629	08217	07170	02319	.04698
126	.02209	16322	04025	.01851	02581	-,02716	04743	07285	13055	.10515
127	12226	00042	.01361	07299	15377	05581	01386	.05182	.06273	.01847

Table 14-(Continued)

128	18501	08464	- •∩7 757	13016	06268	13714	.00456	01266	08415	09653
129	08066	04282	•09240	18095	12706	01746	12676	- 1P224	17174	15385
150	-,16369	13231	• r5301	08962	.09833	~. ∩0190	10108	15849	19200	15287
131	09912	.03569	•n6947	05275	.10909	.11769	03261	.0345A	.02411	03744
132	-,00614	06304	• 10510	09555	06989	.07344	.06612	06798	11689	20413
133	00175	.03436	• 02087	04025	07169	04501	07683	12174	.01492	04017
87	 07160	08089	•64968	13707	-,10162	09957	00560	12625	21340	05910
A	.09609	.11192	.23702	26977	.19184	.16354	.02677	.13876	.06715	.04045
В	.12254	.12474	03846	.24601	12825	02785	.00688	.08556	04348	•09636
С	.17565	.17102	•n705 3	.27361	.19341	.04186	.04621	.04298	01127	•11022
D	.11653	.09123	**0041	23119	.11076	.18588	.07505	.10361	•08609	.08343
E	.07381	11238	10108	09213	15494	01117	.15077	.12247	.04876	.0095J
F	.03983	17216	•13193	•10702·	•05390	.12222	14534	07879	-,19028	 05370
G	.03607	00594	n2213	- 02534	03449	05559	14487	02349	11600	•03851
Н	01320	.00668	•n0673	06055	05488	04305	11461	10694	14218	04077
J	02459	02376	→•n1522	05175	02343	07575	.11480	03163	08393	01940
K	02650	.01414	- ∙00865	06653	01588	07906	.00770	08927	14438	04159

	100	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122
01	07943	.08819	.n7012	.0852A	.01284	14017	.02712	.08189	10951	•.02571
DŽ	15255	08627	-•n8485	.01408	.01491	12841	.11312	.05891	05957	.23678
03	01600	08521	.n6131	.00915	.04360	.00108	.05995	.12825	.09554	•06990
04	06409	02361	04212	.01000	-,03973	07426	.03960	.14574	01350	•16188
05	59383	0200a	.12223	05477	-,04362	•00304	. 00482	.06493	.19873	05742
06	06290	.01588	12761	02515	.04930	.02064	.08409	04343	.09.79	.13332
D7	13673	.02123	•01611	.03230	.12844	05000	.00987	.23616	.11n97	•07964
Da	19082	06826	-• 64584	.10939	.03745	08466	.12907	.17398	.01459	•11871
ÜĢ	10646	-,13346	₹•015%1	⇒ •00812	.05970	•09826	.18332	.14780	-,02066	•0818F
010	15281	05023	18265	.12732	.00113	.01756	···· 04346	.1691A	.22670	01188
011	15755	14020	n0024	.03428	12091	.06582	.07331	.04139	02094	•0€70₽
D12	26841	16072	•n269 7	.16528	.03259	.00412	.08248	.1 4453	0 4581	.09666
013	~.1 2005	.02102	•n0736	·D2475	.01439	04601	.03264	.04912	13:92	.10270
014	21124	.02810	- •04855	•06250	.07138	.04059	.02997	.01096	.06753	•05409
D15	- ,13430	09162	.02170	.07752	-13029	.05453	.02315	.10411	•01634	•16452
016	01751	-,16837	-•n0107	.03708	.07499	02531	.11024	.11097	.07095	.17724
017	17899	10728	•n0672	•03026	.07035	.09465	.17817	00175	.11043	.13160
018	13905	11376	11866	+. 03279	.17248	.02522	.01060	.03603	09722	·1P224
019	19870	05289	•n2723	.05032	05.328	.02039	.05545	.16961	06647	02112
050	20300	11149	•n8948	•0126A	.05705	07084	07729	.29469	.11726	.06828
D51	18818	.07512	• 06806	,11391	.14898	.03286	.05383	.08205	.05695	•12017
022	33486	- ,03940	n1320	.02357	.n289 7	14103	07166	.02062	.05229	00064
023	11533	.00593	•n9563	.02758	.05711	.13538	.20203	.08894	.02321	.17049
024	14020	04344	•04964	→. 06701	.03527	.07237	.05737	.04029	.02202	.21453
D25	12377	.03914	•13768	•13949	09317 .05718	.03894	00172	.08408	.18793	.00717
U26 U27	25221 09735	12354 .07315	-•∩5645 •n4183	.07426 .02430	•0571 0	00309 01799	.06n91 00072	.16389 .19317	.01993 .16294	•12578 •04740
028	.16911	.01183	•n0101	05439	.02348	.04563	.07653	0P159	00n14	.13553
88	.02259	.06917	•n0588	.01120	03248	05570	11562	18901	03930	11886
89	11339	01547	02811	01169	04009	01024	09214	14717	12380	11581
90	27973	02226	-•n1566	01376	 07556	15681	076A2	10715	01788	.00108
9 i	.07213	.04519	-•n3275	.11050	DBn75	04609	09760	1606n	.13698	14129
92	.08266	.04621	.03693	• 04095	04187	06231	01976	.01626	.03526	.09095
93	·21051	.03359	05798	01449	05215	15672	25011	12083	B0010.	13410
94	.18930	•U6986	-•n6886	11336	*.1 3253	04493	18372	.05566	.12731	 16440
95	.06085	.05406	·r2243	n3331	12429	11400	08962	.00722	·15659	.04030
96	.45419	05804	- ∙n8367	11452	- •00059	01923	12733	 05299	02338	 02084
97	•45339	.07667	12949	14483	.01943	- .01060	11415	14849	•00009	07010
98	.26667	.02770	-•n0035	17315	-,06942	10526	20715	20552	•0430 7	11540
99	.24315	.03124	- •∩9836	 05 <u>3</u> 96	12015	- .08605	10206	23757	03957	20421
100	1.00000	-,01154	-•n86 73	≈.12766	.01972	03880	08511	11377	12915	•10857
114	01154	1.00000	•×3451	.23943	•02004	.12223	04579	03593	.08675	r4607
115	08673	.33451	1.00000	49343	•15925	·23868	·11847	•054 <u>8n</u>	•26314	•12646
116	12766	.23943	•49343	1.00000	·19n50	.34803	19728	.07407	.23270	.12742
117	.01972	.02004	•15925	•19050	1.00000	.27107	.24763	.19039	14206	.20292
118	~. 03888	.12223	.23868	.34803	.27107	1.00000	.32429	.16865	.27281	.17069
119	08511	04579	•11887	.19728	.24763	.32429	1.00000	.21526	109534	•64868 20524
120	11377	0359 3	.05480	•07407 03370	.19039 .14206	.16865 .27281	.21526 .09534	1.00000	.12323 1.00000	•2452 6 •10517
121	12915	.08675	•26314	.23270 .12742	.20292	.17069	.64868	.12323 .24526	.10517	1.00000
122 123	.10857	-,04607 .11339	•12646 •5407	.24271	.12401	.18883	.18507	.16819	.17268	•19557
124	13384 .03457	.63383	•15447 •18938	.17541	.04621	.12062	09291	08835	.15931	12030
125	01603	.28644	69653	41172	.20777	17470	06660	.05401	.28817	•10142
126	01800	16672	.34718	79282	.192A9	.22830	.13430	.04976	.25413	.11746
127	•02970	.01395	•10115	18561	.66417	29760	.06878	08172	.09555	07176
10/	90E710	401030	AIGTTO	* TOOU!		8 5 7 1 2 0	4.00,0	9 U.C. 2 7 Z	40,555	

Table 14-(Continued)

128	00354	.07540	.22577	.28348	.31193	.80400	.23733	.12463	24027	+15491
129	10957	.08675	.16021	.24823	19461	.36706	.64860	.14504	.18050	.49701
130	07546	00691	• n7107	.08370	.07196	.15087	.06794	.82430	.10316	13710
131	06592	.00130	21452	.10541	.09042	.23888	.06411	.16686	.75177	•11967
132	.12617	.03542	.09997	.12336	.19104	.21575	.44242	16967	.21259	•76794
133	07129	.07417	.24786	13029	.10082	13391	.09791	,12034	•1626 2	13216
87	06032	.03185	06942	02635	.00548	.04025	.09795	11443	05n 79	•n2518
A	02575	-,02333	*c8921	•1760 8	02599	.01729	01066	10182	05875	•n2615
В	.12036	00604	.14715	•10805	.16296	.0082 7	- 05514	- 07962	 04.995	06191
C	.16796	 02665	.11349	.07957	02531	m.02336	• 07437	- •04948	- •04334	11196
D	.00998	 09806	•11990	17646	• 09345	= •04862	 0582 2	0.096	13399	06322
Ε	.04207	.01783	•01640	09519	03713	04055	03871	02366	10904	•04719
F	17640	07715	•n7288	.05950	~. 08508	10386	10546	05241	01380	-•09744
G	13240	04976	.11081	00461	.06714	06614	06211	01319	02309	20164
H	01189	.16791	• 09566	•12685	.08078	.10064	05674	.09748	.02553	+0884 6
J	00860	.12321	•n1338	.03973	03260	.23212	.12412	07730	•04710	+09112
K	01932	.17344	• 6344	-10156	.06353	.21013	.11261	.11416	.04320	•11720

Table 14-(Continued)

_	123	124	_125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132
01	.04391	.06355	•071E0	•12701	06715	16520	03960	.01855	05989	11282
02	.02678	18179	07019	•00949	11544	10058	06854	.01116	03226	13235
υJ	.12977	-,11862	•n3089	.04571	05030	05721	02669	.13691	.10355	•06924
D4	.18112	-,11340	- •⊓29₽9	05434	09614	07526	.09033	.11093	05827	.15448
05	.10446	03326	64644	00946	06244	.00788	.02216	.05841	.08535	08683
06	.13228	18628	10950	02264	02664	.08084	.08246	.00862	.17969	•17029
07 02	.04419	05947	.01288	•06773	00582	06983	04007	.24054	.13409	.02519
80	-17591	-,18124	• 02071	13903	~.02050	06915	.05163	,14881	•00000	.07894
D g	-, 06917	- 49757	1 6 9 9 £	00376	.00472	.07888	.09712	.22242	.07602	.10335
Dio	.21754	*. 04737	+17178	.13910	08961	03279	10643	.16496	.16531	03613
011	07251	=,14854 = 10704	•n6013	• 02894	-09325	.06034	03046	.09382	03714	•64444
012 D13	.11032	19726 20955	09592	.07864	04317	.01879 .02280	00963	.10912	08526 08526	•08136
014	.06217 .26529	07006	.01280 04235	01517 -00147	06214 .05341	.04994	05296 -15569	.00194	04866	.03403
D15	.09479	17441	=•n1246	06480	00617	.08339	.08768	03772	.03329 01390	•13366
016	.18284	21445	-•n6034	10593	06776	06711	.08152	.04256 01676	.04294	.16410 .00311
017	.01626	15891	-110034 -03414	•02418	08881	-00711	16289	01213	.04994	.16013
018	.11094	-,17321	=•∩8405	07555	09405	07204	.05082	.02133	04513	•18269
D19	.04063	16417	98090	• 04958	02004	.03027	.06122	.15737	11199	.03753
020	.15507	20838	• n8075	01796	14293	10186	05801	.25405	02171	•12612
021	.16179	08762	n6603	02734	01173	.11199	.23664	03248	02570	24747
022	05930	16008	• 02649	•01956	09010	08922	.03462	01405	.02061	.05058
D23	.11553	18004	n5928	07018	07945	.06111	20680	.0669R	02087	.19469
มี24	.13773	20080	·61799	12872	08025	10224	01023	01906	08756	£8930•
025	19208	03121	n3569	08492	12089	- 03779	03563	07079	10952	02465
026	23635	18647	n5294	01860	03487	00532	.15096	.14245	03895	16862
027	.04337	01133	11228	05327	07134	05889	03608	.19556	.17745	.04868
D28	.13797	-,09507	•n3830	01131	03592	.04732	.01108	11604	.03993	.17158
88	07127	.10813	•n5928	•05021	06329	.05571	06825	17229	01861	r9782
89	08875	. U5737	- •∩8694	02806	 00070	n3187	19522	11756	 077∩3	12151
90	.00992	01690	-•n027 7	•02269	~. 12226	18501	08066	16369	09012	00614
91	.02174	.15403	• 0E490	•16322	00042	08464	04262	1.231	.03569	 0€304
92	.01797	• 09408	•n2314	•04025	.01361	07757	.09240	.05301	•0694 7	•10510
93	.00136	.07842	03687	•01851	07299	13016	18095	08962	05275	- •0955 5
94	04992	.04290	roa28	02581	15377	06268	12706	.09833	.10909	06989
95	01143	.07775	-•n1629	02716	05581	13714	01746	0019n	.11769	.07344
96	06375	.02334	ne217	04743	01386	.00456	12676	1010a	03261	·6612
97 98	-,29940	.24929	07170	-•07285	.05182	01266	10224	15849	03458	06798
99	07109	.17118	n2319	13055	.06273	^8415 09653	17174 15385	1929n	.02401	11689
100	-,15302	.23321 .03457	\$644n.	.10515 01800	.01947 .02970	=.00754	10385 10957	-,15287	03744	20413
114	+.13384 .11339	.63383	-•n1603 •28644	•16672	.01*95	07540	.08675	07546 00691	06592 .00130	•12617 •03542
115	.15447	.18938	.6965 3	.34718	.10115	22577	.16021	.07107	.21452	09997
116	.24271	.17541	•41172	•79282	.18561	.28348	.24823	.08370	.10541	•12336
117	.12401	.04621	•20777	19289	•66417	.31193	.19461	.07196	.09042	•19104
ile	18883	.12062	17470	22830	29760	80400	.36706	.15087	.23228	21575
119	.18507	09291	06660	.13430	.06878	23733	64860	.06794	.06411	44242
120	.16819	08835	•n5401	•04976	.00172	12463	14504	62430	16686	16967
121	.17288	.15931	.28817	25413	.09555	.24027	.18050	.10316	.75177	.21259
122	.19557	12030	.10142	.11746	.07176	.15491	.49701	.13710	.11967	.76794
123	1.00000	.05189	15537	.17042	.01065	.10186	.24280	.05134	.04114	.20199
124	.05189	1.00000	.33459	.22371	.18066	.08631	.04421	00062	.12445	01403
125	.15537	.33459	1.00000	.53612	16985	.18065	.11786	.12721	.29939	.07286
126	.17042	.22371	.53612	1.00000	.19409	.23819	.23729	.15558	.18453	.14701
127	.01065	.18066	.16985	.19409	1.00000	.36339	.20748	.16889	.22574	.18663
			-	_					•	

Table Il -- (Continued)

128	.10186	.08631	.18065	.23819	.36339	1.00000	.38049	.13135	.31599	.29250
129	24280	04421	11786	23729	20748	. 38n49	1.00000	.13017	.22809	.64314
130	.05134	00062	12721	1555B	•16A89	.13135	.13017	1.00000	.23579	.18259
131	04114	12445	+29979	.18453	,22574	.31599	.22809	.23579	1.00000	.22760
132	.20199	01403	07286	.14701	18663	.29250	.64314	18259	.22760	. 1.00000
133	.68464	.11075	.307a0	.12895	.11665	13490	.17571	.14404	.13311	.16401
87	.07890	00787	-03950	00275	05219	.02429	.13672	.11504	.03458	n3555
A	.03721	02621	13982	.11773	01077	 05908	01417	.11110	06222	- •€7956
. B	04316	⇒.01135	14707	-04856	•05350	02130	14122	11365	13019	1 4900
C	01482	02802	12253	04547	- ,00685	08031	14553	06601	12006	17749
Ď	04914	0.172	.08058	•11742	03865	-,08111	09832	.04522	13287	17557
Ε	02618	 05186	01905	14967	-,09662	-,00666	08640	-,06497	-,1 4485	•00940
F	06820	08653	•n3251	.01054	21849	16873	-,12130	05413	 02253	14332
G	11349	06766	 ຄ1428	05310	07706	10412	- 19849	04484	 0289 7	29272
H	.04601	.02933	.n3893	11814	09627	.04280	06946	.07920	.01057	•n3882
J	.17241	.03373	04427	.02747	008 56	.20679	.18680	.02984	00262	•16004
K	.14388	.03295	00841	.09023	06623	.15822	.08605	.07259	•00770	•13274

