

Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

1968

Job Satisfaction in Relation to General Satisfaction and Personality

Elias E. Mina

Wilfrid Laurier University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mina, Elias E., "Job Satisfaction in Relation to General Satisfaction and Personality" (1968). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 1384.

<https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/1384>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

JOB SATISFACTION IN RELATION TO GENERAL
SATISFACTION AND PERSONALITY

By

Elias E. Mina, B.A.

Thesis submitted to the Council of Graduate Studies
in Partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Psychology

63699

Waterloo University College

May 10, 1968

Property of the Library
Waterloo University College

UMI Number: EC56544

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EC56544

Copyright 2012 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This edition of the work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the idea that the personal characteristics of the worker and his general attitude toward his environment influence his attitude about his job. 101 public school teachers were administered five questionnaires to measure: overall job satisfaction with a job, degree of intrinsic job satisfaction, general satisfaction, neuroticism, and 18 personality variables. Results suggested that job satisfaction had a positive relation to general satisfaction and a negative relation to maladjustment. Overall job satisfaction and intrinsic job satisfaction were not related to each other and each related to a different set of personality dimensions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the teachers who served as subjects of this study and to Dr. S.D. Saleh for his helpful guidance and criticism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	11
CHAPTER	
I. Introduction and Purpose	1
II. Historical Review of Job Satisfaction Research	3
III. Statement of the Problem	20
IV. Method	23
1. The Population	23
2. Instruments used	23
a) The measurement of Job Satisfaction	23
i) The Job Description Index	24
ii) The Job Attitude Scale	25
b) The measurement of Neuroticism	26
c) The measurement of "General" Satisfaction	27
d) The California Personality Inventory	27
3. Procedure	28
V. Results	30
VI. Discussion	41
VII. Summary	46
REFERENCES	49
APPENDICES	
Appendix A	53
Appendix B	54
Appendix C	55
Appendix D	56
Appendix E	57

TABLES

	Page
Table I	32
Table II	33
Table III	34
Table IV	36
Table V	37
Table VI	38

1 - INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The area of worker-attitude and worker-motivation has provided anomalies for industrial psychologists as well as for executives of business and industry. The extent of interest in this area is reflected in the following two quotes. In his review of publications in industrial psychology in 1956, Katzell (1957) states that "this topic grows to the point where it is probably the most active one in current industrial psychology" (p.240). In Haire's (1959) overview of industrial psychology, the author remarks that "In many ways the history of the attempt to deal with motivation in industrial social psychology covers a large part of the whole field," (p.186). The predominance of this topic area is also seen in the number of references cited in a review of the literature on the topic of job attitudes by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957).

Most of the studies, however, have concentrated on examining the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity. These studies reported conflicting results with only a few supporting the long expected relationship between the two variables. As will be revealed from the detailed review of the literature, the research in this field has been confined to studying relations between only some of the sets of variables and the range of situations covered in most studies has been severely limited.

Most researchers investigating the area of job satisfaction appear to have neglected consideration of the personality of the individual worker and his attitude toward facets of his environment other than his job. The purpose of this study will be to investigate the idea that the personal characteristics of the worker influence his attitudes about his job. Assuming that job attitudes form a central role of total adjustment, it is expected that the individual's attitude toward work will be reflected in the degree of his total personal adjustment. It is assumed in this study that job satisfaction is only one aspect of the individual's "general" satisfaction. It is expected that the attitude of the individual toward general aspects of his environment will be reflected in his attitude toward his job.

II - HISTORICAL REVIEW

The research of Taylor (1912) can be taken as a beginning for the development of interest in job satisfaction. Taylor developed a technique of management which he identified as the "task system" and which was later designated by his associates as "Scientific Management". This technique emphasized two major principles: first, the need to discover by experiment the best methods of performing on the job and their classification; and secondly, the responsibility of management to discover these methods and making them available to the workers. Thus, gains in productivity are dependent on the management rather than on the amount of effort exerted by the workers. Taylor did not, however, measure the morale or satisfaction of the workers he studied.

The first attempt at a measurement of employees' attitudes was undertaken by Hoppock (1935) and recorded in his book: Job Satisfaction. Hoppock followed a detailed interview format to obtain the basic information and details regarding the jobs of the workers he studied. After this initial interview, the workers were given an attitude scale to estimate their own satisfaction and a "check list" of opinions on job satisfactions. In addition to this, the worker was asked to keep a form on which he can record his daily feelings about his job for a period of two weeks.

Hoppock reported one such study in which he compared satisfied

and dissatisfied teachers. This comparison was based on the results from a 258-item questionnaire involving anonymous self-estimates of job satisfaction which were obtained from 500 teachers. One aspect of Hoppock's study revealed that the "satisfied" teachers showed "fewer indications of emotional maladjustment." (p.26)

Since 1930, some 2,000 studies have been published which deal in one way or another with the problem of job satisfaction and its relation to productivity, using as a measure of satisfaction the worker's attitude. Most of these studies have been concerned with factors such as working conditions, the nature of supervision and salary, which were considered to be most essential for satisfaction with a job. These studies dealt with job satisfaction as a causal agent which directly influences performance. The general hypothesis guiding these research efforts was that increased job satisfaction would somehow produce increased efficiency, and efficiency would be directly manifest in the productivity of the worker. The usual research design in such studies has been to collect measures of satisfaction and of productivity for a sample of workers and to correlate the two sets of measures.

An extensive review of studies using this approach was offered by Brayfield and Crockett (1955) in which the authors reported finding "minimal or no relationships" between employee attitudes toward their job and performance. The reviewers concluded that satisfaction with one's position in a complex system such as work need not imply a strong motivation toward outstanding performance within that system, and that productivity was only peripherally related to many of the goals of industrial workers.

Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) are critical of the earlier survey of the literature on the grounds that the authors were biased in their choice of studies since they selected a limited number to include in their report. Herzberg, et.al., reviewed the literature up to that date and reported some positive relations between job attitudes and job performance. Of the twenty-six studies cited, the reviewers found that fourteen had reported significant positive relations between job attitudes and productivity, whereas nine studies found the two variables not related, and three studies report a negative relationship.

Vroom (1964), in turn, was critical of the Herzberg, et.al. (1957) review because the authors did not take into account individual differences when they used the term "social aspects of the job" to refer to all "on the job" contacts made by the worker with other workers. According to Vroom, one person may derive satisfaction from one type of contact whereas another may derive satisfaction from a very different kind of contact. Vroom was, however, essentially in agreement with other investigators of job attitudes with regard to the magnitude of their relation to performance. He reported that the correlations between the variables of job attitude and performance, were in the expected direction but not significant. Because of this lack of significant association between the two variables, Vroom preferred to regard them as "conceptually and empirically separable outcomes of the person-work role relationship." (p.187)

A more recent survey of the issues and problems that have emerged from studies of job satisfaction was offered by Fournet, Distefano, and

Fryer (1966) in which they discussed methodological approaches, factors associated with job satisfaction, and theoretical issues and problems. The authors suggested that it has been difficult to understand how job satisfaction is related to performance because the variables involved are "intercorrelated to such an extent that it is extremely difficult to isolate them for scientific investigation." (p.180) They concluded that much of the data reported in the literature today are contradictory due to an inadequate comprehension of the influence of a wide range of confounded variables and because investigators work from different theoretical positions and use varying methods and different populations of subjects.

Reviewing the evidence concerning the relationship between performance on the job and the worker's satisfaction, Katzell (1957) concluded that the matter can be summed up in a probabilistic statement: The odds are about even that a positive relationship exists, about one to two that no relationship exists and about one to nine that the relationship is negative. Vroom (1964) suggested that the matter is still unclear especially when it is noted that even where positive relationships have been reported, they have been of a very low order of magnitude. Clearly, the relationship between these two variables is no simple problem since there are many factors affecting the magnitude and direction of this relationship.