				T	apte In(Co	ntinuea)			•	
	133	87	. А	В	Ċ	ם	Ε	F	G	* H
D ₁	04301	.10356	09839	p8812	D7077	.01609	.07852	09394	.00099	.15799
D2	03012	.01383	n6396	07296	15186	09260	18205	.04502	.11540	21492
03	.10076	.13168	13885	03865	01520	00920	08932	.07214	12986	•0787 7
D4	.09462	04009	•n335A	07394	10525	03653	.01890	.03303	.01230	02294
05	•17036			14736	15456	.09650				
		.01298	•n6045				.04653	.21339	•08516	.05041
D6	10879	•u2284	18956	13600	16923	23488	09847	.02694	.00268	.22176
D7	00167	.00685	n0546	03961	04829	02624	10006	.08047	.08146	.21587
DB	-,01412	.01739	-•n6427	15700	20765	06688	06458	.09927	•07447	•17593
D9	•06170	-,01360	-• n1192	08342	09458	00513	-,03322	.01721	010P1	.05215
010	•2505 8	.04224	•n3916	.08424	.10328	• 05554	16313	.12625	.01585	.10130
011	02393	01009	-•n2518	•10661	.04010	07787	09707	.04987	.04510	.12021
012	01566	.05733	- ∙n7263	01137	~. 09501	00359	04438	.02699	02851	·20082
013	06633	. 05465	 :8988	+.19 886	24008	21501	03141	01919	 0202 7	.04137
014	.10982	.06202	ne74e	11853	10428	13597	06519	01166	00965	•05888
D15	.02799	07860	•n1671	• 04264	05926	01906	00028	.06182	 06589	·15390
016	12431	.05518	-•n7937	00157	07523	 0630 3	,03429	.02227	12721	.20373
017	10800	01137	•p2186	10123	-,14460	05629	11193	07461	05n11	.06157
D18	•06974	.02840	04413	- •05350	10701	11619	.01947	.05357	03070	. 06308
019	•0908 7	.16364	•18309	•14272	.12918	.12837	.08898	.03349	00501	.06646
D20	.12436	.07508	• 03944	01486	17244	02233	.00969	.09659	03948	.14075
021	06021	05412	- •∩7391	10120	15405	09726	.04960	.02961	03774	⊶. 00598
022	05407	.14163	n3916	- ,053∩8	.01322	.03753	05087	.16628	.08630	•06243
023	.03450	.04301	•n2643	08847	12172	05734	01155	09730	11293	.10657
024	.09845	01760	n6394	03057	15006	11130	.07305	.01107	02776	.14747
D25	.14001	.09492	n62n9	04308	11963	16775	12734	08175	09529	.16433
026	.06568	.02882	00426	09243	15752	09461	06281	.01720	09223	.12658
027	.11340	.05892	·n5367	00070	00634	05657	.02615	.09579	01514	06955
028	.06462	07014	13815	05107	14249	24203	02127	16073	02735	03424
88	04667	21033	.16482	08066	12523	.20428	08128	.16428	.03584	98000.=
-89	04481	11474	6229	04624	19763	.13383	00718	10588	.03672	02006
90	00175	07160	• 09609	12254	.17565	.11653	.07381	.03983	.03607	01320
91	.03436	28089	•11192	.12474	.17102	.09123	11238	.17216	.00594	• 00668
92	.02087	.04968	•23702	.03P46	.07053	.30041	10108	.13193	-,02213	.00673
93	04025	13707	.26977	24601	27361	.23119	09213	.10702	02534	06055
94	07169	10162	19184	12 ^A 25	19341	.11076	- 15494	05390	.03449	05488
95	04501	09957	.16354	02795	.04186	.18588	01117	12222	05559	04305
96	07€83	0056u	· 02677	.00688	.04621	.07505	.15077	14534	14487	11461
97	12174	12625	13876	•08556	04293	.10361	12247	07879	02349	 10694
98	.01492	-,21340	n6715	04348	01127	.08609	.04876	19028	11600	14218
99	04017	05910	·04045	• 09636	11022	.08343	00953	05370	.03851	cup77
100	07129	06032	-•c2575	12036	16796	00398	.04207	17640	13240	01189
114	.07417	.03185	-+n2333	00604	02065	09806	.01783	07715	04976	16791
115	24786	.06942	•n8921	•14715	.11349	11990	.01640	07288	110A1	09566
116	13029	.02635	•176ne	10805	07957	.17646	09519	.05950	00461	12685
117	10882	.08548	•n2599	.16296	.02631	.09345	03713	08508	.06714	.08078
118	.13391	.04025	01729	•n0827	02336	04862	04055	10386	06614	•10064
119	.09791	.09795	=•01066	06514	07437	05A22	03871	10546	06211	• 05674
120	.12034	.11443	•10182	-:07962	04948	.08096	02366	05241	01319	.09748
121	•16262	05079	05875	04895	04934	13399	10904	01380	02309	.02553
122	.13216	.02518	•n2615	06191	11196	06322	.04719	=.01360 =.09744	20164	.02895
123	.68464	.02516	•n2615 •n3721	04316	01482	04914	.02618	06820	11349	.04601
124	.11075	00787	n2621	01135	02802	04172	05186	08653	06766	.02933
					• • •	·				
125	.30780	.03950	.13982	•14707	.12253	.08058	-,01905	.03251	01428	.03893
126	.12895	00275	•11773	.04856	.04547	.11742	14967	.01054	05310	.11814
127	.11665	05219	01077	.05350	00685	03865	09662	21849	07706	09627

Table 14-(Continued)

128	.13490	.02429	n5908	02130	08931	ne;i1	00666	~.1687J	10412	.04280
129	.17571	.13672	-•n1417	14122	14553	~. 09₽32	08040	12130	19849	-,06946
130	14404	.11504	+12110	11365	06691	.04522	- ,06497	05413	04484	.07920
131	.13311	•63458	-,06222	13019	12706	*. 13287	- 14485	+.02253	+.02897	.01057
132	.16401	.03555	- •07956	1 4900	17749	17557	.00940	14332	29272	.03882
133	1.00000	.04724	·n5421	00599	.01042	.03370	.10087	02877	07489	n1982
87	.04724	1.00000	• 00135	.02538	.01850	01373	.17251	04670	10589	.12978
A	.05421	.00135	1.00000	.49051	.49591	.66442	.13475	.05542	01900	10n6i
8	00599	.02538	.49051	1.00000	.78122	.42009	.02080	.10342	.16204	01799
C	.01042	.01850	•49591	.78122	1.00000	.45176	.06122	.19247	.18636	10358
D	.03370	01373	+66442	, 42809	•45176	1.00000	.14676	. 2405n	.14947	05617
Ε	.10na7	.17251	•13475	.02080	.06122	.14676	1.00000	.04654	13172	.03566
F	02877	04678	•n5542	.10342	.19247	.24050	.04654	1,50000	.30011	.12466
G	07489	-,10589	01900	.16804	.18636	.14947	13172	.30011	1.00000	- ∙00552
н	01982	.12978	-,10061	01799	10358	05617	.03566	.12486	00552	1.00000
j	.04009	.05784	08461	14526	18403	21287	.11175	01692	11203	.30185
K	.01927	.11471	10882	10076	-,17772	-,16707	.08839	.06318	07169	.78506

T	able 11:(Co	
	ئ	K
٥ı	00924	.09276
02	.04810	.16139
03	.06807	.08649
D4	.01100	00016
05	.08715	.08897
06	.16447	.24251
D7	05718	.09279
Dв	.10617	,17112
D G	00729	.03139
D10	12106	01079
011	01761	.05871
012	.01458	.12970
013	.02442	.04119
014	.16(67	.13834
015	 00008	.U9267
D16	05972	.08372
017	C5342	.00676
D18	.06377	.08216
D19	01877	.03333
D20	.03115	.10779
DZÍ	.05015	.03222
D22		01792
	09240	
052	.05051	.09837
D24	03784	.06733
025	,08373	15250
026	.01794	.U91Ub
027	02355	.03026
058	 00267	02182
83	05667	34032
89	08166	 √6834
90		02650
91	÷.02459 •02376	01414
92	-,01522	08865
93		
	+. 05175	
94	.02343	0158d
95	+.07575	 U790á
96	11400	•U0770
97	-,03163	 ∪8927
98	. 08393	14438
99	01940	04159
100	00060	J1932
114	12321	.17344
115	01338	.06344
116	.03973	.10156
117	.03760	.06353
113		
	.23212	.21013
119	.12412	.11261
120	.07730	.11416
121	.04710	.04320
122	.09112	•11720
123	.17241	.14388
124	.03373	03295
125	04427	00841
126	02747	.09023
127	00056	06623
4-1	.00036	.00023

Table 11 -- (Continued)

. 30	.20679	.15622
128		08605
129	.1 8680	
130	.02984	.07259
131	00262	.00770
132	.16004	.13274
	04009	01927
133		11471
87	.05784	
A	08461	-,10882
В	14526	10076
č	18403	-,17772
ă	21287	16707
_	.11175	.ua839
Ē		.06318
F	01692	
G	11203	07169
н	.30185	.78506
ij	1.00000	. 42494
	.82494	1.00000
K	,06474	_,

TABLE 15
INTERCORRELATIONS AFORG ITEMS ON THE WEIGHTED DIFFERENCE SCALE

	3701	6XDS	9XD3	12XD4	15×05	18X06	21X07	24XD8	27 vn9	30x010
3X01	1.00000	.16613	+11404	.06773	.07774	.11552	.33151	.11249	.39450	.27528
6XD2	.16613	1.00000	·18159	.24045	•13929	.47585	.21434	.45884	•2885 6	•14650
9xD3	.11404	.18159	1.00000	D1807	00211	•20548	.25033	.13282	.12312	.12940
12XD4	.06773	.24045	01807	1.00000	.15700	•33029	.04983	.26428	.12087	•10180
15X05	.07774	.13829	n0211	15900	1.00000	.06276	.26155	•1392n	•066 6 2	•25838
16x06	.11552	.47585	• 2054B	.33029	.06276	1.00000	.21327	.45386	15022	•r#574
21×D7	.33151	.21434	.25033	-04923	. 26155	.21327	1.00060	.31940	.43075	.30439
24x08	.11249	.45884	13282	.26428	13920	45386	.31940	1.00000	.25062	.24711
27x09	.39450	.28856	.12312	.12087	.05462	.15022	.43075	.25062	1.00000	.16865
30,D10	.27528	.14880	• 12940	.10100	•25838	.08674	.30439	.24711	.36085	1.0000
33xD11	02907	.20001	=•ი0439	.17657	.19509	.17013	.08761	.20279	.20296	•16019
36,012	.03229	19096	01197	·17579	45664	.23182	21441	. 1751g	.14937	•31589
39XU13	.20714	29529	•n4438	.25208	.15267	.34125	.1 4808	.39651	.30473	.22915
42x014	.31909	.19604	02733	•12804	.27743	.23023	.30736	.25999	.31846	.20814
45 ₈ 015	.09805	.16145	- •04797	29955	.25€81	.27389	.14801	.33199	.28131	•19332
48xD16	.21670	.33036	n8846	.33033	.14993	.31688	.17968	.3851;	.29932	•25928
51x017	.C8735	.19048	00247	.32622	•12352	.38563	.15171	.17451	.13149	•1086 9
54xD18	.08727	35970	03112	29063	.17801	.33686	.13404	.31494	.24609	•16777
57xu19	.0426 2	.18187	·D8116	15715	20845	19947	.18841	.30317	.26947	.22254
90XUS0	.23467	.31722	.21568	15628	37486	.21917	.37749	.36164	.37986	.35313
63xU21	.06868	.03011	14896	.32551	.25549	.18797	.05701	.20129	.05505	15845
66xU22	.18474	.36735	13499	.26193	.35499	.37682	.35002	•5065n	.32867	.37001
69,023	.17515	.16582	•2355 8	.03240	.13405	.09229	.27680	.29245	.25593	.22619
72xU24	 00278	.22557	•n1519	•42P17	• 17875	.42013	.11323	.31214	.11666	·24906
75x02 5	.18657	.06150	• 0353 1	09132	.25574	.09595	•2260 3	.13747	.11611	.22824
78xD26	·10757	.29713	∸•ი2057	25606	.28411	•34097	.17053	.40713	.21720	.23562
81 XD27	.23548	.22355	•n7448	.07213	.21311	•07002	.1 9650	.13902	.23610	•55684
8 4%D28		33203	•17135	•165PO	- ,0509 0	.28453	.13115	.31118	.20951	. 15414
88×101	.13640	.J7263	.01800	•D5554	+14189	+11396	.09061	.09346	•16664	·16789
89,102	•09869	.68526	• n6010	07205	.23100	.00335	.11685	.04217	.13438	.18741
90x103	.01350	01521	13015	.03936	·13n15	.12243	.09728	.15868	02390	•13758
91x104	.07721	• u 0 8 1 5	•0591 6	-+01462	.15170	08063	. 03088	.04679	•09209	•14716
92,105	. 14766	•11150	•n9625	•19065	20344	.12576	.20003	.15694	.17384	•n9511
93×106	13933	.11135	14552	•n1325	.10133	.03983	.06796	.08766	• 04246	•17461
94x107	.13599	.00028	.12239	00702	0.3471	.08725	•06266	.08624	00167	•1462B
95x108	.14102	00034	•n5278	·15183	23711	•00266	.21294	.09550	·11323	•13162
96x109	00279	 08406	•02390	02595	•n642 7	.01634	.14474	•0123n	0 00088	•c7038
97x110	.25#2 8	06909	n0581	09197	.10552	10724	.13688	14174	.04881	C4913
98x111	.15615	 u5289	·r6318	.08174	.14292	-,05253	.17794	.02708	11453	·13815
99X112	.11785	-,03964	•12656	28831	.00712	-,08827	.05514	14807	13759	• 00005
100113	.07485	11343	•64552	09257	32488	.01562	.104P7	 12655 ′		C2224
87	. 0885 9	.u6247	•n905 1	11221	.03994	.00459	.04934	.03525	.07043	•0208 7
A	.12472	.07691	•n2579	.07472	.06957	10690	.10234	.01340	14439	•13394
В	.11439	.01241	•∩66₹5	 07730	09432	07814	.07506	12216	.06776	.15493
Ç	14176	-,02362	• n542 3	04906	-,13718	10010	.09502	12355	.10336	•21565
Đ	.17750	2690	•n9647	.0893 3	.05131	14571	.07655	06528	.04078	12962
E	04359	08831	⊸.ე3975	•06333	00313	06553	14437	00955	03218	01798
F	.11083	.00301	.05394	67689	18747	.03238	.01052	.0693A	00011	•07461
G	.06694	.13651	.09139	02651	04285	.00516	.16794	.06385	.03366	.05414
н	.08634	.17578	•22791	00687	.11214	.20347	19123	16819	.03865	•65800
J	07167	.09555	•17602	.00204	.08990	.15677	04000	.11184	-,00506	05629
K	.00250	.16535	•25085	00086	.12524	.22839	.08861	,16627	.01701	01356

Table 15--(Continued)

	33xD11	36x012	39XD13	42XD14	45XD15	40X016	51x017	54X018	57X019	60XD20
3XD1	02907	.03229	.20714	.31909	.09805	.21670	.08735	.08787	.04262	.23467
6XD2	20001	.19096	29529	.19604	.16145	.33036	.19048	.35970	.18187	.31722
9XD3	00439	01197	.04438	02733	04797	.02846	00247	03112	.08116	.21568
12x04	.17657	.17579	·25208	12804	.29955	.33033	32622	29063	.15715	.15625
15xD5	19509	45654	•15267	27743	25681	14993	.12352	.17801	.20845	.37486
18xD6	.17013	23182	-4125	23023	27.189	.31688	38563	33686	.19947	.21817
21107	.08761	.21441	14808	-30736	.14001	.17968	.15171	.13404	.18841	.37749
24 X D B	20279	.17510	.79651	25999	.33199	.38511	17451	31494	.30317	.36164
27xD9	.20296	.14937	.30473	.31846	.28131	.29932	.13149	24609	.20947	.37986
30xD10	.16019	31589	. 22915	20814	.19332	.25928	.10809	.16777	22254	.35313
33xD11	1.00000	.37898	.26128	.27317	.31692	.21550	.23550	.36953	.21253	•13765
36x012	.37898	1.00000	.22461	.17939	.28797	.23063	.23973	.28807	.38822	.21632
39xD13	26128	.22481	1.00000	35398	.28679	.26001	.26818	.26974	.26ani	.36515
42x014	.27317	.17939	• 35398	1.00000	.18165	.20828	.22399	.27770	.12055	.31003
45%D15	31692	28797	.28679	.18165	1.0000	.42364	.25677	.63717	.30976	.41411
48,016	.21550	.23063	•26001	•20828	42364	1.00000	.21862	.47195	.33707	.38722
51x017	.23550	.23973	.26818	.22399	.25677	.21862	1.00000	.12187	15327	.14873
547018	.36953	.28807	26974	.27770	.63717	.47195	.12187	1.00000	.34822	.30512
57xD19	.21253	.38822	26001	.12855	.30976	.33707	.15327	.34822	1.00000	.44185
60XDSD	.13765	.21632	.36515	.31003	.41411	.38722	.14873	.30512	.44185	1.00000
63xu21	.22460	.34906	26959	.24445	.42292	.13876	.30005	.27101	.194=2	.11935
66,022	22328	.41622	. 17319	.32701	.37501	.40365	.26336	.36095	.55:66	45433
69,023	.12466	00352	.26185	.32915	.16933	•16829	.05752	.18290	.22478	•3359n
722024	.23994	.25140	. 26533	•14952	.45198	.41142	.30921	.41357	.33311	.27077
75/025	.20820	.27247	-•n6731	•30228	.163n9	.17033	.08632	.1448A	.01401	.20529
78 _X D26	.21687	.39823	*31921	•18151	•62590	.32668	.24933	.43498	·34764	.39672
81x027	.27265	.22040	•18864	•2 ⁰⁸ 11	.09219	.22110	.13649	.06615	.16062	•11744
847028	.18582	.U3267	.41214	•n7847	•144n2	.27653	.04071	.15462	.25394	.25592
88×101	•07204	.01109	• 14510	•07600	•13020	.c7746	.13528	.1138)	.05240	.07764
89,102	.07823	.14930	-11407	.04433	02513	05102	02374	01666	.05413	.07446
90x103	0059 6	.16096	•n2575	•12564	05308	.04039	.10546	07615	•14684	•06790
91,104	•1475U	u2680	•n+042	• 00093	00565	•04842	• 03A84	07894	.03902	.04704
92×105	.10852	.12286	.13543	.04789	•14162	.18317	.16287	.03277	.17593	.21484
93,106	.16055	.10100	•n289 3	.04530	• 05896	.01182	.20040	.03664	.09370	.10079
94x107	.06181	.01531	00716	01301	.01856	01633	.15949	06366	•01796	•09051
95x108	.04657	.14152	·n3516	•07136	.13033	•11429	.17013	00689	.08341	•18250
96X109	.01747	.10519	- • 06256	•00447	.03286	01850	.037eB	08763	.01529	•09153
97x110	02117	07e85	- +02744	06649	04443	.04992	00i94	09549	-,12415	02839
98x111	.04165	46611	-+n2528	.08027	.03644	.07197	.05953	00086	04277	.13652
99x112	02942	10827	- 15075	06162	32879	00476	06754 .03308	20606	13n71 11880	06324 06552
100113	.04866	10400	n6457	08796	.04548 10225	.09%02 .03%81	04156	05055 -02717	.15047	-06851 13830
87	03441	.05592	n17n8	• 06658		•00369	16245	03757	12573	.21514
Ä	0.922	.03032	.n1251	.04705	.04783	.07329	.01284	05121	.09940	•16395
8	.11465	.04112	±.62429	00610 00022	.06752 00801	07329	.01611	07220	.08983	.03829
C D	.05678	U0217 .04696	B0486 n0703	00022	.06866	00805	.14299	12116	.09634	11087
E	.01670 04103	00136	•n2055	•01018	.067 16	•n5253	04653	.01392	•08182	01978
E. F	00102	.12794	.n2055	00380	.05275	02402	04383	.01722	06236	•n3640
G	01209	06656	=.n2223	.01639	04720	10142	02656	08207	02564	01127
ь Н	.10r34	.16816	n0112	.04045	14342	10508	00442	.07721	13292	06977
r: J	05721	.00614	03960	10490	00375	13868	13700	06087	.01755	04379
ĸ	.01881	.10794	02668	.09097	.08216	02793	08930	.08607	.09643	.01324
N.	*01001	* TO 1 24	- 114 000	*****	*********	*02170	*00,00	400007	*******	

Table 15-(Continued)

				Table	15-(Contin	nea)				
	63x021	66x022	69X023	72XD24	75XD25	78XD26	81x027	84 Y D 2 8	88X101	89X102
3X01	.06868	.18474	.17515	00278	18657	10757	.23548	06608	.13640	09869
6XDS	.03011	36735	16582	.22557	.06150	29713	22355	.33203	07263	r8526
9X03	14696	.13499	•23558	.01519	.03531	02057	07448	.17135	.01200	.06010
12X04	32551	.26195	03240	42017	09132	-25686	07213	16580	05554	07205
15xD5	.25549	.35499	•13405	.17875	26574	.28411	.21311	05090	.14189	23100
16X06	.18797	37682	09229	42013	09595	34097	07002	28453	.11396	.00335
21x07	.05781	.35002	27680	11323	22603	17053	19650	.13115	09061	11685
24 XD8	.20129	.50650	29245	.31214	.13747	.40713	13902	.31118	09346	04217
27xD9	.05505	.32867	25593	.11666	.11611	.21720	.23610	20931	16664	13438
30x010	15845	.37001	.22619	24906	22924	.23562	.22684	.15414	.16709	19741
33,011	.22460	.22328	12466	23994	20020	.21687	.27265	.18582	.07804	07823
36x012	.34906	.41622	00352	25140	27247	39823	.22040	.03267	01109	14930
39xU13	26959	.37319	26183	26533	06731	.31921	18864	.41214	14510	11407
42x014	24445	32701	.32915	.14952	.30228	18151	20811	07847	07600	04423
45xD15	42292	.37501	•16933	45098	.16309	62590	.09219	14402	13030	02513
48XU16	13676	40365	16829	41142	.17033	J2668	.22110	.27653	.07746	05102
51x017	30005	26336	.n5752	30921	.08532	.24933	.13649	.04071	.13528	- 02374
54x018	.27101	.36095	18290	41357	.14488	.43498	.06615	.15462	.11381	21666
57x019	19452	-55366	. 22478	33311	.01401	34764	.16062	25390	05240	05413
60%020	11935	.45433	-33590	27077	20529	.39672	11744	25592	07764	07446
63XU21	1.00000	.37840	13302	25461	12717	46544	09330	09503	10691	09306
66,022	.37840	1.00000	.22096	.37554	09380	46954	19423	19610	.16454	13358
692023	.13302	.22096	1.00000	.06358	.22976	.24019	16363	24071	- 03413	.01163
72x024	.25461	.37554	•n6358	1.00000	.09883	.33212	.05369	.18397	.11209	09092
75xD25	.12717	.09380	.22876	.09883	1.00000	.23186	.26739	.00399	06431	.08435
78xU26	.46544	.46954	.24019	.33212	.23186	1,00000	.13734	.18138	.18799	11384
81xu27	.09330	.19423	• 16363	.05*69	.26739	.13734	1.00000	.1435n	.09153	.12307
84xD28	.09503	.19610	24071	18397	.00399	.18138	.14350	1.00000	.02923	.08094
88x101	·10691	.16454	03413	•11209	66431	.18799	.09153	.02823	1.00000	.60559
89x102	.09306	.13358	01163	09092	.08436	11384	.16307	08094	60559	1.00000
90x103	·19608	.13102	00220	• 07374	.23819	.06687	.11131	02736	.10277	.18579
91x104	03722	.05725	·n0516	12562	.09114	.05269	.21302	05999	.30381	46168
92x105	.09738	.23223	. 13616	.10312	.09957	.18775	.13933	.08043	277.3	.31687
93x106	.08776	.11982	•n9816	.02775	.08486	.09885	.21640	. 08230	.35112	40317
94x107	.01302	.01351	7256	 03547	.15309	01163	.23475	.07375	.20518	.23068
95x108	.09640	.10051	•12607	•0913 <u>1</u>	•1987 6	.09116	.11073	.03953	.23179	.27294
96x109	.10268	•G2451	 ∩0253	05734	.26589	.00568	.00773	.08414	.04766	·19986
97x110	.01411	20772	11078	08092	.11453	12069	.11322	.05934	.20224	23224
98x111	.09019	06760	•p34¤B	•04696	•15396	.05259	.03903	.15993	4.24382	• 14677
99x112	38319	17208	- •∩9395	+. 21714	▶1 4785	23237	.22430	.06561	•26069	.25130
100113	02180	19550	12727	- •04035	.07127	 13056	.01373	.11294	.02208	•r089 e
87	08929	.16734	-•10500	02504	.03927	.01103	.02443	11287	12547	03082
A	02351	.00634	•:1an5	D3189	•00167	.03641	.13297	01092	•0810B	.02973
8	00084	02106	 r6317	09555	0nn80	05656	.09217	.08207	 02838	03131
č	06901	01074	n9513	+.15757	03933	13733	.11594	01322	.04992	.08953
D	02540	.01541	-,01632	02412	10114	.00230	.09624	09846	.18340	•10371
E	.05334	.02294	20043	•1970 7	04031	•00057	.06940	.03969	05A78	05958
F	03803	.12217	•n2105	•039BD	09666	.01100	.18106	08244	12144	10638
G	00654	.08802	04146	06007	09974	- .05562	.09888	01967	00408	·05945
н	.04771	.13600	.04500	.14159	.11786	.11921	.05790	00658	.00428	00022
J	.04508	01799	•n6953	02117	.01171	.07823	03060	.05052	06409	07631
K	.05802	.06980	•n6921	.07198	.07524	.12440	.01468	.02849	04332	04379

Table 15—(Continued)

						• •				
	90X103	91x104	92X105	93x106	94×107	95X108	96X109	97x11n	©8X111	99X112
3XD1	.01350	.07721	14766	13933	.13599	.14102	.08279	.25828	.15615	.11785
6X02	01521	.00815	11150	11135	.00038	00034	08406	06909	05289	03964
5XD3	13015	.05916	.09625	.14552	12239	.05278	.02300	00581	06318	.12656
12X04	.03936	01462	.19082	01325	00702	15183	02595	09197	.08174	28831
15XD5	.13015	•15170	+20344	.10188	.03471	.23711	.06627	10552	14292	.00712
18XD6	.12243	08063	12576	.03983	.08725	00266	01634	10724	05253	08827
21X07	.09728	.03088	•20003	• D6796	06266	-21294	14474	13688	.17794	.05514
24xD8		.04679	•15694	•08766	.08624	09550	.01230	14174	02708	14807
27XD9	.15860 02390	.08209	17384	•04246	00167	.11323	00088	04881	11453	13759
		.14716	•n9511	•17461	.14628	.13162	.07038	04913	.13815	.00005
30x010	.13758			.16055	.08181	.04657	.01747	02117	.04165	- 62942
33xD11	00596	.14750	.10852	•10100	.01531	.14152	.10519	07885	06611	10827
36x012	•16096	02683	12286	.02803	00716	03516	06256	02744	02528	15075
39,013	.02575	.04042	•13543	.04530	01301	.07136	.00447	06648	•Den27	-•n6162
42xD14	.12564	.00093	• 04789	•04550 •05896	.01256	.10033	.03286	04443	.03644	32879
45,015	05308	00565	•14162		01633	.11429	01850	.04992	.07197	co476
48×016	.04039	.04542	•:8317	.01182		.17013	.03788		05953	06754
51x017	.10546	.03884	•16287	.20040	.15949	00689	08763	00194 09549	00086	20A06
54x018	07615	07894	•n3277	.03664	06366					13071
57x019	.14684	.03982	• 17593	.09370	.01796	.08341 .18250	.01529 .09153	12415 02839	-,04277 -13652	-• C6324
60XD50	.06790	.04704	.21494	•10079	.09051				.09019	38319
63xD21	.19608	03722	•n9738	.08776	01702	.09640	.10268 .02451	.01411	06760	17208
66XD22	.13102	• U5725	•>3223	•119A2	.01351	.10051		20772 11078	23488	-•09395
69,023	.00280	.00516	-13616	+08/16	.07256 03567	.12607 .09131	~. 00253 ~. 05734	08092	.04696	21714
72,024	.07374	12562	.;0012	.02775	.15309	.19ª76	.26599	.11453	•15396	14785
75xU25	.23819	.09114	• 49957	•08486 •09885	01163	.09116	•0056 8	12069	.05259	23237
78xU26	.06687	.05269	•18775		23475	.11073	.00773	.11322	03903	.22430
81,027	.11131	.21302	•13933	.21640	.07375	.03953	.08414	.05934	15993	.06561
84x028	.08736	.05999	+n8043	.08230	.20518	.23179	.04766		.24362	•26089
88x101	.10277	.30381	.27733	.35112		.27294		.20224	.14677	.25130
89x102	.18579	46168	•31687	.40317	.23068		.19986	.23224	-	•09485
901103	1.00000	•35317	•>27#8	•15681	.18485	-24508	.34161	.13983	.24638	•30596
91 x 104	.35317	1.00000	•39895	.4n152	.29539	.25400	.30955	.23179	.21143	•10922
92,105	.22788	.39895	1.00000	.47752	.42670	.74911	.35681	.20817	.11592	•10962 •18555
93,106	.15681	40152	•47752	1.00000	.646A3	•46450	.21686	.16811	.12025	• -
94x107	.18485	.29439	.42670	.69683	1.0000	.46878	.34697	17427	00636	*Leve3
95,108	.2450B	.35400	,74911	.46450	.46878	1.00000	.39304	.30670	.19509	.15219
96x109	.34161	.30955	• <u>35681</u>	.21686	,34697	•39304	1.00000	.36277	.26464	.17859
97x110	.13983	.23179	.20817	.16811	.17427	.30670	.36277	1.00000	.45918	.41510
98x111	.24638	.21143	11592	.12025	-,00636	•19509	.26464	.45918	1.00000	.28030
99x112	.09485	.30596	•10922	.18555	.09893	•15219	.17859	.41510	.20030	1.00000
100113	.04444	11963	•n8565	•10094	.02056	.04830	.35318	.43167	.31865	.27339 02282
87	.01221	.00732	•12461	04640	11004	.01664	.07627	07945	11260 .05510	02262 -05750
A	01030	.15037	25910	.27200	.22401	•24970 07030	.07728	.18061	07148	.11290
В	07948	. 56619	•n465 7	.25562	.17671	.07030	.05666	.16170	08769	.10049
ç	06259	.16997	•n6257	•2400 7	.17928	.07413 .30715	.00438 .15447	.02247 .19004	01963	•13959
ם	08052	.10200	•32273	24846	.18266 - 18866	noe56	.08145	.16602	.01750	00335
E.	.05185	02200	n4921	06767 -12964	18946 .11411	•16539	08038	0458u	18641	05794
F	08999	.14128	13393				01411	07576	14563	00167
G	08280	•03035	00407	.09875	.15229	.01248	01411 07689	07576	05142	.01881
H	05385	00355	•n5914	01057	07469	.01684				
ن	•11924	.02184	n2118	01515	.01510	00558	.11274	00658	01074	.01148
K	• 04855	•u0851	.01771	00212	03558	.00317	.02582	02667	04543	.01264

Table 15-(Continued)

				_		•	_	_		
****	100113	87	Α	F)	C	47750	E	F	G	H
3XD1	.07485	.08859	•12472	11439	.14176	•17750	04359	.11083	.06094	.08634
6XD2	11343	.06247	•n7691	.01241	02362	~ .02690	08831	.08301	.13851	•17578
6XD3	.04552	.09051	•n2579	06635	05/123	.09647	 03975	.05394	.09139	•22791
12XD4	09257	11221	•n7472	07730	04906	.08933	.06333	.07689	.02651	00687
15x05	32488	.03994	n695 7	-+09432	13718	.05031	00313	.18747	.04285	.11214
1 p X D 6	.01562	.00459	10690	07814	10010	-,14571	06553	.03238	.00516	·20347
21x07	.10487	04934	10234	07506	.09502	.07655	-,14437	.01052	.16794	•19123
24X08	-,12655	03525	•01340	12216	12355	06528	00955	.06938	•063A5	16619
27X09	13681	.07043	14439	•08776	.10336	.04078	03218	00011	.03366	03865
30 / 010	02224	.02087	13394	15493	.21565	.12962	01798	.07461	.05414	.05800
33xD11	04866	-,03441	n4922	11465	.05678	.01670	04103	00102	01209	•10034
36×D15	10400	.05592	• 02025	04112	00217	.04696	00136	.12794	-, 0665 6	•16816
39XD13	-,06457	01708	•n1251	02429	00486	00703	.02055	.05903	02223	00112
42,014	 08796	.06658	•n4705	00610	0002 <i>2</i>	 01360	.01018	00380	.01639	•04045
45xu15	0454B	10225	•n4783	•0 <u>6</u> 752	00201	•06766	.06716	.05275	04720	.14342
487016	.09302	.03381	•n0389	.07329	03645	 00₽05	.05253	.02402	10142	•1050E
51 X 017	.03308	04156	• 16245	.01284	.01611	•14299	04653	04383	~. 02656	00442
54XD18	05055	.02717	- ∙03757	 05121	07220	-,12116	.01392	.01722	08207	.07721
57x019	11esc	.15047	. 12573	•09940	.08983	.09634	.08182	.06236	-,02564	.13292
60xD20	06552	.u886 1	·21514	.16395	.03929	.11 08 7	01978	.0364n	01127	.06977
63xU21	02180	08929	 ↑2351	00084	06901	02540	.05334	03803	00654	•04771
66 XU22	19550	.16734	•n0634	02106	01074	.01541	.02294	.12217	.08802	.13600
69xD23	12727	10500	• • 1805	~ •06317	09513	-*01935	20043	.02105	04146	.04500
72 x U 24	0 4035	02504	- n31.9	09555	15757	02412	.19707	.03980	06co7	•14159
75xD25	07127	.03927	•n0167	••00080	03933	10114	04031	09666	09974	•1178 6
78×026	13056	01103	.n3641	05656	13733	.00230	.00057	.0110n	05562	.11921
81×027	.01373	02443	13297	•09217	11594	09624	•06940	.18106	83AP0.	.05790
84 X U 2 B	.11294	11287	n1092	.08207	01322	~ •09046	.03969	08244	01967	- •00658
88,101	.02208	12547	•08108	 02838	04992	18348	05878	.12144	00408	.00429
89×102	00698	03082	•n2973	03131	00953	•10371	≈. 05958	•1063a	.05945	00022
90,103	.04444	.01221	01030	07948	06259	08052	.05185	08999	 08280	05385
91x104	.11963	.00732	·15037	.06619	.1699 7	•10200	02200	.1412A	03035	-•00355
92×105	.08565	.12401	•25910	04657	.06257	32273	04921	.13393	.00407	.05914
93,106	10094	04640	.27200	-25562	24007	.24846	06767	12964	.09875	.0 <u>1</u> 057
94x107	.oen56	11034	22401	•17671	17928	.18266	18946	.11411	15229	- •07469
95,108	04630	.01664	•24970	•07030	.07413	.30715	00856	.16539	.01248	•01684
96x109	,35318	.07627	•r7728	.05666	00428	.15447	.08145	- ∙08038	01-11	07689
97,110	.43167	07945	•18U61	16170	• 0 <u>8247</u>	.19004	16602	04584	07576	02611
98x111	.31865	-,11260	∙n5510	07148	08769	01963	.01750	18641	14563	05142
99x112	.27339	02282	•n5750	11290	•10n4 9	•13959	00335	05794	00167	·r1881
100113	1.00000	01004	-•n2701	12740	• 14392	01083	.05435	-,19371	11623	•05352
87	01004	1.00000	00135	.02538	01850	01373	.17251	0467n	10589	.12978
A	02701	.00135	1.00000	.49051	•49591	.66442	.13475	.05542	01900	10061
8	12740	.02538	.49051	1.00000	.78122	+42809	.02080	.10342	.16804	01799
Ç	.14392	01850	49591	•78122 "2822	1.00000	.45176	06122	19247	18636	10358
ō	01083	01373	• 66442	.428ng	45176	1.00000	.14676	.2405a	14947	05617
E	.05435	.17251	• 13475	.02080	.06122	.14676	1.00000	.04654	13172	.03566
F	19371	04670	05542	-10342	.19247	.24050	.04654	1.00000	.30011	.12486
G	11623	10589	01900	-168N4	.18636 - 10350	.14947	13172	.30011	1.00000	00552
H	.05352	12978	10061	01799	10358	05617	,03566	•12486 •1686	00552	1.00000
ي	.02897	05764	08461	14525	18403	21287	.11175	01692	11203	.30185
K	.04157	.11471	:0882	10076	17772	16707	.08839	.06318	07169	.78506