X In the "The Motivation to Work," Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) offered a two factor theory of job satisfaction which seems to be helpful in considering possible sources of confusion in this area. This theory is discussed in detail here because of its value in drawing

attention to the need for more detailed examination of both the factors affecting job satisfaction and the possibly complex nature of attitudes toward the job. It has also become clear from the studies and discussion stimulated by Herzberg's work, that a more complete understanding of how job attitudes are related to personality variables was necessary before sophisticated questions concerning job performance effects can be asked.

Herzberg, et.al. (1959), were interested in finding the conditions which have an influence on job attitudes of accountants and engineers. The unique method of this study involved asking a group of accountants and engineers to think of a time when they felt "exceptionally good" or "exceptionally bad" about their jobs, either their present job or any other job that they had in the past. Personnel administrators interviewed each of the subjects, explaining the purpose of the project and the nature of the information required. Each respondent was required to provide at least one sequence of events for satisfied and dissatisfied periods of job morale. The workers were also asked to clarify the nature of the events and their personal reactions to these events. The subjects reported the following factors as sources of dissatisfaction: salary, working conditions, supervision, interpersonal relations with supervisors, peers, and subordinates, company policy and administration, factors in personal life, status, and job security. The following six factors were reported to be sources of satisfaction with the job: achievement, recognition, responsibility, growth in skill, advancement, interesting work, and other matters associated with the self-actualization of the individual on the job.

These results led to the controversial "Motivation-Hygiene" theory which states that some factors ("motivators") lead to positive job satisfaction, while the other factors ("hygienes") determine job dissatisfaction. Herzberg refers to the satisfying aspects of the job as "motivators" because they characterize the individual's active "responsibility for psychological growth." He refers to the factors associated with low job satisfaction as "hygiene" factors because they relate to the environment of the working situation and serve to prevent dissatisfaction rather than cause satisfaction with a job. In other words, these hygiene factors which were traditionally perceived by managers as motivators, were now revealed by Herzberg to be dissatisfiers only.

From the analysis of their findings Herzberg and his associates reached some definite conclusions. They reported that satisfaction is not the counterpart of job dissatisfaction. The opposite of job satisfaction is no job satisfaction, and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction. An important generalization from the study claims that job satisfaction was determined by the feelings an individual has for the content of the job and job dissatisfaction is determined by the feelings an individual has toward the environment in which his job is performed.

There have been a number of replications and extensions of the two-factor theory since the publication of the Motivation to Work, in 1959. These studies have essentially validated the study for a number of occupations and organizations.

Saleh (1962 and 1964) reported studies on the source of job satisfaction and its effects on attitudes toward retirement. He hypo-

thesized that "intrinsically" oriented preretirees would have a better attitude to their approaching retirement than those who were "extrinsically" oriented. "Intrinsic" motivation is that which stems from the content of the job, while "extrinsic" motivation is mainly derived from "hygiene" factors or the environment in which the job is performed.

Saleh used two measures: one for assessing the general attitude toward retirement and the other for assessing the preretiree's motivation direction. The measure of attitude toward retirement was established by the use of a seven-point scale to the question, "If I were to rate my general feeling about my coming retirement, I would say that I am ____." For a measure of the degree of intrinsic job satisfaction, Saleh devised a job attitude scale which was presented in a paired comparison format.

The findings of this study showed that preretirees who stressed intrinsic factors as the source of job satisfaction had a more favorable attitude toward retirement than those who stressed the extrinsic factors. Saleh reports that 89% of the positive attitude sequences involved motivator items, in contrast to only 33% for the negative attitude events. Hygiene factors, on the other hand, were six times as frequent in causing negative job attitudes as they were in bringing about positive feelings. This study allowed generalization of the Motivation-Hygiene theory to job satisfaction among those who are about to retire from formal work.

In a study employing the same techniques reported by Herzberg, et.al. (1959), Schwartz, Jenusaitis, and Stark (1963) used supervisors from separate environments as subjects. Two additional independent variables were introduced. The first variable consisted of the 15 scoring categories of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. The second

variable was composed of six non-test items describing the background and status of the subject (age, job classification, education, department, union membership, experience). The results of this investigation showed that five of the original six motivators occurred more frequently in the high job attitude sequences than in low attitude sequences: achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement and possibility of growth. Nine of the ten original hygiene factors were also reported to be significantly more frequent in the low job attitude sequences. Only the "motivator" factor of the work itself and the "hygiene" factor of interpersonal relationships with subordinates were found to have switched roles for this sample of 111 male supervisors. These results strongly supported the conclusions of Herzberg's study, identifying job related factors with negative experiences. The investigators found no variation with respect to the subject's age, job classification, education, and personality.

Myers (1964), in a study of engineers, manufacturing supervisors, hourly technicians, and female assemblers, also found that the factors that motivated employees were different from the factors that dissatisfied employees. This study is important for its evidence on the wide range of populations for which the theory holds and for its finding of differences in the degree of importance of motivators and hygiene factors between job levels. The scientists and engineers showed the most common motivator to be achievement, and the two most frequent hygiene factors to be company policy and administration and supervision which were consistent with Herzberg's prediction. The manufacturing supervisors showed that recognition and achievement were the important motivators, whereas

The theory has been criticized on three bases: the limitation of the theory to the method used in the original design, the inapplicability of the theory to all occupations, and the question of unidimensionality of the two-factors.

Vroom and Maier (1961) emphasized the risk of accepting the individual's descriptions of the real reason for job satisfaction since there is a tendency for the individual to attribute the causes of satisfaction to his own achievements and accomplishments on the job and to attribute dissatisfaction, not to personal inadequacies or deficiencies, but to factors in the work environment.

Ewen (1964) pointed out other deficiencies in the methodology of the Herzberg study and was critical of the narrow range of jobs investigated, and the absence of any measure of overall job satisfaction. That is to say, the generalizing of the results of the original study beyond the situation in which it was obtained was not warranted.

Other investigators have proposed alternatives to Herzberg's interpretation of his controversial study. They argued that the relative frequency with which job-content or job-context features would be mentioned as sources of dissatisfaction may be dependent on the nature of the content and context of the work roles of the respondents. Vroom (1964) used the results of a study by Walker and Guest (1952) on assembly workers in an automobile plant to support this possibility. In the Walker and Guest study, the repetitive nature of the work (job content) was the most frequent factor disliked about the job. On the other hand, pay and security (job context) were the factors liked.

In the same vein, Friedlander (1965) compared the value needs of

white-collar and blue-collar occupations. His findings indicated that the task-centered opportunities for self-actualization were of prime importance to white-collar workers only, while the social environment was of paramount value to the blue-collar workers. Following interviews with a selected cross section of the working population, Centers and Richards (1966) reported the extent to which extrinsic or intrinsic job components were related to occupational levels: at higher occupational levels, intrinsic job components were more valued, at lower occupational levels, extrinsic job components were more valued. All these studies suggest that generalizations about job motivations on the basis of a sample that is too selective can be risky.

Critics of the two-factor theory have questioned the presence of a unidimensional attribute underlying both the motivators and the hygienes and suggest that Herzberg's two-factor theory may be an oversimplified representation of job satisfaction. Ewen (1964) and Burke (1966) questioned Herzberg's assumption that if supervision is a dissatisfier, it cannot be a source of recognition, which is a satisfier. Similarly, salary is a dissatisfier, but it may at the same time, represent achievement and recognition, which again are satisfiers.

Similarly, Malinowsky and Barry (1965) investigated the applicability of Herzberg's assumption of two independent sets of variables (motivator and hygiene) with a sample of 117 blue-collar workers. Through factor analysis of a work attitude survey, it was found that the job attitude of blue-collar workers could be separated into two independent sets of variables comparable to Herzberg's. However, both these sets of variables were found to be positively related to job satis-

faction. Thus, these two sets of work attitudes variables were not totally independent of each other, at least when they are obtained from blue-collar workers.