Table 15-(Continued)

3X0107167 .0021 6X02 .09555 .165; 9x03 .17602 .2504 12X04 .002040004 15X05 .08990 .125; 18X06 .15677 .228; 21X0704000 .088; 24X08 .11184 .166; 87X0900506 .017; 30X01005721 .018; 33X01105721 .018; 36X012 .00614 .107; 39X01303960026; 42X014 .10460 .090; 445X01500375 .082; 51X01713700083; 51X01713700083; 51X01713700083; 51X01713700083; 51X01713700083; 51X01713700083; 63X021 .04508 .058; 66X02204379 .013; 66X02204379 .013; 66X023 .06953 .069; 69X02402117 .075; 75X025 .0171 .075; 75X025 .0171 .075; 75X025 .0171 .075; 75X026 .07823 .069; 92X10207631043; 90X103 .11924 .088; 91X104 .02184 .088; 91X1050151500218 .917; 91X106 .015150035; 94X107 .01510035; 95X10800558 .003; 95X108005680218 .003; 95X109005784048; 97X11000658026; 98X11101074046; 97X11000658026; 98X11101074046; 99X112 .01148 .0126; 97X11000658026; 98X11101074046; 99X112 .01148 .0126; 97X11000658026; 98X11101074046; 97X11000658026; 98X11101074046; 97X11000658026; 98X11101074046; 97X11000658026; 98X11101074046; 97X11000658026; 98X11101074046; 97X11000658026; 98X11101074046; 97X110026;	ĸ
6X02	50
9x03	
12x04	
15x05	
16x06	
21x0704000 .0888 24x08 .11184 .1666 27x0900506 .017 30x01005629013 33x01105721 .0186 33x01105721 .0186 33x013039600266 42x014 .10490 .090 42x014 .10490 .090 45x01500375 .082 48x016138680276 57x019 .01755 .096 60x02004379 .0136 63x021 .04508 .0586 66x02201799 .0696 63x021 .04508 .0586 66x02201799 .0696 69x023 .06953 .0697 72x0240217 .0776 75x025 .01771 .0776 75x025 .01771 .0776 75x025 .01771 .0788 88x101064090437 88x102076310488 88x101064090437 90x103 .11924 .0986 88x101064090437 90x103 .11924 .0986 99x102076310437 90x103 .11924 .0986 99x102076310437 99xx104 .02184 .0086 99xx1100558 .0031 99xx11000558 .0031 99xx11000558 .0031 99xx11101074 .0266 99xx111 .01074 .0467 .05784 .1144 A .08461 .1086 B .14526 .1007 C .18403 .177	
24xD8	
\$7x09 -,00506	
30xuit	
33xuli05721 .0164 36xuli05721 .00614 36xuli00614 .1073 39xuli03960 .0266 42xuli00490 .0909 45xuli00375 .0822 48xuli138680275 51xuli137000835 51xuli06087 .0865 57xuli04508 .0586 60xu2201799 .0696 60xu2201799 .0696 63xu21 .04508 .0586 66xu2201799 .0696 69xu23 .06953 .0696 77xxu2402117 .0716 78xu26 .07823 .0696 81xu2703060 .0144 84xu28 .05052 .084 88xu101064090435 89xu102076310436 89xu103 .11924 .0948 99xu103 .11924 .0948 99xu104 .02184 .0085 99xu1050218 .0174 97xu1000558 .0033 99xu10700558 .0033 99xu10800558 .0033 99xu109 .11274 .0266 99xu1101074 .0469 97xu10006580266 99xu1101074 .0469 99xu12 .01148 .0126 100112 .02697 .0413 87 .05784 .1144 A .08461 .1086 B .14526 .1007 C .18403 .1777	
36x012	Ü
39xU13039600264 42xU14 .10490 .0994 45xU1500375 .0823 48xU1613868U275 51xU17137000835 57xU19 .01755 .0966 60xU2004379 .0136 66xU2201799 .0696 66xU2201799 .0696 72xU2402117 .0715 75xU25 .01771 .0755 72xU2402117 .0715 84xU26 .07823 .1244 88x101064090433 89x102076310433 99x103 .11924 .0483 99x103 .11924 .0483 99x104 .02118 .0176 93x106015150021 99x107 .015100353 99x108 .00658 .0084 99x11000658 .0084 99x111010740485 99x111010740485 99x112 .01148 .0126 99x112 .01148 .0266 99x112 .02697 .0414 A084611086 B145261007 C18403177	
42 x D 14	
45x01500375 .0823 48x016138680274 51x017137000835 54x018 .06087 .0865 57x019 .01755 .0964 60x02004379 .0136 66x02201799 .0696 66x02201799 .0696 72x02402177 .0715 78x025 .0171 .0755 78x025 .0171 .0755 78x026 .07823 .1244 81x02703860 .0144 84x028 .05052 .084 88x101064090435 89x102076310435 89x102076310435 99x103 .11924 .0985 99x104 .02184 .0085 99x10502118 .0177 97x11000558 .0033 99x11101074 .0026 99x112 .01148 .0266 99x112 .02697 .0415 87 .05784 .1144 A .08461 .1086 B .14526 .1007 C .18403 .1777	Э
48xu16138680275 51xu17 -13700 -0093 54xu18 .06087 .0265 57xu19 .01755 .0966 60xu2004379 .0136 66xu2201799 .0696 69xu23 .06953 .0697 72xu2402117 .0715 78xu26 .07823 .1244 81xu2703060 .0144 84xu26 .05052 .0288 88x101064090433 89x102076310433 90x103 .11924 .0985 91x104 .02184 .0985 91x10502118 .9177 93x106015150256 94x107 .015100356 94x107 .0151500218 97x11000658 .0031 98x111 .01074 .0266 98x111 .01074 .0266 98x111 .01074 .0266 98x111 .01074 .0266 98x111 .01074 .0467 97x120 .0148 .0266 98x111 .01674 .0467 97x120 .02697 .0414	7
51x017137000835 54x018 .06087 .0866 60x02004379 .0135 65x021 .04508 .0586 66x02201799 .0695 69x023 .06953 .0695 72x02402117 .0715 75x025 .01171 .0755 84x026 .07823 .1244 84x026 .05052 .0284 88x101064090433 89x102076310433 89x102076310433 90x103 .11924 .0085 91x104 .02184 .0085 92x10502118 .0177 93x106015150021 94x107 .015100355 94x107 .015100355 94x107 .015100355 94x107 .015100355 95x10800558 .0084 96x109 .11274 .0256 97x11000658 .0035 98x111 .01074 .0456 98x111 .01074 .0456 97x110 .02697 .0416 87 .05784 .1144 A .08461 .1006 B .14526 .1007 C .18403 .177	6
54xU18	
54xU18	Ü
57x019	
60xu2004379 .0133 65xu21 .04508 .0586 66xu2201799 .0696 69xu23 .06953 .0697 72xu2402117 .0715 78xu25 .01171 .0752 81xu2703060 .0148 88x101064090433 89x102076310437 90x103 .11924 .0489 91x104 .02184 .0897 92x10502118 .0177 93x106015150021 94x107 .015100356 95x10800658 .0033 96x109 .11274 .0266 98x111 .01074 .0266 98x111 .01074 .0266 98x111 .01074 .0467 97x110 .02697 .0414 68 .02697 .0414	
63xu2i	
66xU2201799 .0698 69xU23 .06953 .0697 72xU24 -02117 .0717 75xU25 .01171 .0752 81xU27 -03660 .0148 81xU27 -03660 .0248 68x101 -06409 -0433 89x102 -07631 -0433 99x103 .11924 .0488 91x104 .02184 .0088 92x105 -02118 .0177 93x106 -01515 -00218 93x106 -01515 -00218 97x110 -00658 .0033 96x109 .11274 .0256 97x110 -00658 -0267 97x110 -01148 .0126	
69xU23	
72xU2402117 .0715 75xU25 .01171 .0755 81xU26 .07823 .1244 81xU2703n60 .0146 84xU28 .05c52 .0244 88x101064090433 89x102076310437 90x103 .11924 .0485 91x104 .02184 .0085 91x10502118 .0177 93x106015150021 94x107 .015100356 94x107 .015100356 95x10800558 .0033 96x109 .11274 .0266 97x110006580266 98x111010740457 97x110 .02697 .0416 98x111 .01074 .0266 98x111 .01074 .0457 100112 .02697 .0416 87 .05784 .1147 A .08461 .1006 B .14526 .1007	
75xu25	
78xu26	
81xU2703n60 .0144 88x101064090433 89x102076310433 90x103 .11924 .0485 91x104 .02184 .0085 92x10502118 .9177 93x106015150021 94x107 .015100355 94x107 .015100355 97x11000558 .0033 96x109 .11274 .0266 98x111010740465 98x111010740465 98x111 .010740465 98x111 .01074 .0266 98x111 .01074 .0466 98x111 .01074 .01666 98x111 .01674 .04666 .01666	
84xu28	
88x101064090433 89x102076310433 99x103 .11924 .0485 91x104 .02184 .0086 92x10502118 .9173 93x106015150021 94x107 .015100355 95x10800558 .0033 96x109 .11274 .0256 97x110006580256 97x110006580256 97x110010740457 97x110 .01148 .0123 100112 .02697 .0413 87 .05784 .1144 A084611006 B145261006 C18403177	
89x102076310437 91x104 .02)84 .0088 92x10502118 .0177 93x106015150235 95x10800558 .0033 96x109 .11274 .0256 97x110006580256 97x11001740457 97x112 .01148 .01256 99x111010740457 97x112 .02697 .0411 87 .05784 .1147 A084611086 B145261007 C18403177	
90x103	
91x104	
92x10502118 .0177 93x106015150021 94x107 .015100355 95x10800508 .0031 96x109 .11274 .0256 97x110006580266 98x111010740457 99x112 .01148 .0126 100112 .02597 .0411 A084611006 B145261006 C18403177	
93x106015150021 94x107 .015100359 95x10800558 .0031 96x109 .11274 .0256 97x110006580266 98x111010740457 99x112 .01148 .0126 100112 .02697 .0411 A084611086 B145261007 C18403177	
94x107	
95x10800558 .0031 96x109 .11274 .0256 97x110006580266 98x111010740457 99x112 .01148 .0126 100112 .02897 .0411 87 .05784 .1144 A084611086 B145261007 C18403177	2
96x109	98
97x110006580266 98x111010740457 99x112 .01148 .0126 100112 .02697 .0414 A084611086 B145261007 C18403177	
98x11101074045/ 99x112 .01148 .0126 100112 .02597 .041/ 87 .05784 .1147 A084611086 B145261007 C184031777	
99x112 .01148 .0126 100112 .02897 .0411 87 .05784 .1141 A084611086 B145261001 C18403177	
100112 .02697 .0411 87 .05784 .1147 A084611086 B14526100 C18403177	
87 .05784 .1147 A084611086 B145261007 C18403177	
A084611086 B14526100 C18403177	
B145261007 C184031777	
C18403177	
	6
n =.21087 =.1676	12
)7
£ .11175 .088;	59
F =.01692 .0631	8
G112030716	59
H .30185 .785)6
J 1.00000 .8249	
K .82494 1.000	Ù

TABLE 16

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG ITEMS ON THE IMPORTANCE SCALE

	_	,	•	••		18		24	27	30
-	3	6	9	12	15 •13687	.22567	21 .40577	,11831	.49256	•396 33
3	1.00000	.30967	19951	.14041						.39633
6	.30967	1.00000	.33346	.37400	.28348	.46652	.21022	.39411	.33039	
9	19951	.33346	1.00000	.17578	05779	.25854	.26085	.28846	.21142	.11714
12	14041	.37400	• 17576	1.76000	+14676	.23951	.11098	.19206	03245	.15211
15	,13687	.28348	- .∩5779	. 14676	1.00000	.23724	.33061	.12620	.21899	.29523
18	.22567	46652	+25854	.23951	23724	1.00000	.32344	.37726	.25194	-26392
21	.40577	.21022	•>6005	•11008	.33061	.32344	1.60000	.28175	V47784	.35840
24	11831	.39411	•28846	19206	.12620	.37726	.28175	1.00000	+23500	.36327
27	•49256	.33039	21142	03245	.21899	.25194	47784	.23500	1.00n0a	,4358n
30	39633	.30627	11714	.15211	,29523	.26392	.35840	.36327	.43680	1.00000
33	.11928	.15862	01374	•12536	19296	29894	19585	.19391	.11613	.27834
36	.15720	.30866	•10358	.21545	43426	.31833	.24722	58553	.19210	•4n565
39	.37722	.32767	•107d0	+27459	.23915	.29424	•28555	43131	20303	46593
+2	.32894	.50565	• 06843	•08022	.32742	.21902	.35579	.15393	34759	.40836
45	.19076	•50033	136F7	•20103	.25192	.37625	·25603	.30929	.17627	.31208
48	.23185	.36702	18453	•09935	•23º86	.37017	.20457	•30066	.32529	.38000
51	.23192	.15596	• c7132	20734	.06389	.39157	15490	.07738	.08268	.20396
54	.16139	.23854	• 08U1O	16511	.12464	.35020	19638	.22953	.11840	•16201
57	.07987	.17759	•n7237	.11271	.22241	.08029	.1630 3	.21943	.11462	+16461
60	.39387	.36840	•19959	12914	.34876	•19676	.43670	.34961	.44418	.35350
63	.26847	.67439	-•n4912	•09658	.25955	.09425	.15163	00253	.13540	.27043
65	.21596	.32520	• <u>13708</u>	*1558S	.33966	.27775	.31573	36097	.36580	+36907
69	.22809	.15738	26009	02593	.17779	13674	27059	28371	.30202	.20640
72	.05001	.17271	•n7911	•26B61	09147	22233	11548	.17801	.04728	.23827
75	.21434	13237	- •n6158	n725 7	•18897	.23394	24665	.27557	.26474	.23959
78	.22211	.40321	•14159	16160	19589	.42730	.19742	.33803	.23871	•36467
81	.29267	.27369	•n8895	.23167	.16943	•19542	.19720	21863	.23176	12666
84	.22433	.41852	+23792	38570	24777	27722	.26955	43261	.17460	#35463
101	.24334	.26662	•r.6881	.11545	.16387	.22036	.10320	.05221	.24315	.:9961
102	.17842	11359	•n3191	.07299	.25103	12308	11863	01457	13964	•19741
103	00602	61954	-•15890	00997	.17583	•04277	04655	.04269	04840	.16124
104	15841	.12929	f.1831	•13705	.12!79	.07124	.14357	.11062	.22365	.22058 .13033
105	.26608	•20258	.07515	24649	20103	14868	.18570	.12838	•18945	
106	27259	.16805	•16196	15211	17776	.14900	.11043	.07101	.11893	•15805 •17374
107	.24519	40004	10294	+11613	16932	•1067d	.05675	.04953	.03415	
108	.30203	2973	• 6918	.31621	19324	.09837	21296	.03184	.15267 .19415	•17338 •22969
109	16480	.12673	12348	10121	.30359	•1239 7	.27930 .22991	08289	17791	.22469
110	.30311	.12655	5,360,1	•11042	.20723	.18075		.08657	.27506	.21392
111	.18226	.17391	13743	. 22462	.20255	•18652	.27667	.32339	.04268	•21392 •18660
112	14513	.19086	13655	14310	.22163	•2850 7 •0946 7	.20732 .19083	.127 <u>16</u> .09019	•18735	•17906
113	.04419	.11262	•00560	.D2318	.50027 .04431	01018	.07195	.06270	.09951	- •00045
87	.06869	.07457 .17782	n4208	13890 .08220	.05108	.09059	13552	.09476	.17206	•18568
A	.20200	.10495	•11537 •68817	02042	.00708	.07684	12437	05425	11852	18751
8	+18414	10091	•n7533	• n2795	04491	.04787	14823	03204	13474	.22860
Ç	.19778 .22232	. u57 33	11624	17433	- 03357	07131	10887	04624	04706	•15544
Ē	06819	.01758	11024	10104	- 07494	01287	13713	01585	01255	.08370
F	•08551	.0856 3	-038BB	.10059	06625	01494	02795	01334	01907	.00441
G	.06309	.12161	•n5234	.04416	01314	00076	.15933	.01073	.05160	07365
Н	.03498	.05713	.20061	01479	.12468	.09387	.11606	10774	.02553	05464
Ü	07520	.11620	13786	02002	.05283	.09389	02222	08220	01891	00375
K	03400	.10547	+21144	02002	10631	12211	05486	11069	02085	03155
, .		420041	157744	- 4 64 - 53	******	*****	400-00	471007	1-60.00	

Table 16--(Continued)

	33	36	39	42	45	48	51	54	57	60
3	.11928	.15720	.37722	.32894	•19076	.23185	.23192	16139	.07987	.39387
6	.15862	.30866	32767	.20262	•20099	.36702	.15596	23854	.17759	.36840
9	.01374	.10358	.10780	∙ស្≲ខឹមុ	.13607	.18453	.07132	.00010	.07237	•19959
12	.12536	.21545	.27459	•08022	.20183	•09985	.20734	.16511	.11271	.12914
15	.19296	.43426	.28915	.32742	.25192	.23086	.06389	.12464	.22241	.34876
18	.29894	.31833	29424	21902	.37625	.37017	.39157	.35820	.08029	·19676
21	•09585	.24722	28555	.35579	.26603	.20457	.15490	.19638	.16303	.43670
24	.19391	.28223	.43131	15893	.30929	.38066	,07738	.22953	.21943	.34961
27	.11613	.19210	.30903	34759	17627	.32529	.08268	.11840	.11462	.44418
30	27834	.40565	.46893	40836	.31208	.38000	.20396	.16201	.16461	.35350
33	1.00000	.34782	.26685	.32472	19314	.24667	.36477	25828	03372	.08679
36	.34782	1.00000	32107	28037	.26572	.33117	.28656	25045	-25185	.22634
39	.26685	.32187	1.00000	43891	.37690	.30256	29692	27903	.228n2	•51329
42	32472	.28037	43891	1.00000	33304	.12789	30415	33423	.04750	•40767
45	19314	.26572	• 37690	33309	1.00000	43628	34193	40947	.10479	.27818
48	.24667	.33117	30256	32789	43628	1.00000	38052	50647	.18002	.34002
51	.36477	.28656	29692	.30415	34193	.38052	1.00000	.39874	03475	-11246
54	.25828	25045	.27903	33423	40947	.50647	.39874	1.00000	11826	.24938
57	.03372	.25185	.22802	04750	.10479	.18602	03475	11826	1.00000	.36472
60	.08679	.22634	• 51329	40787	27018	34002	11246	2498a	.36472	1.00000
63	.27418	.35101	.26341	.26770	.19696	.21721	.21036	.13652	.07416	.17812
66	.09062	.27476	.27154	.18161	.25392	.33302	.06460	.12773	.42405	.39899
69	.16200	.10691	54258	•18589	.18306	.21015	.05835	.27249	.22546	.33965
72	.27892	.11666	·18728	-13014	.27322	.2840€	.30911	.30783	• 266° 5	•10047
75	.48462	.32962	.30682	45535	.27683	.29013	.23596	.30205	01311	.10866
78	.23695	.25667	•39206	22740	•57255	.32584	.19328	.20301	19577	·26676
8;	.33744	.25875	•27563	.32460	.23557	.23193	.29291	•1625o	10036	•10709
84	.25;31	.35932	•49736	.19547	.27211	.35041	.07411	.24851	.38547	•44094
101	.06392	•06768	•1451B	.16576	.20580	.27421	.11710	.1740c	.00411	.22477
102	.14675	.17643	•16127	-21316	02729	.06518	00308	•0055a	02575	•119 ^{:3} 6
103	07020	.684 71	• n2153	.09439	05746	.05370	- 03400	 0321a	.20352	.07057
104	.13664	.10565	• n84 97	.18253	.16530	·20876	.06823	01166	. 10202	16520
105	13168	.13509	-14412	12136	·18675	•19432	.10429	.03736	•18201	•21676
106	.11994	.10565	•07737	•0€749	09055	•13778	.22242	.02105	16598	•16558
107	.18n92	.10255	∍n8235	64859	.02812	.09750	17564	 04946	.10358	•14594
108	.10199	24976	.21110	•16996	•15A40	.14601	.22853	.02003	17450	•21209
109	.24190	.32497	•16171	.19112	•15428	•09P6 9	.07897	.01018	24235	.24308
110	.16741	.33011	21636	.20254	.25328	-28260	13037	.19494	.02341	425191
111	.23716	•22691	24557	•2306 5	.22316	12521	. 10716	.1473n	.15272	•34053
112	.22923	.30983	13527	.25349	.32024	.20779	.20970	.30928	02668	.18812
113	.30062	.36826	•20886	.37069	•23909	• t 7227	18613	.1n53n	.12147	25292
87	05022	. u205 7	04554	.01117	07669	.01689	05283	00512	•09788	•n9911
A	.13446	21544	•19617	•22958	.06273	.11288	22995	.02144	.04622	.25735
B	.04639	.15327	•16004	16994	.05412	16611	.15567	.01262	.03188	.23973
¢	.05165	.16901	•19684	•15610	.06796	+14855	.20821	.05323	.02839	.15306
Ü	.14854	.11703	15561	·19n26	15923	.05639	.30468	02154	.02283	13727
E	.06612	. 06645	•n5673	.12429	.14518	.03220	.07587	.04839	.07313	03235
F	06053	.12203	•n7954	00385	.0290	•01556	.01930	02921	.07587	00930
G	07111	06715	-•n3795	.02698	03141	01023	.01900	- 12484	02000	.01440
Н	.01942	• 04596	-•n4329	00431	.05329	-•07106	00063	.03243	13415	.00262
J	09583	00242	-• ne054	04437	-,00943	14773	15888	.03286	.06407	06546
K	05540	.03224	-•n6651	03191	.02158	-,13959	15412	.03560	.12600	04372

Table 16--(Continued)

					~-	7.0				4.00
-	63	66	69	72	75	78	81	P4	101	102
3	-26847	•21596	•22809	.05001	.21434	.22211	.29267	.22433	.24334	17842
6	07439	.32520	15738	•17271	.13237	.40321	.27369	.41852	.26662	.11359
9	04912	•13708	•26003	+07911	→, 06158	.14199	•08895	.23792	.06681	•03191
12	.09658	.12982	⊶∙ก2593	26861	.07257	.16160	.23167	.38570	.11545	.07299
15	•25955	33966	•17779	.09147	•18897	.19589	16943	•24777	.163R7	•251 03 .
18	.09425	•27775	• 13674	.22233	.23394	.42730	.19942	.27722	.22836	.12308
21	.15163	.31573	•27059	.11588	.24665	.19742	.19720	.26955	,19320	.11863
24	00253	.36097	• >8371	•178ni	.27557	.33803	.21863	.43261	•05221	01457
27	.13540	.36580	•30202	.04728	.25474	.23871	.23176	.17460	.24315	.13964
30	•27n48	.36907	• 20640	.23827	.33959	.36467	.38666	.35463	.19961	•19741
33	.27418	•09062	•16200	·27892	•48462	.23695	.33744	.25131	.06392	•14075
36	.35101	.27476	10691	•11666	.32962	.25667	.25875	.35932	•06768	.17643
39	.26341	.27154	34258	.18728	.30682	.39286	.27563	,49736	.14518	•16127
42	•2677B	.18161	•18589	.13014	.45535	•2274 a	.32460	.19547	.16576	.21316
45	19696	.25392	• 18306	.27322	.27683	•57255	.23557	.27211	•2058 0	•02729
48	21721	.33302	•21015	28406	.29013	.32584	.23193	.35041	.27421	.06518
51	.210 36	• 46464	•n5835	•30911	.23596	•19328	.29231	.07411	.11710	 00308
54	.13652	12775	. 27249	•30783	• 30205	.28301	.16250	.24851	.17400	.00550
57	07416	42405	• 22546	•26695	01311	.19577	.10036	.38547	.00411	•02575
60	17812	.39899	• 33965	-10047	.18886	.26676	.10709	.44094	.22477	.11936
63	1.00000	.24161	•n9821	.16466	34984	.28150	.39162	.31168	.08866	•20822
66	.24161	1.00000	•26896	·26043	12821	.36673	.20664	.32973	.23192	·17458
69	.09821	•26896	1.50000	•1 6 677	19143	.27830	15129	.22085	.01021	•01531
72 -	16466	26043	+16677	1.00000	.22012	.15139	.22662	.22596	.17851	07013
75	.34984	.12821	+18143	.22012	1.00000	.26360	.36971	20762	.04932	.12265
78	28150	.36673	•27830	.15139	26360	1.00000	.26036	.41068	.24806	•19827
81 84	39162	.20664	•15129	•22662	.36971	.26036	1.00000	.26244	.05718	.18450
-	.31168	.32973	•>2085	22596	20762	.41068	.26244	1.00000	.05607	.15925
101	-08866 38883	.23192	•n1021	17851	.04932	.24806	.05718	.05607	1.00000	•60798
102 103	20822	•17458 •17552	•n1531	07013	.12265	.19827	.18450	.15925	.60798	1.00000
104	.14446	•17352 •15743	•n4871	•07376 •03374	.16625 .11333	.00230 .21471	.03521	.08510	00086	-14607
105	.10538 .17859	.26443	-•n0053	.053/4 .07310	.13442	.27376	.19065	.17923	•33669 •35	•48660
106	17426	.25031	•n2379	•06882	12177	•16170	.16961 .17768	.21813	.25016	•36252
107	09980	.18415	•11963 •n5228	*03337	.09A87	•12095	.12449	.15421 .15606	.31003 .23212	.42811
108	16449	•14688	• naske	.14012	.15044	.16751	.14172	.22272	.20171	.28981 .28644
109	21292	2999 7	• 19061	15755	19150	.19346	20072	.17492		•26087
110	40538	12785	00309	14212	•18901	25863	14396	32393	.14681 .37317	•26067 •32890
111	.12483	17839	•30474	•n9531	.26921	19753	18372	.28566	.08568	.05694
112	•19708	.07858	n3810	.09986	.27245	.21833	.13283	.21193	.40274	.32576
113	•25775	.20458	•n1226	09420	.29584	13560	17291	.17086	.30247	.33531
87	- 07175	14151	11969	02217	06929	02630	04720	07498	.00969	.03539
Ä	06536	03496	n9071	01915	07997	06318	15998	10508	00732	00871
B	.15873	01268	-•n5979	15293	05524	00537	14103	15260	→.11558	00559
č	10049	02240	07149	10097	09625	06308	19269	.10613	03962	.02195
ō	09059	01726	- n3426	.07764	.04966	11499	23297	.07678	.09329	.06005
Ē	04610	.06138	18580	24668	.11270	07874	10186	09557	03032	08413
F	08953	.06543	n4299	.04858	06918	.00085	19121	.04222	.04721	.06128
G	.03620	u7532	00830	08442	04179	.03437	.16491	01712	02087	.03749
н	.10432	.13400	-•n0029	.05778	00845	.05750	.05015	00311	.01752	.01528
J	.01316	, 11356	•n6419	.00861	07576	.10487	03088	.09446	02954	02409
K	.06664	•u8503	n3827	.03746	05931	.10200	.00450	.05859	01216	·00257

Table 16-(Continued)

	107	104	105	106	197	108	109	110	111	112
-	103	.15841	•26608	•27259	24519	.30203	.16480	.30911	.18226	•145 1 3
3	00602	•	•20258	.16805	09004	12973	.12673	.12655	.17391	.19086
6	01954	.12929	.,		10294	.06918	• • • • •			
9	12890	.01831	•07515	.16196	11613	.31621	.12348	.09668	.13743	13655 14310
12	00997	.13705	• 24649	.15211	• • •	.19324	.10121	.11042	.22462	
15	.17583	.12179	.28183	•17776	.15932	•	.30359	.20923	.20255	.22163
16	.04277	.07124	14868	.14900	.10670	.09837	12397	.18095	.18652	28507
21	.04655	.14357	• 18570	.11043	• 056 75	.21296	.27930	.22991	•27667	.20732
24	04269	.11062	•12838	.07101	04853	.03184	08289	.08657	.32339	12736
27	04840	.22365	118945	11A93	03415	+15267	19415	.17791	.27506	•045€€
30	.16124	.22058	•13038	•15805	.17374	.17338	.22969	.22469	+21392	*18660
33	.07020	.13664	.13166	•11994	.18092	.10199	.24190	.16741	.23716	.28983
36	.08471	.10565	+13509	.10565	10255	24976	32497	.33011	22691	.30983
39	.02153	.08497	14412	+07737	09235	21110	.16171	.21636	24557	12527
42	.09439	.18253	12136	+06749	04959	.16996	.19112	.20254	•23065	52244
45	05746	.16530	18675	09055	21520	15840	.15428	.25328	22316	.32024
48	.05370	,20876	19432	•13778	.08790	.14661	.09869	.28250	12571	.20779
51	03400	.06823	•10429	.22242	.17564	.22853	.07897	13037	.10716	20970
54	03218	.01166	•n3736	.02105	04946	.02003	.01018	19494	·14730	.3092A
57	.20352	.10202	.18201	16598	.10758	.17450	24235	.02341	.15272	02668
60	.07057	.16520	•21676	•16558	.14594	.21209	.24308	.25191	.34053	·18812
63	•14446	.10538	•17859	•17426	.09980	16449	.21292	. 40538	.12483	•1970B
66	.17552	.15743	·26443	.25031	.13415	14688	,29997	.12785	17839	•c7858
69	.04871	00053	•02379	+11963	.05228	.0803 7	.19061	-,00309	.30474	01810
72	.07376	.03374	.08310	.06882	.03337	.14012	.15755	.14212	09531	•09986
75	.16625	11333	13442	.12177	09487	.15044	.19150	.18901	.26921	.27245
78	.08230	.21471	•>7376	.1617n	•12095	16751	19346	.25863	•19753	.21833
81	.03521	.19065	•16961	17768	12449	.14172	.20072	•14396	.18372	•13283
84	.08510	.17923	•21613	•15421	.15606	.22272	17492	.32393	. 28566	21193
101 102	.00086	.33669	•25016 -(252	.31003	.23312	20071	.14681	.37317	•08568	40274
103	.14607	.48660	•36252	.42B11	.28981	28644	.26087	.3289n	.05694	.32576
104	1.00000 .23824	.23824 1.00000	• 16570	•10516 •42220	.19386 .30235	.12647 .31418	.33475	.06876	.18502	0653
105	•	•43047	•43047 • 60000		.38371	57973	.23462	.24021	.15131	12360
106	.16570	42220	1.60000	•5155 <u>1</u>	72946	46410	.44285	32599	18322	•13241
	.10516		•=1551	1.00000	-	-	.26575	.28237	.04226	.10478
107	.19386	.30235	• 38371	•72946	1.00000	41088	.37130	.23492	01117	-04993
108	.12647	.31418	•57973	.46410	41088	1.00000	.43320	20889	19466	.16715
169	.33475	.23462	44285	•26575	37130	·43320	1.00000	.25507	34987	20376
110	.06876	24021	.32599	.28237	.23492	.28889	.25507	1.0000n	.10101	.46640
111	.18502	.15131	16322	•04226	01117	19466	.34947	10191	1.00000	•19537
112	-,00653	.12360	•13241	•10478	.04993	.16715	.20376	.48640	19537	1.00000
113	.06423	.19949	•30046	•26632	.22123	19527	•37978	30065	·25451	.42604
87	.07294	.11564	•17944	.066P3	03385	.09579	.11300	04433	.02735	.04616
A	05900	.14762	•16642	.19594	.17911	.25556	.09682	.13799	01922	.01291
ē	09956	.06727	•n8187	•17649	15136	.12202	.04317	.1541a	10465	03226
C	08823	.14982	•n3156	.16322 .17701	.12770 .18705	.09753 .34074	02038	.11900	16647	.00012
E	16949 -03288	.07027 .09062	•18929 •0009	•17701 ••03013	*.13750	02122	.16335	.22586	12851	16699
F	11840	.06181	•n2049	•13261	•19000	15912	05983 .07459	.07763	08438 09085	04784 04061
Ğ	12581	.00578	•n6313 •n7673	•15261 •16076	.17951	.04801	.08797	.0648n	- 12948	04061 07265
H	05640	.01042	• 07974	13337	00007	.07521	.04518	09935 -11653	•11068	14052
Ĵ	.16355	.03608		07146	.05807	.06514	.05698		.05726	05096
K	.07900	.02337	• 02607		.03299	•		.06182		
'n	101300	*05091	•n6415	.12584	690677	-08516	.05955	.10487	.09637	.11206