Friedlander (1964) had eighty subjects from a variety of occupations who were attending evening courses in psychology rate the importance of various factors according to their perceived importance in producing satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Results revealed that intrinsic job characteristics were important to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction, while extrinsic aspects were relatively unimportant as satisfiers or dissatisfiers.

It may be that much of the unexplained discrepancy among the job satisfaction studies can be accounted for by attending to individual differences among workers, by considering the individual workers' personalities and their overall "general" satisfaction.

Among early studies particularly relevant to this approach is that of Kornhauser and Sharp (1932) who examined both job satisfaction and neuroticism and found them not to be related. The investigators did find, however, that the more neurotic and unstable workers were more readily disturbed by certain "undesirable" supervisory practices. McMurry (1932) reported findings for two samples of women employees. He used a personality inventory measuring neuroticism, and correlated it with expressed job satisfaction. In his first sample he obtained a significantly negative correlation between neuroticism and satisfaction, but in the second the correlation was not significant.

Friend and Haggard (1941) analyzed a group of counselees according to a high or low job adjustment on the basis of a job satisfaction

questionnaire. The investigators used detailed life histories in their search for differences between the two groups in family history and in personality trends. Subjects with low adjustment came from "disorganized family groups" while those with high adjustment came from closely knit homes. Herzberg et.al. (1957), and Vroom (1964) consider this study to be an important pioneering and exploratory work in the field of job satisfaction, presenting the first indication that personality and environment of the individual worker may be related to job attitudes.

This problem has also been tackled by investigating the effects of monotonous work on satisfaction. Walker and Guest (1952) hypothesized that repetitive work would, in general, be boring, monotonous, and unpleasant to all workers, and that repetitiveness in a job would, therefore, produce generally unfavourable attitudes toward that job. They discovered, however, that a minority of the automobile assembly line workers who were studied were not averse to the repetitive nature of their work. The authors suggested that an investigation of the individual personalities of these workers would clarify this difference in attitude.

Also investigating susceptibility to industrial monotony, P.C. Smith (1955) used the responses of a group of seventy-two female sewing machine operators, to questions concerning feelings of monotony and boredom on the job. The results of this study revealed the worker susceptible to monotony to be restless in his daily habits and leisure activities and to be "less satisfied with personal, home, and plant situations in aspects not directly concerned with uniformity or repetitiveness" (p.329). Accordingly, the author concluded that feelings of monotony

were a function not only of the task performed, but of more general factors in the individual worker.

Weitz (1952) proposed that job dissatisfaction was but one aspect of general dissatisfaction in all areas of the worker's life. It was the author's contention that those with high general dissatisfaction scores would more likely be dissatisfied with their job. That is to say, a worker's sources of job dissatisfaction were an integral part of how generally dissatisfied a worker is in everyday life. Weitz produced an inventory of items, some directed specifically to the general life situation of the respondent, which he gave to a sample of factory workers. He reported the correlation between general life dissatisfaction and job dissatisfaction to be positive and significant.

X Herzberg et.al. (1957) concluded, after reviewing eight studies relating personality variables to job attitudes, that job dissatisfaction was usually found in association with some form of maladjustment. The authors portrayed the satisfied worker as "a more flexible, better adjusted person, who has come from a superior family environment, or who has the capacity to overcome the effects of an inferior environment."
(p 20)

Herzberg et.al. (1959) were aware of personality differences and attempted to account for these differences when they formulated the two-factor theory by distinguishing between "Motivation seekers" and "Hygiene seekers." The motivation seekers are those who are motivated by the nature of the task and have high tolerance for poor environmental factors. These people are motivated by achievement, responsibility, growth, advancement, work itself, and earned recognition.

"Hygiene seekers," on the other hand, are motivated primarily by the nature of their environment and tend to avoid intrinsic motivational opportunities. They are, instead, motivated in the direction of temporary satisfaction and satisfying their avoidance needs. Hygiene seekers show little interest in quality of work and are preoccupied with maintenance factors relating to the job such as pay, benefits, supervision, working conditions, administration, and fellow employees. On the basis of these assumptions Herzberg (1966) suggested that the neurotic is an individual with a life time pattern of hygiene seeking. His defenses against anxiety represent the origin of his hygiene seeking.

Herzberg and Hamlin (1961) extended the implications of the motivation-hygiene theory to include the fields of mental health and mental illness. The writers postulate two mental attitudes that are necessary for mental health: an avoidance adjustment that is related to the environment, and a personal adjustment which depends on the successful striving for psychological growth and self-actualization. Thus, the factors that are responsible for mental health are those that enhance personal growth and self-actualization: "achievement, responsibility, meaningful work and advancement."

According to this view, the factors which determine mental health are not the opposite of those which determine mental illness. The factors which determine mental illness are those "hygiene factors" which describe the environment of the man and which have little effect on mental health. The factors which determine mental health are those which relate to this personal growth and self-actualization. Thus, total adjustment depends on the satisfaction of two separate type of needs: personal growth experiences and successful avoidance of discomfort from poor hygiene.

This concept of mental health also accounts for the differences in abilities of the individuals to achieve goals. More generally, the individual's achievement will depend on a realistic attitude. That is to say, an individual who has vague aspirations and unrealistic goals is essentially a hygiene seeker who seeks satisfaction in unrealistic surroundings rather than in the job itself.

Hamlin and Nemo (1962) tested this Motivation-Hygiene concept of mental health in a study of schizophrenic patients. The aim of this study was to test whether schizophrenics who had improved in their health according to psychiatric assessment would show a different motivational pattern than a group of schizophrenic patients who had not improved.

The investigators asked the subjects to respond to a forced-choice activity questionnaire in which various occupations and activities were matched and a choice between one or the other had to be made. Subjects were also asked to explain the reasons for their choice and these reasons were classified as motivators or hygienes. The improved schizophrenics were reported to have obtained higher "Motivator" scores than the unimproved. This suggested that the improved patients tended to seek satisfaction in self-actualization: achievement, responsibility and goal-directed efforts. This supported the general proposition that positive mental health depends to a large degree on developing an orientation toward self-actualization. However, this question remains: did the patients improve because they always had this outlook or has their outlook changed as a result of their improved health?

More recently, Vroom (1960) pointed out "that there has, however, been a tendency for investigators in social psychology to concentrate on

one or the other of these sets of variables in the explanation of social phenomena," (p.332). To remedy this deficiency, Vroom studied the effects of employee participation in making decisions which he considered as the independent variable, and job satisfaction which was the dependent variable. For personality factors Vroom measured "need for independence" and "authoritarianism." The "amount of psychological participation" was found to be correlated significantly with the workers' job performance. The size of the correlations varied in direct proportion with the workers' need for independence and authoritarianism. This suggests that authoritarianism and need for independence interact with participation in determining motivation for effective performance.

The literature dealing with the satisfaction-personality relationship presents less disagreement than that noted earlier for the satisfaction-productivity problem. However, the evidence is by no means conclusive. New measures of job attitudes that distinguish between personality types should provide more insight into the nature of interaction between personality-variable and job satisfaction. It may be that the recent two-factor theory developed by Herzberg can be used to account, at least in part, for the individual differences among workers in the domain of "personality."

III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The present study was undertaken to examine some implications of the general proposition that job attitudes are a part of the whole structure of attitudes of the individual and so should relate meaningfully to personality variables and to attitudes of satisfaction with other life circumstances, external to the job. The difficulty investigators have experienced in demonstrating relations between job performance and job satisfaction may result partly from the lack of specificity of these job satisfaction measures. These measures may be greatly influenced by personality and general life satisfaction of workers rather than specifically by the job experiences.

Herzberg proposed that a dimension of job satisfaction relates to a particular sub-set of the attitudes of an individual which are relevant to motivation to work. A job satisfaction measure like that of the Job Attitude Scale, devised to tap this special dimension of job satisfaction, should be positively related to personal adjustment, but negatively related to neuroticism.