Table 16-(Continued)

					_	_	_		_	
	113	87	A	8	C	D	Ε	F	G	H
3	.04419	.06869	.20200	.18414	.19778	.22232	06819	08551	.06309	03498
6	.11262	.07457	• 17782	•10495	•1 <u>0</u> 091	.05733	.01758	.08563	.12161	.05713
9	.00560	.04208	• 3 1537	+08817	07533	.11624	.00938	.03688	.05234	.20061
12	.02318	13890	·n8220	- • 02042	.02795	•17433	.10104	.10059	.04416	•ถ1479
15	.50027	.04431	•n5108	.00788	04491	~.03357	07494	.06625	01314	.12468
18	.09467	01018	•n905 9	•07684	.04787	.07131	.01207	01494	•00076	•n9387
21	.19083	.07195	•13552	.12437	14923	·10887	13713	02795	+15933	•11606
24	.09019	.06270	•n9476	05425	03204	04824	.01585	01334	•01073	•10774
27	.18735	.09951	•17206	.11852	13474	.04706	01255	01907	.05160	r2553
30	.17906	~. 00045	• 18568	•18751	.22A60	.15544	.08370	.00441	•07365	05464
33	.30062	-,05022	• 13446	.04639	05165	.14854	.06612	06053	07111	1942ع.
36	.36826	.02057	• > 1544	.15327	.16901	.11703	.06645	.12203	08715	•04596
39	.20886	-,04554	•1961 7	•16004	.19684	.15561	.05073	.07954	03795	04329
42	.37069	.01117	.22958	16994	.15610	.1 9026	.12429	00385	.02698	00431
45	.23909	-,07669	•n6273	.05412	.06796	15923	14518	.00290	03141	.05329
48	.17227	.01689	·;1288	.16611	·14755	.05639	.03220	.01556	01023	- •07106
51	.18613	05283	.22995	•15567	.2nn21	.30468	,07587	.01930	.01900	nepa3
54	.10530	.00512	· n2144	.01262	.05323	02154	04839	02921	-,12484	.03243
57	.12147	.09788	.04622	.03188	.02839	.02283	.07313	.07587	02000	. 13415
60	.25292	.09911	. 25735	.23973	.15306	.13727	03235	- 0n93n	01440	•00262
63	.25775	07175	· n6536	15873	.10049	.09059	.04010	08953	.03620	.10432
66	.20458	.14151	n3496	01268	02240	- .01726	.06138	.06543	.07532	.13400
69	.01226	11969	•69071	- •05979	-,07148	03426	18580	.04299	 00830	- .00029
72	.09420	02217	•n1915	-,15293	-,10197	.07764	.24668	.០4858	 08442	•C5778
75	.29584	06829	•∩89 97	05524	.09625	•04966	.11270	06918	04179	00845
7a	.13560	 D2630	•r6318	 00537	06308	11499	.07874	.oro85	03437	.05750
81	.17291	04720	• 15998	.14103	• 19269	.23297	·10186	.19121	.16491	.05015
84	•17u86	 ∪7498	• 10508	.1526n	10513	.07678	.09557	04222	01712	⊸.ຄຕ31:
101	.30247	•00969	r0732	 j 1558	03962	.09329	03032	.04721	 02∩₽7	•01752
102	.33531	.03539	-•n0871	00559	02195	.06005	08413	.06128	.03749	•01528
103	.06423	.u7294	- .∩590n	- •09956	- 08323	16949	.03288	11840	- 12591	C5640
104	·1994 9	11564	• 14762	•0672 7	14982	.0702 7	.09062	.06181	+00578	.01042
105	.30046	.17944	• 16642	.03187	03156	18929	.02049	.06313	•07673	.07974
106	.26632	.06683	•19594	•17649	•16322	17701	03013	.13261	•16076	•13337
107	.22123	03385	•17911	.15136	.12770	.18705	13750	.19000	.17951	00007
108	.19527	.39579	• 25556	.12202	.0975 3	34674	02122	.15912	.04PN1	.07521
109	.37978	.11300	•n96A2	.04317	- 02038	.16335	0598 3	.07459	08797	.04518
110	.30/65	.04033	·13799	15410	11900	+22586	.07763	•0648n	- 09935	11653
111	.25451	.02735	-•n1922	10465	16547	12851	08438	09085	12948	11068
112	.42604	.04616	.n1291	.02226	.00012	·16699	- 04794	04861	07265	14062
113	1.00000	.09726	-•n1599	02803	05584	⊶.01251	05078	01023	00198	•13692
87	.09726	1.00000	.n0135	.02538	01850	01373	.17251	 0467a	-,10589	.12978
A	01599	.00135	1.00000	.49051	49591	.66442	13475	.05542	01900	10061
В	02803	.02538	.49051	1.00000	78122	42809	.02080	.10342	.16804	01799
C	05584	.01850	. 49591	78122	1.00000	.45176	06122	19247	18636	10358
D	01251	01373	• 66442	.42819	.45176	1.00000	.14676	.2405n	14947	05617
٤	.05878	.17251	•13475	.02080	.06122	14676	1.00000	.04654	13172	•03566
F	.01023	04670	.n5542	-10342	.19247	24050	.04654	1.00000	30011	•12486 - 00553
G	00198	10589	n1900	.16804	.18636	14947	13172	.30011	1.00000	00552
н	.13692	.12978	10061	01799	-,10358	05617	03566	.12486	00552	1.00000
Ų	.09166	5784	••∩8461	14526	18403	21267	.11175	01692	11203	.30185
ĸ	.13587	.11471	10882	10076	-,17772	16707	.08839	.06318	07169	.78506

Table 16--(Continued) -.07520 .11620 .13786 -.02002 .05283 -.03400 .10547 .21144 12 15 18 12 24 27 33 35 35 42 -,00753 .10631 .09389 .12211 -.02222 .05486 .08220 .11069 .02065 -.00375 -.09583 -.00242 -.06054 -.03155 -.05540 .03224 -.06651 -.04437 -.03191 -.04437 -.00948 -.14773 -.15886 .03286 .06407 -.06546 .01316 .01356 45 48 51 54 57 .02158 -.13959 -.15412 .03560 .12600 60 -.04372 63 66 69 72 75 78 81 .06664 .08503 .03827 .00861 .03746 -.07576 .10487 -.03688 .09446 -.02554 -.02409 .16355 .03408 .02607 .07146 .05694 .05698 .06514 .05726 -.05931 .10200 .00450 .05859 101 102 163 ...01216 .00257 .07900 104 .02837 105 .06415 105 .12584 107 .03299 .08516 109 . 05955 110 111 112 113 87 A .10487 .09637 .11296 .09166 .13587 .05784 .11471 -.08461 -.14526 -.10882 -.10076 -.18403 -.17772 -.21287 -.16707 .11175 -.01692 -.11203 E .08839 .06318 -.07169 J0185 .78506

1.00000

..82494

.82494

1,00000

TABLE 17
FACTOR PATTERN MATRIX OF EVALUATIVE SCALE ITEMS

									Facto	r									,
Questionnsire Item	1	2	3	4	3	6	1	8	9	10	11	12	13	-14	15	16	17	18	h ²
1. Institution's Reputation	+.02	.04	31	-, 11	04	•.13	.23	.11	.28	.03	.01	09	.04	.08	.02	,01	34	.02	.52
2. Opportunity to Use Skills	-19	09	.0)	+,01	09	11	-13	.04	.60	09	04	-,65	.03	03	.03	02	+,08	03	.60
. Thinking About Job Outside Work	.18	+.09	.07	-16	.01	. 64	- 04	01	.33	.21	15	- , 04	. 14	13	.58	.07	.03	05	.63
. Good Planeing of Work by Supervises	.62	.05	-,07	14	-,01	- 04	.02	10	-21	.10	06	04	26	.02	.12	-,05	14	11	.60
5. Pay for the Work You Do	.03	.09	07	.09	79	.01	•.12	.01	14	.10	- 13	- 10	• 02	05	.00	.01	10	.01	- 73
Feeling of Satisfaction From Job	-35	.02	02	.02	03	.09	• - 17	05	. 19	.01	10.0	.02	-19	+. 26	15	.07	12	12	.70
7. Prestige of Joh Outside Institution	07	.08	-10	.07	~.28	.08	02	.18	.20	.06	03	.23	.29	01	-12	-23	39	.07	.63
8. Opportunity to Develop New Skills 9. Feeling a Part of the Institution	,10 -,03	-,23	12	,01 -,06	08	25 16	01	.16	.45	03	09 01	.11	.14 .66	25 03	11 01	19 15	05	.15	-62
9. Feeling a Part of the Institution 10. Information Relating to Procedures	.13	08	•.10	-14	.0)	16	17	- 02	.04	27	- 22	24	.12	.17	14	24	•,09	. 24	.62
11. Cooperation from Faculty	.28	,00	.0В	.02	.03	.04	,08	0)	.07	- 18	20	24	01	. 23	27	•.03	13	.41	.63
12. Institution's Treatment of Employees	.11	26	13	.02	11	18	.06	02	.19	02	- 22	C6	.16	06	21	27	.07	-13	.62
13. Contribution to Institutional Operations	.00	02	05	.07	.02	, O2	.09	.03	.62	.00	01	124	. 16	05	13	.08	26	.08	.72
14. Your Work Flace	.11	.02	00	09	-,07	-14	10	.11	. 14	.22	.03	.05	.02	22	68	.12	-,02	,03	. 72
15. Supervisor's Appreciation of Work	.83	00	.09	.02	.02	04	.05	01	01	~ .05	08	02	-11	.01	05	.00	02	.01	.82
lo. Freedom to Make Decisions in Work	. 34	02	.00	,05	01	02	.00	OZ	.11	. 07	. 01	~.03	.25	04	20	.25	•.13	25	.53
17. Conperation Among Fellow Workers	- 37	06	03	19	06	-,01	12	02	.08	16	05	03	.15	06	18	.07	24	.06	.57
1B. Prompt Action on Complaints	.59	-14	.03	00	08	.02	-11	- 05	.03	.06	20	.22	06	.12	22	.08	13	.04	, 73
19. Opportunity to Change Jobs	.05	17	10	.05	.00	08	. 14 . 01	11	17	.04	26	.06	-16	10	.02	34	*.52	04 01	.67
20. Prestige of Jub at Institution	.08	05 07	06	.70 •.0B	25	. 16	.04	.01	.32	.06	07	,11	07	.03	.01	.15	21 .01	.03	. 72
21. Supervisor Cetting Along with Feeple 22. Opportunity for Frometion from Job	.18	02	08	.18	11	.06	10	.04	- 01	- 06 - 12	- 13 - 05	.04	.38	10	20	24	01	.04	.57
23. Contact with Co-workers Outside Werk	.01	.õi	.04	14	.06	.05	.13	,03	.01	- 01	- 02	10	.83	.10	.10	.08	.05	06	.71
74. Knowing What Supervisor Expects of You	,65	. 14	- 0-	.04	05	.09	04	15	.03	.07	- 02	07	.23	.17	08	.02	D4	11	.67
25. Opportunity to Obtain Equipment	.02	13	.02	.09	10	06	05	- 1)	.01	18	17	10	14	. 11	38	.25	34	05	.68
6. Recognition for Good Ideas or Work	.71	08	03	05	02	10	+.08	.00	06	.05	08	05	.10	11	06	05	02	.03	• 72
7. Administration's Support of Supervisor	.13	-17	.01	01	09	19	16	.02	, 09 , 86	00	.08 03	10 09	09	.07	13	03 03	58	.17	.72
28. Joh ⊎ork Load	••11	.09	05	06	- 16	.12	.02	10	00	03	03	02	.03	-18	06	11	.05	.07	.71
19. Treated Fairly in Salary Increases 10. Treated Fairly in Promotions	OZ	.09	06 .01	03	01 61	18	,04	12	-,06	19	- 00	.01	04	09	22	16	.19	03	.65
1. Vacation Policy	03	OB	72	01	.08	19	01	O.	.01	02	10	.01	-,01	~.04	08	-71	.04	06	.67
12. Sick Leave Policy	.12	01	19	08	-12	04	14	.08	11	-,00	07	01	.02	02	02	.59	.04	.22	.58
D. Maternity Leave Policy	.01	.22	12	.08	- , 04	17	02	26	.13	06	.10	.06	.07	.03	.15	.32	-,02	.49	. 64
M. Miscellaneous Leave Policy	.17	.23	42	.03	.04	~.22	.07	07	.09	06	. 0%	01	.16	.12	20	.13	. 24	.06	-58
31. Retirement Income Pay Deductions	04	.08	75	.16	.08	.03	03	10	05	.00	07	04	~.08	.01	07	.06	07	.00	. 66
6. Group Life Insurance	G2	01	73	14	19	03	03	01	.10	06	.04	.01	.06	.04	.02	-21	06	07	.75
7. Hospital, Medical, Dental Insuracon	.04	10	72	17	19	.14	.12	.13	.03	.03	-,03 -,03	.03	06	.06 11	-12 03	.03 -,01	.08	.04	.71
8. Retirement Plan	.06	04	78 26	.12 -,06	15	.02	-,03	.13	- 04	- 02	.14	00	02	+.03	.03	-,01	19	.46	-58
19. Appeals Procedure 10. Your Job Security	.04	17	.01	.01	14	02	.08	.03	. 16	26	17	07	.09	.02	22	.07	.20	.55	.70
1. Chance to Mort New Temple in Work	.02	15	.12	10	. 16	13	. 14	13	09	05	05	09	.21	23	06	.18	27	. 14	.68
2. Supervisor's Concern for You as Person	.82	01	-,03	-,00	00	12	.et	00	- 05	.02	03	.00	.02	.05	.06	.09	- 12	.16	. 74
3. Pay Compared to Other Secretarial J.As	.03	12	05	.08	65	.02	07	.05	09	. [8	.07	03	00	15	.07	-06	05	.45	. 81
4. Parking (lumployee)	·. 10	.07	04	05	00	O1	09	.07	- 04	-,07	90	.07	06	07	.11	.01	.06	.01	. 79
5. Paintenance of Bulldings (Employee)	06	.37	.02	.00	.12	04	-11	.07	.03	07	17	00	11	69	05	01	02	.02	.78
6. Haintenance of Grounds (Employee)	07	.0)	02	.03	.03	01	02	- 14	. 04	04	10	03	.08	15	02	10	01	.00	.8.
7. Turnover (Deployee)	02	.08	.04	-05	07	.04	02	.10	- 11	09	.06	30	01	03	03	02	.03	.04	. 74
8. Campus Mail Service (Employee)	.00	.09	.04	.10	.08	.02	.03	.86 .06	0L	- 05 - 04	.09	07 .02	.01 13	.01	.03	.00 04	.04	-,01	.72
9. Tardinesa (Employee)	.15	.07	05	.79	.06	03	01	,02	.07	- 00	00	05	.04	.03	02	10	.03	,09	.83
0. Part-time Help (Employee) 1. Procedures (Employee)	02	.11	05	.06	.07	03	.85	04	.07	03	.02	.02	.03	02	.04	08	.02	.04	.82
2. Absenteeism (Employee)	06	03	•.04	. 52	03	.09	.00	-,07	•.10	03	.11	03	03	18	.11	01	05	.06	.81
3. Restroom facilities (Employee)	04	.07	05	.10	.03	.01	08	.05	- 04	- 90	09	01	.07	.10	.11	.04	08	.02	.86
4. Parking (Supervisor)	.05	.03	.00	06	06	.05	.07	01	.03	03	8)	06	.01	.01	.03	.10	01	04	76
5. Maintenance of Suildings (Supervisor)	,04	. 39	.07	02	11	.00	.26	.07	03	08	•.19	- 14	07	56	02	-14	.09	05	. 77
6. Maintenance of Grounds (Supervisor)	.11	-79	10.	.06	10	,05	-13	.03	03	.01	95	08	.10	11	04	.01	01	- 04	.77
7. Turnover (Supervisor)	.03	.00	.04	02	04	.08	.07		03	04	02	84	.11	.02	02	-01	03	02	. 79
B. Campiis Mail Service (Supervisor)	03	.02	•06	.09	.06	00	.11	.82	- 10	.00	02	-, 18 -, 02	.01	.01	07	03	01 .03	.00 10	.83
9. Tardinėse (Supervisor)	•.12	.09	0)	.76	.07 00	04 .93	.09	.18	.13 .05	07 -,01	10 03	02	00	.16 -,00	12	04	.00	04	.87
O. Part-time Help (Supervisor) 1. Procedures (Supervisor)	.03	,01 -,05	04	.00	.01	.09	.07	107	10	.07	.02	05	.02	04	02	00	01	-,00	.85
	16	05	-,10	.77	12	.09	.15	.00	• 05	0.05	.01	07	•.03	.01	.02	.05	-,03	.02	. 74
2. Absenteelsm (Sepervisor)	16	•.19	.03	.05	03	.08	.04	00	.09	87	-,04	11	05	12	08	.10	.04	02	.82
3. Restroom Facilities (Supervisor)		-110	•••	•••	,				,		,								
•																			