In the present study the relation between intrinsic job satisfaction and personal adjustment was compared with the relation of overall job satisfaction and personal adjustment. The overall job satisfaction measure should relate positively to general satisfaction. The overall job satisfaction however, is not expected to show as high a relationship with either personal adjustment or neuroticism as these variables will with the Job Attitude Scale.

To examine this difference in the characteristics of a general satisfaction measure and a specific job satisfaction measure, scales measuring both were administered to a sample of public school teachers, who are assumed to be from a relatively homogeneous work setting. These scores were then related to measures designed to reflect personality variables concerned with adjustment. For this purpose a scale devised by Weitz (1958) to measure general satisfaction was used. The neuroticism scale of the Eysenck Personality Inventory was employed as an index of personal differences in adjustment of a fundamental sort. The California Psychological Inventory was selected for use as a measure with several dimensions related to personal adjustment.

The data collected to test these ideas were examined in the light of the following specific hypotheses:

- 1) "Overall" job satisfaction, as measured by the Job Description Index, will relate negatively to neuroticism, as measured by the Eysenck Personality Inventory, and positively both to general satisfaction, as measured by Weitz's General Satisfaction Index, and to those personality qualities considered to reflect good personal adjustment, as measured by the California Psychological Inventory.

- 2) "Intrinsic" job satisfaction, as measured by the Job Attitude Scale, will relate negatively to neuroticism, and positively both to general satisfaction, and to those personality qualities considered to reflect good personal adjustment.

- 3) The unique importance of motivational factors as measured by the "intrinsic" job satisfaction scale, as distinguished from the conventional "overall" satisfaction measure, should be reflected in:

- (a) The absence of a relationship between these two measures of job satisfaction,
- (b) The presence of a higher negative relation between "intrinsic" job satisfaction and neuroticism, than between "overall" job satisfaction scores and neuroticism, and
- (c) The presence of a higher positive relation between "intrinsic" job satisfaction and the personality variables indexing good personal adjustment, than between "overall" job satisfaction scores and those same personality variables.

IV. METHOD

1. Subjects

The subjects were 101 public school teachers, 68 males and 33 females who attended summer school at Waterloo University College. The subjects ranged in age from 20 to 64. Their mean age was 29.8. The distribution of the subjects' professional level was as follows:

Category I: 20

Category II: 32

Category III: 44

Category IV: 5

These categories reflect the level of competence of these teachers according to the classification of the boards of education as determined by experience and education. Thus, those in the lower categories are less experienced and have few or no courses toward their B.A. degree, whereas those in the higher categories have more experience teaching and are close to completing their B.A. degree.

2. Apparatus

Five questionnaires were used in this study: two measures of job satisfaction, one measure of neuroticism, one personality inventory, and a measure of "general" satisfaction.

a) The measurement of Job Satisfaction:

The two attitude questionnaires used to provide measurements of the subjects' degree of job satisfaction included the Job Description

Index (J.D.I.) and the Job Attitude Scale (J.A.S.).

i) The Job Description Index (J.D.I.)

The Job Description Index is a job satisfaction measure developed for use in the Cornell Studies of Job Satisfaction. (Hulin, Smith, Kendall, and Locke, 1963). The J.D.I. offers measures of satisfaction with five areas of jobs: the type of work, the pay, the opportunities for promotion, the supervision, and the people on the job. For each area there is a list of adjectives or descriptive phrases with a blank space beside it. The respondent is asked to write "y" for "yes" beside each word or phrase that describes the aspect of his job in question, or "n" for "no" beside the adjective or phrase if it does not describe it. He is asked to write "?" if he is undecided.

The advantage of this instrument is that it requires the respondents to describe their work, rather than ask them how satisfied they were. It is believed that in "describing" his job, the subject shows his satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with it. Another advantage of this instrument is that it measures the respondents' attitude toward different aspects of his job rather than "global" or "general" satisfaction.

The developers of the J.D.I. chose 30 to 40 items for each scale from other job satisfaction inventories and available lists of adjectives or phrases which could apply to various aspects of a job. These items were then subjected to several series of analyses, item intercorrelations, and item validation before the final format was reached. A total of 952 people in seven different organizations were used in the development of the J.D.I.

Split-half estimates of internal consistency yielded average reliabilities of +0.79 and +0.74 using 168 Cornell students as subjects (Smith, 1963). The split-half internal consistencies for the final revised J.D.I. scale, using a sample of 80 employees from two electronic plants was over 0.80. The validity of the scale was evaluated through the convergent and discriminant validity correlation of four methods of rating satisfactions with the five job areas. The correlations reported by the investigators (Locke, Smith, Hulin, and Kendall, 1963) were all significant and ranged from 0.30 to 0.59.

ii) The Job Attitude Scale (J.A.S.)

The Job Attitude Scale (J.A.S.) developed by Saleh (1963), consists of 16 statements representing six "job related" factors, and ten "context related" factors. The "job related" factors were: achievement, recognition, advancement, growth in skill, responsibility, and interesting work. The following ten factors were "context related" factors: salary, interpersonal relations with supervisors, interpersonal relations with subordinates, interpersonal relations with peers, technical supervision, company policy and administration, working conditions, factors in personal life, status, and job security.

Each statement is paired with the other fifteen in a forced choice format. The statements are distributed evenly and each statement has the same chance to appear as the first or the second item in the scale. The "social desirability" or appeal of the statements was checked against Uhrbrook's extensive list of standardized statements. (Saleh, 1962) A split-half reliability coefficient of 0.94 was found by Saleh (1963) using 18 university freshmen as subjects.

The scale is scored by a key which yields the number of "job related" statements checked by the subject. In other words, the resulting figure is the "degree" to which the subject is "intrinsically" oriented. (i.e. the number of times a motivator factor was chosen over a paired hygiene factor.) The directions instructed the subject to:

Indicate in each of the following items which of the two factors will be more satisfying to you as you perform your job. Make only ONE choice for every pair of statements. DO NOT SKIP ANY PAIRS. If you find it hard to choose between two statements, just make the best choice you can.

b) The measurement of Neuroticism

The Eysenck Personality Inventory (E.P.I.) was employed to measure neuroticism (N). The E.P.I. was derived from the Maudsley Personality Inventory, which Eysenck developed in 1959, and is usually referred to as "the American Edition of the Maudsley Personality Inventory." It contains 57 items of which 24 are keyed to measure neuroticism, 24 to measure extraversion, and a lie scale which is borrowed from the MMPI to detect subjects who are inclined to "fake good".

Split-half and Kuder-Richardson estimates of item intercorrelations for each scale are between 0.75 and 0.90 in various samples (Eysenck, 1964). "Neuroticism" has a consistently higher reliability than "Extraversion." Test-retest reliabilities range from 0.70 to 0.90 which are among the highest to be found among personality inventories.

Although validity information on the E.P.I. is not yet available, it is pointed out by the authors (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1964) that "individuals who impress others as being stable or unstable in their everyday behavior, ans-

wer the E.P.I. in a corresponding manner." (p.13)

c) The measurement of "General" satisfaction:

Weitz (1952) proposed that the satisfaction of a worker be interpreted in the light of some general satisfaction index. To measure this general satisfaction, Weitz developed a questionnaire which contains a number of items that require the subject to check if he was satisfied with the situation described by that particular item or not. Some of the items were directed specifically to the subject's job or work and the other items to matters relating to the general life situation of the respondent. An examination of the split-half reliability of this questionnaire, yielded a correlation of 0.75 (Weitz, 1952).

d) The Personality Inventory:

The California Psychological Inventory (C.P.I.) is a 480 item true-false personality inventory yielding scores on 18 factors of "normal" functioning. The scales are grouped into four broad categories:

Class I. Measures of poise, ascendancy and self-assurance

- | | |
|-------|---------------------|
| 1. Do | Dominance |
| 2. Cs | Capacity for Status |
| 3. Sy | Sociability |
| 4. Sp | Social Presence |
| 5. Sa | Self-Acceptance |
| 6. Wb | Sense of Well-being |

Class II. Measures of socialization, maturity, and responsibility

- | | |
|-------|----------------|
| 7. Re | Responsibility |
| 8. So | Socialization |
| 9. Sc | Self-control |

- 10. To Tolerance
- 11. Gi Good impression
- 12. Cm Communalility

Class III. Measures of achievement potential and intellectual efficiency

- 13. Ac Achievement via conformance
- 14. Ai Achievement via conformance
- 15. Ie Intellectual efficiency

Class IV. Measures of intellectual and interest modes

- 16. Py Psychological-mindedness
- 17. Fx Flexibility
- 18. Fe Femininity

The inventory was developed primarily for use with "normal" (or non-psychiatrically disturbed) subjects, and for use in settings other than psychiatric clinics. The scales were designed to measure personality characteristics which have a wide applicability to general human behavior.