TABLE 18
FACTOR PATTERN MATRIX OF DIFFERENCE SCALE ITEMS

Que	ationnaire Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Factor 10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	16	19	ħ?
1.	Institution's Reputation	,02	18	73	.04	.09	02	.01	+.07	. 16	. 12	.14	02	.02	.22	.05	.14	49	05	.07	.514
2.	Opportunity to Use Skills	~.07	.07	09	17	01	50	05	.03		.02	.26	.02	.09	.21	Z4	13	.09	.11	.18	.676
3.	Tilnking About Job Dutaide Work	-,01	07	. 15	.07	.17	31	.12	.05		14	10	.02	27	.07	, 10	- 19	-43	04	•24	.607
4.	Good Planning of Work by Supervisor	.65	. 06	11	~. OB	-12	22	. 12	06		. 02	15	12	.08	. 14	.01	06	20	.09	• 17	.679
ş.	Pay for the Work You Do	.05	.08	,05	.03	.03	- 14	.08	.83		03	16	02	-,01	-,91	7-11	.06	03	.00	• , 25	,821
6,	Feeling of Satisfaction From Jub	- 29	.19	• . 05	03	07	32	09	10		.05	.18	.07	.27	.03	*.20	-11	.09	-01	133	1773
7.	Prestige of Job Outside Institution	- 13	,04	.19	.03	-24	15	18	. 14	16	.09	.18	.25	.26	. 26	~.01	05	•11	21	.03	.597
8. 9,	Opportunity to Develop New Skills Feeling a Part of the Institution	.13 -,03	07 -01	08	06	. 14 . 2 1	29	04	.01	.00	07	.13	.08	.25	, 18	36	.09	03 02	.09 29	.25	.672 -673
10.	Information Relating to Fracedures	.07	16	12	-15	.17	.09	,28	.15	04	05	09 .24	08	.09 13	04	44 38	-,43	.06	.04	.05	.614
11.		07	10	.11	01	02	11	07	.08	08	- 17	- 03	.11	.11	01	.06	79	08	.10	05	.756
12.		.15	-, 16	07	08	,13	08	07	.29	.16	23	.24	05	.04	-,03	26	18	00	.15	.06	.586
13.		,15	03	08	.05	-,02	66	08	.07	.08	.01	- 05	.02	.13	.01	-,04	14	18	10	.08	.714
14.	Your Work Place	.05	.06	.02	.01	09	.01	. 24	.09	01	.00	09	.11	.78	.03	.06	12	,01	08	00	.747
15.	Supervisor's Appreciation of Work	.64	.02	.12	01	08	.09	.01	+.03	.03	05	.21	.09	17	05	00	10	10	07	.18	.805
16.	Freedom to Make Decisions in Work	.17	.16	D1	11	20	.03	.16	14	-:15	- 10	. 29	.14	19	, 13	.01	.01	31	21	.31	.701
17.		.35	12	02	07	04	-,05	26	.05	18	16	02	06	.38	01	09	.01	05	27	03	.642
	Prompt Action on Complaints	. 36	.18	.05	•.03	11	.00	-12	01	.09	03	.20	.23	-,02	01	02	47	08	.03	.16	-731
19,		. 15	04	.06	.08	.10	.02	.06	.17	.10	- 21	11	-11	- 19	05	29	.04	47	20	.10	.662
70.		.73	03	19	.13	-24	31	.09	-21	07	17	. 24	.04	20	. 11	.00	01	11	18	.00	,699
	Supervisor Cetting Along with People	.90	05	-,04	- , 04	.01	02	- , 06	.09	,04	.05	- 08	.02	-13	06	,01	.06	.03	.00	10	.821 .661
32.		. 33	06	.07	.06	09	-07	0z	- 26	13	- 14	15	.09	.14	. 76	25	.05	04	03	.28	.656
23.	Contact with Co-workers Outside Work	01	.D2	.05	12	04 15	12	.04	.04	.11	- 00	.03	01	.09	-,09	.04	.10 30	03 .09	78	.06	.719
24.	Knowing What Supervisor Expects of You Opportunity to Obtain Equipment	07	18	12	03	.01	09 .07	.07	.09	- 19	.06	.28	- 17	15	.04 08	18	30	10	06	02	.736
26.	Recognition for Good Ideas or Work	.56	.05	00	04	.04	.13	.08	.08	,00	- 10	.76	.06	-,00	.06	11	.03	11	03	-21	-678
27.	Administration's Support of Supervisor	05	.02	.10	.04	.17	22	.04	.04	31	05	.03	- 12	.01	-,00	.13	26	64	.05	01	.689
26.	Job Work Load	10	00	04	04	17	76	.16	26	01	06	17	07	10	13	.04	.02	00	13	07	.733
29.	Vacation Tolley	.06	01	.21	.08	13	03	.01	.07	.00	.09	- 31	-,07	.03	10	-,64	03	+.05	.05	10	.677
30.	Sick Leave Policy	15	.01	.22	.07	04	10	0.	.08	. 17	.06	.04	.04	08	10	64	-05	.07	-02	12	.630
	Maternity Teave Policy	.04	14	• 2 2	11	15	.06	.05	19	.06	18	.04	04	.08	-18	-, 36	.18	11	-18	- 26	-588
	Miscellaneous Leave Policy	11	12	-51	.01	22	17	-05	-21	- 0	08	10	. 02	-,15	06	01	-11	+.19	-30	-,61	.669
33.		02	.00	.78	18	01	01	02	.00	.02	.11	02	04	09	-15	09	.03	.07	08	-11	696
34.	Group Life Insurance Hospital, Medical, Dental Insurance	05	02	.76	-19	03	.08	.08	18	14	01	02	- 19	.09	Ul	13 05	09 01	02	07	.02	.736 .765
36.		04	.07	.69	13	.17	.08	07	.31	05	.06	.12	05	04	.11	01	04	.00	02	17	.747
37.		.09	01	.29	11	.04	.03	07	37	-11	- 16	,15	.03	.03	14	04	.28	.14	.05	35	644
	Job Security	07	- 32	.09	00	05	•.01	27	16	08	15	15	-14	18	11	-,13	.23	24	.09	39	.691
	Chance to Meet New People in Work	.01	.13	-,06	.07	15	- 12	.08	.01	11	.04	07	.08	03	.10	13	.05	.05	.00	73	.708
411.	Sipervisor's Concern for You as Person	72	.01	, oa	.03	15	04	.02	00	01	- 00	- 05	.01	01	.02	13	-17	19	-13	10	.774
41.	Pay Compared to Other Secretarial Jobs	.01	.00	.CB	-,05	03	63	06	.79	.04	, DV	.09	.08	13	.01	06	.08	05	.06	19	. 795
	Parking (Umployee)	.15	13	.10	.02	00	08	.04	.04	.09	.67	.03	07	.02	05	01	.10	61	05	.06	.807
41.	Maintenance of Buildings (Employee)	.07	- 70	01	01	03	.co	.05	.07	10	.20	.06	.01	16	.01	.00	08	-12	33	22	.788
44.		.07	-,77	. 02	-,09	05	.01	.00	.04	.06	.03	.15	.07	.04	19	.03	.05	03	.11	.16	.784
45.		.01	13	04	00	.07	-,00	.05	.0	.02	- 06	- 04	-83	. 04	06	.02	00	.03	08	06	759
	Campus Hail Service (Employee)	• .00	07	07	-,10	.05	03	. 94	.03	09	.06	-11	.10	01	83	07	02	01	10	-07	.831
	lardiness (Employee)	20	05	~. 11	80	.03	- 03	.00	.06	-04	07	01	03	.01	11	09	02	04	12	.10	.750
	Part-time Rolp (Employee)	.08	.06	.01	13	- 89	.04	.06	.02	.02	01	.02	.08	05	•.03	.02	.10	05	.02	03	.841
50.		.02	16	.07	-,04	.03	.03	.04	-11	82 01	- 05	.11	.02	09	11	.11	10	02	.06	08 11	.813 .852
51.	Absenteelsm (Employee)	.03 80.	03 03	.04	88	.02	08	.0) .85	08	.06	.05	.08	.02	.23	06	.04	.16	.05	.02	.04	4856
52.	Restroom Facilities (Employee) Parking (Supervisor)	•.01	07	.04	-,09	.01	-11	.05	.00	05	.80	- 03	.05	02	03	10	.02	05	.13	.00	.759
53		~.05	69	03	.04	01	.00	.13	13	- 25	.19	- 14	.10	12	.13	07	16	•.03	-,14	08	.791
54	Maintenance of Crounds (Supervisor)	08	77	.00	08	.02	01	02	08	06	.01	.03	.10	.09	06	03	.05	08	.21	-16	.778
55.	Turnover (Supervisor)	07	03	-,05	.00	.07	.06	.04	02	- 04	04	12	82	. 05	14	.05	08	.04	.13	05	.798
56.	Compus Hail Service (Supervisor)	.08	-,04	10	07	.02	05	00	.01	15	.05	.01	.18	00	82	10	04	.02	02	.05	.839
57.	Tardiness (Supervisor)	.09	04	.06	72	02	.18	.09	.07	08	.05	-,21	.01	.10	20	.07	.14	10	08	. 16	.825
58,		00	.01	.03	04	. 92	.08	.02	01	-,04	.02	06	.05	04	03	00	03	03	.05	.01	.867
		09	-,02	01	07	.07	.01	04	00	89	.00	03	05	00	10	.02	-02	.01	.07	07	.836
	Abscateeism (Supervisor)	. 19	.00	. 14	76	.09	07	-07	10	11	00	05	1.04	-01	05	.09	02	.06	- 04	08	.757
₩.	Restroom Facilities (Supervisor)	13	.01	03	06	.06	.01	.87	.04	04	.06	01	.07	.00	.00	05	07	07	04	11	.816
Zi g	envalue	9,09	5.01	3.97	2.99	2.49	2.22	2.06	1.94	1.76	1.69	1.49	1.44	1.43	1.34	1.29	1.23	1.12	1.06	1.01	

TABLE 19
FACTOR PATTERN MATRIX OF WEIGHTED DIFFERENCE SCALE ITEMS

							Fee	tor						
Quest	ionnaire Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	h ²
	stitution's Reputation	07	•06	.75	02	.10	.02	04	.20	02	01	01	.04	.603
	pportunity to Use Skills	.06	-,07	.06	-06	07	.10	- 17	05	59	.10	28	.07	.576
	linking About Job Outside Work	~.00	•14	.12	05	07	.01	-13	02	28	.20	54	13	.494
	ood Planning of Work by Supervisor	.13	.21	01	-21	.18	22	.03	.01	33	05	•23	.46	.65
	ay for the Work You Do	.09	.05	.03	.74	.19	-12	10 .06	- 13 .02	.06	04	.03	16	. 73
	ecling of Satisfaction From Job	.07	- 03	00	09	05	.04		_	90	04	01	06	78
	restige of Job Outside Institution	05	.03	.62	.08		02	-15	12	19	.01	12	22	.60
	proctunity to Develop New Skills	.07	.01	.04	.02	06 05	.05	.04 05	22	51	.31	.01	-,07	• 58
	eeling a Part of the Institution	.14	- 03	.76	18	08	.13	11	30	.10	.07	.02	.14	.684
	nformation Relating to Procedures	.03	.01	.45	06	04		66	01	.07	.02	.04	10	.430
	poperation from Faculty	.32	.02	.12			.01		_		.05	.11	09	-62
	nstitution's Treatment of Employees	- 14	02	.09	.23 05	17	,01 ,12	26 23	38	11	34	.19	- 29	.68
	entribution to Institutional Operations	03	08	-24		.04	03	24	- 14	- 21	.29	.26	. 36	-61
	our Work Flace	06	11	. 38	+23			.02	06	17	.30	. 25	14	.61
	apervisor's Appreciation of Work	.82	.08	-06	05	.03	.0l	-,21	26	19	06	.20 19	05 -16	.79
	reedom to Make Decisions in Work	.38	.04	-14	.03	.00	- 09	-,15	- 21	50	18	. 28	.08	.54
	operation Among Fellow Workers	.75	09	-12 03	.02	.02	.04	14	02	•.1z	.05	02	03	.67
	rompt Action on Complaints proceedings to Change Jobs	.17	.06	- 05	.08	13	. 04	08	- 69	.03	,02	02	.09	.63
	restige of Job at Institution	26	.11	.30	.19	.08	05	,10	35	02	.25	15	•.03	.62
	aperviser Getting Along with People	.23	.02	.04	.02	•.01	.09	.03	01	- 09	.07	.72	•.07	.68
	poortunity for Promotion from Job	.11	.01	.27	.20	21	.12	.03	44	28	01	.09	.02	.70
	ontact with Co-workers Outside Work	11	-12	-11	.13	.06	+.12	03	06	.09	.80	02	10	. 75
	nowing What Supervisor Expects of You	.39	.04	07	.13	.14	14	00	16	38	13	.05	.13	. 55
	prortunity to Oblain Equipment	.13	.05	.04	.12	-16	14	23	.08	07	.11	.01	74	. 73:
	cognition for Good Ideas or Work	.53	- 01	01	.10	06	. 22	.08	- 14	16	.14	.23	15	-64
7. A	Uninistration's Support of Supervisor	- 14	.09	.18	.09	01	01	71	03	.02	.00	08	04	.61
8. J	oh Work Load	03	-,06	09	34	.18	10.	22	36	24	.43	05	-21	•67.
9. V	scation Policy	.18	. D6	.08	.07	. 15	. 82	.09	.15	12	11	.01	.17	.78
10, S	ick Leave Policy	- 04	.09	.05	.06	.02	.82	01	·.06	.02	03	.03	- 04	.76
1. H	aternity image Policy	45	.10	13	.03	-24	.07	.01	37	22	.03	.40	22	•6B
2. Mi	taccilaneous Leave Policy	16	. 34	-,10	01	.18	. 39	22	19	.14	.06	.01	.04	-563
3. A	tirement Income Pay Deductions	.02	.79	.06	.10	.09	405	.06	- 14	.00	.00	03	.15	.726
4. Çı	roup tile Insurance	.07	.70	05	~.10	17	٠ 31	17	- 12	04	.05	~.05	06	.73
S. He	espital, Medical, Dental Insurance	~.05	,79	02	18	24	. Vá	13	.12	06	.06	03	14	-741
	etirement Plan	00	, 81	.05	.19	.19	05	.07	- 04	.03	.00	.00	.04	.77
7. As	ppeals Procedura	÷.10	.38	•0%	29	.26	04	.15	24	02	05	.19	37	-66
	b Security	-, 00	.12	.15	15	.66	.12	05	.10	.10	19	04	03	-661
	hance to Heet New People in Work	.06	- , 04	.02	.01	.79	.13	.08	.07	.05	.26	.08	06	.718
	purvisor's Concern for You as Person	- 24	- 0/	•.05	.01	.45	.26	27	.03	06	- 15	·.48	15	. 75
	sy Compared to Other Secretarial Jobs	.14	.02	.19	*.73	-37	06	04	CI	.0ú	•.21	.02	14	.792
•	yAlue	7.78	4.39	2.30	1.91	1.89	1.56	1.42	1.15	1 31	1 22	1 11	1 06	