Test-retest reliabilities based on 200 male prisoners retested after one to three weeks ranged from 0.49 to 0.87 with a median of 0.80. For high school subjects retested after one year, the median test-retest correlation was 0.65 for males and 0.68 for females. The validity coefficients of the subscales, based largely on differences between extreme groups and on cross validation studies, ranged from 0.21 to 0.60. The manual also reports intercorrelations of C.P.I. scores with those of several other widely used tests of personality (Gough, 1957).

3. Procedure

The five questionnaires were administered over a period of two days to a group of 101 public school teachers attending psychology classes

during the summer session at Waterloo University College. The California Psychological Inventory and the Job Attitude Scale were administered on the first day and the General Satisfaction Index, the Job Description Index, and the Eysenck Personality Inventory were administered on the second day. Anonymity was guaranteed and the subjects were assured that the data was to be kept confidential and that the research focus was on group results.

V. RESULTS

The findings of this study are presented in three sections. Average scores and intercorrelations of the measures of job satisfaction, neuroticism, and general satisfaction are considered first. Secondly, average scores obtained on the personality variables of the California Psychological Inventory and the correlation of these variables with the two job satisfaction measures, neuroticism, and general satisfaction are reported. Thirdly, the differences between the two job satisfaction measures, in terms of their relationships with the other variables are examined.

(1) Intercorrelations of the Job Description Index, the Job Attitude Scale, Neuroticism, and the General Satisfaction Index.

A comparison was made of male and female scores on the Job Description Index, the Job Attitude Scale, Neuroticism, and the General Satisfaction Index. As shown in Table 1, the mean scores of men and women on the life satisfaction scale and the two job satisfaction scales were very similar. In the case of neuroticism, however, women obtained significantly higher scores than men at the 0.05 level of confidence as shown by the t-test. Use of the F-ratio revealed no differences between the variances of male and female scores on these measures.

The intercorrelations of the Job Description Index, the Job Attitude Scale, Neuroticism, and the General Satisfaction Index, were computed separately for males and females. The correlations for the male

sample are shown in Table II. In that table it can be seen that there was a significantly negative correlation between Neuroticism and the three other measures: the Job Description Index, the Job Attitude Scale, and the General Satisfaction Index, while significant positive correlation was found between the General Satisfaction Index and the Job Description Index. The correlations between the two job satisfaction measures, and between the General Satisfaction Index and the Job Attitude Scale were not significantly different from zero.

In the case of the female sample, as shown in Table III, none of the intercorrelations were significant. However, the pattern is clearly congruent with that of the male sample.

The differences between the intercorrelations of the two samples were examined with the results shown in Appendix A. The Z-score revealed only one significant difference at the 0.05 level of confidence between the intercorrelations of the two samples: that between neuroticism and the Job Attitude Scale was significantly higher for the sample of males than it was for the females. The other differences were not significant.

TABLE I

Means and Standard Deviations of the Job Description Index, Job Attitude Scale, Neuroticism, and the General Satisfaction Index

Inventory	Means and Standard Deviations				t	F
	Males (N=68)		Females (N=33)			
	M	SD	M	SD		
J.D.I.	161.4	20.5	158.2	23.1	-.71	1.26
J.A.S.	31.4	10.0	29.5	8.5	.95	1.36
Neuroticism	7.9	3.6	10.5	4.1	-3.26*	1.29
G.S.I.	25.2	7.0	24.4	6.2	.56	1.27

*p < 0.05

TABLE II

Intercorrelations between the Job Description Index, (J.D.I.), Job Attitude Scale, (J.A.S.), Neuroticism, and the General Satisfaction Index, (G.S.I.), for the Male Sample (N=68)

	J.D.I.	J.A.S.	Neuroticism	G.S.I.
J.D.I.				
J.A.S.	.09		-.30*	.28*
Neuroticism			-.37*	-.05
G.S.I.				-.33*

* $p < 0.05$

TABLE III

Intercorrelations between the Job Description Index, (J.D.I.), Job Attitude Scale, (J.A.S.), Neuroticism, and the General Satisfaction Index, (G.S.I.), for the Female Sample (N=33)

	J.D.I.	J.A.S.	Neuroticism	G.S.I.
J.D.I.		.00	-.25	.33
J.A.S.			.24	.01
Neuroticism				-.25
G.S.I.				

(2) Relations of the California Psychological Inventory and the Job Description Index, the Job Attitude Scale, Neuroticism, and the General Satisfaction Index:

Comparisons were made for both the means and standard deviations of male and female scores on the California Psychological Inventory. The results of the analyses are shown in Table IV. The F test provided no basis for rejecting the hypothesis that there was homogeneity of variance on all 18 C.P.I. dimensions for men and women. The analysis of the difference between the means by means of t tests revealed, at the .05 level of confidence, that the men scored significantly higher on the dimensions of dominance, social presence, and self acceptance, whereas the women scored significantly higher on the femininity scale.

The Correlation coefficients found between the Job Description Index, the Job Attitude Scale, Neuroticism, the General Satisfaction Index and the 18 personality dimensions on the California Psychological Inventory are reported in Tables V and VI for the males and females respectively.

The males scores showed a positive significant relationship between the Job Description Index and four dimensions on the California Psychological Inventory: socialization, self-control, tolerance, and good impression. The Job Attitude Scale yielded positive correlations with six of the California Psychological Inventory variables: dominance, sociability, social presence, sense of well being, tolerance, achievement via conformance, and intellectual efficiency. The only personality dimension which related to both job satisfaction scales was tolerance.

For the same group of subjects, neuroticism was found to correlate significantly and negatively with eleven of the California Psychological Inventory dimensions. The General Satisfaction Index correlated significantly and positively with the following three variables: sense of well

TABLE IV

Means and Standard Deviations on the California Psychological Inventory Variables for the Male and Female Samples

Variable (C.P.I.)	Means and Standard Deviations				t	F
	Males (N=68)		Females (N=33)			
	M	SD	M	SD		
Dominance (Do)	28.5	5.5	26.2	4.9	2.01*	1.25
Capacity for Status (Cs)	20.3	3.1	19.6	3.4	1.01	1.23
Sociability (Sy)	25.6	4.2	24.0	3.3	1.91	1.66
Social presence (Sp)	37.8	6.0	34.1	5.6	3.02*	1.13
Self acceptance (Sa)	22.6	4.0	20.8	3.1	2.29*	1.63
Sense of well being (Wb)	37.7	4.0	37.5	4.1	.26	1.08
Responsibility (Re)	30.8	4.0	31.5	4.0	-.79	1.01
Socialization (So)	37.7	4.4	38.6	3.8	-.98	1.35
Self control (Sc)	29.6	7.4	31.5	7.4	-1.20	1.00
Tolerance (To)	24.1	4.2	24.1	3.7	.01	1.30
Good impression (Gi)	17.1	5.1	18.5	5.8	-1.24	1.30
Communality (Cm)	26.1	2.0	26.2	1.6	.20	1.62
Achievement via Conformance (Ac)	28.6	4.1	28.3	3.5	.43	1.39
Achievement via independence (Ai)	21.0	3.8	22.3	3.9	-1.52	1.03
Intellectual efficiency (Ie)	39.6	4.5	39.1	3.7	.53	1.53
Psychol. Mindedness (Py)	11.8	2.8	11.9	3.0	-.16	1.16
Flexibility (Fx)	10.2	4.1	10.9	3.7	-.82	1.17
Femininity (Fe)	17.4	3.4	24.7	3.4	-10.20*	1.01

* $p < 0.05$

TABLE V

Correlations between the California Psychological Inventory
(C.P.I.) and the Job Description (J.D.I.) Index, Job
Attitude Scale, (J.A.S.) Neuroticism, and the General
Satisfaction Index (G.S.I.), for the Male Sample (N=68)

Variable (C.P.I.)	J.D.I.	J.A.S.	Neuroticism	G.S.I.
Dominance (Do)	.08	.25*	-.28	-.04
Capacity for status (Cs)	-.01	.22	-.33*	.14
Sociability (Sy)	.14	.30*	-.33*	.09
Social presence (Sp)	.10	.32*	-.33*	.09
Self acceptance (Sa)	.13	-.02	-.13	-.05
Sense of well being (Wb)	.16	.31*	-.54*	.35*
Responsibility (Re)	.03	.15	-.12	.00
Socialization (So)	.29*	-.05	-.14	.21
Self control (Sc)	.24*	-.12	-.33*	.30*
Tolerance (To)	.31*	.39*	-.53*	.21
Good impression (Gi)	.26*	.22	-.42*	.25*
Communality (Cm)	-.14	.07	.10	-.12
Achievement via conformance (Ac)	.24*	.24*	-.38*	.30*
Achievement via independence (Ai)	.07	.22	-.20	.10
Intellectual efficiency (Ie)	.14	.46*	-.41*	.18
Psychological mindedness (Py)	.17	.20	-.28*	.05
Flexibility (Fx)	.13	.21	-.22	.04
Femininity (Fe)	.13	-.01	.07	.25*

* $p < 0.05$

TABLE VI

Intercorrelations between the California Psychological Inventory variables and the Job Description Index, Job Attitude Scale, Neuroticism, and the General Satisfaction Index for the Female Sample (N=33)

Variable (C.P.I.)	J.D.I.	J.A.S.	Neuroticism	G.S.I.
Dominance	.10	.11	-.30	.29
Capacity for status	.19	-.15	-.26	.14
Sociability	.19	.07	-.28	.21
Social presence	.08	.13	-.19	.09
Self acceptance	.05	.13	-.19	.18
Sense of well being	.29	.16	-.34	.13
Responsibility	.23	-.02	-.19	.08
Socialization	.43*	-.07	-.65*	.25
Self control	.34	-.03	-.56*	.11
Tolerance	.35*	.10	-.47*	.06
Good impression	.27	-.001	-.43*	.40*
Communality	.22	.00	-.03	-.14
Achievement via conformance	.28	-.06	-.51*	.08
Achievement via independence	.19	.19	-.24	-.11
Intellectual efficiency	.37*	.19	-.24	.02
Psychological mindedness	.03	.10	-.25	-.04
Flexibility	.03	.11	-.21	-.20
Femininity	-.18	.00	.28	-.16

* $p < 0.05$

being, self-control, and good impression.

For the group of female subjects, the Job Description Index correlated significantly with only three of the 18 variables of the California Psychological Inventory: socialization, tolerance, and intellectual efficiency. There was no significant correlation between the Job Attitude Scale and any of the personality variables.

Neuroticism correlated negatively and significantly with five of the variables of the California Psychological Inventory: socialization, self-control, tolerance, good impression, and achievement via conformance. The General Satisfaction Index was found to correlate significantly with only one variable of the California Psychological Inventory: good impression.

The difference between the intercorrelations of the two job satisfaction measures with the 18 variables of the California Psychological Inventory for the male and female sample were examined, with the results shown in Appendices B and C respectively. There was no significant difference between the two sets of correlations of the two samples.

(3) Differences between the Job Description Index and the Job Attitude Scale in terms of their relations with neuroticism, general satisfaction, and the 18 personality variables.

The correlations between the two job satisfaction measures, as reported in the first section, were found not to be significantly different from zero for both the males and females. These two correlations were reported in Tables II and III. There was no significant difference between the correlations derived from the two samples.

In the case of the male sample, two significant differences were found between the two job satisfaction measures in terms of their relationship to the other variables. The correlation of socialization with the Job Description Index was significantly higher, at the 0.05 level of confidence, than that with the Job Attitude Scale. Intellectual efficiency, on the other hand, correlated significantly higher with the Job Attitude Scale, at the 0.05 level of confidence, than with the Job Description Index.

In the case of the female sample, there was also two such significant differences. Neuroticism correlated negatively with the Job Description Index, but positively with the Job Attitude Scale. The difference between those two correlations was significant. Socialization also correlated significantly higher with the Job Attitude Scale than with the Job Description Index. Both of these differences were significant at the 0.05 level of confidence.

VI. DISCUSSION

1) Overall job satisfaction, General Satisfaction, and Personal Adjustment

The first major question raised in this study asked whether persons who are, in general, satisfied with their jobs are better adjusted and more satisfied with life than those who are less satisfied with their jobs. The results obtained with the male teachers indicated that the answer to the question may be in the affirmative. Data from the female sample, however, provided no support for the hypothesis in question.

The percentage of significant correlations found for the two samples supports the above conclusion. For the male group, six of the twenty scales used in the study correlated with overall job satisfaction in the expected direction. For the group of females, however, only three of the twenty correlations carried out were found to be significant and in the expected direction. This suggests that job satisfaction in the case of males cannot be considered independent of personal adjustment and satisfaction with other life situations.

The discrepancy between the male and female results may be a reflection of the difference in importance of the work role to the self-concept between men and women. In support of this argument is the observation that the men and women differed significantly on five of the twenty variables. Specifically, the men scored significantly higher on the scales of dominance, social presence, and self-acceptance, whereas the women were significantly higher on neuroticism and femininity. All of these differences, except for neuroticism, are consistent with the social

roles of males and females in western society. It is not known, however, why the women scored significantly higher on the neuroticism scale.

The relation of overall job satisfaction to neuroticism, and to the other scales of personal adjustment, suggests that job satisfaction may be a function of a generalized tendency not to become anxious in response to external pressures or situational states. The relation of overall job satisfaction to general satisfaction suggests that the more job-satisfied subject would continue to be relatively satisfied regardless of how the situation itself might change, whereas the dissatisfied worker would tend to remain "unsatisfied" although his work situation was radically changed. Furthermore, the positive relation of overall job satisfaction to socialization in both samples, suggests that the more satisfied teacher is more socialized and self-confident in personal interaction.

2) Intrinsic Job Satisfaction, General Satisfaction, and Personal Adjustment

The second hypothesis stated that intrinsic job satisfaction would relate positively to general satisfaction and to personal adjustment. Again, there was a difference between the male and female groups. Eight of the twenty correlations between intrinsic job satisfaction and personal adjustment measures were found to be significant for the group of males, whereas none of these correlations were found to be significant in the case of the females. The relations in question then, exist only for the male sample. This finding is consistent with the previous explanation that men and women differ in their attitudinal and motivational structure.

Specifically, for the male sample, the measure of intrinsic job satisfaction was found to correlate significantly and negatively with neuroticism, and positively with dominance, sociability, social presence, sense of well being, tolerance, achievement via conformance, and intellectual efficiency. These findings support Herzberg's contention that the intrinsically motivated worker is less neurotic, and possesses qualities consistent with personal adjustment. These results also suggest that the intrinsically oriented male teacher is more socialized and self-confident in personal interaction, and possesses greater potential for effective personal functioning than the extrinsically oriented worker.