TABLE 20
FACTOR PATTERN MATRIX OF IMPORTANCE SCALE ITEMS

						Facto							h ²
westionnalre Item	1	2		_ 4	- 5	6	7	8	9 	10	11	12	h*
. Institution's Reputation	.03	.19	04	. 14	.73	.00	10	.22	.05	18	01	.01	.712
. Opportunity to Use Scills	.21	03	06	03	•18	17	36	15	.19	.18	43	.00	.677
. Thinking About Job Outside Work	.03	.16	.07	.10	.17	- 12	00	.08	12	-,15	76	05	.690
 Good Planning of Work by Supervisor 	.12	.01	.00	.03	07	.01	- 64	02	11	02	07	.04	• 773
. Pay for the Work You Do	.05	.04	.05	13	.11	-,01	06	05	.05	. 79	.10	03	.696
 Feeling of Satisfaction From Job 	02	00	20	02	.04	15	14	.13	.06	.13	47	• 33	•605
 Prestige of Job Dutside Institution 	- 11	08	.06	06	-62	.06	02	. 07	24	-15	19	.03	•603
. Opportunity to Develop New Skills	.51	05	17	09	-,03	-,06	04	20	13	.04	38	.07	-644
. Feeling a Part of the Institution	02	06	06	+,05	.80	16	. 12	08	02	.05	12	03	.725
O. Information Relating to Procedures	.18	06	35	18	.42	13	06	.05	.13	.09	01	-,01	.589
1. Cooperation from Feculty	.02	.14	65	.03	16	. 06	.04	. 02	•.12	-18	08	-17	-624
 Institution's Treatment of Employees 	.08	01	24	07	04	. 16	14	.23	.05	.55	16	02	.626
3. Contribution to Institutional Operations	-59	.0)	09	-15	. 24	.08	16	. 02	02	.15	.17	-16	.693
4. Your Work Place	.07	07	25	.18	-41	08	.01	- 04	13	.30	-27	. 24	- 642
5. Supervisor's Appreciation of Work	.25	05	.02	.04	01	13	04	.09	12	.03	.02	- 59	.566
6. Freedom to Make Decisions in Work	.14	.03	05	•.15	. 12	13	.07	.02	.17	.07	09	.57	5B5
7. Cooperation Among Fellow Workers	22	-27	27	-17	.07	- 16	17	06	.08	-06	.03	.63	.713
8. Prompt Action on Complaints	.11	08	.01	.04	03	.01	.05	07	05	.01	01	. 76	•642
9. Opportunity to Change Jobs	.28	-12	.29	57	01	.20	06	.01	.04	.20	.03	.08	.643
O. Prestige of Job at Institution	.40	.05	-29	•,01	.44	.03	.02	.02	14	-25	.06	.13	.701
1. Supervisor Getting Along with People	-11	.01	32	15	.11	.11	.02	-67	.15	.04	16	04	.721
2. Opportunity for Promotion from Job	.13	.07	.08	56	.24	09	406	01					- 666
3. Contact wich Co-workers Outside Work	.35	.18	02	13	, 23	.23	.39	05	.25	- 12	16	.19	.615
4. Knowing What Supervisor Expects of You	22	05	07	50	01	.10	- 22	.09	_	*.l2		- 56	.655
5. Opportunity to Obrain Equipment 6. Rucognition for Good Ideas or Work	.09	02 .03	60 13	.03 11	06	02	.11	.08	22 .01	. 08	11	•16	.630
6. Recognition for Good Ideas or Work 7. Administration's Support of Supervisor	.04	.03	60	10	.24	-,00	~,21	.13	.10	10	G2	06	- 583
8. Job Work Load !	-63	.02	01	10	07	.08	28	. 29	03	.06	•.13	04	. 585
		.02	.20	00	.13	72	.01	.13					.738
9. Vacation Policy	13	.21	06	.05	.02	66	.03	.18	.10	.07	09	. 24	.735
0. Sick Leave Folicy	- 04	.02	19	59	- 10	-17	.07	- 02	.02	-15	.02	20	
1. Maternity Leave Policy	.10	•25	10	-,12	.06	62	11	08	26	02 13	-16	11	.553
2. Miscellaneous Lesva Policy 3. Rutirement Income Pay Deductions	.02	.49	-11	-,11	.05	- 24	26	.04		.04	.15		.635
4. Group Life Insurance	.02	.86	02	.01	01	15	.03	.02	21	.02	09	.01 .02	.613
	.01	.87	-,09	01	08	02	.07	01			09		.810
5. Hospital, Medical, Dantal Insurance 6. Retirement Plan	06	.52	.13	00	.14	.01	-,38	.12	27	.07		05	.767
7. Appeals Procedure	20	.28	06	35	.07	.03	.00	.15	64		-16	.06	.695
8. Job Security	.03	.03	.10	.06	.05	19	.01	.75		•23	11	10	-683
9. Chance to Meet New Paople in Work	.13	*.14	12	07	•12	02	- 13	- 03	03	-02	07	.09	. 736
O. Supervisor's Concern for You as Person	11	17	.02	.20	13	29	02	.47	72 22	.05	10	02	.681
	- 09	-14	05	.08	08	12	11	.10		-28	24	.20	.72
1. Pay Compared to Other Secretarial Jobs	-,07	• 14	05	.08	00	-12	• • • •	-10	16	.73	.05	.04	.713
igenvalue	9.53	3.19	2.31	1.95	1.81	1.58	1.34	1.29	1.21	1.12	1.06	1.00	

Table 21. Multiple Correlations of Frequency of Absences with Four Demographic Variables and Expressions of Overall Job Satisfaction.

Predictors	β	N	<u>R</u> s	
Age	1305			
Salary	.0763			
Job Level	1896	143	.266	
Length of Service	.0320			
Evaluative Score	1238			
Age	0905			
Salary	0080			
Job Level	1314	142	.328*	
Length of Service	.0278			
Difference Score	.2254			
Age	0998			
Salary	.0025			
Job Level	1426	142	.315*	
Length of Service	.0129	•		
Weighted Difference Score	.2118			

 $[*]_{\underline{p}} < .05$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acton Society Trust. <u>Size and morale: A preliminary study of attendance at work in large and small units</u>. London, Acton Society Trust, 1953.
- Adams, J. S. Toward an understanding of inequity. <u>Journal of Abnormal</u> and <u>Social Psychology</u>, 1963, 67, 422-436.
- Argyle, M., Gardner, G., and Cioffi, F. Supervisory methods related to productivity, absenteeism, and labor turnover. <u>Human Relations</u>, 1958, <u>11</u>, 23-40.
- Baldamus, W. and Behrend, H. Variations in absenteeism during the week:
 An index of employee morale. Nature, 1950, 165, 831-832.
- Balfour, C. Manpower: The absent millions. <u>Management Today</u>, 1971, March, 38.
- Baskett, G. D. and Mulaik, S. A. <u>Program manual for the Univac 1108</u> statistical programs. Georgia Institute of Technology, 1971.
- Baumgartel, H. and Sobol, R. Background and organizational factors in absenteeism. <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1959, <u>12</u>, 431-445.
- Behrend, H. Absence under full employment. University of Birmingham: Faculty of Commerce and Social Science, 1951.
- Behrend, H. Absence and labor turnover in a changing economic climate. Occupational Psychology, 1953, 27, 69-79.
- Behrend, H. Voluntary absence from work. <u>International Labour Review</u>, 1959, 79, 109-140.
- Bernberg, R. E. Socio-psychological factors in industrial morale: I. The prediction of specific indicators. <u>Journal of Social Psychology</u>, 1952, <u>36</u>, 73-82.
- Brayfield, A. H. and Crockett, W. H. Employee attitudes and employee performance. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 1955, <u>52</u>, 396-424.
- Canfield, G. W. and Soash, D. G. Presenteeism: A constructive view. <u>Personnel Journal</u>, 1955, 34, 94-97.
- Claudy, J. G. An empirical investigation of small sample multiple regression and cross-validation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1969.

- Comrey, A. L., High, W., and Wilson, R. C. Factors influencing organizational effectiveness: VI. A survey of aircraft workers. <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1955, <u>8</u>, 79-99.
- Cooper, R. and Payne, R. Extroversion and some aspects of work behavior.

 <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1967, <u>20</u>, 45-57.
- Covner, B. J. Management factors affecting absenteeism. <u>Harvard Business</u>
 Review, 1950, 28, 42-48.
- Covner, B. J. and Smith, M. Times absent and days absent as a measure of absenteeism. <u>Personnel</u>, 1951, <u>28</u>, 23-27.
- Cramer, E. <u>Manova program-multivariate analysis of variance</u>. University of North Carolina Psychometric Laboratory, Chapel Hill, 1969.
- Crowther, J. Absence and turnover in the divisions of one company, 1950-1955. Occupational Psychology, 1957, 31, 256-269.
- Darlington, R. B. Multiple regression in psychological research and practice. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 1968, 69, 161-182.
- Ewen, R. B. Weighting components of job satisfaction. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1967, <u>51</u>, 68-73.
- Ferguson, G. A. <u>Statistical analysis in psychology and education</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Fleishman, E. A., Harris, E. F. and Burtt, H. E. <u>Leadership and super-vision in industry</u>. Ohio State University: Bureau of Educational Research, 1955.
- Fortuin, G. J. Sickness absenteeism. <u>Bulletin of the World Health</u> <u>Organization</u>, 1955, <u>31</u>, 513-541.
- Fox, J. B. and Scott, J. F. <u>Absenteeism: Management problem</u>. Boston, Harvard Business School, 1943.
- Frederiksen, N. and Melville, S. D. Differential predictability in the use of test scores. <u>Educational and Psychological Measurement</u>, 1954, 14, 647-656.
- Gadourek, I. Absences and well-being of workers. Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1965.
- Gale, J. B. Absence from work in May and June 1955. <u>Personnel</u> <u>Practices Bulletin</u>, 1955, <u>11</u>, 39-43.
- Gaudet, F. J. Solving the problems of employee absenteeism. New York: American Management Association, 1963.

- Gibson, R. O. Toward a conceptualization of absence behavior of personnel in organizations. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, 1966, <u>11</u>, 107-113.
- Giese, W. J. and Ruter, H. W. An objective analysis of morale.

 <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1949, 33, 421-427.
- Graen, G. Instrumentality theory of work motivation: Some experimental results and suggested modifications. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph</u>, 1969, <u>53</u>, 1-25.
- Guilford, J. P. <u>Fundamental statistics in psychology and education</u>. McGraw-Hill: New York, 1956.
- Harding, F. D. and Bottenberg, R. A. Effect of personal characteristics on relationships between attitudes and job performance. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1961, 45, 428-430.
- Hays, W. L. <u>Statistics for psychologists</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.
- Heneman, H. G., Comaford, C., Jasmin, J. and Nelson, R. J. Standardized absence rates: A first step toward comparability. <u>Personnel</u> <u>Journal</u>, 1961, 40, 114-115.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O. and Capwell, D. F. <u>Job</u> <u>attitudes: Review of research and opinion</u>. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.
- Herzberg, P. A. The parameters of cross-validation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Illinois, Urbana, 1967.
- Hewitt, D. and Parfit, J. A note on working morale and size of group.

 Occupational Psychology, 1953, 27, 38-42.
- Hill, J. M. M. and Trist, E. L. Changes in accidents and other absences with length of service. <u>Human Relations</u>, 1955, <u>8</u>, 121-152.
- Hitt, W. D. A statistical analysis of certain factors related to employee morale. Unpublished doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1956.
- Huse, E. F. and Taylor, E. K. Reliability of absence measures.

 <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1962, 46, 159-160.
- Indik, B. P. Some effects of organization size on member attitudes and behavior. <u>Human Relations</u>, 1963, <u>16</u>, 369-384.
- Isambert-Jamati, V. Absenteeism among women workers in industry.

 <u>International Labour Review</u>, 1962, <u>85</u>, 248-261.

- Jackson, J. H. Factors involved in absenteeism. <u>Personnel Journal</u>, 1944, <u>22</u>, 289-295.
- Kahne, H. R., Ryder, C. F., Snegireff, L. S. and Wyshak, G. Don't take older workers for granted. <u>Harvard Business Review</u>, 1957, 35, 90-94.
- Kearns, J. C. Controlling absenteeism for profit. <u>Personnel Journal</u>, 1971.
- Kerr, W. A., Koppelmeir, G. J., and Sullivan, J. J. Absenteeism, turnover, and morale in a metal fabrication factory. <u>Occupational Psychology</u>, 1951, <u>25</u>, 50-55.
- Kornhauser, A. W. and Sharp, A. A. Employee attitudes: Suggestions from a study in a factory. <u>Personnel Journal</u>, 1932, <u>10</u>, 393-404.
- Kossoris, M. D. Absenteeism and injury experience of older workers. Monthly Labor Review, 1948, 67, 17.
- Lamberth, J. and Padd, W. Attitude similarity as a determinant of worker absenteeism. Unpublished manuscript, University of Oklahoma, undated.
- Lapping, D. Social health aspects of industrial absenteeism. <u>Journal</u> of Social Research, 1953, 4, 146-156.
- Lennerlof, L. <u>Supervisory Criteria</u>. Stockholm: Swedish Council for Personnel Administration, 1966.
- Liddell, F. D. K. Attendance in the coal-mining industry. <u>British</u> <u>Journal of Sociology</u>, 1954, <u>5</u>, 28-86.
- Lokander, S. and Machl, M. Sickness absence in a Swedish company, Part IV. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 1964, 40, 401-418.
- Loveland, E. H., Ronan, W. W., and York, C. M. <u>A study of operations</u> effectiveness. Atlanta: Georgia Institute of Technology, School of Psychology, 1968.
- Mann, F. C. and Sparling, J. E. Changing absence rates: An application of research findings. <u>Personnel</u>, 1956, <u>32</u>, 392-408.
- Mare, G. D. and Sergean, R. Two methods of studying changes in absence with age. Occupational Psychology, 1961, 35, 245-252.
- Mayo, E. The social problem of an industrial civilization. Boston: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, 1945.

- Melbin, M. Organizational practice and industrial behavior: Absenteeism among psychiatric aides. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 5.
- Metzner, H. and Mann, F. C. Employee attitudes and absences. <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1953, <u>6</u>, 467-485.
- Mosier, C. I. Problems and designs of cross-validation. <u>Educational</u> and <u>Psychological Measurement</u>, 1951, <u>11</u>, 1-11.
- Mulaik, S. A. Personal communication, 1971.
- Mulaik, S. A. and Burkheimer, G. <u>Factor analysis, multiple pass</u>. (Program for the Univac 1108), Georgia Institute of Technology and University of North Carolina, 1971.
- Naylor, J. C. and Vincent, N. C. Predicting female absenteeism. <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1959, <u>12</u>, 81-84.
- Newton, R. A. An investigation of certain personality factors in relation to industrial absenteeism. Unpublished masters thesis, Pennsylvania State College, 1950.
- Noland, E. W. Workers attitudes and industrial absenteeism: A Statistical Appraisal. American Sociological Review, 1945, 10, 503-510.
- Olkin, I. and Pratt, J. W. Unbiased estimation of certain correlation coefficients. Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 1958, 29, 201-211.
- Patchen, M. Absence and employee feelings about fair treatment. <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1960, <u>13</u>, 349-360.
- Plummer, N. and Hinkle, E. N. Sickness absenteeism. <u>Archives of Industrial Health</u>, 1955, 218-230.
- Plummer, N. Absenteeism in industry. Advanced Management, 1960, 25, 21-24.
- Porter, L. W. and Lawler, E. E. Properties of organization structure in relation to job attitudes and behavior. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 1965, <u>64</u>, 23-51.
- Porter, L. W. Job attitudes in management: I. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1962, <u>46</u>, 375-384.
- Revans, R. W. Human relations, management and size. In E. M. Hugh-Jones (Ed.) <u>Human relations and modern management</u>. Amsterdam: North Holland, 1958, 177-220.

- Ronan, W. W. Individual and situational variables relating to job satisfaction. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology Monographs</u>, No. 1, 1970, <u>54</u>.
- Saunders, D. R. Moderator variables in prediction. <u>Educational and Psychological Measurement</u>, 1956, <u>16</u>, 209-222.
- Sawatsky, J. C. Psychological factors in industrial organization affecting employee stability. <u>Canadian Journal of Psychology</u>, 1951, 5, 29-38.
- Schenet, N. G. An analysis of absenteeism in one war plant. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1945, <u>29</u>, 27-39.
- Sergean, R. and Brierley, J. Absence and attendance under non-continuous three-shift systems of work. <u>Nature</u>, 1968, <u>219</u>, 536.
- Shepherd, R. D. and Walker, J. Three-shift working and the distribution of absence. <u>Occupational Psychology</u>, 1956, <u>30</u>, 105-111.
- Shepherd, R. D. and Walker, J. Absence from work in relation to wage level and family responsibility. <u>British Journal of Industrial Medicine</u>, 1958, <u>15</u>, 52-61.
- Sinha, A. K. D. Manifest anxiety affecting industrial absenteeism.

 <u>Psychological Reports</u>, 1963, <u>13</u>, 258.
- Smith, A. J. Menstruation and industrial efficiency. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1950, <u>34</u>, 1-5.
- Smith, P. C. The development of a method of measuring job satisfaction: The Cornell studies. In E. A. Fleishman (Ed.) <u>Studies in personnel and industrial psychology</u>. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1967.
- Tallacchi, S. Organization size, individual attitudes and behavior:
 An empirical study. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1960, 5, 388-420.
- Tucker, H. I. and Lotz, J. F. Absenteeism: Experience with a liberal paid-absence plan. <u>Personnel</u>, 1957, <u>33</u>, 327-336.
- Van Zelst, R. H. and Kerr, W. A. Worker's attitudes toward merit rating. <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1953, <u>6</u>, 159-172.
- Vroom, V. H. Ego-involvement, job satisfaction, and job performance.

 <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1962, <u>15</u>, 159-177.
- Vroom, V. H. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.

- Waters, L. K. and Roach, D. Relationship between job attitudes and two forms of withdrawal from the work situation. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1971, <u>55</u> (1), 92-94.
- Wherry, R. J. A new formula for predicting the shrinkage of the coefficient of multiple correlation. <u>Annals of Mathematical Statistics</u>, 1931, <u>2</u>, 446-457.
- Wherry, R. J. Factor analysis of morale data: Reliability and validity. <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1958, <u>11</u>, 78-89.
- White, B. L. Job attitudes, absence from work and labour turnover.

 <u>Personnel Practices Bulletin</u>, 1960, <u>16</u> (4), 18-23.
- Wyatt, S. and Marriott, R. Absence during the war. <u>Industrial Health</u>
 Research Board Memorandum, M. R. C. 47/168, I. H. R. B. 47/10
 (1947).
- Yoder, D., Heneman, H. and Rheit, E. F. <u>Triple audit of industrial</u> <u>relations</u>. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951.
- Yuzuk, R. P. The assessment of employee morale: A comparison of two measures. Research Monograph No. 99, Bureau of Business Research. Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1961.