No significant relation was found between intrinsic job satisfaction and general satisfaction for either of the two samples. This result is not consistent with the hypothesis in question. The implication here is that the intrinsically oriented teacher may not necessarily be satisfied with other life circumstances external to the job.

3) Overall Job Satisfaction and Intrinsic Job Satisfaction Compared

The third major question raised in this study asks whether the two job satisfaction measures relate to each other and whether their relations to the measures of personal adjustment are similar in pattern.

It was specifically hypothesized that there would not be a relationship between the two measures of job satisfaction. It was also hypothesized that the measure of intrinsic job satisfaction would show a higher correlation with variables indexing personal adjustment than would the measure of overall job satisfaction.

No relation was found between the two job satisfaction measures for either of the two samples. This suggests that the two job satisfaction

measures are tapping different aspects of job satisfaction. In support of this conclusion is the observation that socialization, a measure of social maturity, correlated significantly with overall job satisfaction in both samples, and did not show any significant relation to the measure of intrinsic job satisfaction. The difference between the correlations of the two job satisfaction measures with socialization was found to be significant in the case of both samples.

It is also of interest to note here that intrinsic job satisfaction correlated significantly with two measures of achievement potential and intellectual efficiency for the male sample. This evidence suggests that the Job Attitude Scale may be tapping achievement potential and intellectual efficiency, both qualities which are likely to be associated with the "intrinsically" oriented, according to Herzberg's distinction between those who are motivated by the content of the work itself, and those who are motivated by the environmental aspects of the job.

There was no evidence to support the hypothesis that the Job Attitude Scale would yield higher correlations with the personality variables measuring good personal adjustment than would the measure of overall job satisfaction. Both the Job Attitude Scale and the Job Description Index related to different sets of variables, and only two significant differences were found between the way the two job satisfaction measures related to the other variables.

4) Conclusions

It was hypothesized in this study that job satisfaction is related to general mental health and to certain personality dimensions.

This position was supported by the relationship found in the present study between indicators of positive mental health, general satisfaction, and personality dimensions, and the two measures of job satisfaction.

It can be concluded from the present study that some underlying factors of personal characteristics are, at least in part, determinants of feelings and attitudes toward and about the job. It is also possible to conclude that "job satisfaction" represents a sampling of the general domain of "attitudes." One should not then continue to talk about the relationship of job satisfaction to personality, but rather about job satisfaction as one aspect of personality.

There was little evidence supporting Herzberg's prediction regarding the intrinsically oriented worker having better personal adjustment. It is clear that both "intrinsic" and "overall" job satisfaction relate equally to personal adjustment. However, the measure of intrinsic job satisfaction does appear to tap achievement potential and effective intellectual functioning.

Future research on the subject of job satisfaction should include measures of the worker's personality since there is evidence of relations existing between the worker's personal characteristics and his attitude toward the environment in which he works. A cross-validation of the findings of this research, using a different type of work group and different measures, would test their generality.

VII. SUMMARY

A review of the literature of the area of job satisfaction revealed that most studies concentrated on the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity. This study was undertaken to probe a most neglected aspect: the relation between personality characteristics and job attitude. By measuring both job attitudes and personality variables of a sample of public school teachers, the study attempted to answer two main questions:

- 1) Are there personality characteristics which will differentiate teachers who are satisfied with their jobs from those who are dissatisfied? And are there personality characteristics which are specifically related to the two types of motivation distinguished by Herzberg's two-factor theory?
- 2) Are job attitudes a reflection of the total adjustment of the individual and does job satisfaction reflect the individual's satisfaction with other aspects of his environment?

Five inventories were administered to 68 male and 33 female public school teachers attending summer session courses at Waterloo University College. These five inventories measured the following variables: overall satisfaction with the job, intrinsic job satisfaction, general satisfaction, 18 personality variables, and neuroticism.

The intercorrelations between these five measures were considered separately for the males and females. The overall results of the study

suggest that maladjustment has a negative relation to job satisfaction. For the male sample, significantly negative correlations were found between overall job satisfaction and neuroticism. Significantly positive correlations were found between overall job satisfaction and the following variables: general satisfaction, socialization, self-control, tolerance, and good impression. Intrinsic job satisfaction correlated positively and significantly with: dominance, sociability, social presence, sense of well being, tolerance, achievement via conformance, and intellectual efficiency.

For the female sample, neither of the job satisfaction measures correlated significantly with neuroticism. The measure of overall job satisfaction did, however, correlate positively and significantly with three personality dimensions: socialization, tolerance, and intellectual efficiency. No significant correlations were found between the measure of intrinsic job satisfaction and any of the personality dimensions. The only significant difference between the correlations of the male and female samples was that of the Job Attitude Scale and neuroticism which was positive but not significant for the females, negative and significant for the males. A comparison of the two job satisfaction measures in terms of their relationship to all the variables under study, revealed two significant differences for each of the two samples. These two differences were not significant, however, in terms of the predictions made by the third hypothesis of this study.

The implications and significance of the results were discussed. It is clear that overall job satisfaction and intrinsic job satisfaction are positively related to both personal and social adjustment. However,

it appears that the measures tap separate areas of personality dimensions with the measure of intrinsic job satisfaction tapping achievement potential and effective intellectual functioning, and the measure of overall job satisfaction tapping general satisfaction and social adjustment.

REFERENCES

- Brayfield, A.H. and Crockett, W.H. Employee attitude and employee performance. Psychol. Bull., 1955, 52, 396-424.
- Burke, Ronald J. Are Herzberg's motivators and hygienics unidimensional? J. appl. Psychol., 1966, 50, 317-321.
- Centers, Richard, and Byental, Daphne, E. Intrinsic and extrinsic job motivation among different segments of the working population. J. appl. Psychol., 1966, 50, 193-197.
- Ewen, Robert. Some determinants of job satisfaction: A study of the generality of Herzberg's theory. J. appl. Psychol., 1964, 48, 161-163.
- Eysenck, H.J. and Eysenck, S.G. Manual of the Eysenck Personality Inventory. London: University of London Press, 1964.
- Fournet, Glenn P., Distefano Jr., M.K. and Pryer, Margaret, W. Job satisfaction: Issues and problems. Personnel Psychol., 1966, 19, 165-183.
- Friedlander, Frank. Job characteristics as satisfiers and dissatisfiers. J. appl. Psychol., 1964, 48, 388-392.
- Friedlander, Frank. Comparative work value systems. Personnel Psychol., 1965, 18, 1-20.
- Friedlander, F. and Walton, E. Positive and negative motivation toward work. Administration Sci. Quart., 1964, 9, 194-207.
- Friend, Jeanette G., and Haggard, E.A. Work adjustment in relation to family background. Appl. Psychol. Monogr., 1948, No. 16.
- Gough, Harrison G. Manual for the California Psychological Inventory. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1957.
- Haire, M. Psychological problems relevant to business and industry. Psychol. Bull., 1959, 56, 169-194.
- Hamlin, R. and Nemo, R. Self-actualization in choice scores of improved schizophrenics. J. clin. Psychol., 1961, 18.
- Herzberg, Frederick. Job attitudes in the Soviet Union. Personnel Psychol., 1965, 18, 245-252.

- Herzberg, Frederick. The motivation to work among Finnish supervisors. Personnel Psychol., 1965, 18, 393-402.
- Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the nature of man. Cleveland: The world publishing Company, 1966.
- Herzberg, F. and Maslin, R.M. A motivation-hygiene concept of mental health. Ment. Hyg., 1961, 45, 394-401.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, R., Peterson, R. and Capwell, D. Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Services of Pittsburgh, 1957.
- Herzberg, R., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. The motivation to work. New York: Wiley: 1959.
- Hoppeck, Robert. Comparisons of satisfied and dissatisfied teachers. Psychol. Bull., 1935, 32, 681-691.
- Hulin, C.L., Smith, P.C., Kendell, L.M. and Locke, E.A. Cornell studies of job satisfaction: II. Model and method of measuring job satisfaction. Cornell University, 1963. (Mimeo)
- Katzell, R.A. "Industrial psychology." Annual Rev. Psychol., 1957, 8, 237-268.
- Kornhauser, A. and Sharp, A. Employee attitudes: suggestions from a study in a factory. Personnel J. 1932, 10, 393-401.
- Locke, E.A., Smith, P.C., Hulin, C.L. and Kendall, L.M. Cornell studies of job satisfaction: V. Scale characteristics of the job description index. Cornell University, 1963. (Mimeo)
- Malinowsky, Michael R. and Barry, John R. Job attitudes of blue-collar workers. J. appl. Psychol., 1965, 49, 446-451.
- McMurry, R.N. Efficiency, work-satisfaction, and neurotic tendency. Personnel J., 1932, 11, 201-210.
- Meyers, M.E. Who are your motivated workers? Harvard Business Review, 1964, 42, 73-88.
- Saleh, S.D. A study of attitude change and its effect on the pre-retirement period. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Western Reserve Univer., 1962.
- Saleh, S.D. A study of attitude change in the pre-retirement period. J. appl. Psychol., 1964, 48, 310-312.
- Schwartz, Milton, J., Jenusaitis, Edmund and Stark, Harry. Motivational factors among supervisors in the utility industry. Personnel Psychol., 1963, 16, 45-53.

- Smith, Patricia C. The prediction of individual differences in susceptibility to industrial monotony. J. appl. Psychol., 1955, 39, 322-329.
- Smith, P.C. Cornell studies of job satisfaction: I. Strategy for the development of a general theory of job satisfaction. Cornell University, 1963. (Mimeo)
- Taylor, F.W. The principles of scientific management. New York: Harper, 1911.
- Vroom, V.H. Some personality determinants of the effects of participation. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1960.
- Vroom, V.H. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Vroom, V.H., and Maier, N.R.F. Industrial social psychology. M. Farusworth, P.R., McNemar, O. and McNemar, Q. (Eds.) Annual Review of Psychology, 1961, 12, 413-446.
- Walker, C.R. and Guest, R.H. The man on the assembly line. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Weitz, Joseph. A neglected concept in the study of job satisfaction. Personnel Psychol., 1952, 5, 201-205.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Differences between Male and Female Intercorrelations of Job
Description Index, the Job Attitude Scale, Neuroticism,
and the General Satisfaction Index

Variables	Correlation Coefficients		Z
	Male (N=68)	Female (N=33)	
J.D.I. & J.A.S.	.09	.00	.40
J.D.I. & Neuroticism	-.30	-.25	-.30
J.D.I. & G.S.I.	.28	.33	-.23
J.A.S. & N.	-.37	.24	2.76*
J.A.S. & G.S.I.	.15	.01	.62
N. & G.S.I.	-.25	-.33	-.41

* $p < 0.05$

APPENDIX B

Differences between the male and female samples on the intercorrelation between the Job Description Index and the 18 variables on the California Psychological Inventory

Variables	Correlation Coefficients		Z*
	Male (N=68)	Female (N=33)	
J.D.I. & Do	.08	-.10	-.83
J.D.I. & Cs	-.01	.19	.90
J.D.I. & Sy	.14	.19	.20
J.D.I. & Sp	.10	.08	.10
J.D.I. & Sa	.13	.05	.36
J.D.I. & Wb	.16	.29	.62
J.D.I. & Re	.03	.23	.90
J.D.I. & So	.29	.43	.73
J.D.I. & Sc	.24	.34	.49
J.D.I. & To	.31	.35	.23
J.D.I. & Gi	.26	.27	.05
J.D.I. & Cm	-.14	.22	1.60
J.D.I. & Ac	.24	.28	.23
J.D.I. & Ai	.07	.19	.54
J.D.I. & Ie	.14	.37	.67
J.D.I. & Py	.17	.03	.63
J.D.I. & Fx	.13	.03	.45
J.D.I. & Fe	.13	-.18	-.95

*None of the Z values were found to be significant at the 0.05 level of confidence.

APPENDIX C

Differences between the Male and Female Samples on the Intercorrelations between the Job Attitude Scale and the 18 Variables of the California Psychological Inventory

Variables	Correlation Coefficients		Z*
	Male (N=68)	Female (N=33)	
J.A.S. & Do	.25	.11	.63
J.A.S. & Cs	.22	-.15	1.64
J.A.S. & Sy	.30	.07	1.10
J.A.S. & Sp	.32	.13	.93
J.A.S. & Sa	-.02	.13	.71
J.A.S. & Wb	.31	.16	.75
J.A.S. & Re	.15	-.02	.76
J.A.S. & So	-.05	-.07	-.16
J.A.S. & Sc	-.12	-.03	-.40
J.A.S. & To	.39	.10	1.42
J.A.S. & Gi	.22	-.01	1.02
J.A.S. & Cm	.07	.00	.32
J.A.S. & Ac	.24	-.06	1.39
J.A.S. & Ai	.22	.19	.12
J.A.S. & Ie	.46	.19	1.40
J.A.S. & Py	.20	.10	.45
J.A.S. & Fx	.21	.11	.45
J.A.S. & Fe	-.01	.00	-.01

*None of the Z values were found to be significant at the 0.05 level of confidence.

APPENDIX D

Comparison of the Job Description Index and the Job
Attitude Scale with all the Variables under study
(Male Sample, N=68)

Variables	Correlation Coefficients		t
	J.A.S.	J.D.I.	
Neuroticism	-.37	-.30	-0.50
General satisfaction	.15	.28	-.82
Dominance (Do)	.25	.08	1.03
Capacity for status (Cs)	.22	-.01	1.41
Sociability (Sy)	.30	.14	.98
Social presence (Sp)	.32	.10	1.43
Self acceptance (Sa)	-.02	.13	-.96
Sense of well being (Wb)	.31	.16	.90
Responsibility (Re)	.15	.03	.69
Socialization (So)	-.05	.29	-2.12*
Self control (Sc)	.12	.24	.78
Tolerance (To)	.39	.31	.54
Good Impression (Gi)	.22	.26	.29
Communality (Cm)	.07	-.14	1.23
Achievement via Conformance (Ac)	.24	.24	.03
Achievement via independence (Ai)	.22	.07	.90
Intellectual efficiency (Ie)	.46	.14	2.11*
Psychological mindedness (Py)	.20	.17	.17
Flexibility (Fx)	.21	.13	.50
Femininity (Fe)	-.01	.13	-.81

*p < 0.05

APPENDIX E

Comparison of correlations of the Job Description
Index and the Job Attitude Scale with all Variables
under study (Female Sample, N=33)

Variables	Correlation Coefficients		t
	J.A.S.	J.D.I.	
Neuroticism	.24	-.25	2.00*
General Satisfaction	.01	.33	-1.30
Dominance (Do)	.11	-.10	.83
Capacity for status (Cs)	-.15	.19	-1.33
Sociability (Sy)	.07	.19	-.47
Social presence (Sp)	.13	.08	.20
Self acceptance (Sa)	.13	-.05	.71
Sense of well being (Wb)	.16	.29	-.57
Responsibility (Re)	-.02	.23	-1.00
Socialization (So)	-.07	.43	-2.15*
Self control (Sc)	-.03	.34	-1.5
Tolerance (To)	.10	.35	-1.05
Good impression (Gi)	-.01	.27	-1.10
Communality (Cm)	-.00	.22	-.87
Achievement via conformance (Ac)	.06	.28	-1.38
Achievement via independence (Ai)	.19	.19	.01
Intellectual efficiency (Ie)	.19	.37	-.76
Psychological mindedness (Py)	.10	.03	.26
Flexibility (Fx)	.11	.03	.32
Femininity (Fe)	.00	-.18	.70

* $p < 0.05$